

UDK 327.7/8:172.4:303.721

TODOROVA NATALIYA,
Ph.D., Associate Professor, Uzhhorod National University

TODOROV IHOR,
Doctor (hab.), Professor, Uzhhorod National University

ETHICAL ASPECTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'S FOREIGN POLICY (1999-2014) IN THE CONTEMPORARY ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

The Ukrainian society's current expectations of the international community's effective reaction to violations of international law by the Russian Federation in the Crimea and on the Donbass and the declared aspiration of Ukraine to pursue membership in the European Union determine the relevance of this article, which is devoted to the ethical aspects of the contemporary foreign policy of the European Union. The paper aims to highlight the ethical component of the foreign policy conduct of this supranational association in 1999-2014 through the prism of contemporary foreign academic debates on these issues, describes the current trends and interpretations, generalizes the main directions of the debate and their possible consequences.

Key words: foreign policy; the European Union; values; ethics; international relations; soft power.

On numerous occasions the European Union's officials have declared the EU's stance on promoting and protecting certain ethical values in its foreign relations, namely human rights protection, humanitarian aid provision, etc. The Ukrainian academic community's attempts to study the specific aspects and challenges of the EU contemporary foreign policy are inevitably drawing their attention to the European Union's 'ethical foreign policies', especially in view of the Ukrainians' current expectations concerning Russia's breaching the international law in the Crimea and Donbas and in view of Ukraine's aspirations for the EU accession. The EU foreign policies aimed to promote certain 'ethical' values and principles have become the focus of substantial theoretical research by and debates among international relations scholars, which, in turn, requires thorough analysis to inform the Ukrainian academic and political thought meaningfully.

The purpose of the paper is to provide the overview of the contemporary academic debates concerning the ethical aspects in the EU foreign policy, to describe the current trends and interpretations of these topical issues and their implications. Being informed by the key foreign publications devoted to this issue (see References), the article summarizes the main lines of debates and scholarly forecast of the EU ethical foreign policy possible developments. The chronological framework of the research covers the period from the Amsterdam Treaty of 1999, which introduced the post of the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, to the beginning of Russian aggression in Ukraine in 2014.

1. The origin of the ethical component in the EU foreign policy

Having unified the countries of the continent, Europe currently aims at becoming 'a credible force for good'. As Javier Solana - EU High Representative for the CFSP and ESDP, - put it, 'from a continental agenda, we should move to a global agenda. From building peace in Europe to being

a peace-builder in the world' [*Countering Globalisation's Dark Side, 2007*]. Strange as it may seem, at this very controversial period of its existence, 'the EU is seeking to position itself as a global player with a broad spectrum of civilian and military capabilities - an ambition which touches on the highly sensitive issues of member states' sovereignty and nationhood' [*Aggestam, 2008*]. The EU is looking for a new meaning of collective purpose and legitimacy, which seem to be found in foreign and security relations.

It was Tony Blair's 1999 Chicago speech that summarized the idea later termed a 'liberal interventionist' approach to foreign policy. When the international community faced their inability to prevent genocide and massacres they started questioning the prevailing 'realist' orthodoxy in foreign policy and experienced what Robin Cook described as the 'ethical dimension' of foreign policy [*Blair, 2006: 4*].

This new international mission of the EU to act as a 'power for good' and a 'peace-builder' was formulated in a debate about universal ethics, which recognized the EU as a 'force for good', justifying new power capabilities in European foreign policy. The notion of 'ethical power Europe' reflects a significant change in the EU foreign policy that implies its proactive work to alter the world towards its vision of the 'global common good' [*Blair, 2006: 16*].

The EU proactive role takes on new duties in such areas as crisis management, peacekeeping, state-building, and reconstructing failing states - complementing the important role it has already played in the fields of development aid and humanitarian assistance [*European Council, 2003*]. By pursuing a wider vision of European interests, the EU is contributing to a 'better world' by strengthening justice (human rights) and order (effective multilateralism).

Critically examining the self-image of the EU as an ethical power 'doing good' in the world, the scholars under-

stand this concept as the one open to critical reflection and raise ethical considerations in international politics focusing on the question 'whether such ethical ambitions represent progress or simply a dangerous utopianism' [Aggestam, 2008: 2].

