Magdalena Góra, Katarzyna Zielińska

EUROPEANISATION IN THE EU NEW MEMBER STATES. ASPECTS AND RESEARCH AGENDAS

Introduction

After the beginning of the 1989 breakthrough the concept of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) became widely used as synonym for the group of ten countries from the former Eastern Bloc aspiring to EU membership. A troubled historical experience of long foreign domination, fragile statehood and experience of socialist regimes are shared by Central and Eastern European countries giving this region its distinctive tone. The similarities cannot, however, conceal the differences, as over history the common transformations were moulded by the local particularities – distinct histories, different cultures and dissimilar mentalities of each country.

The recent accession of Central and Eastern European countries to the EU was yet another common experience of the region, initiating chain of alterations at various dimensions of political, legal, social and cultural lives of the new member states. The volume before you is an attempt to present and assess changes resulting from the accession and European integration processes, grasping both similarities and differences in the countries of the region. In this respect the articles collected in the book fit the wider research agenda called Europeanisation.

Europeanisation has become a very fashionable term in social sciences over the last decade. Nonetheless, the concept continues to be challenged and contested (Olsen 2002; Flockhart 2010). A review of literature indicates a variety of meanings attached to it, various levels of analyses as well as a range of contexts in which it is applied (Graziano and Vink 2007; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003). Initially it aimed to grasp the changes taking place in the old member states; however, it was quickly and fruitfully adopted to describe changes in the CEE region. However, before presenting the application of the term in research on changes in the CEE region, we will first briefly review the attempts to define the concept of Europeanisation.

Europeanisation or EU-isation?

One of the first aspects of the discussion on the term "Europeanisation" deals with its relationship with European integration. It can on the one hand be used in a broader sense of diffusion of cultural products developed in Western Europe (Featherstone 2003). It is done either in the form of its political dominance over the world in a form of imperialism and colonial domination or via transnationalisation of diffusion of products between nation-states on the continent. The second group of usages of the term Europeanisation refers to the political processes stemming from the European integration and functioning within supranational polity (Featherstone 2003). Trine Flockhart makes this distinction precise when she notes that:

> EU-isation is a small, but important part of much broader and longer term process of Europeanisation, which is predominantly concerned with "cultural encounters" (...). The ideational content of "cultural encounters" includes all norms and behavioural practices that make up the identity of the community in question. In the case of Europeanisation everything that is, or has been, widely regarded as "European" in a former present (2010: 791).

In the context of the CEE region both understandings need to be taken into account. The long-term phenomenon of Western norm diffusion as well as the more recent massive and constructive impact of EU-isation form crucial reference points for understanding social and political alterations. In the presented volume we decided to focus more on the EU-oriented aspects of studies on Europeanisation. Therefore in the following sections we will review the developments of the concept in the area of EU studies.

Johan P. Olsen (2002) offers a useful typology of the term Europeanisation understood in a narrower sense of the changes induced by the European integration. He distinguished five groups of research on what he calls "different phenomena called 'Europeanisation'; that is, what is changing" (Olsen 2002: 922). The first group refers to the expanding borders of the EU supranational polity in the form of enlargements. The second is connected with the developing institutions at the European level and giving them – within a constitutionalisation of the EU – competences to directly influence the domestic level and control compliance with the EU law. The third group deals with the "central penetration of national systems of governance" (Olsen 2002: 923) and refers to the process of creating a specific system of multilevel governance. In this sense "Europeanisation, then, implies adapting national and sub-national systems of governance to a European political centre and European-wide norms" (Olsen 2002: 924). The fourth meaning of the term is connected with the export of forms of governance created in Europe beyond the continent. "Europeanisation signifies a more positive export/import balance as non-European countries import more from Europe than vice versa and European solutions exert more influence in international fora" (Olsen 2002: 924). This happens via various tools of European foreign policy and equipping the instruments such as association agreements with the component of democratisation and promotion of EU norms. Finally, Olsen's fifth group describes such an understanding of Europeanisation as political unification process. This is

the most complex and overarching process of creation of a novel type of polity in Europe (Olsen 2002: 924). The importance of this typology comes from the fact that Olsen stresses that the term Europeanisation refers to the analytical tool being able to describe the process of domestic change resulting from the process of European integration. Such changes are occurring within the EU and are also exported else-where. Europeanisation is therefore connected with more widely defined research on political change.

