

THE LIMITS OF REALIST CONCEPTIONS OF SECURITY: EXAMING THE
VIEWS OF CAMPBELL AND WAEVER

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ELFESİYA SEVEN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL
SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

JANUARY 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Master of Science

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Ayata
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bedirhanoglu (METU, IR) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci (METU, ADM) _____

Assist. Prof. Ömür Birler (METU, ADM) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Elfesiya Seven

Signature

ABSTRACT

THE LIMITS OF REALIST CONCEPTION OF SECURITY: EXAMING THE VIEWS OF CAMPBELL AND WAEVER

Seven, Elfesiya

M.S., Department of Political Science and Public Administration

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Cem Deveci

January 2015, 89 pages

This thesis examines two different and contemporary theories which criticize the centrality of “security issues” in the re-establishment of the post-Cold War international order as one of the fundamental principles of the realist school. The views of David Campbell and Copenhagen Securitization School focus on the role of “the security issue” in the determination of the Cold War policies, and ask whether this security care lost its effects or not in the process of determination of foreign policies. Both of these views provide critical readings of the security issues, whereas in terms of their possible solutions that they offer to “security issues” they are different. In the first three chapters of this thesis a detailed presentation of these views are given, and their criticisms to the concept of security is illustrated. In the next chapters, the criticisms of these theories of the current understanding of security are investigated and it is asked whether these theories are able to go beyond the mainstream understanding of security. The major concern is to question whether these two contemporary theories go beyond the limits of realist understanding of security. As a result, it is argued that both of these views offer serious criticisms to existing security concept, they disclose the ties of the current understanding to Christian tradition, and underline certain conflicts between democracy, freedom and rights on the one hand and security on the other. However by not offering any solutions to dehumanization of the enemy both of these theories have certain limits with respect to current existing understanding of the concept of security.

Keywords: David Campbell, Copenhagen Securitization School, Ole Waever, security, post-Cold War era

ÖZ

REALİST OKULUNUN GÜVENLİK KAVRAMLAŞTIRMASININ SINIRLARI: CAMPBELL VE WAEVER' İN GÜVENLİK KAVRAMI İNCELEMELERİNİN BİR SORUŞTURMASI

Seven, Elfesiya

Yüksek Lisans, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Cem Deveci

Ocak 2015, 89 sayfa

Bu tezde Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemde yeniden şekillenmeye başlayan uluslararası düzenin kurulması ve devam ettirilmesinde, realist okulun temel prensiplerinden biri olan güvenlik meselesinin yeri ve öneminin eleştirisini sunan iki farklı ve çağdaş teori sunulmuştur. Tezde Soğuk Savaş dönemi politikalarının belirlenmesinde kilit bir rol oynayan “güvenlik meselelerinin”, bu savaşın bitmesiyle birlikte etkisini yitirip yitirmediği, yitirmediyse nasıl bir hale dönüştüğü gibi sorular etrafında kurgulanmış olan David Campbell ve Kopenhag Güvenikleştirme Okulu'nun görüşleri incelenmiştir. Her iki görüş de güvenlik meselelerine eleştirel bir okuma sunma, ve post-modern düşüncelerden neşet etmeleri bakımından ortak bir çerçevede buluşmalar da güvenlik kavramına yaklaşımları ve sundukları olası çözümler bakımından farklılaşmaktadırlar. Bu tezin ilk üç bölümünde bu görüşlerin ayrıntılı sunumları verilmiş, güvenlik kavramına yönelttikleri eleştiriler gösterilmiştir. Sonraki bölümlerde, her iki görüşün de sundukları eleştiriler doğrultusunda halihazırdaki güvenlik kavramına getirdikleri eleştirilerin bir soruşturulması yapılmış ve iddia ettikleri gibi anaakım güvenlik kavramına getirdikleri eleştirilerin hakikaten mevcut güvenlik kavramının ötesine geçip geçemedikleri sorusu sorulmuştur. Bu tezin asıl derdi, mevcut güvenlik kavramı ve etrafında oluşan meselelere eleştirel bir yaklaşım sunan çağdaş iki teorinin sundukları eleştiri ve katkıların mevcut güvenlik kavramının ötesine geçip geçemediklerinin bir soruşturmasıdır. Yapılan

soruşturmanın sonucunda, her iki görüşün de mevcut güvenlik kavramına ciddi eleştiriler sundukları, hristiyanlıkla olan bağlarının ifşa edildiği, demokrasi ve özgürlük ve haklarla olan temel uyumsuzluklarının gösterildiği ve fakat düşmanın ötekileştirmesi adı altında insandışılaştırılması ve savaş arenasında arkaik bir tepki olarak köleliğin tekrardan çeşitli şekillerde ortaya çıkmasına bir çare sunamadıkları ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Keimeler: David Campbell, Kopenhag Güvenlikleştirme Okulu, Ole Waever, Güvenlik, Soğuk-Savaş sonrası dönem

To us.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very happy to find a chance to offer my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Cem Hoca at the beginning of my thesis that is written under his guidance. He is not only my supervisor during my thesis study; he is the man who teaches us how to shrug shoulders with innocence. I am very thankful to him for his everlasting and lively courses during my education. And I know, I will remember him with his vivacity. I also thank very much Ömür Hoca for rigorous feedbacks and detailed reading, and I also thank Pınar Hoca for her thoughtful criticisms and comments in the Examining Committee.

Let me present my apologies to readers while confessing Arman Konukçu's contributions to my thesis. I am sorry but Arman's rhythm is nearly in everywhere of this thesis, without him perhaps it would be different. Arman would say for former sentence for instance, of course, it would be Elfesiya! How can it not be different? Yeah, he does not much like perhaps, but still he is cool.

And also I should mention names of Süleyman and Rasim with cheer and amity. It is fun to listen their mockeries about my never-ending writing process. Perhaps, I could not finish this study if I would not have my precious friends, Eda, Tekin, Didar, Burak, Fikret, and all the others. Last but not least, I want to thank Department of Public Administration of Mersin University where I spend enjoyable times with them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.
ABSTRACT	Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.
ÖZ	Hata! Yer işareti tanımlanmamış.i
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. CAMPBELL’S CRITICAL OUTLOOK TO MAINSTREAM SECURITY STUDIES: FEAR POLITICS AND RE-PRODUCTION OF METAPHYSICAL DUALITIES	8
2.1 Alternative Approach of David Campbell to Classical IR Theories	8
2.2 Critical Reading of the Notion of Security	9
2.3 Epistemic Position of Campbell	11
2.4 Contingency and Performative Features of Identity	14
2.5 Derrida and “ <i>coup de force</i> ”	15
2.6 Campbell’s Response to “Postmodern Approaches”	17
2.7 Deconstruction of the Security and Foreign Policy	18

2.8 An Alternative Approach to The Periodization of The History of International Relations	20
2.8.1 Blumenberg-Löwith Debate on Legitimacy of Progress.....	20
2.8.2 Evangelism of Fear, or Fearful Apparatus of Statist Discourse	25
2.9 From Bio-Medical Discourse to The Myth of The Unity of Nation.....	29
2.10 Empirical Studies on U.S. Foreign Policy and Wars Narratives	30
2.11 Levinas Ethics, Love for The Other and Call for Rethinking IR Theories	34
2.12 Contributions of Critical Approaches of Campbell to Current Security Debates	36
3. THE POLITICS OF SECURITIZATION: SECURITIZATION PROCESS AS SPEECH ACT AND THE ROLE OF DESECURITIZATION FOR DEMOCRATIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	39
3.1 Copenhagen Securitization School: Main Theoretical Features.....	39
3.2 “Natural Necessity” of International Politics: “Men Rule Wherever They Can”	40
3.3 The Judgments about Justice in International Politics: Specialization of Public Issues and Public Safety	40
3.4.1 An Alternative Approach to International Politics: Arendtian Action Theory	42
3.4.2 Core Ideas of Copenhagen Securitization School: Desecuritization and the Sociology of Durkheim.....	43
3.5 Durkheimian Concept of Conscience Collective.....	44
3.6 Political Attitude of Copenhagen Securitization School: What is a Theory?	45
3.7 Securitization as a Process: Applying Speech Act Theory.....	45
3.8 Three Questions of Theory and Three Components of Securitization School	46

3.9 The Conditions of Possibility of Security as Performative Act.....	49
3.9.1 Transcendental Signified and the function of threat in IR	50
3.10 The Debate on Security Mode of Handling Issues and Casual Mechanism of Securitization.....	50
3.11 Theoretical Components of Copenhagen Securitization School: Speech Act theory, Action Theory and “Transcendental Signified”.....	53
3.12 The Political, Decision and Schmittian Debate on Who Will Take the Decision	54
3.13 The Word “Eikos” and Conventional Features of International Politics: Re-Thinking Our “Judgments about Justice”	56
3.14 Conclusion: The Necessity to Constitute New Definitions for International Politics	56
4. DE-HUMANIZATION OF THE ENEMY, HUMAN RIGHTS AS A PERFECTION OF THE UNIVERSAL ABOLISHMENT OF THE SLAVERY	58
4.1 Comparison of the Critical Security Approach of Campbell and Copenhagen Securitization School	58
4.2 Copenhagen Security School	59
4.3 Locating Campbell and CSS into the Content of Certain Older Distinctions of Political Theory: Fear, Love and Enemy, Courage.....	64
4.4 General Summary of the Comparison of the Campbell and CSS.....	67
4.5 Dismantling Security: Inadequacy of the Classical Cartography as a Tool in IR Studies	68
4.6 Abolishment of the Slavery and Necessities of Right to Have Rights	68
4.7 Human Rights, Distance vs. Boundaries: Fear politics, Openness and Dehumanization of the enemy	69
4.8 Conclusion: Possession of Rights as Perfection of the Universal Abolishment of Slavery	71

5. CONCLUSION.....	73
REFERENCES.....	80
APPENDICES	
A. Türkçe Özet.....	84
B. Tez Fotokopisi İzin Formu.....	89

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis I will examine two relatively current international relations theories which aim to dismantle the concept of security. Both of these theories are concerned with the security policies of modern states and their main presuppositions. I am interested with these theories and their alternative approaches to security based international order in the context of following question: what are the limits of these approaches and whether these theories able to go beyond the current limits of mainstream security studies?

Before proceeding, let me begin with a story. In the *Great Wall of China* Kafka (1993) narrates the story of construction of the Great Wall as a first person narrator and as a native Chinese with his own sense of humor. Let me touch on this sense of humor which is hidden in the story. The story narrated by the native Chinese man about his time and his country starts with the news about the accomplishment of the northern part of the Great Wall and after this news a private investigation starts. The investigation on the architecture of the construction of the wall leads this man to ask certain questions which were postponed during the construction, but since construction was over, the narrator finds the right to impose these questions. Because, the inquiry on the construction and the aims of the wall were the boundaries of the narrator's life story and as it is finished, he wishes to investigate his own construction of life. The method of this investigation, the desire to investigate is a hesitant desire and the narrator seems ready to renounce telling the story because, "There was no other way ... except the way it happened". But still this is not same as *Candide's* optimism¹ on what happens because; this Chinese man was not sure even during the construction.

¹ "A novel of satire by Voltaire, in which a long series of calamities happens to the title character, an extremely naive and innocent young man, and his teacher, Doctor Pangloss. Pangloss, who reflects the optimistic philosophy of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, nevertheless insists that, despite the calamities, "all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds."(Hirsch, 2002: 88)

After inquiry on the construction of the wall, narrator starts to tell another story which is about the relation between the emperor and his people. Kafka portrays the relation between people and their emperor as an intimate relation, which waits to be fulfilled. Each and every person in this country wait the herald to bring the message of the emperor, but there are lots of circles around the emperor and the herald must first deal with them, and waiting the message of emperor is transformed in to “hopelessly and full of hope” engagement between a dead man, because emperor sends his herald in his death bed and his “pathetic subject”. Identification of people as a woman is a classical narrative that was used in Hebrew and Bible such as “Church is the bride of Christ” and the husband figures were replaced from time to time with reference to gods, and emperors but, the analogy of people as a wife always remain same. But, in this story Kafka distorts this classical narrative of husband-wife allegory and he replaces it with narrating the story of desperate intended bride and the man in his death bed. The Great Wall that protects people from the outsiders of the wall is not the only wall because there are lots of other walls within the country and even around the emperor, then narrator has to stop his investigation, because he realizes that the investigation of weakness appears the source of “ways of unifying” his people. And for this reason, he does not wish to go any further, due to the hesitation that trembles his feet, since this is the ground where they live.

I introduce this story of Kafka, because it seems relevant to the questions of this thesis and further it may provide the chance to explain my arguments on modern role of courage in the discussion on the duality of fear and love. Furthermore, I will also mention Judith Butler’s views on gender without going in detail, because I will present certain parts of her approach with regard to my topic. The analogy in Kafka’s story concerning the bondage between wife and husband with the bondage between the people and emperor may be thought together with Butler’s criticisms of gender politics and perhaps we might extend the investigation which Kafka left.

In this story the allegory of the construction of the wall for protection against the attacks of the northern nomads and the architectural design of the wall refer to the construction of the identity of the Chinese society. In the story, narrator first explains the construction method of the wall, and this method, besides its impracticality for

protection, has an incomprehensible structure, since the construction of wall is based on the separation of sections instead of continuity. Workers had to travel between north to south and east to the west part of the wall. Hence, the wall will not take the “form of a circle but only a sort of quarter or half circle”. After telling these difficulties in the construction process of the wall and its absolute impracticality and its uselessness for the protection (because “there are said to be gaps which have never been built in at all”), the narrator tells another “wall” which is constructed within the construction process of the Great Wall. In the construction process of the Great Wall, there is a structure which is organized and constructed according to certain rules that aim to form a circle to unify people around the Great Wall and narrator tells that as opposed to first construction method, this second one has no gap. “Every countryman was a brother for whom they were building a protective wall and who would thank him with everything he had and was for all his life. Unity! Unity! Shoulder to shoulder, a coordinated movement of the people, their blood no longer confined in the limited circulation of the body but rolling sweetly and yet still returning through the infinite extent of China” (Kafka, 1993: 133).

One may argue that the topic Kafka has chosen is archaic and it is not relevant to our modern world, but the construction of the Berlin Wall proves that Kafka’s visions are in fact modern ones. Many scholars argue that after the fall of the Berlin Wall the Cold-War era has finished and in international relations new politics has emerged, and the promises of this new era and the demands of people have changed. In this thesis I will examine two post-Cold-War theories of security in international relations, because both of these theories agree on the idea that after the Cold-War era the term security and its references should be re-examined. Although their standpoints and views on security are different from each other in accordance with their definitions of security, both of them convey ideas derived from “post-modern” theories.

The word security has been central in international relations, and in mainstream understanding of this discipline the meaning of security has been mostly discussed. Besides, these discussions and the relation between politics and war have been re-evaluated by scholars during the Cold War era. The two approaches that will be examined in this study could be summarized as an inquiry on the understanding of

the security and the revisions of the main assumption of the security politics. In this regard, I am interested in these approaches on the question that whether these approaches are enabled to go beyond the limits of current security studies.

The security in the mainstream understanding is defined in accordance with “lack” and the priority of this lack comes to existence as a necessity of the sovereign states and so, state as an agency should always care this lack. The priority of security over being the possession of rights and personality has been mostly discussed within political philosophy. This thesis aims to contribute to this discussion by examining the critical approaches toward traditional understanding of security and its relations with rights, in particular at the times of the “lack of security” and the importance of the realization of Human rights. Although, discussions on Human Rights and its realizations are open-ended and there are lots of debates on this issue, in this thesis I will mostly concentrate on the possession of rights and its relations with states, under conditions of insecurity.

The logic of necessity, security and de-humanization of enemy has been established through the priority of the “lack” of security. Although, this rank is not established during the Cold-War era, and the foundation of this thought has been evolved through certain phases, the modern understanding of international order has been established with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The idea of modern states and international order has been re-challenged with the idea of universal human rights and according to that each and every human being had bestowed with certain rights without referring any state or power. The idea of possessing rights as a human being has shown itself in Hegel’s *Philosophy of Right*, and according to Hegel “personality implies, in general, a capacity to possess rights, and constitutes the conception and abstract basis of abstract right. This right, being abstract, must be formal also. Its mandate is: Be a person and respect others as persons” (Hegel, 2001, s. 53). Hence, being a person is a modern idea because it does not belong to any particular people or class but it encompasses each and every person to accomplish its form. The idea of the “capacity to possess rights” was challenged many times during the “times of security problems” and the “personality” of enemy was annihilated because of the necessities of international order. In this regard, the annihilation of the personality of the enemy can be thought in comparison to the universal declaration of human rights.

One of the concerns of my investigation in this thesis is that, after the annihilation of the enemy's personality, how can we formulate what is left behind the annihilation and its relation with slavery. Because, as a modern idea, human rights declares that "no one shall be held in slavery or servitude" (Article 4), however, I think in the theatre of war the enemy's personality has been lost and the possibility of slavery re-emerges.

In the following chapter of thesis I will illustrate one of the first post-Cold War approaches to the re-examination of security mainly in the context of the analyses of the U.S. foreign policies during the Cold-War. I will present the critical studies on security by David Campbell and try to illuminate his criticism toward realist school in international relations theories. Campbell's main criticism stems from post-modern thought in last century, and its ambivalent position toward modern subject and the foundation of it. In this regard, Campbell argues that like modern subject's attachment with pre-modernity, (in particular with the Judeo-Christian tradition) as assumed by post-modern thought modern states also have the same continuity with Christendom and the rupture proposed by modernity has not been achieved yet. Hence, the archaic tactics of Church by appealing to fear politics are still valid for modern states. Furthermore, the continuity of this fear politics that has been inherited by Church to modern states is also used not only for external enemies but also used to discipline population in domestic politics. There are two different foreign policy approaches which are distinguished by their aims and tactics. According to this claim the Foreign Policy (with capital F) refer to the idea, Campbell argues, that consists of fear politics of the U.S. foreign policy which always refers to an absolute enemy. The constitution of the national identity, Campbell claims always needs "enemy" since, the "performatively constituted identity" of nation always needs to referent object outside of itself.

The same goes with the story of the Great Wall of China, the constitution of the wall for protecting the country provides the chance for the constitution of homogenous and unified, and docile body of population. As an antidote to this "enclosure", Campbell suggests new ethical ways of conducts between people to overcome this enclosure, that is to say, to annihilate the fear between people and instead of nationally separated people he aims to diminish the boundaries which constituted

nation-states. Campbell's criticism of the security policy and fear politics of modern states is helpful to see the link between personality and the identity of a state. Because, states approve the personality of people if and only if they belong to particular state, and in the enemy based politics, the personality of people is annihilated.

