

УДК 81'272(4)

V. Romanova

THE CONCEPT OF EUROPEANIZATION AND ITS APPLICATION VIA LANGUAGE POLICIES

This article covers the main approaches towards understanding the concept of Europeanisation and investigates its application in regard to language policies. In particular, the article explores the issue which is still overlooked by international and domestic academics: the application of the concept of Europeanization in regard to promoting European norms on language policies beyond the European Union.

The article pays special attention to the EU's impact on Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) 'inside and outside the EU'. First, the article stresses that the EU's efforts regarding promoting particular language policies in CEE were the most effective before the CEE states joined the EU. This is illustrated with the help of the case of Latvia, one of the Baltic States.

Second, the article identifies the means of promoting European norms on language policies beyond the EU. It concludes that the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership (ENP) is ill-fitted to export the EU's norms regarding language policies into the third countries, including CEE beyond the EU. The author claims that The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe in 1992 and entered into force in 1998, can be regarded as the main instrument of promoting European norms on language beyond the EU. The article highlights that the Committee of Experts is responsible for carrying out the monitoring mechanism provided for by the Charter: the mechanism that is specifically designed to protect and promote regional and minority languages in Europe, 'inside and outside the EU'.

Thus, the article contributes to the exploration of the issue which is still overlooked by international and domestic academics – Europeanisation beyond the EU in particular – promoting European norms on language policies beyond the European Union.

Keywords: Europeanisation, language policy, the European Neighbourhood Policy and the Eastern Partnership, the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.

This article seeks to investigate the concept of Europeanisation and its application in regard to promoting European norms on language policies beyond the European Union (EU). It reviews key approaches towards interpreting the concept of Europeanisation and identifies the means of promoting European norms regarding language policies beyond the EU.

Europeanisation is a contested concept. Buller and Gamble (2002) discuss the diversity of approaches towards its understanding and identify

three main ways to interpret it. First, Europeanisation can mean the establishment of governing institutions at the EU level. Radaelli [9] gives an example of Lawton's (1999) definition of Europeanisation as 'the *de jure* transfer of sovereignty to the EU level' [9 p. 3]. Second, Europeanisation can be interpreted as the process and the result of the political unification of the EU. Third, Europeanisation can be understood as the domestic impact of the EU. The third interpretation corresponds to the definition of Börzel (1999), who understands Europeanisation

as ‘process by which domestic policy areas become increasingly subject to European policy-making’. In this case Europeanisation can affect particular policies or policy styles, ‘for example by making it more or less conflictual, corporatist or pluralist, or more or less regulative’ [9 p.14]. Buller and Gamble [1] add that in this case Europeanisation can occur outside the EU: it can refer to the examples where the specific forms of the EU’s governance are exported outside the EU’s territorial boundaries. Schimmelfennig [14] concludes that ‘the scope of Europeanization is not conceptually limited to the impact of the EU on its member states’ [14, p.5] and can have a wider outreach. In case Europeanisation is understood as the domestic impact of Europe, it can be driven by the EU or domestic policy-makers [11]. When Europeanisation is domestically driven, non-EU governments may import the EU’s policies in order to legitimise their domestic actions (Buller and Gamble 2002). This approach corresponds to the lesson-learning model: ‘a state adopts EU rule, if it expects these rules to solve domestic policy problems effectively’ [12, p. 672]. In other words, domestic policy-makers proactively seek to adopt EU solutions for the benefit of their constituencies.

Academics thoroughly study the EU’s impact on those Central and Eastern European (CEE) states that joined the EU in 2004 and 2007 [12]. Research within the framework of the external incentives model finds that lesson-learning had relatively low impact on CEE during the accession process, while conditionality played the major role. ‘The dominant logic underpinning EU conditionality is a bargaining strategy of reinforcement by reward, under which the EU provides external incentives for a target government to comply with its conditions’ [12, p.662] cited from [14]: 3). Schweltnus et al [15] summarize the set of external conditions: ‘the size of the reward, the credibility of delivering or withholding the reward, the strength of conditionality, and the determinacy of conditions’ [15, p. 7]. The model expects a candidate state to adopt the EU’s norms if the EU’s rewards are higher than domestic adaptation costs. There are alternative academic approaches. ‘Institutional outcomes in the regionalization of the CEE [countries] have been overwhelmingly driven by domestic political factors arising out of their transitions from communism rather than by EU conditionality pressures’ (Hughes et al., 2004: 174). Where accession states received mixed signals from the EU they tended to choose

those options that were more suitable for domestic elites [6].

During pre-accession and accession the EU promoted anti-discriminatory language policies and respect towards minority languages in CEE. According to the 1993 Copenhagen criteria, candidate countries were expected to demonstrate respect for and protection of minority rights. In 2001 the European Commission additionally referred to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, which regulates the use of minority languages in public, educational, and administrative life [2]. Most often language policies prioritised the use of minority languages in different aspects of private and public life, as well as education of and in minority languages.

