EUrope and the World: Perspectives on EUrope - The English School Meets Post-Colonialism

Introduction

Yannis A. Stivachtis[1]

[1] Department of Political Science, Virginia Tech, VA, USA

Correspondence: Yannis A. Stivachtis, Department of Political Science, Virginia Tech, 119 Major Williams Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA. Tel: 1-540-231-5816. E-mail: ystivach@vt.edu

Europe is in flux, as is the Europe Union (EU). There may be institutions, commissions, ranks, codified policies, and (the illusion of) structures; it seems, however, that ultimately there is also movement, change, instability, hybridity, and –in the contemporary world of advanced capitalism, €-crisis, and economic hazard – a great deal of uncertainty, surprise, and psychology. Beyond 'structures' and 'policy' one needs therefore, if one wishes to understand the EU and act politically in any meaningful way, to explore and decipher perceptions, political language, beliefs, ideologies, and the political thought of, and within, Europe and the European Union. Only through the study of perceptions, political language, beliefs, ideologies, and political thought can one understand and respond politically to transformations, changes, instabilities, and crises. This seems in present times even more important than ever. Very rarely, however, operate perceptions solipsistically within and through the self, even though they are very often believed to do, constructed in some binary opposition opposite a stigmatized 'other'. Under such circumstances they then need to be and become practically reassured in violent and martial ways. In order to overcome self-centrism and to accomplish less instrumentalized relations, i.e. freed from binary stigmatizations, one not only has to investigate perceptions of Europe and the EU about itself, but also, and with at least the same importance, perceptions of Europe and the EU from 'outside'. This is the main purpose and focus of this issue.

Further to such theoretical considerations, such an investigation seems empirically particularly relevant because Europe, historically and present-day, extensively invokes and invoked images of the non-European 'other' for its own identity constructions. Therefore, it is important to ask how do these 'others' reversely perceive and think about Europe: how are Europe and the EU being seen from around the world? What are the objects of such perceptions: the EU as a regional organization; EU enlargement; European 'free' trade and Europe as an economic partner; Europe as an institution; as a global power; as a 'soft' power? Or: 'Europe' as a geographical entity and space? And/or: 'Europe' as inhabiting the most forceful colonial and imperial powers of the past, very often key and founding members of the EU itself? Thus: what part plays history and historical consciousness of European relations to the world; and to which degree? From an analytical point of view one also has to ask what kind of theories and concepts seem appropriate to understand and explore those questions and related dynamics?

This brief sketch outlines the key concerns and questions which are asked and addressed in this special issue; and which are explored looking into political perceptions and discourses on Europe and the EU from around the world: the Middle East; Russia; China; Japan; the United States; Latin America; the ASEAN; sub-Saharan Africa; and Turkey. The editor does not wish to summarize those individual contributions and their empirical findings; they may speak for themselves, each engaged in giving respective peoples and states a voice towards, vis-à-vis, and sometimes also opposite Europe and the European Union. In contrast to an attempt to summarize, this Introduction aims at outlining the analytical focus of the study of perceptions of Europe as it underlies more or less explicitly the single contributions in this issue chosen by their authors to discuss and deal with their topics.

Europe and the EU as a historical movement of emergence, extension, contraction, thus of change and transformations, is a theme which seems to be covered by the study of "international society" through an English School perspective. The understanding of Europe as an international society in historical existence, emerging, extending, and finally exporting its institutions on a global scale is an ontological and epistemological approach which is easily applicable to the EU (see , for example, Czaputowicz, 2003). Many valuable and important studies have been undertaken by English School scholars exploring historical movements of European states

(Wight, 1977; Watson, 1992; Bull/Watson, 1984; Butterfield/Wight, 1969; Stivachtis 1998), primarily focusing on transformations from what is called "international system" to "international society". When finding those transformations, English School scholars appear enthused by the fact that (what they call) 'anarchy' can be overcome by some form of socialization among states; and they appear enthused to such a degree that while pursuing and studying historical oscillations between 'anarchy'/ 'system' and 'socialization'/'society' they tend to forget, or ignore, that respective movements of international society do not only represent forms of socialization, but, too, are articulations of violence.

With a few exceptions and only quite recent, did studies in the scholarly environment of the English School engage the question of violence inherent in the movements of international societies (Gong, 1984; Little and Buzan, 2009; Linklater, 2011). It is, however, not only the lateness of such thematizations by English School authors (widely understood), but also their Western-centric and Hegelian ontology why those thematizations stay limited to understanding non-Western thinking as 'mimicry' to Western scholarship and as 'pre-theoretical'! (Note 1). Through such limitations their view and thematizations of violence incremental to every international society's movement remains arbitrary and random where it would need to be systematic and built-in the ontology of the study of international society.

