

NÚMERO 209

LORENA RUANO

JEAN MONNET CHAIR

The Europeanization of National Foreign Policies
Towards Latin America: The conceptual framework

MAYO 2011



www.cide.edu

• Las colecciones de **Documentos de Trabajo** del **CIDE** representan un medio para difundir los avances de la labor de investigación, y para permitir que los autores reciban comentarios antes de su publicación definitiva. Se agradecerá que los comentarios se hagan llegar directamente al (los) autor(es).

• D.R. © 2011. Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, carretera México-Toluca 3655 (km. 16.5), Lomas de Santa Fe, 01210, México, D.F.
Fax: 5727•9800 ext. 6314
Correo electrónico: publicaciones@cide.edu
www.cide.edu

• Producción a cargo del (los) autor(es), por lo que tanto el contenido así como el estilo y la redacción son su responsabilidad.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the generous funding from the European Commission Jean Monnet Programme for this project. This paper reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein. She is grateful for the valuable comments and suggestions from all the participants in the workshop "The Europeanization of national foreign policies towards Latin America" held at CIDE in March 2010, as well as the colleagues from the División de Estudios Internacionales at CIDE. She also acknowledges the collaboration of her research assistants, Jesse Rogers and Michelle Torres Pacheco.

Abstract

To answer the question of how Europeans formulate their policy towards Latin America, in a way that makes it comparable to policy towards other regions, it is necessary to bring back the focus of analysis to the national level for it is there that most of the EU's foreign relations originate. However, this has to be done while keeping in mind that member states have become ever more entangled within the EU. Building from the literature on europeanization, this book chapter proposes an analytical framework based on three types of relations between the EU and the national level, "upload", "download" and "sideways" europeanization, to answer two specific questions: 1) What has been the dominant process of each member state's policy towards Latin America in relation to the EU's: "upload" "download" or "sideways" europeanization?; 2) How has this occurred and varied over time and policy areas?

This chapter is devoted to establish the common conceptual framework that will be the basis for the case studies that constitute an edited book. To do so, it is divided into two sections. The first section situates this study in relation to the existing literature, at the intersection of three strands of academic work: europeanization, European foreign policy and relations between Europe and Latin America. It analyzes each one in turn, and presents the concepts borrowed from them to build the analytical framework. The second section addresses some methodological issues and explains how this study intends to deal with them. It then outlines with more precision the variables and hypotheses to be highlighted by the case studies so as to facilitate a structured comparison that helps develop the conceptual and theoretical tools further.

Resumen

Para responder la pregunta sobre cómo los europeos formulan sus políticas respecto de América Latina de forma que pueda ser comparable con las políticas hacia otras regiones, es necesario centrar el análisis en el nivel nacional dado que ahí se originan la mayoría de las relaciones exteriores de la Unión Europea (UE). Sin embargo, esto se debe hacer teniendo en mente que los estados miembros de la UE se han vuelto cada vez más interdependientes dentro de ésta. El presente capítulo, basado en la literatura sobre "europeización", propone un marco analítico basado en los tres tipos de relaciones entre los niveles nacional y de la UE: europeización de tipo "upload", "download" y "sideways". El objetivo de responder dos preguntas específicas: 1) ¿Cuál ha sido el proceso dominante de cada uno de los Estados miembro en cuanto a la formulación de políticas respecto de

América Latina en relación con las de la UE: europeización “download”, “upload” o “sideways”?; 2) ¿Cómo ha ocurrido y variado esto en cuanto al tipo de políticas a lo largo del tiempo?

Este capítulo está dedicado a establecer un marco conceptual común que sirva de base para los casos de estudio que constituyen el libro editado. Para ello, se divide en dos apartados. La primera sección sitúa el presente estudio, en relación con la literatura existente, en la intersección de tres vertientes académicas: europeización, política exterior Europea y relaciones entre Europa y América Latina. Este texto analiza cada una de ellas y presenta conceptos derivados de éstas para la construcción de un marco analítico. La segunda sección aborda diversos asuntos metodológicos y explica la forma en la que se intentará lidiar con ellos. Posteriormente, se definen con mayor precisión las variables e hipótesis que deberán resaltar los estudios de caso, con la intención de facilitar una comparación estructurada que, más adelante, contribuya a desarrollar herramientas teóricas y conceptuales.

Introduction

To answer the question of how Europeans formulate their policy towards Latin America,¹ in a way that makes it comparable to policy towards other regions, it is necessary to specify which actors participate and how decision-making processes affect outcomes. In the case of foreign policy, EU member-states **remain fundamental actors**. Therefore, this book argues that, for a more complete **understanding** of these relations, it is fundamental to bring back the focus of analysis to **the national level** for it is there that most of the EU's foreign relations originate. However, this has to be done while keeping in mind that **member states have become ever more entangled within the EU**. The interactions between the national and EU levels have reshaped governance in Europe, and foreign policy -though peculiar- is no exception, yet relatively little research has been carried out about them. For that reason this project argues that it is crucial to focus the study in the relations between the EU and the national levels.

Building from the literature on **Europeanization** (Börzel, 1999; Risse, *et al.*, 2001; Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003), this book proposes an analytical framework based on three **types of relations** between the EU and the national level, "**upload**", "**download**" and "**sideways**" Europeanization, which is applied across seven national case studies of policy towards Latin America. The case studies are carried out by experts in the specific countries' policies towards Latin America, are: Spain, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Poland (a Central European member state), Ireland (a small member state) and Sweden (a Scandinavian member state). All case studies seek to answer two specific questions: 1) What has been the dominant process of each member state's policy towards Latin America in relation to the EU's: "upload" "download" or "sideways" Europeanization?; 2) How has this occurred and varied over time and policy areas? By answering these two questions for seven national case studies, this book contributes to the understanding of the Europeanization of national foreign policies in general, by taking **relations with Latin America as a case**. The most important contribution is, therefore, the comparison across national cases of the same policy, through a shared conceptual framework and research questions.

This chapter is devoted to establish the common conceptual framework that will be the basis for the case studies. To do so, it is divided into two sections. The first section situates this study in relation to the existing literature, at the intersection of three strands of academic work: Europeanization, European foreign policy and relations between Europe and Latin America. It analyzes each one in turn, and presents the concepts

¹ We use the shorthand term in Latin America, but this includes also the Caribbean, and the abbreviation LAC to refer to the region.

borrowed from them to build the analytical framework. The second section addresses some methodological issues and explains how this study intends to deal with them. It then outlines with more precision the variables to be highlighted by the case studies so as to facilitate a structured comparison that helps develop the conceptual and theoretical tools further.

The intersection of three literatures

This study sits at the intersection of three bodies of literature where an enormous gap exists: the literature on europeanization, the literature on European foreign policy and the literature on relations between Europe and Latin America. The literature on europeanization has generally concentrated on policy fields different from foreign policy (i.e. environmental policy), and in the cases in which it has ventured to do so, it has done it mainly through detailed single case studies, shying away from comparisons,² and certainly, never touching upon relations with Latin America. So this intersection of europeanization and European Foreign Policy is still an expanding field where more work needs to be done. Indeed, relations with Latin America constitute a promising area to do comparative work on europeanization of foreign policy, because variation across national cases is wide. In turn, the literature about European foreign policy towards Latin America remains distant from these academic discussions in Europe and the United States about European Union (EU) governance and policy-making. The existing literature is rather descriptive and tends to concentrate either on the output of the Brussels institutions (Alizal, 2002; IRELA, 1997), on one of its member states (Bulmer-Thomas, 1989) or on the Latin American side (Roy and Domínguez, 2007).

Europeanization: Upload, download, and sideways policy transfers

Since the focus of this study is on the relationship between policies at the national and EU levels, it is first and foremost grounded on the ever expanding literature on europeanization. It can be argued that this literature has identified three broad **types of policy transfer** between the national and the EU level which, depending on the direction of such transfer, are labeled "upload", "download" and "sideways" europeanization. This are summarized in table 1, and will be explained in turn.

² We See for example White, 2001; Wong, 2006; Oliver and Allen, 2006; Miskimmon, 2007. There are, of course, a few authors that engaged in comparative analysis: Tonra, 2001; Kavakas, 2001; Bailes, et al., 2006.

