

## EU Studies in Denmark and Sweden

Garski, Salla; Jørgensen , Knud Erik; Manners, Ian

*Published in:*  
Analyzing European Union Politics

*Publication date:*  
2012

*Document Version*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Garski, S., Jørgensen , K. E., & Manners, I. (2012). EU Studies in Denmark and Sweden. In F. Bindi, & K. Eliassen (Eds.), *Analyzing European Union Politics* (pp. 135-154). Il Mulino.  
[http://www.mulino.it/edizioni/volumi/scheda\\_volume.php?vista=scheda&ISBNART=14716](http://www.mulino.it/edizioni/volumi/scheda_volume.php?vista=scheda&ISBNART=14716)

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [rucforsk@kb.dk](mailto:rucforsk@kb.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

SALLA GARSKY, KNUD ERIK JORGENSEN AND IAN  
MANNERS<sup>1</sup>  
EU STUDIES IN DENMARK AND SWEDEN

In this brief chapter we take stock of Danish and Swedish scholarship on the European Union (EU). We intend to analyze and evaluate Danish and Swedish scholarship on EU issues, using a mixed methodology integrated into the analysis of this chapter. The method integrates a secondary analysis of leading literature by Garský; an extensive comparative bibliometric survey building on Manners (2007); and the comparative assessments of EU studies by Jørgensen and Manners based on their professional experiences of EU studies across Europe. The chapter points out controversies on research perspectives, and suggests new EU research questions that collaborative projects could address.

Viewed from the outside, the idea of Scandinavian commonality and community is undoubtedly powerful. During the Cold War, the impact of Scandinavian scholarship and membership in the European Union (EU), as represented by Denmark, was limited. With the 1995 enlargement of the EU and the entry of Sweden and Finland, there was much expectation of a more powerful role for Nordic policy ideas and analysts. This chapter attempts to take stock of this scholarship by undertaking the particularly difficult task of analyzing and evaluating Danish and Swedish political science research on European integration and governance. This task is demanding because the challenges of critical self-evaluation and reflection have remained strongly present over several decades of Danish and Swedish EU membership, like in most member states.

Literature reviews on the EU of Nordic scholarship in general, and Danish and Swedish scholarship in particular, are limited in many respects. First, the number of such surveys is restricted, and the most relevant include the work of Jørgensen (1995), Miles and Mörth (2002), Angström, Hedenström, and Ström (2003), Ruin (2003), Breitenbauch and Wivel (2004), Friedrichs (2006), Kinnvall (2005), and Manners (2007). Second, these surveys are somewhat limited by the embeddedness of the authors, i.e. the inherent difficulties in being objective about one's own research community. A good example is the review of Nordic political science by Lee Miles and Ulrika Mörth. They identify six areas of Nordic strength in

the study of European integration – the relationship between the «nation-state» and European integration; «Europeanization»; non-alignment; small states; council presidencies; and Nordic cooperation. However, the survey is limited by the lack of identified weaknesses in Nordic scholarship on the EU [Miles and Mörtz, 2002].

In general it is possible to identify two different general trends in Danish and in Swedish research on the EU. Danish EU research is characterized by being an older and more internationalized body of work from a relatively large number of scholars working in a smaller member state and, moreover, working predominantly in English. In contrast, Swedish EU research is characterized by being a younger and less internationalized body of work, stemming from a relatively smaller number of scholars working in a larger member state.

### *1. The EU history of Denmark and Sweden*

Among the Nordic countries, Denmark was the first to join the European Community (EC), in 1973. Given the country's dependence on export, in particular of agricultural products to the UK, accession made economic sense. A referendum in 1972 showed a fairly comfortable majority in favor of Danish membership. However, the referendum also showed the Danes and their politicians were split into two groups on political and cultural matters. In fact, Denmark is widely perceived as belonging among the most skeptical of further deepening of the EC/EU [Egeberg, 2003]. A number of features exemplify this complex attitude towards Danish EC/EU membership. Nordic cooperation, for example continued to be perceived as a potential alternative for multilateral engagement, and within the EC, successive Danish governments pursued a strict intergovernmental mode of cooperation. Four political parties – social democrats, liberals, social liberals and conservatives – entered into a consistent alignment, thus securing a parliamentary majority in favor of but not necessarily enthusiastic about Danish membership.

