



Mapping the political geographies of Europeanization: National discourses, external perceptions and the question of popular culture

Progress in Human Geography
37(6) 737–761

© The Author(s) 2012

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0309132512472093

phg.sagepub.com



Sami Moisio

University of Oulu, Finland

Veit Bachmann

Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany

Luiza Bialasiewicz

University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Elena dell’Agnese

University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

Jason Dittmer

University College London, UK

Virginie Mamadouh

University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract

Political geographers have significantly contributed to understandings of the spatialities of Europeanization. We review some of this work, while also highlighting research themes where further political-geographic research would be insightful. We note the importance of work that captures both the diverse expressions and meanings attributed to Europe, European integration and ‘European power’ in different places within and beyond the EU, and the variegated manifestations of ‘Europeanizing’ processes across these different spaces. We also suggest that political-geographic research can add crucial input to reconceptualizing European integration as well as Europeanization as it now unfolds in a time of ‘crisis’.

Corresponding author:

Sami Moisio, University of Oulu, Oulu 90014, Finland.

Email: sami.moisio@oulu.fi

Keywords

Europeanization, foreign policy, geopolitics, political geography, popular culture

I Introduction

The current European economic crisis has not only prompted an intense political debate on notions of ‘European solidarity’ and ‘European values’, but has also drawn attention to significant political, economic and cultural differences in ‘EU’rope.¹ At the same time, the crisis in Europe has led to a repositioning of ‘Europe in the world’; as Engelen et al. (2011b: 571) note, although ‘the geopolitical and geoeconomic orbit of the EU’ had become in recent years ‘tangible’, there is now ‘a widespread sense that things have gone awry’. The events of 2011 have in fact highlighted not only the power of EU institutions to transform seemingly domestic economic and political issues into ‘all-European’ matters, but have also resulted in a wholesale remaking of a distinct ‘European’ political space, not just within but also vis-a-vis its putative ‘outside’.

Different geopolitical imaginations of ‘EU’rope have formed an integral part of discussions on the economic crisis in both EU institutions and Member States, foregrounding once more how the European integration process and the spatial discourses of ‘EU’rope are co-constituted. The crisis has indeed put well into evidence the argument that European integration can be understood as a set of discursive practices that set boundaries for imaginations and articulations of the EU, as well as of its future geopolitical role in Europe and in the wider world. Not surprisingly, one of the most visible geopolitical imaginations of the economic crisis has been premised on a distinction between the irrational, naive, irresponsible and chaotic European South, and a rational and (fiscally) responsible North, articulated within a variety of disparaging, geographically determined monikers, from the ‘Garlic Belt’ to the ‘Club Med’ (and, of course, the infamous PIIGS

– Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, Spain). Writing in the midst of one of the flash points of the crisis, *The Economist* (2011: 34) could thus note that ‘150 years after Italy cast off foreign rule and won independence, the country still needs the *vincolo esterno*, the “external constraint”’, distilling a variety of similar arguments for politico-economic paternalism and the ‘defense of [European] monetarist orthodoxy against Mediterranean leniency’ (Engelen et al., 2011b: 576; see also Engelen et al., 2011a, and, for a discussion of longer-standing imagined geographical divides of this kind, Agnew, 2001).

Simultaneously, the emergence of such divisive imaginations has also given rise to alarmist warnings that, by endangering the fiction of European unity, the new spatial divisions would diminish the political and economic clout of the EU within and beyond its confines, both in its immediate ‘Neighbourhood’ but also, and perhaps especially, with respect to the United States as well as increasingly important new partners such as the BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India, China). The crisis thus comes at a time of growing emphasis – rhetorical, as well as institutional – on ‘EU’rope’s international role, with the appointment in December 2009 of a new EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, Catherine Ashton, and the creation of the European External Action Service, marking the development of a distinct EU ‘geopolitical persona’ (see Kuus, 2011b).

What is more, and related to the above points, the current condition has also illuminated that Europe means different things in different places, and that the politics of integration evokes different responses, tactics and strategies in different geographical contexts. The crisis has, indeed, given rise to widely different imaginations of

‘EU’rope, differentially mobilized by various political groupings, institutions and elite fractions across the continent (Clark and Jones, 2012), highlighting the wide variety of ways in which the influence of the EU and associated ‘European values’ are interpreted and called up in various parts of the EU, and beyond.

In this paper, we suggest that the spatial and temporal differences in the processes of building ‘EU’rope as a meaningful space of societal and political action and engagement – the ways in which ‘EU’rope is contested and played out in political discourses and practices – merit further reflection and, perhaps paradoxically, this is an especially good moment to do it. In particular, the complex geographical articulations of the current crisis highlight the need for a spatially sensitive, contextual approach, one able to capture not only the diverse expressions and meanings attributed to ‘Europe’, European integration and ‘European power’ in different places (within and beyond the EU27), but also the highly variegated manifestations of ‘Europeanizing’ processes across these different spaces. Here, we argue, the contribution of political geographers is – and could further be – key, and an important addition to the broader literature in European Studies.

The article is structured in six sections. In section II, we situate our argument within recent political-geographic research on European integration. Sections III, IV and V present three inter-related research agendas where, we suggest, contextually sensitive political-geographic research would be particularly insightful. Most importantly – and in this sense going beyond existing reviews of work on Europeanization – our aim is not only to provide an assessment of contributions focusing on the ‘internal’ political geographies of European integration, but also to problematize more widely the sociospatial imaginaries of ‘EU’rope as constructed and deployed from *both within and outside the EU*. Already some years ago, Mamadouh (2001), Sidaway (2006) and Van der Wusten (2000)

drew attention to the challenges posed by transforming notions of EU territoriality to traditional political-geographic concepts and understandings. Our article not only presents some of the work that has been done since their reviews appeared, but also aims to cover broader ground, suggesting some new directions for research. It should also be noted that throughout we refer to the work of both geographers and select scholars in cognate disciplines that, we believe, deploy a ‘political-geographic’ approach, sensitive to the variety of contexts of and for Europeanization.

II Investigating the spatialities of Europeanization

‘EU’rope remains a rather strange ‘beast’, to use the characterization of Sidaway (2006). What is more, the even more ambiguous question of ‘European power’ largely falls into ‘the gaps within the literature of international political analysis’ (Elgstrom and Smith, 2006: 1). Broad questions such as ‘what the EU is’, ‘what the EU is becoming’ and ‘how we are to understand the basic model of European integration or the development of its political legitimacy’ thus continue to play a central role in the literature of European integration studies and integration theory.²

The contribution of political geographers to the first and second generation of integration theory, which was dominated by functionalist, federalist and intergovernmentalist approaches (see Caporaso, 2008; Risse et al., 2001) was limited. However, what could be considered the ‘third stage’ of conceptualizing the integration process, which from the 1990s onwards has been structured around the concept of ‘Europeanization’ (Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005) and debated through ideas such as ‘Normative Power Europe’ (Manners, 2002) or ‘conditionality’ (Grabbe, 2005), has attracted geographers’ sustained attention and critique (see, for

example, Bialasiewicz, 2008; Bialasiewicz et al., 2005; Clark and Jones, 2008; Jones and Clark, 2009). Nonetheless, such literature has largely not been inclined to engage in building broad explanatory theories of European integration. It has, rather, predominantly chosen to scrutinize the changing spatialities of the process of European integration – a process envisioned as not having any specific political or geographical ‘end points’, but which nevertheless has major impacts on both the discursive and material dimensions of social and political life within and beyond the EU.

Political-geographic contributions to the study of European integration and Europeanization can be divided into two, partly overlapping, branches. First, the study of the Europeanization of spatial policies and territorial structures can be recognized as a distinctive body of literature. Second, there is now a growing political-geographic literature which inquires into the political practices by which the space-making for ‘EU’rope takes place beyond explicitly ‘spatial’ policies. These analyses range from the discursive study of EU foreign policy to ethnographically grounded accounts of the operation of geographical knowledge within the EU as a transnational bureaucracy.

I Europeanization of territorial structures and spatial policies

The institutional deepening of European integration beyond mere intergovernmental coordination in the 1990s proceeded in tandem with notable attempts to reorganize the spatial structures of the EU. Both processes were arguably entangled with neoliberal governmental rationalities as they highlighted the discourses of competitiveness and a ‘knowledge-based society’. The attempts to reorganize the geography of Europe from the latter half of the 1990s onward can thus be thought of as a particular response to geopolitical imaginations that portrayed a ‘weak Europe’ in the middle of a

global economic struggle for growth and competitiveness (Moisio, 2011: 20–21).

The reorganization of European political space in the EU’s nascent spatial policies has been scrutinized in depth by geographers and planning scholars (Deas and Lord, 2006; Dühr et al., 2010; Evers et al., 2006; Faludi and Waterhout, 2002; Lévy, 1997; Sykes, 2008; Sykes and Shaw, 2008). These studies, albeit in different fashion, concentrate on EU-orchestrated spatial policy visions, institutions and practices which together form the core of the Europeanization of planning in Europe (cf. Böhme and Waterhout, 2008) highlight the institutionalization of the EU as a distinct political opportunity structure (Börzel, 2002). Scholars have also explored the adoption of European spatial planning practices, principles and lexicons in different EU Member States’ territorial policies. This literature is primarily concerned with how the EU shapes national planning agendas and principles through an attempt to craft a supranational ‘normative order’ (for the concept, see Olsen, 2002) for space-making in ‘EU’rope. It thus conceives integration largely as a gradual diffusion of territorial policy-making from within the EU institutions into spatial policy practices in the Member States.

