DIEGO BORRAJO VALIÑA

III Premio AEPDIRI «Antonio Truyol y Serra»
a la Mejor Tesis Doctoral en Relaciones Internacionales

EUROPEAN GOVERNANCE AND GLOBAL SECURITY ASSEMBLAGES

The emergence of the European Union's integrated approach to external conflicts and crises (2009-2020)

LA GOBERNANZA EUROPEA Y LOS ENSAMBLAJES GLOBALES DE SEGURIDAD

La emergencia del enfoque integral de la Unión Europea en la gestión de conflictos y crisis en el exterior (2009-2020)

Prólogo de
José Luis de Castro

ÍNDICE

INTRODUCTORY PART

CHAPTER 1

FRAMING THE RESEARCH PROJECT

THEORETICAL PART

CHAPTER 5

AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE INTEGRATED APPROACH WITHIN HE EU MODEL OF SECURITY GOVERNANCE

METHODOLOGICAL PART

CAPÍTULO 6

UN MARCO ANALÍTICO PARA EL ANÁLISIS DE LA COMUNIDAD (EPISTÉMICA) DE SEGURIDAD DE LA UE

EMPIRICAL PART

CAPÍTULO 7

LA CONFIGURACIÓN ESTRATÉGICA/TECNOLÓGICA DE LA UE: DESDE LA EMERGENCIA DE LA GESTIÓN DE CRISIS A LA GOBERNANZA DE LA SEGURIDAD

CAPÍTULO 8

**VARIACIONES EPISTÉMICAS EN LA COMUNIDAD DE SEGURIDAD
DE LA UE: EL ENFOQUE INTEGRAL**

CONCLUDING PART

CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSIONS

ANEXO

RESUMEN DE LA TESIS

PALABRAS PREVIAS

La publicación de la obra de Diego Borrajo Valiña, titulada *La gobernanza europea y los ensamblajes globales de seguridad. La emergencia del enfoque integral de la Unión Europea en la gestión de conflictos y crisis en el exterior (2009-2020)* constituye un motivo de enorme satisfacción para la Asociación Española de Profesores de Derecho Internacional y Relaciones Internacionales, ya que ha sido galardonada con el III Premio AEPDIRI «Antonio Truyol y Serra a la mejor Tesis Doctoral en Relaciones Internacionales»*. La tesis fue dirigida por el profesor José Luis de Castro Ruano, profesor titular de Derecho Internacional Público y Relaciones Internacionales, y defendida en la Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU).

Desde 2015, con miras a impulsar carreras investigadoras de excelencia de sus miembros más jóvenes, la AEPDIRI decidió premiar las mejores tesis doctorales en cualquiera de las disciplinas cubiertas por la Asociación, defendidas en una Universidad española, pública o privada, convocando bienalmente los premios «Adolfo Miaja de la Muela» a la mejor Tesis Doctoral en Derecho Internacional Público, «Mariano Aguilar Navarro» a la mejor Tesis Doctoral en Derecho Internacional Privado, y «Antonio Truyol y Serra» a la mejor Tesis Doctoral en Relaciones Internacionales. Como consta en las bases (*www.aepdiri.org*), todas las tesis que concurren a los premios han de haber obtenido la máxima calificación.

A partir de la segunda edición, la AEPDIRI y la editorial Marcial Pons alcanzaron un acuerdo para la publicación de los textos premiados. Así, la tesis de Diego Borrajo Valiña, defendida en la Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU), es la segunda publicación de esta colección de Premios «Antonio Truyol y Serra».

En esta ocasión el jurado estuvo integrado por los profesores Rafael García Pérez, profesor titular de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Vicente Garrido Rebolledo, profesor titular de Relaciones Internaciones de la Universidad Rey Juan Carlos I e Inmaculada Marrero

---

* El II Premio AEPDIRI «Antonio Truyol y Serra» se concedió a Victoria Rodríguez Prieto, por su tesis, ya publicada en esta colección, *La actuación normativa de la Unión Europea en la Asociación Oriental. Los casos de Georgia y Moldavia (2009-2018),* Marcial Pons, 2018.

Rocha, profesora titular de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad de Granada. El premio fue concedido por unanimidad.

La Junta Directiva de la AEPDIRI quiere aprovechar estas líneas para felicitar al autor por el premio obtenido, merecido reconocimiento a la calidad de su trabajo, y para desearle mucha suerte en su carrera académica. También deseamos animar a los jóvenes investigadores, miembros de la Asociación, a presentar sus trabajos a las próximas ediciones de los Premios a las mejores Tesis Doctorales.

<div align="right">

Caterina García Segura

Presidenta de la AEPDIRI

</div>

PRÓLOGO

El libro que tengo la satisfacción de prologar llega en un momento oportuno y llena un cierto vacío en la, por lo demás, muy fructífera literatura de la academia española sobre la materia. El trabajo de Diego Borrajo Valiña *European Governance and Global Security Asemblages: the Emergence of the European Unión's Integrated Approach to Conflict and Crisis* coloca el «enfoque integral» en el centro del análisis sobre la gestión de crisis y la política de seguridad de la Unión Europea, cuestión que ha adquirido en los últimos años una posición bastante relevante en la agenda comunitaria en general y, especialmente, entre los instrumentos de acción exterior de una organización que pugna por jugar un protagonismo creciente en la arena internacional. Así, esta publicación ayuda a comprender mejor la naturaleza singular de la acción exterior de la UE, que tiene precisamente en el «*comprehensive approach*» (o mejor, «*Integrated Approach*», según la terminología actual que es la que recoge el autor en la publicación) uno de sus elementos más característicos y definitorios. El libro que el lector tiene en sus manos proporciona un alto nivel de conocimiento sobre la forma en que se definen los objetivos políticos, las prioridades y las políticas en el ámbito comunitario en coordinación con los Estados miembros y otros actores concurrentes en la acción sobre el terreno en el exterior. En particular se centra en la PESC/PCSD, los mecanismos de gestión de crisis y el nexo entre seguridad y desarrollo en el marco del enfoque integrado de conflictos y crisis externas haciendo especial hincapié en el Cuerno de África y el Sahel.