Such engagement has therefore to focus on colonial and imperial politics, mostly exerted by European states between the 1500s and into the Twentieth century. The study of legacies of colonial and imperial politics applies, too, to the study of the EU as some recent publications have tried to show (Phillipson, 1992, 2002; Behr,2007; Böröcz and Kovács, 2001; Zielonka, 2006; Hansen, 2002; Diez, 1999; Foster, 2010). This focus, namely the study of the EU questioning and exploring its colonial and imperial legacies, creates an interesting encounter between the English School and post-colonial study; an encounter and combination which seems further to offering interesting insights necessary since eight of twenty-seven (27) Member States of the European Union have been colonial powers, some of them until long after World War II.

One therefore must at least hypothesize that this history and respective legacies play a role in perceptions of the EU from 'outside'. And, as the discussions in this volume demonstrate, they indeed do to varying degrees. So it is particularly from Middle Eastern, Chinese, South and Latin American, sub-Sahara African, ASEAN, and Turkish perspectives that colonial and imperial past plays an important role in perceptions of Europe and the European Union (Note 2). Europe as the 'subject of history' (in the words of Chakrabarty, 2000) and the colonial/imperial experience still seem to resonate within the experience, memory, and public discourses of many societies 'outside' Europe. The EU would thus be well advised to take those perceptions serious and to translate related 'outside' perceptions into policies of respect, humility, and fairness; and, accordingly, to avoid politics which enforce those legacies and perceptions respectively. In any case such rhetoric as Barroso's on the EU as empire (Note 3), do not seem to reassure those 'outside'-voices and do not represent the EU as a 'new', non-colonial, anti-imperial Europe; particularly because Barroso managed to speak about the EU as empire even without referring to and mentioning those who were colonized and imperialized by European powers. He only referred to the EU Member States as if the anxieties of colonialization and imperialization were shared most vividly and only by those within the empire: a bizarre idea. At best this is very unluckily worded; at worst it may irritate societies 'outside' Europe.

What we learn from the study of perceptions of the EU from around the world (from 'outside') is the merging of Europe and the EU in and through those perceptions: Europe and the history, memories and legacies of its politics are not distinct from, indeed are very often seen as interwoven with, the European Union (Note 4). But what perceptions of Europe and the EU dominate the picture of Europe and its integration within societies which have not been actively subjugated to European colonialism (such as Russia) and liberated themselves very early on respectively, such as the United States?

The Structure of the Volume

The present volume is divided into ten articles. In the first article, Hartmut Behr argues that the idea and study of international society can be applied empirically to Europe and the Europe Union (EU). According to Behr, as the example of EUrope most clearly demonstrates, the development of international society genuinely depends upon violence in its peripheries. In EUrope's case this is exemplified by colonialism and imperialism of European states most of which are now core members of the European Union. Therefore, the author suggests, the study of Europe and the EU is ontologically linked to the study of colonialism and post-colonialism that founds and necessitates epistemologically an historical and comparative approach. According to Behr, the refusal of this ontology and epistemology may enable to study internal policy processes, but would remain within self-centric and solipsistic foci on the European 'Self' and would thus block systematically all attempts to interrelate the EU

to the world. Such a refusal would further render it impossible to envision the EU as an international or even global actor conducting policies other than hegemonic and paternalistic.

In the second article, Europe's relations with the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) is discussed by Raymond Hinnebusch in the context of normative (International Society) and materialist approaches (World System's Theory). The author first summarizes European imperialism's export of a flawed Westphalian state system and then demonstrates how Europe is "caught" between MENA and the US and co-opted into a division of labour toward the region. Hinnebusch also examines the gap between the normative rhetoric and actual inequitable outcomes and structures constructed under the Euro-Mediterranean partnership looking at the three "baskets" of economic developmental, political reform and cultural convergence. Hinnebusch employs four "hard cases": EU policies toward Palestine, Iran, Syria and Turkey to illustrate the ambiguities of the EU's approach to MENA. The author concludes that the EU MENA policy is caught between the rhetoric of post-colonialism and practices of neo-colonialism.