The concept of Europeanisation understood as a form of EU-isation was at first developed in these areas where the role of supranational institutions is the strong-est, particularly so where the EU law has a direct effect at domestic level. However, as various research has shown the impact of the European integration on domestic change is much broader and also affects areas where the EU institutions have no strong competence to act (Graziano and Vink 2007; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003).

What seems to be clear from the presented overview is that Europeanisation in the area of EU studies focuses on domestic change as a result of the functioning in the broader frames of EU polity. It is also clear that the significance of Europeanisation as an explanatory scheme depends on the type of EU polity modes of governance. The strongest results and an important contribution to research come from the areas covered by the supranational Community method in governance. Less strict is the open method of coordination as well as intergovernmental procedures such as in the area of common foreign policy. As a result, in various areas of European integration the process of Europeanisation will happen differently as well as being differently defined. The definition of Europeanisation offered by Claudio Radaelli seem to aptly grasp the discussed complexity of the term. According to him, it is:

> (…) a process of (a) construction, (b) diffusion and (c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, "ways of doing things", and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structure, and public policies (2000).

As is visible, what is perceived as the EU's impact is wider than only legal norms in form of the EU law. One can say that the term Europeanisation embraces or can embrace all social, political and economic aspects of changes within contemporary society. Thus, it seems that one clear and precise definition of Europeanisation is not possible. This however does not mean that the concept is futile. On the contrary, it attracts scholars' attention to the fact that the contemporary changes within Europe (and beyond Europe in some cases) are induced by wider and more universal proc-esses, and research on transformation of Europe must take this into account. As Johan Olsen puts it: "Europeanisation may, however, turn out to be less useful as an ex-planatory concept than as an attention-directing device and a starting point for further exploration" (2002: 943).

The concept of Europeanisation and Central and Eastern Europe

Application of the concept of Europeanisation, in its various meanings, to the context of Central and Eastern Europe can be beneficiary from the research perspective. An illustration may be provided by Kevin Featherstone's fourfold typology (2003) of Europeanisation to describe changes in Central and Eastern Europe. Firstly, Europeanisation can be treated as a historic phenomenon, meaning that Europe dominated the development of the humanity and "exported" social norms, cultural beliefs, values and behaviour (Featherstone 2003: 6). Such understanding of Europeanisation puts into the heart of scholars' interest the patterns of development, spreading modernisation and various cultural and intellectual phenomena. In this sense of the term, the CEE region could be perceived as a long-lasting object of Europeanisation as historically it was in the sphere of strong influence of Western Europe and one of the first regions to absorb the ideas from the West. Hence, some scholars employ postcolonial theories to explain the relationship between the regions and certain developments in CEE (Janion 2007).

Secondly, the term Europeanisation may be used as a description of the "increasing transnationalism: that is, the diffusion of cultural norms, ideas, identities, and patterns of behaviour on a cross-national basis within Europe" (Featherstone 2003: 7). In this group of research the term is used very broadly and can cover processes within various aspects, and touches upon activities of the organisations such as the EU or the Council of Europe indirectly. Here again we can find fruitful examples in CEE. A prominent one comes from the post-1989 period, when all of the CEE countries and their societies started looking west and searching for patterns to follow. This also refers to the historical phenomena such as growing interconnection between political units and redefining borders from the barriers to the bridges between political systems and societies.

