

## THE INTERNAL-EXTERNAL NEXUS IN THE SECURITY NARRATIVE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

**Ana Paula Brandão**

[abrandao@eeg.uminho.pt](mailto:abrandao@eeg.uminho.pt)

Lecturer in International Relations at the School of Economics and Management, University of Minho (Portugal), and researcher at the Centre for Research in Political Science (CICP). Holder of a PhD in Political Science and International Relations, a Master Degree in European Studies and a Bachelor Degree in International Relations. Director of the PhD Programme in Political Science and International Relations and of the MA in Community Policies and Territorial Cooperation.

Research interests: security theories, European security, human security, political system of the European Union.

### Abstract

The construction of EU security actorness has been accompanied by a narrative on security nexuses (internal-external, security-development, civilian-military, public-private) associated with the so-called 'comprehensive approach'. The end of the Cold War enabled the explicitness of EU security actorness. The post 9/11 facilitated the reinforcement of previous trends (transnational threats, externalisation of 'internal security', interpillarisation) and the introduction of innovative tendencies (comprehensive approach, internalization of the Common Security and Defence Policy, interconnection of security nexuses). This paper focuses on the internal-external security nexus declared by the EU in the post-Cold War, and reflects about the rationale and effects of the European narrative and practices on the configuration of a post-Westphalian security actor. Based on the analysis of three expressions of the nexus, it is argued that the latter reflects a securitising move of the European actor explained by the convergence of opportunity (redefinition of security, prioritization of transnational threats in a globalized world, soft power enhancement in the post-Cold War), capacity (legal, organic and operational in the field of security, after the entry into force of the Treaty on European Union), and (ambition to have a) presence. The holistic approach underlying the logic of the nexuses is the result of a co-constitutive adequacy: appropriation of policies and instruments of a multifunctional actor for security purposes (security of the EU and of European citizens); securitization of issues in order to promote the policies and the actor.

### Keywords:

European Union; internal security; CSDP; security nexuses; securitization

### How to cite this article

Brandão, Ana Paula (2015). "The Internal-External nexus in the security narrative of the European Union". *JANUS.NET e-journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, N.º 1, May-October 2015. Consulted [online] on date of last visit, [observare.ual.pt/janus.net/en\\_vol6\\_n1\\_art1](http://observare.ual.pt/janus.net/en_vol6_n1_art1)

**Article received on November, 13 2014 and accepted for publication on April, 10 2015**



## THE INTERNAL-EXTERNAL NEXUS IN THE SECURITY NARRATIVE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

Ana Paula Brandão

The initial economic specialization of the European integration process and the failure, in the fifties, of the European Defence Community (EDC) project, associated with the nature of the threat and the guarantee of the security needs of the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) during the Cold War period, contributed to postponing the inclusion of the security area in Community Treaties. Despite that omission, the security rationale was present either as a catalytic of the process (prevention of European interstate conflict) or in the result (creation, consolidation and expansion of the European security community).

The changes in the post-Cold War created the opportunity for a new stage, favouring the clarification of the European security actor. The Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992 defined competencies in the field of security, both externally, under the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and internally within the framework of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters (in the broader context of cooperation in the field of justice and internal affairs<sup>1</sup>). The formalization of cooperation on security followed specific aspects: intergovernmental nature ensured through two differentiated pillars (second and third pillars), enshrined in the Treaty on European Union, albeit under a single institutional framework; coordination of national policies in the framework of the European Union (and not the European Community) deprived of legal personality; reproduction of the state model of separation between the external dimension of security (second pillar of the EU) and its internal dimension (third pillar of the EU); cooperation covering "all matters relating to security in the EU"<sup>2</sup>, although subject to a specified time in the area of defence. The institutionalization of the (then called) European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) by the Treaty of Amsterdam established the military cooperation, albeit limited to the Petersberg tasks<sup>3</sup>, contributing to the recognition of security actorness by state actors (members and non-members), heirs to the realist legacy that values the military component and the classic distinction between internal and external security. Two changes concerning security introduced by the aforementioned Treaty must also be stressed: the restriction of the third pillar to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters; the possibility of externalizing such cooperation. A decade later, the Treaty of Lisbon conferred legal personality upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> The JHA Cooperation (Justice and Home Affairs) includes several areas (immigration, asylum, customs cooperation, judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, police cooperation, and fight against crime.

<sup>2</sup> Preamble of the Treaty on European Union (1992).

<sup>3</sup> Humanitarian and rescue tasks; peacekeeping missions; combat forces' missions for crisis management, including peacemaking operations. These missions were initially defined in the context of the Western European Union (WEU) by the respective Ministerial Council which, in 1992, met in the Petersberg Hotel in Königswinter (Germany).



European Union, eliminated the pillar structure and transferred matters relating to 'national security' to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Gradually, in true Monnet's fashion, the Union acquired political capacity (designing and implementing policies, setting priorities and agendas, minimum internal cohesion, internal legitimacy of the political process), legal capacity (adoption of legal rules), institutional capacity (common institutions with responsibilities in the area and specific agencies), diplomatic capacity (negotiation and international representation), and material capacity. The area of security includes the Common Foreign Security Policy/Common Security and Defence Policy and cooperation in the field of 'internal security', as well as other Union policies. This allows it to perform four functions in the field of security (Kirschner and Sperling, 2007): prevention (of interstate and intrastate conflicts); assurance (peacebuilding); protection ('homeland security'); compulsion (peacemaking, peacekeeping, peace enforcement).

What are the implications of the gradual institutionalization of the European security actorness? This evolution has been accompanied by the narrative that emphasizes a 'global' actorness ambition in terms of geographic reach and of holistic approach (comprehensive approach). The community nexuses are one of the axes of this approach, which includes the declared "nexus between the internal and external aspects of security". This paper intends to answer two questions: Why the nexus? How is the nexus built? Resorting to the securitization theoretical framework (Buzan, Wæver and Wilde, 1998), combined with the conceptual matrix of Bretherton and Vogler (2007)<sup>4</sup> on European actorness, it argues that the nexus between internal security and external security represents a securitising move of the European actor explained by the convergence of opportunities (redefinition of security, prioritization of transnational threats in a globalized world, soft power enhancement in the post-Cold War), capacity (legal, organic and operational in the field of security after the entry into force of the Treaty on European Union), and (ambition to have a) presence. The holistic approach underlying the logic of the nexuses is the result of a co-constitutive adequacy: appropriation of policies and instruments of a multifunctional actor for security purposes (EU and European citizens' security); securitization of issues in order to promote the policies and the actor.