TABLE 1. TYPES OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EU AND NATIONAL LEVELS

	THREE TYPES OF EUROPEANIZATION			OTHER TYPES OF INTERACTION BETWEEN THE NATIONAL AND EU LEVELS
	<i>DOWNLOAD</i>	<i>UPLOAD</i>	<i>SIDEWAYS</i>	
DEFINITION	National adaptation to EU policy	Projection of national interest into EU policy	Socialization and learning	Not policy transfer: i.e. division of labour
MECHANISM (INDEPENDENT VARIABLES)	“Pressure to adapt”: 1. depends on “goodness of fit” between EU and national level 2. It is differentiated across policy areas depending on EU competences	1. “Interest” (policy priority) 2. “power” (coalition building capacity at the EU level)	Policy diffusion, learning, information sharing, “the logic of appropriateness”	Change in EU and national policy caused by other factors: i. e, globalization, UN, OECD, etc.
WHAT CHANGES? (DEPENDENT VARIABLES)	National policy	EU policy	EU and national policies	EU and national policies

The starting idea of the concept of europeanization was what Böerzel called “download” and served to identify changes in national policies influenced or determined by the EU. This is the most widely known definition, generally used to guide case studies on “national adaptation” to EU policy (for example see Jordan, 2002). According to Risse, *et al.* (2001), as the EU layer of institutions expands and thickens upon national states, it it puts “pressure” on domestic structures and/or policy-areas to adapt. The extent of this “pressure to adapt” is determined by the “goodness of fit” between the national existing policy and the one existing at the EU level, and the outcome is modulated by “mediating factors” situated at the domestic level, such as the number of veto points, the existence of “facilitating institutions” and a cooperative culture (see table 3). Outcomes are highly differentiated across member states, because “previously existing policies” and “mediating factors” situated at the national level exhibit a great deal of variation.³

³ Some authors like Hérítier and Knill (2001) have constructed typologies of such outcomes.

In the case of EU policy towards Latin America, this concept highlights that member states have had very different tasks in front of them when adapting to EU policy. For example, in the late 1980s when Greece and Spain joined the EEC, it was more of a challenge for Spain to adapt to an EEC trade policy that discriminated against Latin America than for Greece, with Spain having a “worse fit” between its national pre-existing policy and Community policy, since it had started trading considerably with that region. This meaning of europeanization has been suitable to study the EU’s most recent enlargement to Central and Eastern Europe, as new member states had to adopt the *acquis communautaire* through internal reforms even before accession (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005).

A key criticism to this “top-down” approach has been that it assumes something called “EU policy” exists independently of the member states that have to adopt it, which is **only** the case for states **before** their accession to the EU. In all other instances, as is well known, member states constantly try to shape EU policy to make it “fit better” with their national preferences and previously existing policies (Miskimmon, 2007). Indeed, the fingerprints of member-states are all over EU policies, i. e. the French and the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), Monetary Union and Germany (Bulmer, 1997). In the case of policy towards Latin America, Spain has certainly been a central actor since its accession to the EEC, projecting its policy preferences into the EU arena (Schumacher, 1995). For this reason it is important to include in the conceptual framework this other type of interaction between national and EU policy: the “projection” of national preferences into EU policy or “**upload europeanization**”. Interest and power seem to be the variables behind a successful policy upload (see tables 1 and 2).

In turn, these two definitions of europeanization have been criticized for their “verticality”, as they do not allow space for a more diffuse approach to policy transfer, thus adding a third conceptualization: “**sideways europeanization**” (Radaelli, 2000). This relates to mechanisms of learning and socialization among member states and European institutions that lead to policy convergence. Decisions made at the state level are becoming more dependent on collective positions that, in addition to countries’ specific interests, are shaping national foreign policy platforms (Tonra, 2001). Indeed some of the case studies developed in this project show that national policy-makers look at what other member states are doing with regard to Latin America when drafting their own policy papers (see the chapters on Germany and Sweden). This kind of europeanization introduces a more agency centered approach, than the previous two, which emphasize structural factors.

It is important to stress that these three types of “europeanization”, although intimately linked, entail **separate processes**, each with **different causal mechanisms** (summarized in table 1). Not surprisingly, there is a debate about whether it is appropriate to use the same term to describe such

different things. Yet EU and national policies are mutually constitutive in reality, so it would be inappropriate to use a different term. Therefore, it is important to establish precise guidelines for accurate analysis in order to keep this most commonly accepted nomenclature, while keeping conceptually separate the different processes that it entails. In the second section of this chapter, the mechanisms and variables of each type of europeanization are constructed and explained in greater detail.

Finally, due to the multiplicity of relations and processes intervening in foreign policy making at the national and European levels, there is a wide array of interactions that are **not** europeanization, but which must, nevertheless be acknowledged. These “**other**” **types of interaction** form a separate category which encompasses various diverse processes. In this study, for example, a certain “division of labour” between the EU and national institutions (or among member states) stands out. These “other” types should not be ignored by this research, but must be kept conceptually separate as they do not entail policy transfers.

Having outlined the main types of europeanization that will guide the case studies it is now time to turn to the particular policy that will be the object of analysis: foreign policy.

European Foreign Policy

The use of the term “European foreign policy” is relatively recent, since, for a long time in the history of European integration, foreign policy has been strongly guarded within the national remit by member states, concerned about its implications for national sovereignty. The first efforts from EEC member states to establish common positions towards certain external issues started in the 1970s. The civil wars in Central America were, in fact, amongst the first such issues.⁴ These coordination efforts became known by their institutional name, European Political Co-operation (EPC), the first formal arrangement gathering and unifying the foreign policy positions of EEC members at the time. However, the use of the term “foreign policy” remained anathema at the EEC level, and developed only with the set up of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) with the Maastricht Treaty in 1993. From then on, the academic literature on European foreign policy concentrated for a long time almost exclusively on CFSP, especially on how its intergovernmental nature made it ineffective (Nuttall, 2000; Cameron, 1998; H. Smith, 2002; Wagner, 2003). Other aspects of the EU’s relations with the

⁴ The San José Dialogue, by which the Contadora group, led by Mexico sought to bring peace to Central America in the 1980s included the participation of EEC foreign ministers as well as from other European states interested in the process, like Spain and Sweden. This was one of the first instances in which the EEC tried to behave as a group in foreign policy.

outside world, known as “External Relations” and under the remit of the European Commission were kept officially and conceptually separate.

More recently, scholars have agreed that, to gain a better understanding of what Europe does in the international arena, it is necessary to go well beyond CFSP. There is a growing interest in including “external relations” and other links, especially those related to humanitarian aid, bilateral and regional trade negotiations and even Justice and Home Affairs (Smith, 2003). Furthermore, there some authors like Hill have repeatedly insisted that it is impossible to understand what the EU does abroad without at least a cursory look at its member states (Hill, 1996; 1997) Taking these elements into consideration has contributed to a long debate on what kind of international actor the EU is, and on whether the tools of foreign policy analysis could be applied to it (Peterson and Sjørnsen, 1998; Zielonka, 1997; Smith, 2004; White, 2001).

This project therefore welcomes the broad definition, developed by Carlsnaes, *et al.* (2004), which takes a broad approach that incorporates three subsystems:

- 1) Relations emanating from the (CFSP) and, since 1997, also the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP), that is formerly “Pillar II” of the EU;
- 2) The external aspects of Community policies, that is Trade, External Relations and Development Cooperation (mainly from former “Pillar I”, but also, from “Pillar III”);⁵
- 3) National foreign policies.

This broad definition, which extends the analysis beyond the CFSP, is welcome for many reasons, of which two are of special relevance to this project. First, as will be explained below in the case of relations with Latin America, the CFSP matters only marginally; **the issues which are of most interest to both sides of the Atlantic are trade, investment and development cooperation.** Competences in these policy areas remain within the remit of former Pillar I (External Relations, Trade), although occasionally, issues of former Pillar II (security, drug-trafficking) and Pillar III (justice and home affairs, like immigration or extradition) pop up in the agenda. Thus, going beyond CFSP is crucial to include the key themes of the EU-LAC relationship.

The second reason why a broad view of European foreign policy which incorporates the three subsystems mentioned by Carlsnaes, *et al.* (2004) is relevant for this study is that **many foreign relations instruments still remain within the national remit, or are shared between the EU and its**

⁵ Although the Lisbon Treaty officially abolishes the “pillar structure” of the EU, in practice, CFSP (former pillar II) and issues of Justice and Home Affairs (former Pillar III) remain distinct from Community policies due to their intergovernmental decision-making procedures (consensus).

member states (Hill, 1996; H Smith, 2002). Studies that focus exclusively on what the Brussels institutions do in relation to Latin America, offer a partial picture. Even in economic matters, it is not enough to look at the EU institutions: whereas competences have been passed on to the European Commission on the field of trade and competition, other areas, like investment (until the Lisbon Treaty) and taxation, remain firmly anchored within the national remit. For example, Mexico complemented its EU Association Agreement with a multitude of bilateral agreements with each member state on investment and taxation (Pi Suñer, *et al.*, 2011). Other foreign policy issues might be promoted through bilateral channels (cultural cooperation is the most obvious example) or multilateral organizations such as the United Nations (see table 4 on policy instruments). In sum, this definition which includes the EU and national levels, while keeping them conceptually separate, fits the purpose of our research, which is aimed at analyzing the relationship between sub-systems.