Another way of using the term – and the third of Featherstone's types – is connected with the functioning of the novel type of polity in Europe – the European Union. Europeanisation is treated as a description of institutional adaptation of the domestic level (nation-state) to the functioning in the broader multinational and supranational political system. Such an understanding of the term originates from the observation of changes resulting from the intensified integration. In the context of the CEE countries this type of research covered various aspects of the domestic changes in the candidate countries during the process of association under the Europe Agreements from the beginning of 1990s, establishing association of the CEE countries with the European Community, and afterwards during the period of accession (Dimitrova 2002; Goetz 2001; Milczarek and Nowak 2003). Some scholars divide this period into pre-EU Europeanisation and EU-isation starting after the enlargement. We will come back to this division in the following sections.

Fourthly, Europeanisation embraces the studies on the adaptation of policies and policy processes within the EU. This understanding is complementary to the previous one, but focuses on the different aspects covered by the European integration to

various degree from common market to the foreign policy. In the context of the CEE such an understanding of Europeanisation found expression in significant and varied research on the changes in CEE countries, e.g. transformation of foreign policy (Pomorska 2007; Kamińska 2010), changes in equality policies (Chiva 2009, Krizsan and Popa 2010).

However, in the context of CEE, one of the most important areas of studies, contributing significantly to the development of the concept of Europeanisation in its narrower sense, was studies on the eastern enlargement. The process – initiated immediately after the beginning of the political changes in the CEE region – served as a natural laboratory for observing and assessing the influence of Western institutions on the newly recreated states. As Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier stressed in the relation to studies on Europeanisation, "[i]ncluding the CEECs would not only make the empirical picture more complete but, above all, permit us to test the established findings in a new context and check some new variables" (2005: 5). In their attempt to systemise the EU impact on CEE countries, the authors propose three theoretical models explaining the process of Europeanisation during the EU enlargement process. They distinguish two perspectives focusing on the one hand on the EU level as an initiator and propagator of changes and on the other hand on CEE actors being responsible for inducing the changes. On the other spectrum they noticed that two types of logic explaining social actions characteristic respectively of the rationalist and constructive school were in use: the logic of consequentiality and logic of appropriateness. Out of these two dimensions three possible models can be extracted: the external incentive model, social learning and lesson-drawing. In the following section we will briefly present these models.

The external incentives model stresses the centrality of the EU role in shaping changes taking place in CEE countries and the bargaining nature of the process (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005: 10). However some authors stress that at first the "pre-EU" Europeanisation (Lippert et al. 2001) of CEE started by adaptation to the norms, rules, practices of a number of international organisations such as NATO, WTO, OECD, Council of Europe, OSCE, the EU etc. Most of these international organisations centred their relations with candidate countries on a set of official and unofficial conditions of membership. The Council of Europe required a functioning democratic system with free elections, introduction of the protection of human rights and ratification of crucial international conventions. In 1993 the EU spelled out the three well-known Copenhagen criteria: a functioning democratic system with high standards of human and minority rights protection; functioning of the free market economy being able to sustain the free competition pressure within EU common market, and finally introduction of the *acquis communautaire*. The beginning of the accession negotiations in 1998 overwhelmingly dominated the functioning of the CEE states, and this can be perceived as a factor initiating the "EU Europeanisation" phase. This process, due to its detailed and massive requirements for future members – with the proverbial 80,000 pages of EU law – strongly influenced applicant countries. The progress was monitored, and only after formal fulfilment of conditions was membership granted.

The external incentive model is based on the set of conditions developed by the EU and afterwards enforced with a stick and carrot mechanism on the candidate countries. The important mechanism of the process of Europeanisation in the context of enlargement is the policy of conditionality developed by the EU to assist the candidate countries. Its core element is that "[t]he EU provides the incentive of membership as a conditional reward for adopting and complying with its rules. Governments calculate whether the benefits of membership outweigh the domestic costs that arise from adopting the EU's rules" (Börzel and Sedelmeier 2006: 66). This stream of research following the model stresses that the process of change on domestic level – beside the obvious long-term benefits – did not happen in the political vacuum but rather, on the contrary, it costs local political elites a lot. The political conditionality hypothesis is connected with the general systemic change and stresses that "the level of democracy in the neighbouring countries of the EU increases with the size and the credibility of the EU's conditional incentive" (Schimmelfennig and Scholtz 2008: 190). The efficiency of conditionality depends on many variables, among others the level of domestic political cost or the credibility of the promises given to the candidate country (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005). Domestic change in the general framework of European integration depends on such indicators as the size of a country, pre-existing policies and how far the country's domestic policy requires adaptation; the political process in which policies are embedded and which determines the scope and speed of a change; reform capacity of the state; domestic political costs, and finally discourse (Schmidt and Radaelli 2004). Karen Smith clearly states:

