

Journal of Contemporary European Research

Volume 9, Issue 3 (2013)

Introduction

EU Security Governance: From Processes to Policies

Francesco Giumelli *Metropolitan University Prague*

Chantal Lavallée *European University Institute*

Citation

Giumelli, F. and Lavallée, C. (2013). 'EU Security Governance: From Processes to Policies', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*. 9 (3), pp. 365-371.

First published at: www.jcer.net

The European integration process has led to the creation of a polycentric political configuration characterised by a decentralised policy-making process where several actors are involved in various domains, and the area of foreign and security policy is no exception to this. The recent developments in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) show a growing synergy between national, transnational and supranational levels where a wide range of actors cooperate. Empirical research on CFSP/CSDP based on a social network analysis confirms that security management has been transferred to the European Union (EU) level, but remains controlled by state actors who interact through transgovernmental processes (Mérand et al. 2011). While diplomats and militaries are shaping those policies with their national and organisational social representations (Mérand 2008, 2006), they are also influenced by the supranational culture present in the official intergovernmental process which can be described as a supranational intergovernmentalism system (Howorth 2010). Moreover, because of the inclusion of supranational actors, it could be argued that European security has even become supranational (Kaunert and Léonard 2012; Ojanen 2006).

Over the last decade, we have noted two complementary trends. On the one hand, the formulation and implementation of CFSP/CSDP are increasingly performed in Brussels by state representatives, European civil servants and the politico-military structures permanently hosted there (Davis Cross 2011, 2010; Juncos and Pomorska 2011, 2006). On the other hand, the European Security Strategy (ESS), omnipresent in the EU discourse, emphasises a comprehensive approach to security, civilian and military, as well as the merging of internal and external security. The ESS insists notably on the need for using the right mix of instruments at the disposal of the EU because threats are not purely military (Biscop 2008). Furthermore, the ESS presents the EU as a global player 'particularly well equipped to respond to such multi-faceted situations' (Council 2003: 7). The Lisbon Treaty, aiming at bringing all EU external action tools together, strengthened this trend and even created an external action system entirely 'Brussels-ized' (Missiroli 2010: 444). This system is mainly based on the activities of the European External Action Service (EEAS) and is represented by the hybrid position of High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR) and Vice-President of the Commission (VP). Therefore, 'Brusselization not only exists; it works' (Howorth 2012: 36).

However, the coherence and coordination between its instruments and policies remain a huge challenge for the EU as a whole. The state-based approach has failed to explain how this new system works. This perspective does not consider all players, and by doing so it minimises the importance in the policy process of non-state actors and their interactions, whether they engage in cooperative or competitive behaviours (Gegout 2010; Pollack 2003; Ginsberg 2001; Majone 2001; Moravcsik 1998; Hoffmann 1966). The security studies academic literature offers many interesting analyses (Gebhard and Norheim-Martinsen 2011; Biscop 2008; Duke and Ojanen 2006; Berenskoetter 2005), but it has mostly concentrated on the theoretical dimension of the EU comprehensive approach to security and its challenges. Therefore, analyses of practices in the post-Lisbon configuration of actors are missing and needed to understand the challenges facing the EU integrated approach.

This special issue aims at contributing to the security governance literature by further exploring how the EU external action system works. This is largely done through the analysis of case studies that can highlight how security is managed at the EU level and beyond. The special issue intends to bridge the theory and practice of European governance in the field of foreign affairs and security by investigating different aspects of the EU's international action. To this objective, the analytical tools provided by the multi-

level governance approach (Héritier and Rhodes 2011; Hooghe and Marks 2001; Armstrong and Bulmer 1998; Marks et al. 1996; Bulmer 1993), which was born in opposition to the idea that states were the only and most important actors involved in the European policy-making process, are helpful. More precisely, the 'security governance turn' in International Relations theory (Christou et al. 2010; Norheim-Martinsen 2010) opens a new avenue of research to understand the EU as a security actor (Wagnsson et al. 2009; Kirchner and Sperling 2007; Kirchner 2007, 2006; Webber et al. 2004; Krahmann 2003). This innovative analytical framework shifts the emphasis from the traditional intergovernmental approach of European security to a system whereby several actors, public and private, interact formally and informally at different levels in EU policy-making processes with various instruments to coordinate, to manage and to regulate security issues. However, both vertical and horizontal security governance should be considered to take into account the plurality and diversity of actors, whether in a hierarchical or non-hierarchical perspective, and also the merging of internal and external aspects of security (Schroeder 2011).