Hoy las amenazas a la seguridad no se refieren única ni principalmente a cuestiones estratégicas y militares; sino que la seguridad se ve afectada por múltiples asuntos como la pobreza y las consecuencias lacerantes derivadas de ella, por la dependencia energética, la competencia por los recursos naturales, el terrorismo, la potencial utilización de armas de destrucción masiva, la descomposición de los Estados, las violaciones de los derechos humanos, las amenazas sanitarias y pandémicas y un largo etcétera. La UE parte de un enfoque amplio de la seguridad para enfrentar los desafíos actuales que requieren de intervenciones globales, anticipatorias y multidimensionales; por ello desarrolla una acción multifacética en el campo de la prevención y gestión de conflictos, mantenimiento de la paz, reforzamiento de la seguridad, así como gestión civil y militar de crisis. La gestión de crisis internacionales se está convirtiendo en la dimensión más característica de la política exterior

común. Desde hace ya muchos años, la UE se ha ido dotando de instrumentos de diferente naturaleza (diplomáticos, económicos, comerciales, cooperación al desarrollo, ayuda humanitaria, misiones operativas de naturaleza civil y/o militar, etc.). Y ahí va a residir su singularidad y su valor añadido en materia de gestión de crisis respecto de la acción de otros actores: su capacidad para movilizar una muy amplia gama de instrumentos de diferente naturaleza que le proporcionan una capacidad global, «integral», de gestión de crisis. Es precisamente este «enfoque integral», que caracteriza buena parte de la gestión de crisis que lleva a cabo la UE, su rasgo más definitorio. El enfoque integral que practica la UE es simultáneamente multidimensional (porque incorpora diferentes instrumentos), multinivel (incorpora diferentes y variados actores) y secuencial (se produce en diferentes momentos y fases del proceso de la crisis). Parte del hecho de que una crisis es siempre un proceso acumulativo en el que la intervención puede y debe producirse en diferentes momentos de acuerdo a diversos criterios de oportunidad, capacidad, alerta, etcétera.

Enfoque integral, estrategia global, resiliencia, autonomía estratégica, cooperación estructurada y otros muchos, son todos ellos términos y conceptos que jalonan el edificio que la UE ha construido, está construyendo, en estos últimos años, para convertirse en un actor internacional más importante y más potente, con una capacidad para jugar papeles cada vez más relevantes en la escena internacional. La política de seguridad y defensa ha pasado de ser un tabú en el proceso de integración europea a ocupar un lugar central en la agenda comunitaria. Es una dimensión ineludible del análisis de la actualidad del proceso de integración. Casi todas las reflexiones acerca de la UE como actor internacional, van acompañadas de la controversia asociada a la discusión sobre su naturaleza, sus capacidades, sus debilidades, su eficacia o su inoperancia, así como sobre su peculiar forma de actuación. En ese sentido, un conocimiento profundo del enfoque integrado de la actuación de la UE en la gestión de conflictos y crisis en el exterior como el que nos proporciona este libro, se antoja de una pertinencia y una utilidad muy notable.

La investigación que ahora ve la luz en formato de monografía, con ligeras modificaciones y actualizaciones, se inició en enero de 2014 gracias a una beca concedida por el Programa Predoctoral de Formación de Personal Investigador del Departamento de Universidades e Investigación del Gobierno Vasco/Eusko Jaurlaritza, que se extendió hasta julio de 2017. Para desarrollar el trabajo de campo de la tesis el autor llevó a cabo una estancia como investigador visitante en el Centre d'Études Européens del Institut de Sciences Politiques de Louvain-Europe ISPOLE de la Université Catholique de Louvain. Posteriormente, entre finales del 2019 y principios del 2020, el doctor Borrajo trabajó en el Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior, precisamente en el ISPD «Integrated Approach for Security and Peace Directorate», donde pudo conocer de primera mano la dimensión práctica de su objeto de estudio asistiendo y participando activamente en diversos programas de PESC/PCSD de respuesta a las crisis en el exterior de la UE. Qué duda cabe que esta publicación se ha visto enriquecida también con la experiencia y el aprendizaje que le proporcionó su paso por el SEAE.

Quisiera también incluir en estas páginas una breve referencia al autor. Conocí a Diego Borrajo Valiña en septiembre de 2011. Pronto destacó en mis clases en el Máster en Estudios Internacionales de la Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea como un estudiante brillante. Diego se había licenciado en Ciencias Políticas y de la Administración en la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, con una especialización en Relaciones Internacionales. El curso 2010-2011 lo llevó a cabo en la Facultad de Ciencias Políticas de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid en el marco del Programa Séneca; y un año antes había completado un Curso en Relaciones Internacionales y Unión Europea en la Universidad de Aberdeen con el Programa Erasmus. En nuestro máster destacó por su profundidad reflexiva y la brillantez de sus siempre mesurados análisis. Tuve la satisfacción de dirigirle su tesis doctoral con mención de «tesis internacional» defendida en julio de 2017 y que obtuvo la calificación de Sobresaliente *Cum Laude* por unanimidad de una Comisión Evaluadora integrada por los profesores Dr. Romualdo Bermejo, catedrático de Derecho Internacional Público de la Universidad de León, Dr. Michael Keating, catedrático de Ciencia Política de la Universidad de Aberdeen y la Dra. Leire Moure, profesora agregada de la Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea.