> The use of political conditionality is particularly contentious: while some governments and political activists appreciate the support it gives reformers, others resent it as an imposition of foreign values. The critics are aided by the inconsistent use of conditionality – which opens the EU to charges that it imposes conditionality only when its interests are not adversely affected (2004: 157).

Heather Grabbe developed a catalogue of mechanisms used by the EU to effect change through conditionality. She stresses the process of gate-keeping allowing the EU to control access to negotiations and further stages in the accession process and pressure the governments to impose desired decisions. The second type is benchmarking and monitoring, which relies on the establishing of certain standards and afterwards scrupulous and regular assessment of progress. The EU delivered models for the desired changes, which took the form of provisions of legislative and institutional templates. The important mechanisms were financial incentives in the form of aid and technical assistance, and finally advice and twinning (2001: 10–21).

However, the EU accession negotiations were hardly the only source of changes. Some scholars coined an adaptation-by-anticipation thesis. This approach stressed that the anticipated membership has become a powerful incentive itself for state modernisation and the reform of the CEE countries without stating a clear template to follow. The concept of the logic of appropriateness serving as a justification for political actions is useful in explaining this phenomenon (Sjursen 2006; Olsen 2008). As Johan P. Olsen writes:

> The logic of appropriateness is a perspective on human action. To act appropriately is to proceed according to the institutionalised practices of a collectivity and mutual understandings of what is true, reasonable, natural, right, and good. Actors seek to fulfil the obligations and duties encapsulated in a role, an identity, and a membership in a political community. Rules are followed because they are perceived to be adequate for the task at hand and to have normative validity (2008: 193).

Therefore constructivists argue that CEE countries behaved appropriately because they wanted to be accepted within the community of Western countries, where they felt they belonged. Based on the argument built relying on evidence from the economic sphere by Kalypso Nikolaidis (1993), Elisabeth Johansson-Nougés claims that:

> (…) in order to be accepted as worthy "Europeans" and show their European credentials to opt-in to the exclusive club of the EU, the majority of the applicant states adapted their political preferences closely to the European Union's long before they were recognised as official EU candidates (2004: 81).

The alternative two models proposed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005) focus precisely on a more constructivist reading of the changes. In the perspective of the social learning model the EU is perceived as a community of values which the candidate countries want to join and want to adapt the norms and rules because they are perceived as good. As mediating factors of this approach the authors stress three elements: legitimacy, identity and resonance (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005: 18). The legitimacy of the rules relies on their clarity and perception as good or proper and therefore accepted. The identity is easier to explain, and stresses that the rules perceived as own or leading a group to be accepted where they want to belong are easier to accept. Finally resonance is connected with the local popular subjects and recognition of the rules.

The second model of lesson-drawing relies on the observation that a significant part of the changes in the candidate countries happened without compulsory or coercive means. On the contrary, it was actually the voluntary decision of states and elites to mimic models from where they thought it was good to take them. In this model the authors also developed a set of factors. The first one is dissatisfaction in the level of functioning of domestic institutions and as a result the search for new solutions. The second factor is connected with the existence of EU-centred epistemic communities – the groups, as Peter Haas would stress, that are responsible for delivering solutions when cognitive uncertainty occurs (1992) and in this particular context being already involved or in professional terms linked with the EU circles. The third factor is that the rules are transferable, meaning that they can be reintroduced in a new context. This third model in a way reconciles both positions of rational and constructive perspective.