In recent years, several special issues and edited volumes on EU security governance (Breslin and Croft 2012; Kaunert and Léonard 2012; Christou and Croft 2010; Kirchner and Dominguez 2010; Wagnsson et al. 2009) have been published. The concept of governance has been useful to highlight how decisions are made, an alternative to the state-based approach, shifting the focus to non-state actors and the norms disciplining their interactions. The new institutional framework provided by the Lisbon Treaty, combined with the evolving norms, creates the need for constant attention to such processes so that further studies are needed to enhance further the EU security governance literature. This special issue attempts to contribute to the literature in three fundamental directions.

First, it identifies under which conditions the Brusselization process takes place and how the integrated approach to security works. It analyses EU processes towards policy implementation to determine how new practices structure EU security governance, when authority is shifted from the capitals of EU member states to Brussels, who is involved and how they cooperate at the different stages of the policy-making process.

Second, the special issue also contributes to the debate on how actors decide in the EU. There is an emphasis on the role of norms and interests, for instance with the study of the role of the High Representative and the diplomatic system of the EU, but also on the norms that regulate how supra-national institutions can direct/foster cooperation in foreign policy, with a special interest in the Commission and the recently established EEAS. The role of civil society and industries are not forgotten when defence matters are discussed, for instance, when the action of the EU is directed at targeting third civil society groups with the EULEX mission and the international cooperation in fighting organized crime. These examples provide additional insights into the role of the different actors in the governance of EU security issues.

Finally, the third added value is the empirical analysis of the post-Lisbon Treaty context and the new role for European institutions. The High Representative, the EEAS, the Commission and the diplomatic structure of the EU with the norms that discipline its functioning are at the core of the special issue. The newly established EEAS finds itself in between a rock and a hard place, swinging between relevance and apathy when it comes to forming EU external actions. The Commission does also exercise a growing role in foreign policy determined by the extended powers of the EU, but this process is limited by the intricacy of interests with other EU institutions as well as the member states.

The three values are cross-cutting themes of the six articles that compose this special issue. First, Lavallée's and Giumelli's articles explore the growing role of supra-national institutions in the governance of EU security. Second, Carta's and Christova's contributions elaborate on the implications for security governance, looking at how the EU has adapted and established new practices of governance. Third, Zyla & Kammel's

and Carrapico's articles complete the issue with analyses of specific security issues leading them to evaluate the concept of governance itself. Finally, the commentary by Missiroli further contributes to bridge the gap between theory and practice by analysing the general aspects of security governance after Lisbon.

Chantal Lavallée with her article 'From the Rapid Reaction Mechanism to the Instrument for Stability: the Empowerment of the European Commission in Crisis Response and Conflict Prevention' focuses on the underestimated role of the Commission as a supra-national actor in security. Lavallée argues that the Commission has empowered its role in crisis response and conflict prevention over the last decade from the inception of the Rapid Reaction Mechanism to the implementation of the Instrument for Stability and has contributed to structuring EU security governance. This interesting contribution gives another perspective to the EU role in security with an innovative community instrument which supports the objectives and completes the activities of CFSP/CSDP, strengthening therefore the integrated approach of security.

Francesco Giumelli with 'Beyond Intergovernmentalism: the Europeanization of Restrictive Measures?' argues that the decision-making process for EU sanctions cannot be understood through the intergovernmentalist approach. This article attempts to contribute to solving this problem by investigating the restrictive measures policy of the European Union in order to identify three conditions under which intergovernmentalism should be used. First, when EU institutions are dependent on EU member states for information and expertise; second, when decision-making powers are mainly in EU capitals; and third, when there are no exclusive *fora* for decision-making in Brussels. The study of the restrictive measures of the European Union does not meet any of these three conditions; therefore the article argues that the concept of supranational intergovernmentalism offers useful insights to understand the EU security governance of CFSP sanctions.

Caterina Carta focuses on the EEAS as representative of a system of governance. 'The EU in Geneva: the Diplomatic Representation of a System of Governance' presents a thorough analysis of the decision-making process in the post-Lisbon setting. In the new scenario, it is plausible to assume the EU diplomatic system is representative of a system of governance, and, through this, of its constitutive independent units. The way in which the EU's political system is represented through diplomatic practices is telling of two interrelated aspects of the EU's international actorness. First, it reveals the link between the foreign policy of a non-state actor and sheds light on the division of competences that characterises the EU's foreign policy-making system. Second, it highlights the complex institutional and organisational features of a non-state diplomatic system. The study of EU multilateral delegations at the United Nations and the World Trade Organization is key to understanding the processes and inter-relationships in practice between EU member states and EU 'non-state' institutions.