In the third chapter of this thesis I will introduce Copenhagen Securitization School and their analysis of security process. This school focuses on the "process of security" and new international order after the fall of the Berlin Wall. According to this view, instead of singular nation state, there are new formations in international order which are established through regional separation. Although, in time the scope of analysis has been transformed from particular states into the security complexes, the reason behind the security process is same. According to this view security is a speech act and it depends on the existential threat of the established social values. This theory focuses on security as a process and examining each part of this process according to the relation between securitization actor and audience reaction to this speech act of security. As opposed to the classical understanding of military based security agenda, the Copenhagen School members consider security in a broader agenda which gives the central role to discursivity. Hence, this theory provides new perspective unlike the realist school understanding of military-based security understanding.

In the fourth chapter, I try to compare these two theories according to their understanding of security and states policies in the time of "security problems". My investigation on these theories will turn to endeavor to find alternative answers to my original question: what would be possible contribution of these theories on dismantling security and security based politics to exceed logic of necessity in IR and their possible solutions for de-humanization of enemy/other. The fact that, both of these theories are discontent with classical understanding of security and its possible contributions, and in this thesis I will demonstrate the limits and the scope of these approaches according to their own axioms and aims.

In the story of Great Wall of China, Kafka investigates how people purchase the feeling of being secure at the expense of their power. The concept of right to

possession of right aims to abolish this exchange and also aims to abolish the archaic analogies established long before. Hence, conception of security as a lack and de-humanization of enemy are a challenge before our world that warns us to make an investigation on our situation. The de-humanization of enemy in favor of security problems, necessities and power politics may provide certain feeling of security in particular situations but, the idea of being a person, having the right for possession of rights, demands courage of not hoping to wait a message from higher authority to oneself to possess this right.

CHAPTER 2

CAMPBELL'S CRITICAL OUTLOOK TO MAINSTREAM SECURITY STUDIES: FEAR POLITICS AND RE-PRODUCTION OF METAPHYSICAL DUALITIES

This section of my thesis is organized to introduce one of the current approaches in international relations which aims to criticize mainstream tendency in the discipline. After the end of the Cold War era, critical attitudes toward the presuppositions of the theories of international relations have become effective. The effects of postmodern thought on international relations have been mostly emphasized by the scholars of this discipline. This section could simply be summarized as a discussion of the projection of “postmodern theories” onto international relations. To be more specific, I will try to re-organize postmodern approach in international relations with particular attention to the notion of security, and with particular focus on David Campbell's work

2.1 Alternative Approach of David Campbell to Classical IR Theories

Let me begin by focusing on the new security approach of David Campbell, as opposed to “classical” approaches. He concentrates on the notion of security, foreign policy and sovereignty. It would not be an exaggeration to encapsulate his theory as an extension of postmodern thought into international relations (Campbell, 1998b :epilogue). His arguments mainly depend on the criticisms of mainstream international relation theories, realism, anarchic system of international arena, or power politics. As opposed to these approaches to international relations (IR), he introduces new possibilities that could enable us to grasp alternative politics in global era. Moreover, these new possibilities according to Campbell would save us from the

dominance of power politics and allow new approaches to “democracy”. To reveal these possibilities, the classical approaches should be read critically and as Campbell has quoted from Michel Foucault “practicing criticism is a matter of making facile gesture difficult” (Foucault, 1977-1984: 154-155).

Since his project is highly extensive for this thesis, I will focus on his criticism concerning the notion of security and the way this notion is employed in international relations and foreign policy. Then, I will concentrate on Campbell’s researches on the Cold War era, the Gulf War and the civil war in Bosnia. By doing that I will clarify his “alternative approaches”, then I will discuss his theory within the framework of contemporary human rights debates, and whether it is worth to pay attention to his work for overcoming human rights abuses in international relations, civil wars and humanitarian interventions.

2.2 Critical Reading of the Notion of Security

Campbell’s criticisms begin with an attack to “mainstream”, “traditional narratives” in international relations theory. The question he pursues could be introduced as; what do IR theorists think (imply) about when they think or talk about security?

Campbell differentiates his “interpretive approach” from “international relations theories” which are, for him, based on the “the political relations among states”. Although the banality of this approach according to Campbell is accepted by many, its usefulness to grasp the “process of understanding global life in particular way” (Campbell, 1998b: 18) provides its legitimization. These theories however, according to Campbell, depend on the assumption concerning the division between theory and practice, while interpretive approach sees “theory as practice”. Disconnecting theory from practice causes missing the “reciprocal agonism between indeterminacy and determinacy; which is a fundamental condition of possibility for political life” (1998b: preface).

While Campbell explains his attitude as opposed to traditional international relation theories, basically realist/classical theories, he uses the concept of “history of present” suggested by Michel Foucault; he begins by clarifying what he does not

understand from this concept, or more clearly what is the major contribution of this concept in criticizing classical-modern theories. According to him, history of present does not “try to capture the meaning of the past, nor does it try to get a complete picture of the past as a bounded epoch” (Campbell, 1998b: 5) whereas history of present as a mode of analysis “asks how certain terms and concepts have historically functioned within discourse” (Campbell, 1998b: 6). Hence, it could be possible to read the history of present as an attitude which provides making genealogy of “traditional narratives” which are hitherto accepted as historical facts and truth, and then it serves to reveal possible alternatives, ways and interpretations that have been ignored according to modern way of fatalism.

One may argue that creating an alternative approach to “mainstream” (IR) theories to go beyond the existing dilemmas and differentiating it from “problem-solving” understanding on the one hand, but claiming not to construct a discipline on the other, creates certain methodological difficulties. This is perhaps the weakest part of his theory. Asserting to be an alternative approach to mainstream, existing and approved theories at least on the ground of their “scientific proof” tacitly professes that these theories are not based on scientific ground. More interestingly than that, Campbell, though referring to Foucault nearly in almost all in his book, he seems not sensitive enough to the discussions on philosophy of science, methodology and the criteria of acceptance of scientific proof and lastly and maybe most importantly, debate on the possibility of separating between scientific knowledge from metaphysical thought.

He introduces “postmodern” approaches to IR to illuminate the dark side of foreign policy of “sovereign states” which according to him, always proffers the “impossibility of any other chance”, “realm of necessity”, “extraordinary cases” or no other alternatives to legitimize its actions. However, the critical inquiry on security, foreign policy and “anarchic states system” aims to reveal possible ways to avoid mainstream narratives and instead to introduce new “conditions of possibility” for political life which do not depend on the deep-seated dualities: self/other, us/them, inside/outside and so on.

From now on, the inquiry on the deep-seated philosophical duality that Campbell concentrates on will be analyzed in this thesis. Furthermore, in this chapter though Campbell himself does not directly concentrate on the ethical duality between good and evil, I will attempt to bring this duality to discussion. The discussion on the duality of good and evil may open new possibilities for thinking the relations between other as an enemy/evil. I will also discuss Campbell's assertion on the deep-continuities between Christian thought, Christendom, and modern-sovereign-state. Such thesis of continuity will be examined when we introduce Campbell's analyses on foreign policy and how foreign policy is shaped through the discourse of "society of security".

2.3 Epistemological Position of Campbell

To illustrate Campbell's new alternative interpretation, his criticism of "traditional" IR theories on the ground of epistemology has crucial importance both for explicating his epistemological position and the reasons behind his assertion that all theories in IR hitherto been accepted should be evaluated in the same pot. He differentiates his attitude as opposed to epistemic realism which, according to him, could be defined as "whereby the world comprises objects the existence of which is independent of ideas or beliefs about them". Epistemic realism provides only the "logic of explanation" and "narrativizing historiography" as epistemic tools to create "meta-theoretical discourse amongst practitioners of the discipline of international relations" (Campbell, 1998b: 20). After that, Campbell draws the boundary between his interpretive attitude and epistemic realism and he traces back the tools of this epistemology to find where/when and -if possible- how these tools were used by practitioners. The inquiry on these traces however follows two different ways and sometimes it is even bifurcated.

Campbell appeals to ideas of Noam Chomsky on the Cold War, some epistemic realist thinkers to reveal their attitudes, though most of them are not IR theorists at least not professionally. His critique toward those thinkers according to their epistemic position could be interpreted as an intellectual criticism to find new possibilities in understanding the period called the Cold War. At certain points the

sound of these criticisms comes into ears a little bit angry. There are certain questions arising, for instance: if epistemology of these thinkers is wrong from the very beginning (because they aim to find knowledge of the given) then how Campbell himself could cultivate an expectation of consistency in their thoughts. Furthermore, most of those thinkers have publicly spoken their “own” ideas on the war situations in which their country was one of the sides. Therefore, their ideas might be coming not from a professional perspective of a “thinker” or “philosopher” or from the view of a “practitioner” but from a member of society.

To overcome the major dualities in IR theories Campbell traces back all these dualities to the duality between discursive and nondiscursive. He argues that this duality provides adequate positions to traditional narratives to practice their arguments. Furthermore, thanks to this duality these narrators could work in a place where theory is separated from the practical and hence correspondence of their theory to practical is not a matter of discussion. This provides them somehow arbitrary power that could discipline the identity of “nation” and it gives “author-ity” to define “who we are”. To go beyond these narratives he suggests to deconstruct the duality between discursive and non-discursive realms, and yet such deconstruction is not suggesting discursive having priority over the nondiscursive. He is clearly against prioritization: Most famous formulations are condensed in “if discourse is all there is” “if everything is language” or “if there is no reality”. However by claiming these, he thinks that they tacitly accept two separate realms, discursive and nondiscursive. According to Campbell, when the current debates on language, interpretation and understanding in the natural and social sciences are considered such criticisms are no longer innocently sustainable, and such argument, though used to oppose to heretics by true believers, “they cannot be put forward as a self-evident truth” (Campbell, 1998b: 6). Campbell accepts the idea that the world exists independently of language, but without appealing to language and traditional interpretation, conceiving the world is impossible. He constitutes his epistemology on the ground of the two opposite methodologies. He differentiates his epistemology from epistemic realism: his methodology differs from epistemological realism at the point of rejecting the possibility of knowing “real” world without any “medium”, “language” or “interpretation”. This is a typical rationalist claim contra realist’s

arguments defending the possibility of “immediate” knowledge. He clarifies his epistemology by referring to Laclau and Mouffe’s arguments on discursive and nondiscursive knowledge. It would be proper to quote the following long passage to make easy to grasp Campbell's attitude. Laclau and Mouffe argue that “the fact that every object is constituted as an object of discourse has nothing to do with whether there is a world external to thought or with the realism/idealism opposition... What is denied is not that... objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute themselves as objects outside of any discursive condition of emergence.”(Laclau; Mouffe, 2001: 108). Campbell directly quotes these sentences in his books to make clear his methodology, as opposed to epistemic realism which provides him the logic of explanation, cataloging, calculating and specifying “real causes” (Campbell/Dillon (eds) 1993:8) whereas the logic of interpretation provides to expand “the domain of social and political inquiry” (Campbell, 1998b: 7).

Hence, the claim that “there is nothing outside of discourse” according to Campbell provides the opportunity to grasp the “textual nature” of the world politics and international relations. Moreover, this methodology as opposed to classical interpretations accepts the power of documentations -which according to Foucault- society is always bound up.

Furthermore, by entering into the “polemical conflict” between Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, Campbell propounds Derrida’s declaration (Campbell, 1993: 18, notes:10)“there is nothing outside the text” to examine foreign policy in the context of how “referents signified as belonging to “external” reality are in actuality “internal” to discourse”(Campbell, 1993: 9). For instance, “departmental summaries, National Security Council papers, Presidential Decision documents, and memoranda of all kinds... and so on” play the role of medium which allows the decision-making the very conditions of possibility for internalizing the “external reality” into discourse. Against such narrowing, the enlargement of interpretive imaginations provides to account for recent developments instead of accepting classical narratives.

This brief discussion on Campbell’s “approach” to methodology and epistemology indicates that his aim to create new ways for thinking the “other” is flourished within

the same ground that he criticized, deconstructed, and responded by Campbell himself. It is possible to claim that this theoretical discussion is somehow exaggerated by me. However, when this discussion springs to “knowledge” of violence, this sensitivity on methodology will be well understood.

2.4 Contingency and Performative Features of Identity

To grasp Campbell’s outlook to the USA’s foreign policy, and the way it is constituted one should focus on his ideas concerning the relation between identity, and its performative characteristics. The contingency of international relations and its absorptions by foreign policy through the discourse of security is problematized in his interpretive approach. According to him, “identity is an inescapable dimension of being” (1998b:9), identity should not be understood as god-given or by nature, it is constituted in “relation to difference”. Moreover it is not determined through intentional behavior or planned action; on the contrary it is always re-constituted and re-shaped through relation with difference/other. The difference also is not constant, or difference in itself, as William Connolly have argued in *Identity and Difference*, it is constituted in relation to identity (2002:204-5). Hence, according to Campbell the relation between identity and difference is performatively constituted and it contains no “foundations that are prior to, or outside of, its operation” (1998b:9). The suggestion of performatively constituted identity which is influenced from Judith Butler’s theory of performatively constituted gender provides new approach to international relations, instead of the traditional approach that has been found on fixed and constant boundaries. This approach introduces performativity and contingency of identity. Campbell claims that, therefore, “the inscription of boundaries that serve to demarcate an “inside” from an “outside” a “self” from an “other” a “domestic” from a “foreign”(1998b:9) is achieved through constitution of identity. Such understanding of identity depends on Judith Butler's criticism of gender, body and sex. Butler’s view as opposed to the claims of unproblematic and naturalized body and gender asserts that body and its sex, or gender has no “originary”, “naturalized” or “prediscursive” domain. The body and its boundary as well as the border between internal and external according to Butler are “tenuously

maintained by the transformation of elements that were originally part of identity into a defiling otherness” (quoted in Campbell, 1998b:9).

Hence identity of body is always on the target of understanding the normal, the accepted and the desirable, to establish these aims there are always codes which constitute body, understanding the gendered identity of the body as performative means that it has “no ontological status apart from the various acts that constitute its reality” (2006:136). Furthermore, the body’s identity which is discursively constructed serves to the purpose of disciplining sexuality and it produces as well the “discourse of primary and stable identity”. Therefore, as Campbell agrees with Butler an identity is constituted “not [through] a founding act, but rather [through] a regulated process of repetition” (2006:133. emphasis in the original).

By appealing to Butler’s performative gender theory Campbell suggests that the state could be understood as having “no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality”. He claims that however, he does not assert that “state is analogous to an individual with a settled identity”. On the contrary, “performative constitution of gender and the body is analogous to the performative constitution of the state” (1998b:10). Therefore, for Campbell, instead of pre-given and stable identity of state, state identity is constituted through a stylized repetition acts, and achieved not through a founding act but various repetitive acts.

2.5 Derrida and “*coup de force*”

Being a performatively constituted identity, the state always needs to appeal to an “origin”, beginning or foundation. Whereas in his earlier work Campbell links this foundation with security dilemma or the threat of the death of the state; however, in his later work, *National Deconstruction*, he appeals to Derrida’s notion of “*coup de force*”. Although, in this later work Campbell advocates performatively constituted identity which draws attention to “the reiterative and citational practice by which discourse produces the effects that it names” (1998b:24), he makes a distinction between these arguments from the constructivist thought which could be briefly articulated as “all things are socially constructed”. Campbell, by appealing to Butler,

separates his position with the concept of “construction”. Construction tacitly refers the two distinct realms: language and the “real world”. Moreover, the distinction between discursive and nondiscursive tacitly makes the assumption of sovereign subject who “volitionally... willfully engages in construction without constraint” (1998b:25). Although the topics of this thesis are not directly related with Derrida and his notion of *coup de force*, to make Campbell’s theory more elicited I will briefly introduce the notion. Finally I will enter into Campbell’s theory of security and the state identity, mainly nation-state.

In his work, *National Deconstruction*, Campbell focuses on Derrida’s famous text, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority and Declaration of Independence”. He refers to this work of Derrida to illuminate the relation between performatively constituted identity and state. The notion *coup de force*, according to Campbell, is illustrative to understand the foundation of nation states, since in this text; Derrida makes a deconstructive inquiry on the relationality between sovereignty, law and violence. To make this argument more clarified, I will briefly introduce Derrida’s thoughts on the mystical foundation of state, law and the role of violence in the very act of this foundation. In reading the American Declaration of Independence, Derrida focuses on the idea that in the act of declaration, the “entity” which the whole declaration has taken its meaning was also established through the act of declaration itself. Hence, the people have been living in the land which now called America had not existed as an entity before this declaration. As Derrida declares, “If it gives birth to itself, as free and independent subject, as possible signer this can only hold in the act of the signature”, hence “the signature invents the signer” (1976:10). Hence, according to Derrida, foundation of all states occurs in a situation that is called revolutionary and self-referential. Derrida calls this feature of states as a “mystical”, since all foundations refer to their foundation as a beginning and inaugurate laws without referring anything other than them. This act of foundation is, as Derrida asserts, nothing but a performative act which produces in the form of “constative act”. It merely “claims, declares, assures it is describing”. Hence, Derrida makes an inquiry on the origin of authority and he asserts that the foundation of ground and the position of law “can’t by definition rest on anything but themselves” (Force of Law: 14).

The notion *coup de force* plays crucial role in this act of foundation and in the position of law, since in the very foundation of states, the violence, which is nothing but performative act, also could ground foundation for the very act of the foundation of state and law. Hence *coup de force* can take any number of forms that depends on the performative act of foundation of the state, entity and authority. Since it is the violence which constitutes the very ground of authority that sets the separation of legitimate and illegitimate acts. Hence, the state and the law that provide the conditions of possibility of the separation of legitimate and illegitimate are themselves beyond this duality and it always depends on contingency. There are positive effects of this assertion which provides going beyond current dead-locks of politics and democracy; however it always contains the risks of deification of state and its power. Since, nobody has the performative power than the state, and then state is defined as “a monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force”.

2.6 Campbell’s Response to “Postmodern Approaches”

I have introduced certain concepts and main resources that are incorporated by Campbell into the criticism of “traditional” IR theories. Firstly, I have presented his standpoints with respect to those theories which ignore the “conditions of the possibility” of politics and the contingency of life. Furthermore, Campbell directly focuses on the main assumption of these traditions providing crosscheck of the truth of these assumptions. Hence, the pre-given assumptions of these approaches always function as an Archimedes’ point that serves to verify the claims of these approaches.

Second, I have tried to clarify Campbell’s perspective with respect to postmodern approaches. I have introduced his viewpoint on contingency of identity, both at the level of individuals and states, and how identity is constituted through performative acts underlining the impossibility of the fixation of identity. In this regard I have briefly introduced Butler’s critical approach on discursive features of gender, body and sex. Although Butler focuses on the disciplines of body according to the technology of the constitution of female identity, Campbell has made an analogy between performative constitution of gender and body with performative constitution of the state. However, to make an analogy between performative constitution of the

state and the body is not an unproblematic analogy, and Campbell does not seem to take this problem seriously.

