EU Mediterranean Policies Still Lack a Unified Scientific Approach

ALBINA OSREČKI,
Zagreb, Croatia

The plurality of approaches to understanding Euro-Mediterranean relationship represents a challenge for the EU policy formulation. This article provides an overview of the approaches' potential overlap in giving EU policy-making advice via an integrative approach called Analysis of Foreign Policy (AFP). The novelty in applying AFP approach provides parallel analysis of EU Mediterranean policies that other approaches lack, and enables application of their comparative analysis thanks to its two main components: levels of analysis of foreign policy and phases of foreign policy process.

Key words: Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, European Neighborhood Policy, Union for the Mediterranean, Analysis of Foreign Policy.

INTRODUCTION

For the last two decades the EU has been addressing the Mediterranean as its south neighborhood with three different policies: Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) from 1995–2008, European Neighborhood Policy (ENP) since 2004 and Union for the Mediterranean (UFM) since 2008. The first two were initiated as EU policies (Gillespie 2008, 278) whereas UFM as substitute for the unsuccessful EMP was initiated by one of its member states[1] and at later stage has been accepted in a modified version by the EU institutions and has been implemented in parallel with the ENP. So far, a number of different approaches in the field of social sciences and particularly

---

1   UFM was launched on the initiative of the (then) French president Nicholas Sarkozy during the period when France presided over Council of the EU in the second half of 2008.

in discipline of international relations (IR) have been applied in analyzing the EMP, the ENP and the UFM. However, the plurality of approaches to understanding Euro-Mediterranean relationship and prescribing various policy solutions, represent a big challenge for the EU policy formulation. The aim of this review article thus is to provide an overview of the approaches' potential overlap in giving EU policy-making advice via an integrative approach called Analysis of Foreign Policy.

VARIETY OF IR-GROUNDED APPROACHES TO UNDERSTANDING THE EURO-MEDITERRANEAN AREA

At first impression the reason for this observation is understandable in view of divergent character of EU Mediterranean policies (the latter including discourse, strategic vision, modes of cooperation with Mediterranean Partner Countries – MPC, and different ways of financing their activities). I will briefly illustrate the differences in character between the EMP, the ENP and the UFM based on the analysis of their founding documents.[2]

With regard to *discourse*, the EMP was placing an emphasis on comprehensive cooperation in different issue areas[3] and solidarity in keeping with privileged nature of the links forged by neighborhood and history (Barcelona Declaration 1995, 2) while the UFM has focused on the quality of cooperation by putting an emphasis on equality of EU member states and MPC e.g. envisaging summit meetings taking place alternatively in the EU and in MPC, as well as establishing a co-presidency from the EU and the elected Mediterranean Partner Country respectively (Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean 2008, 14). However, the ENP has defined the Mediterranean region as

---

2   Barcelona Declaration (1995) of the First Euro-Mediterranean Summit inaugurating EMP; ENP Strategy Paper (2004) and Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean (2008) launching UFM.

3   These are trade, migration, political cooperation, and forging cultural and social links. (Council of the European Union. 1995. First Euro-Mediterranean Summit: Barcelona Declaration. D(95) Barcelona, November 27–28.)

an area undergoing serious problems of stagnation, social unrest and unresolved conflicts (ENP Strategy Paper 2004, 3) while partners have been in an inferior position in relation to the EU.

On the subject of *strategic vision*, the EMP had a long term aim of achieving Euro-Mediterranean cooperation, the ENP has focused exclusively on safeguarding its (security and energy) interests, while the UFM represents a technocratic idea based on short term practical technical projects that are easy to reach an agreement on and enable avoidance of political deadlocks that were so frequent in the framework of the EMP (Gillespie 2008, 277; Delgado 2011, 41).

On the issue of *modes of cooperation* with MPC, the EMP applied non-governmental type of cooperation in which the emphasis was put on strengthening decentralization that made room for activities of civil society (Johansson-Nogués in Bicchi and Gillespie ed. 2012, 35). On the other hand, the ENP has been based on co-operation between EU institutions (European Commission) and governments of individual MPC. In fact, the ENP has been created at a time when the common discourse with Mediterranean partners was lacking (after terrorist attacks in the US in 2001) and therefore it has not developed closer ties with civil society institutions (ibid). The UFM in comparison with the ENP has represented the 'classical type' of intergovernmental cooperation on individual basis between EU member states and MPC without discrimination and interference of the EU institutions (Xenakis and Charalambos 2009, 131).