The scholars who focus on what is understood by ethics in foreign policy examine the nature and content of ethical values; the relationship between ethics and interests; the exercise of power, particularly the just use of military force; and the problems inherent in pursuing a consistent ethical foreign policy. All these issues give the new insight into the EU's international role.

As L. Aggestam [2008: 2] maintains, the concept of ethical power Europe appeared 'as a depiction of the growing strategic role the EU wants to play in the world by acquiring a broader spectrum of power capabilities.' Unlike civilian and normative power, concepts of ethical power Europe comprise both civilian and military power, as well as social and material power, which, in turn, calls for revision of European foreign and security policy.

Ethics is an intensely disputed matter, and the notion of 'ethical power Europe' is understood differently. The EU's international role is currently re-conceptualized, using ethics as the starting-point for analyses. The origin of ethical component in the EU's foreign policy is supported by the following reasons:

1. In order to be able to exercise power proactively by becoming a global player on the international arena the EU builds on its painful experience of being unable to apply its power with greater effect, which 'had a formative impact on the subsequent development of the EU as a strategic actor' [Blair, 2006: 3], and focuses on the intentions and purposes behind the active exercise of the EU's power.

2. As the distinction between civilian and military instruments so central to the concepts of civilian and normative power does not capture more recent developments within the EU, it is crucial to focus on the ethical dilemmas involved in choosing either the military or civilian instrument in foreign policy, in other words, on the justifications behind the exercise of power.

3. As ethics and the EU are indivisibly entwined, the ethical component in the EU foreign policy emphasizes responsibility beyond borders, bringing issues like human rights, humanitarian intervention, international criminal justice, international economic justice and democracy promotion onto its agenda [Coicaud and Warner, 2001: 5]. This results in 'enabling the EU to assume a more assertive role in foreign, security and defense policy' [Aggestam, 2008: 4].

4. Although the EU is a unique hybrid international polity with significant supranational competence, there is no common opinion 'whether this 'difference' produces a distinctive normative foreign policy unlike that of any other international actor'.

5. Apart from bringing the 'international' back into concepts of the EU's international role, there is also an aim to bring back the 'national', member-state dimension, which emphasizes the continued role of interests in the dynamics of European foreign policy. Fusion of material interests and ethical considerations explain mixed motivations of the EU states [Aggestam, 2008: 4].

However, ethical component remains challenged in international politics because it is closely linked with particular worldviews, each with its own assessment of whether the international system can be changed. The EU, on the contrary, puts forward solutions that make

progress feasible. That peace was achieved in war-torn Europe generates a powerful ethical imperative in European foreign policy that succeeded in achieving peace after WWII proves the EU capacity to become a peace-builder in the world.

It should be stressed that the self-image of the EU as a 'force for good' is created with reference to the 'universal values', which are queried and often regarded as an imposition of western values, the issue regarded in the next section of this paper.

2. Ethicality versus Pragmatism

Ethicality versus pragmatism dilemma represents the modern political discourse regarding the EU contemporary foreign policy. On the one hand, some scholars consider how pragmatism informs the EU actorness in a broad scope and study the EU as a legal person primarily constituted by and simultaneously autonomous of its member states. On the other hand, there is an approach emphasizing the ethical component crucial to understanding the EU's foreign policy.

As the traditional principles of sovereignty and non-intervention ordering the international system are being redefined in a globalized world, A. Krakiewicz maintains that in cases of humanitarian crisis, the emphasis is now shifting towards the responsibility of states to protect vulnerable populations at risk from civil wars, insurgencies, state repression and state collapse [2007, p.38]. Thus, the international community of states is now believed to have a responsibility to act, even when it means using the military force. This is one of the ethical questions Europeans have been facing since the end of the Cold War order.

As A. Krakiewicz emphasizes, "it is often overlooked that the European perception of international justice and multilateralism is not uniform, but that there are instead many differing forms and rationales behind the more general approval of it" [2007: 39]. The case with the Iraq intervention reflected different vision of the European states concerning the application of the international law to regulate the use of force. The EU foreign policy demonstrates divergences which 'will continue to pose problems for forging a concerted European policy on the use of armed force in international affairs' [Krakiewicz, 2007: 39].