The Danish parliament was largely opposed to the 1986 Single European Act (SEA). An informative referendum overruled the majority of parliamentarians and Denmark ratified the treaty. The Danish approach to

EU politics is to go for minimalist cooperative schemes and subsequently comply with commitments. This position is preferred to maximalist strategies no one complies with. The 1992 referendum on the Treaty on the European Union (TEU), where Denmark rejected the treaty, made it an «exceptionalist» member state, an informal status that was somewhat toned down after the subsequent referenda in France, the Netherlands and Ireland in 2005 and 2008 respectively. However, the four opt-outs, hammered out in Edinburgh in 1993 secure that charges of exceptionalism have not entirely disappeared.

Finally, since 2001, the Danish government has been dependent on a very outspoken nationalist party in the parliament. Rhetoric is strong, yet the party votes in favor of more than 80 per cent of laws having a European origin.

Sweden's relationship to the rest of Europe and the European integration process has been ambivalent over time. Before and partially after the EU-accession, Sweden balanced between, on the one hand, its long self-perception of neutrality, the desire to protect the Swedish welfare state, and disinclination to supranationalism, and, on the other hand, the economic necessities of its export-oriented economy and growing globalization. Subsequently, until the 1990s Sweden preferred to develop bilateral and multilateral (EFTA, EEA) trade agreements with the EC and stay outside the political or military commitments of the EC and NATO.

Without underestimating the impact of the changed security situation of the 1990s, it was nevertheless mostly for economic reasons – and the pressure from the powerful business community and labor unions – that Sweden became an EU member state in 1995 [Klasson, 2004; Ingebritsen, 1998; Miles, 2005]. Sweden has often been portrayed as euroskeptic [Lubbers and Scheepers, 2005], federal-skeptic [Miles, 2005], or a reluctant European [Gstöhl, 2002]. However, its participation in Schengen, the European police cooperation, and other internal and external issues, not to speak of its active role in the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) tells a different story [Lee-Ohlson, 2008; Miles, 2005].

Sweden has been particularly active and successful in supporting integration in the areas of transparency, environmental and social issues, the Baltic Sea region, as well as the development of crisis management and peace keeping [Langdal and Sydow, 2009; Johansson, 1999; Miles, 2005].

However, while Swedish law, central government and political bureaucracy are Europeanized, popular opinion has remained mixed towards the EU [Silander, Wallin and Bryder, 2004; Pettersson, 2000]. Popular opinion has also resisted European monetary integration; in the Swedish Euro referendum of 2003, 55.9 percent voted against and 42.0 percent for Swedish participation in EMU [Valmyndigheten, 2003].

In general, Swedish EU-scholars do not seem to share the Euro-skepticism or anti-Europeanism of popular opinion. However, there are other factors such as Sweden's geographical location at the periphery of the EU, its relatively small population size, and its tradition of consensus-seeking politics, which may have shaped European integration studies in Sweden. It is therefore not surprising that early studies by Swedish scholars tended to treat EU membership in ways similar to Swedish membership of other international organizations [Tallberg, 2003; Elgström and Jönsson, 2004].

## *2. Traditions*

In general, while the universities of Gothenburg and Lund have led the way in establishing centers for EU research, European studies have evolved in a much broader way across Sweden. European integration research is conducted in nearly all Swedish universities, including Uppsala, Stockholm, Malmö, Linköping, Örebro and Umea, and there seems to be a particular interest in eastern Europe, the Baltic countries and Russia all over the country [Hydén et al., 2002]. The first international degree program in English was created in 2003 with the international program for European studies (IPES) at Malmö University. This program is part of the research environment at the School for Global Political Studies at Malmö which has a particular focus on the Öresund region, in the context of the EU.

Both Gothenburg and Lund universities have the status of Jean Monnet Centers of Excellence, with the Gothenburg Center for European Research (CERGU) and the Lund Center for European Studies (CFE). The political science departments have been important entrepreneurs of these centers, even though CERGU and CFE both have multidisciplinary scopes;

the CFE comprising social sciences, humanities, and law and the CERGU economics, business, law, social sciences, arts, and education. As both centers cover a wide range of topics, CERGU has focused on the eastern expansion of the EU, the study of the politics and economics of the Baltic states, and the Swedish opinion on the EU, while CFE's main emphases are negotiations, informal networks, and formal institutions<sup>2</sup>.

