

Critical Security Studies Place's In International Relations

Saeid Vosoghi *, Ghasem Rezaee **, Majid Divsalar ***

* Associate Professor of International Relations, Esfahan University, Iran

** Master of Arts in International Relations, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza Branch, Iran

*** PHD Student, Islamic Azad University, Science & Research Branch, Department of International Relations,
Esfahan, Iran
pisq88@yahoo.com

Abstract: At the heart of Critical Security Studies (CSS) is a commitment to promoting emancipation. The argument of the paper is that, for that commitment to emancipation to be effective, CSS scholars must develop a deeper understanding of the ways in which academic professional training can undermine that commitment and must develop strategies so that they can succeed in academia while protecting that commitment. In this article indexes of Critical Security Studies (CSS) such as Security Studies, Foundational Claims, Schools relate to Critical Security Studies & challenges, Achievements and Limitations, its Ethical Commitments and Future Pathways And New Framework for Critical Security Studies will analysis.

[Saeid Vosoghi, Ghasem Rezaee, Majid Divsalar. **Critical Security Studies Place's In International Relations.** Journal of American Science 2011; 7(12):691-703]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). <http://www.americanscience.org>.

Key Words: Critical Security Studies, Security Studies, emancipation, Schools

Introduction:

Critical Security Studies is the most sustained and coherent critique of traditional Security Studies. (Booth, 2005:40). Security studies was, for many years, a specifically American discipline, linked to the logic and practice of Cold War strategy. In its earliest days, it was driven forward from two specific points of influence. One was the academic discipline of realism with key contributors such as Reinhold Niebuhr, Hans Joachim Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz pondering the meaning and implications of the thermonuclear revolution against the emergence of the Soviet threat (Craig, 2003). The second strand of influence was a network of civilian scholars, all working at the RAND institution during the 1950s and 1960s drafting recommendations to the air force and American policy makers on the strategic questions of national security (Kuklick, 2007:6). The most important figures associated with the RAND institution included people such as Bernard Brodie, Albert Wohlstetter, and Thomas Schelling. Three things were specific to the theorizing of the RAND scholars: one was a particular reliance on a mathematical-economic reasoning; the second was their general interest in organization theory; and finally third, their adherence to a particular style of reasoning, what we would now call rational choice theory, set them apart from their contemporary academic interlocutors (Kuklick, 2007:23). Gradually, realism came to adopt this same general style of mathematical jargon and rationalist inference, and eventually breaking off from classical realism's 'unscientific' approach to the study of international relations. Following this development which was

properly consummated in 1979 with the publication of Waltz' Theory of International Politics (Waltz, 1979), realism came to signify a specific set of assumptions that were seen to be general to the international condition. One being the view that international relations are characterized by anarchy, i.e. the lack of an overarching power implies that all states are subject to a permanent state of structural insecurity (Morgan, 2007). In turn, this structural insecurity indicates that every state is subject to the same logic of wanting to secure a critical amount of hard power in order to dissuade others from attacking one's interests and independence. Thus, the second trait of realism is its vital focus on the hard issues of security, on the relative distribution of power and offensive capabilities. A third element of realism is that it takes the state to be the main unit of concern in international relations. Finally, fourth, realism is characterized by a pessimistic world view. With the inherent logic of the international system being founded on insecurity, mutual suspicion, and self-interest, realism expect(ed) neither peace nor progress to take place in international relations in any significant measure.

Then came the end of the Cold War, casting into doubt the merits of a theory professing that neither progress nor significant change was worth worrying about. In essence, the very fact that strategic bipolarity had come to an end served to disprove the core contention of many realists that international politics was governed by a specific systemic logic (Morgan, 2007:24). The realist response to these questions of concern was, in a sense, provided by Stephen Walt who attempted to retrace and reorient

the meaning and relevance of security studies in his 1991 article on 'The Renaissance of Security Studies' (Walt, 1991). In this article, we will evaluate the concept of Critical Security Studies and other related issues to this subject and finally drawing Future Pathways.

What Is Security Studies?

Critical Security Studies is the most sustained and coherent critique of traditional Security Studies. (Booth, 2005:40). Security studies have been among the last bastions of neorealist orthodoxy in International Relations to accept critical, or even theoretically-sophisticated, challenges to its problematic. Recent polemical exchanges in the security studies literature have, however, at least linked the term "critical theory" with security studies, and although they do not necessarily advance the debate, they at least raise the question: what is a critical approach to security studies? My goal in this paper is not to invoke a new orthodoxy of "critical security studies" or to participate in polemical recriminations, but to illustrate what a critical engagement with issues and questions that have been taken as the subject matter of security studies involves. we do this in several steps:

a) A review of the (brief) debate in security studies concerning the contributions of "critical" scholarship;

b) A presentation of the intellectual "foundations" of critical approaches to International Relations;

c) An overview of current research within "critical security studies" that illustrates its ability to generate a challenging and productive research agenda;

d) A discussion of the intellectual and disciplining power of mainstream security scholarship, and the difficulties this poses for critical challenges.² ultimately, this is healthy for security studies as a whole. Security studies continues to be treated by many scholars as a theoretically-impooverished cousin to the sturdy children of International Relations, which could include (depending on your preference) liberal and radical approaches to International Political Economy, neoliberal institutionalist analyses, regime theory, foreign policy analysis and so forth.⁴ Debate among competing approaches, and a greater conceptual clarity, can only strengthen the claims of security studies scholars for intellectual respect. What is more, it is possible to argue that far from falling into desuetude with the end of the Cold War, many of the most interesting theoretical issues in International Relations - concerning, for example, identity politics and communal conflict, multilateral security institutions, the development of norms and practices,

and so-called new issues (such as the environment) - can be most usefully studied through a prism labeled "security studies."