In the next article, Sabine Fischer investigates how the EU is being perceived in Eastern Europe. Fischer argues that some neighbours have membership ambitions and see the EU as a model (cf. the enlargement/democracy narrative). For others, relations with the EU are an instrument to balance regional relations (cf. the geopolitical narrative). Finally, some perceive the EU as striving to expand its influence beyond its borders (cf. the value empire narrative). The article investigates the discourses on the EU in the eastern neighbourhood and Russia. It starts from the assumption that perceptions in the region have a strong impact on the EU's ability to pursue its policy goals. At the same time, EU policy influences debates in its partner countries. By examining this interrelationship the author seeks to provide an understanding of the extent to which the EU is able to play the role of an important regional actor in the post-Soviet space.

In the fourth article, Michael Barr examines the Chinese perceptions about the European Union. He points out that Sino-EU relations are officially described as a 'comprehensive strategic partnership' and are bound to play a key role in shaping the character of the newly-emerging multi-polar system. The author starts from the point that at present, the EU is China's biggest trading partner, while China is the EU's largest source of imports and second largest two-way trading partner. However, while recognising such closeness, Barr adopts a slightly more critical stance towards Sino-EU relations and analyses how internal political debates within China influences how leading Chinese actors construct various images of Europe. Central to this analysis is Chinese attempts to create counter narratives of both colonial history and of the structure of the state system as a way of challenging dominant European conceptions of order.

In the next article, Shogo Suzuki traces the historical evolution of the images of Europe in Japan. He argues that while the length of Japan's interactions with Europe do not compare to those between China, Korea, and Japan, the Europeans have nevertheless played a significant role in the process of constructing a Japanese identity. According to Suzuki, while Europe initially played a part in consolidating ethnocentric notions of Japanese superiority, since the expansion of European International Society in the late-nineteenth century, Europe has played a role as a "positive" other that Japan has frequently sought to emulate and mimic, even at the height of Japan's rebellion during the Asia-Pacific War of 1931-1945. Suzuki concludes that this dynamic has persisted to this day, even under the shadow of American hegemony and Japan's incorporation into this order after 1945.

In the sixth article, Yannis Stivachtis investigates the American perceptions of the EU and its role in world affairs. Drawing on the theoretical and historical framework of the English School, the article explores the American perceptions against the historical development of the relations of the United States with various European states and the EU as a whole. Stivachtis argues that American perceptions of the EU and of its international role have little or nothing to do with the American experience with European colonialism and imperialism. The existence of strong cultural, political, economic, and social ties between the U.S. and the European countries explains why the EU is trusted so much by the American public. Therefore, the author concludes, the divergence between the U.S. and the EU occurs within the bonds of a family of states that distinguishes itself from the rest of the international society.

In the seventh article, Joanildo Burity focuses on the Latin American perceptions of the EU and addresses two aspects of a critical perspective on issues of integration, in which the EU features as a model and a counterpart to South American processes: first, representations of cosmopolitan engagement in issues of development, rights and cultural identity; and second, participation in attempts to promote alternative forms of global governance. Burity argues that discourses of civil society activism and its global networks and participation in international fora enact an agonistic cosmopolitics where Europe appears as both model and adversary. Derrida's logic of exemplarity is introduced to illustrate this point, in contrast to intellectual responses from Latin America

emphasising globally connected localities – i.e. reconstructions of traditional ideas and signs of new discourses of community, religion and cultural identity as political resources. Such globalised localisms, according to Burity, reconfigure historically crystallised forms of "influence" of Europe on Latin America, problematise notions of cosmopolitanism, and contest representations of both identities and their historical links.

The next article, written by Noel Morada, examines ASEAN-EU relations using the framework of international society of the English School. The author attempts to examine the utility of pluralist and solidarist conceptions of international society in understanding the nature and dynamics of ASEAN-EU relations and the ASEM process. Morada argues that interregional relations between ASEAN and the EU have for the most part been determined by their identities as pluralist and solidarist societies, respectively, which is clearly manifested in their different perspectives and approaches on political, economic, and security issues. According to Morada, the EU is primarily considered a strategic partner of ASEAN in the latter's attempt to balance its relations with other external powers, particularly in dealing with rising power like China. However, Morada concludes, their partnership remains narrow and shallow even as the EU is perceived mainly as a donor to ASEAN's socioeconomic development goals.