Finally I focused on Campbell's epistemic attitude with regard to his distance from epistemic realism. By this separation he illuminates his position with regard to the impossibility of the separation between discursive and nondiscursive realms. He argues that this distinction, although it has been used to exclude non-believers in Christian discourse, after the postmodern inquires on language and its relations with the problem of meaning became invalid. Hence, I have presented the main pillars of Campbell's thought when he pursues his criticism at mainstream IR theories and defends his epistemic attitude. Let me now focus on his attempt for deconstructing the conceptions of security and foreign policy.

2.7 Deconstruction of the Security and Foreign Policy

I will now concentrate on Campbell's criticisms of the relation between "constant articulation of danger" in IR and state's identity or existence. His main arguments on this matter depend on his theoretical articulation that I have presented in the previous section. His criticism focuses on the idea that the constant articulation of danger that has been interpreted as the main threat to the existence of a state according to the traditional "representations of international politics" leads us to miss the very conditions of possibility of international politics. He asserts that this misinterpretation arises from the effects of epistemic realism on IR theories. However having "no ontological status apart from the many and varied practices that constituted" the reality, states are directly opposed to the situation of a fixed and constant identity (1998a:11). Since the traditional interpretations in IR depend on the main arguments of epistemic realism, they accept danger as a pre-given issue which should be eliminated among states. Furthermore, because the objects of danger have been interpreted as a security problem to the very existence of a state, diminishing the security problem has been the foremost target in IR and nearly all relations among states have been understood through this paradigm. Campbell's main challenge to these arguments depends on the idea that if security is defined through the absence of the movement, then the state "would cease to exist" (1998a:12).

Ironically, the inability of the state projects of security provides a chance to be a guarantor of identity for the state.

Campbell's analyses on danger and security of the state identity mainly concentrate on the relation between performative constitution of identity in a contingent way as opposed to the dominance of power politics and interpretation of danger without appealing to the antagonism between discursive and non-discursive realms. Therefore, with this theoretical articulation it is proper to examine Campbell's criticism of constant articulation of danger through foreign policy and the historical roots of this tradition in detail.

Grasping how the identity of the state has been shaped in modern era needs to concentrate on the rupture between Christendom and modernity, which began with the Peace of Westphalia (1648). In the traditional narratives of IR this event has been interpreted as a turning point, since, the Westphalian moment signifies the beginning of the new era in IR, and furthermore, the history of modern Europe after this moment has been interpreted as "a history of sovereign states acting in a multistate system" (1998a:41). This era is however not only depicted by referring to the terms "independence", "sovereignty", "nonintervention" and "international law". According to Campbell, the teleological understanding about modern state which directly refers to the historical process about centralized territorial modern states has also risen. Hence, with the Westphalian moment states are understood as natural outcome of historical process that revealed in Europe and as opposed to Christendom signifying harmony- at least on the ground of diplomacy- between states as opposed to traditional anarchy. Campbell pursues a short genealogy of international relations of Europe from Christendom to Westphalia and he concentrates on the idea of "Westphalia as a rupture". Although according to classical theories in IR the Westphalian moment "constitutes the conditions of possibility for the discipline" (1998a:41), and it establishes an origin for the history of sovereign states, he asserts that these are nothing but "statist discourse of international relations" (1998a:4). By relying on certain contributions of historical sociology Campbell asserts that these arguments have been challenged and the idea of clear-cut distinction between Christendom and the Westphalian moment has been falsified in the context of social formation and homogeneous and settled identities. Hence, the interpretation of the

Westphalian moment as a rupture and, accepting this moment as the origin of “subsequent sovereign states” only serve for the legitimization of statist discourse in international relations.

2.8 An Alternative Approach to the Periodization of the History of International Relations

The classical periodization on IR has been challenged by various disciplines such as historical sociology, theology and legal theory and Campbell praise some of them to clarify his arguments. Although the periodization of IR has already been challenged by various studies according to Campbell, it is proper to focus on the relation between Christendom and modern sovereign states in the context of the discourse of danger and security. In this context he appeals to two important figures of modern social theory whose arguments mostly reject the thesis of rupture between Christendom and modern “self-assertive constitution of” identity. Let me now present the debate between Blumenberg and Löwith which seems to be central for Campbell's view on security.

2.8.1 Blumenberg-Löwith Debate on the Legitimacy of Progress

In *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* (1983), Hans Blumenberg investigated the modern idea of progress and its legitimacy. His inquiry mainly concentrated on the discussion on modernity and its links with Christianity through secularism and the idea of progress. In the intellectual climates of his time his thesis was opposed to the thesis of another German social scientist Karl Löwith. This is known as Blumenberg-Löwith debate and Blumenberg, in the first part of his book, focuses on the thesis that modernity is nothing but the secularization of Christian way of thinking especially, “eschatology of secularization” and “re-occupation of ‘old’ positions” by modern way as claimed by Löwith. However, there was a rupture in Christian thought itself according to Blumenberg and it divides Christianity itself into two; the early Christianity and the medieval one. This rupture, he asserts, oscillates between the Hellenistic idea of *pronoia* (Providence) and biblical eschatology. According to

Blumenberg the rupture is about the fear of “the end of world” that mostly spreads from the church itself. But he remarks that this fear was firstly and mostly shared by early fathers of church because “expectation of an apocalypse as compensation for an interest directed at the world and at history, can itself only be ‘worldly’”(Blumenberg, 1983, s. 41). This Christian eschatology, therefore, was established through a separation from both Hellenistic view and Judaic tradition. Furthermore, early church fathers those re-interpreters of Christianity to accomplish this mission, invent new genre called *kerygma*, the Greek word used in New Testament for preaching. This genre however should be thought with apocalypse that will come as a revelation of the will of God though it is never desired or at least wished. The discussion on the break within Christianity illuminates first how states inherited the genre of *kerygma* (preaching) as a strategy for protecting their identity. Second, the discussion on “evangelism of fear” in particular in the U.S foreign policy that Campbell concentrates in his interpretive approach has excluded the “fear of the death of the state” by these policy makers themselves, since there is no possibility to know their “intentions” apart from the texts they left. Furthermore, the state elites or experts of IR theories vis. their very existence (profession, the place in society etc.) depend on the existence (survival) of the state itself the feeling of being in danger through their analyses is not only matter of mere “illusion” or “delusion” but material conditions of their being. Hence, the Weberian concept of *verstehen* that is aiming to put yourself into another's shoes to understand someone through its perspective is not a matter of “old” positivism as Campbell claims (Campbell, 1998b: 23).

Campbell’s reading of *The Legitimacy of Modern Age* concentrates on third and fourth chapters of the book and he is interested in the modern concepts of self-assertion, secularization (*Verweltlichung*: becoming worldly). This is related with his thesis the relation between church and church in the context of fixation of identity through concerning determining place of man in the world. Campbell’s interpretation of *Legitimacy of Modern Age* mainly has two points. The first one is on the discussion of the continuity between Christian thought, which has been materialized through the churches, and modern, scientific thought that has been shaped by modern nation-state. This historical periodization as opposed to the arguments that modernity is nothing but secularization of eschatology indicates the

differences between modern and medieval epochs. In this separation, scientific thinking and self-assertion of individual could not be interpreted basically as the secularization of Christian concepts in modern way. Blumenberg does not condemn modernity as a new way of Christianity but he calls for re-thinking on the history of progress to overcome Christian roots and so as to find antidotes for the discontents of modernity.

On the other hand, by accepting the differences between these two epochs Campbell concentrates on the criticism of Blumenberg on the supposed similarity between them. To make this claim more clear Campbell appealed to the continuity between Christendom and later period marked by the dominance of state forms in the context of the way mankind interpreted the world. To understand this relation he analyses metaphors illuminating how the identity of “man” was constructed. Under Christendom, theology has the divine power to determine the proper place of men, and his behavior and hence it provided to secure his identity by referring to the omnipotence of the God. However, faced with contingency, self-assertive individual to answer the question of place, has appealed to reason, instead of God. At this point Blumenberg claims that though the solutions that are posed in modern rational era were different from those in mediaeval one, the ways the problems concerning the place of man were posed were similar and the continuity between these two eras at stemmed from that.

To clarify the continuity between Christendom and modern era Blumenberg appeals to the metaphors that are useful to understand this continuity. Although each era had a different metaphor to illuminate common feelings and human actions, he asserts that both eras had the same question which focused on the issue of handling the danger, uncertain and “unfinished world”. The metaphor of unfinished world is the center of this continuity. In mediaeval era the teleology of man has been determined according to his relation with God: man was in a dangerous, sinful world and the salvation of him was no certain. However, this uncertainty provides the condition of possibility of human action, and with the modern era the notion of unfinished world has been transferred to the immanent idea that grounds the modern idea of progress. According to this idea the world is the place where man could hope the completion of his vocation, his proper place whereas this hope will never be realized. Thus the

realization of this aim means that “all the activities of men would be for nothing”(1998a:47).

In brief, Blumenberg has two important arguments about the ground idea of the continuity of Christendom and modern era as opposed to the classical periodization of IR, as Campbell suggests. He appeals to the metaphors, which according to Blumenberg illuminate, the foundation of these two eras, and the main motives of them is nothing but the idea of progress that was shaped according to the teleology of man in uncertain, dangerous world and the idea of progress that is constituted by modern attitude of self-assertion. Since the questions posed were same in both eras, the possible answers that are given in these eras could not provide us the possibility to interpret them in two separate ways. Therefore, according to Blumenberg, though the possible answers given in modern era were secular, the problems were still spiritual. The metaphor “unfinished world” could provide powers to states to replicate themselves so as to replace of the salvation of church, since only the church could protect true Christians from the danger of evil through commands of God. However with the modern age states are the only guarantors of the security of people against the dangers of the uncertain world, possible but uncertain threat of enemy/other.

Blumenberg focused on the identity of “man” in both Christendom and modern era that has been shaped by the modern sovereign state and he asserted that in both eras securing identity has been provided through the help of danger that feeds from the uncertainty of the world. This is the case even though their possible answers are differentiated according to their designated authority to apply. As opposed to Christendom, in modern era, the uncertainty of the world was transformed to the unfinished world that should be interpreted according to reason. Blumenberg’s thesis directly concentrates on the theme of securing identity of men by the spirituality of the question that has been posed in both eras: “how could/should or even ought man to handle with the uncertain, unfinished world?”

The criticism focusing on the periodization of history by appealing to the rupture between faith and reason or Christendom and modern era comes from Derrida as well. Although his inquiries follow different routes from Blumenberg’s, he

concentrates on the relation between the authority and reason and he is interested with the authority of reason. In the text, "The Force of Law" he examines the relation between law and authority in the context of the modern sovereignty whose authority seems to be grounded on the reason. However, after the investigation on the "*coup de force*", he concludes that "reason cannot be the ground for the authority of reason". Since the origin of authority, the foundation or ground, the position of the law can not by definition rest on anything but themselves, they are themselves a violence without ground (1992:14). Hence, the origin of laws and institutions are without essential ground. The assertion however does not mean that the origins of laws are illegal, because "they are prior to law, they are neither legal nor illegal". Derrida's deconstruction of authority aims to reveal the absence, "empty place" of authority, since "the legitimacy of law is undecidable".

The concept of empty place is also used by Claude Lefort to explain the rupture that separated Christendom from modern era. Lefort interprets this rupture by referring to the cutting head of king which symbolizes the empty place of political power that should be filled by political action, and it is the condition of possibility of democracy. Campbell relies both on Derrida's term empty place of authority to underline the mystical foundation of authority and he claims that: the "ethos of deconstructive thought can appreciate the contradictions, paradoxes, and silences of political problems in a complex world, and enable flexible strategies that are neither merely pragmatic nor purely ad hoc by fostering and negotiating their agonistic interdependencies" (Campbell,1998b:242).

Carl Schmitt is another German political theorist whose criticisms on continuity between Christendom and modern sovereign state have influential effects on Campbell's thought. Schmitt's arguments on the continuity between the two eras basically depend on the idea that the concepts of the modern political theories are nothing but the secularized concepts of the medieval eras. Although Blumenberg accepted the role of the Christendom in modern era, Schmitt rejects the idea that transferring of the Christendom to modern sovereign is simply the result of the secularization. Moreover, the authority of reason and scientific rationality that shaped the Enlightenment thought was exaggerated by nineteenth-century Romantics, though the separation of knowledge and faith was not as clear-cut as it

was told. Hence, Blumenberg's objections to the classical periodization in IR and the arguments of Schmitt as well focus on the relation between faith (Christendom) and knowledge (Enlightenment). Firstly, Blumenberg rejects the total rupture between these two eras according to the interpretation of the metaphors of the uncertainty and dangerous world that feeds from the same attitudes. Secondly, as opposed to Schmitt's thesis on the secularization that changed the color of the concepts, forms but not their contents, he asserts that though secularization has the power to change the way the answers given, the questions posed were same with medieval era, since the separation of faith and knowledge was not as clear as it is told.

2.8.2 Evangelism of Fear, or Fearful Apparatus of Statist Discourse

As it is clear, Campbell relies on certain alternative social theories to re-think the relation between the Christendom and modern sovereign states, and his thesis could be summarized by reference to the concept of "evangelism of fear". This phrase is used by Jean Delumeau to reveal the deep roots of Christian doctrine in western culture, pedagogy and its power on the western thought. In the influential work, *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of the Western Guilt Culture, 13Th-18th Centuries* (2007), Delumeau concentrates on the relationality of the guilt cultures that Christianity has continuously cultivated by the help of the idea of sin. The perishability and uncertainty of "this world" has been the object of the scorns from Plato to Saint Paul to Christian Reformers, and this idea, according to Delumeau, has been transformed into the *Contemptu Mundi* (contempt of the world) in Christian world, and it is best represented in the work of Pope Innocent III *De Contemptu Mundi* (On the Contempt of the World). The mentality behind *Contemptu Mundi*, albeit its Christian motives, goes down to ancient Greek attitude toward the perishable world and its effects on the philosophical thought. The pessimistic attitude toward this world designated the place of the man in this world, and the impossibility of finding "proper" place of man in this uncertainty created the cult of guilt, and the contempt of this world (Delumeau, 2007).

The seed of the cult of guilt has been nourished by Christianity with the help of cult of sin, death and immortal life. To gain power from the masses Christianity has

always appealed to the sentiment of fear to ground Christian doctrine. The cult of sin was directly correlated with *Contemptu Mundi* since this perishable world is insufficient to protect man from danger, injustice and finally from death. The desire of man which is determined by his bodily joy could not cause to forget his mortality. Instead the death, the final judge of the God in this world will take him from this perishable world to the eternal punishment. Hence, the power of the church that directly feeds from the fear of the eternal punishment to all sinners has been grounded through the *Contemptu Mundi*. Furthermore the disposition of man to sin because of his body reproduces continuous sense of guilt. These sentiments have always been whipped through the sermons of the church; however, these thoughts, according to Delumeau have mostly spread from the monastery to society because of the historical circumstances such as the Black Death, and the influxes of Turks. All these events have been interpreted through the Christian doctrine and the practices in the monastery. The cult of guilt has spread to the whole society in the fifteen and the sixteen centuries. These doctrines gradually have found dominant place in pedagogy as well, according to Delumeau.

Therefore, following Delumeau, Campbell argues that the cult of guilt that feeds from being sinful and the fear of punishment have penetrated the western thought. Such penetration has created a fruitful space for modern states to develop strategies which discipline society through the enemy who brings “threats to our life”. The concept of evangelism of fear depicts the strategies of modern sovereign state that are inherited from the Christian church and this concept reveals the continuity between Christendom and modern era. Furthermore, the fear of the death in modern era started to signify the “death of sovereignty”, disorder and chaos. Hence, Campbell asserts that “the state project of security replicates the church project of salvation” (1998a: 50). State gains its legitimacy through the promise of security to its citizens; otherwise the manifold of dangers would face them. The threat of the state to its citizens is similar to the church as well; since the church had used the arguments that the unbelievers would be condemned do “unredeemed death”.

In brief, as opposed to classical periodization that defends the clear-cut break between Christendom and the modern state, Campbell asserts that the IR narratives on periodization ignore the common strategies that are used by the church and the

modern state. In this respect, evangelism of fear and cult of guilt have played dominant roles in the construction of the modern state.

The relation between the strategy of evangelism of fear and “considering the war in terms of narrative and the authority (author-ity) to narrate” (Campbell,1993:2) constitutes one of the most important parts of Campbell’s approach. To grasp this relation properly it would be useful to associate this relation with Campbell's criticism concerning the epistemic realism and his inquiry on the textuality of the foreign policy and international relations. Campbell is inspired by Foucault’s arguments that by being a discipline IR create its own experts and power to possess the author-ity about decisions on wars, enemy and danger. Such power, however, could only be realized through the success of the effects of these narratives on people and their attitudes. The reason behind this argument depends on the idea which is opposed to epistemic realism. The order and unity of all could only be possible by discourse the unity of all to maintain the order of things. In this respect, Campbell concentrates on the narratives that are narrated by the authority which possesses the power operating through expertizing.

In the domain of IR the effects of experts are stronger than other realms because of the closedness of the domain and the discourse of the “realm of the necessity”. The rules of the game described through mainstream approaches and the discourse of danger that feeds from the so-called anarchy of the international realm provides the conditions of possibility for the interchange of the discourse of fear and danger. The strategy of the evangelism of fear works both in the segments of society and international realms. However, to grasp this relationality through mainstream narratives is not possible according to Campbell, because of the boundary that made this separation possible. Hence, the demonstration that these theories could only be possible by appealing to themselves; it is nothing but a self-referential system.

This is the manner, Campbell elaborates, the conditions of possibility for the boundary which provides the ground for mainstream narratives and their consequences. These consequences are very probable. The establishment of boundaries that create the possibility of the “securely grounded state” and “the international system” bring along the notion of the “foreign”. The construction of the

foreign works by referring to the separation of the inside and the outside. Yet, the separation that emerges from the boundary is not fixed; on the contrary, it is always subject to the displacements through the position of boundary. Since, it is performatively constituted, the displacement of the boundary and the changing character of the depiction of “the foreign” stem from their relationality with the identity of us, who we are, which is “domestic”. Hence, the fatal notions that work according to the rule of international relations narratives have been constructed through the binary oppositions that always refer back to each other. With the help of the principle of the “reciprocal determination with another term”, the crucial notions of IR seem to work through the rules that constitute order and meaning.

The narratives in IR theories that have grown in the soil of these binary oppositions ignore the performatively constituted features of identity and its relation with difference. Furthermore, these narratives, according to Campbell, exaggerated the differences between Christendom and modern sovereign state to conceal their commonality in the context of appealing to the cult of guilt, and fear. Furthermore, these narratives conceal the “mystical foundation of authority”. The boundary that made oppositional binaries possible always refers to these oppositions to legitimize its validity, while these binaries took their very existences from the existence of the boundary. Hence, it seems like the Kafkaesque story that no one knows the beginning and the end. It is created and works through pre-existing principles that also provides its conditions of possibility of existence.