By following some of the most common conceptualizations of Europeanization as an actually existing phenomenon that needs scholarly explanation (see, for example, Radaelli, 2003), scholars interested in the concrete territorial policies of the EU have been interested in the diffusion and institutionalization of informal EU rules, policy paradigms and ways of doing things which are crafted as supranational policy processes, and then incorporated into spatial planning practices by domestic institutions. Engaging with some key ideas on policy diffusion and policy transfer recently theorized in human geography (e.g. Prince, 2012), a variety of empirical studies have examined how Member States’ regional planning systems have

been transformed in order to make them better 'suited' to the implementation of the EU's spatial planning ideas (see, for example, Böhme, 2002; Börzel, 2002; De Jong et al., 2002; Gualini, 2004; Kettunen and Kungla, 2005; Pasquier, 2005; Stegmann-McCallion, 2008). These studies often explore the domestic 'impacts' of supranational spatial policy-making and 'European pressure' on policy formation in the Member States.

More critical work on European space-making has stressed that 'Europeanization' is too often considered in the spatial planning literature as a technical exercise whereby particular 'European' spatial knowledges are embedded in the actions of planners and policy-makers in Europe (see, for example, Luukkonen, 2011). This work draws on analyses of EU spatial planning and regionalization which highlight the discursive nature of making a rationally organized and controlled 'unified European territory of speed' for the supranational project (a process which Jensen and Richardson, 2004, call a 'monotopic Europe'). This critical approach also underscores that European space-making (including the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and EU-orchestrated regionalization) is explicitly about the political production of space, rather than a non-political implementation of supranational policies in an already-existing political space (Clark and Jones, 2009; Gualini, 2004; MacLeod, 1999). What is more, other studies have stressed how the construction of the supranational EU political space has been a highly contested process, marked by struggles over the location of power and authority (Leitner, 2004). Most importantly, recent political geographical work has posed an explicit critique to the 'a-territorial' character of the mainstream Europeanization literature (Clark and Jones, 2009).

The active political production of political space in 'EU'rope has also been approached from the perspective of a 'political economy

of scale'. Scholars have commented on how complex processes of rescaling, in which the Keynesian spatial fixes of the EU Member States are being rethought, have surfaced in a variety of governmental projects for European space-creation (Moisio, 2011). Political geographers have also illuminated that space-making for 'EU'rope is characterized by scalar processes which potentially destabilize the national spatiotemporal fix (Brenner, 1998, 1999; MacLeod, 1999) and which revolve around ideas of trans-European connectivity, new urban and infrastructure networks and transnational regions (Richardson, 2006). One of these scalar processes touches upon city-regionalism, which arguably has become one of the central spatial constituents of the EU's geopolitical persona, and has been an integral part of attempts to build 'open' political spaces for the operation of the 'EU'ropean economy – supported, for instance, by the URBAN programme (see Dukes, 2007; Hamedinger and Wolfhardt, 2010) or 'town-twinning' initiatives (see Clarke, 2009). This scalar process has, most frequently, been coupled with policies of 'territorial cohesion'. Jensen and Richardson (2004) thus argue that in the institutionalized discourse of European spatial planning:

The urban theme is to be found in relation to the notion of growth as it surfaces in the view of cities as driving economic motors and polycentric nodes in a global network. The policy goal of cohesion is then to be seen as intimately linked to the question of territorial identity. This is so because the imagined community of monotopic Europe needs cohesion as its vehicle for the idea of a level and coherent playing field in order to carry forward the message of 'one Europe'. (Jensen and Richardson, 2004: 226)

We could thus argue that the model of city-regionalism instigated by the EU and articulated through concepts such as 'polycentricity' (see Davoudi, 2003) or 'global integration zone' may be regarded as a contingently produced

geopolitical project of capitalist globalization which receives its power from the discourses of knowledge-based-society and competitiveness (cf. Jonas, 2012). At the same time, the construction of 'European' city-regionalism can also be treated as a scalar performance for 'EU'ropean becoming. In other words, even if the making of the spaces of the Union has been characterized by a rhetoric of 'flows' and 'speed', space-making for 'EU'rope may be considered as an ongoing process of fixing the boundaries of a 'European space' and the creation of new scales of governance and socio-economic life (cf. Hudson, 2004).

2 Critical political geographies of Europeanization

While the institutionalization of the EU's spatial planning discourse has had a major impact on the writings on European integration of geographers and spatial planning scholars from the 1990s onwards, a second major stimulus to critical political-geographic work on European integration came from the process of the so-called 'Eastern Enlargement' (which began in the 1990s and was finalized in 2007) and the consequent reshaping of the European 'Neighbourhood'. Over the past decade, a number of scholars have thus scrutinized the ways in which places and regions are being brought into the 'EU's orbit' (e.g. the contributions in Bialasiewicz, 2011).

Critical political-geographic readings of the EU enlargement process were quick to remind that geopolitical imaginations of Europe, based on persistent markers such as 'West' and 'East', not only have specific historical genealogies, but also commented on the ways in which these latter could be – and indeed were – deployed as rhetorical resources in contemporary political practices (see, among others, Clark and Jones, 2012; Jeffrey, 2008; Kuus, 2004; Moisisio, 2007, 2008). Although some of this work has, at least implicitly, built on previous debates in

European integration studies dealing with the actualization of the politics of conditionality in East Central Europe (such as those by Grabbe, 2005, or Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005), its unique contribution lies in its focus on processes of 'othering' and emergent identity politics, as well as on geopolitical aspects of the interaction between EU institutions and applicant states. Indeed, various political geographers have deconstructed the 'return to Europe' discourse championed by some applicants during the accession process, noting how this discourse was not only predicated on an understanding of a particular moral responsibility of the EU to engineer 'European unity', but also engaged the reinvention and reinscription of much longer-standing geographical concepts such as 'Central Europe' (Hagen, 2003; Kuus, 2007; Moisisio, 2002).

The pre- and post-enlargement shaping of a 'European Neighbourhood' has also commanded the attention of political geographers, including several special issues/sections of journals (see, for example, Bialasiewicz et al., 2009). In particular, attention has focused on some of the ways in which the different policies that have constructed the EU's 'Neighbourhood' as a specific geopolitical site are closely associated with the suggested transformative power of the EU vis-a-vis its 'outside'. Whether in the Mediterranean (Jones, 2006, 2011) or the 'Eastern Dimension' (Browning and Joenniemi, 2008; Moisisio, 2007), political geographers have highlighted the roles of both the European Commission as a mediating and stabilizing builder of geopolitical discourses (see also Jones and Clark, 2008; Kostadinova, 2009) and non-Member States in negotiating such discourses (and, indeed, their possible constitutive impacts on the nature of EU policies themselves – see Browning and Christou, 2010).

The work on the discourse of 'Neighbourhoods' has not only illuminated that geopolitical discourses are situated in institutional contexts, thus defining the limits of appropriate and

expectable actions, but also demonstrated the value of intensive and contextually grounded field research in the study of space-making in and for 'EU'rope. Kuus (2011a), for instance, has investigated the Eastern direction of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) by looking at how the representatives of the new Member States deploy specific geographical knowledge claims as expertise which, according to these experts, should be used in dealing with the Eastern Neighbourhood in specific kinds of ways (see also Jones, 2006, for similar research on 'expert' constructions of the Mediterranean).

Studies that concentrate on the EU as a transnational bureaucracy often examine the attitudes and policy preferences of key figures in EU institutions towards the integration process (for a recent example, see Ellinas and Suleiman, 2011). However, the Eastern expansion of the EU brought wider questions of power and geographical knowledge into the research agenda of political geographers. Those interested in the discursive aspects of 'making space' for the EU in institutional contexts and practices beyond EU spatial policies have investigated how EU power operates within and beyond the EU through particular geopolitical knowledge, agency and geographical conceptualizations. Kuus (2011b), again, has made conceptual openings by scrutinizing the geographical knowledge production within the EU's bureaucratic practices. She has examined the formation and operation of 'geographical expertise', and how this expertise can be understood as a sociospatial phenomenon which is embedded in institutional structures of the EU bureaucracy, thus creating specific knowledge hierarchies within the EU (see also Krzyzanowski and Oberhuber, 2007).

What is more, critical political geographers have also begun to note how 'EU'rope is not only diversely projected at the national scale within the Member States, for diverse territorializations of European power are also visible outside of the EU-27. Europeanization is thus

also being reconceptualized more broadly as a 'legitimizing process through which the EU strives to gain meaning, actorness and presence internationally' (Jones and Clark, 2008: 546). Beyond its official borders, the EU's external relations – an increasingly important part of the Union's political agenda – are multiscalar and differentiated, engaging a variety of actors and institutions ranging from transnational to local. The EU's ambitions of being an important regional and global actor and 'civilian power' are increasingly the object of critical scrutiny by political geographers (Bachmann and Sidaway, 2009; contributions in Bialasiewicz, 2011).

Finally, and related to the above concerns, a growing body of political-geographic work is beginning to scrutinize new bordering discourses and practices of the EU, which together form differentiated border regimes, geostrategies, and practices of inclusion and exclusion across the EU, but also well beyond (Andrijasevic and Walters, 2010; Browning and Joenniemi, 2008; Scott, 2005; Scott and Van Houtum, 2009; Walters, 2004). Indeed, as European states and institutions increasingly take recourse to a variety of 'externalized' and 'off-shore' border solutions, European border-making growingly exerts a powerful influence on the EU's image and influence both in its immediate Neighbourhoods and the wider world – a topic that recent work by geographers has begun to tackle in more detail (see, for example, Bigo and Guild, 2005; Casas-Cortes et al., 2012; contributions in Geiger and Pécoud, 2010; Hyndman and Mountz, 2008; Levy, 2011; Van Houtum, 2010).