Since 1998 Swedish universities cooperate within the Swedish Networks for European Research in political science (SNES), economics (SNEE) and law (NEF), which have helped to create a critical mass of international policy research for wider public and democratic debates. In particular, the Swedish Network for European Studies in Political Science (SNES) organizes Swedish seminars, conferences and post-graduate education<sup>3</sup>. The disadvantage of these well-funded networks is their tendency to focus EU research inwards in Sweden, rather than encourage outward-reaching international networks.

In addition to the universities, two policy research institutes are of importance for EU studies in Sweden. The Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI) is a politically-independent public service institution and its Europe program covers policy-relevant topics related to the European integration from the EU institutions and specific policy areas to EU foreign and security policy<sup>4</sup>. The Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies (SIEPS) was established by the Swedish government in 2002 to conduct and promote research and analysis of European policy affairs. Its research covers economic issues, the external dimension of the EU, and institutional and legal developments in the EU. The SIEPS publishes semi-annual papers on the EU presidencies and it regularly provides the Swedish parliament and government with briefs on issues concerning EU institutions, law and economics<sup>5</sup>.

While it is challenging to evaluate the influence of EU-research on Swedish society, it is easier to assess its impact on the policy makers. Swedish scholarship has close ties to the political society not only because the universities and research institutions are publicly funded, but also because of the relatively small size of the country. The establishment of the SIEPS and its assignment to provide policy analysis for the government and other political actors shows that Swedish political actors are particularly interested to involve scholars in EU-related decision-making.

In terms of wider publications, Swedish scholarship can be characterized by two trends: a smaller body of research in English intended for reading by the international academic community and a larger body of publications in Swedish intended for teaching and for stimulating the domestic public debate. The first body of literature is dominated by Lee Miles' numerous works, which have made a major contribution to Anglophone research on Swedish EU politics. By advancing the framework of Wessel's fusion perspective, Miles sheds light on the Swedish adaptation to the EU in his latest book, *Fusing with Europe*. According to Miles, the Swedish state apparatus, balancing between European integration and a federal-skeptic public opinion, is the defender of the EU. Thus, the Swedish political elite has adopted the fusion perspective. However, due to national necessities, Swedish EU politics remains conditional and often favors national interests over further integration [Miles 2005, 307].

The second body of Swedish literature is more diverse, in general led by the teaching books of Karl Magnus Johansson and the annual EU reviews of the SNES. Johansson's edited volume on *Sverige i EU* («Sweden in the EU») declared in 1999 that it is the nation-state logic that characterizes Sweden's membership and relationship to the EU [Johansson, 1999]. Five years later, *Svensk politik och den Europeiska Unionen* («Swedish politics and the European Union») [Bryder et al., 2004] explored how Europeanization has influenced the organization and contents of Swedish politics. Both edited books approach Sweden's relationship to the EU through different policy areas, such as environmental, social, monetary, or foreign policy. However, Johansson's book also addresses cooperation problems as well as formal and informal institutions. The SNES annual volumes attempt to capture the Swedish-EU discussions from a variety of perspectives with, for example, the most recent volume edited by Oxelheim, Pehrson and Persson (2010) on *EU och den globala krisen* («The EU and the Global Crisis»).

### 3. Theories

Denmark and Sweden both have theoretical diversity and strength in EU studies, although there are differences which reflect their particular

engagements with the rest of the EU. In general, the traditional importance given to theoretical insights in political science has a parallel in EU studies, reflected by the relatively strong influence of international social theories in the region. Six theoretical areas can be identified where Danish and Swedish EU-scholarship is important, if not leading in the field: systems theory, Euro-skepticism and non-participation, negotiation theory, social constructivism, post-structural theory, and the study of EU foreign policy.

Following in the footsteps of David Easton and Leon Lindberg, systems theory analysis was led by Morten Kelstrup's work on the EC as a political system [Kelstrup, 1990; 1993]. While the political system approach was subsequently taken up again by scholars outside the region in the mid-1990s, the work of Jonas Tallberg and Daniel Naurin on executive implementation and the Council of Ministers broadly continues in this tradition of treating the EU as a political system with clear-cut executive, legislative and judicial branches of government [Tallberg, 2003; Naurin and Wallace, 2010].

The historically contested relations of Denmark and Sweden with the EU/EC have provided the foundation for the second area of theoretical strength on the study of Euro-skepticism and non-participation of member states. While the 1992 Danish referendum on the Maastricht Treaty provides the starting point for this theoretical strength, the much longer history of Danish and Swedish suspicion and reservation towards the rest of Europe should not be underestimated. This perspective can be found particularly in the work of Danish scholars working on Euro-skepticism [Sørensen, 2007], EMU [Marcussen, 2000], and the Danish «opt-outs» [Adler-Nissen, 2009; Manners et al., 2008].