Foundational Claims of Critical Approaches International Relations

There are six foundational claims at the core of critical approaches to International Relations, which can be summarized as follows:

- the principle actors (subjects) in world politics - whether these are states or not - are social constructs, and products of complex historical processes that include social, political, material and ideational dimensions;

- these subjects are constituted (and reconstituted) through political practices that create shared social understandings; this process of constitution endows the subjects with identities and interests (which are not "given" or unchanging);

- World politics is not static and unchanging, and its "structures" are not determining, since they are also ultimately socially constructed;

- our knowledge of the subjects, structures and practices of world politics is not "objective," since there exists no objective world separate from the collective construction of it by observers or actors;

- The appropriate methodology for the social sciences is not that of the natural sciences, and there is no methodological unity of science. Interpretive methods that attempt to uncover actors' understandings of the organization (and possibilities) of their social world are the central focus of research;

- The purpose of theory is not prediction (control) or the construction of transhistorical, generalizable causal claims; contextual understanding and practical knowledge is the appropriate goal. (Krause, 1996:2-7)

Critical Security Studies (CSS)

What does all of this mean for security studies? The challenge faced by proponents of critical security studies is to present a coherent and intellectually robust research agenda that generates interesting debates and insights into the complexities and potentials of contemporary (and past) security issues. Space prevents me from a comprehensive review of all the literature that could be included under this umbrella; instead, I will highlight a variety of bodies of critical scholarship to demonstrate that there is an active and vibrant research community in critical security studies. I have organized this work under three headings: studies of the construction of "objects" of security; examinations of the construction of threats and appropriate responses; and evaluations of the possibilities for amelioration or transformation of security dilemmas.

What we have not done is engage in a discussion of the appropriate methodology for critical security

studies, and the way in which this may contrast with a rationalist approach; that task awaits another paper. Critical Security Studies presently appears to be only united as far as it strives to present an alternative to the positivist traditional security studies which have struggled to rationalize the end of the Cold War. Wyn Jones however, in the introduction of *Critical Theory & World Politics*, has made a strong case that the heterogeneous and contradictory nature of critical IR theory is united by their ‘concern with the question of emancipation’ (Jones 2001: 15). Similarly Stephen Eric Bronner, who studied the Frankfurt School, in *Of Critical Theory and Its Theorist* makes a case that the only thing common to all critical theorists (Frankfurt School) is a concern to explore barriers to and possibilities for human emancipation (Bronner 1994). Could emancipation indeed be the glue that could bring all these supposedly divergent CSS approaches towards useful outcomes or was it never meant to be? This is what this essay will now examine in greater detail. (Krause, 1996:12-14)

Methodology: Critical Security Studies (CSS)

The Critical Security Studies (CSS) approach to international relations challenges realism and performatively proves that security is a paradoxical, epistemologically flawed and ontologically unstable concept with no fixed definition. A branch of critical theory, CSS is a broad and diverse field with theorists ranging from critical realists to poststructuralists. However, it is united in its criticism of the neo-realist framework of security, which shall be presented later. Perhaps, Robert Cox comes closest to discerning the difference between the “realist” problem-solving approach to international relations and critical theory in “Social Forces, States and World Orders:

Beyond International Relations Theory,” when he states that the former takes “prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organized...as the given framework of action,” while the latter “calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing.” Thus, Critical Security Studies is an unorthodox and questioning outlook to the dominant social and power structure, institutions, and ideologies.

Another component of critical theory that differs from realism is that critical theory recognizes “change, the openness of history, and the unfinished nature of the human experiment”. Therefore, while Critical Security Studies questions prevailing structures and attitudes, it is less concerned with alternatives and more concerned with a deeper understanding of security. Some may reject critical theory for advancing an unsatisfying and incomplete methodology that may not be workable and policy-oriented. However, rejection and rethinking is the

first step towards any structural changes. There is no point in advancing a completely alternative framework of security without first changing mindsets by questioning the very nature of security. Furthermore, the very exercise of criticism presents us with a more realistic picture of the world than the present ideology of security as presented by the state (and its elites). Even CSS theorists differ on how to construct alternative models of security, in order to provide for the ultimate goal of the CSS project: human emancipation.

CSS scholars are divided into two distinct categories: wideners and deepeners. While wideners claim that the greatest threat to state survival is not military-based, but economic, social and environmental, deepeners focus on the question of whose security is threatened and whether the security project is better achieved with an individual or society-centered referent rather than the state. The two categories are not mutually-exclusive, and this paper will advance a concept of security that both widens and deepens the field of security studies. At the same time, it is impossible to achieve the end goal of human emancipation without questioning the existing oppressive power structures and institutions; hence, this paper will also take a poststructuralist outlook to the question of security and deconstruct the concept of the national security state, in addition to the flawed neo-realist notion of security. (Prema, 2006: 4-5)

Emancipation As Foundation Critical Security Studies

Within the critical theory as a conceptual framework, emancipation represents the master signifier upon which all other dimensions get their meaning and configuration. While Habermas believes that emancipation is the rational independence of action, it is defined by Andrew Linklater as powers of self-determination and the ability of initiate actions. In the same context, Ken Booth defines emancipation as a guarantee for the liberation of both individuals and nations from the restrictions and limitations that confine and, at times, prevent their freedom of choice and actions. Meanwhile, Richard Ashley describes emancipation as freedom from unjustified restrictions, hegemonic and repressive rules as well as distorted communicative conditions and understanding that ignores the abilities and capacities of individuals and nations to make their own future through free will and knowledge. Consequently, critical theory defines emancipation as autonomy, freedom of action, security and freedom of individuals and nations from domineering and repressive structures and elimination of restrictive social grounds and contexts which are conducive to

injustice, and redefinition and reconfiguration of justice and equality in the international system.

Emancipation could be realized through inter-subjective understanding, discursive ethics, critical contemplation and resistance against hegemonic forces. Critical contemplation also requires the exploration and critique of human subjective assumptions and restrictive social structures to discover and recover diversions, ambiguities and chicaneries formed throughout human history and international system. These are structures and relations that have shaped social and human restrictions and are institutionalized and pretended to be natural and truthful due to the promotion of hegemony and domination. Emancipation, therefore, requires political, social and ethical reformation in both domestic and international society as well; an objective would not be materialized within instrumental rational choice approach, but feasible through moral-communicative and critical-transcendental rationality, simply because these hegemonic and repression structures are the outcomes of application of distorted wisdom in the world. (Dehghani Firouz Abadi, 2008: 8-9).