All in all, as we have attempted to highlight in this introductory section, the predominant emphasis in political-geographic work to date has been on the diverse *impacts* of European integration on territorial (internal) borders, on bordering processes (at the external borders), and on (national) territorial structures and spatial policies. In the sections that follow, we

highlight three broad areas where, we believe, further political-geographic research can be of particular value: (1) the actualization of 'EU'rope in national political discourses and practices; (2) representations and perceptions of a global 'EU'rope; and (3) the role of 'European' popular cultures in framing and making European identities both within and beyond 'EU'rope. We choose to focus on these three particular themes for we believe that they best draw attention to some of the crucial questions highlighted by the most recent literature on European integration, but also (and perhaps even more importantly) by current political debates regarding the future of the EU (and its powers, in particular). These include the question of the increasingly complex entanglements of the 'national' and the 'EU'ropean, the much-lamented lack of a 'EU'ropean demos (and shared interest), and the vexed relationship between the EU and its outside. This is also why we highlight throughout the paper the importance of critical inquiry into how 'EU'rope's interior and exterior are constantly produced and re-enacted in discourses and practices (see, for example, Busch and Krzyzanowski, 2007).

III Europeanization in national political discourses and practices

Across different geographical contexts, European integration is a social and political process in which 'Europe' figures as a differentially articulated concept, vision and project within self-defining national narratives (see Wæver, 2005: 33). Indeed, one of the key intellectual challenges highlighted by the recent Europeanization literature has been the complex entanglement of national and European narratives. There is inevitably some tension not only between the 'national' and 'European' geopolitical imaginations and narratives (Powell, 2011), but also between the different national narratives within which Europe is located in the Member States, in accession

countries, or outsiders. Contested geopolitical narratives of 'EU'rope are hence perpetually constituted in political action. One may thus examine how both Europe and the EU are understood, defined and legitimized in different places, and how these different discourses of 'EU'rope operate within different cultural contexts. Since these contexts are characterized by particular national traditions, the 'actualization of ["European"] political discourses' (see Kangas, 2009), in diverse political practices, in different temporal contexts and by different elite fractions, remains a pivotal research question in political geography (cf. Clark and Jones, 2012).

Beyond studies focusing specifically on the nature and evolution of multilevel governance in the EU (Bache and Flinders, 2004; Hooghe, 1996; Hooghe and Marks, 2003; and, in geography, Boyle, 2000; Mamadouh and Van der Wusten, 2008; Murphy, 2008), the wider literature on the 'politics of scale' has drawn critical attention to the sociospatial construction of supranational scalar fixes in Europe (see, for example, Jessop, 2005; Leitner, 2004). Adding to the above-cited studies, however, European space-making can also be regarded as a process whereby different scales are narrated and performed (including negotiation and contestation) in various geographical and institutional contexts. Viewed through this lens, different actors and institutions can be seen to produce discursive scalar practices through which Europe 'becomes'. An analysis of the ways in which 'EU'rope results from different 'sayings and doings' which continually produce Europe as an effect can thus be fruitfully associated with post-structural approaches to scale (for discussion, see MacKinnon, 2010: 26–27). For instance, by examining the actual social processes as well as institutions subject to scaling processes, the performative reading of scalar 'sayings and doings' can provide new insights into the issue of Europeanization as an 'actually

existing phenomenon' which entangles the national, the EU and Europe in a complex manner.

Even if it is clear that European integration is understood, legitimized and articulated – and, thus, performed – differently and serves distinct needs in political struggles in different national contexts, there is a lack of studies which inquire into how 'EU'rope is located within national political discourses and political contestation. Scholars in IR have conducted some comparative work on the operation of certain 'we concepts' such as nation, state and Europe in different national political discourses (see Wæver, 2005), and some research has also focused on how nationally structured understandings of European geopolitical order impact on political decision-making in different national contexts (Risse et al., 1999). However, contextual political-geographic work that would examine these questions systematically across the EU is virtually absent. The absence of this type of research is regrettable, given that the EU and Europe remain contested issues, in a number of national contexts, open to reformulation and political struggle (a few exceptions are Antonsich, 2008a, 2008b; Painter, 2002, 2008).

Different conceptions of Europe and the EU may serve diverse political interests, such as different fractions of (national but also international) capital. In the early 1990s, Finnish membership in the European Union, for instance, was not only legitimized by appeals to 'material benefits' of membership, but also by an identity politics regarding the location of Finland in relation to Western Europe (Moisio, 2008; Moisio et al., 2011). The role of particular elite fractions, more specifically those representing the interests of export industries, was crucial in legitimating the relationship between Finnish nation, state and 'EU'rope in this context.

Both Kuus (2004, 2005, 2007) and Dittmer (2005) have commented on how EU membership has served particular identity-political needs in

post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe. These identity issues have been less salient in most of Western Europe – notwithstanding the UK where an ambiguous attitude towards the 'EU'ropean project has existed from the start. In any case, a number of differentiated and overlapping geopolitical imaginations have been, and currently are, at play in Europe. A comparative study would disclose both general features and the uniqueness of those geopolitical imaginations in different national contexts. We should therefore pay attention to, for instance, how particular spatial ideas about European territory and its boundaries resonate with specific national traditions and how these ideas gradually become integrated into the territorial policies of the EU.

National political cultures are constituted by distinct concepts, framings and silences that structure possible imaginations and articulations both of European integration and Europe (Antonsich, 2008a; Reuber et al., 2005). Accordingly, the *experience* and *expectations* of Europe are fundamentally structured by – and differentially refracted through – national traditions. For instance, the membership of Turkey and the concept of federalism both carry a number of contested meanings across Europe. Similarly, positioning the EU as a 'global power' has various connotations in different places – and is bound up with radically different 'geographical imaginations' (see Laidi, 2005; Rupnik, 2007). However, rather than being opposite categories, the EU and the national are mutually constitutive (Beck and Grande, 2004). It is thus crucial to explore further and explicate how 'EU'rope is understood and performed in political practices in different parts of Europe.

One sphere where political geographers have focused their investigation of the process of EU integration has been the discourses and practices of neoliberal marketization, in particular as regards the EU enlargement process (Smith, 2002). The link between the spread of neoliberal governmental rationalities and Europeanization within the 'old Member States' has, however,

attracted less scholarly attention. Yet it seems clear that, particularly since the Maastricht treaty in the early 1990s, many market-oriented reforms in the Member States have been articulated through the EU or associated with 'European ways of doing things'. The ways in which 'EU'rope has been mobilized in political action and the actual processes of neoliberal globalization have been partly co-constituted. In such a view, the constructions of a particular vision of globalization and European integration play a powerful causal role in moulding policy discourses throughout Europe (Smith and Hay, 2008).

In this realm, political geographers have indeed begun to engage with how globalizing planning rhetoric has played a crucial role in the space-making practices of EU Member States (e.g. Paasi, 2012). It has also been suggested that Europeanization, neoliberal globalization and associated state transformation(s) are clearly complementary rather than contradictory trends (Wallace, 2000). The varied ways in which 'EU'rope is played out in the globalizing policy processes among professionals and state elites in different geographical contexts has, nonetheless, remained a largely untouched area in political geography. There is a lack of contextualized analyses of the attitudes of policymakers and state elites towards Europeanization, globalization and specifically the relationship between the two (see, however, Rosamond, 2012). A contextually sensitive investigation of the political-economic processes and the contested geopolitical imaginations and performances of Europe within different Member States is therefore pressing.

Political movements (including political parties) in Europe have also been influenced by Europeanization processes in diverse ways, i.e. have adopted specific ways to articulate – legitimize or reject – the European project in their political agendas. The ways in which Europe and the EU are being performed in the campaigning of various movements nonetheless

require systematic research. For instance, the growing variety of 'radical' and Eurosceptic political movements merit increasing comparative and contextual attention, for European integration seems to supply political movements from the far left to the far right with notable rhetorical as well as political resources. Some of these movements are indeed only capable of existing and operating through the very same 'Europeanized' political processes (such as the European Parliament elections) against which they argue and position themselves (see Triandafyllidou et al., 2009). A contextual analysis of these 'radical' movements would significantly increase knowledge of Europeanization and its operation in different geographical and temporal contexts, as such groupings often operate with competing articulations and understandings of 'EU'rope (see, for example, Feakins and Bialasiewicz, 2006; Mamadouh, 2009). For instance, far right political groupings in Member States ranging from Italy and Sweden to Great Britain and Hungary are increasingly lumping together European integration and the 'threat of immigration' as a 'national' issue (see Triandafyllidou et al., 2009). This form of political action has become particularly visible with the recent economic downturn.

In sum, further study of the actualization of 'EU'rope in national public policy discourses needs to combine a focus on space-making in Europe (and *for* 'EU'rope) with attention to the broader processes of capitalist globalization. Even in the era of increasing 'flow rhetoric' and 'fast geographies', spatially and territorially bounded loyalties and the associated 'slow geographies' continue to shape the political performances of various elites and the lives of ordinary people in Europe (Paasi, 2001, 2008). Attachment to European institutions, narratives and practices is thus frequently marked by certain national traditions. The ways in which the national, the European and the global are entangled and play out in the construction of the EU as a simultaneously integrating and

disintegrating, as well as globalizing, polity (depending on the viewpoint and context) remain both an empirical and a theoretical challenge for political geography.