In the ninth article, Siegmar Schmidt analyses African perceptions of the EU's policy toward Africa from a constructivist research perspective. From this perspective perceptions are important because they contribute to a foreign policy identity. The interaction of self-ascribed roles with external perceptions and expectations creates a foreign policy identity which manifests in foreign policy roles such as "civilian power". The main questions that Schmidt addresses are: How do African elites and Africans at large perceive the European Union (EU)? What is the image of the EU in Africa? The article gives a brief overview on historical legacies and the current interregional relations and assesses African perceptions of three key areas on the EU Africa policy: the EU's promotion of democracy and human rights, the EU's role in trade relations and the EU's policy in the field of peace and security. Schmidt demonstrates that the EU is neither fully viewed as a soft-power nor as a neo-colonialist power and points out that the EU's self-ascribed role is not fully accepted in Sub-Saharan Africa.

In the final chapter, Pinar Bilgin and Ali Bilgiç argue that the literature on Turkey-European Economic Community/Union (EEC/EU) relations mainly scrutinises how various EEC/EU actors vacillate on Turkey's accession to European integration contingent upon their image/s of Turkey. As a result, Turkey's own wavering vis-à-vis EEC/EU, is almost always explained with reference to its domestic dynamics (political and economic ups and downs) but not Turkey's policy-makers' image/s of the European Community/Union. According to the authors, what often goes unacknowledged is that throughout the history of Turkey-EEC/EU relations, Turkey's policy-makers' discourses have oscillated between representing EU/rope as a source of inspiration and a source of anxiety. Contra those readings of Turkey's relations with EU/rope as revolving around the dichotomy of 'Turkey being European/not', the authors' analysis of Turkey's policy-makers' discourses on EEC/EU at key moments of the relationship during 1959-2004 shows that Turkey's policy-makers' representations of EU/rope are structured around three binaries that give away a persistent ambivalence vis-à-vis EU/rope as a source of and a solution to Turkey's insecurities. Bilgin and Bilgiç conclude that such ambivalence, in turn, is not uncharacteristic of post-colonial encounters.

References

Behr, H. (2007). The European Union in the Legacies of Imperial Rule? EU Accession Politics viewed from an historical comparative perspective. *European Journal of Inter-national Relations, 13*(2), 239-262. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1354066107076956

Behr, H. (2010). *A History of International Political Theory: Ontologies of the International.* Basing-stoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Butterfield, H., & Wight, M. (Eds.). *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics* (pp. 89–131). London: George Allen & Unwin.

Buzan, B., & Little, R. (2009). Introduction: Watson and World History. In A. Watson (Eds.), *The Evolution of International Society*. London: Routledge.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference.* Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Czaputowicz, J. (2003). The English School of International Relations and Its Approach to European Integration. *Studies & Analyses, 2*(2), 3–55.

Diez, T. (1999). Speaking "Europe": The Politics of Integration Discourse. *Journal of European Public Policy, 6*(4), 598–613 (special issue). http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/135017699343496

Foster, R. (2010). *Tege Imperium!*: a Defence of Empire. *Global Discourse*. Retrieved December 22, 2011, from http://global-discourse.com/contents

Gong, G. W. (1984). *The Standard of 'Civilization' in International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hansen, P. (2002). European Integration, European Identity and the Colonial Connection. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(4), 483–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/136843102760513875

Hedley, B., & Watson, A. (eds.) (1984). *The Expansion of International Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jozsef, B., & Melinad, K. (Eds.). *Empire's New Clothes:Unveiling EU Enlargement*. Retrieved from www.ce-review.org

Linklater, A. (2011). *The Problem of Harm in World Politics: Theoretical Investigations*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2002). *English-only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Shani, G. (2008). Toward a Post-Western IR. *International Studies Review,* 10, 722-734. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2008.00828.x

Stivachtis, Y. (1998). *The Enlargement of International Society*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Watson, A. (1992). *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis*. London: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203415726

Wight, M. (1977). In H. Bull (ed.), *Systems of States*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Zielonka, J. (2006). Europe as Empire. *The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Notes

Note 1. More on that, see Shani, 2008: 723; Behr, 2010, Chapter III.

Note 2. See especially the papers by Hinnebusch, Barr, Burity, Schmidt, and Bilgin and Bilgic in this issue; for a more detailed theoretical discussion, see the paper by Behr.

Note 3. Sometimes I like to compare it to compare the EU as a creation to the organisation of empires. We have the dimension of Empire but there is a great difference. Empires were usually made with force with a centre imposing diktat, a will on the others. Now what we have is the first non-Imperial empire. We have 27 countries that fully decided to work together and to pool their sovereignty. I believe it is a great construction and we should be proud of it. At least, we in the Commission are proud of it; see also http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-I8M1T-GgRU.

Note 4. This merging explains the writing of 'Europe' in many contributions.