The chapter begins by tracing the evolution of the narrative of the security nexuses associated with the construction of the European Union's actorness in the field of security, after the entry into force of the Treaty on European Union, which established cooperation in the fields of Common Foreign Security Policy and 'internal security'.

The second and third sections emphasize the discourse and European practices related to nexus between the internal and external dimensions of security, seeking to answer two key questions - why and how (is it built), from the analysis of three cases (examples of nexuses): the civilian dimension of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP); the internalization of the CSDP; the externalization of internal security.

---

<sup>4</sup> The authors identify three aspects of actorness: opportunity – "factors in terms of ideas and events in the external environment that limit or allow actorness"; capacity – "internal context of EU action – availability of political instruments and agreeing on the Union's capacity to use these instruments to respond to opportunity and/or take advantage of presence"; presence - "the EU's capacity, by virtue of its existence, to exert influence beyond its borders" (Bretherton and Vogler, 2007).



## Security Nexuses

In the post-Cold War, debate about security leading to conceptual, theoretical and empirical pluralism became widespread, resulting in its broader re-conceptualization. No longer at the centre of the realistic approach, security is conceived as a multi-sector phenomenon<sup>5</sup> because it is not restricted to the traditional political and military sectors, and as a multi-level one, because it is not limited to the provider and object of state reference. In short, four central themes in the debate can be identified. First, the critical contributions of the threat's realistic setting warned of the complexity of the post-Cold War environment, characterized by multiple threats including non-state ones. Politically, the discourse about the "changing context", diffuse and unpredictable, became widespread. A second front of the debate focused on the referencing *object of security*, deconstructing the realistic equation -'state security' equals 'security of people'? from the question, 'whose security?' One of the answers favoured the people-centred approach in the context of the 'humanizing' discourse of the nineties, also present in the field of development. The diversity both in terms of threat and object (of security) justified a third axis of the reformulation applied to the *security provider*: besides the state, historically enshrined as *the* actor of security, other actors contribute to the security of persons, ranging from supra-state organizations to nongovernmental organizations. The academic and political trend towards a holistic approach (*comprehensive approach*) to security is reinforced by the fourth axis of the debate: the *security nexuses*. The narrative of the nexuses is based on the idea of interdependence of phenomena - two or more phenomena that "are intrinsically interlinked and mutually reinforcing" (Ganzle, 2009: 11) – as opposed to the border rationale (*lato sensu*)<sup>6</sup> underlying the realist paradigm. Thus, the threats are "dynamic" (European Council, 2003: 6) and multidimensional, which requires inter-state coordination in preventing and combating them. The nexus is intensified by the increasing transnational nature of threats.

By way of illustration, two examples are given here to illustrate the presence of the European actor associated with narrative and practice of nexuses. Somalia and the Sahel are perceived as an insecurity continuum, where state fragility, extreme poverty, food crises, climate change, corruption, internal tensions, illegal trafficking, terrorism, violent extremism, and radicalization are interconnected, with a "growing direct impact on the interests of European citizens" (EEAS 2011). In both cases, the EU has adopted a comprehensive approach: the humanitarian support to Somalia in the 1990s was later combined with development cooperation, political dialogue, civil and military instruments;<sup>7</sup> the Strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel (EEAS 2011), with a budget of 600 million euros, covers the areas of security, peace-building, conflict prevention, development, and the fight against radicalization.

---

<sup>5</sup> Barry Buzan (1991) defined five security sectors: political; military; economic; environmental; societal.

<sup>6</sup> Border not only in the geographical sense but also political (conceptual, operational and organizational separation between political areas).

<sup>7</sup> "The rising of the Somali insurgent group Al Shabaab in 2006 and its support for Al Qaida's international jihad as well as the escalating attacks on international shipping within the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean resulted in enhanced securitization of EU policies toward Somalia since 2007" (Ehrhart and Petretto, 2014: 182).



In the area of security, the narrative of links abound (security-development/poverty-conflict, migration-security, energy-environment-security, terrorism-organized crime, terrorism-proliferation, civilian-military, internal-external security, public-private security) understood as interdependent, merged or continuum phenomena, a narrative that culminates in a kind of "Pandora's box" - the interconnection of nexuses.

### **The In-Out Nexus**

The interdependence between the internal and external dimensions (European Council 2003 and 2008, Council of the European Union 2010) is a transverse view to official EU documents relating to security. What does this interdependence mean?

Both in the political and academic contexts<sup>8</sup>, different expressions, not necessarily synonymous, have been used to refer to the phenomenon. This wording cacophony does not facilitate the work of politicians (policy-making) and of academics (teaching and understanding the phenomenon). The strictly scientific field has been marked by "empirical ambiguity, theoretical fragmentation and a lack of scholarly dialogue on this issues" (Eriksson and Rhinard, 2009: 244).

Historically, the study of security, combined with state polity, was based on the separation between "the two arms of the Prince" (Pastore, 2001), the image of "separate tables"<sup>9</sup> being quite fitting. The complexity of the phenomenon, associated with the diversification of threats and the multitude of actors, either as providers of security or as a source of threat in the context of intense mobility and communicability worldwide, bucked the traditional paradigmatic, political and organizational separation between the internal and external dimensions of security defined by the realist legacy. The end of the Cold War and the events of September 11, 2001 potentiated the perception of a holistic security (comprehensive approach) covering four areas: security sectors (multisectoral security beyond political and military sectors); subjects of security (multiple actors, including individuals and groups beyond the state); security players, either as security providers or as sources of threat; border dynamics (trans-governmental cooperation for security; actions of transnational entities for security purposes; perverse transnational actors). In the European Union, the nexus can be applied to different phenomena which, in short, stem from three dynamics: (a) internalizing external phenomena; (b) externalization of initially internal phenomena; (c) cross-border phenomena. As an example:

---

<sup>8</sup> "blurring the distinction between internal and external security" (Pastore, 2001); "external dimension of Justice and Home Affairs" (Wolff, Wichmannb and Mounier, 2008); "dimension/outer face of internal security" (Rees, 2008); "external aspects of internal security" (Trauner, 2006); "convergence of external and internal security"/"division between dissolving external and internal aspects" (dissolving divide) (Lutterbeck, 2005); "merger between internal and external security" (Bigo, 2000 and 2001; Ehrhart, Hegemann, Kahl 2014), "interface between internal and external security" (Ekengren, 2006), "internal-external security nexus" (Eriksson and Rhinard, 2009; Trauner, 2013), "externalizations of internal security" (Monnar, 2010); "External dimension of the area of Freedom, Security and Justice" (Cremona, Monar and Poli, 2011; Monar 2014).