The main concern about the use of this term is whether it is possible to talk of “policy”, when so many objectives, instruments and actors are involved. Indeed, it might be more appropriate, in the context of such a wide definition, to talk about **European Foreign Relations**, especially when unpacking the second and third sub-systems, which typically include complex policy-networks that encompass state and non-state actors at the national and transnational level. Yet, it is certainly pertinent to stick with the term “policy” in order to signal that the focus of this analysis is on official (state and EU) actors and processes, rather than private, societal and non-governmental ones.

Certain authors have also expressed their concern about the use of the term “policy” in the face of a great lack of **coherence and consistency** between the former Pillars (Cameron, 1998) and how this has shaped the various ways in which the EU is projected towards the international community.⁶ This concern will be further discussed in the section that follows.

Special characteristics of foreign policy europeanization

Another issue raised by the literature is that, although it has been argued forcefully that foreign policy is *not* immune to the pressures of europeanization (Wong, 2007), it is certainly pertinent to spell out some of the aspects that make this policy area special when studying its europeanization. First, the *acquis communautaire* is rather “thin” in this policy area (at least outside trade issues) and because of the

⁶ On this issue, the Lisbon Treaty, ratified in 2009, provided the EU with legal status, and made an effort to increase coherence across the huge variety of topics its foreign relations touch upon, with the creation of a new post that combines the former EU Foreign Policy Representative and the Commission’s Directorate General for External Relations (DG Relex).

intergovernmental nature of CFSP, the relationship between the EU and member states is not so vertical as in other policy areas, like environmental policy for example, and as implied by the “download” model with its idea of “pressure to adapt” (Miskimmon, 2007). For that reason, it is pertinent to argue that in some issue areas of Europe’s foreign relations, especially those **structured in an intergovernmental fashion**, the processes at hand might be best described by Radaelli’s (2000) “sideways” Europeanization. Even before the concept of europeanization came into fashion, scholars had noted that the foreign policies of EU member states were increasingly defined in relation to what other European states did, because relations with the latter were their foreign policy priority. In a three-country study on the effects of the CFSP on national foreign policies, it was found that CFSP increased their exposure to information and to a much wider range of international actors; affected the ways in which they organise their foreign ministries; created a basic commitment to joint policy making; seriously affected their positions on security and defence; and broadened their foreign policy agendas (Smith, 2003).

Yet, it must not be forgotten that in other issue areas, like trade, “pressure to adapt” to EU rules is considerable, especially for new member states, which have not had the chance to influence EU policy in the first place. Indeed, it might be the case that some of them have the relationship they have with Latin America only because the EU has it. Or why else would Estonia have a free trade agreement with Mexico and Chile? Furthermore, in certain issue areas the outcome of interactions between national and EU foreign policies might not be policy transfer, but other types of relations. This is especially the case in issue areas in which the EU has no “exclusive authority”, like Development Cooperation, one of the fields in which the EU is at its most powerful as an international actor and where networks are becoming larger and more complex. Since competences are shared between the member states and EU institutions, there is much space for different combinations of EU and national policies apart from “Europeanization”: from complementation to substitution and duplication.

A second (and related) special characteristic of all foreign policies which matters for the present project is that they are *multisectoral*: foreign policy includes issues that range from security to human rights, passing through trade. This has several important consequences. To begin with, different processes or types of europeanization often coexist in different issue areas of a single state’s foreign relations: the same state which is an “uploader” in one issue in which it has strong preferences (*i. e.* Poland and Human Rights regarding Cuba) might be a “downloader” on other issues (Poland and Development cooperation). Therefore analysis needs to be fine tuned to detect these nuances by breaking down the main issue areas, instruments and objectives of foreign policy (see tables 2 and 4).

A further effect of the multisectoral nature of foreign policy is the problem of “horizontal segmentation”, which europeanization makes more acute (Kassim, *et al.*, 2000). This is a challenge to any state (i.e. the US and its policy towards China: trade vs. human rights) as modernity drives bureaucracies towards increased specialization. In the case of the EU it becomes all the more visible as states have transferred competences over certain policy fields considerably, as in trade. **Coherence remains a central challenge for a policy field where several issues converge, and competences are unevenly distributed.** This gives way to instances of “indirect uploading” (see chapter on Ireland), in which a strong advocate in one apparently unrelated EU policy area (like Ireland in agriculture) ends up shaping parts of EU foreign policy towards Latin America (trade protectionism).

A third feature that makes foreign policy peculiar is the central role played by the concept of “national interest”, so difficult to define precisely and *a priori* in the context of a multisectoral policy, yet so crucial for analysis. For the purposes of this project it has been suggested to break it down into specific “policy priorities”, which are easier to identify empirically (see table 2) by looking at the agendas of states in the particular issue areas that touch upon relations with Latin America. This is important because, *interest in Latin America is a characteristic that has very wide variation* across member states and policy areas, which makes this particular area of foreign policy interesting to study, in order to see the effect of “interest” as a variable on the europeanization of national foreign policies.

TABLE 2. INTEREST OF STATES DEFINED AS POLICY PRIORITIES IN SPECIFIC AREAS

			INTENSITY OF POLICY PREFERENCES	
			POLICY PRIORITY	NOT A POLICY PRIORITY
MAIN ISSUE- AREAS OF EU RELATIONS WITH LA, WHERE POLICY OBJECTIVES AND INSTRUMENTS ARE BEING DEVELOPED	ECONOMIC RELATIONS	TRADE		
		INVESTMENT		
	POLITICAL RELATIONS	VALUES (HUMAN RIGHTS, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY)		
		DIPLOMATIC, SECURITY		
	DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION	CULTURAL RELATIONS		
		DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION		

Relations between Europe and Latin America

The third literature that intersects this project is that on Europe's relations with Latin America, which straddles between the fields of history, area studies and international relations. Most of it is descriptive, and oddly enough, developed by scholars based in the Americas who are interested in explaining to their publics European politics and integration (Sbérro and Soriano, 2005; Roy and Domínguez, 2007), and by European scholars interested in Latin America (Bulmer-Thomas, 1989). Therefore, this literature is rarely linked to the theoretical discussions on either European foreign policy or, even less, Europeanization. In general, there is a tendency to equate European foreign policy to what comes out of the EU and its Brussels-based institutions, particularly the Commission, leaving aside member states and their foreign policies, which is where the actual grounding of the EU's foreign policy is located. The most important contribution of this area of research is a **thematic and historical map of the evolution of relations between Europe and Latin America**. It is important to highlight briefly here some of the insights and contextual information provided by this literature, where most of the empirical material lies.

A first valuable insight is that relations between some European powers and the Americas **date back a long time**, as they have their roots in the colonial era, starting in the XVI century, with the arrival of Spain and Portugal (to Latin America), as well as France, Britain and the Netherlands (to North America and the Caribbean). The conquest of Latin American countries by Spain and Portugal created a strong bond between colonizers and colonized, not replicated elsewhere: driven by the zeal of evangelization, Spain in particular imposed structures, institutions, culture and traditions which have had such a deep rooting, that many of these were not completely eroded even

after independence processes in the early XIX century. In the case of Portugal, the monarchy even moved to Brazil, as it fled the Napoleonic wars. Some EU member states, like the UK and France, still have a territorial presence in the Caribbean region, a fact that certainly impacts on their policies and relations towards the area, and on those of the EU. Other European countries which did not have colonial presence in America, got involved in many of the dynamics of the region, for example, through migration in the XIX and XX centuries (Italy, Ireland, Germany, Poland). As will become clear in the case studies, the history of relations between each EU member state and Latin America is an important determinant of their contemporary interests and links (or lack of them) towards the region. It could be argued that **history matters**, as it has determined what Risse, *et al.* (2001) calls “national pre-existing policy”, and therefore has a strong incidence in the “goodness of fit” with EEC/EU policy that developed at the end of the XXth century. For that reason, all the case studies start with a historical account that can go back well before the creation of the EU.