Emancipation has become a highly controversial term in critical security studies. While some consider it as a central concept to critical security studies others are mighty critical of the image it conjures. Taken on its own, it conjures a state of fulfillment of divine proportion. Many have criticized the utopian ideals suggested by the term as far removed from reality of the world. Others have accused it to be a western concept of human freedom which may not culturally suit the third world countries. Yet others have criticized the proponents of the concept of themselves violating the 'critical' aspect of critical security studies. And yet others cannot reconcile a stable and harmonious world where power and order is supposedly non-existent.

To appreciate the notion of emancipation and its proponents in its appropriate context, it will be useful to firstly review the various schools of critical security studies and their central idea. The paper will then define and illustrate the notion of emancipation according to Welsh School and discuss whether emancipation could indeed play a useful role in bringing together the diverse schools of critical security studies. In the process the paper will highlight the main criticisms against the concept and attempt to reconcile some of the common misunderstandings. It will also discuss those criticisms which are indeed problematic in advancing an emancipatory approach and where possible attempt to offer some alternatives. The study will then examine Singapore's experience in adopting a pragmatic approach in its development which could

suggest a practical manifestation of emancipation. The essay will finally conclude on whether the notion of emancipation could become central to critical security studies. (Pope, 1971)

Critical security studies: Three Schools

1- The Copenhagen School

In *People, States and Fear*, Buzan attempted to broaden and deepen the concept of security by including threat beyond the state and military e.g. economic, societal, and environmental and levels of threat that besides state includes the society and individuals. The Copenhagen School rejects the viewpoint that security can be objectively given, but regards it as a social process applicable to any existential threat by any chosen referent object that requires exception measures. The action of securitizing is known as "...a speech act. By saying 'security', a state-representative moves the particular case into a specific area and thereby claim a special right to use the means necessary to block this development" (Wæver 1995: 55). The Copenhagen School has been criticized for not going far enough to totally break away from the realist state centric notion of security. Together with Wæver and de Wilde, Buzan have retained state-centrism by arguing that to securitize an issue is to render it "so important that it should not be exposed to the normal haggling of politics but should be dealt with decisively by top leaders prior to other issues" (Buzan, Ole Wæver & Wilde 1998: 29). The School is also accused of merely shifting to other positivist epistemology by labeling identity as having an 'essential character' (McSweeney 1996: 84) or as a given. While the military and political sectors, the referent object may be the state, in the societal sector the referent object is identity, or 'more specifically, it is about the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture, association, and religious and national identity and custom. While acknowledging that through a 'speech act' any referent object could be under threat and become a security concern, addressing of the threat by the state is to solve a security problem and not necessarily to encourage/realise emancipatory tendencies. Booth counters the state or society centric notion of security of the Copenhagen School by highlighting that 'it is illogical to spend excessive amounts of money and effort to protect the house against flood, dry rot and burglars if this is at the cost of the well-beings of the inhabitants' (Booth 1991: 320).

2- The Frankfurt School

The first meaning of the term critical theory was that defined by Max Horkheimer of the Frankfurt School of social science in his 1937 essay *Traditional and Critical Theory*. According Horkheimer and also

Adorno, Critical theory seeks “to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them”. For Horkheimer a capitalist society could become more democratic when ‘all conditions of social life that are controllable by human beings depend on real consensus’. Horkheimer and Adorno, in the later works on Dialectic Enlightenment however presented a rather pessimistic view on whether humans will ever be able to overcome the power of instrumental rationality (material development) and achieve emancipation. An alternative approach to Critical theory of the Frankfurt School that broke away from the production focus of the earlier proponents, was advanced by Habermas’s discourse theory where decisions are made based on consensus arrived through discussions free from any domination. In his subsequent Theory of Communication, Habermas’s argues that emancipatory potential is to be found in the realm of interaction of communication where great emphasis is on language. Alex Honneth a more contemporary critical theorist of Frankfurt School, further advanced Habermas ideas to take into account socio-cultural identities. As noted by Wyn Jones, ‘while Honneth certainly concurs with the broad thrust of Habermas’s communicative turn, that is, the attempt to locate emancipatory potential and politics in the realm of interaction rather than work – he disassembles from Habermas’s stress on language (Jones 2005: 225) towards a theory of recognition. Overall the Frankfurt School approach is essentially emancipatory in nature. All of them want to improve the human life from a social perspective. While Horkheimer and Adorno may have come from a Marxist perspective of responding to dangers of capitalism, Habermas was prepared to advance social reforms within the modern capitalistic world through active communication. Honneth through theory of recognition further refined the approach by incorporating the interplay of identities in the social world. They all strive to shape this world from a liberating human perspective. My take is that while the Frankfurt School’s origins may have been Marxian, over the years it has moved towards a blend of normative and with post modernist rationalizations. In , *The Changing Contour*, Linklater highlights that there is very little difference between Habermasians’ normative stress on ‘unconstrained communication’ to Lyotard’s support for ‘equal rights of participation in a universal speech of community’.

3- The Welsh School

Inspired by the Frankfurt School’s notion of emancipation and disillusioned by the realists to explain post Cold War, the Welsh School, and especially Ken Booth, makes it absolutely clear that emancipation, not power or order is the goal of

studying security. “Security” means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, and political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation, not power or order, produces true security. (Booth 1991: 319)

Critical Security Studies: challenge, dialogue, silence

This section will put forward an overview of the intellectual evolution of Critical Security Studies (CSS) – since its inception as a multifaceted challenge to ‘traditional’ accounts of security up to the current situation, in which a systematic dialogue between different critical approaches is gaining importance. The objective will be to highlight the centrality within CSS of understandings about the political and the security-politics nexus, and to demonstrate that a thorough discussion about these assumptions – which is crucial to the development of current debates – is yet to take place.

By CSS I mean the critical debate that had its first expression with the publication, in 1997, of an edited volume by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, and that has served since as an umbrella term to designate a variety of approaches to security that hold as their objective the problematization of realist/ statist/ masculinist/ militarist/ ethnocentric accounts, as well as the development of alternative views that aim to be more politically aware, historically and sociologically grounded and normatively oriented. I am not claiming that critical approaches started in 1997 – to do so would be to overlook the invaluable influence of earlier developments such as peace research and feminist thought – but merely suggesting that this edited volume marks the beginning of a systematic interaction between different critical approaches.