The three presented models reflect the discourse on the Europeanisation within the EU and especially the interconnection between the domestic and supranational level in inducing the changes. This became even more visible in the studies on the changes in the CEE region after enlargement (Riedel and Pacześniak 2010; Milcza-

rek and Barburska 2008). The new member states have become directly exposed to the EU institutions' actions and legal acts and started to shape the politics and policies of the EU directly. This fuelled the next wave of research on post-enlargement compliance (Dimitrova 2010; Epstein and Sedelmeier 2008), the effects of enlargement on the EU institutions and democracy (Zielonka 2007; Sjursen 2006) and on the CEE societies (Góra and Mach 2010). The main, overarching question for various research initiatives is how the countries and their societies follow the path of modernisation and Europeanisation without the powerful mechanism of conditionality. This is also one of the main questions which underscores this volume. This brief overview of the literature on Europeanisation sets its general theoretical framework. This is further complemented by the commentaries written to each part of the book and illustrated by the case studies offered by the articles contributing to the volume.

Presentation of the book

This book is addressed to those interested in Central and Eastern Europe. It has two main aims. On the one hand, it presents the recent alterations in the region resulting from the processes of European integration. In other words, it offers an account of the process of Europeanisation in the region occurring after the accession and going beyond conditionality mechanisms. On the other hand, the collection attempts to offer reflection and contribute to the discussion on how the changes taking place in CEE influence theoretisation on Europeanisation – a concept initially constructed in order to tackle the changes taking place in response to the processes of European integration in the old member states.

Most of the texts included in this volume were already published in various journals in recent years, after enlargement,[1] with the exception of original articles by Nicole Gallina and Martin Dangerfield, as well as the contributions written by Christopher Lord, Zdzisław Mach, Hans-Jörg Trenz and Magdalena Góra, serving as commentaries to each part of the book. Attempting to bring in the voices from the "core" and the "periphery" of social sciences, the reprinted articles were selected from both journals published in Central and Eastern Europe, often with limited circulation, as well as those more recognisable in the global network of scholars and researchers. The major key for selection was to choose articles that look at the CEE region and highlight significant changes – not always only positive – induced by the European integration.

The book is divided into four parts, each concentrating on an area where changes seem to be most profound and most interesting from the point of view of theorising on the impact of European integration processes, i.e. democratic consolidation in the region, collective identity construction, functioning of civil society and studies on foreign policy and international relations.

---

[1] Full information on the place the articles were initially published is included in the texts.

The articles constituting the first part of the volume critically evaluate the impact of the EU on development and sustainability of democracy in the region in the pre- and post-accession period. They problematise the link, habitually taken for granted, between European integration and democratisation. The short commentary to this part of the volume is written by Christopher Lord, who puts the case studies presented in the articles into the wider context of discussions on the problem of democratic auditing and measuring the quality of democracy as well as the democratic character of the EU. Lord also raises the question of the interdependence between the democracy of the member states and the EU. There seem to be agreement between the authors contributing to this part of the book that the process of European integration contributed immensely to the development of democracy in the region. The conditionality mechanism and requirement to introduce *acquis communautaire* into a state's legal system served as a powerful incentive for change. However, in the light of the return of nationalistic and populist politics in the region, more profound analyses suggest that the way the accession negotiations and adjustments were done in practice could indirectly contribute to undermining consolidation of democracy in the new member states. The articles tackling this issue approach the problem from different perspectives and focus on distinctive areas. Grzegorz Ekiert assesses the impact of the EU integration on the process of democratisation by comparing the countries which have become member states and those which have not. The empirical data suggest that the accession process significantly contributed to democracy consolidation in the candidate countries as well as to the building of the free market economy. However, Ekiert shows that the character and speed of the accession process as well as the way the EU membership requirements were adopted pose several dilemmas to the long-term development and quality of those democracies.