From independence onwards, the resources and trade potential of the Latin American countries made them attractive to European powers, and became the dominant elements of European interests toward the region. Nevertheless, the interaction has been volatile, with **episodes of closeness punctuating a general trend of gradual distancing** (Pi-Suñer, *et al.*, 2011). Advances and setbacks have been influenced by multiple factors such as international context, national positions and external shocks. Rarely conflictive since the proclamation of the Monroe doctrine (and the advent of US hegemony in the region), the interaction between Europe and Latin America has been **dominated mainly by economic matters** -with the important exceptions of Cuba, the Malvinas/Falkands war, and the wars in Central America. In the second half of the XX century this economic relation was actually affected by the integration process: the establishment of the EEC’s preferential trade system with its member states’ former colonies of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (known as ACP countries), weakened trade links with Latin American countries of Spanish and Portuguese origin. This was not the only fact affecting economic relations: nationalist policies in the region scared away foreign investment, while a lack of competitiveness displaced Latin American suppliers to European markets, in favour of competitors from other regions like Asia. All this is important, because the **European integration process was centered on economics, and therefore affected relations between member states and Latin America long before the establishment of ECP or CFSP.**

Despite being rooted in strong economic interests, the spheres of interaction expanded into politics and development cooperation in the early 1980s, as a result of two key factors. First, the **civil wars in Central America** that started at the end of the 1970s gave a boost to cooperation within ECP,

as European member states broke a long tradition of seeing Latin America as the natural area of influence of the United States, and working as a group allowed them to have a more active political role in the region. Second, the accession of Spain and Portugal to the EEC in 1986 triggered a new era, as the new member states, and in particular Spain (for which Latin America was clearly a foreign policy priority), worked hard to upload their relations to the European level. Since the 1990's, Latin America as a foreign policy topic has increasingly taken ground in the EU agenda; has gained a heading in the EU budget; and numerous policy tools have been put in place to institutionalize the EU's relationships with it, such as cooperation and association agreements, bi-regional dialogues, strategic partnerships, and so on.

Thus a study of European policy towards Latin America that concentrated exclusively on CFSP would indeed miss most of the picture and a long period of integration history. That is why an all encompassing definition of European foreign policy, as discussed above, is indispensable to approach this subject. Concentrating only on the output of CFSP (or what Carlsnaes calls subsystem 1), would mean would leave aside trade and development issues which have been central in the articulation of these relations for the past twenty years. Focusing exclusively on what comes out of the Brussels institutions would not reveal the key role played by certain member states, Spain in particular.

According to this body of literature three broad issue areas are at play in relations between Europe and Latin America: economics (trade and investment), politics (values and diplomatic/security), development and cooperation. This in turn, is important in order to organize empirically where the policy priorities ("national interest") of EU member states' can be situated in relation to Latin America (table 2).

Methodological considerations and working hypotheses

In depth-historical case studies informed by theory

The first methodological consideration to be addressed is the definition of Europeanization. In this project, we take Europeanization as “policy transfers among national and EU foreign policy instruments, objectives and ideas, caused or influenced by the interaction with each other”.⁷ As explained in the first section, Europeanization can take place in three broad ways, depending on the direction of policy transfer: download, upload and sideways processes.

Once the concept is established, another concern is to avoid overdetermining the outcome of research. How do we know Europeanization when we see it? It might be the case that change of national foreign policy is the result of some other cause, like globalization or some other internal development, rather than change at the European level (Bulmer, 2007). Risse, *et al.* (2001) and Radaelli and Pasquier (2007) stress that to avoid such problem, a research design that uses process-tracing is the most adequate to detect change and elucidate its mechanisms and causes. Also Radaelli and Pasquier (2007) have strongly argued that this problem can be addressed with a research design that starts and ends with the national states, rather than starting at the EU level and then looking at member states to conclude that, “if something similar to what exists in Brussels exists at the national level, then it must be Europeanization”. Since Europeanization is a process of change, then it is important to stay at the same level of analysis to be able to detect what changes. For that reason, especially for instances of downloads and sideways Europeanization, this book presents **national** case studies. A detailed study of the multiple events and changes in national contexts could only be achieved by *in-depth case studies* of certain member states’ policy towards Latin America.

Another important methodological issue is that, when studying policy transfers, time is fundamental because the object of analysis is *variation WITHIN the units throughout the years*. The way to address this is to carry out historical studies of the countries that **cover a long enough period of time so as to identify change**. Also, historical case studies should address one of the most important questions raised by this project: which states are uploaders and who are downloaders, and in which policy area? In other words, how is Europeanization taking place? This book will show that the whole process is not only complex, but also dynamic. The same member state could play different roles depending on the issue area and historical context. A historical

⁷ In this we depart from the definition by Risse, *et al.* (2001) who confusingly equate “Europeanization” with integration at the EU level, and we borrow from Radaelli’s clearer definition.

analysis is the only method which allows the identification of stages or changes in the position of member states through a period of time in certain topics. Yet, in order to make these historical case studies comparable, they must be informed by a common theory, with a shared conceptual framework and definitions, which is the purpose of this chapter.

A last point that needs to be made explicit -and which reinforces the choice for national case studies- is the fact that the meaning of europeanization varies greatly from one member state to the other. This is important because it has a significant incidence in what Risse, *et al.* (2001) identify as a key mediating factor: "a cooperative culture". For example, a member state like Britain, where elites have consistently taken a view of the EU as alien and menacing to sovereignty, will be much more reticent to be seen favouring europeanization, especially of the download type, than a member state like Germany, where the European project has been essential to the reconstruction of the national identity since the 1950's (see also Miskimmon, 2007). Therefore, it is important for the case studies to include a section that briefly outlines how each particular state has viewed its relation with European integration in general and europeanization in particular.

The causality mechanisms and some hypotheses

The object of study has been clearly defined in previous sections as policy transfers among national and EU foreign policies towards Latin America. However, as the literature as pointed out, it is difficult measure these policy transfers in an ordinal way (Vink and Graziano, 2007; Radaelli and Pasquier, 2007), so we propose to use the typology summarized in table 1, which in turn, will enable to better **understand** the ways in which europeanization is taking place. In other words, the aim is to disentangle under which circumstances europeanization takes the form of an upload, and in which it looks more like a download or a sideways policy transfer. Here it is important to insist that europeanization can manifest in different forms (upload, download and sideways), and does not necessarily mean "convergence" between national and EU policies. Each has different causal mechanisms behind, according to the theoretical literature. In the following section, the variables are presented and detailed for each type of europeanization and some working hypotheses are presented.

Variables and hypotheses: download

With regard to *download*, we follow Risse, *et al.* (2001) who identify the dependent variable as **change in national policy**, which is relatively easy to observe empirically by looking at the objectives, instruments and ideas structuring national policies towards Latin America. The independent variable

defined by Risse, *et al.* (2001) as “pressure to adapt”, is more problematic, as its definition is related to the “goodness of fit” between the pre-existing national policy and that at the EU level; a “bad fit” leads to more pressure, while a “good fit” creates less pressure for change at the national level. There is a certain circularity in this argument, as the categorization of this independent variable is related to the dependent one (national policy). Indeed, a “good fit” between national and EU policies might be the result of a previously successful upload. Moreover, the exact result of a “bad fit” is determined, in turn, by a number of other variables that these authors call “mediating factors”: veto points, facilitating institutions and culture.

For these reasons, in this study, we propose a different definition and categorization of “pressure to adapt”. It can be argued that “pressure to adapt” actually varies much more clearly among issue areas of EU governance: “community policies”, giving exclusive competences to EU institutions (like Trade) and governed by rules that are obligatory, generate much more “pressure to adapt” than policies in which competences remain national (security) or are shared between the national level and the EU level (Development Cooperation) (Miskimmon, 2007). In other words, it will be easier for national governments to deviate from EU templates in handling their relations with Latin America in the latter kind of issue areas, because there will still be ample room for national ideas, objectives and instruments to “complement” or even “counterbalance” the parts of EU policy that need to be adapted.⁸

This is not the end of the story, however. The variable “goodness of fit” is still relevant, for it points at the degree of compatibility or alignment between national and EU policies. We argue however, that it is better used as an intervening variable that explains different ways of “downloading”, given a similar level of pressure to adapt, as summarized in table 3. Moreover, it could be argued that EU membership creates pressure for change at the national level in any case, even if there is a “good fit”, for there is still the need to take into account the fact that the member state belongs to the EU, and that creates informal pressure to “do what is appropriate” (March and Olsen, 1989) as a member of such club. Peer pressure can indeed be an important trigger of sideways europeanization.

⁸ *Et al.* (2001) mention this differences across sectors but do not incorporate it in their analysis systematically.