IV Representations and perceptions of a 'Global 'EU'rope'

Diverse understandings of the purpose of European integration – 'what 'EU'rope is for' – also frame understandings of the EU's international role. Since its beginnings, the European integration project has always had an external component seeking to promote a collective European role. The signing of the Treaty of Rome in 1957 established the European Development Funds (EDF) as a first common framework towards what were then mostly colonies and former colonies of European countries. As a result of rapid economic recovery in Western Europe during the 1960s, and the accession of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom to the common market in 1973, the first geopolitical visions and narratives for a collective Europe started to emerge in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In many ways, the most enduring of these has been François Duchêne's (1972, 1973) vision of Europe as a global *civilian power*.

Duchêne described 'Europe as a process' with the goal to '*domesticate* relations between states, including those of its own members and those with states outside its frontiers' (Duchêne, 1973: 15, 19–20). This '*domestication of international relations*' referred to the transfer of 'the interior level of civilianized structures [of domestic policy conduct] to the international system' (Kirste and Maull, 1996: 301, our translation). Based on the goal of creating an interdependent area of peace and prosperity, Duchêne observed and advocated an international system of regulated interactions centred around institution-building, multilateralism and supranational integration, democracy, human rights

and the restriction of the use of force in international politics.

Duchêne's ideas have since served as a point of reference for a range of geopolitical visions of global 'EU'rope (see Bachmann and Sidaway, 2009; Manners, 2010; and, for a different perspective, Toje, 2011). Nonetheless, such articulations, often calling upon an integrated/integrating Europe to play a lead role in world politics, tend to forget Europe's imperial history characterized by the belief that Europe was the 'most civilized and best governed of all the world regions' (Bassin, 1991: 3) and therefore has the right to 'teach' its model of political and economic organization to the rest of the world. Indeed, as Hooper and Kramersch (2007) have perceptively argued, to those viewing the European project 'from the outside', 'EU'rope often appears:

oddly unreflexive about its own imperialisms, past and present ... The result is a geopolitical analysis which not only precludes recognition of the spatiotemporal complexities of empire, but masks Europe's current complicity in the production of exploitative and oppressive relations within as well as beyond its newly minted frontiers. (Hooper and Kramersch, 2007: 527)

Although there is, as yet, a dearth of comparative political-geographic work on this topic, researchers in other disciplines have begun to pay attention to divergences in the EU's external role and representation. In a recent wide-ranging research project on 'The External Image of the EU', Lucarelli and Fioramonti (2009a, 2009b; see also Lucarelli and Manners, 2006), for instance, have examined external perceptions of the EU. On the one hand, they found out that the EU's role towards developing countries, in particular in the field of global economic policy, was frequently criticized for double standards, protectionism and the vigorous pursuit of European economic interests (Fioramonti and Poletti, 2008: 171–173). This stands in decisive contrast to the

EU's self-representations that aim to position the Union as a 'helping hand' for developing countries (EC, 2007). Nonetheless, it is precisely in this policy field where they found European power and 'actorness' to be perceived as most pronounced and influential.

Lucarelli and Fioramonti's (2009a, 2009b) research also revealed, however, positive perceptions of the EU with respect to its model of political-economic organization and its commitment to 'civilian' standards in international policy conduct, albeit its influence in this realm was generally regarded as limited. In particular, the EU's role in fostering multilateralism, its potential in shaping a new multipolar global order and its perceived willingness to shape new 'security paradigms' for a new global governance were perceived as crucial (Fioramonti and Poletti, 2008: 174). 'EU'rope thus faces a dilemma between its appeal as a 'geopolitical model' and resentment towards its 'gocioeconomic power', a sphere where its influence is considerably greater (see also Bachmann, 2012).

This apparent divide in international perceptions of the EU as geopolitical model and socioeconomic power is one topic where further research by political geographers would be most welcome. Although some work already exists on this topic with respect to the EU's relations with African countries (see Bachmann, 2011), studies focused on other parts of the world are, as yet, largely lacking. Yet the sort of disjunctures noted by the above authors in the African context are certainly observable elsewhere: we can cite here, for example, the 2008 Mercosur summit, where the question of Europe's 'global role' for the first time took on unprecedented importance. While the Latin American leaders gathered for the event praised the value of the EU model of regional integration (that Mercosur, in many ways, attempts to emulate), as well as new 'openings' in trade, they took a strong stance against the just-announced EU 'returns directive'.³ In an official communication, the Mercosur member and associate states affirmed

that they 'reject any attempt to criminalize the irregular migration and the adoption of restrictive immigration policies', noting how 'South America had welcomed with generosity and solidarity millions of European migrants in previous centuries'. As commentators on the event noted, 'EU'rope was being explicitly held to task to uphold the values it supposedly stands for. Hugo Chavez, with his characteristic frankness, put it thus: 'Civilized Europe – I say that ironically – has legalized barbarism' (cited in Phillips, 2008; see also Doctor, 2007).

The ways in which other parts of the world 'return the gaze' upon 'EU'rope – as during the Mercosur event – is, indeed, another realm of inquiry where more critical political-geographic research is required, in particular regarding the context-specific articulations and interpretations of 'EU'rope's global role, and how these latter are inescapably interwoven with other preceding connections and relations, including colonial histories as well as those of im- and emigration (for some initial thoughts, see Biebuyck and Rumford, 2012; Nafafe, 2012).

As we have already hinted at in the introduction, a substantial body of work already exists on some of the ways whereby the EU's stated external policy goals are selectively taken up – and interpreted – by the various 'partner' states. Much of the early research in this regards has focused on the Mediterranean, for decades the privileged space of EU external action and 'EU'rope's 'natural' space of responsibility (see Jones, 2006; Pace, 2004; Pardo and Zemer, 2005). The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership created in 1995 served, in fact, as the model for the Union's European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), launched in 2003 as part of the Union's preparations for the enlargement of 2004. The ENP took the ideas of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership further in elaborating a broader vision of the Union's 'proximity policy' – and in regimenting the EU's relations with neighbours not just to the South but also to the East

as an umbrella framework through which ‘EU’rope could extend its influence to neighbouring countries without offering the promise of eventual membership. As Tassinari (2005: 6) has argued, the ENP has been ‘directly linked to the EU political and ethical *mission civilisatrice*’. As such, it is also ‘where the Union’s political and normative limits are approached, and the EU’s “post-modern” ability to pursue its “different” project clashes with the more traditionalist forces of modernity: borders, territory and sovereignty’ – and it is indeed on these disjunctures that many of the existing political geographic analyses have focused (see, among others, Browning and Joenniemi, 2008).

Other studies have looked specifically at how partner states – like Ukraine and Belarus, in the case of the EU’s Eastern Neighbourhood – have become very good at ‘playing’ European rules in order to obtain concessions in trade or visa regulations (Browning and Joenniemi, 2008; Clark and Jones, 2012). In the East, moreover, there is a further dimension to the attempted projection of European power: the role of Russia. The selective appropriation of EU rules by states like Ukraine in order to obtain ‘loyalty rewards’ is, in fact, coupled with the explicit threat of ‘another choice’, an alternative power centre to which to turn unless the EU is more forthcoming. Russia, however, is not the only ‘ghost’ haunting the EU’s actions in the international arena. The role of the United States has been and continues to be similarly important in formulating understandings of the political geographies of the projection of European power (for a recent review, see Toje, 2008). Although geographers have focused some attention on the emergence of a transatlantic divide during the years of the G.W. Bush administration (see, among others, Bialasiewicz and Minca, 2005; Elden and Bialasiewicz, 2006), more work is needed, in particular, on how these two global actors construct and frequently contest the spaces of their action and ‘responsibility’.

At the same time, the EU is increasingly confronted and contested – also in its traditional ‘spaces of responsibility’ such as Africa (see the mapping in ESPON 2006) – by new actors, in particular China. There is some excellent recent work by geographers on the emergent role of China on the African continent (in particular its role in development – see Mohan and Power, 2009; Power and Mohan, 2010; Tan-Mullins et al., 2010), but more such work is sorely needed, also focused on how actors in other parts of the world, such as the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa), perceive ‘EU’rope (see Cervo, 2010; Xiang, 2004). The EU’s external role has long been articulated through its putative ‘difference’ from other global powers. It is therefore also important that we recognize *how* such other global powers in many ways often determine the conditions of possibility for EU actions, whether in the Mediterranean, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia or Africa. As states in other regions of the world assess the place of ‘EU’rope in their own geopolitical and economic agendas, perceptions of the EU and its role in the world will vary widely depending on the context, the location and the eye of the beholder.

Further contextual analysis is thus needed in order to develop a better understanding of the various localized imaginations and articulations of Europe, the EU, and its geopolitical roles and functions, both within the EU and beyond. We believe that such a contextual approach could allow us to understand better how perceptions of what the EU ‘is’ – and what it is ‘for’ – are influenced not only by distinct national political cultures and calculations of geopolitical and geo-economic advantage, but also by past colonial and imperial histories and present-day diasporic and migrant connections (see Biebuyck and Rumford, 2012). Moreover, existing studies of the EU’s geopolitical role are – somewhat surprisingly – largely divorced from those focusing on EU borders and migration ‘management’. Analyses of ‘EU’rope’s expansive roles

and its regional and global projections as a 'force for good' are indeed kept (predominantly) separate from studies focusing on other policies and processes of closure, most evidently bordering and securitization. Yet it is these latter policies and processes (like the EU's geopolitical clout) that most strongly mark its perception abroad. Finally, further attention needs to be given to some of the performative aspects of the various projections of the EU's (real and perceived) global roles – and in the next section we turn our focus to some of these aspects of Europeanization.