The case of Latvia is telling. Latvia committed itself to joining the EU; however, it was not invited to begin accession negotiations at the Luxembourg European Council of 1997 (Hughes et al. 2004). There remained a chance to get the respective invitation at the Helsinki European Council in December of 1999. In 1998 the Latvian national parliament passed the State Language Law. It required private businesses and enterprises to conduct their activities in Latvian. The Law made the use of foreign languages in dealings with central and regional authorities illegal. Even public signs in foreign languages were forbidden [15, p. 13]. The Law was heavily criticized by the European Commission, because it discriminated the rights of numerous Russian speakers in Latvia (up to 40% of the entire population) [2]. The Law put Latvia at risk of missing the opportunity to start EU accession. A few days before the 1999 European Council the Latvian president refused to sign the Law and ensured the Law was amended by the national parliament. This made it possible for Latvia to be invited to begin accession negotiations at the Helsinki European Council in 1999. Language policies in Latvia continued attracting special attention of the European Commission. A general evaluation of Latvia’s accession progress in 2000 noted ‘Latvia fulfils the Copenhagen political criteria. Although significant progress has been achieved in the integration of non-citizens it will be necessary to ensure that the final text of the Language law is compatible with international standards and the Europe Agreement’ (European Commission 2000). Research finds that the EU’s efforts regarding language policies in CEE take effects; however, they were the most effective before accession [15].

Europeanisation in CEE outside the EU remains overlooked by academics. Schimmelfennig [14] finds that scholars tend to examine Europeanisation beyond Europe via the prism of ‘what the EU is in its foreign relations’. There are numerous approaches towards defining what the EU is in its foreign affairs. Historically the common market provided the grounds for European integration, and till now the EU uses the single market as a material venue, as an institutional venue, and as interest contestation [3]. In relation to CEE, the EU often highlights its normative power – the power to define what ‘normal’ is [3]. As Manners notes, the EU can serve as an example for others and can spread its norms by means of contagion, informational diffusion, procedural diffusion, transference, overt diffusion, and the cultural filter. The EU fits into the criteria of normative power, which are listed by Forsberg [5]. First, the EU possesses a normative identity. As Manners (2002) suggests, the EU’s identity includes five core and four minor norms. One of the minor norms represents anti-discrimination and the protection of minorities [8, p.242]. Second, the EU claims to have normative interests. Third, it behaves in a normative way. Fourth, it employs its norms as the means of influence. Fifth, despite ‘EU policy in third countries and regions has been characterised by low consistency and effectiveness’ [14, p/17], still there is evidence the EU is able ‘able to achieve normative ends’ [5].

Probably the main institutional framework for Europeanisation beyond Europe is the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP). Its main declared goals include preventing ‘the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and its neighbours’ and exporting the EU’s norms beyond Europe. The ENP covers a wide range of third countries: the EU’s Eastern European neighbours (excluding Russia), the Middle Eastern and North African countries, as well as the Caucasus. The ENP is framed as a process of ‘joint ownership’ of the EU and partner countries. According to Sedelmeier, this does not necessarily increase the chances of successful Europeanisation, because domestic political actors can pick and choose those policy preferences that are the most suitable for their own agendas. The strengthened ENP – the Eastern Partnership (EaP) – is meant to further support good governance in EU’s eastern neighbours. Some of the aspects of the ENP and the EaP resemble pre-accession instruments, which the EU employed in relation to those CEE

states that joined the EU [10]. However, the ENP’s and the EaP’s conditionality is weaker than the enlargement-related conditionality, because the perspective of EU membership is not suggested. The ENP and the EaP prioritise security issues [16] and do not pay special attention to language policies. However, the ENP and the EaP are not designed to export the EU’s norms regarding language policies into the third countries.

Language policies are the subject of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (the Charter), which is specially designed to protect and promote regional and minority languages, as well as to enable speakers of a regional or minority language to use it in private and public life. The Charter was adopted on 25 June 1992 by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe and entered into force on 1 March 1998. One of the objectives of the Council of Europe is to promote awareness and to encourage the development of Europe’s cultural identity and diversity, including protecting and promoting regional or minority languages. The Committee of Ministers decides Council of Europe policy and approves its agenda. It consists of the ministers of foreign affairs of its 47 member states or their permanent diplomatic representatives, including Ukraine. Also, the Committee of Experts is responsible for carrying out the monitoring mechanism provided for by the Charter. The Charter ‘...is based on an approach that fully respects national sovereignty and territorial integrity. It does not conceive the relationship between official languages and regional or minority languages in terms of competition or antagonism’ (Council of Europe). It defines regional or minority languages as languages that are traditionally used within a given territory of a state by nationals of that state who form a group numerically smaller than the rest of the state’s population; they are different from the official language(s) of that state, and they include neither dialects of the official language(s) of the state nor the languages of migrants’ (Council of Europe). So far the Charter [4] can be regarded as the main instrument of promoting European norms on language beyond the European Union.