TABLE 3. INTERPLAY OF DOWNLOAD VARIABLES: GOODNESS OF FIT AND DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETENCES

PRESSURE TO ADAPT	HIGH PRESSURE TO ADAPT		LOW PRESSURE TO ADAPT
DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETENCIES	EU EXCLUSIVE COMPETENCIES:	SHARED COMPETENCIES	EXCLUSIVE NATIONAL COMPETENCIES:
EXAMPLE OF POLICY AREA	TRADE, COMPETITION	DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION	DIPLOMACY, SECURITY, GOVERNANCE
"GOOD FIT" *	H1: Policy convergence through download: national policy is aligned with the EU's. Little change is necessary.	H5: Policy convergence: certain elements of national policy align with EU. National policy complements and reinforces that of the EU.	H3: Policy convergence through learning and diffusion. national policy complements and reinforces that of the EU.
"BAD FIT" **	H2: Partial policy change: only compulsory elements of EU policy are adopted at the national level. State will try to modify EU policy (upload)	H6: Partial policy change: only compulsory elements of EU policy are adopted. National policy deviates from EU policy an even contradicts it.	H4: Partial policy change might occur due to peer pressure. National policy counterbalances the EU's. Other foreign policy instruments are used.

*A "good fit" might be the result of a previous successful upload

** Outcomes depend on "mediating factors": veto points, facilitating institutions and cultures.

The interplay between these two variables leads to formulate the following hypotheses about the ways in which europeanization download takes place (or does not):

- H1: When the policy area is governed with exclusive competencies at the EU level and there is a "good fit" between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, then **policy convergence** is more likely. Little change (i.e. administrative) is necessary at the national level to comply with EU obligations. Although the pressure for change is high, the cost to do so is low, so change occurs easily.
- H2: When the policy area is governed with exclusive competencies at the EU level and there is a "bad fit" between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, then **policy change at the national level is only partial**, in order to comply with those parts which are compulsory. For example, instruments might be adopted, but goals remain unchanged. There is partial convergence, but significant elements of policy remain untouched. Additionally, the misfit and strong pressure to adapt constitute important

incentives for member states to try to modify EU policy to make it fit better with its interests (**upload**).

- H3:** When the policy area is governed with exclusive competencies at the national level and there is a “good fit” between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, then **policy change does not need to occur** in order to have convergence, for interests and ideas and institutions are already aligned. Further **convergence might result from socialization** and learning.
- H4:** When the policy area is governed with exclusive competencies at the national level and there is a “bad fit” between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, then the outcomes can vary greatly as **there is more room for states to deviate from EU policy**. Here the influence of mediating factors as well as the intensity of national interest is at its highest level of incidence on outcomes. The most likely outcome is that policy change does occur at the national level and **other foreign policy instruments** and fora are chosen for action. Yet, if the member state finds itself isolated within the EU, “the logic of appropriateness” or “peer pressure” can be high enough for some **partial change** to occur through **sideways** policy transfers.
- H5:** When the policy area is governed with shared competencies and there is a “good fit” between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, **policy convergence** is again likely (as in H1). Certain elements of national policy align with EU: those which are compulsory. The national components of that policy remain distinct but align with the other components so as to complement or/and be reinforced by EU policy.
- H6:** When the policy area is governed under shared competencies and there is a “bad fit” between the national and the EU pre-existing policies, **partial policy change** is likely: only compulsory elements of EU policy are adopted. **National policy deviates from EU policy** and even counterbalances it.

This way of defining and relations among the variables allows for a more precise idea of the ways in which download takes place, when it does, and also which situations are likely to lead to other types of Europeanization, such as upload (H2) and sideways (H4). Let’s turn to upload.

Variables and hypotheses: upload

The second type of europeanization, called “upload” or “bottom-up” model, refers to the projection of national policy preferences to the European Union level. The mechanisms behind a successful “projection” are much less developed theoretically, because this meaning of “europeanization” has been less studied empirically in a systematic fashion. The literature identifies traditional variables like “interest” and “relative power” behind this kind of europeanization (Wong, 2006). For a member state to be able to *upload* its preferences, two elements need to be present:

- 1) “**interest**” defined as the intensity of a policy preference,
- 2) “**power**”, defined as the capacity to build a coalition at the EU level that supports its policy preferences.

The precise operationalization of some of these variables remains a challenge, if one pretends to build them *a priori*. Actually, this is a task to be resolved empirically by the case studies, which should not be put in a too tight straightjacket beforehand, for it could result in missing out important elements of the historical analysis. That is also necessary when identifying “national interest” which varies over time, as well as capacity to build coalitions at the EU level, which becomes more complex after each enlargement and treaty revision.

Yet there is still room for some useful working definitions. With regard to the variable “interest” or “intensity of preferences”, we can use a simple and widely used dichotomy, depending on whether the issue area at stake is a **policy priority or not**, as specified in table 2. A state which, like Spain, finds that all the issue areas of the relationship with Latin America are policy priorities, could be said to have a strong interest, while a state like Poland, which only really cares about human rights in Cuba, while the rest is secondary, can be categorized as generally having a weak interest. This definition of “interest” gives both a general view of the national interest of each state under study, and a precise idea of which specific areas are more important to it.

The variable “power” is much more **complex** to define as it refers to the fact that the capacity to upload objectives and instruments into the EU also depends on the number of states that **share an interest** in that particular area, or on whether there is a blocking minority that opposes it. Because some compromise is necessary to build coalitions, what actually ends up being “uploaded” are the interests of a coalition of states, rather than the imposition of a national policy to the rest. That is why EU policy normally looks like a “patchwork” of national policies (Héritier, 1996).

The combination of these two variables leads to the following hypotheses as summarized in table 4.

TABLE 4. EXPECTED OUTCOMES ON EUROPEANIZATION “UPLOAD” OR “BOTTOM-UP MODEL”

		COALITION AT THE EU LEVEL: SHARED INTEREST	
		WIDELY SHARED	ISOLATION
NATIONAL INTEREST	POLICY PRIORITY	H7: Successful upload	H9: Partial or no upload
	NOT A POLICY PRIORITY	H8: Successful upload	H10: No upload. Policy preference remains at the national level or adapts (download)

- H7: When a state has a strong policy preference and it manages to build a wide enough coalition (or blocking minority) that shares its views, then a **successful upload** is likely.
- H8: When a state has a policy preference that is not a priority but which is widely shared by other member states (or blocking minority) then a **successful upload** is likely.
- H9: When a state has a strong policy preference and but finds itself in isolation with respect to other member states (does not even achieve a blocking minority), then only a **partial upload** is possible at best, depending on its whether the use of a veto is possible. The assumption would be that, having a strong policy preference, the state in question would be ready to use the veto if necessary. The voting rules, which vary from one policy area to the other, matter here.
- H10: When a state has a policy preference that is not a priority and finds itself in isolation with respect to other member states (does not even achieve a blocking minority), then **no upload is possible**. Two outcomes are then possible depending on the way in which the policy area is governed (pressure to adapt): if the policy area is governed with exclusive competencies at the national level, the **policy may remain untouched at the national level** in deviation of EU policy. However, if the policy area is governed with exclusive or shared competences with the EU level, then there will be pressure to adapt to EU policy and a **download** is likely (H10).

The ability to build coalitions at the EU level (or power) needs further discussion, for it is not only a question of summing up a number of given preferences among other member states. Preferences are not given, as the Moravcik and Putnam models of EU policy making assume (Miskimmon, 2007),

but are in turn shaped by EU institutions and contact among member states (sideways). The role of EU institutions as transmission belts for this interest projection at the EU level and to other member states, in their capacity as agenda setters, and loci for peer pressure is enormous and requires special mention. It is here that upload and download meet the sideways approach to Europeanization. For this reason, it becomes impossible to talk about upload and sideways Europeanization in foreign policy without setting out which are the actors involved, as well as the processes in which they participate, and in particular, the instances in which specific member states can have influence in shaping other member states' and EU institution's preferences. That is the topic of the next section.

Actors and processes

At the EU level, three main actors can be identified: the European Council, the Council of the European Union (formerly known as Council of Ministers) and the European Commission.

The **European Council** is the body composed by the heads of State and Government of EU member states; despite its lack of legislative capacity it has great influence in the integration process, especially in the establishment of political guidelines as it is the main **agenda setter**. Until the Lisbon Treaty, the country holding the six-month rotating Presidency of the European Council could exercise considerable leverage on defining the priorities of the EU, including foreign policy objectives, through setting the agenda. Thus, Spanish presidencies of the Council (notably 1995 and 2010) had as their priority to make significant progress in relations between the EU and Latin America. Since the Lisbon Treaty, the Presidency is now a permanent post, removing somewhat this opportunity for member states to push their star projects during their Presidency. Also, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, established by Lisbon, is involved in the meetings of the Council. This new post is no longer supposed to represent solely the member states, as the High Representative is also vice-President of the European Commission, thus making it more complex for individual member states, like Spain, to exert pressure in order to advance its own policy preferences. The previous post was held by a well respected Spanish diplomat, Javier Solana, an advantage that Spain and its Latin American agenda have now lost, in favour of the UK, as the post is now occupied by a British citizen, Catherine Ashton.