It is consensual to argue that CSS was born under the double sign of ‘challenge’ and ‘dialogue’: challenge to the status quo of security studies and dialogue between different views, backgrounds and disciplines. The balance between these two signs can be said to have changed in the past ten years, with the slow but steady introduction of many critical concerns into the political agenda – environmental and human security are but two examples – and with the growing need to systematize critical achievements, insights and experiences. This does not mean that the ‘challenge’ component has stopped being important, but rather that the intellectual reproduction of CSS and its gradual consolidation as a field have underscored the importance of a more

systematic interaction ³ between different approaches. This tendency is evident if we compare the seminal 1997 volume – which presented a plurality of chapters with no explicit attempt at establishing a consensus – with the recent manifesto put forward by the ‘c.a.s.e. collective’, an initiative that gathers some of the most productive authors in the field. Even though CSS was and is a field characterized by plurality of opinion and dissent, since its inception it had a unifying idea that can be characterized as an intention of politicization, that is, a desire to ‘bring the political back into security studies’. This thrust was made explicit right from the outset. The organizers of the 1997 volume argued that the new strand of security studies wished to impose itself by putting into question the patterns and schemes by which knowledge about security was produced and, consequently, by questioning the way security studies conceived and addressed ‘reality’ – be it the reality of its subject in the strictest sense, be it the wider realm of social and political life. As a consequence, an effort of historical and political framing was seen as essential. The groundings of ‘traditional’ conceptions of security were identified in particular understandings of subjectivity and sovereignty – in other words, it was argued that the common understandings about security were inherently connected with specific understandings about how the political world should be understood:

‘[g]rasping the contemporary meaning and nature of security, then, means coming to terms with the historical dynamics that constitute contemporary world politics, and the way in which security is understood within the dominant modes of contemporary thought’. Traditional security studies were seen as theoretically framed by a particular political and historical worldview, one that, in turn, they were implicated in reproducing. The embeddedness of security within a statist-anarchic understanding of world politics constrained the relationship between security studies and its subject in a triple way:

firstly, the theoretical imagination of security studies (that is, what is conceived as possible and legitimate knowledge) became limited to considerations about survival and stability of the state vis à vis the uncertain intentions of other states; secondly, the seemingly permanent character of current political arrangements contributed to the crystallization of security knowledge as unchanging in its ‘core truths’, thereby enshrining a set of parameters of scientificity and legitimate academic inquiry; thirdly, by accepting unquestioningly these political arrangements, security studies became a powerful tool in their reproduction. CSS thus aimed at undertaking a step back. The objective was to give

security a historical, political and social content by questioning its meaning and value. The former referred to the concept of security itself (what is it to be secure and from what kinds of threats?) and to its referent object (who or what is to be rendered secure?). The latter referred to the ethico-political context in which security comes about (how does a ‘security issue’ arise?), to its effects (what does ‘security’ do?) and to the normative desirability of a security situation. Downplaying the ‘scientific’ and ‘truthful’ character of traditional accounts, CSS showed the relationship of mutual dependency between representations of security, normative choices and the way security concerns and practices are played out in the social and political world – in other words, the interconnection between what security is deemed to be, the political and normative considerations behind these accounts and their effects in practice. The denial of the necessity and neutrality of existing accounts ultimately aimed at reintroducing the possibility of agency.

Thus, CSS was, from the beginning, a political endeavor that attempted to open up the way for a problematization of the concept of security that could provide the intellectual background against which reflection and debate about desirable practices could be undertaken. The different critical approaches within CSS have assumed this commitment in different ways, but intention of politicization can be deemed omnipresent. Wæver, whose ‘securitization theory’ has been accused of being conservative and thus only marginally critical, explicitly stated that ‘[t]he securitization approach points to the inherent political nature of any designation of security issues and thus it points an ethical question at the feet of analysts, decision-makers and political activists alike: why do you call this a security issue? What are the implications? Wæver highlights the ultimately political and ethical standpoint upon which security analysis is undertaken¹. Although departing from different understandings about the security-politics nexus, as will be seen in section II of this paper, Booth’s and the Welsh School’s conception of security as derivative of prior political conceptions points to the same interdependency between security analysis and a political/normative intention. Finally, the sociological explorations undertaken or inspired by the Paris School are clear attempts to provide security analysis with a ‘thick’ political content – it is no surprise that concepts such as ‘field’, ‘capital’ and ‘struggle’ acquire particular importance. The centrality of ‘politicization’ to CSS is nicely summed up in a recent document that can be said to constitute the latest (and, given its authors, perhaps the most authoritative to date) expression of what the field is all about:

‘What underpins critical approaches to security in Europe is the identification and denunciation of depoliticization, both in the social realm and in the realm of academia. The present article is therefore to be understood in part as a call for the return of a certain number of issues to the realm of politics’.

Nonetheless, this paper argues that the lack of a systematic and deep engagement with the security-politics nexus has had, and continues to have, detrimental effects in the development of a fruitful dialogue within CSS. The most obvious consequence is the uncomfortable position that the Welsh School holds in the field – a situation that is a mixture of misrepresentation and self-exclusion and that manifests itself in the way in which its contributions have been reduced to ‘normatively’ and an abstract concern with ‘individual security and emancipation’, the result being a somewhat dismissive. Moreover, and most importantly, the failure to engage in a thorough analysis of the assumptions regarding the nature of the political and the value of security have resulted in CSS not being able to fully realize the potential, not only of the various approaches it houses under its umbrella, but also of the interaction between them. Dialogue has been constrained by the failure to engage with basic assumptions. Positions seem to grow more entrenched – Booth demonstrates a reluctance in engaging in a fruitful dialogue, and many critical scholars reveal an almost knee-jerk reaction against calls for emancipation – and a true synergy is yet to be achieved within CSS. In sum, this paper departs from the following assumptions: a) recent developments in CSS, of which the ‘c.a.s.e. collective’ manifesto is one of the most theoretically interesting and academically significant, have demonstrated the growing importance of dialogue between different theoretical approaches, as a way of integrating critical insights and achievements, as well as allowing for a more comprehensive and informed critique/reevaluation of practices; b) this dialogue has had beneficial results but has been undermined by significant discrepancies regarding the relationship between security and politics and by the often unquestioned acceptance of a particular understanding of this relationship, as will be seen in the next section; c) this silence has led to a widening gap between the Welsh School and other approaches, most notably the Copenhagen School this gap is particularly important given that one of the main thrusts of CSS has been the intention to ‘politicize’ the realm of security, that is, to denaturalize and introduce an element of normative choice and political agency in the process of understanding and dealing with security in practice; e) as a consequence, this silence, besides preventing CSS from engaging

in a truly plural debate, has curtailed its critical potential. (Nunes, 2008: 2-8)