2.9 From Bio-Medical Discourse to the Myth of the Unity of Nation

After explicating the relationality between oppositional binaries and the conditions of possibility of boundary, Campbell focuses on the outcome of this relationality in the context of shaping of foreign policy, war stories and he endeavors to go beyond these approaches. Firstly, he concentrates on the boundaries that construct the dichotomies such as inside/outside, self/other, and order/disorder. These dichotomies do not only work through territorial separation which shapes the territorial boundaries of modern

state, but also they serve to create possible spaces for the identity construction. The identity of “we” is constructed both through where we live but more importantly according to who we are. The question of “who we are?” is understood according to its binary opposition, that is “who we are not” or even who we are not to be”. The identity of “us” is directly connected with “our” morals and our depiction of the “good”. Hence, the dichotomy of us and them is not only shaped through the territorial space, but also it determines our “moral space” which is different from the “foreign”. Therefore, the discourse of danger can operate through both in territorial danger that threatens our very existence and the danger coming from outside to our moral space which forms our identity. The enemy, threat of death to the moral space of society unlike territorial one could be spread to the identity of society like a disease. The metaphor of disease however is not a coincidence, since the morality of inside is described through the discourse of purity, and originality viz. the outside. The difference is coded through the narrative of defilement, consequently “danger is inherent to that relationship” since “ danger is a part of all our relationship with the world” (1998a:81).

Zygmunt Bauman in the work *Modernity and Holocaust* analyses this analogy between enemy inside “us” and the defilement through the conceptualization of modern “gardening” state, and also views " the society which rules as an object of designing, cultivating and weed-poisoning” (Bauman, 1991) . Bauman asserts that anti-semitics’ view came to an end with Holocaust in Germany. However, nearly all modern states of twentieth century fed from the idea that state should weed out the dangerous “elements” in its garden to construct healthy and harmonious society. The consequence of creating healthy society which is defined through purity and harmony was nothing but refinement of dangerous parts of society such as Jews, Gypsies and other “unhealthy” parts.

The logic of differentiation that was constructed according to the representation of danger which refers to the logic of defilement puts us into prison of particular and closed system of representation. The representation of danger that mostly comes from the discourse of defilement, disease and impurity reckons the society as an organism, body. However, such presupposition concerning the vision of society brings along medical discourse with itself which investigates society through the

“bipolarity of healthy, normal and pathological and abnormal”. The internal structure of this organized being should be arranged against the possible danger which could lead to death of society. Hence, outside of morally and territorially constructed border there is always the possibility of danger, since the separation of good and bad always signs the struggle between evil and goodness. And so without needing to define themselves and their goodness they always condemn others to be evil.

States do not only divide up lands through border lines but also they separate people by appealing to the moral values and “public” safety. As opposed to the territorial safety that was firmly regulated through cartography, and inter-state treaty, the borders of the identity of nation are always subject to manifold of manipulations. The ambiguous depiction of enemy in the “uncertain world” forces “us” to be in vigilance and be aligned against “possible enemy”.

2.10 Empirical Studies on U.S. Foreign Policy and Wars Narratives

Let me now introduce Campbell's interpretations of the U.S. foreign policy and how discourse of threat is used in traditional IR theories. Campbell explains his outlook as “non-essentialist account of danger” and instead of asking how the United States foreign policy serves to the national interest, he examines the way through which the inscription of foreignness into the U.S. foreign policy helps to produce and reproduce the political identity of the doer behind the deed (Campbell, 1998b: Preface X). Hence, instead of analyzing “doer” Campbell mainly concentrates on the “deed” that has shaped the U.S. foreign policy by analyzing how identity of being good/real citizens of the U.S has been changed with regard to communism, then the terrorists. In this regard he investigates how “the boundaries of a state’s identity are secured by the representation of danger integral to foreign policy (Campbell, 1998b: 3).

Among the interpretations of the era called the Cold War, Campbell concentrates on the reports and papers of the State Departments of Policy Planning, National Security Councils (NSC) and some other texts (that he thinks) playing crucial roles in determining the U.S. foreign policies. The documents however “which guided national security policy did more than simply offer strategic analyses of the 'reality'”

they confronted: they actively concerned themselves with the scripting of a particular American identity” (Campbell, 1998b: 32). In this regard, foreign policy “was not something subsequent to the state or the inter-state system, but integral to their constitution” and hence “foreign policy was not a bridge between two distinct realms, but something that both divided and joined the inside and outside the state and interstate system”(Campbell, 1998b: 58). For instance, in these documents “the threat of communism” was defined as “directed generally against the inherent dignity, freedom, and sacredness of the individual; against all God-given rights and against Judeo-Christian code of morals on which our civilization rest, against our established norms of laws and order; against all peaceful democratic institutions”(Campbell, 1998b: 27).

Campbell focuses on the idea that these texts while framing the whatness of enemy and potential dangers, are also used for the re-production of the American identity by detaching these features of enemy from the idea(s) of identity of us . The ideals of identity however are nothing but the imaginations of themselves and they are far from the realm of experiences. The ideals of the American society work through firstly disciplining domestic sphere according to permanent cautions on the threat of being “poisoned” from external features of enemy. And second, through the “construction of the foreign” the loyalty of the population to ideals are subjugated. The ideals are far from reaching the reality and hence the fulfillment of being a good citizen is impossible, and it is an example to the idea of unfinished world that Campbell had exposed by reference to Blumenberg’s work. This is not so much different from the impossible mission of Sisyphus. The threat of Communism in the cold war era was a fertile soil for creating “a strategy of otherness designed to discipline the self” (Campbell, 1998b: 58), and Campbell claims that the U.S. foreign policy did not miss this opportunity. The other, namely the communist threat, provides the chance for disciplining certain “identities” in the American society such as feminist activists, labor unions’ members, drug users and even AIDS patients (Campbell, 1998b: 110). The function of foreign policy provides a “double exclusionary practice” that invented to satisfy the need “to discipline and contain the ambiguity and contingency of the domestic realm” (Campbell, 1998b: 64) and to provide the ground for condemning “defilements of inside”, internal threats of “ideal

society” to make possible external dangers. Because of these defilement and “heretics”, the power and threat of the other/enemy could have the chance of infiltrating into “sterilized” American society. This bio-medical discourse on society, therefore, bestows “clinical” power to political power and so society had to be in quarantine. For instance, the quarantine period may not finish even the threats of communism have passed, since the identity of the American citizens is always under threat. This, however, is not related to threats or dangers since, “source of danger has never been fixed”(Campbell, 1998b, p. 31). This is because of the performative nature of identity and contingency of life. The theory of performatively constitution of identity works also for statist discourse that knows the objects of “danger” with the help “governmentality”. It is possible to claim that Campbell’s main criticism gravitates exactly here. In this context the term governmentality refers to the duality, with the help of its practitioners, which was constructed in a specific way by the elites of IR theorists and practitioners.

The representations of enemy depend on conditions and vary from bio-medical discourse to discourse of the “unity of society” while, the principle behind this representation flow functions according to the duality between self and other. Therefore, by accepting the performatively constituted identity ever since its constitution (*coup de force*), nation-state is already created within the form that always keeps flux in a proper way. In short, state acts like the Pied Piper of Hamelin, it promises to protect its population’s life from everything, but sometimes at the expense of their children. The charming sound of the pipe bewitches the ears as the irresistible tune of Sirens made the sailors forget their route and the representations that a state designs for the sake of its own survival are as attractive as the pied costume of the piper.

The threat of communism during the cold war era provides a fertile soil to perform the duality of enemy/other and good/us. Thanks to this threat, Campbell asserts that, sovereign power of the U.S.A has been shaped according to state-based foreign policy and political identity. The inscription of sovereign power however has not gained acceptance only through territorial necessity but also it continually refers to “moral necessity”. Moral necessity or moral concern and limits of the American nation is one of the major concerns in critical approach, and according to Campbell it

is not only the manner of the cold war, but also it was employed in both Gulf War discourse and in Bosnian civil war. The discourse of moral necessity cuts through all sides of civil war (Campbell, 1998b: 41). Hence, the U.S. Foreign Policy- with capital (F)- is differentiated through its features to refer the foreign policy that its concern does not depend the territorial integrity of a country but “serves to reproduce the constitution of identity” with appealing to “moral concerns” of the nation, whereas further Campbell claims that some of them are not “real concerns” at all(Campbell, 1998b: 62).

The discussion on "moral territory" of the nation and its territorial integrity has brutally shown its effects in Bosnian Civil War (BCW), and the parties of that war always refer to their “rights” on “true” possessor and nominee of population’s moral concerns. Campbell’s investigation on BCW mainly concentrates on this duality between parties of wars and he interprets civil war not according to the paradigm of national struggle that “the rest of the world already expect” from this part of the world. Campbell rather suggests that the consequences of this expectation should be counted as one of the reasons behind this bloody civil war. The civil war that happened in Bosnia according to his interpretations was grown more violent because both parties claim the rights of the possessor of “moral values” that constituted the Yugoslavian nation, and hence “the other” was condemned not only as an enemy but also as defilement, and sickness in the healthy body of nation. During this “sterilization” however according to Campbell “west” of the world evaluated this war through state-based narratives and has seen the war as “normal” for the Balkans. Because, according to this paradigm the national re-organization of Balkan territory had to have these experiences to arrive at modern nation-state system.

2.11 Levinas’s Ethics, Love for The Other and Call for Rethinking IR Theories

Throughout the discussion on the state-based discourse of enemy and identity politics of state Campbell also refers to the theory of contemporary French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas to go beyond the duality of self and other. The philosophical contributions of Levinas to ethics and in this regard his suggestions are rich enough and it exceeds the discussion of this thesis. However, to understand Campbell’s

interpretation I will elaborate on two main concepts of Levinas which are influential on Campbell's alternative outlook. According to Campbell the duality of self and other mainly grows into the discourse of “knowing” other in a unity. It means that, the other always comes to self as a unity that self contains it without any excess. For instance, in the discourse of enemy, the other always refers to evil, dangerous and the source of threat, however, according to Campbell the other is always more than it is supposed to be and through “love” and “responsibility” to other it is possible to reveal the irreducible “excess” of other.

In Levinasian ethics, according to Campbell “love for other” and “responsibility for the other” are two crucial concepts that manage to go beyond the current duality between self and other which Campbell projects onto the realm of international relations. Instead of representing the other as unified and well-established in the discourse of enemy which is constructed by the meta-narratives of state-based paradigm, he offers an alternative way of conduct to the other. When his criticism of modern nation-states and its continuity with Church (in the context of fear politics) are taken into consideration, this new perspective as opposed to the confinement of the other in the unity of enemy or the object of fear, suggests an alternative ethical position that does not pretend to “know” the other in its totality. For instance, Campbell claims that the other, depicted as an enemy to the U.S. Foreign Policy always presents itself in a totality and it is nothing but the source of danger that should be eliminated. The elimination of the other, however, is not one of the concerns of Campbell since according to his interpretation the other always provides the conditions of possibility for constitution of identity. Levinasian ethic in this duality provides the opportunity to approach the other not as a well-established and attainable unity (as it is claimed in the discourse of security) but it contains more than what it is supposed to know, whereas the self is also far from being a unity. To reveal this surplus of the other in the discussion of IR, Campbell suggests the “love for the other”, which goes beyond the fear that is constantly imposed through security discourse (Campbell, 1998a: 172). Love for the other in the current “society of security” i.e., the feeling of being insecure, to be open to varied dangers and having “constant” identity, presents an alternative ethical conduct between the self and the other which demand to response to the other. It means that, in the face of the

other one has to response to the call of the other and this responsibility for the other comes to the self as a necessary effect of the love for the other. Hence, Campbell thinks that these ethical conducts could challenge the mainstream narratives that are dominant in IR theories and as opposed to the state-based discourse (which always needs for an enemy/other), the possibility of new politics could flourish. Because, in the statist discourse “idea of ‘the political’ has been subsumed by and made synonymous with the state” (Campbell, 1998b: 199), and to go beyond this confinement the need for new ethical conducts and “non-conservative way of democracy” are necessary (Campbell, 1998b: 163).

Without entering into the discussion of ethical philosophy of Levinas it is possible to claim that there are certain difficulties of the practicability of this ethic in the realm of politics, especially in IR. Entrance of the third party into this relationship is somehow problematic and Campbell himself is aware of such problem. However, according to him, this problem could be also solved within the relation itself, and love for the other is more valuable than fear from the other. Second, when Campbell’s critical approach and its diagnosis on the deep-continuity between Christianity and modernity is taken into account, it is possible to ask why Campbell ignores the obvious connections of “love” with Judeo-Christian tradition. It is a matter of fact that fear and love are the two main feelings that shaped the preaching of church, and salvation is only possible through love. For instance, in Mark 12:31 it says ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ There is no other commandment greater than these.”

Furthermore, the political effects of the response for the call of the other, in the shadows of the sovereign nation-states as Campbell himself depicts, may not be as powerful as Campbell hopes. Since, the “call” that comes from the other is also subjected to statist discourse and “love” itself does not seem enough to go beyond the representation of the other that presented. Furthermore, it is possible to ask: what is the ground of the obligation of this “response” to other that Campbell proposed? For example, why Athenians are obliged to response to ironical questions of Socrates? Did not they have to kill Socrates at the end because of the feeling that they should response to him?

2.12 Contributions of Critical Approaches of Campbell to Current Security Debates

Finally, the consequences of the analogy that Campbell made between sovereign state and modern individual show themselves at the expense of the missing the “here-and-now” of the social. His alternative approach has remarkable contributions to current discussion on “security”, whereas the alternative ways of practice do not seem practical enough at least for now. The interpretation of Campbell mainly concentrates on western parts of the world with the exception of Gulf War. Though his solutions pretend to be “universal”, the “security problem” is not only a matter of the west of the world and their conducts with the eastern parts of the world. There are lots of people who suffer from wars and violations of the right to live and for them fear from death is not a matter of “abstraction”, but it simply comes from their experiences in Middle Eastern countries.

To conclude, being an alternative approach, Campbell firstly criticizes the mainstream IR theories that are grounded on epistemic realism. The assumptions of this mainstream paradigm, however, do not permit to go beyond current problems while its usefulness in international relations provides the legitimacy of them. In this regard, Campbell's criticism of the current IR theories can be evaluated as an attempt to introduce a paradigmatic shift in Kuhnian sense (Kuhn, 1970: 102). Furthermore, though his interpretations do not aim at constructing a complete theory in IR as he claims, his criticism of mainstream theories aims at deconstructing nearly all grounds of them.

In this project, Campbell re-evaluates all the assumptions of these theories in the context of the security problem, the object of danger and fear politics. To make these inquires more eligible he reveals the relationality between this discourse and identity politics of nation-state which is nothing but performatively constituted and deprived from constant identity. In this regard, he underlines the deep-continuity between Christianity and modernity through certain crucial concepts that are also valid in current IR theories. This emphasis is the core of his deconstruction, because IR Theory is shown to be coming from a particular source. Finally, to overcome the

confinement of IR politics he offers Levinasian ethic and alternative ways of conduct as an antidote for postmodern epoch.

The critical approach of David Campbell presents a non-essentialist view of security and unsubstantial sentiment of fear that are infected by nation-states through statist discourse in IR theories. This unsubstantial sentiment of fear mainly comes from the sources that are in fact far from being a “real” danger; however, for the sake of fixation of identity this sentiment is used by realist school both for the domestic and the foreign policies. This double usage of enemy perception is disclosed by Campbell’s inquiries on the U.S. Foreign Policy during the Cold War era and the Gulf War. Furthermore, his analysis also focuses on the specialization of knowledge in IR, and hence, this realm has its own experts, and these elites "make the best decisions for the nation and the state". With these contributions of his project to make the history of present it would be possible to suggest that by explicating the relationality between foreign policy and domestic politics and its necessary links with identity present alternative interpretations for understanding the U.S. Foreign Policy.

However, it is difficult to detect a paradigmatic shift in IR theories. Because, Campbell’s analyses mainly depend on the Cold War epoch and generalization of this event is inconsistent with the pursuit of writing history of present. His “why not” attitude towards current IR theories could challenge the main assumption of these theories; but, in the case of warfare, deaths are experienced as real and in the case of civil war such as in Syria where “epistemic agreement” between people has been diminished, the other always comes with challenge and with the question of password.

CHAPTER 3

THE POLITICS OF SECURITIZATION: SECURITIZATION PROCESS AS SPEECH ACT AND THE ROLE OF DESECURITIZATION FOR DEMOCRATIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

3.1 Copenhagen Securitization School: Main Theoretical Features

In the previous chapter, one of the main figures of American critical security studies was examined, and this part of my thesis study is dedicated for a discussion of an example of the contemporary European school, Copenhagen Securitization School. In declaring to be an alternative to hitherto security studies, both of these approaches are nearly in the same position. Being in the same position with respect to generally accepted statist understanding of security brings them together to a certain extent. The concern behind both outlooks could be summarized as an inquiry about the limits of international relations, since these limits are mostly accepted as if they are the laws of nature.

I want to begin by presenting a story from Thucydides's great work the *History of Peloponnesian War* (2013). Let me warn you, this story is not an epic war saga for honor and glory which includes the Gods of Homeros as sides of it. It is closer to Herodotus's testimonies. It is a story that in the vigil of a great war, yet it does not stay in shadow of this war. The mainframe of the story is that the most powerful state of the region Athens comes to Melians' lands to ask for submission to them. The strategies of Athens are determined, Melians should not interact with any enemies of Athens. At least during the war, they should give their freedom to Athens. Due to Melians current power, it is most proper decision. But Melians think that giving freedom to Athens would be an insult for their free ancestors. Before starting to tell story, I want to mention that the people in dialogues, their understanding of representation would be different from our modern world.

Thucydides in this book lets Athenians to say: “In the case of the gods we believe, and in the case of humankind it has always been obvious, that as a necessity of nature wherever anyone has the upper hand they rule” (Thucydides, 2013: 382). Athenians remind the “necessity of nature” to Melians with innocence and they also add that “We were not the ones to lay down this law, nor the first to take advantage of its existence”. Athenians act as if there is nothing to do aside from showing respect to this law of nature. The questions that Melians posed are understood by Athenians as envy to their power. The Athenian envoy explains this as simple as it would be: “Knowing that you and everybody else, having the same power as we have, would do the same as we do” (Thucydides, 2013: 382).

3.2 “Natural Necessity” of International Politics: “Men Rule Wherever They Can”

The so-called natural necessity of international politics (“wherever anyone has the upper hand, they rule”) has been widely challenged ever since the time of Thucydides and even the war of the Athenians against the Melians has been criticized with regard to unequal positions between them. However, the motto that the Athenian envoy said to Melians and to all small islanders has been echoed in various ways: “In the human sphere judgments about justice are relevant only between those with an equal power to enforce it” (Thucydides, 2013: 380). Of the gods they believed were dead a long time ago and nowadays the temples of their gods have visitors who have no faith in them. Furthermore, of the men they knew were far from our understanding of modern men without doubt, but how could their principles pertaining to “judgments about justice” still be relevant today?