<sup>9</sup> Term used by Gabriel Almond to characterise Political Science ("Separate Tables: Schools and Sects in Political Science". *Political Science and Politics*. Volume 21, no. 4: 828-842).



<b>THREATS AND RISKS</b>	
External original (to the EU) of insecurity /internalization of the effects of external insecurity (a)	Ex. Instability, tension and/or conflict in Europe's neighbouring areas
Illegal activities within the EU and across (external) borders of the EU (c)	Ex. Illegal trafficking; cybercrime
<b>PREVENTION/FIGHTING</b>	
Externalization of European cooperation in the field of internal security (EU's cooperation with external actors – states, international organizations – in the areas of terrorism, transnational crime, etc.) (b)	Ex. EU-US cooperation in the fight against terrorism
Use of EU internal policy instruments externally (b) (b)	Ex. external dimension of Europol
Use of internal security instruments externally (b)	Ex. Police missions (CSDP)
(Possibility of) Using EU external policy instruments internally (a)	Ex. CSDP
Transgovernmental cooperation (c)	Ex. European networks (ex Police Chief Task Force); international networks (ex. Financial Action Task Force)
Combined use of external and internal instruments	Ex. Civilian-military cooperation
Inter-governmental policy coordination	Ex. Internal security objectives in external policy External policy objectives in internal security (exporting the internal model to third countries)

Underlying the in/out narrative is the idea of "globalization of security" associated with the "predominantly transnational character of postmodern risks" (Rehrl and Weisserth, 2010: 21). In this context, a CFSP that is effective in preventing and combating external threats is considered to be a condition to ensure the internal security of the European area. In turn, an effective internal security system is understood as a condition for the former to be an active policy. In the same vein, the European Security Strategy (European Council, 2003 and 2008) asserts the "indissoluble link between internal and external aspects of security" (European Council, 2003: 2), explained by several phenomena, namely: Europe's vulnerability due to its reliance on an infrastructure interconnected in various areas (transport, energy and information); the external dimension of organized crime; the global nature of terrorism, which has increasing resources, including connection through electronic networks; proximity to troubled areas as a result of EU enlargement; regional conflicts that have direct or indirect impact on European interests; climate change that has a "threat multiplier effect" (European Council, 2008: 5). Thus, in the "era of globalization, distant threats may be as much a concern as those that are near at hand" so "the first line of defence will often be abroad" (European Council, 2003: 6) and it is therefore necessary to "improve the way we reconcile the internal and external dimensions" (European Council, 2008: 4). In this sense, the Internal Security Strategy (Council of the European Union, 2010) supports the concept of internal security that is "comprehensive and complete, extending to multiple sectors" and a "global security approach with third countries" (European Council, 2010: 29).

The most recent events, particularly in the field of terrorism, have contributed to intensifying the in-out nexus security narrative. In February 2015, the EU Council reaffirmed the imperative to complement measures in the area of justice and home



affairs with a commitment externally, particularly in the Middle East, North Africa, the Sahel, and the Gulf. In the words of Federica Mogherini, the fight against radicalization and violent extremism must continue to be "a priority, not only for internal and security action, but also for our diplomatic and foreign policy" (EEAS 2015).

In short, the European narrative shows a securitization trend built on the risk of lack of control in a globalized world full of threats described as complex, dynamic, less visible, unpredictable, where remoteness (fragile, unstable and insecure) has become close.

## **The External-Internal Nexus in the Common Security and Defence Policy**

Devised for the European Union's external action under the CFSP, the CSDP<sup>10</sup> was established in 1999 as another instrument at the service of the EU's international and security actorness. The external/internal interdependence began expressing itself in the civilian dimension, reflected in the use of police and judicial means in external instability areas. Following the terrorist attacks of March 11, 2004 in Madrid, the possibility of internal use of the resources, including military, of a policy built for international use was advanced.

### *The Civil Dimension of the Common Security and Defence Policy*

The Common Security and Defence Policy was conceived to implement the use of force for peacemaking purposes in areas external to the EU. This initial structure was changed as regards both the nature of operations/resources (within politics, military only) and their scope (originally, only external). Even before the implementation of the policy<sup>11</sup>, the European Council, at a meeting in Santa Maria da Feira in June 2000, endorsed the civilian dimension of the then called ESDP. The latter started to include four priority areas of civilian crisis management: police; rule of law; civil protection; and civil administration (European Council, 2000).

This dimension resulted from the national preferences of militarily neutral states interested in participating in the new policy without jeopardizing the civilian nature of their national foreign policies, which reinforced the policy's initial goal to promote and give credibility to the international actorness of the EU: "strengthen the Union's external action through the development of a military capacity for crisis management, as well as a civilian capacity" (European Council, 2000: 2). Concurrently, it reinforced the holistic approach to security, which also underlies the desire to contribute to peace and stability of the Union:

Protecting the European Union's internal security involves not only measures at and within the Community borders, but also, in particular, engagement abroad.

---

<sup>10</sup> Then known as the European Security and Defence Policy (PSDP).

<sup>11</sup> Organic operation (political-military structures) and on the ground (missions): establishment of political-military structures on a permanent basis in 2001; Declaration on Operations in December 2001; EUPM (European Union Peace Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina) first mission in January 2003.



(...)

*On the one hand, we must combat the causes and roots of instability and radicalization using development aid and economic cooperation. On the other hand, we need mechanisms to replace, rebuild or support structures in the field of public security and order following crises. Aside from the deployment of military and police personnel, civil protection teams play an important role here in rebuilding infrastructure (...). (Future Group, 2007: 1).*

Despite this innovation, the truth is that the EU already had experience in civilian crisis management, notably through the Commission's activities under the Development Policy and, above all, Humanitarian Aid. The upgrading of the CSDP contributed to the European specificity in civilian crisis management, having no equivalent internationally. One of the peculiarities is related to civilian-military coordination arising from military support to civilian presence on the ground: civilian missions usually integrate military personnel for advice, planning and/or reconstruction activities. The existence of mixed missions (civilian/military) should also be noted.

