

Conference Paper

Securitization in Modern Politics: Complex Security Institution

Gazi Giray Gunaydin

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Yildirim Beyazit University, Ankara, Turkey

Email address:gazigiraygunaydin@gmail.com**To cite this article:**Gazi Giray Gunaydin. Securitization in Modern Politics: Complex Security Institution. *Social Sciences*. Vol. 6, No. 3, 2017, pp. 85-90.

doi: 10.11648/j.ss.20170603.13

Received: May 13, 2017; **Accepted:** May 27, 2017; **Published:** June 29, 2017

Abstract: In modern politics, security is a phenomenon, which may be seen as a complex institution beyond any ordinary concept. It is not a specific term only concerning a particular area: While security is a concept, which is composed of the discrepancy between danger and precaution, securitization is an engraved phenomenon penetrating to throughout the modern life, which fear is the fundamental determinant. Without understanding the historical roots of security, it is not possible to grasp the modern security institutions. Additionally, it is clear that fear that may be acknowledged an essential element of security does not belong only modern times because of the nature of humanity. Therefore, the question of the motivations of security within the frame of fear should be answered. In this context, it is obvious that there is an immense dilemma between security and freedom in modern politics. In fact, the concept of freedom should be discussed as part of securitization policies in the modern paradigm. Because the freedom of people means the measure of limitations of individual life from now on. Additionally, the concepts of anatomo-politics and biopolitics in Michel Foucault literature may make it possible to discuss securitization in modern politics. By this means, this article pursues also the question: May securitization be equivalent of Foucault's biopolitics? While discussing security and securitization theoretically, it is aimed to answer the question with reference to fiction, how security institutions are built. In order to glance the paradigm of securitization, *Night*, written by Bilge Karasu, is unique novel illustrating the construction process of fear in Turkish literature. This article is intended to challenge the concepts of security, securitization from the world of dangers and fears. Within this scope, the theoretical debate will cohere the opportunities of the literature through the night workers.

Keywords: Security, Securitization, Fear, Freedom, Modernity, Globalization, Anatomo-Politics, Biopolitics

1. Introduction

What are the historical roots of security? Was the world more secure in the past or does today's world more dangerous despite technical developments? What is the relation between security and fear? Do fears regenerate or do they exist primordially in human nature? If it is constructed, how and which process contribute generating the fears? Is it possible to discuss security without fear? Is there any end(less) of the threshold of security? What are the limits of security? What determines to limits of security? Is it possible that to mention security as a tangible notion? Which context operates while establishing to security institution in recent politics? Is biopolitics, which came up with Michel Foucault, can be seen

as a kind of securitization policy? These questions still can be extended more. The existence of security cannot be considered independently of modernity and globalization. This article aims to look the reasons for seeking securitization theoretically in the context of security and freedom and the relationship between fear and danger through *Night*, which is the novel written by Bilge Karasu.

It is difficult to put precise time concerning to emerge the security phenomenon. There were horrible wars among great empires in mythical narratives and other historical sources verify the thesis, which cruelty, terror, grief, and fears do not only pertain to the modern era. Annexation desires of empires, defense strategies against great powers, bilateral security risks of ancient great empires in macropolitics are entirely part of

security issues of ancient times. On the one hand, as a social fact in pre-modern times, there were specific groups designed traditionally as a community (*gemeinschaft*) around the culture of the neighborhood. With a specific community within the framework of the traditional neighborhood relations, what can be security risks? Its sounds seem to be despicable crimes like homicide, bribe, rape, extortion and so forth. In retaliation for crimes, native authorities had likely classical precaution, punishment and discipline mechanisms. Security does not have any political meaning except for ordinary crimes. Therefore, it cannot be mentioned the existence of security institution in a community. It is obvious that the risks of modern governments and societies upon security are disparate and utterly different from traditional counterparts. Thereby, security should be considered as modern phenomena. It is not possible to judge today's security perception in the traditional context. In that case, the paradigm, which relies on modernity and its transformed forms, has constructed to the security concept and determines what it is.