This article has covered the main approaches towards understanding the concept of Europeanisation and has clarified the means of promoting European norms regarding language policies. The article has claimed that the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages can be regarded as the main

instrument of promoting European norms on language beyond the European Union. This helped to contribute to the exploration of the issue, which is

still overlooked by academics – Europeanisation beyond the EU, in particular – in regard to language policies.

Bibliography

1. Buller J. Conceptualising Europeanisation / J. Buller, A. Gamble // *Public Policy and Administration*. – 2002. – No 17 (2).
2. Cheskin A. History, conflicting collective memories, and national identities: how Latvia's Russian-speakers are learning to remember / A. Cheskin // *Nationalities Papers*. – 2012. – No 40 (4). – P. 561–584.
3. Damro C. Market power Europe / C. Damro // *Journal of European Public Policy*. – 2012. – No 19:5. – P. 682–699.
4. Forsberg T. Normative Power Europe, Once Again: A Conceptual Analysis of an Ideal Type / T. Forsberg // *JCMS*. – 2011. – No 49 (6). – P. 1183–1204.
5. Haughton T. When Does the EU Make a Difference? Conditionality and the Accession Process in Central and Eastern Europe / T. Haughton // *Political Studies Review*. – 2007. – No 5. – P. 233–246.
6. Gänzle S. EU Governance and the European Neighbourhood Policy: A Framework for Analysis / S. Gänzle // *Europe-Asia Studies*. – 2009. – No 61 (10). – P. 1715–1734.
7. Manners I. Normative Power Europe: a Contradiction in Terms? / I. Manners // *JCMS*. – 2002. – No 40 (2). – P. 235–258.
8. Radaelli C. Whither Europeanisation? / C. Radaelli // *European Integration online Papers*. – 2000. – No 4 (8).
9. Sasse G. The EBP: Conditionality Revisited for the EU's Eastern Neighbours / G. Sasse // *Europe-Asia Studies*. – 2008. – No 60 (2). – P. 295–316.
10. Schimmelfennig F. Theorising EU Enlargement: Research Focus, Hypotheses and the State of Research / F. Schimmelfennig, U. Sedelmeier // *Journal of European Public Policy*. – 2002. – Special Issue 9/4. – P. 500–529.
11. Schimmelfennig F. Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe / F. Schimmelfennig, U. Sedelmeier // *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2004. – No 11 (4). – P. 669–687.
12. Schimmelfennig F. The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe / F. Schimmelfennig, U. Sedelmeier (eds.) // Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 2005.
13. Schimmelfennig F. Europeanization beyond Europe / F. Schimmelfennig // *Living Reviews*. – 2009. – No 4 (3).
14. Schweltnus G. It ain't over when it's over: The Adoption and Sustainability of Minority Protection Rules in New EU Member States / G. Schweltnus, L. Balaz, L. Mikalayeva // *European Integration online Paper*. – 2009. – Special Issue 2, Vol. 13.
15. Zaiotti R. Of Friends and Fences: Europe's Neighbourhood Policy and the Gated Community Syndrome / R. Zaiotti // *Journal of European Integration*. – 2007. – No 29 (2). – P. 143–162.

Романова В. В.

КОНЦЕПЦІЯ ЄВРОПЕЇЗАЦІЇ ТА ЇЇ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ ЩОДО МОВНОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ

У статті подано результати аналізу основних підходів до розуміння концепції Європеїзації, зокрема щодо мовної політики. Основну увагу приділено питанню, що дотепер лишається поза увагою більшості науковців – питанню застосування концепції Європеїзації стосовно просування європейських норм щодо мовної політики за межі Європейського союзу (ЄС). Підкреслено, що вплив ЄС на країни Центрально-Східної Європи був найбільш ефективним у період до їхнього вступу до Європейського союзу. Зокрема, це стосується і мовної політики, що проілюстровано на прикладі Латвії. Можливості ЄС просувати європейські норми щодо мовної політики за межі Європейського союзу за допомогою Європейської політики сусідства та Східного партнерства визначено як обмежені. Зроблено висновок, що ключовим механізмом у цьому контексті є Європейська хартія регіональних мов та мов меншин.

Ключові слова: Європеїзація, мовна політика, Європейська політика сусідства, Східне партнерство, Європейська хартія регіональних мов та мов меншин

Матеріал надійшов 24.02.2016