A decade later, there has been a clear prevalence of civilian missions at the expense of military operations. This development has been accompanied by organic changes, due to the creation of organizations, either specific to the civilian component, or with civilian-military coordination, as well as by the diversify of the type of missions (police, rule of law, monitoring, security reform, assistance at the border) and geographical areas.

#### *The (declared) Internalization of the Common Security and Defence Policy*

In the fight against terrorism after 2001, the European Council, under the aegis of the Spanish Presidency, adopted a declaration on the specific contribution of the CFSP/ESDP. The document (European Council, 2002) highlighted the following areas: "political dialogue with third countries (promoting human rights and democracy, non-proliferation and arms control) and international assistance; conflict prevention; post-conflict stabilization; exchange of information and production of situation assessment documents and early warning reports; developing a common assessment of threats against member states or against force without crisis management operations; determining military capabilities required to protect such forces from terrorist attacks; analysis of the possibility of using military and civilian resources to help protect civilian populations from the effects of terrorist attacks."

As requested in the report presented to the European Council on the Implementation of the Declaration on Combating Terrorism (European Council, 2004a) and in the Action Plan, the Political and Security Committee drafted a more detailed document on the specific contribution of the ESDP that underlined the comparative advantage of the European Union, holder a variety of instruments, including civilian and military, to fight a complex and multifaceted threat. The "Conceptual Framework" begins by noting the global contribution to prevent (long-term) terrorism:



*In response to crises, the Union can mobilise a wide range of both civilian and military means and instruments, thus giving it an overall crisis-management and conflict-prevention capability in support of the objectives of the Common Foreign and Security Policy. This facilitates a comprehensive approach to prevent the occurrence of failed states, to restore order and civil government, to deal with humanitarian crises and prevent regional conflicts. By responding effectively to such multifaceted situations, the EU already makes a considerable contribution to long term actions for the prevention of terrorism. (Council of the European Union, 2004: 6).*

As regards the specific contribution of the then designated ESDP, four areas of activity were identified, including consequence reaction and management (dealing with the effects of an attack combining military and civilian means)<sup>12</sup>. Despite the different national sensitivities as to the use of military means in the fight against terrorism, official documents show a consensus on various aspects, such as prevention of the terrorist threat in the territories of Member States, the protection of democratic institutions and civilian population from terrorist attacks, including CBRN, and assistance to a Member State subjected to an attack (European Council, 2004)<sup>13</sup>.

In the same vein, there is a solidarity clause in case of terrorist threats and natural or human origin catastrophes which, while not falling under the CSDP, allows the Union to mobilise "all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the Member States"<sup>14</sup>.

### **The Externalization of Internal Security**

European cooperation accomplishes the externalization of internal security at two levels: the externalization of the internal security of Member States (MSs); externalization of EU internal security through the external dimension of its activity (cooperation with international organizations and third countries). So, as an example, by sharing information, Europol undertakes the externalization of both national police activity and European cooperation<sup>15</sup>. In this section, we focus on the second level.

Cooperation in terms of 'internal security' in the area of transnational security issues between Member States was launched in the 1970s outside the framework of the Treaty

---

<sup>12</sup> The other three relate to: prevention of terrorist attacks, including sea and air surveillance operations; protection of staff, equipment and resources, protection of civilian key targets, including critical infrastructure, in the area of operations, and protection of European citizens in third countries; support to third countries in the fight against terrorism.

<sup>13</sup> Externally, the restoration of order in failed states and post-conflict stabilization must be mentioned (European Union, 2004b).

<sup>14</sup> Article 222 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

<sup>15</sup> In 2006, Europol approved the Europol External Strategy for 2006-2008. In September 2008 it was decided to extend the strategy until 2009. The Europol Strategy 2010-2014 includes several points on the external dimension: cooperation with key partners through the establishment of joint operational plans, agreements and R&D activities to develop new techniques to prevent and fight serious crime and terrorism.



of Rome and community institutions, in the broader context of justice and home affairs (JHA). The driving factor in this informal interstate cooperation was the growing international terrorist activity in Western Europe, which showed the limits of national means to fight effectively against the threat.

In June 1976, ministers meeting in Luxembourg established an informal framework for cooperation - TREVI - that "worked outside the framework of the European Communities on a purely intergovernmental basis as part of the cooperation process in the field of foreign policy" (Mitsilegas et al, 2003: 23). The structure initially consisted of two groups - TREVI I, dedicated to transnational terrorism, and TREVI II, which focused on matters relating to public order, organization and training of police forces - composed of officials from ministries, police and national intelligence services. In the 1980s, the cooperation agenda began to prioritize preventing and combating transnational activities such as drug trafficking and organized crime, which led to the creation of the TREVI III group. Objective 1993 – establishing the internal market<sup>16</sup> – intensified security concerns associated with the creation of an European area without internal borders, leading to the creation of new cooperation bodies, including TREVI 1992, which focused on police cooperation and internal security matters deriving from the abolition of the internal borders of the European community. In this development, the contribution of the Schengen Agreement and the subsequent Implementing Convention, albeit celebrated outside the scope of Community law, should be noted. Schengen, which anticipated the free movement of people among signatory states, also advanced compensatory measures in terms of security.

The second phase of cooperation was initiated by the revision of the Maastricht Treaty that formally introduced JHA cooperation under the Treaty on European Union (TEU):

*"[T] he most significant change (...) [was] the fact that, through changes to the Treaties, internal security matters were first brought to the centre of the integration process. (...) in the wider context of JHA, internal security matters have become part of the political agenda of the Union" (Mitsilegas et al, 2003: 32).*

The third pillar of the European Union maintained the intergovernmental nature of cooperation, although using EU institutions, with particular regard to the EU Council. The Treaty of Amsterdam introduced three changes: the communitarisation of some JHA issues (immigration, asylum, justice in civil matters), the third pillar becoming restricted to police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters; the integration of the Schengen *acquis* into Community law; the external dimension of JHA.

The Treaty of Lisbon established cross changes, notably by giving the European Union legal personality so that cooperation on internal security came under the umbrella of an international organization, and by formally abolishing the pillars<sup>17</sup> for the sake of

<sup>16</sup> Free movement of goods, capital, services and people.