Darina Malová and Branislav Dolný's contribution also focuses on the accession process, pointing to the shortcomings in the way the negotiations were held. They point out that these negotiations prioritised the government's accountability to international organisations over their accountability towards their own constituencies, which as a result constrained public debate on the alternatives and strengthened the position of the elites directly involved in the negotiations. Undoubtedly, the accession, through conditionality, promoted democratic institutions, stabilised the horizontal division of powers, rule of law and human and minority rights protection. However, it neglected or even constrained the development of participatory/or popular democracy.

The limitations of democratisation through European integration are further discussed in Nicole Gallina's article. This focuses on the post-accession period and points to the discrepancy between stable democratic institutions and political actors whose behaviour is incompatible with the consensual character of those institutions. Gallina's research shows that political elite behaviour in Central and Eastern European countries, confrontational and hierarchical in character, may endanger sustainability of democracy and contribute to the "negative Europeanisation" of their countries.

Jacques Rupnik's article also concentrates on the post-accession period, exploring the backlash against democracy observed in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Rupnik interprets these developments as a challenge to the linear or progres-

sive vision of democratisation, showing the possibility of regression. He links this backlash with the lack of civic culture and lack of political cultures, resulting from the limited range of democratisation through conditionality.

The second part of the book focuses on collective identity transformations resulting from the processes of European integration. This section is introduced by a commentary written by Zdzisław Mach, discussing the impact of the European enlargement on the construction of European identity.

In the articles constituting this part of the book two dimensions are particularly visible. On the one hand they discuss the European identity and collective memory alterations resulting from inclusion of the new member states. On the other hand, the articles discuss the changing nature of national identity and collective memory resulting from the European integration. The former theme is central for Gerard Delanty's article on "Peripheries and Borders in Post-Western Europe". European integration accompanied by globalisation contributed to the emergence of both post-national and post-Western Europe, and profoundly reshaped the self-understanding of Europe. At the heart of these transformations lay changes regarding traditional core-periphery relations between Western and Eastern Europe – a simple polarity was replaced by more complicated and dynamic relations between the two. Delanty also relates the different historical experiences between Western and Central and Eastern Europe which produced distinctive definitions of difference in both regions, contributing to dissimilar notions of citizenship.

This issue is discussed in more detail in André Liebich's article. An analysis of majority versus minority relations in the member states seems to indicate sharp differences between two "Europes" – Western and Eastern. The dissimilarities can be largely explained by the different experiences of both regions. Historical experience and current perception of state fragility as well as the lack of experience with immigrant minorities in the new member states had a profound impact on minority-majority relations. Those experiences found expression in reluctance towards any form of autonomy or accommodation for minorities in the new member states.

The last article contributing to the part on collective identities, written by Georges Mink, takes up the issues related to collective memory in enlarged Europe. The author discusses changes taking place at national and European level, pointing to the interdependence of both. We can currently observe a "recycling" of representations of symbolic pasts in the contemporary political games played by interest groups, political parties, or states in various arenas. On the other hand, such mobilisations encounter reconciliation tendencies developed either in civil society or being steered by national or international institutions. Mink points to a paradox posed by the reconciliatory character of the European integration project assuming homogenisation – attempts to incorporate one's own collective identity heritage "into the historical heritage of Europe in the name of its universality (…) may have the unsought and undesired effect of renationalising memory". In fact, the European space is an arena for various, often conflictual memories used and abused by various competing actors.

The third part of the book focuses on civil society organisations (CSOs) in the Central and Eastern European countries in the context of European integration. The

commentary to this part is written by Hans-Jörg Trenz, who provides a more general account of the CSOs' development in CEE after 1989, as well as offering broader theoretical lenses for the analysis of their activities in the multi-dimensional reality of the EU, with particular focus on the notion of bottom-up Europeanisation.

The theme of Europeanisation of domestic actors is further developed in the article by Ondřej Císař and Kateřina Vráblíková, providing a case study on women's groups in Czech Republic. In discussing the impact of the EU integration, the authors point to three important changes – access to resources, changing access to the domestic political institutions and international opportunities for political mobilisations. Undoubtedly, the European integration contributed significantly to the empowerment of the groups. However, it also initiated some less positive changes – professionalisation, adjusting the agenda to the available funds, financial dependence and instability of organisations.