A second actor that must be taken into account is the **Council of the European Union**, which is actually a body which meets in multiple configurations, or sectoral Councils. Paramount among them in terms of foreign policy-making is the Council of General Affairs, attended by member states' foreign affairs ministers, who are in charge of the CFSP and of

coordinating and bringing coherence to the output of other sectoral Councils, such as Trade, Agriculture, and Development Cooperation, where voting rules may vary from one issue to the other. **National interests are well represented** in the Council by the ministers coming from the governments of member states, and by their Permanent Representatives in Brussels who meet in COREPER to prepare the work of the Councils. They, in turn, receive input from technical committees composed mainly of national officials, but which also allow the participation of other groups such as non-governmental organizations, lobbies, or specific actors whose interests are at stake (the art of defending and projecting one's interests through these instances is known as *commitology*). It is through the Councils of Ministers that national governments have most influence in the EU's policy making processes, as it approves legislation (see below). As will be explained below, the main challenge for member states to "defend their national interest" at the Council, is that the former gets "unpacked" into sectoral issue areas, and policy preferences across them might not necessarily be coherent or consistent. The challenge of coordination at the national level has become great as European integration has progressed (Kassim, *et al.*, 2000) and increased "horizontal segmentation". The case studies in this book illustrate this point constantly (see chapters on Spain, Ireland and Germany in particular).

The third most influential actor at the EU level is the **European Commission**, which proposes legislation, and more importantly, has exclusive competencies over the implementation of certain policies, like Trade and Agriculture, and a shared role with member states in Development and Cooperation, all areas which are central to relations between Europe and Latin America. Therefore, the Commission's role has been paramount in articulating these relations, which explains why Latin American diplomatic services tend to focus on the Commission and forget about other EU institutions. For member states, holding a particular post within the Commission represents an additional way of exerting influence in the policy-making process at the EU level, despite the vow of Commissioners to defend the "European interest". The case studies show clearly how the "Marín factor", that is, having a Spaniard as Vice President of the Commission and in charge of External Affairs, was certainly a valuable asset for the Spanish government in uploading its Latin America policy at the EU level. Before him, France pushed the topic through Claude Cheysson and Jacques Delors, while British commissioners in charge of Trade, like Leon Brittan, have sought to keep the EU as open as possible to outsiders.

More recently, the **European Parliament (EP)** has become an increasingly relevant actor in relations with Latin America. It had little competences until the Maastricht Treaty, but is now, after the Amsterdam and Lisbon treaties, a co-legislator with the Council of Ministers. Its role has therefore been variable

with history, becoming more visible in recent years. In particular, it has been required to ratify the EU's Association Agreements with Mexico and Chile, and will need to do so in the forthcoming agreement with Central America. Because of its openness and accessibility, it has also become a platform for Latin American NGO's to denounce their own governments, as has been the case with Mexico (Ruano, 2008). The bulk of work at the EP is carried out by specialized committees, and not surprisingly, those dealing with relations with Latin America have been mainly Spanish (like José Ignacio Salafranca) and German MEPs. Through members of the EP, again, national policy priorities get projected into the EU level, but fragmented according to party political lines. This is a matter that will have to be taken into account for future analysis, but given the time frame of this research, has little relevance.

At the **national level**, numerous actors, going from the government branches and ministers of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development to professional associations, NGO's, private companies, lobbies, political parties, churches and even influential individuals, form complex networks. The structure of these networks may vary from one policy area to another; the **density and horizontal coordination of such networks** also differs considerably between countries. It can be assumed that the denser and more crowded the national policy networks involved in relations with Latin America, the more this region will be a policy priority to national governments. This point will be addressed by the case studies of this project.

The interactions of the actors and institutions mentioned at both levels entail complex dynamics **which this book will try to disentangle**. Despite the dominance of the national component in European foreign policy, this section has shown that the evolution of institutions, instruments and policies at the EU level has had an impact in national contexts, at least, by providing the member states with additional fora, and instruments in their policies towards Latin America. It is through these institutions and processes that policy transfers upwards, downwards and sideways take place.

Case selection

Equally important to the methodological matters discussed above is the issue of case selection. For budgetary and time reasons, it is impossible to carry out case studies for all 27 members of the EU, so a selection was necessary. **Spain**, as the member state with **most interest** (or most intense preferences) in the LAC region has been a pivotal player in this particular policy area so it had to be included. The other three traditional European "great powers", **France, Britain and Germany** also had to be included, for they have been influential in the international relations of Europe both within and outside the Union. They, in other words, are the **most powerful** members, susceptible of building coalitions, or blocking minorities around their interest, even when

these have not been a priority. Then, other member states were grouped into three categories within which member states are assumed to have similar characteristics in their relation to the EU and in their foreign policies: Scandinavia, Central Europe and “small member states”.

Scandinavian countries are assumed **not to have particularly strong interest** in relation to Latin America so it was important to have one in the sample to see the play of this variable. Another relevant characteristic of this group of countries is that most of their foreign policy instruments towards the developing world are concentrated on **Development Cooperation**, an area of shared competences at between the EU and the national level, and in which outcomes are therefore less precisely predicted by our theoretical framework. Among them, **Sweden** was chosen, as it is the one that had the most significant relationship with the LAC region, so europeanization effects could be more closely observed.

With regard to the countries of Central Europe that joined the EU in the most recent enlargement, they were particularly interesting to study in order to elucidate the pressure and success of download in a policy area in which they had no previous input. As “**late comers**”, they did not have the opportunity to previously upload their preferences into EU policy towards Latin America, so they were obliged to **download** it as part of the *acquis communautaire* that they adopted upon accession. In contrast to Spain, however, none of them had a particularly strong interest in the region. So the expectation is that these countries would be mainly downloaders. **Poland** was chosen, although because of its size and previous relation with Latin America, it is not particularly representative of the region. However, it is a more interesting case (a “hard” case) to analyze than others in its category, as it allows to see what happens when a state which did not have the opportunity to upload its preferences into EU policy has to download it, but has a previously existing policy (which most of the other new members did not have).

Finally, there is the category of “small member states”, which is problematic as it implies that size is an important variable for our study, yet the working definition we propose of power does not take it into account, because a small country can very well be capable of constructing coalitions at the EU level, despite its limited economic and political weight. So we chose instead to use this instance as a “**null case**”, in the sense of a state with had **no interest and very little previously existing policy** towards the region, in order to have enough variation in these variable within our sample. Most small member states are from Central Europe, but they could not be chosen in order to avoid a confusion with the characteristics of that category. So **Ireland** seemed to be the ideal case, with the expectation that it would be primarily a downloader, although it would, when needed have the capacity to form coalitions at the EU level to upload its preferences.

Certainly, these categories do not exhaust the different types of EU member states that could be relevant for this study. An interesting one left out is the “Baltic states” which are different from the rest of Central Europe in that they only recently became independent of the Soviet Union, and therefore not only did not have a previously existing policy towards Latin America, but a foreign policy *tout court*. Another attractive category to analyze is that of micro-states, like Malta, Cyprus, and Luxemburg as they seem to have a logic of their own (Panke, 2010). And finally there are states which have a significant relation with Latin America but are left out: Italy, the Netherlands and Portugal.

General outline of the case studies

To integrate all the previously discussed elements in the case studies, this framework suggests the following structure for all chapters. First, a section of conceptual considerations in which general topics are discussed such as implications of the membership to the EU, a brief history and nature of the relationship between the member state in question and the EU, as well as some aspects regarding the foreign policy of the country towards Latin America. Second, an overview of the relations and policies towards Latin America after entering the EU should follow. The episodes and events presented should be analyzed by considering and highlighting the process of downloading, uploading and sideways europeanization identified. Finally, a section explaining the current situation, and which also might include some prospective analysis of the relation. This part can be organized in subsections depending on the main issue areas of the relationship like economic relations (involving topics as trade and investment), political dialogue (for example, values and diplomatic contact) and cooperation and development. In order to have a complete picture that include other processes that might be at play, policy instruments outside the EU as well as bilateral ones have to be included in the analysis (see table below).