<sup>17</sup> The veiled prevalence of the second pillar (CFSP/CSDP) should be noted and, in the area of internal security, a *sui generis* communitisation also prevailed (shared legislative initiative; special legislative procedure concerning operational cooperation; opt-out (Protocol 21 on the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland regarding the area of freedom, security and justice; protocol 22 on the position of Denmark) and 'emergency break' (paragraph 3 of article 82 of the TFEU).



greater coherence between policies in general, and between the internal and external dimension of the Union in particular. Of note are also the specific changes in the field of internal security: transfer of this issue to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU)<sup>18</sup>; terminological consecration of "internal security"<sup>19</sup>; judicial control of the EU Court of Justice; creation of the Standing Committee on Internal Security (COSI) "in order to ensure that operational cooperation on internal security is promoted and strengthened within the Union" (article 71 TFEU); possibility of establishing a European Public Prosecutor (Article 86 TFEU) to combat crimes affecting the financial interests of the EU. However, exceptions of the operational component of cooperation should be noted: Parliament is merely consulted; the Council decides unanimously (special legislative procedure). The *sui generis* communitisation and the special procedure in the framework of the TFEU are symptomatic of the state's resistance to empowerment in an area that touches the core of sovereignty.

Along this evolutionary synthesis, the institutionalization of agencies promoting cooperation on internal security should be highlighted. In 1991, at the meeting of the European Council, the Chancellor of Germany, Helmut Kohl, inspired by the FBI model, proposed the creation of a European police agency (Europol, 2009: 11). This proposal led to the creation of the Europol Drugs Unit. Following the entry into force of the TEU, the Europol Convention pursuant to Article K.3 of the treaty was celebrated in 1995. The European Police Office is, since 1 January 2010, an EU agency<sup>20</sup> that provides strategic and operational analysis as well as operational support to Member States, and, more specifically: exchange of information; information analysis; strategic analysis; operations support; knowledge sharing (Europol, 2009: 3). A further three agencies work to protect the Union: Eurojust (European Judicial Cooperation Unit), established in 2002<sup>21</sup>, contributes to the fight against serious cross-border crime by coordinating investigations and prosecutions between Member States; Frontex, established in 2004, promotes the integrated management of the external borders of the Member States; CEPOL (European Police College), established in 2005<sup>22</sup>, offers training to senior police officers of Member States and cross-border cooperation in the fight against crime. The existence of these agencies results from overlapping supra-state dynamics (agencies under EU law, coordination with supra-state institutions), interstate ones (coordination of policies and national resources), and transgovernmental bodies (networks of officials from the ministries, police, prosecutors, judges, members of intelligence services).

Originally devised to function within the Community area, cooperation on internal security later spread out and acquired an external dimension. Although 1999 is

---

<sup>18</sup> Title IV, dedicated to the "area of freedom, security and justice" (AFSJ), constituting one of the eleven areas of shared competence: legislative initiative, although shared with the Member States, of the Commission; ordinary legislative procedure; the majority principle in the Council; adoption of regulations and directives.

<sup>19</sup> In previous versions of the Treaties, the expression was virtually silent. Cooperation in matters of internal security was done through police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters in the framework of the JHA, and, following a review of the Treaty of Amsterdam, of the AFSJ. The Treaty of Lisbon added the term 'national security', which refers to 'internal security of Member States', thus distinguishing itself from the 'EU internal security'.

<sup>20</sup> In 2009, Europol's legal framework was simplified by replacing the Europol Convention and subsequent Protocols by the Council Decision of 6 April 2009 that created the European Police Office under Title VI of the TEU then in force.

<sup>21</sup> The creation of a judicial cooperation unit was triggered by the European Council of Tampere. In 2000 a provisional unit (Pro-Eurojust) was established

<sup>22</sup> Equivalent to an the agency, it was the successor of CEPOL established by Decision 2000/820/ JHA.



considered to be the milestone of this externalization<sup>23</sup>, one can find precedents in the 1980s, particularly associated with the need, identified by the European Commission and the Council, to include the fight against drugs and organized crime in the Union's external relations. In the same vein, the Amsterdam European Council urged "the Council to pursue its work on cooperation with third countries and regions" (European Council, 1997) under the Action Plan against Organized Crime; the Vienna European Council<sup>24</sup> welcomed "the development of various regional cooperation initiatives" and "urged that those related to Latin America and Central Asia be carried forward without delay" (European Council, 1998). The externalisation of proximity with regard to candidate countries for EU accession must also be noted: in 1998, the JHA Ministers of member and candidate countries adopted a pre-accession pact on organized crime (EU Council, 1998). Still regarding proximity, concern was centred in the Balkans, with particular focus on organized crime, so the stabilization and association process, after NATO's intervention in Kosovo in 1999, also included cooperation in this field. The security rationale was explicit in the European narrative:

*"The choice for us in this case is very clear: either we export stability to the Balkans, or the Balkans export instability to us" (Patten, 2002)<sup>25</sup>.*

The Tampere European Council established the externalisation of internal security in the broader framework of JHA, stressing that "all the skills and all the instruments available to the Union, particularly in external relations, must be used in an integrated and coherent manner so that we can create an area of freedom, security and justice. Justice and Home Affairs should be integrated into the definition and implementation of other Union policies and activities" (European Council, 1999).

The following year, the Santa Maria da Feira European Council approved the report on the EU external priorities in the JHA area, stating that these priorities "should be integrated into the overall external strategy of the Union in order to contribute to the creation of the area of freedom, security and justice "(European Council, 2000). It was not about developing a specific/parallel foreign policy, but about consolidating the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice (AFSJ) through EU external action and under the control of diplomats.

---

<sup>23</sup> In the broader framework of justice and home affairs.

<sup>24</sup> Approved the first action plan on Justice and Home Affairs.

<sup>25</sup> "Even before the horror of 11 September, the recent tragic history of the Balkans had shown to Europe and to the wider international community the danger that failed, or failing, states can pose to our stability and security in this small and interconnected world. The Balkans have demonstrated how instability is contagious, how quickly someone else's problem can become everyone's problem. (...) They have reminded us and this too has wider application that standing up for our values when they are in danger, standing up for democracy, for others' rights, for justice, is not flabby idealism: it is a matter of hard security, and profoundly in our self-interest" (Patten, 2002). "Every country of the region is blighted by the smuggling of drugs and cigarettes, by the trafficking of people and weapons, by corruption and by racketeering. The cumulative effect is intolerable - important war criminals remain at large, often sustained by organised crime. It is an affront to justice, a barrier to the progress and development of the countries of the region, and a threat to the security of us all. Quite simply, it must stop" (Solana, 2002).