In terms of *financing*, the activities in the EMP were financed from the EU budget as has been the case with activities in the ENP since 2004. However, the UFM as intergovernmental body has had the possibility to secure funds from different sources: from the EU institutions as well as its member states with interest in particular Mediterranean projects; from funds that MPC have provided by themselves; and from private donors or other interested actors (particular country, banks, other intergovernmental organization etc.)[4]

---

4   The World Bank, the African Development Bank, the Arab Development Bank, Gulf Cooperation Council (Hunt 2012, 174).

This short description of divergence in character/nature of the EU Mediterranean policies is accompanied with parallel differentiation in approaches that have been applied in analyses of the EMP, the ENP and the UFM. For Del Sarto (2006, 9) the EMP was prompted by security reasons but the EU was dealing with problems of security in the EMP in an unconventional e.g. non-military way. Along this line the EU extended cooperation with MPC on issues of economic as well as social security that characterize a *security community* (*SC*) approach; within the latter, a security community is defined as a community of sovereign states that do not resort to force in settling their disputes (Deutsch et al 1957, 5). Given the fact that SC was the model for unification of the EU itself, those researchers who have applied this approach in analyzing the EMP (Bellamy 2004, 11; Adler and Barnett in Adler and Barnett ed. 1998; Adler and Crawford in Adler et al 2006; Attiná in Adler et al 2006) have adjusted it in a way that all MPC cooperating in the EMP have not gained the perspective to the EU membership but have only got the opportunity to work closely with the EU on countering negative consequences for the EU of illegal migration, terrorism and organized crime.

Kodmani (in Crocker et al 2011) applied *regional* approach to analyzing the EMP. This approach advocates broadening of regional cooperation on as many different areas as possible, for which the EU as well as MPC have expressed their interest. Although the concept of the EMP was suited to regionalism approach that advocated creation of common Euro-Mediterranean region, the actual processes were drifting towards regionalization defined as informal and spontaneous processes of interaction and exchange of ideas in many areas of cooperation (Hettne and Söderbaum 2005, 545). For this reason, Bojinović Fenko when dealing with processes of regionalization in the Mediterranean apply *New Regionalism Approach* (*NRA*) as a sub-branch of regionalism which (in relation to 'old' regionalism applied in the second half of 20th century) does not conceptualize Mediterranean region as a physical entity but as a region in perpetual process of changes e.g. as a region in the process of becoming rather than being (Bojinović Fenko 2012, 5).

The UFM with its intergovernmental character signifies a move from regionalism of the EMP towards functionalism (Holden 2011) which can be observed in promotion of regional projects of common interests for the EU and the MPC. In the context of the UFM, it means co-operation of private businesses and interested international agencies as donors in areas of common interests. At the same time, commitment on the part of MPC regarding implementation of political and economic reforms is omitted (Schlumberger in Bicchi and Gillespie ed. 2012, 144), which is in accordance with classical functionalist approach. However, due to political influences (continuing tensions between Israel and Mediterranean Arab Partner Countries) there has been a continuing politicization that has made co-operation in UFM more complicated than it had previously been in the EMP, which makes argument for *neo-functionalism* (rather than classical functionalism) as the approach describing the functioning of the UFM (Holden 2011, 157). Neo-functionalism is characterized by strong influences of EU institutions, which is not entirely consistent with 'pure' functionalism that can explain realization of practical (apolitical) Mediterranean projects. Therefore it comes as no surprise that a great many academic works written on the UFM are dealing with the question of how to strengthen functionality in relation to politicization (Aliboni 2009; Aliboni and Ammor 2009; Bicchi 2011; Darbouche 2012; Delgado 2011; Del Sarto 2011; Gillespie 2008; Gillespie 2012a; Gillespie 2012b; Johansson-Nogués 2012).

Manners (in Whitman and Wolff 2010, 35) has applied *constructivism* to understand the functioning of the ENP. Constructivism starts from the assumption that international relations are a social construction that is guided by material structure (propitious as well as unfavorable external influences) and collective norms that are agreed upon principles of conduct by actors and shape their identities, interests and actions (Checkel in Smith et al 2008, 78; Behravesh 2011, 5). For Manners (in Whitman and Wolff 2010, 35) the adoption of the ENP introduced changes in identities of actors that led into their different interests visible through divergent aims of the ENP in comparison with the aims of previous EMP and subsequent UFM. Identity means an understanding that actor gets about themselves and their place in social