Theories of negotiation, cooperation and bargaining are particularly strong in Swedish EU studies, with the work of scholars at Lund and Stockholm universities examining the roles of the Swedish 2002 EU presidency and European Council meetings in general. Especially Tallberg has contributed to the understanding of the politics, power relationships and the influence of institutions and actors participating to the decision-making of the EU [Elgström, 2003; Elgström and Jönsson, 2004; Tallberg, 2006].

Social constructivist theory has an intellectual home in Denmark and Sweden, with the edited volumes by Knud Erik Jørgensen [Jørgensen, 1997; Christiansen, Jørgensen and Wiener, 1999] playing an important role



in introducing social theory into EU studies. Social theory and interpretive approaches more generally can also be found in EU scholarship at Copenhagen University (Marlene Wind, Martin Marcussen, Rebecca Adler-Nissen, Ben Rosamond), Lund University (Ole Elgström, Annika Björkdahl), Stockholm University (Kjell Engelbrekt, Niklas Bremberg) and Swedish National Defense College (Magnus Ekengren).

Based on critical social theory, Ian Manners' concept of the EU's normative power has significantly shaped the discourse on the EU's role in world politics. Building on the power of ideas, «normative power» introduces an alternative source of power: the ability of the EU to shape the conceptions of «normal» of third states through legitimate opinions and normative justification [Manners, 2002]. The social theory approach deepens the relevance of EU normative power for the study of European integration, as it offers an explanation for European identity construction [Diez and Manners, 2007]. Norms as tools of influence have also been applied by Ingebritsen and Björkdahl in their analyses of Scandinavian countries' policies in the EU. They argue that Scandinavian countries act as norm entrepreneurs in the EU [Björkdahl, 2008] and in world politics [Ingebritsen, 2002]<sup>6</sup>.

The area of post-structural theory is one area in which Danish EU scholars can genuinely claim to lead international scholarship. The impact of scholars such as Ole Wæver, Lene Hansen, Pertti Joenniemi, and Henrik Larsen, in leading post-structural scholarship in EU studies is significant. Here the role of the Copenhagen securitization school has encouraged post-structural insights into the EU in a way found nowhere else in the Europe. Originally located in the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (COPRI), the Copenhagen school has subsequently diversified with Wæver's move to establish the Center for Advanced Security Studies (CAST) at Copenhagen University. Examples of post-structuralist approaches would include Kelstrup and Williams (2000), Wæver (2003), Joenniemi (2007), as well as non-COPRI/CAST work by Larsen (2005) and Haahr (Walters and Haahr 2006).

#### 4. *Quality assessment*

In terms of quality assessment, it appears that Danish and Swedish EU scholarship has been particularly strong in at least three areas, namely sustainable development, gender issues, and aspects of foreign policy. These are tentative observations that remain difficult to disaggregate from wider processes that pre-date the 1995 EU enlargement, but we still feel the Nordic impact important.

As regards the first area, i.e. sustainable development, its principles were introduced to the EC/ EU already back in 1987 (Brundtland) towards the 1992 Rio Conference. Nevertheless, the 1995 enlargement appears to have swiftly enhanced the process and overall focus of the clause [Jordan and Liefferink, 2004]. The immediate impact of Nordic activism appears to have been the mainstreaming of the sustainable development clause in the 1997 Treaty of Amsterdam, together with a much greater emphasis on sustainable development in EU literature and Framework Funding programs. The area of gender empowerment accelerated in a similar manner in the later 1990, although by far pre-dating the 1995 enlargement. In particular, the practices of gender mainstreaming in the EU institutions and the activities of gender scholars and campaigners contributed to this process [Kronsell, 2005; Lenscow, 2006]. The final area(s) of immediate impact appear to be in EU external relations in the aspects of the «northern dimension» and civil-military intervention. The relative emphasis given to the «northern dimension» of EU external relations clearly reflects the concerns of Nordic and Baltic states regarding the EU's emerging asymmetrical interdependence with Russia [Ojanen, 2001; Browning, 2005]. Similarly, the impetus given to civil-military humanitarian interventions by the Finnish and Swedish EU Presidencies is reflected and reflects similar academic and policy-relevant activism [Hjelm-Wallén and Halonen, 1996; Duke and Ojanen, 2006; Lindstrom, 2007].