In contemporary politics, security should be handled in multidimensional perspective. Security is not just subheading of social issues in modern politics. It does not consist of security issues with the apparent surface. Security is a political concept, which is beyond regular threats, risks, and ordinary crimes. Its meaning exceeds to the police force. It is a key point that the paradigm creating the security concept is not stable; it is altered, transformed and evolved depending on the dynamics. *The paradigm is entirety, cannot crumble.* Security cannot be thought independently without the whole paradigm. As likely as not, it is that may be early signs of biopolitics before its explicit manifestation.

At this juncture, the securitization concept beyond a regular security gains importance. In fact, the concept is quite new incomparable to the history of modernity. Securitization term was devised theoretically in the second half of the twentieth century by the Copenhagen School. The theory put forward some processes and a medium for operating securitization. Although biopolitics and securitization seem to stay disparate positions, with this reformer understanding of security issues, it might be possible to think biopolitics and securitization theory together because both of them serves a global story all over the world.

With all that, *Night* written by Bilge Karasu is an unusual novel in Turkish literature revealing how the necessity of security is constructed. The literary language of Karasu in *Night* operates in discrete levels while drawing out "the night workers" with their actions. It will be pursued the question how "the night workers" generate fear and how fear sense causes to the securitized environment in the community. The entity and their actions of "the night workers" are unique sample in terms of showing how security institution establishes through the channels calling fear sentiments. Within the theoretical framework, this text aims to discuss the existence of universal security institution in modern politics that operates in a complex structure.

2. Anato-mo-Politics: Premature Form of Biopolitics

As specified above, thinking security institution is possible only if it is considered in a modern context. Because this article's extent is restricted to deal with security as a complex institution. So, how can it be classified the transformed meaning of security? It depends on directly the transformation of the paradigm. According to the transformable paradigm, the concept of security has evolved, expanded and gained new inferences. It is arduous to put rigid distinctions and to classify the story of security because it is not possible that conceiving modernity is an absolute notion. It is a dynamic fact, which has evolved constantly depending on conditions within the process. This unstable feature of modern paradigm, which is also a decisive element for the security, obstructs to identify the limits of security necessity. Nevertheless, security paradigm may be delimited and characterized as a unique level of security perception before emerging securitization concept. The distinction may be expressed as modern's primitive form of security and its transformed variations, which may be called as postmodernism.

Michel Foucault states that there was anato-mo-politics preceding biopolitics, which targets to human bodies of individuals straight. Anato-mo-politics, which the term is derived from *anatomy*, appeared in the seventeenth and the eighteenth century. It is an absolute modern notion of primitive industrial time, but in fact, it will be served munificently to the world of totalitarian states, bureaucracy and complex industry in the following centuries. There are surveillance and hierarchical mechanism, detection, and official reports. [1] The techniques of power become tangible its authority and operates disciplinary process by the medium of this kind of mechanism. Discipline aims to rehabilitation or intimidating punishment by means of the hospital, asylum, prison, and rehabilitation center. Discipline should be understood as the mechanism ensuring security in order to constitute a homogeneous society.

Anato-mo-politics, which utilizes to discipline techniques, is the output of the modern state. Despite the fact that Foucault emphasizes anato-mo-politics had prevailed in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, it is essentially possible to say that the concept can be complied with totalitarian states particularly in the inter-war period, in following centuries. In other words, anato-mo-politics had prevailed until rising neoliberalism as a decisive paradigm in the mid-twentieth century. It means the paradigm, which has spread to the whole world within the scope of a global story after World War II, gains a new identity after its transformation. Hereby, biopolitics took to the stage in the conditions of transformed paradigm, which will be generated by securitization policies.