En septiembre de 2009 la Asociación Española de Profesores de Derecho Internacional y Relaciones Internacionales AEPDIRI le concedió el III Premio AEPDIRI a la Mejor Tesis Doctoral en Relaciones Internacionales «Antonio Truyol y Serra» con un tribunal integrado por los profesores Dr. Rafael García Pérez, profesor titular de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad Santiago de Compostela, Dr. Vicente Garrido Rebolledo, profesor titular de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad Rey Juan Carlos y la Dra. Inmaculada Marrero Rocha, profesora titular de Relaciones Internacionales de la Universidad de Granada.

El autor es actualmente profesor de Relaciones Internacionales en la Universidad de Deusto y ha seguido trabajando diferentes aspectos de la PCSD. Sin ninguna duda, este trabajo que prologamos va a convertirse a partir de ahora en una obra de referencia sobre la materia.

No me queda sino expresar mi más profunda satisfacción por la publicación de esta investigación, a la vez que agradecer muy sinceramente a la AEPDIRI y a la Editorial Marcial Pons por haberlo hecho posible.

José Luis DE CASTRO
Profesor Titular de Relaciones Internacionales y Cátedra Jean Monnet,
de la Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea
Leioa, 30 de julio de 2020

INTRODUCTORY PART

CHAPTER 1

FRAMING THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The present research project starts from the question concerning the current moment of the European integration. It questions who we are, what it is to be European and what the present of the European integration means today. The present project addresses this debate by questioning the transformations that the EU has experienced as a security provider through the literature about risk society, Security Studies and International Relations.

The very existence of the European Union is at stake. While this is not a novel fact, the integration process is highly contradictory at present[1]. The Union is in a position to complete the path of the Treaty of Lisbon in the Common Security and Defence Policy in the coming years: the search for synergies and the simplification of decision-making and accountability procedures. In short, the conditions for the global projection of the Union, based on a consolidated strategic thinking, are already at hand. At the same time, the growing intensity of the external and internal rejection of the integration process, respectively constrains the EU global projection and deepens the possibilities of its irrelevance or even disintegration[2]. In consequence, the simultaneous development of these two phenomena is not only an expression of the contradictions that characterises the role of the European Union in the world but affects decisively the possibilities to answer the question that opens this introduction.

One of the key elements that has motivated the present research project lies in the existing consensus from the EU security practitioners on the in-

---

[1] S. BULMER and J. JOSEPH, «European Integration in Crisis? Of Supranational Integration, Hegemonic Projects and Domestic Politics», *European Journal of International Relations,* 22, no. 4 (2016), 725-748, doi:10.1177/1354066115612558.

[2] EUROPEAN COMMISSION, *White Paper on the Future of Europe. Reflections and Scenarios for the EU27 by 2025* (Brussels: European Union, 2017), *https://ec.europa.eu/commission/sites/beta-political/files/white_paper_on_the_future_of_europe_en.pdf*; Thomas GEHRING, Kevin URBANSKI and Sebastian OBERTHÜR, «The European Union as an Inadvertent Great Power: EU Actorness and the Ukraine Crisis», *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 2017, 1-17, doi:10.1111/jcms.12530; Luis SIMÓN, *Geopolitical Change, Grand Strategy and European Security. The EU-NATO Conundrum* (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2014), doi:10.1057/9781137029133; Esther BARBÉ, «La UE frente a la emergencia de un mundo posoccidental: en busca del prestigio perdido», *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, no. 100 (2012), 91-112; José Ignacio TORREBLANCA, *La fragmentación del poder europeo* (Barcelona: Icaria, 2011); Richard YOUNGS, *Europe's Decline and Fall. The Struggle against Global Irrelevance* (London: Profile Books, 2010).

creasing complexity and interconnectedness of the security environment and the increasingly hybrid nature of social phenomena, risks and threats[3]. This situation has pushed policy-makers to develop a set of concepts in order to respond to the social claims derived from this situation.

In this regard, the literature on the integration process in the area of the CFSP/CSDP raises the growing concern about the importance of advancing the coherence and effectiveness of the foreign and security policy instruments, which suffered from a high degree of dispersion, in order to enhance their ability to respond to such a complex, connected and contested security environment[4].

As the precepts were included in the Treaty for external action, the concept of IA emerged as part of this narrative, configuring a concept whose definition is widely agreed, but with a certain lack of consensus on how to analyse and define its implementation[5]. It is defined as a whole-of-government technique implemented by an organisation or a group of agents with the aim of making use of capacities and resources more efficiently towards a specific problem or in a specific domain.