Achievements and Limitations

Before beginning it is important to briefly clarify our understanding of critical security studies. As outlined by Krause and Williams critical security studies is a broad church encompassing a range of approaches and analyses drawing on elements of neo-Marxism, feminism, (critical) constructivism and post-structuralism. As already indicated, differences between the approaches can be notable (and will be further indicated below), but underlying critical approaches are also a number of shared premises. In the first instance, these derive from an acceptance of Robert Cox’s distinction between problem-solving theories and Critical Theory.

Problem-solving theories are characterised by their willingness to take the world as it is and are designed to try and correct certain imperfections within it, or to provide guidance to policy-makers of how best to cope with a reality presumed to be largely beyond transformation. Realism is a problem-solving theory that takes the condition of international anarchy (and a particular understanding of it as a realm of competition of all against all) as a given, and as such tries to derive hypotheses about state interests and best behaviour given this condition. In contrast, Cox argues Critical Theory seeks to problematise given orders. Instead of taking the world as given Critical Theory seeks to transform it and make it better. Critical Theory therefore entails a utopian or emancipatory element to it. As such, one central focus of Coxian-inspired critical approaches is on problematising the function of knowledge as produced in problem-solving theories. This entails asking questions such as in whose interest problem-solving theories operate. From this Coxian base, therefore, what holds critical security studies together is a broad acceptance that theoretically derived knowledge about the world is not objective or neutral, but politicised and that as such security needs to be understood as socially constructed. Security theories are therefore best understood as constitutive of security, with the study and practice of security becoming a normative exercise. Critical security studies (css) have therefore tended to orient around a series of questions such as: ‘whose security is (or should be) prioritised’, ‘what are the key threats to security and how are they identified’, ‘where do security discourses come from’, ‘whose interests do they serve’, ‘what’s the connection between security and identity’?

Although a shared terrain therefore exists regarding the contingent and politicized nature of security, where critical approaches differ is in terms of which types of subsequent questions are prioritised

and the answers that are produced. As indicated above, this can range from overtly reconstructive and emancipatory approaches seeking to usurp the state as the referent object of security and refocus security on the individual, to more deconstructive and post-structural inspired approaches focused more on the politics of speaking security and cautious about advocating an emancipatory agenda of change. Taken as a whole, though, two broad themes do emerge from this brief discussion and from the work undertaken in critical security studies to date. First, security is viewed as inherently political, with this leading to a focus on what security does. Second, security is also viewed as inherently normative, with this leading to a concern with how security can be better defined and practiced. More specifically, we would suggest that answers to these questions allow for the characterization of two trends in critical security studies. On the one hand, we can identify a pessimistic understanding of security where security is generally understood to do bad things. On the other hand, a more optimistic understanding of security is evident where it is believed that traditional views of security can be reformed. To highlight these different positions, in the following we draw particular attention to the arguments of the Copenhagen School and Welsh School of critical security studies. What we seek to highlight is how both are underpinned by certain ethical assumptions, but in problematic ways and/or with problematic implications. (S. Browning, 2010: 3-4)

Critical Security Studies and its Ethical Commitments

First, it seems clear that critical security studies needs to engage more systematically with its ethical commitments, to be clearer about what it understands by ethics in the first place, and to be willing to incorporate power more centrally into its ethical proclamations. To start with the final point a shared commitment exists across much of critical security studies that suggests that emancipatory advances in the understanding, practice and provision of security are more likely to occur through the creation of spaces for non-repressive deliberation. The problem with this vision of a Habermasian-inspired discourse ethics is that it simply does not conform to the realities of world politics. The promotion of such a view is highly ironic in three respects. First, it seems to invoke precisely the kind of utopian utopia which the Welsh School at least has been keen to set aside. As Price notes, what is proposed is nothing less than the hypothetical equivalent of the Rawlsian 'original position' that requires participants to ignore group loyalties and identities and structures of power, privilege and subordination, to instead treat everyone as equals. Second, it seems markedly at odds with the

constructivist ontology central to critical approaches to security which when in the mode of critiquing traditional approaches are concerned with demonstrating the socially embedded nature of subjectivity, identity, norms and interests. Third, adopting such an ethic would seem to require actively excluding from the dialogue those who refuse to set aside such considerations – i.e. those 'who fully intend to bring their power to bear on the situation to realize their interests'. On the one hand, this threatens to confine the realm of the ethical to very narrow and largely inconsequential terrain. On the other hand, it entails precisely acts of exclusion that a dialogic ethic is presumably antithetical towards. Indeed, the desire to exclude power, culture, identity, emotion etc..., in the advocacy of processes of non-repressive deliberation might also be understood as a highly conservative move, in that it is liable to reproduce a culturally embedded status quo notion of reason/rationality. In this respect, it is almost anti-political in intent, while simultaneously appearing to hold the idealistic view that it will always be possible to reach consensus around core questions of security. The implication is therefore that the preference for Habermasian-inspired discourse ethics in a considerable amount of the critical security studies literature does not take us very far, and actually raises far more problems than it solves.