Totalitarian states need to establish their ideology using *the ideological state apparatus* and to apply indoctrination policies for this purpose. The main goal of them is embedding official ideology of state to each individual. It is expected to embrace by all people within the envisagement of a homogenous community. However, there are always

marginalized people or totalitarian state declares to foes in this fantasy. To struggle with them (*foes*) legitimates sanctions in the sight of a homogenized community. Certainly, the discourse serving legitimacy of enforcements against oppressed people contributes constructing security. Applying violence and being dissuasive while using violence is the fundamental point of anatomo-politics. It is without doubt direct process that has not complex structure so indeed in comparison with biopolitics.

In Foucault words, there is a ruler, which has the right of life and death but it does not mean that ruler can grant life similarly he can be responsible for death: "The right of life and death is always exercised in an unbalanced way: The balance is always tipped in favour of death." [2] Hence, there is actually only the right of death under the cover of the right of life and death. In that case, the question is why individuals give their rights to absolute power when they make an agreement at the level of social contract. Its response is clear: "They do so because they are forced to by some threat or by need. It is in order to live that they constitute a sovereign." [3] They feel to an obligation of protecting their lives. In a word, it is a straightforward process. Their trust serves only to their death by the favor of the sovereign. Discipline is the main motivation and security is mere instrument absolutely in order to realize it.

3. Biopolitics: Beyond the Modern States

It is possible to put a distinction between traditional and contemporary modern state. This differentiation may be seen also as the difference of modernism and postmodernism. Because the modern state is not absolute fact, it is a dynamic phenomenon. Over the centuries, it has attained different meanings and extent, which was transformed several operational mechanisms in the continuum. On the occasion of the rising neoliberalism, it can be said that the world has become part of a global story more than ever before. It is impossible to say, of course, the global story has prevailed in rest of the world, however, the story of globalization was not experienced such an enormously before in the history. Neoliberalism has rendered possible to the existence of globalization and glocalization. With the effect of USA's unipolar domination in world politics in the post-Cold War era, the global story has caused to be standardized lives, preferences in the numerous fields of life like clothes, daily routine, desires and other stuff. There is an only output of this fact: The absolute paradigm that has spread to the whole world determines to the context of systematically logic, on the one hand, every unit designating its locality alters and adapts figures within the frame of a universal paradigm. There is no longer that the explicit boundaries between safety, security, certainty in the securitized society. [4] As might be expected, the paradigm, which is constructed on the neoliberal vision of the world, has welcomed to securitization policies similar to biopolitics.

Due to all of the reasons regarded above. the problematic of biopolitics cannot separate from transformed meanings of

modernity and security in international relations. The connotations of biopolitics are related to complexity by contrast with anatomo-politics. At this point, biopolitics becomes a part of an activity. It is inclusionary and to cover all parts of life, everywhere with respect to biological. Michel Foucault describes to biopolitics as power technology rather than techniques. So, its application area passes over to people's life comprehensively, not only bodies. It means it deals with to not individual as a body or a social body. It takes care of individuals and their bodies in practical terms and living bodies. [5] It will not be surprising that discipline in biopolitics is beyond the particular techniques unlikely to anatomo-politics.

In biopolitics, discipline looks to people's plenty enough; because this crowd should be peeped, educated, utilized if it is required, punished and transformed to individual bodies for all of them. Initially, there will be establishing power with the method of individualizing and then second establishing power at the mass level through biopolitics. The following new technology is directly related to particular life and is affected by collective processes like birth, death, production, disease and so forth. Biopolitics is beyond disciplinary process, but it does not exclude to discipline, to include it, to change it partially and to place itself instead of disciplinarian technique. [6] It means also there is a self-control mechanism in securitized and "heterogeneous" society. So that it is the essential key point that there is people's crowd, collective process and a global mass are always attractive in terms of biopolitics.