world when identifying others against whose alleged identity they form their own identity (Kubálková 2001, 33). The ENP signaled the changes in identity from 'partners' (visible in the official name of the EMP) to 'neighbors' (again visible in the official name of the ENP). The basic characteristic of partnership is equality and non-discrimination between partners, which is not visible in relations with neighbors as neighborhood is a category of physical closeness but it does not say anything about legal status of this type of interrelationship (Biscop 2003, 7). The ENP signifies the shift in the EU perception of identity of MPC (particularly Mediterranean Arab Partner countries) that were treated as security threat for the EU especially after the September 11th 2001 (and 2004 and 2005 Madrid and London terrorist attacks). The latter prompted the introduction of the ENP with the aim of protecting the external borders of the EU immediately after its biggest enlargement (in 2004) from 15 to 25 member states. Constructivism thus offered a new understanding of EU Mediterranean policies. Constructivists understand immaterial ideational structures in terms of international rules and norms which motivate actors' identities and via identities they construct interests (Bojinović Fenko 2012, 11). Thus interests of actors change if identities change (internalization of new norms via logic of appropriateness) or if norms are not internalized but follow only instrumentally (logic of consequences). In the case of EU Mediterranean policies interests of the EU institutions changed in parallel with changes in identities of MPC, which was visible through change of aims from joint Euro-Mediterranean security (in EMP) to security of the EU borders only (in ENP) thus labeling the status of MPC from partners (in EMP) to neighbors (in ENP).

After 2011 *Euro-Mediterranean regional security complex* (*EMRSC*) as a new approach to analyzing the UFM has been introduced. It represents the adapted version of Regional security complex (RSC) approach of Buzan and Waever (2003) according to which the degree of interdependence is more intense between actors within RSC which have the same (securitized[5]) problems

---

5   Securitization is a speech act that moves one topic away from politics and into an area of security concerns thereby legitimating extraordinary means on the part of state authorities against the socially constructed threat (Buzan and Waever 2003, 481).

rather than between actors among different RSCs. Regional level thus becomes the main level of analysis, and regions are not defined by geography or common culture but are social constructs of its member states designed according to processes of (de)securitization having impact on their security (Buzan and Waever, 2003). Boening (2014) was the first to apply EMRSC approach in her analysis of the UFM. The UFM territorially encompasses all EU member states and all non-EU states that share the Mediterranean coast, which broadens the territorial scope compared to its predecessor – by including Balkan Mediterranean states. After the onset of 'Arab Spring' in 2011, the countries of the whole Euro-Mediterranean area share the same security problems, which according to Boening has led to macro-securitization of the area by identifying the same existential threats that call for joint protection measures of their common interests (Boening 2014, 5–6).

Here we can identify areas of overlap between different approaches in analyzing EU Mediterranean policies. The first overlap regards their common area of interest or more precisely the issue of securitization. SC approach and (EM)RSC deal with security concerns although SC approach broadens their scope beyond military aspects of security and processes of securitization (as seen by (EM)RSC in UFM) on economic and social security in EMP, while constructivism explains the shift in EU Mediterranean policies' interests from joint Euro-Mediterranean security in EMP to security of the EU only in ENP. The second overlap regards defining the space in which EU Mediterranean policies apply. In this regard SC approach together with EM(RSC) and regionalism define regions by elements other than geography, which in the case of SC and (EM)RSC applied in the Mediterranean area are processes of (de)securitization, while regionalism places emphasis on common historical links between north of the Mediterranean (EU) and south (MPC).

However, the major difference between the analyzed approaches which makes it more prominent in comparison to their overlaps concerns three different areas of interests, which make the substance of EU Mediterranean policies and can be summarized as follows. Security is the first area of interest that is prominent in three approaches as stated above in the context of overlapping SC, (EM)RSC and constructivism approaches. The

second area of interest is creating common regional space for EU Mediterranean policies in EMP that is in the focus of regionalism. And finally, the third area of interest that lies in the core of (neo) functionalism approach concerns the realization of common regional projects in UFM for EU institutions and/or its member states, MPC, other interested regional/international agencies, banks and private business. These findings call for an integrative approach that could be applicable to EMP, ENP and UFM.