*"This 'demonstration of force' by the diplomats could also be interpreted as an implicit recognition of the progressive 'contamination' of the EU's foreign policy objectives by internal security concerns" (Wolff et al., 2009: 12).*

In short, the strategy was justified by the "pressure of an increasingly interconnected world and of the inherent international character of threats," the security and stability of the European Union requiring the "external projection of values underpinning the AFSJ," the external dimension contributing to enhancing the credibility and influence of the EU in the world (European Parliament 2007: 354).

The first multi-presidency programme<sup>26</sup> for the external dimension of the JHA (Council of the EU, 2002) provided for the adoption of common strategies (Russia, Ukraine and the Mediterranean), dialogue with partners (US, Canada, Latin America, EFTA countries and African countries), and cooperation with other international organizations (UN, Council of Europe, the Hague Conference and G7/G8).

At the request of the European Council, a strategy for the external dimension of JHA was written in order "to contribute to the successful establishment of the internal area of freedom, security and justice and to advance the EU's external relations objectives by promoting the rule of law, respect for human rights and international obligations" (Council of the EU, 2006: 3). The JHA-RelExt Strategy adopted in December 2005 sought to articulate this area, the CFSP, the ESDP, the Development Policy, the European Security Strategy, and the economic and commercial objectives of the EU, defining thematic<sup>27</sup> and geographical priorities (candidate countries; neighbouring countries, strategic partners)<sup>28</sup>. The following year, a Ministerial Conference took place in Vienna, in which representatives from the EU, from third countries, the United States, Russia and from other international organizations discussed the role of internal security in relations between the EU and its neighbours. The geographical priority was also explained by proximity:

*Internal security cannot be guaranteed in isolation from the outside world and, in particular, from immediate European neighbourhood. It is therefore important to ensure coherence and complementarity between the internal and external aspects of EU security. As recognized in the European Security Strategy and the Internal Security Strategy, the relationships with our partners are of fundamental importance in the fight against serious or organized crime and terrorism. (European Commission, 2011: 12).*

---

<sup>26</sup> The trio consisted of the Belgian, Spanish and Danish Presidencies.

<sup>27</sup> Terrorism, organized crime, corruption, drug trafficking, management of migration flows.

<sup>28</sup> North Africa (fight against terrorism), Western Balkans and other neighbouring countries (fight against organized crime, corruption, illegal immigration and terrorism), Afghanistan (fight against the production and trafficking of drugs) and African countries (cooperation on migration matters).



The Working Group JAIEX<sup>29</sup> was created to facilitate coordination between JAI and RELEX groups, particularly in terms of exchange of information and strategic and horizontal reflections.

How is cooperation in the sensitive area of internal security undertaken? Four principles govern the external dimension (European Commission, 2011: 3): differentiation, by regional area and/or country; conditionality, i.e. enhanced cooperation is gradual and depends on progress and success in the agreed areas; coherence with the overall foreign policy of the EU, with other relevant policies and cooperation in different regions/countries; regionalization, which translates into supporting regional and sub-regional cooperation initiatives. The cooperation comprises three levels: general, supported by partnership and cooperation or association agreements that cover several areas, including internal security; specific, through agreements on internal security; operational, mainly associated with the external dimension of EU agencies. Cooperation is implemented by means of legal, political, diplomatic, and financial instruments: agreements/treaties/conventions, joint political declarations, programmes/agendas/action plans; meetings (from annual summits at the highest level to regular meetings between senior officials, and including the meetings of cooperation councils, committees and subcommittees); networks of experts and professionals; assistance programmes.

The EU-Russia cooperation is an example of this. The St Petersburg Summit in 2003 launched the four common spaces of cooperation, including the space of freedom, security and justice. Two years later, the respective road map<sup>30</sup> was approved, whose implementation is monitored by the cooperation central body, the Permanent Partnership Council in the field of Freedom, Security and Justice that meets twice a year. The road map, in the point related to security, envisages cooperation in the fight against terrorism and all forms of organized crime<sup>31</sup>. The cooperation has resulted mainly in supporting the preparation of legislation, training and exchange of information. Over the years there has been a "growing network of professional contacts, meetings and consultations, commitments" (Hernández i Sagrera and Potemkina, 2013: i). Despite the positive effect of this socialization, the concrete results of cooperation have been limited. In the specific area of internal security<sup>32</sup>, the agenda has been dominated by transnational crime, drug trafficking and terrorism<sup>33</sup>. An operational agreement was also concluded between Russia and Frontex to promote practical cooperation at three levels: training, exchange of knowledge and good practices; sharing of information for risk analysis; joint operations. The agreement established

---

<sup>29</sup> This Working Group of the EU Council, initially under the name JAI-RELEX Ad Hoc Support Group, became permanent (JAI-RELEX Working Party) in 2010, after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon.

<sup>30</sup> "Road Map on the Common Space on Freedom, Security and Justice" (EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council on Freedom, Security and Justice, 2005).

<sup>31</sup> The road map covers the following areas: terrorism, document security, transnational organized crime, money laundering, drug trafficking, trafficking in human beings, corruption, vehicle theft, and items with historical and cultural value.

<sup>32</sup> The broader agenda of the FSJ includes the movement of people and migration. Two agreements were signed (Agreement between the Russian Federation and the European Community on the facilitation of the issuance of visas to the citizens of the Russian Federation and the European Union and the Agreement between the Russian Federation and the European Community on readmission, 2006) and the "Common Steps towards visa free short term travel for Russian and EU citizens" (2011) is in progress.

<sup>33</sup> "European Union Action Plan on Common Action for the Russian Federation on Combating Organized Crime" (2000), "Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal Service of the Russian Federation for Narcotics Traffic Control and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction" (2007). Available at: <http://www.russianmission.eu/en/basic-documents>.



with Europol<sup>34</sup> prior to the approval of the road map is limited to the sharing of strategic information<sup>35</sup> and threat assessment documents, and negotiations on an operational agreement have not yet taken place<sup>36</sup>. Despite two rounds of negotiations<sup>37</sup>, the agreement with Eurojust has not yet been completed, so until now cooperation is materialized in the meetings of the parties' liaison officers. The main obstacle to cooperation results from the EU's use of political conditionality, which is not well accepted by Russia (Hernández i Sagraera and Potemkina, 2013). In addition, the deficit in mutual trust, which is fundamental in sensitive areas such as security, the heterogeneity of legal and administrative cultures and the differences in the perception of threats are also factors that deserve to be mentioned.