Just before introducing the securitization theory of Copenhagen School (CSS), I want to concentrate on the Melian dialogue once more. Thucydides tells that instead of bringing the Athenian delegation before people in assembly, Melians brought Athenians before the “authorities and smaller ruling group” (Thucydides, 2013: 375).

Furthermore, he adds that Melians told the delegation to explain the “business” to them. Actually, the word “business” is far from being in a proper place in this narrative not only for its economical associations but since the fate of a “site” cannot be a matter of business. However, the word “business” was used once more in the dialogue when Athenians refuted the claims of justice that Melians posed. When Melians started to analyze the common issues not with regard to justice but with regard to advantage and benefit, dialogues took new direction and both sides of negotiation tried to prove that their arguments would disclose benefits for both sides. However, in this discussion Melians acted as if they were in a business transaction and forgot the political inequalities between them. Then, Athenians warned Melians about the fact that submission would save them and they “would profit from not destroying” them. There were two options; namely submission or being destroyed which Athenians always reminded to Melians, since the possibility of resistance to Athenian power seemed to them as negating the law of necessity.

Judgment on the decision of Melians for war and their destruction by the Athenian power is a difficult task and there have been lots of perspectives on this issue. Despite the fact that people are intending to judge Athenians’ unproportional force or Melians’ temerarious attitudes, I want to draw attention on Melians’ evaluation of their conditions in Thucydides’ text. Firstly, Melians did not bring the delegation before the people in assembly because they thought that the war had already begun between them. Commissioners said that “With the realities of war, which are already with us and not just a future prospect” (Thucydides, 2013: 3799 and the decision on war has been given. Furthermore, in the following sentence, commissioners added that the delegations were nothing but “self-appointed judges of what is said” to them. Second, they associated the negotiations with business and met them to a small group of persons who were probably the best speech-makers of Melians. However, Athenians did not accept such arrangement of meeting without challenge and they claimed to perceive this arrangement as a restraint to use seductive arguments. Actually, it seems that Athenians interpret this secret session as a proposal to make man to man speech and Melians interpret this as a reality of war.

3.3 The Judgments about Justice in International Politics: Specialization of Public Issues and Public Safety

My question is that if Athenians' delegation was not brought before people and had told them to explain the "business" to small number of people, how Athenians would have been sure that Melians will keep their word on being neutral on the war between Athenians and Spartans. Because, the demand of Athenians from Melians was a public question and it is a matter of the fate of whole city. However, Melian rulers took this issue firstly as a business and then they set their disdain over the safety of their city. The word "business" here brings Hannah Arendt's concept of "work" to my mind since Melians took the issue as if it was a matter of something professional and they wished to handle the negotiations with "interest", "profit" and by reckoning the possibility of coming out victorious in the war against Athenians with their wisdom and help of their gods. Furthermore, to be safer before Athenian delegation they have preferred closed session instead of popular assembly to prevent their "people" from "seductive arguments" of Athenians. It is possible to say that, Melians have already acknowledged the power of Athenians and the fear they sank into caused to interpret the negotiations as if it belongs to a business world where only some people could handle it. However, being surrounded by Athenians, for Melians, was a public issue because it was a matter of safety of a country. Hence, each and every citizen of Melos had right to speak before the Athenian delegation. Furthermore, no one could be sure about the possible outcomes of that non-permitted public session. Even if the popular assembly took the same decision as the Melian commission did, we would be sure that the people of Melos would decide on war in the face of being destroyed by powerful enemy instead of being ruled by Athenians. Hence, we would talk about them as the nation that was ruined because of their virtue.

3.4. An Alternative Approach to International Politics: Arendtian Action Theory

The importance of the political thought of Hannah Arendt is not limited to Thucydides' text but also directly related with this chapter of my thesis. Arendt's thoughts on politics and "unpredictability" of an action are mostly celebrated by Ole Waever, one of the two founders of securitization school. Arendtian notion of politics is linked with the second core concept of securitization theory; desecuritisation. Beginning with the second concept instead of the first one may seem odd, but to compare CSS with Campbell's views and to examine the differences between these two theories, the concept of desecuritisation seems more fertile. Desecuritisation according to Waever first, is related to the question of "what does a particular theory do politically" (Waever, 2011) and secondly it is tracing back the process of securitization reversely. Furthermore, desecuritisation seems as if it is a normative part of this theory, and with this concept, Waever and Buzan try to illustrate how desecuritisation process works same as securitization process does. They aim to push the classical definition of analysis in international politics without totally rejecting the ground of certain realist arguments prevalent in the discipline of international politics.

3.4.1 Core Ideas of Copenhagen Securitization School: Desecuritization and the Sociology of Durkheim

The definition of desecuritization can be framed as follows: a specific security issue gets -not may be all at once but still as possible as it is- lost. From now on this loss will be traced and examined as Waever does. In Waever's text it is said that there are two possibilities in this process of loss. It is either explicit or its existence is slowly perishing. As an example of explicit loss, the collapse of the Soviet Union can be given because when the Soviet Union collapsed, communist threat became immediately non-existent. And also for the example of slowly decreasing loss, *h1n1 swine flu virus* is a quite good example for which the threat of *h1n1 swine flu virus* decreased slowly by the decrease of the number of deaths caused by it. The main difference between these two examples is the source of the threat. First example is a

political threat caused by the fact that this threat is created by a political entity namely the Soviet Union. The second example is a “natural” threat by a biological organism but afterwards it has been converted into a political issue. Although a scientist may see the occurrence of *H1N1 swine flu* as a scientific and observable phenomenon, a settled political attitude convinced the scientists to act as a security guard by using their knowledge on science despite the fact that the occurrence of flu belonged to the field of biology. By itself, biology cannot decide whether a flu or human being should survive but politics must, since this threat is defined as if it has an intentional aim to destroy all humanity. Therefore threats can be divided into two subsets; namely political threats converted from biology and political threats caused by social concerns in these examples. In earlier writings, Waver analyzed political threats caused by social concerns by following the sociology of Durkheim who had introduced the term “*conscience collective*” as an important concept.

3.5 Durkheimian Concept of *Conscience Collective*

Conscience collective in Durkheimian vocabulary refers to “the totality of beliefs and sentiments common to the average citizens of the same society” (Durkheim, 1984: 79). However, the French word conscience may refer to both conscience and consciousness and hence it is not only a matter of religious and moral sentiments of a society but it also signifies the cognitive beliefs and sentiments in the same society. Furthermore, though this conscience does not appear in a specific organ in society, it determines the form of society by diffusing into the whole. However, it is far from being the same or the totality of each individual conscience and yet, “it can be realized only through them” (Jones, 1986: 30). To be more relevant to this study the example “crime” that Durkheim worked on can give an illuminating instance. Durkheim insists that “we do not reprove it because it is a crime, but it is a crime because we reprove it” (Durkheim, 1984: 81). Waever, in this regard evaluates the declaration of “threat to the existence of a society” as one of the important “crimes” to the state that offends the core moral values of society. In this regard, any “crime” that is labeled as a threat to the existence of a society has a reflection from the social. However, such declaration of caution and correspondence from social is a process

that CSS examines as securitization process. This process is composed of three main and relatively stable components in the division of labor in society according to securitization school.

3.6 Political Attitude of Copenhagen Securitization School: What is a Theory?

Waever thinks that there have to be few concepts in a theory and to grasp a theory one should “focus on the core idea that defines it”. Therefore, he subscribes to the idea of minimalist and particular theory. Second, he divides a theory mainly into two parts: One is the theory itself, the core idea, concepts and the other is “its cumulated insights from empirical studies”. (Waever, 2011: 471). Furthermore, he defines securitization theory not simply as a theory that is to be tested by set regularities but as something which concentrates on distinct rationality and political operation and explicates their relations with other particular theories.

Waever argues that securitization theory is focused on three different research questions: The first one is the “knowledge of the political process of securitization” and the second one is to ponder on politics implied in the theory whereas the last one is related with the theory within politics. In this regard, he thinks that a theory becomes critical according to the “the work it enables one to do with and this work effects on real-life political struggles, the handing of issues and dynamics” (Waever, 2011: 468).

3.7 Securitization as a Process: Applying Speech Act Theory

To present the answers of these questions of Copenhagen School, I will focus on the meaning of the concept of securitization as a process and the “conditions of possibility” of this process in social realm. CSS subscribes to Derrida’s intervention on reading a text that has been discussed in the former chapter which can be summarized by reference to the principle of “there is nothing outside the text”. This intervention seems crucial for Waever and Buzan for two reasons: Firstly, instead of seeking the most “probable” prediction about actors of international politics and making an intention analysis, they concentrate on the deed rather than pondering

about the purpose of “doer”. Due to this method, CSS claims to go beyond the discussion between namely normative approach in IR and the realist school. This discussion basically refers to whether an agent in international politics is responsible for the effects of its deed or it is just a matter of acting upon the surface of the world politics. The surface of this world however in a realistic view has always been shaped according to “historical necessities”, and the geographic and demographic characteristic of an entity in this planet has the same fate with the justice that rules behind these entities and this planet. Hence, anyone who acts in a particular manner is dwelling on something that is subject to conditions within which it has been shaped. For instance, Hans Morgenthau (1978), one of the most influential figures of realism, defines the position of a realist fundamentally on the ground of scientific knowledge, as it deals with the “objective laws” that govern both at the level of society and international politics. The concepts pertain to realism according to Morgenthau are power and the interest of nations, but not in nation-state *sensu stricto*, which reveals itself in foreign policy.

3.8 Three Questions of Theory and Three Components of Securitization School

After this brief introduction to the theoretical assumptions of Copenhagen school, I will demonstrate the relationships among the three components of the aforementioned securitization process and the three main questions of CSS that have been posed on the study of international politics. Being a process, securitization has been examined firstly as a speech act. The theory of speech act has been widely accepted by various social and linguistic studies and it was mainly developed by the influential studies of J.L. Austin on performative utterance and his theory of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (Green, 2009). To analyze the logic of security in international politics, Copenhagen school employs Austin’s theory of performative utterance and, as a result, they supplement one more example of question “how it (security) performs its function”? Because Waever himself asserts that as it is quoted in this text, there are core “ideas” in a particular theory and the empirical studies, applications of this theory are different from them. Austin’s speech

act theory is one of the core ideas in securitization school. Actually, this is the ground that realist scholars attack the theory of Copenhagen school: CSS is relying on the claim of modification of IR theory according to “various streams of European approaches”. Furthermore, the relation between CSS and Schmittian friend-foe distinction has been also criticized according to its allegiances with “sacred referent objects of security” (Mavelli, 2011). The success of the performance of security speech depends on the “facilitating conditions” which mainly control sign chains according to core values (vertical axis) and Mavelli focuses on the similarity with religion and “a suspension of the ethical”. In addition, these critics are also justifiable because “sacred” and “profane” are the first and foremost measurements of elementary forms of religious life according to Durkheim.

After these brief discussions on the critics of theoretical positions of CSS, Let me now focus on the speech act theory. The performative utterance of a speech firstly asserts that language is an object of a science and it is not basically a means of expression of a thought and even not a "function of a speaker" according to Saussure. Austin in this regard studies speech, not only as a system of signs but also as an act, since according to this view speech is one of the ways of desiring. Hence, in an illocutionary act for instance the actor of speech exhibits the desire in a performative way. The classical example of such act is giving a name to someone or something, since the idea that the relationship between the name and the referred object is arbitrary, is widely accepted since nominalism, Austin claims that the very act of naming itself is part of speech and even it is only speech act. For instance, giving a name to a pet is an act that is announced by the owner of pet to people around him and it is done only with saying the name of her. Nevertheless, such illocutionary acts according to Austin, depends on some determined conditions between actors, audience and other components of performance.

The logic of security is subject to the performative utterance according to CSS and uttering the word security by referring to threat to core moral values of society is an act for the transformation of “normal” politics into the security alarm. Hence, Buzan explains this performativity of security as a self-referential practice, “because it is in this practice that the issue becomes a security issue – not necessarily because a real

existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat. (Buzan & Waever & Wilde, 1998: 24).

CSS claims that securitization process comes into picture firstly with the speech act of an actor whom is agreeable to speak on security and “threat”. In this regard it is possible to say that CSS and Campbell is likeminded in their criticisms of the experts of IR “business”. However, unlike Campbell’s idea that these experts appeal to the evangelism of fear to control and tame performatively constitution of identity of population, CSS argues that the social is already flourished on relatively stable “core values”. Furthermore, not only core values but the conditions of possibility of the speech act of security is determined through cultural and contextual understanding of security, because for this approach security and threat are productions of conventional securitization and desecuritization processes and every process will be a supplement to the concept of security. Moreover, speech actors took correspondence, or touch the reactive body of social to desire to come to the attention of threat that “future to come” to the core values of social state. The “real existential of threat” is however in this action not taken account in Copenhagen school for certain reasons. Firstly, as it is mentioned, CSS asserts that for going beyond the prevalent discussion on the “will” of actors in IR, they refuse to make intention analysis. Furthermore, avoiding the discussion concerning real or artificial threat provides to analyst to keep “absolute prepositionless” with respect to the subject that interested him. The main questions of CSS according to Waever are; “Why do you call this a security issue? What are the implications of doing this-or of not doing it?” Second, Austin claims that illocutionary acts are neither true nor false and not descriptive, and hence it is an accomplishment of a desire. Therefore, instead of wondering on “realness” of a threat, CSS concentrates on the sign chain of speech and its correspondence on audience. Unlike Campbell’s insistence on fear politics both in domestic and international realms, CSS claims that referring to conscience collective does not necessarily produce fear and the reaction what emerges from this contact is a kind social reflection. Hence, these reflections according to Copenhagen school provide to leap to new sign chain and politics is transformed to “security mode of handling issue”, because of the fact that this sign chain referent system has

been associated according to “transcendental signified” threat to the very existence of a social.

3.9 The Conditions of Possibility of Security as Performative Act

The success of performative utterance of security that comes forward with securitization actors depends on the inter-subjectivity of the threat, since the threat is directed towards social and not the sum of each and every individual in social and hence reaction comes from the solidarity. The sign according to New Oxford American Dictionary is an “object, quality, event, or entity whose presence or occurrence indicates the probable presence or occurrence of something else”. The sign of a threat that is announced in speech act of security infers to another sign in this chain and according to CSS this sign chain has been shaped by cultural and conventional sign system between states in IR politics. This assertion reminds us the Schmittian theory of the exception and some scholars have indicated the resemblance between these two theories. However, instead of the Schmittian theory of exception Waever mostly refers to language of security and sign chains of normal way of politics and security mode of issues. However, any sign chain has its own association’s principle and inference grammar, or according to Derrida, not infer but delay, detour of sign in chain. The classical example that Barthes gives about the Eifel Tower in the city of Paris can be useful in this regard: Firstly, the Eifel Tower was not in the first plan of the city and it was constructed later on the city center. However, the centrality of the Eifel Tower is not related with its function because apart from the balcony that is located at the top of tower, it does not differ from crossly constructed staff. Although it was not in the plan of city in the beginning, by force of its visibility from the whole city with the help of its vertical section, it gives arrangement to whole city. Furthermore, the only place in Paris which is not subject to the image of Eifel Tower is the center of this tower and hence this tower looks at Paris while it is seen in every place of the city.

3.9. Transcendental Signified and the function of threat in IR

The word threat as I understood in Copenhagen school allows to organize the signs according to different associations, and like trumpet of Israfil (in Islamic tradition the angel who will blow the trumpet to announce the resurrection day) gathering all the sign chains according to one direction. The threat to existence of social is related with the threat actually “future to come” and the threat to existence even it is the domestic realm as Campbell argues would be evaluated according to bio-medical discourses. Hence, the threat to social always refers to the outside of the “ideal of social” and even when it is in the center of the sign chain that directs the flow of sign through determined destination, it is outside of the realm of signs and that is why Derrida calls it “transcendental signified”. For instance, in the medieval age this transcendental signified was the God, in the age of Enlightenment it was man and according to Derrida in this age it is language. For instance, God as transcendental signified adjusts the whole signifiers, and plays central role in the semiotic system, though it is outside of this world.

Interpretation of the “threat” as a transcendental signified is another commonality between Campbell’s security approach and Copenhagen securitization school in regard to centrality of threat in the statist discourse. The discontent of both of these theories concentrates on the word “threat”. However Campbell interprets this issue as a symptom of fear politics to control identity while CSS is interested in the principles of associations in the security chain which is composed of signs.

3.10 The Debate on Security Mode of Handling Issues and Casual Mechanism of Securitization

The securitization process according to securitization theory of Copenhagen school takes a new direction after the performative speech act and it focuses on new ways of politics. Aforementioned before, this new sign chain and mechanism highly resembles to Schmitt’s theory of exception. In the phase of the securitization process democratic and usual social start to assign new significance and it has (or gains)

correspondences from the social. Waeber accepts the fact that there are entities which are separated from each other in international realm whose foreign policies are determined through their interests. It should be added that the word “interest” here refers to one of the core ideas of the realist view and of Waeber between realist school and Schmittian exception and decision theory is tied with his position with respect to the rationality behind the “interpretation of threat” by policymakers in IR and the obscure relationality with spatiotemporal predicaments of the process of securitization. Hence, as some scholars argued that, the position of Waeber and Copenhagen school in their relationship with the realist view and the decisionism in Schmittian sense are not obvious enough. It could be pointed out that the distinctness of CSS from Campbell’s critical security approach becomes clear. Waeber agrees on the principle of the realist school which can be summarized as “if you can you must” not because it is a law of nature, but in international politics things work in this way. Waeber wishes to go beyond the statist discourse that imposes the necessity of international realm to domestic politics.

Copenhagen school may not directly, but due to the necessity of their theoretical attitude acknowledge the fact that the language of the social states has been shaped through the sign chains of international realms and diplomatic language of the statist discourse is used by them also in domestic realms. Furthermore, the logic of security has some implications in the realm of domestic which carries the risk of suspending the democratic way of life and society. To demolish these side effects of securitization process is the main purpose of CSS and for this very reason CSS tacitly appeals to the Arendtian action theory and the concept of “publicness”. Arendt’s concern for the “publicness” and “judgment on justice” mainly concentrates on the idea that “publicness” is the main ground or an “agora” in the sense of antique site of Greeks where a public decision has been taken. As opposite to tyranny or the logic of “business”, public issues should be discussed before people. Instead of bringing to the public an issue before people, the discourse on the seriousness of an issue and specialization of a public issue mostly IR discussions as Waeber asserts wish to handle with professional tools in IR traditions.

The word desecuritisation is used in this regard to bring public issue before people to go beyond mainstream judgments on justice of IR. However, this does not mean that

all the issues that labelled as desecuritisation issue must be brought to the public. Waever, in this sense, recognizes the rules of game of IR and a possibility of desecuritisation of all issues seems impossible even in the global age.