The scholar also maintains that 'the distinction between legal and moral interpretations of the legitimate use of force captures the essence of the divergent arguments put forward by European states' [Krakiewicz, 2007: 40] as to the possibility of military intervention to settle international crisis. Having chosen the Iraq-war-related foreign policy of Germany, Poland and the United Kingdom as the key players to determine the future of European unity, the author studied their interpretation (moral or legal) of international norms with regard to military interventions. The most often debated issues - a weapon of mass destruction, human rights, UN Resolutions, and multilateralism - have been used as benchmarks to trace whether priority is given to pragmatism or ethicality in international affairs.

While Britain tries to balance "between prevailing norms and multilateral institutions, on the one hand, and an effective response to new security threats and human rights violations, on the other" [Krakiewicz, 2007: 42-43], in fact, the UK government gives priority to ethical considerations over pragmatism. Quite similarly to Great Britain, Poland's approach to international norms falls into the category described as 'moral' due to the 'willingness

to revise the existing legal framework through proactive engagement in conflict resolution', yet Poland is stronger willing 'to rely on purely moral arguments [Krakiewicz, 2007: 45] in order to respond to the new challenges to global security. Germany, however, places strong emphasis on 'maintaining order and stability in the international system, for which observance of the existing rules of the United Nations was deemed essential' [Krakiewicz, 2007: 45-46]. The German's attitude towards international norms differs markedly from the Polish and British approach in the sense that it adopts a stricter interpretation of the existing legal framework.

Intra-European disagreements over the rightfulness of using the military force to solve international problems revealed some significant differences among European governments on some of the most topical problems in the reform of the international norms of military intervention. Although European governments generally support the United Nations and international law, they react differently to important challenges posed by the new international security situation, which may influence the future European unity.

There exists some fundamental underlying agreement on the need to intervene in the name of human rights and democracy and as a result of a new, broader understanding of security. Yet a European consensus on the necessary conditions for such interventions was obviously not reached [Krakiewicz, 2007: 47], as well as there was no progress on the issue of the rightful use of military force.

In 2003 the EU in its European Security Strategy recognized that there was a 'need to develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid, and when necessary, robust intervention' [European Council, 2003: 11]. Having admitted that the use of force may be required, the EU has failed to agree on a common response to the changing norms of military intervention. As A. Krakiewicz concludes, the 'disagreements on this issue can be expected to cause considerable difficulty in forging a Europe-wide consensus with regard to the use of force in the EU foreign policy' [2007: 47].

A significant number of scholars criticize the tendency to define EU foreign and security policy in terms of an 'ethical' commitment to transform the world in Europe's image. As A. Hyde-Price [2008] concludes, the EU can be charged of hypocrisy when it proclaims its ethical intentions but then pursues policies that favor European economic, strategic or political interests. He maintains that 'if member states want the EU to be a serious actor in the international system, the best advice they could follow would be to tone down its 'ethical' discourse, recognize the complexities and moral dilemmas of international politics, and stop assuming that what is good for Europe is good for the world. Given the anarchic structure of the international system, some degree of security competition between great powers is inevitable. Anarchy and the unequal distribution of relative power capabilities generate a self-help system, in which projects to create perpetual peace, international harmony and 'effective multilateralism' remain vulnerable to shifts in the underlying balance of power' [Hyde-Price, 2008: 37].

A. Hyde-Price further criticizes an ethical foreign policy that may degenerate into a 'crusading moralism', an 'ethic of ultimate ends'. Realists argue that an effective EU foreign and security policy must be based on a hard-headed calculation of common 'European' interests weighed against the balance of power and competing conceptions

of the summum bonum, not on the idealistic pursuit of second-order normative concerns. For realists, international politics is inherently tragic, and consequently the pursuit of ethical goals will be heavily constrained by the structural dynamics of the international system. Recognizing the diversity and pluralism of international society, realist ethics are based on a 'morality of individuality', not a morality of communal ties or of the common good [Hyde-Price, 2008: 44].

A supporter of pragmatic approach in the EU foreign policy, S. Wood [2011] maintains that pragmatism could assist EU's decision-makers and policy-shapers, if they want to achieve meaningful normative ends through its external policies. According to S. Wood, pragmatism is relevant for the *vita contemplativa* and the *vita active*, deciphering what Europe does and might be, and a guide for its decision-makers. He also stresses that the self-interested pragmatism of the EU member states, pressured by domestic imperatives, is the crucial characteristic of its external relations. The resulting disunity can damage the EU's normative or ethical agenda and prospects. The EU's ability to extend its ethical values is 'constrained when actors it wants to socialize have considerable leverage and contrasting preferences in foreign, security or economic policy, or in governance methods and values' [Wood, 2011]. As a result, for the EU to become a normative or ethical power of global dimension it is necessary to revise pragmatically the theory on its external relations and its foreign policy.