One of the most relevant lines of research on the institutionalisation process of the Integrated Approach[6] in the area of CFSP/CSDP addresses its conceptual and procedural improvement in terms of policy-making[7]. Other

---

[3]   See for instance: HIGH REPRESENTATIVE, *A Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe* (European Union, 2016), *http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/docs/top_stories/pdf/eugs_review_web.pdf*; Donald TUSK, Jean-Claude JUNCKER and Jens STOLTENBERG, *Joint Declaration by the President of the European Council, the President of the European Commission, and the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization,* 1 (2016), 1-2; Gearoid MILLAR, «Disaggregating Hybridity: Why Hybrid Institutions Do Not Produce Predictable Experiences of Peace», *Journal of Peace Research,* 51, no. 4 (2014), 501-514, doi:10.1177/0022343313519465.

[4]   Eva GROSS, *CSDP between Internal Constraints and External Challenges*, Eva GROSS and Anand MENON (eds.) (EU Institute for Security Studies, 2013), doi:10.2815/33094; Luc VAN DE GOOR and Claudia MAJOR, «How to Make the Comprehensive Approach Work. Preparation at Home Is Key to Effective Crisis Management in the Field», *CRU Policy Rief*, 2012.

[5]   Svenja POST, *Toward a Whole-of-Europe Approach. Organizing the European Union's and Member States' Comprehensive Crisis Management* (Berlin: Springer VS, 2015), doi:10.1007/978-3-658-08023-5.

[6]   The concept that is the object of analysis in the present work has changed its nomenclature over time. This has caused some inconvenience when drafting this monograph, since this thesis was defended shortly before the Council Decision of the 22nd of January 2018, which marks the shift in the English language from Comprehensive Approach to the current Integrated Approach. On the contrary, as some sections are written in Spanish, this situation does not occur since Integrated Approach has been its original name, even before the Council Decision of 2013. Regarding the existence of these two terms in English, this work will refer to the concept as Integrated Approach in the introductory part and in the conclusions, since both sections refer directly to the present time while the rest of the chapters will refer mainly to the progression of the concept as it was conceived even before 2013 until 2018 (it is the case for the main policy documents and the interviews conducted in 2016 as part of these research project), referring therefore to the concept as Integrated Approach.

[7]   See, for instance: Thierry TARDY, «The EU: From Comprehensive Vision to Integrated Action», *EUISS Policy Brief*, EU Institute for Security Studies, 2017; Sven BISCOP, «Finally: A New EU Strategy», *Global Affairs* 2, no. 4 (2016), 1-2, doi:10.1080/23340460.2016.1237558; Sven BISCOP, *A Strategy for Europe's Neighbourhood: Keep Resilient and Carry on?*, 2017; Nathalia TOCCI, «The Making of the EU Global Strategy», *Contemporary Security Policy* 37, no. 3 (2016), 461-472, doi:10.1080/13523260.2016.1232559; Eva GROSS and Ana E. JUNCOS (eds.), *EU Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management, Roles, Institutions and Policies* (London: Routledge, 2011).

lines of research have directly studied this problem from the perspective of Foreign Policy, European Integration Studies and Critical Security Studies. However, these latter have focused their attention on widening process of security through CFSP/CSDP and the cooperation of the MSs in security policy. In particular, they produced debates about the emergence and re-signification processes of forms of security and forms of governance, the implications of the internal-external security nexus, the security-development nexus, the concept and practices of resilience, and the progressive technologisation of security policies (surveillance and control), with special emphasis on the increasing ontological or societal implications that security plays today and its connection with identity in contemporary societies.

At the beginning of the research process, evidences were found in the literature on the importance of the Integrated Approach for the transformation of the EU and the MSs as security providers[8]. When discussing the fundamentals of the Integrated Approach, policy experts and academics frequently refers to the transformations of the security environment which is understood to be increasingly complex, interconnected and contested and the need to develop formulas for achieving a more coherent and effective CFSP/CSDP, which includes non-state actors. In this sense, the implementation of the IA is not confined to the EU alone but it is also implemented by other security providers such as the UN, the AU, the OSCE and NATO and States, such as France and United Kingdom among others[9].

It also highlighted the growing linkage between the EU's Integrated Approach within the foreign and security policy and the crisis management framework and its growing importance in managing the complexity of the Union's environment. This concomitance led finally to identify a lack of work about the emergence of the Integrated Approach within the literature from a security perspective based on ontological and societal security, technologies of risk and security devices.

In this sense, the present work considers the latent problematic of security in modern societies[10] (networks, complexity, risk, fear and uncertainty)

---

[8] Michael E. Smith, «Institutionalizing the "Comprehensive Approach" to EU Security», *European Foreign Affairs Review,* 18, no. Special Issues (2009), 25-44; Rolando Mosa Moschini, «The Comprehensive Security Concept of the European Union», in Hans Günter Brauch *et al.* (eds.), *Globalization and Environmental Challenges. Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century* (Berlin: Springer, 2008), 651-657.

[9] Cedric de Coning, «Peace Enforcement in Africa: Doctrinal Distinctions between the African Union and United Nations», *Contemporary Security Policy*, 2017, 1-16, doi:10.1080/13523260.2017.1283108; Mats Berdal and David H. Ucko, «The United Nations and the Use of Force: Between Promise and Peril The United Nations and the Use of Force: Between Promise and Peril», *The Journal of Strategic Studies,* 37, no. 5 (2017), 665-673, doi:10.1080/01402390.2014.937803; Volker Hauck and Camilla Rocca, *Gaps between Comprehensive Approaches of the EU and EU Member States* (Maastricht: European Centre for Development and Policy Management, 2014); Cedric de Coning, *The United Nations and the Comprehensive Approach*, 2008.