V Europeanization in popular cultures and the framing and making of European identities within and beyond 'EU'rope

When examining perceptions of what Europe 'is' and what it is 'for' – whether within Europe, when querying the diverse articulations and understandings of the process of European integration (as highlighted in section III), or beyond the EU-27, when analysing understandings of 'EU'rope's global role (as noted above) – the role of the media and popular culture is of paramount importance. Although existing political-geographic research has tended to focus on institutional or elite representations of Europe and its various roles, a body of work (dating back to Shore, 1993) has as its focus the role of culture in framing – and making – the geographies of Europeanization, at home and, increasingly, also beyond the EU's borders. Clark and Jones (2008), without mentioning popular culture specifically, note the importance of various 'spaces of Europeanization':

Within these spaces, historically and geographically determined 'EU'ropean values are continually juxtaposed with identities held at individual, organizational, community and territorial scales to promote socialization and learning opportunities, with accompanying politics arising

from reappraisal or entrenchment of attitudes, visions and values held by actors. Some of these spaces we argue are specialized, autonomous entities with their own dynamics, discourses and clienteles. Other spaces – notably the broadest social space of Europeanization, European society – are multidirectional arenas of interaction. (Clark and Jones, 2008: 313)

Culture should be understood as precisely one of these arenas of interaction, and in this section we expand on the ways in which EU cultural policy has attempted to sculpt this arena.

Beyond the various effects on which we comment in the introduction to this article, the ongoing Eurozone crisis has also drawn attention to the seeming failure of EU institutions to produce a sense of commonality among its citizens such that the common welfare of all can survive as a priority under financial stress. Similar stressors have raised this question in the past, such as concerns over migration from Eastern Europe in the post-accession period, but the Eurozone crisis has heightened this tension. It is thus crucial to examine the emergence of EU cultural policy over the last two decades. Although some interpretations of this effort have noted how it is frequently discounted as simply a cynical attempt to produce a new identity to further the economic goals of European elites (Shore, 2000; Verstraete, 2010), it is in some ways a paradoxical endeavour, as this attempt to produce globalized, cosmopolitan European subjectivities to further the demands of global capital has often relied on the trappings of modernist theories of nationalism (Aiello and Thurlow, 2006). As Uta Staiger (2009: 12) argues, new attempts to narrate Europeaness occur in a context where 'citizenship [is based on] cultural membership, thus entailing clearly ideological and self-enclosed, if not to say exclusionary, conceptions of contemporary European societies'.

Staiger further argues that recent discourses found in EU cultural policy have engaged with

citizenship in a highly diverse range of ways, conforming neither to liberal expectations of rights nor cultural conceptions of identity. Instead, a range of engagements with Europe have been offered, often themed around the notion of ‘unity through diversity’. This has often taken the form of a concern with a common European heritage, fetishizing architectural styles and artistic movements as diverse contributions to a broader European culture. This latter is perhaps best identified in the European Capitals of Culture scheme, in which applicant cities are expected to express their individual, local contribution to wider discourses of European heritage (Griffiths, 2006; Lähdesmäki, 2012; O’Callahan and Linehan, 2007; Verstraete, 2010).

In short, EU cultural policy has been largely perceived as too weak to overcome the economic and other tensions inherent to the European project. Criticism of this cultural policy has often emphasized the lack of everyday ‘EU’ropean experiences provided by fragmented, nationally based media. Debates over the Europeanization of the spheres of media and popular culture have often drawn on geohistorical accounts of national integration, highlighting the role with which language and the ‘printed word’ have been saddled by many modernist scholars (Deutsch, 1966; McLuhan, 1962), regarding the integration of national territories via construction of imagined communities (Anderson, 1991). In this narrative of nation formation, the emergence of print capitalism created an incentive for the territorialization of cultural groups by generating pressure for the emergence of dominant languages and dialects across wide swathes of space, and subsequently consolidating national territories through the constitution of newspaper and literary markets, a common ‘us’ that would be covered through the activities of the press. The notion of imagined communities posits a direct link between the communication media and the processes of state-building. In carrying this

argument forward to the EU context, some scholars (Gerhards, 2002) have argued that the scarcity of common everyday cultural experiences, such as Europe-wide news media, have contributed to the perceived lack of a common public space. More specifically, others have stressed that ‘European cooperation and problem solving creates public spaces but has not (as of yet) produced a single, general European public sphere’ (Eriksen, 2005).

Rectifying this lack has been a task of the European Commission since the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, which included cultural cooperation within the remit of the Union. Some elements of this strategy have included the Culture 2000 programme and the Media 2007 programme, each of which aimed to preserve cultural diversity while producing a common cultural space through aid for the production and distribution of audiovisual materials (within the EU and beyond). Nevertheless, the role of language still remains important, as the goal of maintaining cultural diversity (along with many other disincentives) has prevented EU Member States from introducing a top-down policy of linguistic convergence. This outcome is at variance with the context in which modernist notions of nationhood were composed, in which the language of the national elites was typically promoted as the common language of commerce and culture. It thereby indicates certain limits to applying the concept of imagined communities to the EU context, and hints at some of the conceptual flaws in trying to do so. Modernist theories have largely viewed the nation as eclipsing the forms of political organization that preceded it, while the European project is generally understood as developing alongside and interpenetrated with the nation state, as well as other regional identities. This plural set of identities is marked by multilingualism (see, among others, Kraus, 2008; Phillipson, 2003; Van Parijs, 2011) and a sense of identity permanently ‘in becoming’. Our attention then must turn to some of the everyday practices and

performances of such an identity, in order to trace the possible emergence of a European communicative and public sphere. Indeed, recently it has been recognized that if a European public sphere exists at all (or will exist) it is as a result of the Europeanization of various national news media (Pfetsch et al., 2008; Thiel, 2008).⁴

Nevertheless, conceiving the nation as a communicative space does not imply only referring to the 'complementarity of the communicative facilities acquired by its members' (Deutsch, 1966: 98). Indeed, the relevance of communication in the making of national identities does not rely solely on the practice of a common language. First, this is because, even if definitions of 'communication' imposed by the functionalist approach tend to highlight textuality, the literature on nation-building has also focused on the crucial role of other 'visual' cultural practices such as landscape painting and cartography (Anderson, 1991; Daniels, 1993; Smith, 2000). Yet, thus far, there has been little application of this literature to the supranational context of the EU (Bagnoli, 2005); indeed, the argument that the EU needs to promote cultural connection through the promotion of audiovisual culture is overly textual in focus and ignores the already extant cultural connections provided by cultural practices such as football and musical performance that already transcend national boundaries. Further, communication in the form of popular culture can be used to provide shared narratives and identities. In this realm, the relevance of cinema in the making of national popular cultures has been highlighted, as has the importance of television (del'Agnesse, 2009; Schlesinger, 2000).

Much attention has been paid to the role that the media plays in the cultural constitution of nations (Schlesinger, 1993; in the context of the EU, see Schlesinger, 1999), while lesser efforts have been made towards an understanding of the role played by transnational media in the making of the European Union public sphere. However, as remarked by Koopmans and Pfetsch (2007):

scholars have come to agree that the emergence of a genuinely transnational mass media system in Europe is rather unlikely. If there are supranational media to be detected, they are confined to a limited audience of political and business elites, who communicate in English, or they take the form of non-political media that specialize in sports and music. (Koopmans and Pfetsch, 2007: 61)

On the other hand, the popular reach of the EU's new internet communications initiatives – including *eutube* and a variety of issue-specific web-based 'debate forums' – remains to be ascertained (although see the recent discussion in Mamadouh, 2011).

A research agenda that operates through attention to the contextualization of media products, via methodologies such as ethnography, interviews and questionnaires, could generate interesting results that indicate a higher degree of Europeanization in the spaces of popular culture than is currently understood to exist. This raises intriguing questions about what is and is not labelled as national or European, offering potentially different policy options for the European Commission in their efforts to promote a 'EU'ropean public space (a related point is made in Risse, 2004). These new practices would then need to be contextualized in different national popular cultures and accordant with differing expressions of Europeanization, as well as divergent reworkings of national imaginations of the national, the European and the 'EU'ropean. Here, political geographers can make an important contribution, as too in the emerging realm of EU cultural diplomacy, and the making of 'European' publics beyond the borders of 'EU'rope.

VI Concluding remarks

Understanding the political geographies of European integration presents theoretical, methodological and empirical challenges, as we have tried to highlight in the above sections. At the same time, we believe that political geographers

stand to contribute in important ways to a more nuanced and context-sensitive understanding of the myriad processes that go under the rubric of ‘Europeanization’, within and beyond ‘EU’rope.

As we have tried to outline in this review and call for further inquiry, political-geographic research can add crucial input to reconceptualizing European integration as well as Europeanization as it now unfolds in a time of ‘crisis’. Consider, for instance, the ongoing processes in which national polities around Europe are ‘renationalized’ in political performances. A contextually sensitive analysis could shed new light, among other things, on how such current performances are ‘renationalized’ in popular culture. At the same time, the current crisis has also prompted political action that boosts federalization, reworking in new ways associated scalar imaginaries of (European, but also national) unity and disunity. These are clearly processes that merit scholarly attention. What is more, the aforementioned processes are taking place concomitantly with the EU’s ongoing attempts to renegotiate its relations with third states. In sum, political geographers could attempt to shed light on how the current crisis is both differently experienced – but also variably envisioned and called up into the national political lexicon and political and geopolitical practices – in the different Member States *and* outside Europe.

As some excellent already existing research has done, political geographers can engage with the varied geographies of European neoliberalism(s), thinking about how these geographies are interwoven with processes of political-economic ‘Europeanization’. One of the challenges is thus to study the ways in which the highly ‘economized’ ‘EU’rope is politically articulated, performed and translated in different ‘national’ contexts. It is similarly crucial to pay increasing attention to the interconnections between the operation of neoliberal political rationality and the supranational space-making actions for ‘EU’rope.