Alina Christova focuses on the security governance of CSDP missions. Focusing on the EU experience in Iraq, 'Seven Years of EUJUST LEX: The Challenge of Rule of Law in Iraq' elaborates on how the EU decides about projecting force and personnel beyond its borders and considers how such a presence is assessed within the EU. Her article deals with the implementation of collective actions in the security field to engage with long-term processes. EUJUST provides an interesting example to help understand under what conditions coherent policy is enacted by EU members. A relevant aspect is the evolution of how the mission and how the EU dealt with the shortcomings of the missions, the decisions undertaken to solve emerging issues and how these decisions originated. Christova's article highlights the establishment of governance practices in security for the EU, thus bearing great relevance for the special issue.

Ben Zyla and Arnold Kammel focus on how governance systems do not rule out the existence of hierarchical relations among the actors. In 'Practising EU Security Governance in the Transatlantic Context: A Fragmentation of Power or Networked

Hegemony?', the two authors challenge the 'orthodox view' that networks within the EU governance literature are often conceived as flexible and hierarchy-immune responses to increasingly global policy challenges. Through the application of a neo-Gramscian approach to governance, Zyla and Kammel show that a transnational (or supranational) hegemony exists to which the nation states are increasingly subordinate. The authors do so by looking at the experience of the EU in Libya to highlight how the ongoing practices are strongly influenced by existing hegemonies within the EU, arguing that the networks themselves are reproducing such power relations. Zyla and Kammel also hold that it is political leaders and high-ranking government officials who remain in charge of the political process, posing interesting questions for the concept of governance itself and suggesting a different reformulation of it.

Helena Carrapico deals with the issue of organized crime and security governance in the EU. The article 'The External Dimension of the EU's Fight against Organized Crime: the Search for Coherence between Rhetoric and Practice' analyses the link between the EU's cooperation with third actors in the area of organized crime, which has been neglected in the literature so far. The focus is on the externalization of knowledge, practice and norms that affect and characterise the functioning of systems of governance. Carrapico's article identifies EU practices in the development of the external dimension of organized crime policies, in light of the theoretical and empirical literature on the security governance of Justice and Home Affairs policies.

In conclusion, **Antonio Missiroli**, Director of the European Union Institute of Security Studies in Paris, presents his view from the perspective of his professional experience as academic and practitioner in EU institutions. Missiroli's perspective is of great value to the analysis of the post-Lisbon setting in the governance of EU security because he provides the necessary bridge between practice and theory if we are to understand how the EU works and what the implications are on the decision-making process of the new institutional setting established by the Lisbon Treaty. The commentary completes the review undertaken by the previous studies by offering an overview of the new practices (if any) established in Brussels since December 2009 and provides insights into how governance practice may develop in the future.