In terms of bibliometric and peer assessments of Danish and Swedish EU studies, it appears that two patterns emerge (Manners 2007 provides bibliometric foundation, updated for this chapter)<sup>7</sup>. Danish scholarship is primarily focused on four centers of research, including Aarhus University, Copenhagen University, Roskilde University and Copenhagen Business School (CBS). At Aarhus University the work of Palle Svendsen, Carsten Daugberg, Jens Blom-Hansen, Knud Erik Jørgensen, Adrian Favell, Gert Tinggaard Svendsen, and Derek Beach has

been important, while at Copenhagen University newly arrived Ben Rosamond, together with Martin Marcussen, Lykke Friis, Marlene Wind, Henrik Larsen, and Dorte Martinsen are important. At Roskilde University, work on the EU and the world by Ian Manners and Gorm Rye Olsen is leading their respective fields, while at CBS Susanna Borrás and Ove Kaj Pedersen do the same. In total, approximately two-dozen Danish-based EU scholars are having an international impact in their work.

Compared to Denmark, Swedish scholarship is more evenly spread around a larger number of universities and research institutes. In this respect, leading Swedish EU researchers are to be found at Stockholm University (Jonas Tallberg and Ulrika Mörth), Lund University (Ole Elgström and Rikard Bengtsson), Sodertorn University (Karl Magnus Johansson and Nick Aylott), Umea University (Torbjörn Bergman), the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute (Mark Rhinard), and Gothenburg University (Daniel Naurin). In total, approximately a dozen Swedish-based EU scholars are having an international impact.

As briefly discussed here, there are some areas of strengths and weaknesses of Danish and Swedish EU studies which can be discussed in terms of quality assessment by drawing briefly on the four previous discussions. First, as the previous discussion illustrated, the two areas of theory and external actions appear to be subfields of study where there is genuine international impact. In terms of external relations, a 2010 Nordic Council project bid led by Walter Carlsnaes (Uppsala University) illustrated the strengths of Nordic scholarship. To illustrate, the project included from Sweden and Denmark Mark Rhinard and Hanna Ojanen (both the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute), Kjell Engelbrekt (Stockholm University), Magnus Ekengren (SNDC), Annika Björkdahl (Lund University) with Annika Bergman-Rosamond (DIIS) and Ian Manners (Roskilde University).

Second, there seem to be a number of areas of Danish and Swedish EU studies where scholarship is not at the level one might expect for a variety of reasons. With a few exceptions, Danish and Swedish studies on social models and welfare policy in an EU context seem almost entirely absent (see Dorte Martinsen's work for an exception). Similarly, studies of the Eurozone are hard to find, which seems odd given the presence of two non-Euro members (Martin Marcussen's work is an exception). Despite the

previous comments, Danish and Swedish scholarship on the EU, environment and global warming is an area where we might expect to find more work (exceptions include Annica Kronsell and Karin Bäckstrand's work). Again, despite the strengths discussed in the previous sections, Danish and Swedish EU work on gender mainstreaming is not as broad as one might expect (although see Annica Kronsell's recent work on Nordic militaries). Strangely, the area of external relations where we might expect Danish and Swedish EU scholarship to be very well developed – development policy – also appears to be relatively weak (see Gorm Rye Olsen and Ole Elgström for exceptions). Given the Nordic region's attachment to democracy, this fact seems particularly weak in the EU context (exceptions include the work of Sverker Gustavsson and Morten Kelstrup). Finally, and most worryingly of all, one major gap in Danish and Swedish EU studies appears to be work on Nordic cooperation within the EU itself (see Pertti Joenniemi for an exception).

What this quality assessment seems to be suggesting is that there are many areas of international excellence in EU studies, such as in social and critical theory, as well as external actions/foreign affairs across Denmark and Sweden. It can also be said that there is excellence in certain specific areas such as sustainable development, gender issues, and agricultural policy, but the first two of these do not have a high impact as might be expected, given Denmark and Sweden's historical attachment to them. Of course, the literature review and bibliometric methodology drawn on here can easily be challenged for its English-language bias, but it does illustrate the dilemma of indigenous versus international (English) publication. Similarly the quality assessment does suggest that further research could further track the dense interrelationships between the EU academic, policy and diplomatic communities which is characteristic of Danish and Swedish societies.