[10] Anne-Marie Slaughter, *The Chessboard and the Web: Strategies of Connection in a Networked World* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2017); Luis Lobo-Guerrero, «"Insurantial Sovereignty" and the Re-Constitution of "the International"», *Insuring War: Sovereignty, Security and Risk* (Routledge, 2012), 153; Didier Bigo, «La mondialisation de l'(in)sécurité? Réflexions sur le champ des professionnels de la gestion des inquiétudes et analytique de la transnationalisation des processus d'(in)

and makes an effort to formulate a point of departure of the research process, which has led to the following definition in terms of governance and security:

i)   The growing complexity of social phenomena in contemporary societies and the complexity of the increasing circulation of risk and threats.

ii)   The diminishing capacity of States or governmental complexes to effectively conduct and regulate security phenomena.

Assuming this problematic as a starting point, this project addresses the particular case of the emergence of the EU's Integrated Approach to security (internal and external) as an institutional response against the increasingly complexity and interconnectedness of the security environment, by equally transforming security governmental agents and technologies towards a more interconnected, multi-layered and complex functioning with non-sate foreign policy actors to deal with governance problems[11].

It is then, when trying to define a specific problem, that is, a precise object of research in the context of this problematisation that the field of security appears as a particularly critical domain. The decisive importance of security has grown in the last decades as it increasingly refers to the fragility of contemporary societies and the increasing dependence on security measures to maintain the necessary conditions to preserve the hegemonic values and interests that characterise a political organisation or political community[12]. In particular, the political dispute over the management of insecurities and the increasing awareness of insecurity within the European Union has been shaped paradoxically in recent years. This debate has played as a vector for more integration in security or it has encouraged an asymmetric ambition among MSs. This debate also resulted in the implementation of restrictive security measures, affecting the guarantee and promotion of human rights and, consequently, the way Europeans interact with each other and how the EU and MSs regulate their relationship with third communities.

In addition, these political differences have intensified in the last years with the social consequences resulted from the 2008 financial crisis and the common position that institutionally prevailed on the recent events occurred in the

---

sécurisation», *Cultures & Conflit*, 58 (2005), 53-100, doi:10.4000/conflits.1813; Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, «Realism and Complex Interdependence», in George T. Crane and Abla Amawi (eds.), *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 337.

[11] High Representative, *The European Union in a Changing Global Environment. A More Connected, Contested and Complex World* (European Union, 2015), *https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/european-union-changing-global-environment*; Simon Duke and Hanna Ojanen, «Bridging Internal and External Security: Lessons from the European Security and Defence Policy», *Journal of European Integration*, 28, no. 5 (2017), 477-494, doi:10.1080/07036330600979714; Florian Trauner, «The Internal-External Security Nexus: More Coherence under Lisbon?», *European Security*, 2011, doi:10.2815/21941; Didier Bigo, «Internal and External Aspects of Security», *European Security*, 15, no. 4 (2006), 385-404, doi:10.1080/09662830701305831.

[12] See, for instance: Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), doi:10.1017/CBO9780511817762; Ken Booth, *Theory of World Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (London and Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publications Inc., 2005).

European neighbourhood (East and South), mainly in the Council. In sum, the European Union is facing with the emergence of restrictive security measures, less and less costly in electoral terms, that leads to an increasingly restrictive and demanding internal and external security policy for European citizens[13].

It is not therefore a speculative or a normative research project. On the contrary, it is a question of identifying the conditions that explain the emergence of a Integrated Approach to security, whose field of development as an object of study makes it possible to highlight some sensitive and fragile points about the EU foreign and security policy whose analysis ultimately lead us back to the starting point from: to inform about what is to be European today on the bases of how are regulate our relations with other regions. That is, the broad purpose of the research is to understand the emergence of the Integrated Approach through its implementation in the context of the EU CFSP/CSDP as a response to the increasing complexity of the security environment.

Assuming this starting point, this thesis contributes to explain the recent transformations of the EU actorness and its model of security governance by questioning how the emergence of the IA is affecting the regulatory principles of the epistemic ground that structures the EU as a security provider. The present research project questions, therefore, those phenomena that take place at present and that somehow condition the role of the EU in the world.

1.   RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This research project examines the emergence of the European Union Integrated Approach (IA) by focusing on the implications it produces on the epistemic structures of the EU security community within the EU security governance model. The objective of this research project is, therefore, to answer the following question: which conditions explain the emergence of the IA as a central concept in the EU security community? And consequently, what are the strategic implications of the IA on the way security issues are regulated through the EU security governance? In order to meet this research objective, a genealogical approach is firstly made with the objective of identifying the previous historical conditions that explain the emergence of the IA as a central concept within the forms of security governance in Europe. Secondly, the IA is analysed in ideational terms by questioning from the perspective of the EU security practitioners (security community), the set of conditions that explain the emergence of the IA as a core idea within the epistemic

---

[13] Mark PHYTHIAN, «Policing Uncertainty: Intelligence, Security and Risk», *Intelligence and National Security,* 27, no. 2 (2012), 187-205, doi:10.1080/02684527.2012.661642; Didier BIGO and Anastassia TSOUKALA, *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty*, *International Relations,* 2008, doi:10.4324/9780203926765; Rens VAN MUNSTER, «Logics of Security: The Copenhagen School, Risk Management and the War on Terror», *Political Science Publications University of Southern Denmark*, no. 10 (2005); Henry ROTHSTEIN, Michael HUBER and George GASKELL, «A Theory of Risk Colonization: The Spiralling Regulatory Logics of Societal and Institutional Risk», *Economy and Society,* 35, no. 1 (2006), 91-112, doi:10.1080/03085140500465865.