### Final Comments

In the post-Cold War, the building of the European actorness on security was accompanied by the narrative of security nexuses. This narrative began to emerge associated with the prevention and assurance functions, in which the nexus between security and development played a part. In this context, particular emphasis was given to the root causes of conflict, as well as situations of state fragility viewed as an obstacle to development and as a source of regional and international instability. The nexus serves the interests of the international organization (as a means to increase the effectiveness of the EU's international and security actorness), of the European Commission (starting from an area under its remit where it has accumulated experience) and of Member States (Europeanization of national policies).

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and subsequent ones in European stages amplified previous trends, consolidating security's holistic approach (comprehensive approach), the ambition of global actorness and security narratives and practices. In this context, "the nexus between the internal and external aspects of security" was reinforced, which stems from three situations that reinforce each other: internalization of externally-based phenomena; externalization of initially internally-based phenomena; transborder phenomena.

The analysis of three expressions of the nexus (civilian dimension of the CSDP, internalization of the CSDP, externalisation of internal security) demonstrates that a combined rationale underlies it: security (ensure the safety and stability of the EU in the presence of transnational risks and threats); political (consolidation of the AFSJ specific area as well as of EU external action); institutional (interest of the European Commission in developing the security components that can have more presence). The security narrative is built on the idea of risk of lack of control in a globalized world of threats, described as dynamic, less visible, unpredictable, where distance, perceived as being fragile, unstable and insecure, becomes close. The actorness and the security narrative of the nexuses are thus co-constitutive: appropriation of policies and instruments of a multifunctional actor for security purposes; securitization of issues to consolidate policies and actor projection. In short, the in/out nexus is justified by the

---

<sup>34</sup> Agreement on Co-operation between the European Police Office and the Russian Federation (2003).

<sup>35</sup> It does not allow the transfer of data.

<sup>36</sup> "Discussion with the Russians had been rather empty. Professor Rees thought that Russia was resistant to EU incentives because the Kremlin considered itself to be too important to have its policies moulded by Brussels" (House of Lords, 2011: 21).

<sup>37</sup> The parties began negotiating in 2009.



environment (opportunity), legitimizing the use of various instruments (capacity) to promote European atorness (presence).

## References

Bigo, Didier (2014). The (In)securitization Practices of the Three Universes of EU Border Control: Military/Navy–Border Guards/Police–Database Analysts. *Security Dialogue*. Volume 45, nº 3: 209–225.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001). “The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security (ies)”. In: ALBERT, Mathias et al. (eds.). *Identities, Borders and Orders*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2000). “When Two become One: Internal and External Securitizations in Europe”. In: M. Kelstrup e M. C. Williams (eds.), *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community*. Londres: Routledge: 320-360.

Buzan, Barry, Waeber, Ole e Wilde, Jaap (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder-CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bretherton, Charlotte e Vogler, John (2007). *The European Union as a Global Actor*. 2ª ed. Londres: Routledge.

Buzan, Barry (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boulder-CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Comissão Europeia (2011). Comunicação da Comissão ao Parlamento Europeu, ao Conselho, ao Comité Económico e Social e ao Comité das Regiões sobre a Cooperação no Domínio da Justiça e dos Assuntos Internos no Âmbito da Parceria Oriental (COM (2011) 564). Disponível em <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0564:FIN:PT:PDF>.

Conselho Europeu (2010a). Estratégia da Segurança Interna da União Europeia: Rumo a um Modelo Europeu de Segurança (5842/2/10rev 2)". Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/librairie/PDF/QC3010313PTC.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/librairie/PDF/QC3010313PTC.pdf).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2010b). Programa de Estocolmo: Uma Europa Aberta e Segura que Proteja os Cidadãos (2010/C115/01). *Jornal Oficial da União Europeia* (C 115), 1-38. Disponível em <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:pt:PDF>.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2008). Relatório sobre a Execução da Estratégia Europeia de Segurança: Garantir a Segurança num Mundo em Mudança. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressdata/PT/reports/104638.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressdata/PT/reports/104638.pdf).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2004a). Declaração sobre a Luta contra o Terrorismo. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/79644.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/79644.pdf).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2004b). Conclusões do Conselho Europeu de Bruxelas de 4/5 de novembro de 2004. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/82547.pdf](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/82547.pdf).



\_\_\_\_\_ (2003). Uma Europa Segura num Mundo Melhor: Estratégia Europeia em Matéria de Segurança. Disponível em <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/031208ESSIIP.pdf>.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002). Declaração do Conselho Europeu relativa ao Contributo da PESC, incluindo a PESC para a Luta contra o Terrorismo, Anexo V às Conclusões do Conselho Europeu de Sevilha. Disponível em <http://europa.eu/bulletin/pt/200206/i1031.htm>.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2000). Conclusões da Presidência: Conselho Europeu de Santa Maria da Feira – 19 e 20 de junho de 2000. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00200-r1.p0.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00200-r1.p0.htm).

\_\_\_\_\_ (1999). Conclusões da Presidência: Conselho Europeu de Tampere – 16 e 17 de junho de 1999”. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00200-r1.p9.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00200-r1.p9.htm).

\_\_\_\_\_ (1998). Conselho Europeu de Viena: 11 e 12 de dezembro de 1998: Conclusões da Presidência. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms\\_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00300-R1.P8.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/pt/ec/00300-R1.P8.htm).

\_\_\_\_\_ (1997). Conclusões da Presidência: Conselho Europeu de Amesterdão – 15 e 16 de outubro de 1999”. Disponível em [http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms\\_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/032h0006.htm](http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/pt/ec/032h0006.htm)

Conselho da União Europeia (2004). Quadro Conceptual da Dimensão PESC da Luta contra o Terrorismo (19747/04). Disponível em <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/pt/04/st14/st14797.pt04.pdf>.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1998). Pacto de Pré-adesão sobre Criminalidade Organizada entre os Estados-membros da União Europeia e os Países Candidatos da Europa Central e Oriental e Chipre. *Jornal Oficial* C, n.º 220: 01-05. Disponível em <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:41998D0715:PT:HTML>.