3. The concept of "soft power" in the international activities of the EU

The modern bipolar world is represented by two global superpowers: the United States and Europe, who are consistently able to project a full spectrum of 'hard' to 'soft' power internationally. The author of the term 'soft power' J. Nye [2004] summarized his idea as follows, "soft power - getting others to want the outcomes that you want - co-opts people rather than coerces them". A key feature of the long and often contested evolution of European foreign policy is its close relationship to the development of key issues within the world arena. The end of the Cold War created a new impetus towards foreign policy cooperation among EU Member States, both for defensive reasons and for more positive reasons connected with the promotion of a 'European model' in diplomacy and conflict management. For instance, after the end of the Cold War, the EU has played an active role in the 'greater Middle East' both diplomatically and more broadly in the provision of support for peace-building processes [Smith, 2009, p. 598].

Meanwhile, T. Blair [2006] warns that 'a great danger is that global politics divides into "hard" and "soft": the "hard" get after the terrorists; the "soft" campaign against poverty. That divide is dangerous because interdependence makes all these issues just that: interdependent. The answer to terrorism is the universal application of global values. The answer to poverty is the same. That is why the struggle for global values has to be applied not selectively, but to the whole global agenda' [Blair, 2006: 23].

Despite its substantial military assets, Europe's true geopolitical comparative advantage lies in projecting civilian influence: economic influence, international law, 'smart' and 'soft power' [Nye, 2004; Nye, 2008]. As A. Moravcsik [2009: 410] puts it, Europe today is more effective at projecting civilian power than any other state or non-state actor. Some of these instruments are wielded by a unified Europe, some by European governments acting in

loose coordination, some by European governments acting unilaterally.

Analyzing the relevant EU activities on the international arena M. Smith [2009: 596] studies the pressures operating on European Union Foreign and Security Policy in the 'triangle of forces' created by the European integration process, developments in the Islamic world and the responses of the United States.

The scholar also sets out three logics inherent in the development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy, distinguishing between the 'internal' logic of the European integration process, the 'external' logic reflecting the opportunity structure in the world arena, which creates challenges and opportunities for the EU and its Member States, and the 'identity' logic, which creates a move towards self-realization and 'self-recognition' on the part of the EU in international politics, and relates this to recent developments in European foreign and security policy [Smith, 2009: 596]. M. Smith argues that the multi-dimensional 'triangle of forces' between European integration, the Islamic world and the United States has played a key role in focusing these developments, by posing challenges to the three logics and creating complex linkages between them.

M. Smith formulates two possible directions for European foreign policy: 1) European foreign policy capable of taking the appropriate initiatives to extend the impact of the EU within the 'triangle of forces', capable of settling internal differences, of recognizing external opportunities and of developing a shared vision on international order to pursue, and consequently, the EU will occupy credible alternative positions, supported by 'hard power', in case of need. This route is high-risk, as it calls for abandoning a 'civilian power' role and developing a far more muscular approach both to the United States and to Islamic countries or movements.

2) The second possible direction for European foreign policy described as 'constrained' prevents the EU from adopting a clear position based on integration logic due to the diversity of internal preferences; consequently, external opportunities are not confronted in a direct way; and there is a conscious attempt either to play down the possibility of a common European understanding of the EU's role(s) or to settle for a common conception of a minimalist role designed to preserve the EU's trading priorities and to avoid confrontations either with the United States or with the Islamic world [Smith, 2009: 611-612].

The reality is that the EU is not in a position to choose one or the other of these routes. As M. Smith [2009] argues, the EU has already been pushed onto terrain where the risks are higher, the potential costs higher and the stakes both for the EU and its Member States higher and there is no going back to the safer terrain of 'soft' or 'civilian power'. When the operation of the 'triangle of forces' is added to the interaction of the three logics, the EU and its Member States find themselves with little room for manoeuvre, because of the ways in which these linked forces converge on the principles and practice of European foreign policy. M. Smith describes this situation 'as between "soft power" and a hard place' [2009: 612].