TABLE 5. INSTRUMENTS OF FOREIGN POLICY MAKING IN DIFFERENT POLICY AREAS

POLICY AREA		PREFERRED INSTRUMENTS OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT		
		EU	BILATERAL	OTHER (UN, NGO'S...)
ECONOMIC RELATIONS	TRADE			
	INVESTMENT			
POLITICAL RELATIONS	VALUES (HUMAN RIGHTS, GOOD GOVERNANCE AND DEMOCRACY)			
	DIPLOMATIC			
DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION	CULTURAL RELATIONS			
	DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION			

Conclusions

Despite EU institutions and integration, national policies remain highly differentiated and cannot be assumed away. That is why they need to be studied in order to gain a more nuanced view of what European Policy towards Latin America is. And, today these national policies cannot be understood in isolation, but must be viewed in relation to the other two sub-systems and each other. Arguably, the most interesting part to analyze is the relationship between the national level and the EU, both in its intergovernmental and its supranational spheres. It is indeed crucial to revise in depth, for example, how national foreign policies manage without one of its hitherto most powerful traditional instruments: trade. This is especially important in the case of a policy towards a region like Latin America that does not present pressing security issues for the EU, and where economic relations and cooperation are the main interests of both parties, and the two issue areas in which supranational Community policies are central, and national coordination remains difficult.

This project presents a research design which is not aimed at hypothesis testing. **The objective is to understand the different types of interaction between the national and EU levels, with foreign policy towards Latin America as a case.** In this way, this elastic conceptualization of europeanization can be a handy heuristic and descriptive device that allows for broad comparisons across several national case studies. Thus, with this typology in mind, it will be possible to identify which have been the dominant processes at play between each of the member states studied and the EU. It is crucial for the case studies, not to take too strict a definition of europeanization in order not to leave out significant information, while, at the same time it is important to pay special attention to the way the concepts may transform. Indeed, in matters of foreign policy, very little is compulsory, outside trade. There is still ample space for national foreign policies to vary, and it could well be the case that, rather than adapting to EU policy, what national governments have done is to accommodate it.

References

- Alizal, Laura del, (2002), *Una nueva etapa en las relaciones México-Unión Europea*, Río de Janeiro, Universidad Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Programa de Estudios Europeos/Konrad Adenauer Stiftung.
- Bailes, Alyson J. K., Herolf G. and Sundelius B. (eds.), (2006), *The Nordic Countries and the European Security and Defence Policy*, Oxford, SIPRI/Oxford University Press.
- Börzel, Tanja A., (1999), "Towards Convergente in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to europeanization in Germany and Spain", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 37 n. 4, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bulmer, Simon, (2007), "Theorizing Europeanization", in Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Bulmer, Simon, (1997), "Shaping the rules? The Constitutive Politics of the European Union and German Power", in Peter J. Katzenstein (ed.), *Tamed Power: Germany in Europe*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Bulmer-Thomas, Victor (ed.), (1989), *Britain and Latin America: a Changing Relationship*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, Fraser, (1998), "Building a common foreign policy: do institutions matter?" in John Peterson and Helene Sjursen (eds.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, Sjursen H. and White B. (eds.), (2004), *Contemporary European Foreign Policy*, SAGE Publishers, London.
- Featherstone, Kevin and Radaelli C. (eds.), (2003), *The politics of Europeanization*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Héritier, Adrienne, (1996), "The accommodation of Diversity in European Policy-Making and its Outcomes: Regulatory Policy as a Patchwork", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 3, n. 2, London, Routledge.
- Héritier, Adrienne and Knill C., (2001), "Differential Responses to European Policies: A Comparison", in Adrienne Héritier *et al.*, *Differential Europe: The European Union Impact on National Policymaking*, Boulder Co., Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hill, Christopher (ed.), (1996), *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*, London, Routledge.
- Hill, Christopher, (1997), "Convergence, Divergence and Dialectics: National Foreign Policies and CFSP", in Zielonka (ed.), *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy*.
- Hoste, Amaury, "The New Latin American Policy of the EU", DSA European Development Policy Study Group Discussion Paper 11, DSA, 1999.
- Instituto de Relaciones Europa-Latinoamérica (IRELA) (ed.), (1997), *La Unión Europea y México: una nueva relación política y económica*, Madrid, IRELA.
- Jordan, Andrew, (2002), *The europeanization of British Environmental Policy*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

- Kavakas, Dimitrios, (2001), *Greece and Spain in European Foreign Policy: The influence of southern member states in Common foreign and security policy*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Kassim, Hussein, Anand Menon B., Peters G. and Wright V. (eds.), (2000), *The National Coordination of EU Policy: The Domestic Level*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- March, James and Olsen J., (1989), *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*, New York, Free Press.
- Miskimmon, Alister, (2007), *Germany and the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Between Europeanisation and National Adaptation*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Nunnenkamp, Peter, (2000), "Possible effects of European Union widening on Latin America", *The European Journal of Development Research*, vol. 12, n. 1, Hampshire, Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Nuttall, Simon J., (2000), *European Foreign Policy*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Oliver, Tim and Allen D., (2006), "Foreign Policy", in Ian Bache and Andrew Jordan (eds.), *The europeanization of British Politics*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Panke, Diana, (2010), *Small States in the European Union: Coping with Structural Disadvantages*, Farnham, Ashgate.
- Peterson, John and Sjørnsen H., (1998), "Conclusion: the myth of CFSP?", in John Peterson and Helene Sjørnsen (eds.), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe?*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Pi Suñer, Antonia, Riguzzi P. and Ruano L., (2011), *Europa*, in Mercedes de Vega (coord.), *Historia de las Relaciones Internacionales de México, 1810-2010*, México, Acervo Histórico Diplomático Genaro Estrada y Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 2011 [forthcoming].
- Radaelli, Claudio, (2000), "Policy Transfer in the European Union: Institutional Isomorphism as a Source of Legitimacy", *Governance*, vol. 13, n. 1, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Radaelli, Claudio and Pasquier R., (2007), "Conceptual Issues", in Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Risse, Thomas, Green Cowles M. and Caporaso J., (2001), "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction", in Maria Green Cowles, James Caporaso and Thomas Risse (eds.), *Transforming Europe: europeanization and Domestic Change*, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press.
- Roy, Joaquín and Roberto Domínguez (eds.), (2007), *After Vienna: Dimensions of the Relationship between the European Union and the Latin American-Caribbean Region*, Miami, Jean Monnet Chair/University of Miami/ Miami-Florida European Union Center of Excellence.
- Ruano, Lorena, (2008), "De la exaltación al tedio: las relaciones entre México y la Unión Europea durante el sexenio del presidente Vicente Fox, 2000-2006", *Foro Internacional*, vol. 191/192, nº 1/2, México, El Colegio de México.
- Sbérro, Stephan y Soriano J.P. (coord.), (2005), *La Unión Europea, su evolución y relaciones con América Latina y el mundo 2005*, México: Porrúa, ITAM, IEIE, Colegio de México y Asociación Konrad Adenauer.

- Schimmelfennig, Frank and Sedelmeier U. (eds.), (2005), *The europeanization of Central and Eastern and Europe*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Schumacher, Edward, (1995), "Spain and Latin America: The Resurgence of a Special Relationship", in Susan Kauffman Purcell and Francoise Simone (eds.), *Europe and Latin American in the World Economy*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner.
- Smith, Hazel, (2002), *European Union Foreign Policy, What it is and what it does*, London, Pluto Press.
- Smith, Karen, (2003), "Understanding the European Foreign Policy System," *Contemporary European History*, vol. 12, n. 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Michael, (2004), "Toward a theory of EU foreign policy making: multilevel governance, domestic politics and national adaptation to Europe's common foreign and security policy", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 11, n. 4, London, Routledge.
- Tonra, Ben, (2001), *The europeanization of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Vink, Maarten P. and Graziano P., (2007), "Introduction", in Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Wagner, Wolfgang, (2003), "Why the EU's common foreign and security policy will remain intergovernmental: a rationalist institutional choice analysis of European crisis management policy", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 10, n. 4, London, Routledge.
- White, Brian, (2001), *Understanding European Foreign Policy*, Basingstonke, Palgrave.
- Wong, Reuben Y., (2006), *The europeanization of French Foreign Policy: France and the EU in East Asia*, Basingstonke, Palgrave.
- Wong, Reuben Y., (2007), "Foreign Policy", in Paolo Graziano and Maarten P. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Zielonka, Jan (ed.), (1997), *Paradoxes of European Foreign Policy*, The Hague, Kluwer Law International.