In this regard the positions of Campbell and CSS come close to each other in terms of their attitude to statist discourse on the necessity, though their range is different, and also in their expectation on the theory and public intellectual. Both theories wish to go beyond the mainstream theoretical boundaries that shaped the international realms and make distinctions between public intellectuals and professional analysts in the discipline of IR. They both criticize highly specialized profession of international politics, power balance theory and diplomacy such contributions cannot be ignored and their discussion of the core ideas of the mainstream theory IR is fertile for the re-evaluation of the presuppositions of the statist discourse. However, both approaches seem to be in need of certain theoretical and analytical accumulation to elaborate major problems they concentrate on. Furthermore, in the performative speech act of security, Waever does not suggest the displacements of the speech actor and the audience for the sake of the “interest of the social”. It means that, in the very act of speech, the actor pretends to speak not for himself, but instead he speaks for the name of the social/audience. Whereas, the displacement also occurs on the side of audience, since the speech on the threat in the future to come is not necessarily an actual threat, and mostly it is not, but it is a virtual threat that some experts can see its coming. Hence, the faith of audience to the prediction of the speech actor causes to act as if they are in the position of decision makers. Hence, in this crossed displacement of performance each part acts as if they are in other’s position. However, CSS does not enter the discussion on the virtual threat and actualization of the virtual threat. In this sense, Campbell’s criticism on being or thinking instead of other is also valid for Copenhagen school. Finally, after this discussion on Copenhagen securitization school and their criticism toward statist discourse it is possible to say that, while CSS pushes certain mainstream boundaries of international politics by employing Arendtian action theory and publicness, because of the ambiguity toward realist school and Schmitt’s theory of sovereignty CSS has been somehow positioned between mainstream theories and policy makers. CSS is not in the position to calculate the next palpable move of “state” when it

accepts the rules of the international politics which have been conventionally accumulated. It recognizes the language and sign chains of the states in IR, but wishes to modify this sign chain according to domestic and democratic signs.

3.11 Theoretical Components of Copenhagen Securitization School: Speech Act theory, Action Theory and “Transcendental Signified”

The securitization process mainly has three components that are articulated by Copenhagen school with reference to “social state”. The term social state firstly aims to go beyond the duality between state and society and to illustrate one of the necessary relations which bring these parts into existence. To work on securitization process CSS aims on the articulation of speech act theory with security studies and its main proposition is that security is an action. Speech actor makes reference to the “valued” referent object of the social. Speech actors have the authority to speak on these values, and these are described as “facilitating conditions” of the performance. Hence, by “uttering” the word security actor makes claims on a specific area that “whatever means to block it”. Furthermore, security is not simply describing what a security is, but it is a “performative utterance” that has the power to create the conditions for reality. Hence, performative security utterance creates a meaning for reality and has a creative power. A speech act is described by Buzan as “[it] holds the insurrecting potential to break the ordinary, to establish meaning that is not already in the context (Buzan: 1998: 46). The performative utterances however are not simply one-sided speech. Rather it has three elements namely, the speech act, and the securitization actor and finally the audience. “By saying the words something is done” (Buzan, 1998)

3.12 The Political, Decision and Schmittian Debate on Who Will Take the Decision

There is also a securitization grammar of international politics and concepts. Security speech actors have power to define security. “Subject, objects and concepts cannot

be seen as existing independent of discourse. Certain categories and arguments that are powerful in one period or at one place can sound non-sensible or absurd at others” (Waever, 2001: 22). Since, state is the most powerful performative agency in regard to establish security discourse and has right to make decision on what/who is the threat or enemy to the existence of the social, and since to take this decision refers to the “security mode of handling issue”, this resembles Schmittian theory of the sovereign. When he looks at the debate on exceptionalism: it happens that the suspension of law for the sake of the existence of political entity with relation to suspension of the ethical in religion. Religion transforms into ideology and ideology can be understood as religion securitized.

Desecuritisation is basically a moment when an entity which in the beginning has been defined and composed as a threat, is decided afterwards that this threat is no longer valuable to keep account of it. Although this keeping account does not have a permanent law to implement, its flow is not random. The reason behind the fact that it is not permanent is the agreement of Waever with the thoughts of Arendt about unpredictability of politics. On the other hand, the reason why Waver perceives the flow as not random arises from like-mindedness of him with realists.

3.13 The Word “*Eikos*” and Conventional Features of International Politics: Re-Thinking Our “Judgments about Justice”

I would now return to the text of Melian Dialogue. The Greek word “*eikos*” has been used for times and has referred to various different meanings. In the glossary at the end of book, “*eikos*” refers to ‘likeness’: probable, likely, reasonable to expect and also it refers to fair, reasonable and equitable. Hence the word “*epieikeia*” refers to fairness. To unveil the ambiguity of the meaning of the word “*eikos*”, I made a quick web search and I countered an impressive work of Christopher W. Tindale, *Reason's Dark Champions: Constructive Strategies of Sophistic Argument* (2010). In the fifth chapter of the first book Tindale makes an investigation on the word *eikos* and he focuses on the work of Plato, Aristotle and Antiphon. *Eikos* appears in one of Plato’s dialogue, *Phaedrus* which is a dialogue on rhetoric. The *eikos* in Socrates’s question firstly refers to nothing but an opinion that is accepted by the crowds. *Eikos* (likely)

in this sense is the tool of “*doxa*” as opposed to truth (*episteme*). Secondly, the likely or probability of Protagoras are attacked by Aristotle in the second book of *Rhetoric* based on the argument that these probabilities make weak argument strong. The weakness of an argument is defined by Plato in terms of its relation with truth, and according to Tindale, “if opinion has no firmer foundation than verbal persuasion, then what is likely becomes a mere topic for manipulation” (Tindale, 2010: 70). However, in the work of Antiphon Tetralogies the word likely refers to different meanings. Firstly, it is not negative as Plato suggested, rather it has positive meaning; it refers to plausibility and reasonableness to accept in the trial. Furthermore, litigants have to make claim on the grounds of “*eikos*”.

In Thucydides’ text, the word “*eikos*” which is first used by Melians is one of the control terms to underline their expectations from this negotiation. The proposal of Athenians on the speech of negotiation is rejected by Melians due to the fact that a war, which is an extraordinary case, cannot be evaluated in the scope “*eikos*”. Opinions of Melians on this argument may also be observed in following section of this conversation. According to Melians, either they will win the argument and Athenians will destroy them or Athenians will win the argument and Melians will be slaves. Therefore, defeat of Melians is predetermined in both cases and hence there is no probability of survival of Melians. On the other hand, Athenians try to make Melians to find a reason to accept the truth that there is nothing more important than pondering about safety of one’s country. Finally, Melians emphasize that Lacedaemonians will give succor to them due to alliance between them and uses Lacedaemonia as a tramp in this conversation. In response, Athenians object to this argument by defining Lacedaemonians as a plausible country and in conclusion they argue that Lacedaemonians has “*eikos*” to decide on implausibility of attempting to give succor.

Thus, whereas, normative viewpoint deals with “politics” in the realms of nations and remains optimist in terms of pushing existing “judgment on justice” toward fairness (*epieikeia*), realism evaluates such demand within the confines of major promises of realist outlook. CSS in this regard, acknowledges the socialness (socially constructed nature) of the threat, on the ground of securitization process understood as a speech act which makes reference to the conscience collective and the threat of

dissolution of core moral values that social has been flourished. However, without entering into a discussion of whether analyst should “provide standards of judgment for specific cases” or reduce “politics of outcomes” CSS insists on “productive”, “irreducible” and “unpredictable” interpretation of politics. Such way of conceiving politics according to Waever should not be evaluated as a “personal penchant on the part of the theory’s founder for a particular concept of politics” but the very structure of the theory “which compels users in such a direction” (Waever, 2011: 468).

3.14 Conclusion: The Necessity to Constitute New Definitions for International Politics

Waever’s recognition of the “obligation” that gives direction to the users of this theory depends on what Arendt defines as the “human condition”. In this sense, Campbell and Copenhagen School are in agreement on the productivity of politics. Derrida’s notion of coup de force underlines the impossibility of finding a ground for political power, whereas Waever appeals to the Arendtian notion of action and politics which have flourished beyond the instrumental reason of the political. Furthermore, both of these criticisms pose a question about the realness of the law the boundaries that realism has drawn concerning the priority of politics. The boundaries and the laws of these boundaries that are becoming within these segmented territories also provide the very existence of these boundaries have no any “realness”. It may be a childish argument but still our planet looks like an egg from space (an adequately elevated point of view that is always desired by realism) and composed of many bright colors instead of boundaries and walls. The world from such an angle is and perhaps will never be appreciated (or taken seriously) by realism which remains insistent upon the priority of politics over law and ethics. Such obsession for power seems to close the door to any norms required by human rights discourse.

In conclusion, I and both of these theorists (Campbell and Waever) are likeminded on the issue that IR discipline is exceedingly specialized and the logic of security is ultimate derivation of fear politics or the perception of the virtual threat. Their controversial relations with both realist view and postmodern approaches however, I

think obstruct to frame their theoretical boundaries but, that is the ground of these two theories. Postmodern or poststructuralist theories do not defend the assumption of their theories but argue that postmodern theory itself is one of the productions of modernity. Hence, both theories are right when they assert that the boundaries of so called classical understanding and relations between these entities have been evaporated. The well-grounded definitions and concepts have been altered and both Campbell and CSS aim to re-evaluate old, mainstream definitions and concepts according to democratic and social needs. However, these endeavors sometimes come to a deadlock because of the “*aporias*” of contemporary philosophical outlooks that those theories employed and conventional and traditional “rules of conduct” of IR.

However, not as a solution but to contribute to the ongoing discussion in IR and mainly politics I want to focus on the word *eikos* more deeply and its relations with human rights debates. After examining these current approaches in IR, and conventional features of this discipline not to make supplement to discussion on right but I will make an inquiry on the word human that human rights assumes.

CHAPTER 4

DE-HUMANIZATION OF THE ENEMY, HUMAN RIGHTS AS A PERFECTION OF THE UNIVERSAL ABOLISHMENT OF THE SLAVERY

4.1 Comparison of the Critical Security Approach of Campbell and Copenhagen Securitization School

In chapter II and III, I tried to present two relatively current approaches in IR theory. It is possible to evaluate both of these approaches as post-cold war theories which attempt to dismantle the dark picture of the cold war era, and its deep rooted policies. As I presented in second and third chapters, Campbell is sure that “the political facts” that shaped the U.S. Foreign policies are not facts in themselves, but only the necessary symptoms of the obsession of security and necessary consequences of the structure of the language of “governmentality”.

Campbell’s main investigation on security and his critical approach focus on mainly three topics; “risk”, “threat”, and “danger”. The U.S. Foreign policy, Campbell argues is based on a simple and highly effective tact since there is no pre-given and fixed identity which differentiates us from the other. The U.S. Foreign Policy always appeals this old and well-established duality. This duality, he believes, determines and reproduces boundaries. The relation between risk and threat seems like the computer system. For instance, the risk for the software is the virus that enables to break the security system of software or find the deficient in the program itself. Hence, the threat that targets the software system is defined according to the software system itself and the “risk” of a virus is defined according to the criterion of the software system itself. For instance, if a virus can find a way to infect a system or break down the security wall it is a dangerous one, because it threatens the working system. Furthermore, every software system is developed or be more risk-free through the process of competing with viruses. It is similar with this system Campbell argues that the U.S. Security program aims at the risk-free international

order. Whereas this security program always need the “danger” to for the re-production a good and healthy American identity. For this reason, he challenges the conventional notion of atomized and self-referent system of international states order.

Campbell’s arguments continue with the criticism of the Christian roots of modern individual states. As opposed to main narratives of modernity and German Romantics he claims that the project of Enlightenment was not successful as narrated before. By the same token, he claims that the old duality of Christian tradition has not disappeared, yet, but only had to be transformed. Although his criticism of Christianity and its deep rooted way of thinking is valuable, I still think that Campbell surpasses the valuable contributions of Enlightenment. One may infer this opinion from the text of Campbell himself because, his challenge to the IR discipline and metaphysical dualities mainly aim to overcome the Christian dualities and such an endeavor seems to be in continuity with Enlightenment critical outlook.

4.2 Copenhagen Security School

Copenhagen Securitization School differs from Campbell’s critical approach on the ground that international order after the cold war era turns into new dimension whereas this new order cannot be understood without the effects of the policies of this era. However, after the cold war era and its effects, CSS argues, that security problems are transformed into the various “sectors” and regional security problems have gained certain significance in international realm. The term sector in the terminology of CSS is related with the Bourdieu’s concept of “field”. According to CSS, securitization process in the last century started to be defined according to different sectors: “the ‘national’ security problem turns out to be a systemic security problem in which individuals, states and the system all play a part, and in which economic, societal and environmental factors are as important as political and military ones”(Buzan, 1991: 368).

Contrary to old and narrow “military and state”-based security analyzes CSS aims to widen “the definition of threat away from purely military to a more general formulation” and in this “multisectoral security agenda” state would not be only referent object for security studies anymore (Barry, 1998:4-7). According to CSS after the Cold-War period the bi-polarity of the international relations transforms into the more regional character. Instead of ideological rivalries and permanent political engagements “regional integration” has emerged. These regional integrations are defined as “special type of subsystem” that are composed of set of states whose “major security perceptions and concerns are so interlinked that their national security problems cannot reasonably be analyzed or resolved apart from one another”(Barry, 1998: 11). Hence, classical understanding of military security concerns which have been narrowed down to the topic of offensive and defensive of each states and their perception on intention of one another is widened by CSS to societal and environmental regions which are as important as military ones. To grasp the concepts of region and sector in the terminology of CSS it is valuable to mention the sociological theory of Pierre Bourdieu and his concepts of habitus and field. To analyze fractionations and divisions in modern societies Bourdieu invents the concepts of “habitus” and “fields”; habitus both produces and re-produces a structure which determines the common ground of the collectivity, whereas fields sign the differentiations of cultural phenomena. Hence, international multisectoral analyzes of CSS could be linked with Bourdieu’s concept of “field” and regional differentiations in Post-Cold War order seems also similar to concept of “habitus”.

CSS certainly accepts the traditional axiom that international relations are products of the anarchic system but unlike old military state based understanding they argue that in this anarchy there are subsystem which are formed according to geographic interactions. For instance, Buzan’s relatively old study on South Asia certainly depends on the idea that this part of the world is one of the examples of the subsystem and this region should be analyzed not according to each individual state but through their interaction with each other and their security policies with respect to their neighborhoods. Buzan defines each part of these regional subsystem as a security complex and according to her claim, contrary to old map of the world which was divided according to the boundaries of each particular states, the new security

map of the world is divided according to these security complexes. Each of these security complexes depicts their geographic positions and their specific types of interaction. Furthermore, according to this approach “regional integration among some members of a complex will transform the power structure of that complex” and for this reason constellation of the each particular states in the same region would be better both for them and for that complex. Hence, the classical understanding of the individual states that always struggle with each other according to the principle of enmity and amity has been transformed to the struggle between relatively widened security complexes. According to this approach European Security Complex, Middle Eastern Security Complex and South Asian Security Complex are the examples of the security complexes in the post-Cold War era in international relations.

Copenhagen approach as I presented is distinguished from Campbell’s critical security study certainly on their regional analyses as opposed to Campbell’s nation-based analyzes. CSS is already aware of this distinction and although they accept the importance of Campbell’s critics on the “obsession of security” policies and his view of the “social construction of security”, CSS still argues that their “methodological collectivism” differs from Campbell’s position that “the individual as the true reference for security-human security” (Barry, 1998: 38). Copenhagen Securitization approach argues against the critical security studies and Campbell because of their confusion between the individual security and state security. Hence according to this criticism, Campbell takes individual security as a referent object and projects to the international relations. While according to CSS the referent object of security is always state in international relations though it was transformed into the wider regional complexes I think this is one of the most powerful challenges that Campbell encountered. On the other side, Campbell’s study on Bosnian Civil War and the world’s “opinions” on the Balkans provide me to ask a question: how any habituated opinions on a region such as Middle East affect the dynamics of the security complex of this region and international relations? For instance, according to Campbell the common opinion of people on Balkans generally relies on the supposition that Balkans there has always been disorder. The relationship between this habituated opinion on certain regions and human rights abuses are important to deal with, because the reaction to nearly the same conditions to different regions varied

according to the “characters” of the regions and unfortunately there are degrees of expectancy to respect human rights criterion which radiated through regions. For instance, in the Middle Eastern parts of the world these expectations diminished to the bottom and the possible defense of human rights and its corresponding expectations are at minimum.

Then, what are the referent objects of security according to Copenhagen School? Referent objects are defined as “things that are seen to be existentially threatened and have a legitimate claim to survival” (Barry, 1998: 36). These objects were only seen as states and the “rhetoric of existential threat” was constructed on states and their existence. Because, security is defined according to survival and state is the most important thing that must survive “if we do not tackle this problem, everything else will be irrelevant (because we will not be here or will not be free to deal with in our own way)”, this is the most common sentences that are heard in such situations. This priority gives the chance to handle with security issues beyond the normal politics and to use extraordinary means. This is the first move in the securitization process, but there must be other steps to speak on securitization process, securitizing move that started by securitizing actors is only established when the audience of these actors accepts the demand of turning to extraordinary politics from normal politics. Hence, securitization process consists of three components; the first one is securitizing move that signs the referent objects of security which existentially threatens the survival of the essential, then the securitizing actors whose performance of speech act and utterance of security transforms the securitization into real sphere, and lastly the acceptance of the audience for the demand that this issue cannot be handled without the transformation of the normal politics to emergency actions and breaking the “normal” rules.(Barry, 1998: 27), (Waeber, 1998). Up to this point, securitization process shows similarities with Campbell’s critical security studies, and the suspension of the democratic and “normal” politics for the sake of the survival of the essential is the most common ground for both these theories.

Securitization is analyzed according to its two-dimensional functions by Copenhagen school, first it is interpreted as a “further intensification of politicization” in which the aspect of openness of the issues to publicness and responsibility is diminished for the sake of the existential priority and hence, politics is erased. Yet, CSS warns about

the possible dangers of the idealization of the national security, because they always argue against the idea of “the more security the better” (Barry, 1998: 29). For the same reason, their approach differs from Campbell’s critical approach, because CSS argues that best strategy within securitization process would be to move within this realm and make some maneuver to affect securitization in the favor of less “abstract” and “idealized” securitization issues. Whereas, Campbell’s interpretations eventually depend on the classical narrative on anarchic realms of international order nothing other than the ground for the self-referential point for security discourse both in international and domestic realms, and so there is no way to make politics within this realm.