However, the EU foreign policy reflects their belief that political rights are not sufficient to foster meaningful democratic change and must be supplemented with social rights, cultural freedom, and collective solidarity. This concept was reflected in the EU's pursuing enlargement policy; offering trade opportunities that help spread

prosperity, democracy, and reform; providing humanitarian assistance, technical expertise, or support for nation building. The EU has the means and credibility to facilitate transition of the post-war countries, and increase the likelihood of a settlement with its soft power actions, effectively transmitting the European version of liberty and democracy.

Conclusion

Having overviewed the contemporary academic debate devoted to the ethical dimension of the EU's foreign policy, it is possible to conclude that, according to foreign scholars, the EU attempts to promote certain values and ethical principles in its foreign relations influence its foreign policy, but do not change it fundamentally. Many researchers emphasize that the modern structure of the European Union hinders the effectiveness of its activity in the ethicality domain. The EU ethical foreign policy has been widely criticized for lacking highly-demanded consistency and coherence. However, the criticism mentioned should not underestimate the positive outcomes of the EU ethical foreign policy, with its substantial potential still to be applied for the common good.

REFERENCES

1. Aggestam, L., 2008. Introduction: Ethical Power Europe? *International Affairs* 84: 1, Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs, p. 1-11.
2. Blair, T., 2006. *A Global Alliance for Global Values*. London: The Foreign Policy Centre, September, 35 p.
3. Coicaud, J.-M. and Warner, D., 2001. *Ethics and International Affairs: Extent and Limits*. New York: United Nations University Press, p. 5.
4. *Countering Globalisation's Dark Side, Europe's World, Policy Dossier*, 2007. Available at: www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/CMS_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/articles/96791.pdf [Accessed 15 October 2017].
5. *European Council, 'A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy'*, 2003. Brussels, 12 Dec. 2003. Available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> [Accessed 25 June 2017].
6. Hyde-Price, A., 2008. A 'Tragic Actor'? A Realist Perspective on 'Ethical Power Europe'. In: *International Affairs* 84: 1, pp. 29-44. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2008.00687.x
7. Krakiewicz, A., 2007. Morality vs. Legality: European Responses to the Changing Norms of Military Intervention. In: *JCER* Volume 3, ISSUE 1, pp.38-50.
8. Moravcsik, A., 2009. Europe: The Quiet Superpower. In: *Rising States, Rising Institutions*. French Politics, 7, 403-422. DOI: 10.1057/fp.2009.29.
9. Moravcsik, A., Nicolaidis, K., 2005. How to Fix Europe's Image Problem. *Foreign Policy* May/June 2005.
10. Ikenberry, G. John, and Joseph, S. Nye, 2004. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. Foreign Affairs 83, no. 3: 136-37. DOI: 10.2307/20033985.
11. Nye, J.S., 2008. Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1): 94-109.
12. Smith, M., 2009. Between 'Soft Power' and a Hard Place: European Union Foreign and Security Policy between the Islamic World and the United States. In: *International Politics*, 46, 596-615. DOI: 10.1057/ip.2009.15
13. Wood, S., 2011. Pragmatic Power Europe? In: *Cooperation and Conflict*. 46: 242. DOI: 10.1177/0010836711406420 [Accessed 20 July 2017].

Тодорова Наталія,

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, Ужгородський національний університет

Тодоров Ігор,

доктор історичних наук, професор, Ужгородський національний університет

ЕТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ЗОВНІШНЬОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО СОЮЗУ (1999-2014 рр.) В СУЧАСНОМУ НАУКОВОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

Поточні очікування українського суспільства дієвої реакції міжнародної спільноти на порушення Російською Федерацією міжнародного права в Криму і на Донбасі і деклароване прагнення України до членства в ЄС визначають актуальність даної статті, яка присвячена етичним аспектам сучасної зовнішньої політики Європейського Союзу. Робота має на меті висвітлити етичний компонент зовнішньополітичної поведінки цього наднаціонального об'єднання через призму сучасних зарубіжних академічних дебатів з цих питань, описує поточні тенденції та інтерпретації, узагальнює основні напрямки дебатів і їх можливі наслідки. Хронологічні рамки дослідження охоплюють період від Амстердамського договору 1999 року, який запровадив посаду Верховного представника з питань спільної зовнішньої та безпекової політики ЄС до початку російської агресії в Україну 2014 року.