community and the implications that the IA produces in reconfiguring their epistemic claims. An ideational approach is therefore conducted by primary analysing how the IA is shaped through official documents (strategic documents and policy roadmaps) and how it is implemented through the EU security instruments (EU policy-tool). Ultimately, a series of semi-structured interviews with EU policy-makers are conducted in order to identify to what extent the emergence of the IA is producing emergent discursive strategies used by this community when explaining the current transformation of the EU security policy within the broader strategic framework of the CFSP/CSDP. This two-stage analysis of the IA contributes to explain the recent transformations of the regulatory principles that structure the EU security governance model (EU *actorness*) and contributes to draw structuration processes within the IA that could inform about the EU as a security provider since the approval of the Lisbon Treaty.

2.   DEFINING THE OBJECT OF STUDY

The emergence of the IA as a concept for the EU as a security provider entails a mobilisation of forces for the reconfiguration of the governmental approach of the EU security continuum based on a risk/crisis management apparatus. Actually, the EU is adapting its security devices in a period of historical transition from the perspective of the forms of governance[14]. The structural shifts experienced among great powers, the transformations on the risk-based regulative principles of international security governance[15], the blurring process of the traditional categories of institutional and technological security devices of the state[16] as well as the increasing heterogeneity and incommensurability of disruptive social phenomena are part of the great transformation[17]. These trends represent, in conjunction with other complex phenomena, a series of momentums of how international relations, processes and agents are changing in a decisive way, evidencing the beginning of an era that seems to lead to a different configuration in the regulative principles of international security governance.

All of them refer to an epochal transformation of governance, where the established categories of the state and security are diluting in a way that results in a blurred continuum of strategic thinking games and actions whose socio-technical articulations of governance are being configured differently, shaping new principles of heterogeneity, dispersion and articulation of governmental complexes, agents and contexts. In particular, these structural

---

[14] Simon HOLLIS, «The Necessity of Protection: Transgovernmental Networks and EU Security Governance», *Cooperation and Conflict,* 45, no. 3 (2004), 312-330, doi:10.1177/0010836710378071.

[15] Peter GILL, «Intelligence, Threat, Risk and the Challenge of Oversight», *Intelligence and National Security,* 27, no. 2 (2012), 206-222, doi:10.1080/02684527.2012.661643.

[16] Alistair J. K. SHEPHERD, «The European Security Continuum and the EU as an International Security Provider», *Global Society,* 29, no. 2 (2017), 156-174, doi:10.1080/13600826.2015.1018146.

[17] Arjen BOIN, Paul't HART and Allan McCONNELL, «Crisis Exploitation: Political and Policy Impacts of Framing Contests», *Journal of European Public Policy,* 16, no. 1 (January 2009), 81-106, doi:10.1080/13501760802453221.

changes seem to be manifested as component of one of the vectors that lead to the increasing possibilities for the circulation of risks among social networks —critical and superficial—, which poses huge challenges with multiple ramifications. From individual security devices and practices to global and local governance designs, from the effects it produces in the field of knowledge to the essential shaping process of subjects. This problematic and instable field of forces has been extensively studied in different disciplines. This research therefore proposes to explore this field from the perspective of governance and security concerning the EU/member states (EU/MSs, hereinafter) which, as any contemporary governmental articulation, is also capture within. However, what is really at stake with the emergence of the Integrated Approach as a mode of assembling security devices?

The proliferation of numerous analyses about the role of the EU as a global or regional power, structural power, normative power or security provider identifies the necessity to rethink the EU role in the world[18]. Equally, different analyses explore emergent governance dynamics of modern societies which also provides key insights about the nature of new types of risk and security dynamics as well as the set of social relations, institutions, norms and legal frameworks and lines of exclusion (class, gender, race among others) that derive from this social configuration: between orders of governance and their practices of security on the one hand, and the critical transformation of social phenomena on the other[19].

Thus, the present research is embedded in this literature that, in essence, revolves around between the increasing technification of security practices and the proliferation of security policies (EU included) on the one hand, and the possibilities of *being* and coexist as a political communities with other political communities (whether they are European or external) on the

---

[18] Esther Barbé, Oriol Costa and Robert Kissack (eds.), *EU Policy Responses to a Shifting Multilateral System* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), doi:10.1057/978-1-137-54758-3; Stephan Keukeleire and Tom Delreux, «Competing Structural Powers and Challenges for the EU's Structural Foreign Policy», *Global Affairs,* 1, no. 1 (2015), 43-50, doi:10.1080/23340460.2015.983730; José Luis de Castro Ruano, «La evolución de la Unión Europea como actor en materia de seguridad y defensa. En busca de un relanzamiento siempre pendiente», *Cuadernos Europeos de Deusto,* no. 1 (2015), 19-48; Rafael García Pérez, «Los desafíos de la Unión Europea en la gobernanza global», *Cuadernos Europeos de Deusto,* no. 45 (2011), 23-47; Charlotte Wagnsson, James Sperling and Jan Hallenberg (eds.), *European Security Governance* (London: Routledge, 2012); Richard G. Whitman (ed.), *Normative Power Europe: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Thomas Diez, «Normative Power as Hegemony», *Cooperation and Conflict,* 48, no. 2 (2013), 194-210, doi:10.1177/0010836713485387; Lisbeth Aggestam, «Introduction: Ethical Power Europe?», *International Affairs,* 84, no. 1 (2008), 1-11, doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2008.00685.x; Ian Manners, «Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms?», *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 40, no. 2 (2002), 235-258, doi:10.1111/1468-5965.00353.