This need to reincorporate power within the reconstructive aspects of theorizing in critical security studies supports Reus-Smit's call for a much broader account of ethics built around the politics of answering a number of questions central to ethical reasoning. For Reus-Smit ethical reasoning has become problematically 'confined to the logical deduction of ethical principles', whereas in practice much more is going on when ethical dilemmas (like whose security to priorities) are on the agenda. Indeed, beyond debates about which ethical principle to invoke in different circumstances, Reus-Smit argues that at least five other issues also need to be resolved. First, he argues, is the question of defining the moral agent in a given situation. Defining the 'we' is an ethical, sociological and political choice that either establishes or rejects obligations and delimits the realm of perceived responsibility to others. Defining the 'we' in internationalist cosmopolitan terms entails a clearly different scope of moral obligation to defining the 'we' in narrower national communitarian terms. Second, Reus-Smit argues the issue at hand requires 'diagnoses. This refers to the empirical issue of how a particular problem is defined – e.g. as genocide or a manifestation of ancient ethnic hatreds. Defining the problem entails the gathering of 'facts' and their

presentation in a narrative socially constructing the nature of the situation confronted. Such processes of naming are far from neutral and entail clear elements of moral evaluation. Third, he argues ethical reasoning almost always entails an evaluation of the potential consequences of adopting different courses of action. However, given that what is at stake here are prognoses about counter-factual histories and scenarios questions of bias and interpretation are central to the process – as can clearly be seen in continuing debates as to whether the removal of Saddam has done more harm than good. Fourth, Reus-Smit argues that all ethical reasoning occurs within a particular context framed by particular social and historical circumstances which go a considerable way to framing what actors perceive as the ‘realm of moral possibility’. The problem, of course, is that actors are also liable to disagree on the context and therefore the limits to moral action. As he notes, such disagreements are evident between realists, who perceive the international system as characterized by continuity, and various other approaches that see scope for change. Finally, he argues actors also have to ‘negotiate the relationship between their obligations and their capacities’. Actors who perceive a moral obligation towards an issue may also feel this is discharged because of their limited capacities to contribute to a resolution. However, capacities are also subject to social construction, being interpreted through various lenses of perceived strategic interests, self-image and social perception. As such sometimes actors may engage in processes of capacity inflation, at other times deflation. For critical security studies the value of Reus-Smit’s framework is that it places Questions of politics, power and identity firmly back at the heart of ethical reasoning, which has traditionally been the strength of the critical project. At the same time, of course, it does not on the face of it offer a clear prescription of right, progressive or emancipatory behaviour. This returns us to a point made earlier in the paper concerning whether approaches embedded in a socially constructivist ontology are in a good position to outline clear moral agendas. We would suggest that two responses to this concern can be discerned from within the literature that warrant further elaboration.

What might be termed a ‘limited ethic’ of critical security studies can be conceptualized in terms of its encouragement of a particular attitude towards security practices? Most obviously this ‘attitude’ requires a critical view questioning where power lies, whose security is enhanced and whose is undermined etc. This is precisely the current strength of critical security studies. However, we would also suggest the critical approach supports an attitude (even an ethic)

of humility and optimism, which flow from its understanding of the socially constructed nature of reality. To the extent to which critical security studies embraces a constructivist view of the world it entails a belief in the possibility of (progressive) change. As Hoffmann notes, the belief in the malleability of social worlds and of the lack of universal moral foundations should encourage ‘humility in our study and practice of world politics and should encourage us to ‘avoid naturalizing or objectifying our moral beliefs’. Beyond, humility there is also a need for optimism or at minimum to avoid fostering a sense of debilitating cynicism. This is to say that instead of simply focusing on the undesirable effects of different social structures and security practices critical security studies should also be sensitive to the context in which those structures and practices are active. This is to say that in making judgments about the progressive nature of a particular practice, norm, structure, or institution it is important to know what one is comparing against. As Sikkink notes, if you compare against utopian visions of an ideal society where considerations of power and instrumental actors are discounted current ‘progressive’ developments will always come up short and appear hypocritical. However, if the comparison is rather drawn against previous practices things might look different. Central to an optimistic attitude is therefore accepting and refusing to get despondent about the fact that overcoming one moral dilemma only begets another moral context inscribed with new moral dilemmas.

However, bearing this attitude of humility in mind a more ‘expansive ethic’ is also evident in critical security studies in that it is clearly possible to identify a number of shared principles and values within critical security studies indicating a preference for: democracy, dialogue, cosmopolitan political community, equality and nondiscrimination. Where more work needs to be done, however, is in terms of justifying such preferences, as for the most part these preferences are implicit or hidden in critical security studies. For example, in general critical approaches to security elicit a preference for a cosmopolitan conception of moral community but it is unclear whether this is a necessary condition. Such a preference, however, needs justification since a Kantian cosmopolitan concern encouraging individuals to think like global citizens also requires invoking a sense of moral universalism that threatens to stifle other things critical security scholars often champion, like retaining space for difference. They also require a defense against (or justification for) criticisms that cosmopolitan universalism simply reproduces a Eurocentric and teleological view of history. Likewise, the emphasis on open dialogue

needs more support. As Hoffmann, Notes the emphasis on free dialogue seems to derive from the centrality of language and communication in a social constructivist understanding of social reality. While he argues it appears easy to infer from this that social construction should therefore 'lead to an ethical prescription for free dialogue' this rather represents the smuggling in of a liberal ethics of tolerance, and is not a necessary result of the centrality of language and communication to constructivist ontology. As he puts it, 'a commitment to open dialogue seems reasonable, but there is nothing in constructivist theory that leads us to the conclusion that open dialogue is any better than other kinds of dialogue. Many kinds of dialogue are possible, and constructivism cannot tell us which kinds are good'. The commitment to free and open dialogue therefore needs to be defended in some other way.

Reviving Emancipation

Ken Booth's past and recent writing will help to clarify some of the criticisms against the emancipatory approach. Booth (2005: 181) highlights that it is 'important to keep in mind that emancipatory politics need not be dominated bywestern ideas. Nor should ideas of universal significance be dismissed just because that is identifiable as having origins within the multifaceted Western world. A more benign world politics needs to reject both ethnocentrism and ethno guilt'. He clarifies that emancipation should not be viewed as western theological concept, and should take into account cultural norms of the different societies albeit still from a universalistic viewpoint. Practically, however this is something that may still be difficult to achieve.