I argue that *Analysis of Foreign Policy* (*AFP*) could be such an approach. AFP originates from the end of 20th Century in Europe and differs from the *Foreign Policy Analysis* (*FPA*) that came into existence in the USA during 1950-ies at a time when Realism was the main theory in International Relations and state was the main foreign policy actor. Unlike FPA, the AFP has introduced a new type of foreign policy actor such as international governmental organization. As the EU is such an organization, it qualifies as a foreign policy actor *per se*. Also, the AFP focuses on different levels of analyzing foreign policy (Hudson 2014, 213; Russett and Starr 1996, 13–16; White in Carlsnaes et al 2004, 246) and thus it is applicable to regional level of analysis that applies to EU Mediterranean policies, as well as 'bureaucracy' level as pointing below by linking domestic environment and politics of MPC to the EU foreign policy.

In my opinion, the AFP has two advantages in comparison to all other approaches which allow its future application as a scientific approach for analyzing all three EU Mediterranean policies. The first one is its applicability for a comparative analysis of all three EU Mediterranean policies thanks to its two main components: levels of analysis of foreign policy and phases of foreign policy process. Levels of analysis explain who the actor in foreign policy process is (Russett and Starr 1996, 19). In the case of EU Mediterranean policies, levels of analysis are bureaucracy (Osrečki, 2016, 93–96) pertaining to the EU institutions that formulate and then adopt EU Mediterranean policies, and regional level due to the fact that all three EU Mediterranean policies are implemented jointly by EU institutions and MPC on regional level. The shift to regional level of analysis also represents the move from foreign policy adoption to foreign policy

environment (Hudson 2014, 161) e.g. to the implementation phase of adopted EU foreign policies in regional (Mediterranean) setting. In this context, the AFP can be described as multilevel approach (Hudson 2014, 6; Ruggie 1993, 172) when applied to the analysis of EU Mediterranean policies.

Phases of foreign policy process (phases of formulation, decision-making and implementation of EU Mediterranean policies) are the second component of the AFP that makes comparative analysis possible in cases of all three EU Mediterranean policies. Phases of foreign policy process show the extent to which the EU institutions are capable to initiate, adopt and consequently implement EU Mediterranean policies thus revealing the capability on the part of the EU to act as a regional actor. In fact, the AFP has evolved round the idea of the EU as a foreign policy actor. Thus the AFP is also actor-specific approach that explains the conduct of the EU as a concrete actor and not a state as an actor in general (Hudson in Smith et al 2012, 14).

The second advantage of the AFP in comparison to all other approaches in analyzing EU Mediterranean policies lays in the fact that it combines some elements of the other approaches (see table 1). First, the AFP combines elements of RSC and regionalism by applying regional level of foreign policy analysis [although RSC and regionalism differ in one aspect: RSC focuses on security threats that tend to split the Mediterranean region on the EU side (the north) and Mediterranean partners' side (the south), while regionalism places emphasis on processes of integration within the Mediterranean region]. Secondly, the AFP includes elements of functionalism that are visible through phases of foreign policy process. In fact, the implementation phase reveals the extent to which Mediterranean projects that are both in the interest of the EU as well as MPC are implemented and the quality of this implementation. Thirdly, the AFP is linked to constructivism through international *norms* that according to the latter shape interests and thus actions of actors (the EU and MPC), and their second overlap is seen in *actors* (EU institutions) which according to the AFP act according to domestic values (potentially inferred via international norms) to maximize their interests.

Table 1: Overlapping of approaches in analysis of EU Mediterranean policies

Approaches	Number of overlaps	SC	(EM)RSC	Regionalism	(Neo) functionalism	Constructivism	AFP
SC	3	–	Securitization / Mediterranean region not defined by geography	Mediterranean region not defined by geography		Securitization	
(EM)RSC	3	Securitization / Mediterranean region not defined by geography	–	Mediterranean region not defined by geography		Securitization	
Regionalism	2	Mediterranean region not defined by geography	Mediterranean region not defined by geography	–			
(Neo) functionalism	0				–		
Constructivism	2	Securitization	Securitization			–	
AFP	4	Regional level of foreign policy analysis			Phases of foreign policy process (implementation)	International norms and actors (EU institutions and MPC)	–

Source: Author's own analysis

CONCLUSION

A brief overview of approaches applied so far in analyzing the EU Mediterranean policies points to their moderate overlapping. However, the existing overlap between approaches regarding the definition of the problems is not getting any stronger, but is possible via application of the AFP as an integrative approach. Thus the novelty in applying AFP approach is in providing us with parallel analysis of EU Mediterranean policies that other approaches lack, and additionally in giving us more complete assessment of effectiveness on the part of actors involved in all phases of foreign policy process in which two existing EU Mediterranean policies (ENP and UFM) are being created, adopted and implemented.