Розглядаються витоки етичної складової у зовнішній політиці ЄС. Розуміння етики у зовнішній політиці, природи та змісту етичних цінностей і проблем, пов'язаних із забезпеченням послідовної етичної поведінки у зовнішній політиці створюють новий вимір розуміння міжнародної ролі ЄС. Етика як предмет інтенсивних суперечок і поняття "етична держава Європа" виступають як вихідний пункт переосмислення сучасної міжнародної ролі ЄС.

Проте етична складова виклинає багато заперечень у міжнародній політиці, оскільки вона тісно пов'язана з конкретними світоглядами, кожний з яких має власну оцінку того, чи можна змінити міжнародну систему. Самореалізація ЄС як "сили добра" спирається на "універсальні цінності", що розглядається як нав'язування західних цінностей і способу життя.

Політичний дискурс щодо сучасної зовнішньої політики ЄС сфокусований на дилемі "етичність - прагматизм": прагматизм як основа діяльності наднаціонального об'єднання автономних держав у широкому сенсі та етична поведінка цього об'єднання в ім'я прав людини та демократії.

Спроби ЄС пропагувати певні цінності та етичні принципи у своїх зовнішніх відносинах впливають на її зовнішню політику, але не змінюють її принципово. Багато дослідників підкреслюють, що сучасна структура Європейського Союзу перешкоджає ефективності його діяльності в етичному відношенні. Етичну зовнішню політику ЄС широко критикують через відсутність необхідної послідовності та узгодженості. Проте, не зважаючи на існуючу критику, не варто недооцінювати позитивних наслідків етичної зовнішньої політики ЄС, а її значний потенціал доцільно вивчати і застосовувати для загального блага.

Ключові слова: зовнішня політика; Європейський Союз; цінності; етика; міжнародні відносини; м'яка сила.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Aggestam L. Introduction: Ethical Power Europe?. *International Affairs*. 2008. 84: 1, Blackwell Publishing Ltd/The Royal Institute of International Affairs, p. 1-11.
2. Blair T. A Global Alliance for Global Values. London: The Foreign Policy Centre, September, 2006. 35 p.
3. Coicaud J.-M., Warner D. Ethics and International Affairs: Extent and Limits. New York: United Nations University Press, 2001. p. 5.
4. Countering Globalisation's Dark Side, Europe's World, Policy Dossier, 2007. URL: www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/CMS_Data/docs/pressdata/EN/articles/96791.pdf (дата звернення: 15.10.2017).
5. European Council, 'A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy'. Brussels, 2003. URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf> (дата звернення: 25.06.2017).
6. Hyde-Price A. A 'Tragic Actor'? A Realist Perspective on 'Ethical Power Europe'. *International Affairs*. 2008. 84: 1, pp. 29-44. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2008.00687.x
7. Krakiewicz A. Morality vs. Legality: European Responses to the Changing Norms of Military Intervention. *JCER*. 2007. Volume 3. ISSUE 1. pp. 38-50.
8. Moravcsik A. Europe: The Quiet Superpower. *Rising States, Rising Institutions*. French Politics. 2009. 7. Pp. 403-422. DOI: 10.1057/tp.2009.29.
9. Moravcsik A., Nicolaidis K. How to Fix Europe's Image Problem. *Foreign Policy*. 2005. May/June.
10. Ikenberry G. John, Joseph S. Nye. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. *Foreign Affairs*. 2004. 83, no. 3. Pp. 136-37. DOI: 10.2307/20033985.
11. Nye J.S. Public Diplomacy and Soft Power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 2008. 616(1). Pp. 94-109.
12. Smith M. Between 'Soft Power' and a Hard Place: European Union Foreign and Security Policy between the Islamic World and the United States. *International Politics*. 2009. 46. Pp. 596-615. DOI: 10.1057/ip.2009.15
13. Wood S. Pragmatic Power Europe? *Cooperation and Conflict*. 2011. 46. P. 242. DOI: 10.1177/0010836711406420 (дата звернення: 20.07.2017).

© Тодорова Наталія, Тодоров Ігор
Надійшла до редакції 14.07.2018