[19] Rita Abrahamsen and Michael C. Williams, «Security beyond the State: Global Security Assemblages in International Politics», *International Political Sociology,* 3, no. 1 (2009), 1-17, doi:10.1111/j.1749-5687.2008.00060.x; C. Epstein, «Who Speaks? Discourse, the Subject and the Study of Identity in International Politics», *European Journal of International Relations,* 17, no. 2 (2011), 327-350, doi:10.1177/1354066109350055; Christopher S. Browning and Matt McDonald, «The Future of Critical Security Studies: Ethics and the Politics of Security», *European Journal of International Relations,* 19, no. 2 (2011), 235-255, doi:10.1177/1354066111419538.

other, in relation to the problematic role these forms of security governance play in the way the European institutions transforms the world[20].

Certainly, the capacity of the states as international regulators to conduct international social phenomena has gradually fluctuated in each historical period according to power relations, institutions and contextual factors among other elements. However, embedded in these dynamics, from a regulative perspective, this fluctuation is also studied focusing on the problematic relation between the course of international events and the effective configuration of the established international security architecture to conduct them in each historical period. In this sense, the current increasing complexity/uncertainty of the social environment and the growing transboundary essence of social phenomena constitute one of the main scenarios of security governance in terms of risk management. Over the last decades, particularly with the rise of neoliberal doctrines in global political economy, most western states and international organisations have experienced the perception of having at their disposal less power to respond effectively to the increasing complexity of the security environment. Some indicators are the decreasing governmental budgets, the rise of stronger non-governmental competitors in (in)security, increasing costs of R&D in public military and security industry, the decreasing public opinion's support to invest in security and military issues and the widening process of the security issues and the increasing perception of common risks and threats[21]. In this line, NATO, OSCE, EU and western states among others has contributed to the broadening of security geography as well as to introduce innovative formulas in security policy.

The Integrated Approach represents the latest term to refer to a governmental technique conceived to respond to an older and large problem in a particular domain of governance and security —NATO, EU, OSCE, ONU and so on—, *i. e.* the continuous rationalisation of state power and its technologies of security. Hence, the IA as a technique of whole-of-government approach represents an emergent strategy to conduct the imperative rationalisation of the security apparatus of state power. However, what differentiates the current situation come from the higher awareness of risk and the highly

[20] A. Amicelle, C. Aradau and J. Jeandesboz, «Questioning Security Devices: Performativity, Resistance, Politics», *Security Dialogue,* 46, no. 4 (2015), 293-306, doi:10.1177/0967010615586964; Peter Adey and Ben Anderson, «Anticipating Emergencies: Technologies of Preparedness and the Matter of Security», *Security Dialogue,* 43 (2012), 99-117, doi:10.1177/0967010612438432.

[21] Pierre Haroche, «Interdependence, Asymmetric Crises, and European Defence Cooperation», *European Security*, 26, no. 2 (2017), 226-259, doi:10.1080/09662839.2017.1294579; P. Holden, «Eternal Potential? Temporality, Complexity and the Incoherent Power of the European Union», *Cooperation and Conflict*, 51, no. 4 (2016), 407-427, doi:10.1177/0010836716668786; David A. Buchanan and David Denyer, «Researching Tomorrow's Crisis: Methodological Innovations and Wider Implications», *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 15, no. 2 (2012), 205-224, doi:10.1111/ijmr.12002; J. P. Burgess, «There is No European Security, Only European Securities», *Cooperation and Conflict,* 44, no. 3 (2009), 309-328, doi:10.1177/0010836709106218; Rafael Grasa and Arnau Gutiérrez Camps, «Conflict Prevention and Decentralized Governance: Some Remarks about the State of the Art in Theory and Practice», *ICIP Working Papers* (2009); James Rosenau, «Change, Complexity, and Governance in Globalising Space», in Jon Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance, Authority, Steering, and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 167-200.

interconnectedness of social phenomena. Thus, the increasing interconnectedness among social systems suggests produces an equal circulation of social risks through these systems, which results in a growing continuum of risk global circuits that pose multiple challenges from a governmental perspective[22]. In other words, Western states no longer have at their disposal sufficient capacity to manage international conflicts or crisis in a relatively feasible way according to the inherited prescriptions. In this sense, the European integration process is partly a response to this historical process of increasing interdependence among political units, not only in terms of international competition but also in terms of risk management[23]. More particularly, in reference to the evolution of CFSP/CDSP as a policy area, the development of the IA contributes to the EU's adaptation to emerging transboundary societal phenomena such as civil wars, famine, natural disasters, corruption, terrorism, piracy, organized crime and trafficking among others, to the extent that the current EU security policy not only comprises diplomatic and military means. On the contrary, it also implies the development of different type of *repertoires* such as border control, police activities, law enforcement, public administration, Security Sector Reform (SSR) and «security» agents such as engineers, lawyers and a diverse range of other professionals[24].

In addition, the advanced institutional framework provided by the Lisbon Treaty and the current *impasse* of the EU integration process represent a valuable time period to analyse the IA in accordance with the recent advances in the consolidation process of the EU as an autonomous security provider.