Ken Booth also clarifies that his emphasis on emancipation as compared to power and order, should not be misunderstood to the total exclusion of power and order. Booth clarifies that 'power should be diffused ...away from state' to '....more local communities' and admits that while politics will always be 'power politics', it does not mean that 'might is right'(Booth 1991: 541). Ken Booth also clarifies that emancipation should be viewed as a 'philosophical anchorage', not a 'neutral foundation', and a practical dynamic process based in 'immanent critique', not a 'timeless endpoint'(Booth 2005: 182). This reinforces the point that there is no preconceived utopia or ideal but one that is derivative and where it is not the endpoint that is important but the act of moving towards it.

In 'On Emancipation' Wyn Jones (2005: 219), cites examples of postmodernists like Jacques Derrida and political theorists like Laclau and Jan Neverdeen Pieterse who have taken an ethical turn by suggesting a possibility of an alternative to the

status quo albeit through a more circumscribed notion of emancipation. In doing so, he suggest that the gap between emancipator critical studies and postmodernism may not be as wide as originally thought and could well converge in future. Elsewhere, Wyn Jones calls for another way 'by which the concept of emancipation can become less of a terra incognita is through concrete analysis of particular issues and areas' (Jones 1999). He sees some positive developments in this respect and cites the examples of the initiatives of Booth and Vale in South Africa and Andrew Linklater in world politics. Adopting a critical theory approach, they discuss the possibility of encouraging the development of 'no statist states committed to regionalism and human diversity both internally and externally,' or "rainbow states" (Booth & Vale 1997: 352,353). Linklater seeks a world political order 'governed by universal sable moral principles" (Linklater 1990: 24, 26) and that the development of a 'universal dialogic community' would create structure and practices that are more universal, more sensitive to cultural differences and characterized by greater material equality(Linklater 1998). In his recent book *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Ken Booth recognized the need to bring CSS forward beyond their differences. He envisaged they are two major roads, that is, critical theory tradition in social theory and radical tradition in international relations theory are converging to form a highway called critical security theory(Booth 2005: 263). This includes the Frankfurt School, ideas of Antonio Gramsci, the Marxism tradition and an embryonic school of critical international theory (linked to Linklater). At a risk of generalizing Booth has identified eight main common themes which are paraphrased as follows:

- All knowledge is a social process. Knowledge is historical and borrowing Robert Cox formulation, 'for someone or for some purpose'. The aim of critical theory is to reveal the interest of knowledge as a factor of social and political enquiry
- Traditional theory promotes the flaws of naturalism and reductionism. Critical theory agrees studying human beings and societies using scientific methods is flawed.
- Critical theory offers a basis for political and social progress. Critical theories stand outside and questions the social or political phenomena, to bring about structural changes in the human interest
- Test of theory is emancipation. The search for multilevel emancipatory communities, locally and globally wherein communication or discourse ethics rather than traditional

politico-military strategizing must be the priority.

- Human society is its own invention. International relations are human made reality or facts by human agreement at the global scale.
- Regressive theories have dominated politics among nations. Ethnocentric and masculinist ideas are regressive. All theories that downplay gender, race and class issues are regressive.
- State and other institutions must be denaturalised. Institutions that do not recognize that every person has an equal moral worth should be changed.
- Progressive world order values should inform the means and ends of an international politics committed to enhancing world security. Promotion of values such as delegitimation of violence, economic justice, the pursuits of human rights, the spread of humane governance, and the development of environmental sustainability.

Towards Future Pathways And New Framework for Critical Security Study (CSS)

Although the above discussion has focused on elaborating strengths and weaknesses in the Copenhagen School and Welsh School our contention is that they are reflective of critical security studies in general. In terms of the politics of security we have argued that there is a tendency to work with Universalist assumptions about what politics does, whether this is viewed positively or negatively. Meanwhile, normatively we have suggested the existence of a shared but relatively weak and certainly undertheorised liberal ethical commitment – not least towards opening space for deliberation and dialogue. Most theorists working in post-structural, Paris School and feminist traditions consistently express similar concerns outlined above about the negative and exclusionary practices associated with contemporary security politics, and endorse opening up the discursive space in which security policies undertaken on behalf of a community are developed. Some within these traditions even explicitly promote a normative concern with emancipation, even if not understood in exactly the same way as Booth. For Richard Wyn Jones this is not surprising, as ‘some concept of emancipation is a necessary element of any form of analysis that attempts to problematize and criticize the status quo’ (original emphasis). None of this is to elide the important differences between these approaches, but rather to suggest the need to put these differences in broader perspective. However,

the failure to develop a really clear, sophisticated and contextual account of the politics of security, combined with a failure to articulate a clear and sophisticated conception of what constitutes progress in terms of security practices and contexts is vitally important as it leaves us short of a compelling rationale (either on analytical or normative grounds) for critical security studies other than as a means of critique. Hence the question of whether critical security studies can provide anything beyond this. Without pretending to be able to lay out a comprehensive agenda for the future of critical security studies the remainder of this paper suggests a series of pathways around which such theorisations might begin to emerge. In the spirit of immanent critique these pathways build on openings already in the literature, but suggest where more work is needed. (S. Browning, 2010: 14 - 15).

Human emancipation is often cited as the ultimate goal of the CSS project. Kennet Booth defines human emancipation as “the theory and practice of inventing humanity, with a view of freeing people, as individuals and collectivities, from contingent and structural oppressions... the concept of emancipation shapes strategies and tactics of resistance, offers a theory of progress for society, and gives a politics of hope for common humanity.”

For Booth then, human emancipation is a concern with questioning and changing structures and institutions that oppress us and prevent us from reaching our true potential, a seemingly Marxist and poststructuralist concern. Emancipation and security become two sides of the same coin for Booth, as humans must be freed from their oppressive structures and overthrow physical and human constraints that prevent them from reaching their true potential. However, emancipation is not the end-all solution but a project that can never be fully realized. This may lead some to question the practicality of the concept. Here, I will draw an analogy from Karl Marx, whose idea of human emancipation was communism, a goal that we can see in the horizon, but the closer we get to it, the further away it seems. Yet, when we look back, we see how far we have come. Therefore, human emancipation serves practical purpose as an imminent critique, which can be utilized as a philosophical anchorage for tactical goal setting.