Similarly, Imogen Sudbery studies the bottom-up process of Europeanisation, taking women's groups in Poland as a case study. The main aim of her article is an attempt to tackle the recourses used by these groups in order to empower themselves at domestic level and to transform the institutional and discursive opportunity structure in their favour. Comparison of the activities of women's groups in two areas where the EU has strong and weak competences (equality in the workplace and sexual and reproductive health and rights respectively) allows her to provide a more detailed mechanism of empowering. The study also discloses the limitations to the empowerment of women's groups vis-à-vis domestic structure.

The last article applies a different perspective. Going beyond the state actors, it focuses on the role of CSOs as agents of Europeanisation in international relations. Kristian L. Nielsen et al. present the case study of Estonia. The article attempts to answer the question about the role of CSOs in the general process of Europeanisation in the framework of the European Neighbourhood Policy and the EU-Russia Strategic Partnership. Research shows that despite the existing avenues offered by the civil society organisations, the EU has not been able to fully use the resources which the organisations could potentially provide.

Finally, the last part of the book examines the impact of European integration on foreign relations in the region. The commentary to this part, provided by Magdalena Góra, briefly presents the historical background to understanding the current developments in the region. It also offers insightful introduction to readings by presenting the currently most influential theoretical perspectives within the field of international relations. The commentary is followed by three texts, illustrating the theoretical schools presented and offering interesting case studies from the region. Firstly, the article by Maria Mälksoo discusses the impact of the self-perception of the Baltic states as victims of Russia's historical violations on the perceptions of the EU's foreign policy by these countries. The EU's vision of foreign policy is accused of indifference towards the history and memory of the Baltic states. In response, these states make demands for a more inclusive understanding of the common European past, reflective to the experience of its various parts, and for creation of a more consenting European foreign policy.

The impact of the member states on the shape of the foreign European policy is also a central theme of the article by Nathaniel Copsey and Karolina Pomorska. The authors attempt to assess the ability of a member state to exercise power and influence on the EU. The article presents a case study focusing on Poland's attempts to shape the European Neighbourhood Policy. The power and influence of a country in the European Union is operationalised by assessing the country's performance in different dimensions – intensity of politic preference, skill of alliance building, administrative capacity, persuasive advocacy and receptiveness of other member states. The assessment of the Polish power and influence on the EU in the context of the European Neighbourhood Policy proved it to be insignificant.

The last text included in this part of the book is an article by Martin Dangerfield presenting the changing role of the Visegrad Group. This subregional group, consisting of initially three countries (Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary) and later four (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Hungary), was created with an aim to facilitate the EU accession for its member states. The article gives a brief account of this stage of the group's development, focusing more on the question about the role of the group in the post-accession period in the enlarged Europe.

References

Börzel, Tanja, Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2006). The EU Dimension in European Politics. In: Heywood, Paul M., Jones, Erik, Rhodes, Martin and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (eds.). *Developments in European Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chiva, Chrisina (2009). The Limits of Europeanisation: EU Accession and Gender Equality in Bulgaria and Romania. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 10 (2), pp. 195–209.

Dimitrova, Antoaneta (2002). Enlargement, Institution-Building and the EU's Administrative Capacity Requirement. *West European Politics*, 25 (4), pp. 171–190.

Dimitrova, Antoaneta (2010). The New Member States of the EU in the Aftermath of Enlargement: Do New European Rules Remain Empty Shells? *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17 (1), pp. 137–148.

Epstein, Rachel A. and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2008). Beyond Conditionality: International Institutions in Post-communist Europe after Enlargement. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 15 (6), pp. 795–805.

Featherstone, Kevin and Radaelli, Claudio (eds.) (2003). *The Politics of Europeanisation*, Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press.

Featherstone, Kevin (2003). Introduction: In the name of Europe. In: Featherstone, Kevin, Radaelli, Claudio (eds.). *The Politics of Europeanisation*. Oxford, New York–Oxford University Press.