* * *

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Kenneth and Bulmer, Simon (1998) *The Governance of the Single European Market*. New York: Manchester University Press.
- Berenskoetter, Felix Sebastien (2005) Mapping the Mind Gap: A Comparison of US and European Security Strategies. *Security Dialogue*, 36 (1): 71-92.
- Biscop, Sven (2008) The European Security Strategy in Context: A Comprehensive Trend, in Sven Biscop and Jan J. Anderson (eds) *The EU and the European Security Strategy: Forging a Global Europe*. London: Routledge: 5-20.
- Breslin, Shaun and Croft, Stuart (eds) (2012) *Comparative Regional Security Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Bulmer, Simon (1993) The Governance of the European Union: A New Institutional Approach. *Journal of Public Policy*, 13 (4): 351-380.
- Christou, George and Croft, Stuart (2010) Introduction. *European Security*, 19 (3): 337-340.
- Christou, George, Croft, Stuart, Ceccorulli, Michela and Lucarelli, Sonia (2010) European Union Security Governance: Putting the 'Security' Back in. *European Security*, 19 (3): 341-359.
- Council of the European Union (2003) *A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy*. Brussels, 12 December.
- Davis Cross, Mai'a K. (2010) *Cooperation by Committee: the EU Military Committee and the Committee for Civilian Crisis Management*. European Union Institute for Security Studies Occasional Paper No. 82, Online: http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/op82_CooperationbyCommittee.pdf Accessed 03 May 2013.
- Davis Cross, Mai'a K. (2011) *Security Integration in Europe. How Knowledge Based Networks are Transforming the European Union*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Duke, Simon and Ojanen, Hanna (2006) Bridging Internal and External Security: Lessons from the European Security and Defence Policy. *European Integration*, 28 (5): 477-494.
- Gebhard Carmen and Norheim-Martinsen, Per Martin (2011) Making Sense of EU Comprehensive Security towards Conceptual and Analytical Clarity. *European Security*, 20 (2): 221-241.
- Gegout, Catherine (2010) *European Foreign and Security Policy: States, Power, Institutions and American Hegemony*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ginsberg, Roy H. (2001) *The European Union in International Politics: Baptism by Fire*. Boulder, CO: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Héritier, Adrienne and Rhodes, Martin (eds) (2011) *New Modes of Governance in Europe. Governing in the Shadow of Hierarchy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoffmann, Stanley (1966) Obstinate or obsolete? The Fate of the Nation State and the Case of Western Europe. *Daedalus* 95 (2): 862-915.
- Hooghe, Liesbet and Marks, Gary (2001) *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Howorth, Jolyon (2012) Security Governance in the EU Space, in Shaun Breslin and Stuart Croft (eds) *Comparative Regional Security Governance*. London: Routledge: 23-43.
- Howorth, Jolyon (2010) *The Political and Security Committee: A Case Study in Supranational Inter-Governmentalism*. Centre d'études européennes Les Cahiers européens de Sciences Po No. 1, Online : www.cee.sciences-po.fr/en/publications Accessed 03 May 2013.
- Juncos, Ana E. and Pomorska, Karolina (2011) Invisible and Unaccountable? National Representatives and Council Officials in EU Foreign Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 18 (8): 1096-1114.
- Juncos, Ana E. and Pomorska, Karolina (2006) Playing the Brussels Game: Strategic Socialisation in the CFSP Council Working Groups. *European Integration Online Papers*, 10: 1-15, Online: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/index.php/eiop/article/view/2006_011a/33 Accessed 08 August 2013.

Kaunert Christian and Léonard, Sarah (2012) Introduction: Supranational Governance and European Union Security after the Lisbon Treaty – Exogenous Shocks, Policy Entrepreneurs and 11 September 2001. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 47 (4): 417-432.

Kirchner, Emil J. and Sperling, James (2007) *EU Security Governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kirchner, Emil J. (2006) The Challenge of European Union Security Governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44 (5): 947-968.

Kirchner, Emil J. (2007) EU Security Governance in a Wider Europe, in Paolo Foradori, Paolo Rosa and Riccardo Scartezzini (eds) *Managing a Multilevel Foreign Policy: the EU in International Affairs*. Lanham: Lexington Books: 23-41.

Kirchner, Emil J. and Dominguez, Roberto (eds) (2010) *The Security Governance of Regional Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Krahmann, Elke (2003) Conceptualizing Security Governance. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 38 (1): 5-26.

Majone, Giandomenico (2001) Two Logics of Delegation: Agency and Fiduciary Relations in EU Governance. *European Union Politics*, 2 (1): 103-21.

Marks, Gary, Hooghe, Liesbet and Blank, Kermit (1996) European Integration since the 1980s. State Centric Versus Multilevel Governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (3): 343-378.

Mérand, Frédéric (2006) Social Representations in the European Security and Defence Policy. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 41 (2): 131-152.

Mérand, Frédéric (2008) *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mérand, Frédéric, Hofmann, Stéphanie and Irondelle, Bastien (2011) Governance and State Power: A Network Analysis of European Security. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49 (1): 121-147.

Missiroli, Antonio (2010) The New EU 'Foreign Policy' System after Lisbon: A Work in Progress. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 15 (4): 427-452.

Moravcsik, Andrew (1998) *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. London: University College of London Press.

Norheim-Martinsen, Per Martin (2010) Beyond Intergovernmentalism: European Security and Defence Policy and the Governance Approach. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48 (5): 1351-1365.

Ojanen, Hanna (2006) The EU and NATO: Two Competing Models for a Common Defence Policy. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44 (1): 57-76.

Pollack, Mark A. (2003) *The Engines of European Integration: Delegation, Agency and Agenda Setting in the EU*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schroeder, Ursula C. (2011) *The Organization of European Security Governance. Internal and External Security in Transition*. New York: Routledge.

Wagsson, Charlotte, Sperling, James A. and Hallenberg, Jan (eds) (2009) *European Security Governance. The European Union in a Westphalian World*. Oxford: Routledge.

Webber, Mark, Croft, Stuart, Howorth, Jolyon, Terriff, Terry and Krahmann, Elke (2004) The Governance of European Security. *Review of International Studies*, 30 (1): 3-26.