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTOR

Albina Osrečki received her PhD in IR at the University of Zagreb (Croatia), Faculty of Political Sciences in 2016. She is currently employed as an analyst in the Ministry of Interior, the Republic of Croatia. Her research interests include Mediterranean policy of the EU in general, with particular emphasis on phenomena of incoherence and inconsistency in EU's external action towards the Mediterranean. Her recent publications include: (1). OSREČKI, Albina. New Media and Arab Spring. Political Thought, Zagreb, ISSN 0032–3241. [Online ed.], 2014, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 101–122. file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/intkor428/My%20Documents/Downloads/Politicka_misao_3_2014_101_122_OSRECKI.pdf. (2) OSREČKI, Albina. Partial Coherence of Aims in the Mediterranean policies of the EU. Political Analyses, Zagreb, ISSN 1847–4977. [Online ed.], 2015, vol. 6, no. 23, pp. 53–58. file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/intkor428/My%20Documents/Downloads/PA_23_Osrecki.pdf. E-mail: albinaosrecki@gmail.com.

REFERENCES

Adler, E., and M. Barnett 1998. 'A Framework for the Study of Security Communities.' In *Security Communities*, ed. Adler, E., and M. Barnett, 29–65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, E., and B. Crawford. 2006. 'Normative Power: The European Practice of Region Building and the Case of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership.' In *The Convergence of Civilizations; Constructing a Mediterranean Region*, ed. Adler, M., Crawford E., Bicchi and R. Del Sarto, 3–47. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Aliboni, R. 2009. 'The Union for the Mediterranean; Evolution and prospects.' *Istituto Affari Internazionali* IAI 09 (2009): 1–19. Accessed October 11, 2014. http://www.researchgate.net/publication/242582504_The_Union_for_the_Mediterranean_Evolution_and_Prospects.

Aliboni, R., and F. Ammor. 2009. 'Under the Shadow of Barcelona; From the EMP to the Union for the Mediterranean.' *EuroMeSCo* 77 (2009): 1–14. Accessed October 10, 2014. http://www.euromesco.net/euromesco/images/paper77eng.pdf.

Attiná, F. 2006. 'The Building of Regional Security Partnership and the Security-Culture Divide in the Mediterranean Region.' In *The Convergence of Civilizations; Constructing a Mediterranean Region*, ed. Adler E., Crawford B., Bicchi, F. and R. Del Sarto, 239–265. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Behravesh, M. 2011. 'The Relevance of Constructivism to Foreign Policy Analysis.' *E-International Relations* (2011): 1–5. Accessed August 14. http://www.e-ir.info/2011/07/17/the-relevance-of-constructivism-to-foreign-policy-analysis/.

Bellamy, A. 2004. '*Security Communities and their Neighbors; Regional Fortresses or Global Integrators*.' Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Bicchi, F. 2011. 'The Union for the Mediterranean, or the Changing Context of Euro-Mediterranean Relations.' *Mediterranean Politics* 16 (1): 3–19.

Biscop, S. 2003. '*Euro-Mediterranean Security; a Search for Partnership*.' Ashgate: Aldershot.

Boening, A. 2014. '*The Arab Spring; Re-Balancing the Grater Euro-Mediterranean*.' Heidelberg: Springer.

Bojinović Fenko, A. 2012. 'Theorizing the Role of Identity in the Change of the Level of Regionness; From Regional Society to Regional Community in the Case of the Mediterranean.' *22nd IPSA World Congress*. Madrid, 08–12 July, 2012. Accessed July 20. http://www.paperroom.ipsa.org/papers/paper_7147.pdf.

Buzan, B., and O. Waever. 2003. '*Regions and Powers*.' Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Checkel, J. 2008. 'Constructivism and Foreign Policy.' In *Foreign Policy; Theories, Actors, Cases*, ed. Smith, S., Hadfield A., and T. Dunne, 71–82. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Council of the European Union. 1995. First Euro-Mediterranean Summit: Barcelona Declaration. D(95) Barcelona, November 27–28. Accessed December 2. http://ec.europa.eu/external-relations/euromed/bd.htm.

–––. 2008. Joint Declaration of the Paris Summit for the Mediterranean. D(08). Paris, July 15. Accessed May 12. http://www.consilium.europa.en/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/er/101847.pdf.