##### *5. Comparative and Temporal Dimensions*

Combining the history of EC/EU integration with the scholarly focus stemming from the two respective countries reveals the ever present influence of the social reality on the research agenda. As documented by

Jørgensen (1995) and Egeberg (2003), Nordic EC/EU discussions have traditionally been confined to the somewhat self-centric enquiry of what is considered to be in the country's best interest. A natural consequence of this has been a strong domestic focus of the research agenda, «quite logical for scholars in a small country surrounded by a very big outside world» [Jørgensen, 1995]. Nevertheless, a more outward-looking, international research agenda can be said to have emerged, by and large, after the Maastricht Treaty, in parallel with the more traditional, domestic agenda. This development should be seen as both reflecting Danish and Swedish political realities, while at the same time mirroring broader theoretical trends within the fields of social and political sciences.

In Denmark, EC/EU scholarship can roughly (and somewhat imprecisely) be separated in two phases, the first stretching from the Danish EC membership in 1972 until the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. The pre-Maastricht phase was marked by research targeting first and foremost institutional matters (hereunder reforms), Denmark's coordinates on Europe's political and economic map (i.e. «Denmark and the EC» and the sometimes troubled relation between Denmark and the EC), and finally, EC external relations [Jørgensen, 1995]. The Danish pre-Maastricht theoretical approach was closely confined to neo-functionalism, with a limited appreciation for alternative theories such as neo-institutionalism, realism and rational choice theory [Jørgensen, 1995].

The emergence of a strong constructivist presence in the Danish political science community can be seen as *the* most important factor that contributed to the enhanced focus on norms and identities in the study of the EU. The introduction of social theory into EU studies can thus be said to have introduced a second phase in Danish EU scholarship, increasingly present in the post-Maastricht years. Gradually, as already mentioned, broader issue areas such as gender-mainstreaming and sustainable development won terrain, which can be coupled to the belief in Scandinavian norm-entrepreneurship and actorness *within* the EU. The same argument can be applied to Swedish gender and environmental research.

The EC/EU research agenda in Sweden can, however, hardly be divided along the same lines as the Danish, first and foremost due to the limited scholarly focus before the Swedish EU entry in 1995. Rather than

speaking about distinct phases in Swedish EU scholarship, it makes more sense to speak about a gradual development towards a set of core competences, mirroring both theory developments, as mentioned above, as well as political realities. With regards to the latter, the focus on negotiation and bargaining, as well as on the civilian dimension of defense cooperation, has crystallized in areas where Swedish EU scholarships have flourished, in particular after 2000. As argued by Lee-Ohlson, «the civilian dimension became a means of shaping and influencing the ESDP in a way conducive to traditional Swedish foreign and security policy thinking» [Lee-Ohlson, 2008]. This, however, was a process that matured over time, and became first recognizable in the period between 2001 and 2003.

### *Notes*

1. Network for European Studies, University of Helsinki; Department of Political Science, Aarhus University; Roskilde University.
2. <http://www.cfe.lu.se/> and <http://www.cergu.gu.se/> (last visited on May 13, 2011).
3. [www.snes.se/](http://www.snes.se/) (last visited on May 13, 2011).
4. <http://www.ui.se/> (last visited on May 13, 2011).
5. [www.sieps.se/](http://www.sieps.se/) (last visited on May 13, 2011).
6. We are well aware that Ingebritsen is Seattle-based and of Norwegian origin, yet her work fits thematically.
7. The bibliometric assessment draws on both monograph and article-based metrics, using Amazon, Google Scholar, and the US Social Science Citation Index. None of these bibliometric means are able to capture peer assessment and reputation.

### *References*

- Adler-Nissen, R.  
2009 *The diplomacy of opting out, British and Danish stigma management in the European Union*, Copenhagen, University of Copenhagen.
- Anckar, D.