We also suggest that political-geographic analyses of European integration need to be expanded from the domain of formal political institutions and texts to the mundane practices of the everyday of Europeans (including but not limited to the cultural realm), looking also to the ways in which new identities and new political subjectivities are being constituted in the spaces of ‘EU’ropean popular culture. A contextually grounded analysis of the Europeanization of popular culture and the media could allow us, for instance, to elaborate new understandings of an emergent European public sphere that move beyond ‘still-national’ conceptions. A cross-national comparative approach would also allow us to bring closer attention to significant differences in perceptions of the EU’s geopolitical role and purpose, among Member States as well as among the Union’s closest ‘neighbours’ and ‘partners’, shedding light on the constitution of context-specific geopolitical imaginations.

Finally, the research agenda that we have tried to outline here is resolutely multiscalar. This does not only (and even necessarily) entail analyses that must somehow subsume both the ‘European’ and ‘national’ (or local/regional) dimensions, but rather a deeper awareness that any analysis of the political geographies of European integration cannot ignore a variety of multiscalar policy networks, knowledge communities, and identity politics, also beyond the borders of ‘EU’rope. It is within these spaces of action where multiple Europes are constantly being produced through articulations and performances (see Biebuyck and Rumford, 2012). It would also be crucial for further analyses to turn their attention to the ‘globalizing’ and ‘transnationalizing’ practices which have always been an integral part of European integration, thereby disclosing the differential operation of these practices (and their underlying logics) in various geographical contexts. In this call, we accordingly have tried to pay ample attention to the ‘view from outside’, for Europe

and Europeanization are shaped by interactive processes not only within and among Member States, but also in relations with third countries. Without engaging with the meaning of Europe for those outside it, it is impossible to grasp the full extent of Europeanization, which reaches far beyond the external borders of the EU.

Acknowledgements

The referees are thanked for their kind and constructive comments on an earlier version of the paper. We would also like to express our sincere thanks to our two editors for their precious feedback during the revision process. The usual disclaimers apply of course.

Notes

1. We use the spelling 'EU'rope to signify the complex entanglements of Europe and the EU in contemporary political practices and discourses, both within the EU and in relations to its outside (without, nonetheless, reducing Europe to the EU – cf. Boedeltje and Van Houtum, 2008).
2. The attempts to conceptualize the EU as a distinctive polity have led to adopting terms such as 'post-national state', 'neo-medieval empire', 'flexible empire', 'super-state' or 'regional hegemony', or invoking concepts of 'meta-governance' or 'multilevel governance'. Some of the above-mentioned characterizations can be found in Anderson (1996), Bache (1998), Bache and Flinders (2004), Barry (1996), Bernard (2002), Browning (2005), Bulmer (1993), Jensen and Richardson (2004), Jordan (2001), Mamadouh and Van der Wusten (2008), Murphy (2008), Peterson (2004), Ruggie (1993), Scott (2002) and Zielenka (2006).
3. Passed by the European Parliament in June 2008, this directive allows for the detention of irregular immigrants for up to 18 months, and bans re-entry for five years (see Directive 2008/115/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on common standards and procedures in Member States for returning illegally staying third-country nationals; see also Acosta, 2009a, 2009b).
4. It should be noted, however, that the efforts of the then Communications Commissioner Margot Wallström in the mid-2000s (such as the 'Plan D for Democracy, Dialogue and Debate', the 'Action Plan on Communicating Europe' and the 'White Paper on Communication' that argued for just such a strategy, including the provision of news material to various national media outlets) were met with scepticism and criticism (see Ivic, 2011; Thiel, 2008).

References

- Acosta D (2009a) The good, the bad and the ugly in EU migration law: Is the European Parliament becoming bad and ugly? *European Journal of Migration and Law* 11: 19–39.
- Acosta D (2009b) *Latin American Reactions to the Adoption of the Returns Directive*. Liberty and Security in Europe Policy Papers. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS).
- Agnew J (2001) How many Europes? The European Union, eastward enlargement and uneven development. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8: 29–38.
- Aiello G and Thurlow C (2006) Symbolic capitals: Visual discourse and intercultural exchange in the European Capitals of Culture Scheme. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 6: 148–162.
- Anderson B (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anderson J (1996) The shifting stage of politics: New medieval and postmodern territorialities? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 14: 133–153.
- Andrijasevic R and Walters W (2010) The international organization for migration and the international government of borders. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28: 977–999.
- Antonsich M (2008a) European attachment and meanings of Europe: A qualitative study in the EU-15. *Political Geography* 27: 691–710.
- Antonsich M (2008b) The narration of Europe in 'national' and 'post-national' terms: Gauging the gap between normative discourses and people's view. *European Journal of Social Theory* 11: 483–500.
- Bache I (1998) *The Politics of European Union Regional Policy: Multi-Level Governance or Flexible Gatekeeping?* Contemporary European Studies Series. Sheffield: UACES/Sheffield Academic Press.
- Bache I and Flinders M (eds) (2004) *Multi-Level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachmann V (2011) European spaces of development: Aid, regulation and regional integration. In: Bialasiewicz L (ed.) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate, 59–84.

- Bachmann V (2012) The EU's civilian/power dilemma. *Comparative European Politics*. doi: 10.1057/cep.2012.25.
- Bachmann V and Sidaway J (2009) Zivilmacht Europa: A critical geopolitics of the European Union as a global power. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34: 94–109.
- Bagnoli L (2005) Europa riconosciuta: Il limite orientale dell'Europa fra cartografia e geografia politica. In: dell'Agnese E and Squarcina E (eds) *Europa: Vecchi Confini e Nuove Frontiere*. Torino: Utet, 39–62.
- Barry A (1996) The European network. *New Formations* 29: 26–37.
- Bassin M (1991) Russia between Europe and Asia: The ideological construction of geographical space. *Slavic Review* 50: 1–17.
- Beck U and Grande E (2004) *Das kosmopolitische Europa*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bernard N (2002) *Multilevel Governance in the European Union*. The Hague: Kluwer.
- Bialasiewicz L (2008) The uncertain state(s) of Europe. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15: 71–82.
- Bialasiewicz L (ed.) (2011) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Bialasiewicz L and Minca C (2005) Old Europe, New Europe: For a geopolitics of translation. *Area* 37: 365–372.
- Bialasiewicz L, Dahlman C, Matteo Apuzzo G, et al. (2009) The new political geographies of the European 'neighbourhood'. *Political Geography* 28: 79–89.
- Bialasiewicz L, Elden S and Painter J (2005) The constitution of EU territory. *Comparative European Politics* 3: 333–63.
- Biebuyck W and Rumford C (2012) Many Europes: Rethinking multiplicity. *European Journal of Social Theory* 15: 3–20.
- Bigo D and Guild E (eds) (2005) *Controlling Frontiers, Free Movement Into and Within Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Boedeltje F and Van Houtum H (2008) The abduction of Europe: A plea for less 'Unionism' and more Europe. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie (TESG)* 99: 361–365.
- Böhme K (2002) *Nordic Echoes of European Spatial Planning: Discursive Integration in Practice*. Stockholm: Nordregio.
- Böhme K and Waterhout B (2008) The Europeanization of planning. In: Faludi A (ed.) *European Spatial Research and Planning*. Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 225–248.
- Börzel TA (2002) *States and Regions in the European Union: Institutional Adaptation in Germany and Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boyle M (2000) Euro-regionalism and struggles over scales of governance: The politics of Ireland's regionalization approach to Structural Fund allocations 2000–2006. *Political Geography* 19: 737–769.
- Brenner N (1998) Between fixity and motion: Accumulation, territorial organization and the historical geography of spatial scales. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16: 459–481.
- Brenner N (1999) Globalisation as reterritorialisation: The re-scaling of urban governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies* 36: 431–451.
- Browning C (2005) Westphalian, imperial, neomedieval: The geopolitics of Europe and the role of the North. In: Browning C (ed.) *Remaking Europe in the Margins: Northern Europe After the Enlargements*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 85–101.
- Browning C and Christou G (2010) The constitutive power of outsiders: The European neighbourhood policy and the eastern dimension. *Political Geography* 29: 109–118.
- Browning C and Joenniemi P (2008) Geostrategies of the European Neighbourhood Policy. *European Journal of International Relations* 14: 519–552.
- Bulmer S (1993) The governance of the European Union: A new institutionalist approach. *Journal of Public Policy* 13: 351–380.
- Busch B and Krzyzanowski M (2007) Inside/outside the European Union: Enlargement, migration policy and the search for Europe's identity. In: Armstrong W and Anderson J (eds) *Geopolitics of European Union Enlargement: The Fortress Empire*. London: Routledge, 107–124.
- Caporaso J (2008) The three worlds of regional integration theory. In: Graziano P and Vink MP (eds) *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 23–34.
- Casas-Cortes M, Cobarrubias S and Pickles J (2012) Re-bordering the neighbourhood: Europe's emerging geographies of non-accession integration. *European Urban and Regional Studies*. doi: 10.1177/0969776411434848.
- Cervo AL (2010) Brazil's rise on the international scene: Brazil and the World. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional* 53: 7–32.