Critics, usually cultural relativists, have derided human emancipation for being a new Western imposition on “Third World” and developing nations, as a way to colonize and control these countries. However, freedom from fear, freedom to live without state repression, freedom to live up to one’s true potential without any barriers and the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are not only

Western ideals. These are human ideals, which also do not originate only in the West as Enlightenment scholars would like us to believe. There should be no doubt that cultural relativism is a critically useful concept, especially since the use of it allows us to celebrate our differences instead of engaging in otherizing behavior. However, human rights and freedoms are not relative and all too often, we find that people are oppressed under the false cloak of cultural relativism. Human emancipation does entail cultural relativism for it is important to advance a universal concept of human security free from ethnocentrism and ideologies.

Additionally, any project on human emancipation should come with a recognition that international relations and the state are not non-gendered, but highly gendered male-dominated institutions of power that exclude women from discussions about their own security. The patriarchal domination of women in the private sphere extends into the male-dominated public sphere. In this case, de-centering the state as the referent object of security is supported by a large segment of feminist security studies as “[national] security (in terms of masculinist modes of domination) secures patriarchal relations of power and renders women insecure precisely because they are women...” Security becomes what men in the national security state make of it. Violence against women, sending their children to war, the raping of woman as a demonstration of power and militarized masculinities pose security problems for women that any alternate framework of security should deeply consider. (Perna 2006, 21-22).

Critical Security Studies and The Way Ahead

The writers of this article believe that way ahead, as has been alluded to but not emphasized by Ken Booth is a managed diffusion of power. However this should be done without compromising overall efficiency necessary for the long term survival of the community. In this real world there are more pressing problems of economic growth and development. Countries will need to prioritize industrial and infrastructure development to sustain the economic growth rather than strive to prioritize to meet the unique and often conflicting needs of all communities. Critical Studies proponents must be mindful that in the short run this approach will inevitably require some compromising of the emancipatory logic. There is a need to adopt a more multidisciplinary and multicultural approach towards human emancipation. Some of the ideas of the postmodernist and indeed even as suggested by Alker the ‘antiessentialist ‘securitisation’ approach of the Copenhagen School. This could lead to a better managed and prioritized humanity security. While the ultimate goal may be human emancipation, the way

towards it will have to start from a perspective of pragmatic economic and social realities.

Rather than freeing all humans from wants, it is felt that a better approach would be to free them from any lack of opportunities. Implicit in this approach is the need to achieve one’s desires according to one’s effort. Also, from an entrepreneurial perspective, some degree of threat is useful in motivating self improvement. A complete removal of any threat could ultimately work against emancipation.

Conclusion:

Critical security studies has been constructed as a subdiscipline of international relations but also exists as a transdisciplinary subfield in which disparate research can connect over some common epistemological, methodological and empirical commitments. Critical Security Studies is the most sustained and coherent critique of traditional Security Studies. Critical Security Studies through the likes of Ayoob, Thomas, Acharya and Wilkinson, has attempted to break away from the constraints of the western paradigms in order to truly understand the security concerns and their manifestations outside the West. Unfortunately, the outcome of this attempt has been a flawed understanding of the problematique. The main conclusion is that the concept of security is now genuinely contested: as part of this contestation, it required that concepts, such as the state, community, emancipation, as well as the relationships, such as those between the individual and their society and between economics and politics, are also subject to contestation. Critical Security Studies, defined more generally, consist of alternatives rejection of realism, but it does not add up to an alternative theory. The Krause and Williams note a mixture of positions posing an alternative to realism and thus offers a much wider perspective on security studies. And while the advantage of this is a wide-ranging critique of the traditional literature, the price is that there is less likelihood of an agreement on how to reconceptualize security. Thus can claim that Critical Security Studies have position and place in international relations. This day the revolution development that in the Middle East (North Africa) occurs can perspective analyzed of the Critical Security Studies and the factors of CSS such as emancipation and human security. In the future we will witness that the world go to use emancipation, integration and the human security. In the conclude of will influence of the Critical Security Studies as the mainstreams in the large scale in international relations.

Corresponding Author:

Saeid Vosoghi (Associate Professor of International Relations, Esfahan University, Iran)

SaeidVosoghi@yahoo.com

Notes:

- Booth, K. (1991), 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 17.
- Booth, K. (2005), 'Emancipation', in K. Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc, London.
- Buzan, B., Ole Wæver & Wilde, J.d. (1998), *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder.
- Craig, Campbell (2003) *Glimmer of a New Leviathan: Total War in the Realism of Niebuhr, Morgenthau and Waltz*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dehghani Firouz Abadi S. J. (Summer, 2008), *Emancipating Foreign Policy: Critical Theory and Islamic Republic of Iran's Foreign Policy*, *The Iranian Journal of International Affairs* Vol. XX, No.3.
- Jennifer Mustapha. (2009), *An Analytical Survey of Critical Security Studies: Making the Case for a (Modified) Post-structuralist Approach*, McMaster University.
- Jones, R.W. (2001), *Critical Theory & World Politics*, Lynne Rienner, London.
- Jones, R.W. (2005), 'On Emancipation: Necessity, Capacity, and Concrete Utopia', in K. Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc, London.
- Krause, Keith (1996) 'Critical Theory and Security Studies: the Research Program of Critical Security Studies', *Cooperation and Conflict*.
- Kuklick, Bruce (2007) *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- McSweeney, B. (1996), 'Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School', *Review of International Studies*, vol 22.
- Morgan, Patrick (2007) "Security in International Politics: Traditional Approaches" in Collins, Alan (ed) *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nunes João Reis. (2008), *Politics, Security, Critical Theory: A Contribution to Current*

Debates on Security, University of Wales, Aberystwyth.

- Pope, A. (1971), 'An Essay on Criticism', in H. Adams (ed.), *Critical Theory since Plato*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York.
- Perna P. Lal. (2006), *Critical Security Studies, Deconstructing the National Security State: Towards a New Framework of Analysis*.
- S. Browning Christopher. (2010), *The Future of Critical Security Studies: CSS, Ethics and Pathways for Future Research*, University of Warwick.
- Wæver, O. (1995), 'Securitization and Desecuritization.' in R. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Walt (1991) "The Renaissance of Security Studies" *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2.
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Relations* (New York: Random House).

11/22/2011