Novedades

DIVISIÓN DE ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA

- David Arellano *et al.*, *Control de los conflictos de interés*, DTAP-255
- David Arellano, Víctor Figueras y Walter Lepore, *Política de tránsito en el DF de México: una introducción a su estudio empírico*, DTAP-254
- Sergio Cárdenas y Maximiliano Cárdenas, *La participación del poder legislativo en la definición de la política educativa en México*, DTAP-253
- Sergio Cárdenas, *Administración centrada en la escuela*, DTAP-252
- Joanna D. Lucio, Edgar Ramírez y Sergio Cárdenas, *¿Libertad para quién? El efecto de comunidades cerradas en el espacio urbano*, DTAP-251
- Edgar E. Ramírez, *Land Development Permitting*, DTAP-250
- Rodrigo Sandoval-Almazán, Luis F. Luna-Reyes y J. Ramón Gil-García, *Índice de Gobierno Electrónico Estatal: La medición 2009*, DTAP-249
- J. Ramón Gil García y Armando Aldama, *Gobierno electrónico en Canadá: Antecedentes, objetivos, estrategias y resultados*, DTAP-248
- J. Ramón Gil García y Luis F. Luna Reyes, *Teoría institucional y simulación dinámica para una mejor comprensión del gobierno electrónico*, DTAP-247
- Ernesto M. Flores-Roux y Judith Mariscal, *Política de generación de infraestructura de telecomunicaciones en México: Una crítica*, DTAP-246

DIVISIÓN DE ECONOMÍA

- David Mayer, *Urbanization as a Fundamental Cause of Development*, DTE-501
- Arturo Antón y Alan Villegas, *El papel de la tasa de interés real en el ciclo económico de México*, DTE-500
- Víctor Carreón, *La arquitectura de mercado del sector eléctrico mexicano*, DTE-499
- Sonia Di Giannatale *et al.*, *Confianza, redes sociales y hábitos financieros: un estudio empírico*, DTE-498
- Antonio Jiménez, *Coordination Incentives for Information Acquisition with a Finite Set of Players*, DTE-497
- Rodolfo Cermeño *et al.*, *Trade Flows and Volatility of their Fundamentals: Some Evidence from Mexico*, DTE-496
- Kaniska Dam, *Principal-Agent Assignment*, DTE-495
- Luciana Moscoso, *Who Runs Against the Incumbent? Candidate Entry Decisions*, DTE-494
- Juan Rosellón *et al.*, *El modelo HRV para expansión óptima de redes de transmisión: aplicaciones en Ontario*, DTE-493
- Alejandro Villagómez, *Notas sobre la primera crisis global del siglo XXI*, DTE-492

DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS INTERNACIONALES

- Álvaro Morcillo, *Towards Europeanization?*, DTEI-208
- Kimberly A. Nolan García, *Enforcement by Design: The Legalization of Labor Rights Mechanisms in US Trade Policy*, DTEI-207
- Kimberly A. Nolan García, *Norms Socialization and NAFTA's Side Accord on Labor*, DTEI-206
- Jorge Chabat, *Combating Drugs in Mexico Under Calderon*, DTEI-205
- David Crow, *(Can't Get No) Satisfaction: An Application of Dynamic Loglinear Models...*, DTEI-204
- Ugo Pipitone, *Los daños del rey sabio: Mao y China*, DTEI-203
- Irina Alberro and J. Schiavon, *Shaping or Constraining Foreign Policy?*, DTEI-202
- Jorge Schiavon, *La diplomacia local de los gobiernos estatales en México (2000-2010)*, DTEI-201
- Luis Fernández y J. Schiavon, *La coordinación en la política exterior de Brasil y México*, DTEI-200
- Alejandro Anaya, *Internalización de las normas internacionales de derechos humanos en México*, DTEI-199
- Rafael Velázquez y Karen Marín, *Política exterior y diplomacia parlamentaria: El caso de los puntos de acuerdo durante la LX Legislatura*, DTEI-198
- Jorge Schiavon y Rafael Velázquez, *La creciente incidencia de la opinión pública en la política exterior de México: Teoría y realidad*, DTEI-197
- Jorge Chabat, *La respuesta del gobierno de Calderón al desafío del narcotráfico: Entre lo malo y lo peor*, DTEI-196

DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS JURÍDICOS

- Rodolfo Sarsfield, *The Mordida's Game. How institutions incentive corruption*, DTEJ-52
- Ángela Guerrero, Alejandro Madrazo, José Cruz y Tania Ramírez, *Identificación de las estrategias de la industria tabacalera en México*, DTEJ-51
- Estefanía Vela, *Current Abortion Regulation in Mexico*, DTEJ-50
- Adriana García and Alejandro Tello, *Salaries, Appellate Jurisdiction and Judges Performance*, DTEJ-49
- Ana Elena Fierro and Adriana García, *Design Matters: The Case of Mexican Administrative Courts*, DTEJ-48
- Gustavo Fondevila, *Estudio de percepción de magistrados del servicio de administración de justicia familiar en el Distrito Federal*, DTEJ-47
- Jimena Moreno, Xiao Recio Blanco y Cynthia Michel, *La conservación del acuario del mundo*, DTEJ-46
- Gustavo Fondevila, *"Madrinas" en el cine. Informantes y parapolicías en México*, DTEJ-45
- María Mercedes Albornoz, *Utilidad y problemas actuales del crédito documentario*, DTEJ-44
- Carlos Elizondo y Ana Laura Magaloni, *La forma es fondo. Cómo se nombran y cómo deciden los ministros de la Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación*, DTEJ-43

DIVISIÓN DE ESTUDIOS POLÍTICOS

- Ana Carolina Garriga, *Objetivos, instrumentos y resultados de política monetaria. México 1980-2010*, DTEP-225
- Andreas Schedler, *The Limits to Bureaucratic Measurement. Observation and Judgment in Comparative Political Data Development*, DTEP-224
- Andrea Pozas and Julio Ríos, *Constituted Powers in Constitution-Making Processes. Supreme Court Judges, Constitutional Reform and the Design of Judicial Councils*, DTEP-223
- Andreas Schedler, *Transitions from Electoral Authoritarianism*, DTEP-222
- María de la Luz Inclán, *A Preliminar Study on Pro and Counter Zapatista Protests*, DTEP-221
- José Antonio Crespo, *México 2009: Abstención, voto nulo y triunfo del PRI*, DTEP-220
- Andreas Schedler, *Concept Formation in Political Science*, DTEP-219
- Ignacio Marván, *La revolución mexicana y la organización política de México. La cuestión del equilibrio de poderes, 1908-1932*, DTEP-218
- Francisco Javier Aparicio y Joy Langston, *Committee Leadership Selection without Seniority: The Mexican Case*, DTEP-217
- Julio Ríos Figueroa, *Institutions for Constitutional Justice in Latin America*, DTEP-216

DIVISIÓN DE HISTORIA

- Adriana Luna, *La era legislativa en Nápoles: De soberanías y tradiciones*, DTH-71
- Adriana Luna, *El surgimiento de la Escuela de Economía Política Napolitana*, DTH-70
- Pablo Mijangos, *La historiografía jurídica mexicana durante los últimos veinte años*, DTH-69
- Sergio Visacovsky, *"Hasta la próxima crisis". Historia cíclica, virtudes genealógicas y la identidad de clase media entre los afectados por la debacle financiera en la Argentina (2001-2002)*, DTH-68
- Rafael Rojas, *El debate de la Independencia. Opinión pública y guerra civil en México (1808-1830)*, DTH-67
- Michael Sauter, *The Liminality of Man: Astronomy and the Birth of Anthropology in the Eighteenth Century*, DTH-66
- Ugo Pipitone, *Criminalidad organizada e instituciones. El caso siciliano*, DTH-65
- Ugo Pipitone, *Kerala, desarrollo y descentralización*, DTH-64
- Jean Meyer, *Historia y ficción, hechos y quimeras*, DTH-63
- Luis Medina, *La Comanchería*, DTH-62

Ventas

El CIDE es una institución de educación superior especializada particularmente en las disciplinas de Economía, Administración Pública, Estudios Internacionales, Estudios Políticos, Historia y Estudios Jurídicos. El Centro publica, como producto del ejercicio intelectual de sus investigadores, libros, documentos de trabajo, y cuatro revistas especializadas: *Gestión y Política Pública*, *Política y Gobierno*, *Economía Mexicana Nueva Época* e *Istor*.

Para adquirir cualquiera de estas publicaciones, le ofrecemos las siguientes opciones:

VENTAS DIRECTAS:	VENTAS EN LÍNEA:
Tel. Directo: 5081-4003 Tel: 5727-9800 Ext. 6094 y 6091 Fax: 5727 9800 Ext. 6314 Av. Constituyentes 1046, 1er piso, Col. Lomas Altas, Del. Álvaro Obregón, 11950, México, D.F.	Librería virtual: www.e-cide.com Dudas y comentarios: publicaciones@cide.edu

¡¡Colecciones completas!!

Adquiere los CDs de las colecciones completas de los documentos de trabajo de todas las divisiones académicas del CIDE: Economía, Administración Pública, Estudios Internacionales, Estudios Políticos, Historia y Estudios Jurídicos.



¡Nuevo! ¡¡Arma tu CD!!



Visita nuestra Librería Virtual www.e-cide.com y selecciona entre 10 y 20 documentos de trabajo. A partir de tu lista te enviaremos un CD con los documentos que elegiste.