- Clark JR and Jones A (2008) The spatialities of Europeanization: Territory, government and power in Europe. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33: 300–316.
- Clark JR and Jones A (2009) Europeanisation and its discontents. *Space and Polity* 13: 193–212.
- Clark J and Jones A (2012) After ‘the collapse’: Strategic selectivity, Icelandic state elites and the management of European Union accession. *Political Geography* 31: 64–72.
- Clarke N (2009) In what sense ‘spaces of neoliberalism’? The new localism, the new politics off scale, and town twinning. *Political Geography* 28(8): 496–507.
- Daniels S (1993) *Fields of Vision: Landscape Imagery and National Identity in England and the United States*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Davoudi S (2003) Polycentricity in European spatial planning: From an analytical tool to a normative agenda. *European Planning Studies* 11: 979–999.
- Deas I and Lord A (2006) From a new regionalism to unusual regionalism? The emergence of non-standard regional spaces and lessons for the territorial reorganization of the state. *Urban Studies* 43: 1947–1877.
- De Jong M, Lalenis K and Mamadouh V (eds) (2002) *The Theory and Practice of Institutional Transplantation: Experiences with the Transfer of Policy Institutions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- dell’Agnese E (2009) *Paesaggi ed eroi: Cinema, nazione, geopolitica*. Torino: Utet Università.
- Deutsch KW (1966 [1953]) *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dittmer J (2005) NATO, the EU, and Central Europe: Differing symbolic shapes in newspaper accounts of enlargement. *Geopolitics* 10: 76–98.
- Doctor M (2007) Why bother with inter-regionalism? Negotiations for a European Union-Mercosur agreement. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 45(2): 281–314.
- Duchêne F (1972) Europe’s role in world peace. In: Mayne R (ed.) *Europe Tomorrow: Sixteen Europeans Look Ahead*. London: Fontana/Collins, 32–47.
- Duchêne F (1973) The European Community and the uncertainties of interdependence. In: Kohnstamm M and Hager W (eds) *A Nation Writ Large? Foreign Policy Problems Before the European Community*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1–21.
- Dühr S, Clomb C and Nadin V (2010) *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dukes T (2007) The URBAN programme and the European urban policy discourse: Successful instruments to Europeanize the urban level? *GeoJournal* 72: 105–119.
- Elden S and Bialasiewicz L (2006) The new geopolitics of division and the problem of a Kantian Europe. *Review of International Studies* 32: 623–644.
- Elgstrom O and Smith M (eds) (2006) *The European Union’s Roles in International Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ellinas AA and Suleiman EN (2011) Supranationalism in a transnational bureaucracy: The case of the European Commission. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49: 923–947.
- Engelen E, Ertürk I Froud J, et al. (2011a) *After the Great Complacency: Financial Crisis and the Politics of Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engelen E, Hendrikse R, Mamadouh V and Sidaway JD (2011b) Turmoil in Euroland: The geopolitics of a sub-optimal currency area? *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29: 571–583.
- Eriksen EO (2005) An emerging European public sphere. *European Journal of Social Theory* 8: 341–363.
- European Commission (EC) (2007) *The EU in the World: The Foreign Policy of the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Evers D, Van Hoorn A Tennekes J, et al. (2006) *Atlas Europa: Planet, People, Profit, Politics*. Rotterdam: NAi Uitgevers.
- Faludi A and Waterhout B (2002) *The Making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No Masterplan*. London: Routledge.
- Feakins M and Bialasiewicz L (2006) ‘Trouble in the East’: The new entrants and challenges to the European ideal. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 47: 647–661.
- Featherstone K and Radaelli C (eds) (2003) *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fioramonti L and Poletti A (2008) Facing the giant: Southern perspectives on the European Union. *Third World Quarterly* 29: 167–180.
- Geiger M and Pécoud A (eds) (2010) *The Politics of International Migration Management*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gerhards J (2002) Das Öffentlichkeitsdefizit der EU im Horizont normativer Öffentlichkeitstheorien. In:

- Kälble H, Kirsch M and Schmid-Gernig A (eds) *Transnationale Öffentlichkeiten und Identitäten im 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 135–158.
- Grabbe H (2005) *The EU's Transformative Power: Europeanization through Conditionality in Central and Eastern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Griffiths R (2006) City-culture discourses: Evidence from the competition to select the European capital of culture 2008. *European Planning Studies* 14: 415–430.
- Gualini E (2004) *Multi-level Governance and Institutional Change: The Europeanization of Regional Policy in Italy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hagen J (2003) Redrawing the imagined map of Europe: The rise and fall of the 'center'. *Political Geography* 5: 489–517.
- Hamedinger A and Wolfhardt A (eds) (2010) *The Europeanization of Cities: Policies, Urban Change and Urban Networks*. Amsterdam: Techne Press.
- Hooghe L (ed.) (1996) *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-Level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hooghe L and Marks G (2003) Unraveling the central state, but how? Types of multi-level governance. *The American Political Science Review* 97: 233–244.
- Hooper B and Kramsch O (2007) Post-colonising Europe: The geopolitics of globalisation, empire and borders: Here and there, now and then. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 98: 526–534.
- Hudson R (2004) Thinking through the geographies of the new Europe in the new millennium. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 11: 99–102.
- Hyndman J and Mountz A (2008) Another brick in the wall? Neo-Refoulement and the externalization of asylum by Australia and Europe. *Government and Opposition* 43: 249–269.
- Ivic S (2011) Review: European Commission's Plan D for democracy, dialogue and debate: The path towards deliberation? *Journal of Law and Conflict Resolution* 3(2): 14–19.
- Jeffrey A (2008) Contesting Europe: The politics of Bosnian integration into European structures. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 428–443.
- Jensen OB and Richardson T (2004) *Making European Space: Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Jessop B (2005) The political economy of scale and European governance. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 96: 225–230.
- Jonas AEG (2012) City-regionalism: Questions of distribution and politics. *Progress in Human Geography* 36(6): 822–829.
- Jones A (2006) Narrative-based production of state spaces for international region building: Europeanization and the Mediterranean. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96: 415–431.
- Jones A (2011) Making regions for EU action: The EU and the Mediterranean. In: Bialasiewicz L (ed.) *Europe in the World. EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate, 41–58.
- Jones A and Clark J (2008) Europeanisation and discourse building: The European Commission, European narratives and European neighbourhood policy. *Geopolitics* 13: 545–571.
- Jones A and Clark J (2009) *Europe and Europeanization: An Empirical Exploration*. London: University College London.
- Jordan A (2001) The European Union: An evolving system of multi-level governance ... or government? *Policy and Politics* 29: 193–208.
- Kangas A (2009) From interfaces to interpretants: A pragmatist exploration into popular culture as International Relations. *Millennium* 38: 317–343.
- Kettunen P and Kungla T (2005) Europeanization of sub-national governance in unitary states: Estonia and Finland. *Regional and Federal Studies* 15: 353–378.
- Kirste K and Maull H (1996) Zivilmacht und Rollentheorie. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 3: 283–312.
- Koopmans R and Pfetsch B (2007) Towards a Europeanised public sphere? Comparing political actors and the media in Germany. In: Fossum JE, Schlesinger P and Ove Kværk G (eds) *Public Sphere and Civil Society? Transformations of the European Union*. Oslo: ARENA, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo, 57–87.
- Kostadinova V (2009) The Commission, ENP and construction of borders. *Geopolitics* 14: 235–255.
- Kraus PA (2008) *A Union of Diversity: Language, Identity and Policy-Building in Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krzyzanowski M and Oberhuber F (2007) *(Un)Doing Europe: Discourses and Practices of Negotiating the EU Constitution*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Kuus M (2004) Europe's eastern enlargement and the re-inscription of otherness in East-Central Europe. *Progress in Human Geography* 18: 472–489.

- Kuus M (2005) Multiple Europes: Boundaries and margins in European Union enlargement. *Geopolitics* 10: 567–570.
- Kuus M (2007) *Geopolitics Reframed: Security and Identity in Europe's Eastern Enlargement*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuus M (2011a) Whose regional expertise? Political geographies of knowledge in the European Union. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 18: 275–288.
- Kuus M (2011b) Bureaucracy and place: Expertise in the European Quarter. *Global Networks* 11: 421–439.
- Lähdesmäki T (2012) Rhetoric of unity and cultural diversity in the making of European cultural identity. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 18: 59–75.
- Laïdi Z (2005) *La Norme sans la Force*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- Leitner H (2004) The politics of scale and networks of spatial connectivity: Transnational interurban networks and the rescaling of political governance in Europe. In: Sheppard E and McMaster RB (eds) *Scale and Geographic Inquiry*. Oxford: Blackwell, 236–254.
- Levy A (2011) The European Union Border Assistance Mission (EUBAM) and the remote control border: Managing Moldova. In: Bialasiewicz L (ed.) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate, 153–184.
- Lévy J (1997) *Europe, une géographie*. Paris: Hachette.
- Lucarelli S and Fioramonti L (2009a) Das globale Image der Europäischen Union. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 23–24: 30–35.
- Lucarelli S and Fioramonti L (2009b) *The External Image of the EU*. Florence: Forum on the Problems of Peace and War.
- Lucarelli S and Manners I (eds) (2006) *Values and Principles in European Union Foreign Policy*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Luukkonen J (2011) The Europeanization of regional development: Local strategies and European spatial visions in northern Finland. *Geografiska Annaler B* 93: 253–270.
- MacKinnon D (2010) Reconstructing scale: Towards a new scalar politics. *Progress in Human Geography* 35: 21–36.
- MacLeod G (1999) Place, politics and ‘scale dependence’: Exploring the structuration of Euro regionalism. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 6: 231–253.
- McLuhan M (1962) *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mamadouh V (2001) The territoriality of European integration and the territorial features of the European Union: The first fifty years. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie (TESG)* 92(4): 420–436.
- Mamadouh V (2009) Establishing a Constitution for Europe during European Union enlargement? Visions of ‘Europe’ in the referenda campaigns in France and the Netherlands. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 26: 305–326.
- Mamadouh V (2011) Global tools for Europeanization: EU tube. In: Jolán R (ed.) *Globalisation, Europeanization, and Other Transnational Phenomena: Description, Analyses and Generalizations*. Budapest: Budapesti Kommunikációs és Üzleti Főiskola/Budapest College of Communication and Business.
- Mamadouh V and Van der Wusten H (2008) The European level in EU governance: Territory, authority and trans-scalar networks. *GeoJournal* 72: 19–31.
- Manners I (2002) Normative Power Europe: A contradiction in terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40: 235–258.
- Manners I (2010) Global Europa: Mythology of the European Union in world politics. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48: 67–87.
- Mohan G and Power M (2009) Africa, China and the ‘new’ economic geography of development. *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 30: 24–28.
- Moisio S (2002) EU eligibility, Central Europe, and the invention of applicant state narrative. *Geopolitics* 7: 89–116.
- Moisio S (2007) Redrawing the map of Europe: Spatial formation of EU’s eastern dimension. *Geography Compass* 1: 82–102.
- Moisio S (2008) Finlandisation versus westernisation: Political recognition and Finland’s EU membership debate. *National Identities* 10: 77–93.
- Moisio S (2011) Geographies of Europeanization: EU’s spatial policies as a politics of scale. In: Bialasiewicz L (ed.) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate, 19–40.
- Moisio S, Stokke K Sæther E, et al. (2011) Interventions in Nordic political geographies. *Political Geography* 30: 241–249.

