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The European Union's Role in Global Economic Governance.

In the following, I will describe and work my way through the following tasks:

“Discuss the relative utility of applying respectively realist and constructivist-inspired theories on the EU's role in global economic governance. Identify different realist (Hyde-Price, Kluth & Pilegaard, Rynning, etc.) and constructivist approaches covered in the course (Manners, Biava, Zielonka, etc.) and reflect on their respective strengths and weaknesses vis-à-vis the above.”

As a start, I have chosen to look at the concepts individually but with a clear line to the scientists, I have chosen to focus on in "Realism" and "Constructivism" and then work with approaches to the topic of connecting to give a brief assessment of their respective strengths and weaknesses!

**Realism**

Realism is working with a basic assumption that international relations are conflictual and that international conflicts ultimately decided by a war (or threats thereof). The main concern of each state is thus to ensure its own survival. Realism considers that international politics is first about power relations between states in the international system.

Realism is also working with the core assumption that the international system is an anarchic system; “There are no international organizations that have authority over the states”. While realism recognizes that there are actors other than states in the international system, they are not considered significant - more realists believe that international organizations can better be described as arenas for States' actions than as independent actors. (Wikipedia, 02/05/2014)

**Constructivism Realism**

Constructivism Realism is characterized by focusing on the international system's anarchic character. The constructivist provide external causes as the basis for international cooperation, and are much more focused on structures than on the players who are crucial to how the international community develops. In addition, using the realism positivist working methods according to constructivism means that you do not get the opportunity to come to a deeper understanding of human actions that are essential to international relations. (Wikipedia, 02/05/2014)

**General Key assumptions**

International systems are anarchic Structural Realism describes the international system as anarchic. Member States must provide for their own security and survival of a competitive world. (Waltz 1959).

States are the primary international actor’s realists emphasize the importance of groups, not individuals, in human history (Carr 2001 91). International politics is a daily competition between political groups, the most important of which is the state. The state is not the only international actor, but it is by far the most important, and it is states, particularly powerful, which sets the framework and establish rules for other actors, including the EU (Waltz 1979 94).
Structural realism and foreign policy analysis

A far bleaker outlook on international politics described exemplified by Duchene (1972) and Manners (2002). Structural realism cannot explain all actions and aspects of various EU matters, and not the shades that are in EU policy. However, it can explain both the Cold War origins and post-Cold War development of European Political Cooperation (EPC) and the CFSP.

Generally, states are faced with a limited number of options in a so-called anarchic self-help system. Powerful states enjoy more leeway than others do. However, the strategic opportunities more limited for the major powers than small states! Powers faces three options: Balancing, Old Maid and Bandwagoning:

- Balancing: Member States may seek to use EU Member States to use the EU to go up against one or to balance against a dominant global power, such as the United States. (Waltz 1979 128);
- Old Maid (Christensen and Snyder 1990): EU member states can "switch sides" and focus on other than the U.S. in place to deal with security threats in the Middle East or Asia-Pacific region (Taiwan, Korea), which provides good opportunity to focus on trade and economic issues;
- Bandwagoning: EU countries could adapt to the strongest power in the system to influence. (Schweller 1994.87).

The European Union as a state-like actor

The EU has evolved over time from primarily deal with internal matters of economic cooperation, to now being an actor with a significant influence in international affairs. In recent years, the EU has expanded its bureaucratic reach with a number of treaties of Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice treaties, and thus gained more authority over the internal affairs of the fiscal and regulatory policies. This increase in capacity leads to a higher degree of influence in international politics (Selden, 2010: 406-407).

The modern sovereign state.

However, what constitutes a state from an international perspective? The EU is sometimes described as a normative power, because the EU is primarily in changing norms. Thus, the EU has increasingly become a practitioner of normative power. (Manners 2002 240 252). It is clear that the EU lacks jurisdiction over sovereign states. As an example, the EU has no direct power in each country’s tax policy.

However, the EU has a direct impact on issues that were previously exclusive to the Member States, through its regulatory structure. While the EU cannot be seen as a state within a traditional Westphalia sense that the EU is clearly an institution that has taken on many of the characteristics of a state (Selden, 2010: 407). Kluth and Pilegaard believes that the EU should be seen as an entity acting jointly, and not simply as the unorganized sum of the actions of the individual member states. This means that the EU is a global player, which includes functions similar to a state, and the general approach reflects the characteristics of the individual member states (Kluth and Pilegaard, 2011: 46).
EU cannot have exactly the same structure as a nation, however, the EU has the right to formulate a common perspective and increasingly use coercive power to ensure that this perspective is prevalent. Kluth and Pilegaard refers to Bretherton and Vogler five basic requirements for “actorness”, namely:

- A shared commitment to a set of guiding values and principles;
- The ability to identify policy priorities and to formulate a coherent policy;
- The ability to effectively negotiate with other actors on the international scene;
- The availability of and capacity to utilize, policy instruments and
- A clear Domestic legitimacy of decision-making and priorities with regard to foreign policy.

(Kluth and Pilegaard, 2011: 48)

They also argue that the EU is essentially meeting the requirements for what is to constitute a global” actor (Kluth and Pilegaard, 2011: 48) Therefore, the EU is a global player with state-like features!

Unlike Waltz who believe that the EU lacks organizational skills, and the collective will to use these ”State-like functions” effectively (Waltz, 2000: 31). The EU will therefore not be able to count as a major player in international politics, as long as the EU is not in a position to implement significant changes in these areas (Waltz, 2000: 31-32).

Whitman very flush with views of the Waltz and stated that: " Although it is possible to bring together the military, economic and diplomatic capabilities of the 28 Member States which suggests that the EU is a putative superpower, the EU is lacking a political decision-making infrastructure that would make it possible to exploit them " (Whitman, 2010: 26).

**EU as a normative power**

Ian Manners has proposed that the EU should be seen as a normative power, and that there should be less emphasis on e.g. the military capabilities of a company. Instead of asking how the EU spends enlargement as a way to balance by increasing the capacity, we should rather ask how the EU diffuses its norms. As Waltz set up a series of "capabilities " then Manners of a structure, which can be understand as, how norms are spread: infection, informative diffusion, procedural diffusion, transfer, overt diffusion and cultural filter (Manners, 2002: 244-245).
Reflections: (reflect on their respective strengths and weaknesses)

The English School  (Constructivism)
English School (or the International Society approach) has a historical and institutional approach to the study of international politics. The approach is focused on the ideologies that influence world politics in which both realism is based on structures that affect players. The English school is trying to avoid the sharp division between state egoism (which represents realism) and the human ability to cooperate (as liberalism represents). (Wikipedia, 02/05/2014)

Strengths: I see the English school theory's forces in the direction of that are more people behind and that things are done based on human needs, etc.!
Weakness: The goal forget for a little firmness, too soft!

Copenhagen School  (Realism)
The school works especially with the term “securitization” that brief, that when something is security, then all policies permitted. One example is the United States after 11 September 2001 where terrorist attacks have been “security minded” in a way that you can make special rules for airport control, border control, general surveillance, and so on. By a subject is made to a matter of survival of the nation can therefore afford to use instruments that under other conditions are unacceptable. About events are truly essential to the survival of the nation is so far not important, what matters is what means, and then you can adopt. Within States relations, one can imagine that, for example, other states arsenals is securitized (as happened during the Cold War) and this will be crucial for how states act towards each other. (Wikipedia, 02/05/2014)

Strengths: I see the Copenhagen school theory's forces in the direction of something is happening that is not all the soft terms that are being made decisions and acted!
Weakness: Man behind are forgotten everything done to the matter and the goal and man are often run over!
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