- 1991 *Nordic political science: trends, roles, approaches*, in «European Journal of Political Research» Vol. 20, n. 112, pp. 239-62.
- Angström, J., Hedenström, E. and Ström, L.-I.  
2003 *Survival of the most citted? Small political science communities and international influence: the case of Sweden*, in «European Political Studies» Vol. 2, n. 3.
- Björkdahl, A.  
2008 *Norm advocacy: A small state strategy to influence the EU*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 15, n. 1.
- Breitenbauch, H. and Wivel, A.  
2004 *Understanding national IR disciplines outside the United States: political culture and the construction of International Relations in Denmark*, in «Journal of International Relations and Development» Vol. 7, pp. 414-443.
- Browning, C. (ed.)  
2005 *Remaking Europe in the Margins: Northern Europe after the Enlargements*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Christiansen, T., Jørgensen, K.E. and Wiener, A. (eds.)  
1999 *Special Issue on The Social Construction of Europe*, in «Journal of European Public Policy», Vol. 6, n. 4.
- Diez, T. and Manners, I.  
2007 *Reflecting on normative power Europe*, in *Power in World Politics*, edited by F. Berenskoetter and M.J. Williams, London, Routledge.
- Duke, S. and Ojanen, H.  
2006, *Bridging Internal and External Security: Lessons from the European Security and Defence Policy*, in «Journal of European Integration» Vol. 28, pp. 477-494.
- Egeberg, M.  
2003 *The Nordic Countries and the EU: How European Integration Integrates and Disintegrates States Domestically*, in «ARENA Working Papers» Vol. 11, University of Oslo.
- Elgström, O. (ed.)  
2003 *European Union Council Presidencies: A Comparative Analysis*, London, Routledge.
- Elgström, O. and Jönsson, C. (eds.)  
2004 *European Union Negotiations*, London, Routledge.

- Friedrichs, J. (2006)  
 2006 *The Nordic Countries, in International Relations in Europe: Traditions, perspectives and destinations*, edited by K.E. Jørgensen and T. Brems Knudsen, London, Routledge, pp. 125-148.
- Gstöhl, S.  
 2002 *Reluctant Europeans: Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland in the Process of Integration*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Hansen, L. and Waever, O. (eds.)  
 2001 *Between Nations and Europe: the challenge of the Nordic states*, London, Routledge.
- Hjelm-Wallén, L. and Halonen, T.  
 1996 *Swedish-Finnish initiative on EU conflict management capability*, joint articles in «Dagens Nyheter» (Sweden) and «Helsingin Sanomat» (Finland), April 21.
- Hydén G., Immergut E. and Underdal A. (evaluators)  
 2002 *Swedish Research in Political Science*, The Swedish Research Council, Stockholm.
- Ingebritsen, C.  
 1998 *The Nordic States and European Unity*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- 2002 *Norm Entrepreneurs Scandinavia's Role in World Politics*, in «Cooperation and Conflict» Vol. 37, n. 1, pp. 11-23.
- Joenniemi, P.  
 2007 *Towards a European Union of Post-Security?*, in «Cooperation and Conflict» Vol. 42, n. 1, pp. 127-148.
- Johansson, K.M. (ed.)  
 1999 *Sverige i EU*, Stockholm, SNS Förlag.
- Jordan, A. and Liefferink, D., (eds.)  
 2004 *Environmental Policy in Europe. The Europeanization of National Environmental Policy*, London, Routledge.
- Jørgensen, K.E.,  
 1995 *Review Article: European Integration as a Field of Study in Denmark*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 33, n. 1, pp. 157-162.
- 1997 (ed.), *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Kelstrup, M.



- 1990 *The Process of Europeanization. On the Theoretical Interpretation of Present Changes in the European Regional Political System*, in «Cooperation and Conflict» Vol. 25, pp. 21-40.
- 1992 *European Integration and Political Theory*, in *European Integration and Denmark's Participation*, edited by M. Kelstrup, Copenhagen, Political Studies Press.
- 1993 *EF's politiske system*, in «Politica» Vol. 25, n. 3, pp. 1-25.
- Kelstrup, M. et al.
- 1990 *The European Security Order Recast: Scenarios for the Post-Cold War Era*, London, Pinter.
- Kelstrup, M. and Williams, M. (eds.)
- 2000 *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration*, London, Routledge.
- Kinnvall, C.
- 2005 "Not Here, Not Now": *The Absence of a European Perestroika Movement*, in *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*, edited by K. Monroe, New Haven, Yale, University Press.
- Klasson, T.,
- 2004 *Välfärdspolitik*, in *Svensk politik och den Europeiska unionen*, edited by T. Bryder, D. Silander and C. Wallin, Malmö, Liber.
- Kronsell, A.,
- 2004 *A "sustainable" impact on the EU? An analysis of the making of the Fifth Environmental Action Programme*, in *The Emergence of Ecological Modernisation – Integrating the environment and the economy?*, edited by S. Young, London, Routledge.
- Kronsell, A.,
- 2005 *Gender, Power and European Integration Theory*, «European Journal of Public Policy» Vol. 12, n. 6, pp. 1022-40.
- Langdal, F. and von Sydow, G.
- 2009 *Introduction: Interim Judgements of the Swedish EU Presidency*, in *The Swedish Presidency: European Perspectives*, edited by F. Langdal and G. von Sydow, SIEPS, available at: [www.sieps.se](http://www.sieps.se) (last visited on May 13, 2011).
- Larsen, H.
- 2005 *Analysing the Foreign Policy of Small States in the EU: The Case of Denmark*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