- Murphy AB (2008) Rethinking multilevel-governance in a changing European Union: Why metageography and territoriality matter. *GeoJournal* 72: 7–18.
- Nafafe JL (2012) Europe in Africa and Africa in Europe: Rethinking postcolonial space, cultural encounters and hybridity. *European Journal of Social Theory*. doi: 10.1177/1368431012444924.
- O'Callaghan C and Linehan D (2007) Identity, politics and conflict in dockland development in Cork, Ireland: European Capital of Culture 2005. *Cities* 24: 311–323.
- Olsen J (2002) The many faces of Europeanization. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40: 921–952.
- Paasi A (2001) Europe as a social process and discourse: Considerations of place, boundaries and identity. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 8: 7–28.
- Paasi A (2008) Is the world more complex than our theories of it? TPSN and the perpetual challenge of conceptualization. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 405–410.
- Paasi A (2012) Regional planning and the mobilization of 'regional identity': From bounded spaces to relational complexity. *Regional Studies*. doi: 10.1080/00343404.2011.661410.
- Pace M (2004) The Euro-Mediterranean partnership and the common Mediterranean strategy? European Union policy from a discursive perspective. *Geopolitics* 9: 292–309.
- Painter J (2002) Multi-level citizenship, identity and regions in contemporary Europe. In: Anderson J (ed.) *Transnational Democracy: Political Spaces and Border Crossings*. London: Routledge, 93–110.
- Painter J (2008) European citizenship and the regions. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 15: 5–19.
- Pardo S and Zemer L (2005) Towards a new Euro-Mediterranean neighbourhood space. *European Foreign Affairs Review* 10: 39–77.
- Pasquier R (2005) Cognitive Europeanization and the territorial effects of multilevel policy transfer: Local development in French and Spanish regions. *Regional and Federal Studies* 15: 295–310.
- Peterson J (2004) Policy networks. In: Wiener A and Diez T (eds) *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 117–136.
- Pfetsch B, Adam S and Eschner B (2008) The contribution of the press to Europeanization of public debates: A comparative study of issue salience and conflict lines of European integration. *Journalism* 9: 465–492.
- Phillips L (2008) Latin American leaders condemn 'racist' EU law. *EUobserver* 2 July. Available at: <http://euobserver.com/foreign/26432>
- Phillipson R (2003) *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Powell RC (2011) From the northern dimension to Arctic strategies? The European Union's envisioning of the high latitudes. In: Bialasiewicz L (ed.) *Europe in the World: EU Geopolitics and the Making of European Space*. Farnham: Ashgate, 105–126.
- Power M and Mohan G (2010) Towards a critical geopolitics of China's engagement with African development. *Geopolitics* 15: 462–495.
- Prince RJ (2012) Policy transfer, consultants and the geographies of governance. *Progress in Human Geography* 36: 188–203.
- Radaelli C (2003) The Europeanization of public policy. In: Featherstone K and Radaelli C (ed.) *The Politics of Europeanization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 27–56.
- Reuber P, Strüver A and Wolkersdorfer G (2005) Europa und die Europäische Union – die gesellschaftliche Konstruktion politischer Räume. In: Reuber P, Strüver A and Wolkersdorfer G (eds) *Politische Geographien Europas – Annäherungen an ein umstrittenes Konstrukt*. Münster: LIT Verlag, 1–23.
- Richardson T (2006) The thin simplification of European space: Dangerous calculations? *Comparative European Politics* 4: 203–217.
- Risse T (2004) European institutions and identity change: What have we learned? In: Herrmann R, Risse T and Brewer M (eds) *Transnational Identities: Becoming European in the EU*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 247–272.
- Risse T, Cowles MG and Caporaso JA (2001) Europeanization and domestic change: Introduction. In: Cowles MG, Caporaso JA and Risse T (eds) *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1–20.
- Risse T, Engelmann-Martin D Knope H-J, et al. (1999) To Euro or not to Euro? The EMU and identity politics in the European Union. *European Journal of International Relations* 5: 147–187.
- Rosamond B (2012) The discursive construction of neoliberalism: The EU and the contested substance of European economic space. In: Strange G and Worth O (eds) *European Regionalism and the Left*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 39–61.

- Ruggie JG (1993) Territoriality and beyond: Problematizing modernity in international relations. *International Organization* 47: 139–174.
- Rupnik J (ed.) (2007) *Les banlieues de l'Europe: Les politiques de voisinage de l'Union européenne*. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.
- Schimmelfennig F and Sedelmeier U (2005) *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Schlesinger P (1993) Wishful thinking: Cultural politics, media, and collective identities in Europe. *Journal of Communication* 43: 6–17.
- Schlesinger P (1999) Changing spaces of political communication: The case of the European Union. *Political Communication* 16: 263–279.
- Schlesinger P (2000) The sociological scope of national cinema. In: Mett H and MacKenzie S (eds) *Cinema and Nation*. London: Routledge, 19–31.
- Scott JW (2002) A networked space of meaning? Spatial politics as geostrategie of European integrations. *Space and Polity* 6: 147–167.
- Scott JW (2005) The EU and 'Wider Europe': Toward an alternative geopolitics of regional cooperation. *Geopolitics* 10: 429–454.
- Scott JW and Van Houtum H (2009) Reflections on EU territoriality and the 'bordering' of Europe. *Political Geography* 28: 271–273.
- Shore C (1993) Inventing the 'People's Europe': Critical approaches to European Community 'cultural policy'. *Man* 28: 779–800.
- Shore C (2000) *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Sidaway J (2006) On the nature of the beast: Re-charting political geographies of the European Union. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B, Human Geography* 88: 1–14.
- Smith A (2000) Images of the nation: Cinema, art and national identity. In: Hjort M and MacKenzie S (eds) *Cinema and Nation*. London: Routledge, 45–59.
- Smith A (2002) Imagining geographies of the 'new Europe': Geo-economic power and the new European architecture of integration. *Political Geography* 21: 647–670.
- Smith N and Hay C (2008) Mapping the political discourse of globalisation and European integration in the United Kingdom and Ireland empirically. *European Journal of Political Research* 47: 359–382.
- Staiger U (2009) New agendas? Culture and citizenship in EU policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15: 1–16.
- Stegmann-McCallion M (2008) Tidying up? 'EU'ropean regionalization and the Swedish 'regional mess'. *Regional Studies* 42: 579–592.
- Sykes O (2008) The importance of context and comparison in the study of European spatial planning. *European Planning Studies* 16: 537–555.
- Sykes O and Shaw D (2008) Investigating territorial positioning by sub-state territories in Europe. *Regional and Federal Studies* 18: 55–76.
- Tan-Mullins M, Mohan G and Power M (2010) Redefining 'aid' in the China-Africa context. *Development and Change* 41: 857–881.
- Tassinari F (2005) Security and integration in the European Neighbourhood: The case for regionalism. CEPS Working Document No. 226. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- The Economist* (2011) A tale of two Italians. Charlemagne blog 29 October. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/node/21534815>.
- Thiel M (2008) European public spheres and the EU's communication strategy: From deficits to policy fit? *Perspectives on European Politics and Society* 9: 342–356.
- Toje A (2008) *America, the EU and Strategic Culture: Renegotiating the Transatlantic Bargain*. London: Routledge.
- Toje A (2011) The European Union as a small power. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49: 43–60.
- Triandafyllidou A, Wodak R and Krzyżanowski M (eds) (2009) *The European Public Sphere and the Media: Europe in Crisis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van der Wusten H (2000) New Europe: A political geography of fragmented unity. *GeoJournal* 52: 87–92.
- Van Houtum H (2010) Human blacklisting: The global apartheid of the EU's external border regime. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28: 957–976.
- Van Parijs P (2011) *Linguistic Justice for Europe and the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verstraete G (2010) *Tracking Europe: Mobility, Diaspora, and the Politics of Location*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wæver O (2005) European integration and security: Analysing French and German discourses on state, nation, and Europe. In: Howarth D and Torfing J (eds) *Discourse Theory in European Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 33–67.

- Wallace H (2000) Europeanisation and globalisation: Complementary or contradictory trends. *New Political Economy* 3: 369–382.
- Walters W (2004) The frontiers of the European Union: A geo-strategic perspective. *Geopolitics* 9: 674–698.
- Xiang L (2004) China's Eurasian experiment. *Survival* 46(2): 109–122.
- Zielonka J (2006) *Europe as Empire: The Nature of the Enlarged European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.