Darbouche, H. 2012. 'Third Time Lucky? Euro-Mediterranean Energy Co-operation under the Union for the Mediterranean'. In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, ed. Bicchi F., and R. Gillespie, 191–209. London: Routledge.

Delgado, M. 2011. 'France and the Union for the Mediterranean; Individualism versus Co-operation'. *Mediterranean Politics* 16 (1): 39–57.

Del Sarto, R. 2006. 'Contested State Identities and Regional Security in the Euro-Mediterranean Area.' Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Del Sarto, R. 2011. 'Plus ça change … Israel, the EU and the Union for the Mediterranean.' *Mediterranean Politics* 16 (1): 117–134.

Deutsch, K., S. Burrell, R. Kann, M. Lee, M. Lichterman, R. Lindgren, F. Loewenheim, and R. Van Wagenen. 1957. '*Political Community and the North Atlantic Area; International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience*.' New York: Princeton University Press.

European Commission. 2004. Communication from the Commission: European Neighborhood Policy – Strategy Paper. COM(2004) 373 final. 12 May. Accessed October 14. http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/strategy/strategy_paper_en.pdf.

Gillespie, R. 2008. 'A 'Union for the Mediterranean' … or for the EU.' *Mediterranean Politics* 13 (2): 277–286.

Gillespie, R. 2012a. 'The UFM Found Wanting: European Responses to the Challenge of Regime Change in the Mediterranean.' In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, ed. Bicchi F. and R. Gillespie, 211–223. London: Routledge.

Gillespie, R. 2012b. 'Adapting to French 'Leadership'? Spain's Role in the Union for the Mediterranean.' In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, ed. Bicchi F., and R. Gillespie, 57–76. London: Routledge.

Hettne, B., and Söderbaum, F. 2005. 'Civilian Power or Soft Imperialism? EU as a Global Actor and the Role of Interregionalism.' *European Foreign Affairs Review* 19 (4): 535–552.

Holden, P. 2011. 'A New Beginning? Does the Union for the Mediterranean Herald a New Functionalist Approach to Co-operation in the Region?' *Mediterranean Politics* 16 (1): 155–169.

Hudson, V. 2012. 'The history and evolution of Foreign Policy Analysis.' In *Foreign Policy; Theories, Actors, Cases*, ed. Smith S., Hadfield, A. and T. Dunne, 13–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hudson, V. 2014. Foreign Policy Analysis; Classic and Contemporary Theory. Second Edition. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hunt, D. 2012. 'The UFM and Development Prospects in the Mediterranean; Making a Real Difference.' In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, edited by Federica Bicchi and Richard Gillespie, 169–190. London: Routledge.

Johansson-Nogués, E. 2012. 'The UFM's Institutional Structure; Making Inroads towards Co-ownership?' In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, ed. Bicchi F. and R. Gillespie, 19–36. London: Routledge.

Kodmani, B. 2011. 'The Imported, Supported and Homegrown Security of the Arab World.' In *Rewiring Regional Security in a fragmented World*, ed. Crocker A. C., and P. Aall, 221–252. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Kubálková, V. 2001. 'Foreign Policy, International Politics, and Constructivism.' In *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, ed. V. Kubálková, 15–37. Armonk: M. E. Sharpe.

Manners, I. 2010. 'European Union Normative Power in the European Neighborhood Policy.' In *The European Neighborhood Policy in Perspective; Context, Implementation and Impact*, ed. Whitman, R. G., and S. Wolff, 29–50. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Osrečki, A. 2016. 'European Union External Action: Inconsistency of Political Process and Incoherence of Aims in the Case of the Mediterranean Region.' Doctoral thesis. University of Zagreb.

Ruggie, J. 1993. 'Territoriality and beyond: Problematising Modernity in International Relations.' *International Organization* 47 (1): 139–174.

Russett, B., and H. Starr. 1996. '*World Politics: The Menu for Choice*.' New York: W. H. Freeman and Co.

Schlumberger, O. 2012. "The Ties that do not Bind; the Union for the Mediterranean and the Future of Euro-Arab Relations". In *The Union for the Mediterranean*, ed. Bicchi F., and R. Gillespie, 133–151. London: Routledge.

Xenakis, D., and T. Charalambos. 2009. 'Greece's Mediterranean Perspective and the French Initiative.' *Hellenic Studies* 17 (2): 123–146.

White, B. 2004. 'Foreign Policy Analysis and the New Europe.' In *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, ed. Carlsnaes W., Sjursen M., and B. White, 11–31. London: SAGE Publishers.