Existent international relations narrative, Campbell argues, always claimed and legitimated itself according to the axiom of the anarchic features of international realms. As opposed to this axiom, Campbell argues against epistemic realism to illustrate how IR theories provide the reproduction of this self-referential system. To demonstrate that, he firstly analyzes the ground of the modern-sovereign states and tries to show the lack of “realist” ground of the sovereign states, then he moves to the narrative on the rupture between modern states and Christendom. His investigation on this rupture leads him to the word security and its relationship with fear and threat, or maybe quite opposite ways. However, in the last instance, he has to recognize the “structure” of the existent “narrative” of the discipline of IR which shapes the “relations” between states in these realms. In this regard, Buzan’s definition of security policy formulated as mixed “elements of a national security strategy with elements of an international security one”(Buzan, 1991: 112) I think, provides a wider perspective on international order, because albeit Campbell’s critics on mainstream narratives he has to accept that the “real” has effects on the conventionally shaped international politics.

The problem of specialization on security, and the question of actors in securitization process will be last topic of my comparison of Campbell’s critical security study and Copenhagen Securitization School. Both of these approaches certainly aim to dismantle the domination of the experts in security because of its possible negative consequences. According to Campbell’s approach, specialization of someone on security issues threatens democracy and politics, and the narrative on fear politics

and enemy-based statist discourse provides its re-production. On the other side, the position of actors has been challenged by Copenhagen School in different ways, firstly they challenge the idea of single referent object of security, and hence the set of the securitization actors are widened as opposed to statist military based security tradition. Also, the concept of desecuritization and “publicness” of security issue are also related with the discussion on actors and experts. In this discussion albeit the “necessities of securitization in definite conditions”, Waever argues that the concept of desecuritization works between theory and practice as well as actors and audience.

4.3 Locating Campbell and CSS into the Content of Certain Older Distinctions of Political Theory: Fear, Love and Enemy, Courage

In chapter XVII of the *Prince* Machiavelli discusses the question of whether it is better to be loved then feared for prince in order to keep its power on people. His assumption on man- "ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, covetous"- brings him to conclude that the best way for a prince is to be feared, rather than to be loved, since men cannot have the power to be loved, but to be feared is still easier than to be loved. The duality raised between fear and love by Machiavelli has been solved in favor of fear because of the "immoral" character of people. And hence, for him the antidote of this "immoral" character is fear and fear provides the source of order. However, as a premise of modernity and scientific thought the "immoral" character that Machiavelli attributes to mankind is not perhaps as essential as claimed by him. The aim of the Enlightenment project depends on the promise that these "predicates" of the pre-modern subject should be dismantled in the favor of autonomous actors who would become “creators of that world” (Stirner, 2009). Hence, today no modern nation-state can declare that its people have immoral predicates and its existence depends on the fear. The promises of Enlightenment and its project of education seem to have failed according to Campbell because of its deep-rooted dependence on Christian tradition. Hence, the human rights demands from the modern-states cannot be solutions because of the "non-modern" predicates of the sovereign states. His criticisms on the failure of the project of emancipation from the “idols” of Christianity seem to me valid, whereas his solution is unable to go beyond to the

duality that Machiavelli proposed between fear and love. Because, the duality established between fear and love is one of the heritage of Christian tradition and Campbell does not focus on this duality as much as he did for other dualities.

Dismantling the concept of the enemy and illustrating its theological supplements has certain values, however the notion of "enemy" beyond these supplements should not be discarded as a whole. Because, "enemy" is an immanent concept even within oneself, the part that which always resists to be the same. This is nothing but the enmity of the other and as the same token this part enables us to distort the absolute empathy to the other. Apart from its religious associations, this tension reveals itself in symptoms of conscience, regret, shame, confession and joyfulness towards oneself. Furthermore, thanks to this tension, other may come into being in spite of me.

The theological aspects of the enemy perhaps lie in Christian tradition as Campbell suggested. For him the category of enemy directly targets self and aims to suppress it and as a consequence of this attempt, we have nothing but castrated and sick culture. The tension between self and I is one side of the coin and the other side is tension between self and other, because for "I" self is nothing but other within oneself. The fear from the self and its desire has been always interpreted as a problem for people and to overcome this tension Christianity chosen the "love" and hence "hate" toward oneself and other. However, there is confusion in this match-up because the opposite of fear should not be love but it has to be courage and I do not understand why Campbell himself does insist on this wrong match-up. The opposite of love I want to argue should be hate or envy but it could not be fear. Concerning the criticism of fear politics and evangelism of fear that appealed modern-states Campbell seems to be right when we outlook to the international politics. However, the antidote for these "idols" is not love as Campbell claims, because perhaps the lack of courage and envy are the conditions of the possibility of this order.

Aristotle in the third book of the *Eudomian Ethics* (2011) distinguishes coward and foolhardiness and defines first one as the one who fears more than he ought to and latter, one that fears less than one ought to. Instead of these two excessive attitudes he affirms the middle habit which is bravery. The brave man Aristotle says

as opposed to these two opposite sides neither has a lack of courage nor is fool to be unaware of the object of the pain, but still one who can overcome the feeling of fears. The sentiments of fear, the anticipation of harm from the object then is certainly not feeling but a consequence of a thinking process, it means it is an affect that is anticipated from the end of a process. Hence, Aristotle separates children and unaware people's attitudes from bravery, because they do not have the ability to distinguish the objects according to their predicates of pain and pleasure.

To think Campbell's critical security studies with Aristotle and the concept of "evangelism of fear" and "society of security" may provide an alternative look to the issue of security. Campbell mainly focuses on the idea that the object of fear has been its ground and it works like the "obscure object of desire" in Lacanian sense. In this slippery ground, "deterritorialization" of the danger produces the ground for the security discourse and fear politics can produce docile and coward bodies. Hence, the boundaries and identity politics of the modern states produce security-obsessed people whose desire is nothing but enclosure.

Waever and his friends' approach to security is a process and they use the concept of securitization. The securitization process according to this school can be understood as one of the example of the performative utterances, because securitization of region and issues depend on not the truth correspondence of the particular thing but relies on the relations between author and audience. However, this relationship is not based on either an absolute contingency or on necessity as the realist claims. In this relationship, CSS argues that this relationship always depends on the occasions that are shaped through flourished ground of these relations and open to some possibilities to affect its conditions.

4.4 General Summary of the Comparison of the Campbell and CSS

By examining the aforementioned approaches which critically investigate and challenge realist perspective on security in international relations one may deduce that in this given order of world politics all particular states are counted as individual

parties and they are floating within the geological shapes of the surface of the segregated map of the world. In CSS there are sets of states but states still act as individual part of those complexes. However, the individuality of a particular state according to realist approach most probably refers to the “monads” of Leibniz, each of which has its own substance and the interaction between them is at minimal level.

Every monad within the international order has its own place in this realm and acts as if it is well established and closed subject system, Campbell interprets the conditions for possibilities of each particular closed system according to identity politics and heritage of church and European philosophical tradition. Whereas, Waever argues that social and cultural inheritance of each country has been flourished according to collective consciousness and moral values of their own, and further these values generate the substance of each particular state. However, the problems of territory and boundaries are examined and problematized by both Campbell and Waever because of the discontent of given international order. The solutions proposed by Campbell to the security based international dominant politics are to opposed to the state-based international narratives, to create independent and autonomous civil society which exceeds the boundaries. However, Campbell does not go in to the detail of that new ethical civil society and its relationship with the state. While, Waever and his friends do not imagine, at least not for near future, the “world civil society”, they only aim to the establish a common ground for detecting and preventing arbitrary securitization process and make securitization more visible for the public discussions.

4.5 Dismantling Security: Inadequacy of the Classical Cartography as a Tool in IR Studies

Let me now go back to the story I referred in Chapter III; in Melian dialogue Thucydides tells the story about Athenians and Melians. This dialogue is mostly interpreted as one of the most important examples which explain the meaning of the

natural necessity and power politics between weak and the strong. According to this view, the rules of game in international order are pre-determined according to power of the each particular state and these rules are accepted as “natural law”. This approach seems to ignore certain achievements in international law and abolishment of slavery is one of the most important of these achievements of humanity that must be defended. The story of Melians had ended with their annihilation by Athenian because at that time slavery is legal norm and discussions on the war between Melians and Athenians were not legal ones but it was evaluated by ethical standpoints.

4.6 Abolishment of the Slavery and Necessities of Right to Have Rights

Abolishment of slavery means to annihilate the idea of the possession of the “souls” and that it will be guaranteed by laws. However in the war periods and states mostly act as if they do not have this rule, because war assumes enemy and enemy means dehumanization and such dehumanization reintroduces possibility of enslavement. The states still recognize other states’s population as slaves and they feel justified to act as if slavery is norm, but it cannot easily be sacrificed because of the necessities of the rituals; wars.

The problem of outsider, the indifferent toward collective consciousness is always “unpredictable” not because it is, but “unpredictable” because of the different attributes they have for prediction, he is unknown other. The problem of outsider is still a problem and it reveals itself certainly during wars and internal disorder. Campbell and Waever are right when they attack on the security policies of some particular states, because states camouflage their banality toward free-man of the “enemy country” by discourse of security and “unpredictability” of others population. In this regard, the limits of criticisms of these both theories to realist conception of security do not achieve to go beyond the “logic of necessity” of mainstream international relations theories because of the discourse of the other as

enemy. In the hierarchical order of international relations, the representation of the enemy is idealized as an absolute evil, the representation of the absolute enemy delays coming to being of the other. Hence, Campbell's critical approaches on security and foreign policies of modern states does not provide satisfying answers to the problems of the constitutions of the identity of self as opposed to the enemy other. While, CSS's analysis on realist concept of security and democratizing the process of securitization will be challenged by "logic of necessity" of realist understanding, because the ground that is accepted by CSS has not too much distance from realist understanding.

4.7 Distance vs. Boundaries: Fear politics, Openness and Dehumanization of the enemy

The boundary and enemy based foreign policy has been discussed and their relation with security mode of politics has been illustrated by examining two current approaches. The security based statist discourse by appealing fear politics always takes dominance and control over its population in domestic, while on the other hand I think it conceals its archaic heritage from the times of slavery. In its most intense mode in mentality of security, states are almost transformed into their archaic form and lost their distance from other states and its population. In the lapse of the boundaries that separate one state from the other one, state evaluates those people nothing but states, because of the process of the securitization that always depends on the dehumanization of the enemy. The enemy is transformed only to the one predicate, which is constituted according to threatening capacity of the other side. Hence, after the lapse of the boundaries apart from the predicates of the being dangerous and enemy there remains nothing, but slaves. However, apart from being an enemy to someone, there is always something more in humankind, but this more than was already sacrificed for the sake of the security based discourse.

The de-humanization of the enemy and hostility against the enemy obstruct the openness between people and harm the distance between cultures. The distance between nations which exceeds beyond boundaries reduced to the merely different that always in the control of the states. However, the distance between nations should

be determined through social and cultural interaction, not by the predicate of the enemy or the attribute of the danger. The distance I want to propose is not metaphysical idea, on the contrary it depends on the social and historical phenomenon collected in the memory of each culture such as language, architecture and even opinions of the one nation for other. The security based politics always reduces to this distance to mere hostility and distance is minimalized to fearful and full of envy gaze. And this gaze focuses to capture only the dangerous attributes of the other, hence after this structure of the language of the international order has been established,, the symptoms of that structure is proposed as laws of nature, and inevitable necessity.

The predicate of the enemy, “evangelism of fear” and “de-humanization of the enemy” are the main concepts which constitute the state based politics in the security politics. As opposed to present judgment on justice between states in hierarchical international relations the haunt of the slavery during war time challenges the universal abolishment of the slavery. And I interpret universal human rights declaration according its relation with abolishment of slavery. The conditions of the possibility of this abolishment though seem succeeded within each particular state, during wartime archaic reflection of the state to “outsider “does not seem to leave slavery behind. Unfortunately, it is the war that “outsiders” confront with each other in most intense, and in those times none would talk with each other but fire of death. After the cold war experience, and the inventions of the total war I think the definition of war should be re-investigated, because the classical definitions of war has been challenged with new strategies and the tactics of security politics also modified according to the relations between war and foreign policy. One of the most important strategies that have been invented in cold-war era is that war should be going on for the victory, but it seems to boring for old times because if you want victory you must end war as possible as you can. Furthermore, theater of war is extended as it was exploded like an atom bomb to nearly almost of the territory of the states. The explosion of the theater of war and invention of the total war was the heritage of the former strategy but identifying a nation against an “other” one is a new shape. However, as CSC has observed there would be regional securitization project and because of the securitization process a particular religion can be defeated

and all region can be opened to security mode of relation. Then, because of the explosion of the theatre of war to all over country, in any defeat all of the population transformed to be defeated “old” soldiers of enemy country. Thucydides told same story about the end of the tragedy of Melians, but let me please to remind you again slavery was a norm in those times.

May be some of us argue against this argument with Rousseau’s too calm argumentation on the freedom of the defeated soldiers for wartime, because no one can boldly think in the theatre of war as Rousseau did and even Napoleon. The antidote for these conditions is not love I am sorry, because we are witness de-humanization of the enemy and no one cares about the pleasure of torturing of the bodies of the enemy anymore, it is wished to annihilate them as if they did not exist before. May be states are more cruel than we thought and its cold cruelty may have the same reason with our temperance.

4.8 Conclusion: Possession of Rights as Perfection of the Universal Abolishment of Slavery

The de-humanization of the enemy in the theatre of war and the so-called logic of necessity in international hierarchical order force us to rethink modern idea of being person and re-evaluate the distinction between being a person and slavery. In this regard universal abolishment of the slavery as a project still waits to be fulfilled. The antidote of this is not not love, as it is examined, neither envy, as Athenian delegation persuades opponents. As antidote for evangelism fear I proposed to modern way of courage. Contra to “slavery” reflection of the states I represent the symptoms of the de-humanization of the enemy according to expression of the enemy that always and all the time zooms in only one predicate of the other, therefore other that enclosed according to the attributions of the enemy reduced to nothing but a figure of the enemy. This figure of enemy provides the opportunity to state to flux throughout the slippery boundaries. To gain these freedoms of movement hence states firstly appeal the slippery boundaries as opposed to the walls and in this slippery ground control the figure of the enemy that always watches “insiders”.

The value of the project of universal abolishment of a slavery calls world's attention to unachieved project of the universal abolishment of the slavery. Because, it enables us to exhibit the transgressions of the limits of freedom to slavery, as opposed to the former; permanent form of slavery, in present established international hierarchical order, particular regions and "fields" may be countered with provisional threat of being subject to threatened like slaves. Hence, the tensions between current limits of realist concept of security and modern idea of having personality sign one of the important steps that have not been accomplished yet, and its coming in to existence in the current discussion calls the attentions to unaccomplished project and it will do it until the annihilation of the necessities which it was grown up.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the views of Campbell have been presented and discussed by examining his works on mainstream understanding of security in international relations, and its relations with the constitution of national identity and fear politics. As it has been noted, the crucial aim of this thesis is to evaluate whether or not this approach goes beyond the main axioms of mainstream discourse on security. In this regard, his criticism on the obsession of security in modern states and their foreign policy established according to the duality of inside and outside is one of the major obstacles for encountering the other beyond the constituted predicates of “natural necessities” of realist understanding. Because, while all of the modern states recognize each and every person as having right of possession of rights beyond any particular characters such as nationality and identity and claimed to respect these rights, in particular situations, the realizations of these rights are ignored by same states due to “priority of the security”. To understand this tension between security and the realization of these rights demands Campbell focuses on the constitution of national identity and this gives us an alternative outlook to the foundation of the modern-state. Because, his criticisms concerning the lack of the foundation of modern state and performatively constituted identity which always refer to the

representation of the other as an enemy provides us an alternative approach to this hierarchy between security and rights.

His alternative approach is framed into three main topics to understand the meaning of security for the modern states. The first topic is related with the question of emergence of modern state and its relations with Christendom. Because, in mainstream understanding, the Westphalian moment is accepted as a rupture which separates modern states from pre-modern political authority, while Campbell argues that this way of understanding has certain inadequacy to understand and it even disguises the continuity between Christendom and modern states in international relations. This discourse of rupture Campbell believes functions to distract the “absent” foundation of modern states, because as Derrida argues the foundation of the modern states is nothing but mystical and self-referential. The concept of *coup de force* refers to this mystical foundation of the authority and Campbell argues that the discourse of rupture between Christendom and modern states is woven over this lack of the foundation. This is the first part of his inquiry on the meaning of security in international relations and this criticisms link with the second part of his approach.

In the second part of his study, he turns to the examination of the similarities between modern state and former establishment in regard to their security tactics. In this part, Campbell mostly deals with the fear politics of church and the establishment of the separation of the inside and outside. Church’s fear politics depends mostly on the idea of salvation and to keep control over this separation, church has manipulated fear by certain tactics. Some of these fear policies and binary oppositions were descended to modern state, but it is crucial to note that, Campbell argues that outside of these fear politics there is no any similarities between modern

state and church, that is to say, he does not claim that modern state is nothing but the continuity of Christianity in the disguise of modern state. In this regard, he subscribes to the project of secularization of modern states, but still argues that modern states have some fear politics due to the archaic binary oppositions established by church. But, his views are not clear enough whether the project of Enlightenment has failed because of this heritage or this project is still in progress in spite of this binary opposition.

After these diagnoses on the modern states Campbell examines the U.S. foreign policy during cold-War and analyses how “true” American identity has been constituted as opposed to the “immoral” Soviet identity. These constitutions of identity and determination of the moral territory of the U.S. during these years mostly relied on the enemy/other and for the same token it was developed according to the representation of the enemy. Hence, U.S. security policies enabled to constitute the “true” identity of American citizens in the shadows of the threats of the “enemy”. Such “evangelism of fear” provides the ground for disciplining the identity according to the ways which sovereign state aims. Furthermore, this fear politics also enables to control domestic realm, because the definition of enemy does not only contain outside of borders, there should also be a vigilance system inside of the borders to protect the “health of the population”. In this regard, Campbell argues that bio-medical discourse was also used in security politics to “purify” nation according to the “image of U.S. nation”.

Hence, Campbell’s examination of security in international relations indicates that modern states in international order always refer to security firstly for disguising their mystical foundations, and secondly security politics enables them to discipline

their population and identity in the favors of states politics. Located into the context of my thesis, Campbell's views on security and its relations with modern state enable us to answer why security has a priority over the realization of rights demands at the expense of the violations of these rights. Because, the survival of the state and the politics of security require suspending human rights and Campbell's criticisms illuminate this hierarchy between security and right. Finally, as an antidote to these diagnoses, Campbell suggests new ethico-political ground that inspired from Levinasian ethics. His argument depends on the idea that, instead of boundary politics that came from the binary opposition of inside and the outside new ethical responsibility toward "unknown" other should be defended. While, these suggestions for the new ethico-political ground and universal civil society may empower alternative approaches to current international order, the possibility of this ground is not realistic in the near future, and his ambivalent attitude toward the project of Enlightenment prevents us from understanding his solutions in this regard. Whereas, his views on the security and fear politics are important contributions to the human rights debates, his assumption that love is a countervailing force is very disputable. Perhaps we should defend a modern way of courage as a virtue as opposed to this evangelism of fear and security politics, and we should understand the declaration of human rights as enabling the ground for this courage. It is perhaps this courage which defends the realizations of human rights as opposed to the feeling of security in particular situations cultivated by fear.