Council of the European Union (2006). Progress Report on the Implementation of the Strategy for the External Dimension of JHA: Global Freedom, Security and Justice - 15363/06. Disponível em [www.psp.cz/sqw/text/orig2.sqw?idd=24469](http://www.psp.cz/sqw/text/orig2.sqw?idd=24469).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2005). “A Strategy for the External Dimension of JHA : Global Freedom, Security and Justice” [14366/3/05REV 3]. Disponível em <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/05/st14/st14366-re03.en05.pdf>.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2002). Multipresidency Programme for External Relations in the Field of Justice and Home Affairs (2001–2002) 5004/02. Disponível em <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?!=EN&f=ST%205004%202002%20INIT>.

Cremona, Marise, Monar, Jörg e Poli, Sara (eds.). *The External Dimension of the European Union's Area of Freedom, Security and Justice*. Pieterlen: Peter Lang.

EEAS (European External Action Service) (2015). Ukraine, Terrorism & Africa Dominate Foreign Affairs Council. Disponível em: [http://eeas.europa.eu/top\\_stories/2015/100215\\_foreign\\_affairs\\_council\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/top_stories/2015/100215_foreign_affairs_council_en.htm).



EEAS (2011). Strategy for Security and Development in the Sahel. Disponível em: [http://eeas.europa.eu/africa/docs/sahel\\_strategy\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/africa/docs/sahel_strategy_en.pdf).

Ehrhart, Hans-Georg, e Petretto, Ehrhart (2014) Stabilizing Somalia: Can the EU's Comprehensive Approach Work? *European Security*. Volume 23, nº 2: 179-194.

Ehrhart, Hans-Georg, Hegemann, Hendrik, e Kahl, Martin (2014). Towards Security Governance as a Critical Tool: a Conceptual Outline. *European Security*. Volume 23, nº2, 145-162.

EU-Russia Permanent Partnership Council on Freedom, Security and Justice (2012). Joint Conclusions. Disponível em [http://www.cy2012.eu/index.php/en/file/D\\_IY7sYpjeP2nxXo9+AUZw](http://www.cy2012.eu/index.php/en/file/D_IY7sYpjeP2nxXo9+AUZw).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2005). Road Map on the Common Space of Freedom, Security and Justice. 10 May, 2005. Disponível em [http://www.russianmission.eu/userfiles/file/road\\_map\\_on\\_the\\_common\\_space\\_of\\_freedom\\_security\\_and\\_justice\\_2005\\_english.pdf](http://www.russianmission.eu/userfiles/file/road_map_on_the_common_space_of_freedom_security_and_justice_2005_english.pdf).

Future Group (2007). 2nd Meeting of the Future Group - Monday, 25 June 2007, Brussels. Disponível em: <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2008/jul/eu-futures-june-internal-sec-2007.pdf>.

Ganzle, Stephan (2009). *Coping with the 'Security-Development Nexus': The European Community's Instrument for Stability - Rationale and Potential*. Bona: Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik.

Hernández i Sagrera, Raül e Potemkina, Olga (2013). Russia and the Common Space on Freedom, Security and Justice. CEPS Papers in Liberty and Security in Europe 54. Disponível em <http://www.ceps.be/book/russia-and-common-space-freedom-security-and-justice>.

Kirchner, Emil, e Sterling, James (2007). *EU Security Governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lutterbeck, D. (2005). Blurring the Dividing Line: The Convergence of Internal and External Security in Western Europe. *European Security*. Volume 14, nº 2: 231-253.

Mitsilegas, Valsamis, Monar, Jörg e Rees, Wyn (2003). *The European Union and Internal Security: Guardian of the People?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Monar, Jörg (2014). The EU's Growing External Role in the AFSJ Domain: Factors, Framework and Forms of Action. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*. Volume 27, nº 1: 147-166.

Parlamento Europeu (2007). Dimensão Externa e Plano de Acção de Aplicação do Programa da Haia: Resolução do Parlamento Europeu, de 21 de junho de 2007, sobre um Espaço de Liberdade, de Segurança e de Justiça: Estratégia para a Dimensão Externa, Plano de Acção de aplicação do Programa da Haia (2006/2111(INI) (P6\_TA(2007)0284). Disponível em <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2008:146E:0353:0361:PT:PDF>

Pastore, Ferruccio (2001). *Reconciling the Prince's Two 'Arms'. Internal-External Security Policy Coordination in the European Union*. Occasional Paper, nº 30. Paris: Institute for Security Studies.



Patten, Chris (2002). Speech by the Rt Hon Chris Patten, CHWestern Balkans Democracy Forum - Thessaloniki, 11 April 2002. Disponível em [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_SPEECH-02-150\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-02-150_en.htm).

Rees, Wyn (2008). Inside Out: the External Face of EU Internal Security Policy. *Journal of European Integration*. Volume 30, nº 1: 97-111.

Rehrl, Jochen, e Weisserth, Hans-Bernhard (eds.). 2010. Handbook on CSDP. Vienna, Federal Ministry of Defence and Sports of the Republic of Austria. Disponível em [https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/csdp\\_handbook\\_web.pdf](https://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/csdp_handbook_web.pdf).

Solana, Javier (2002). Intervention by Javier Solana, EU High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. London Conference on Organized Crime in South Eastern Europe. Disponível em [http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/es/article\\_1804\\_es.htm](http://www.eu-un.europa.eu/articles/es/article_1804_es.htm).

Trauner, Florian (2013). *The Internal-External Security Nexus: More Coherence under Lisbon?* Occasional Paper, nº 89. Paris: Institute for Security Studies.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006). External Aspects of Internal Security: A Research Agenda. EU-Consent. Disponível em <http://www.eu-consent.net/library/brx061012/WP%20VII%20Luif-Trauner.pdf>.

House of Lords, European Union Committee (2011). 17th Report of Session 2010–12: The EU Internal Security Strategy Report. Londres: The Stationery Office Limited. Disponível em <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201012/ldselect/ldeucom/149/149.pdf>

Wolff, Sarah, Wichmann, Nicole e Mounier, Gregory (2009). "The External Dimension of Justice and Home Affairs: A Different Security Agenda for the EU?" *Journal of European Integration*. Volume 31, nº1: 9-23.