- Lee-Ohlsson, F.  
2008 *Sweden and the Development of the European Security and Defence Policy: A Bi-Directional Process of Europeanisation*, in «EU Diplomacy Papers» Vol. 5, Brugge, College of Europe, Department of EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies.
- Lenschow, A.  
2006 *Environmental Policy in the European Union: Bridging Policy, Politics and Policy Dimensions*, in *Handbook of European Union Politics*, edited by K.E. Jørgensen, M.A. Pollack and B. Rosamond, London, Sage.
- Lindström, G.  
2007 *Enter the EU Battlegroups*, in «Chaillot Paper», n. 97.
- Lubbers, M. and Scheepers, P.  
2005 *Political versus Instrumental Euro-scepticism: Mapping Scepticism in European Countries and Regions*, in «European Union Politics» Vol. 6, n. 2, pp. 223-242.
- Manners, I.  
2002 *Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?*, in «Journal of Common Market Studies» Vol. 40, n. 2.  
2007 *The Power of Nordic-EU Studies*, paper presented to the Nordic International Studies Association, Odense.
- Manners, I. et al.  
2008 *The Danish Opt Outs from the European Union: developments since 2000*, Danish Institute for International Studies, available at: [www.diiis.dk](http://www.diiis.dk) (last visited on May 13, 2011).
- Marcussen, M.  
2000 *Ideas and Elites: The Social Construction of Economic and Monetary Union*, Aalborg, Aalborg University Press.
- Miles, L.  
2005 *Fusing with Europe? Sweden in the European Union*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Miles, L. and Mörth, U.  
2002 *Nordic Political Science and the Study of European Integration*, in «Journal of European Public Policy» Vol. 9, n. 3, pp. 488-495.
- Naurin, D. and Wallace, H. (eds.)  
2010 *Unveiling the Council of the European Union: Games Governments*

- Play in Brussels*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Naurin, D., Hoffmann-Martinot, V. and Ware, A. (eds.), *Deliberation Behind Closed Doors: Transparency and Lobbying in the European Union* (Ecpr Press Monographs, Essex
- Ojanen, H. (ed.)
- 2001 *The Northern Dimension: Fuel for the EU? Programme on the Northern Dimension of the CFSP*, Helsinki, Finnish Institute of International Affairs and Institut für Europäische Politik.
- Oxelheim, L., Pehrson, L. and Persson, T.
- 2010 *EU och den globala krisen*, Stockholm, Santerus Förlag.
- Petersson, O.
- 2000 *The European Debate in Sweden*, in «Notre Europé, Research and Policy Paper No. 12».
- Ruin, O.
- 2003 *Political Science on the Periphery: Sweden*, in «The Annual Review of Political Science» n. 6. pp 41-54.
- Silander, D., Wallin, C. and Bryder, T.
- 2004 *Reflektioner över det svenska EU-medlemskapet*, in *Svensk politik och den Europeiska unionen*, edited by T. Bryder, D. Silander and C. Wallin, Malmö, Liber.
- Sørensen, C.
- 2007 *Euroscepticism, a conceptual analysis and a longitudinal, cross-country examination of public scepticism towards the European Union*, Copenhagen, Copenhagen University.
- Tallberg, J.
- 2003 *European Governance and Supranational Institutions: Making States Comply*, London, Routledge.
- 2006 *The Power of the Presidency: Brokerage, Efficiency and—Leadership and Negotiation in the European Union*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomsen, B.N.
- 1993 *The Odd Man Out? Danmark og den europæiske integration 1948-1992*, Odense, Odense University
- Valmyndigheten
- 2003 *Folkomröstning om Euron*, available at:  
<http://www.val.se/val/emu2003/resultat/slutresultat/>

Wæver, O.

2003 *Discursive Approaches*, in *European Integration Theory*, edited by A. Wiener and T. Diez, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Walters, W. and Haahr, J.H.

2006 *Governing Europe: Discourse, Governmentality and European Integration*, London, Routledge.