In the second part of this thesis I presented Copenhagen Securitization School and their views on security. As opposed to Campbell's studies, this school focuses on the new arrangements in international order after cold-war era. This school has two

important scholars and their analyses support each other. Barry Buzan, one of the members of this school examines security in the context of “security complexes”, and their security agenda. According to her, instead of nationally divided and military based security politics, after cold-War experience new security complexes emerged. And, these sets are composed according to their geographical affinity and similarity in their security agenda. Hence, realist understanding of national and territorial security understanding which depends on military based solutions yields to a new and broader understanding of security. As opposed to the two-sided analyses in cold-War period, in this new system, regional security complexes emerged and classical understanding of security studies could not enable to explain them anymore.

Waver, on the other hand, mostly deals with the securitization process in CSS and he tries to explain this process with regard to the politics of security. His views on security begins by the analyzing security as a process and securitization process is explained as a speech act, that is to say, being a speech act security is understood as a performance and it occurs between securitization actors and audience. As opposed to Campbell, Waver believes that although securitization is related with performance and mostly within the controls of securitization actors, this does not mean that it is totally arbitrary. It is an arbitrary act in respect to the temporary determination of the security agenda, while it is not arbitrary in respect to the spatial and social aspects of the context of the security topics. Because, CSS argues that social is established according to certain values and norms, and securitization actors always refer to the threat to these values. In this sense, Waever claims that securitization process is a way of politics and to realize securitization, securitization actors should convince the

audience about the “threat”. After this performance, security mode of politics begins to develop and states deal with security problems outside of “normal politics”.

With regard to this thesis, CSS enable us to change our understanding of international order thanks to their contributions on regional security and their views on the “broader agenda” of security. Secondly, indeed securitization conceived as a process and security as a speech act increase the importance of the human rights, because the declaration of human rights enables empowering people in this process for the sake of the defense of human rights. Actually, in this regard, CSS members are close to the human rights defenders because their positions with respect to securitization are critical and the concept of desecuritization leaves the door open for human rights. Because, the members of this school argue that, security is a social problem and for the sake of the development of democracy, securitization debates should be open to the public opinion instead of the securitization elites. Finally, their analyses on regional security and different sets of security complexes allow us make certain inference for the violations of these rights. Because, in certain regions the realizations of these rights are different due to different security agendas of these regions and this analyses show that instead of total analyses of the world security politics, there are different security complexes.

Hence, in this thesis I tried to present and discuss two relatively current IR theories which dealt with security, both of them are inspired from the “post-modern theories” and they reevaluated main presuppositions of the mainstream understanding of security. I examined both of these theories with respect to their challenges to mainstream understanding of security. Although, these theories are not directly interested with the rights debates, their views and criticism on security enable us to

make certain contributions to this debate. Furthermore, their solutions and possible answers to the question of security differed from each other based on their approaches; I think that both of these theories have significant criticisms on mainstream understanding of security, whereas these challenges to realist conception of security could not go beyond the current limits due to constituted symptom of dehumanization of enemy within war time and this dehumanization obstructs encountering the other without any reference to pre-established and old categories which constituted the very ground of realist conception of security.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aristotle (2011). *The Eudemian Ethics*. New York: Oxford Press

Barry, B. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Pub.

Barthes, R. (1997). *The Eiffel Tower and Other Mythologies*. London: University of California

Bauman, Z. (1991). *Modernity and Holocaust*. Maldon: Wiley-Blackwell.

Blumenberg, H. (1983). *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Butler, J. (2006). *Gender trouble : feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York : Routledge

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, State and Fear:An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Boulder, CO: L. Reinner.

Buzan, B, Wilde, J and Waever O. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Reinner Publication

Campbell, D. (1993) Politics without principle: sovereignty, ethics, and the narratives of the Gulf War. Boulder, Colo. : Lynne Rienner Publishers

Campbell, D. (1994) The Political subject of violence. Manchester ; New York : Manchester University Press

Campbell, D. (1998a). National Deconstruction: Violence, identity, and Justice in Bosnia. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Campbell, D. (1998b) Writing Security United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Connolly, W (2002). Identity\Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox, Expanded Edition, Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press

Delumeau, J (2007). Sin and Fear: The Emergence of the Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries, New York: St. Martin's Press

Derrida J. (1992). Acts of religion, New York : Routledge

Deveci, C. (1998). Siyasetin Sınırı Olarak Kamusalılık: Arendt'in Kant'tan Çıkarımları. Doğu Batı, 2 , (1998), pp.101-116 .

Durkheim, E (1984). The division of Labor in Society, New York : Free Press

Foucault, M. (1977-1984). "Practicing Criticism," in Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings . (e. b. Kritzman, Interviewer)

Hegel, G. (2001). Philosophy of Right. Ontario: Batoche Books Limited.

Hirsch, E.D. (2002). The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know, New York : Houghton Mifflin Company

Jones, R. (1986). Emile Durkheim: An Introduction to Four Major Works. CA: Sage Publications, Inc

Kafka, F. (1993). *Selected Short Stories of Franz Kafka*. New York: Parkway Printing Company Bound.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laclau, M, Mouffe, C (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy : Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London ; New York : Verso

Machiavelli, N. (2005). *The Prince*. Boston, Mass. : Bedford

Mavelli, L. (2011). Security and secularization in International Relations, *European Journal of International Relations*, March 2012 vol. 18, 177-199

Saussure, F. (2003). *Writings in General Linguistics*, New York: Oxford University Press

Stirner, M. (2009, February 12). *The False Principle of Our Education or, Humanism and Realism*. Retrieved October 30, 2014, from the [anarchistlibrary.org: http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/max-stirner-the-false-principle-of-our-education](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/max-stirner-the-false-principle-of-our-education)

Thucydides (2013). *History of Peloponnesian War*. New York : Cambridge University Press

Waever O. (1993). *Identity, migration, and the new security agenda in Europe*. New York : St. Martin's Press

Waever O. (1996). *The future of international relations : masters in the making?*. London ; New York : Routledge

Waever O. (1998). *Seucritization and Desuritization*. In E. R. Lipschutz, *On Security* . New York: Columbia University Press.

Waever O. (2001). Politics, Security, Theory. *Journal of Security Dialogue*. August 2011, 42(4-5):465-480

Yıldırım, E. (Winter 2010)). Return of the Spirit and the Demise of Politics. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* , (vol. 9, no. 27) 107-131.

APPENDICES

A. TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu çalışmada geliştirilmeye çalışılan ana düşünce, Soğuk Savaş sonrasında yeniden şekillenen uluslararası düzende, güvenlik meselelerinin ve bu meseleler etrafında şekillenen güvenlik kavramının, Soğuk Savaş döneminde üretilen güvenlik söyleminden ne denli etkilendiği, bir devamlılık arz edip etmediği ve son olarak da realist okulun özellikle Soğuk Savaş döneminde güçlü bir şekilde dile getirdiği güvenlik kavramının öneminin Soğuk Savaşın bitmesiyle akıbetinin ne olduğudur. Bu sorular etrafında şekillenmiş, realist okulun güvenlik kavramının bir yeniden incelenmesini amaçlayan iki farklı görüş detaylı olarak incelenmiştir.

Bu tezin asıl derdi, incelenen bu iki görüşün iddialarının mevcut güvenlik kavramının temel aksiyomlarının ötesine geçip geçmediğinin ayrıntılı bir değerlendirmesini sunmaktır. Bu minvalde, ilkin Amerikan güvenlik çalışmalarının etkili figürlerinden David Campbell'ın güvenlik üzerine geliştirdiği görüşleri incelenmiştir. Campbell'ın güvenlik üzerine yaptığı çalışmaları iki başlık altında özetlemek mümkündür. İlk kısımda Campbell güvenlik kavramının anaakım uluslararası teorilerde nasıl bir anlatıya sahip olduğunu ve bu anlatının temel dayanaklarının bir incelemesini yapar. Bu çalışmalarının sonucunda Campbell modern uluslararası düzenin kuruluşu olarak kabul edilen Vestfalya Antlaşmasının ve bu antlaşma etrafında kurulan modernlik söyleminin bir yapısökümünü yapar. Bu yapısöküm faaliyeti daha sonra Aydınlanma düşüncesinin Hristiyanlıkla koparamadığı bağlarının ifşa edilmesi üzerine yoğunlaşır. Yapılan derinlikli bir soruşturmanın sonucunda Campbell anaakım uluslararası teorilerinin yaslandığı anlatılarının ve özellikle güvenlik söylemlerinin modernite öncesi çeşitli fikirlerle olan bağlarını ortaya koyar.

Campbell'a göre aslında modernlik söylemi özellikle Alman Romantiklerinin iddia ettiklerinin aksine Hristiyanlık geleneğinden ciddi bir kopuş ve geleneğin reddi değil, sadece kilisenin geliştirdiği çeşitli taktiklerin modern devlet tarafından egemenliğini

pekiştirebilmek ve nüfusun disipline edilmesi için bir el değiştirmesidir. Fakat bu noktada Campbell bir bütün olarak modernliğin reddini savunmaz yalnızca bu bağların koparılmasını ve modernliğin gerçekleştirilmemiş hedeflerinin gerçekleştirilmesi için önündeki engellerin ortadan kaldırılmasını arzular. Zaten, devletlerin korku politikalarının derinlikli bir incelenmesinin yapılmasındaki temel amaç da budur. Böylece, modern devletin kuruluşunun temelinde yatan mitiklik, kendinden başka bir referansının bulunmayışının korku politikalarıyla gizlenmesi projesi Campbell'a göre modernliğin temel açmazlarından biridir. Modern devletin kuruluşu ve Hristiyan gelenekle olan bağlarının devamı aslında korkuya dayalı politikaların işleminin kaynağı olarak değerlendiren Campbell buradan hareketle modern devletin bu korku politikalarını nasıl işlettiği sorusuna yönelir. Bu soru etrafında şekillenecek olan incelemeler ise Campbell'ın projesinin ikinci kısmını oluşturmaktadır.

Korku politikalarının nasıl işletildiği ve modernlik söylemiyle nasıl eklemlendiği üzerine yapılan araştırmada, Campbell'ın başvurduğu temel arguman, projesinin ilk kısmını oluşturan soruya bulduğu cevaplarda zaten mevcuttur. Buna göre, kilisenin inananlar üzerinde kurduğu ilişki ağlarının modernlikle birlikte nasıl modern devletin tekeline geçtiği, hangi taktiklere başvurulduğunun bir incelemesiyle devam eder. Bu taktiklerin incelenmesi, modern devletlerin dış politikalarının belirlenmesinde ve ulusal kimliklerin inşasında korku politikalarının modern devlet için gerekliliğini ortaya koymuştur. Buna göre modernlikle birlikte kimliklerin sabit bir belirleyenden bağımsız olarak şekillenebilmesine karşıt olarak modern devletler ulusal kimliğin inşası ve “biz” kimliğinin kurulması ve diğerlerinden ayrıştırılabilmesi için sürekli bir düşman/öteki hattında kurulan korku politikalarına ihtiyaç duymaktadırlar. Böylece, düşman/öteki üzerinden kurulan biz olmayan değerler üzerinden inşa edilen ulusal kimlik evvela sabit bir belirleyenin olmadığı kimlik inşa süreçlerini denetim altına almakta ve modern devlet tarafından kontrol edilebilmektedir. Ayrıca, ulusal kimliğin düşman/öteki üzerinden kurulan hattı boyunca devletlere geniş bir manevra alanı sağlanmış, toplumsalın inşa süreci topyekün kontrol altına alınmıştır. Dış politikanın düşman/öteki üzerinden kurulması sayesinde, devletler iç politikalarını da bu hattın devamı şeklinde kurarak egemenlik alanları boyunca

nüfusun ehlileştirilmesini sağlayabilecek ve içerdeki hainlerin ıslahı ve ayıklanması sayesinde politikanın teknik bir mesele haline dönüştürülmesi sağlanabilecektir.

Campbell'a göre Soğuk Savaş dönemi politikaları bunun en belirgin örneğidir, fakat Soğuk Savaş sonrasında da bu politikalar devam etmektedir. Çünkü, ulusal kimliğin tehlike altında olduğuna dair üretilen söylemler devletlerin nüfuslarını kontrol altında tutabilmeleri için yeterli zemini sağlayabilmekte ve devler-üstü iletişimleri imkansız hale getirmektedir. Bu tür korku politikalarına dayanan ve ötekinin varlığını salt düşmana indirgeyen kimlik politikalarına karşı olarak Campbell, Levinasçı etiği önermektedir. Çünkü, bu etik sayesinde ötekinin düşman temsiliyle bastırılarak ortadan kaldırılmasına karşı ötekiden gelen çağrıya kulak verme ve sevgi sayesinde devletlerin korku politikalarının ötesinde bir iletişimin kurulmasının mümkün olabilecektir. Ayrıca, dış politikanın salt bir uzman işi olmasının ötesinde insani bir ilişki olduğu gerçeği ortaya çıkacak ve kimliklerin belirlenimi devletin kontrol ve tekelinde olmaktan çıkabilecektir.

Levinasçı etiğin korku ve düşman kimliğinin inşasına karşı olarak kurgulanması hem Levinas'ın felsefesinin Hristiyanlıkla olan bağları düşünüldüğünde hem de korkunun karşısına sevginin çıkarılması bizce bazı sorunlar teşkil etmektedir. Evvela, Hristiyanlıkla bu denli ciddi bir hesaplaşmaya girildikten sonra komşunu sev buyruğundan bağlarını tamamen ayırmamış bir öteki sevgisi anlayışı bir tutarsızlık arz etmektedir. Ayrıca, korkuyla ehlileştirilmiş kimliklerin sevgiyle özgürleşmesini (emancipation) beklemek fazla naif bir düşüncedir. Buna karşı olarak, korkunun karşısına modern bir düşünce olan şahsiyete sahip olmanın cesaretinin daha etkili olabileceğini düşünmekteyim.

Bu çalışmanın incelediği bir diğer görüş ise kıta Avrupasından olan Kopenhag Güvenlikleştirme Okuludur. Bu okul mensupları güvenliğin, Soğuk Savaş'ın bitimiyle birlikte uluslararası düzende yeniden şekillenmeye başlayan kümelenmeler dahilinde yeniden düşünülmesi gerekliliğini savunmaktadırlar. Bu görüşe göre, Soğuk Savaş dönemindeki iki kutuplu dünya yerini yeni güç odaklarına tek etmiş ve artık bölgesel olarak incelenmesi gereken, ortak güvenlik kaygıları etrafında şekillenen ülkeler bulunmaktadır.

Bu okulun güvenlik konusunda geliřtirdiđi bir diđer önemli husus ise güvenliđin bir süreç olarak incelenmesi gerektiđi ve bu sürecin aktörlerle dinleyiciler arasında gerçekteşen bir söz eylemi olduđu fikridir. Bu teze göre bir meselenin güvenlik meselesi haline dönüřtürülmesi ya da güvenlik meselesi haline dönüřtürülmüř bir meselenin olađanlařtırılması güvenlik konusunda söz söyleyebilen aktörlerin söylemde (speech act) bulunmalarıyla mümkün olur. Bir toplumun varlıđına ya da üzerinde inřa olduđu vazgeçilmez deđerlere karřı bir tehditin ortaya çıktıđı yönünde bir algı, aktörleri harekete geçirebilir. Aktörlerin bunu ilan eder, eđer muhataplar gerçekteşen bir tehditin varlıđını kabu ederlerse mesele güvenlik meselesine dönüřebilir. Bu sürece güvenlikleřtirme adına veren bu okul, güvenlikleřtirmenin bařlamasıyla birlikte normal politikanın askıya alındıđını ve olađanüstü siyaset araçlarının kullanıldıđını savunurlar.

Güvenlik meselesinin tamamen ortadan kaldırılması, olađan siyasetin iřlemesinin mevcut düzen içinde pek mümkün olamayacađını düşünene bu okul, güvenlikleřtirme süreçlerinin daha demokratik ve kamusal alanda tartıřılabilir hale gelmesinin devletlerin bařına buyruk güvenlik siyaseti yapmalarının önüne geçebileceđini savunmaktadırlar. Buna göre, bir meselenin güvenlik meselesi olup olmadıđı kamusal alanda yapılacak tartıřmalarla belirlenmeli, salt uzman iři olmanın ötesinde herkesi ilgilendiren bir mesele olmasından ötürü kamusal bir mesele olarak görüřülmesi gerektiđini savunmaktadırlar.

Mevcut güvenlik kavramının incelenmesi üzerine inřa edilmiř bu iki farklı görüřün detaylı bir şekilde incelenmesini amaçlayan bu tezin sonunda varılan düşünce kısaca şöyle özetlenebilir. Her iki görüř de farklı yerlerden mevcut güvenlik kavramının ciddi bir eleřtirisi sunmuř, modernliđin güvenlik ve korkuyla olan bađları üzerinden çeřitli çıkmazlarını göstermiřtir. Ayrıca, ötekinin düşman temsiliyle bastırılmasının ulus devlete olan aidiyetin nasıl güçlendirdiđini gözler önüne sermiřtir. Realist okulun temel kavramlarından biri olan güvenlik kavramının realistlerin iddia ettikleri kadar sorunsuz olmadıđını, kurulmuř olan uluslararası düzenin sonucu olarak ancak incelenebileceđini göstermiřlerdir. Buna karřılık, realist okulun güvenlik kavramını ařmak üzere geliřtirilmiř olan devalar bu görüřlerin iddia ettikleri kadar etkili deđildir. Bunun sebebi olarak da bence köleliđin modern devletlerde ayrı ayrı ilga edilmiř olmasına rađmen, topyekün savařın zorunlu sonucu olarak savař arenasında

köleliğin bazı arkaik şekillerinin ortaya çıkmasıdır. Çünkü, şahsiyete sahip olma fikri, belirli bir devletin mensubu olabilmek şartıyla kısıtlanmış ve savaşta yenilmiş tarafın mensubları köle muamelesi görme tehlikesiyle karşı karşıya gelebilmektedirler.

Haliyle, her iki görüşün realist okulun güvenlik kavramı üzerine geliştirdikleri eleştirilerin mevcut güvenlik kavramının realist okulun iddia ettiği gibi sorunsuz çalışmadığını göstermesi açısından çok önemli katkıları vardır. Bu minvalde geliştirilen eleştiriler realist okulun güvenlik kavramının sınırlarını ve açmazlarını göstermeleri açısından iyi birer çalışma olarak değerlendirilebilir. Fakat, mevcut güvenlik kavramını aşma yönünde geliştirdikleri projelerin de kendi içlerinde bazı sorunların oldukları ve iddia ettikleri gibi mevcut güvenlik kavramını aştıklarını söylemek zordur.