Flockhart, Trine (2010). Europeanization or EU-ization? The Transfer of European Norms across Time and Space. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48 (4), pp. 787–810.

Goetz, Klaus H. (2001). Making Sense of Post-communist Central Administration: Modernization, Europeanisation or Latinization? *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (6), pp. 1032–1051.

Góra, Magdalena and Mach, Zdzisław (eds.) (2010). *Collective Identity and Democracy. The Impact of EU Enlargement*. RECON Report no. 12, Oslo: ARENA.

Grabbe, Heather (2006). *EU Transformative Power. Europeanisation through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Graziano, Paolo and Vink, Maarten P. (2007). *Europeanisation. New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Green Cowles, Maria, Caporaso, James and Risse, Thomas (eds.) (2001). *Transforming Europe. Europeanisation and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.

Haas, Peter M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*, 46 (1), pp. 1–35.

Janion, Maria (2007). *Niesamowita słowiańszczyzna. Fantazmaty literatury*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Johansson-Nogués, Elisabeth (2004). The Fifteen and the Accession States in the UN General Assembly: What Future for European Foreign Policy in the Coming Together of the "Old" and the "New" Europe? *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 9, pp. 67–92.

Kamińska, Joanna (2010). The Link between National Foreign Policy and the Performance of a Country in the European Union: The Polish Case. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 6 (1), pp. 69–84.

Krizsan, Andra and Popa, Raluca (2010). Europeanisation in Making Policies against Domestic Violence in Central and Eastern Europe. *Social Politics*, 17 (3), pp. 379–406.

Lippert, Barbara, Umbach, Gaby, Wessels, Wolfgang (2001). Europeanisation of CEE executives: EU Membership Negotiations as a Shaping Power. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 8 (6), pp. 980–1012.

Milczarek, Dariusz and Nowak, Alojzy Z. (2003). *On the Road to the European Union. Applicant countries' perspective*. Warsaw University Centre for Europe: Warsaw.

Milczarek, Dariusz and Barburska, Olga (2008). Poland in the European Union: First Experiences. Selected Political, Legal and Social Aspects. Warsaw University Centre for Europe: Warsaw.

Nikolaidis, Kalypso (1993). Eastern European Trade in the Aftermath of 1989: Did International Institutions matter? In: Keohane, Robert, Hoffman, Stanley and Nye, Joseph (eds.). *After the Cold War: State Strategic and International Institutions in Europe, 1989–1991*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Olsen, Johan P. (2002). The Many Faces of Europeanisation. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40 (5), pp. 921–952.

Olsen, Johan P. (2008). Explorations in Institutions and Logics of Appropriateness. An Introductory Essay. In: James G. March (ed.), *Explorations in Organizations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Pomorska, Karolina (2007). The Impact of Enlargement: Europeanisation of Polish Foreign Policy? Tracking Adaptation and Change in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2 (1), pp. 25–51.

Radaelli, Claudio (2000). "Whither Europeanisation? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change", *European Integration Online Papers*, 4 (8), pp. 1–28.

Riedel, Rafał and Pacześniak, Anna. 2010. *Europeizacja – mechanizmy, wymiary, efekty*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Schimmelfennig, Frank, Scholtz, Hanno (2008). EU Democracy Promotion in the European Neighbourhood. Political Conditionality, Economic Development and Transnational Exchange. *European Union Politics*, 9 (2), pp. 187–215.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Sedelmeier, Ulrich (eds.) (2005). *The Europeanisation of Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Ithaca.

Schmidt, Vivien A. and Radaelli, Claudio M. (2004). Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *West European Politics*, 27 (2), pp. 183–210.

Sjursen, Helene (ed.) (2006). *Questioning Enlargement. Europe in Search of Identity*. New York, London: Routledge.

Smith, Karen E. (2004). *The making of EU foreign policy: the case of Eastern Europe*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zielonka, Jan (2001). Plurilateral Governance in the Enlarged European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45 (1), pp. 187–209.