As a result, the convergence between the forms of governance and security has experienced a gradual sharpening, resulting in the rise of equivalent

---

[22] Victor GALAZ *et al.*, «Global Governance Dimensions of Globally Networked Risks: The State of the Art in Social Science Research», *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 8, no. 1 (2017), 4-27, doi:10.1002/rhc3.12108; Stefano GUZZINI and Iver B. NEUMANN, «The Ambivalent "Diffusion of Power" in Global Governance», in Stefano GUZZINI and Iver B. NEUMANN (eds.), *The Ambivalent «Diffusion of Power» in Global Governance. International Political Economy Meets Foucault*, vol. I (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 354-366; Arjen BOIN and Magnus EKENGREN, «Preparing for the World Risk Society: Towards a New Security Paradigm for the European Union», *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17, no. 4 (December 2009), 285-294, doi:10.1111/j.1468-5973.2009.00583.x; Claudia ARADAU, Luis LOBO-GUERRERO and Rens VAN MUNSTER, «Security, Technologies of Risk, and the Political: Guest Editors' Introduction», *Security Dialogue*, 39, no. 2-3 (2008), 147-154, doi:10.1177/0967010608089159.

[23] Michael KEATING, *Rescaling the European State: The Making of Territory and the Rise of the Meso* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199691562.001.0001.

[24] Mark FURNESS and Gorm RYE OLSEN, «Europeanisation and the EU's Comprehensive Approach to Crisis Management in Africa», *European Politics and Society*, 17, no. 1 (2016), 105-119, doi:10.1080/23745118.2015.1075779; Damien HELLY and Greta GALEAZZI, *Avant la lettre? The EU's Comprehensive Approach (to Crises) in the Sahel*, 2015; Guillem COLOM, «El largo camino hacia la gestión integral de crisis en la Unión Europea», *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, 34 (2014), 31-48, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5209; Karsten FRIIS and Cedric DE CONING, «Coherence and Coordination The Limits of the Comprehensive Approach», *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, 15, no. 1 (February 1, 2011), 243-272, doi:10.1163/187541110X540553; Margriet DRENT, «The EU's Comprehensive Approach to Security: A Culture of Co-Ordination?», *Studia Diplomatica*, LXIV, no. 2 (2011), 1-18; Christopher M. SCHNAUBELT *et al.*, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach: Integrating Civilian and Military Concepts of Strategy*, Christopher M. SCHNAUBELT (ed.) (Rome: NATO Defense College, 2011); Carmen GEBHARD and Per MARTIN NORHEIM-MARTINSEN, «Making Sense of EU Comprehensive Security towards Conceptual and Analytical Clarity», *European Security*, 20, no. 2 (2011), 221-241, doi:10.1080/09662839.2011.564613.

continuum of security articulations. This is clearly visible when analysing the growing interdependence of different policy areas in the EU. As it is analysed below, different policy areas such as neighbourhood, enlargement, international cooperation and development, climate action and environment, trade, crisis management, regional policy and, particularly, foreign affairs, security policy, migration and home affairs seem to indicate an increasing risk-based common dimension.

Interestingly, it seems that this problematic imbalance —*governance gap*—[25] has contributed to increase the perception of risk insofar as the apparent inability of the EU/MS to conduct the increasing inter-connectedness of recent events has introduced in the formula a certain sense of uncertainty. In this particular case, the institutionalization of the Integrated Approach as a method of rationalisation was simultaneously enhanced with the increasing socially perception of this gap.

In sum, the emergence of the IA not only refers to the EU ambition as a global actor and as a crisis manager to external conflicts and crises. Rather, the IA reveals a deeper transformation, which pre-configures the way the EU security practitioners are conducting this regulative modular process of the EU/MSs complex —the way EU security devices are articulated— whose systemic scale produces «new» patterns in the way EU security devices perform —the «new» geographical divisions, internal-external nexus and civil-military cooperation, and the «new» temporality they produce, crises response mechanisms— that have to be further studied. In other words, what is at stake with the emergence and development of the Integrated Approach?

Firstly, assuming the recent impasse[26], the way in which the EU defines its role as a security provider (or global actor) will decisively determine the way in which the EU resolves —or, on the contrary, assumes unconditionally— the growing securitisation of social relations among Europeans, the increasing securitisation of a growing number of spheres of life on the one hand, and the increasing securitisation that characterizes the current relation between the EU and Europeans (*us*) with third political communities and regions (*the others*).

Secondly, the IA announces the progressive transformation of the European States —mostly Western— from a strong state which was able to respond in a feasible way to a stable set of security phenomena, to a contemporary less powerful state that has to deal with the rescaling of the potential systemic impact of non-state actors and the expansion of the possibilities in the production of risk —natural or hand-made—. In this context, the IA would contribute to rebalance this gap and, consequently, the result of this process will affect the conditions in which the EU/MS complex will deal with political challenges in the foreseeable future.

---

[25] Hence, the current *governance gap* refers to the decreasing power of governmental complexes in contrast with the emergent terms of the increasing complexity of the security environment.

[26] Sven Biscop, «All or Nothing? The EU Global Strategy and Defence Policy after the Brexit», *Contemporary Security Policy,* 37, no. 3 (2016), 431-445, doi:10.1080/13523260.2016.1238120; Sven Biscop and Jo Coelmont, «The EU Global Strategy and Defence: The Challenge of Thinking Strategically about Means», *Egmont Security Policy Brief*, no. 78 (2016).