Biopolitics is not principle, rule or theorem regarding what power is. The fundamental point is the question of "how" during the power mechanisms operate. Foucault interprets for biopolitics that "this analysis simply involves investigating where and how, between whom, between what points, according to what processes, and with what effects, power is applied." [7] And he asks it: "What are we to understand by 'security'?" [8]

The meaning of security has transformed within centuries. It does not constitute an independent process and designated depending on the paradigm. Through Foucault's inferences, the evolution of the meaning of security can be identified in three steps: First, there is an ostentatious and flashy moment of punishment, it is enacting a law and to punish people violating to limits of the law. Second, it is a disciplinary mechanism, which comprises the punishment through the surveillance and control. It can be considered as part of anatomo-politics that is not so complex much. The third one is linked to the security mechanism existing in biopolitics and it paves the way for establishing complex security institution. [9] If so the question should be asked: What does security mechanism mean? Conversely former ones, security mechanism looks some statistics and questions before punishment. For example, there may be some questions about an incident of theft:

"What, therefore, is the comparative cost of the theft and of its repression, and what is more worthwhile: to tolerate a bit more theft or to tolerate a bit more repression? There are

further questions: When one has caught the culprit, is it worth punishing him? What will it cost to punish him? What should be done in order to punish him and, by punishing him, re-educate him? Can he really be re-educated? Independently of the act he has committed, is he a permanent danger such that he will do it again whether or not he has been re-educated?" [10]

Before security mechanisms, these questions were not asked during the time of anatomo-politics. There is direct punishment concerning the law or the aim is disciplining how to apply instruments like a hospital, asylum, school etc. Because of that security is a tool in order to ensure discipline without biopolitics. With the questions of security mechanism as can be seen above, the codes of biopolitics are conducted by the acts of the sovereign. Biopower is not intended to punish the culprit directly, however, it spreads and penetrates to all fields of life how to calculate all costs in complex level. The set of serial phenomena, which are consisted of several mechanisms, contributes the entity of a security institution. At this point, it will be understood that the securitization concept is a fundamental determinant in the impetus of biopolitics.

4. The Securitization Concept

The paradigm formed around neoliberalism has spread widely in the world and so the global story promises freedom to people in the controlled farm. It is a supra-state circumstance. The orientation of the political system is not decisive because the paradigm determines fundamentally what it will be. Therefore, all institutions of any political system serve to the necessity of the political paradigm. [11] It is only possible for applying an instrumental policy like securitization. Otherwise, it would be the end of absolute power without securitization. The function of securitization is similar to *the valve* in the subway, which will be pulled in the moment of danger. Beyond that securitization is the set of processes, which to not necessitate to pull *the valve* because the existence of *valve* effaces the moment of danger, which may be occurred at any time. It means that (most of) people in the subway will be careful to not cause any danger because they see *valve* continually. As Zygmunt Bauman illustrated successively, "present-day insecurity is akin to the feeling the passengers of a plane may experience when they discover that the pilot's cabin is empty – that the friendly captains' voice was merely a replay of an old recorded message." [12] Therefore, the function of securitization is keeping under control in the controlled freedom area rather than punishing directly to anomalous one how to establish self-control mechanism.

Security means to limit rights and freedoms. It is about survival. [13] So, securitization becomes a critical point in terms of affecting people's life. The effect is particularly directed towards "the middle", which covers ordinary people in the public. [14] Both of over-securitization and de-securitization may be hazardous in the realist perspective. Who will decide the limits of security? Besides, which issues will be seen as a security issue? For instance, what is a terrorist

organization, and which one is or not? Is there any difference between the violence of state or terrorist organization? These questions cannot be answered sincerely because, as Ken Booth mentioned, there are word problems under the world problems. [15] In fact, its answer is not so much challenging. But, being word problem under the security issues result in perspective differentiations. Government possessing power is the decision-maker in the micro level. According to the principles of global story, the paradigm possessing absolute power is ultimately the decisive power in the macro level, which will determine what threat is or which fears generate.

Securitization is one of the most featured studies of the Copenhagen School developed by Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan. Securitization theory establishes on mediums, structures, and institutions of contemporary political communication. It evokes the importance of discourse, linguistics and semiological functions. According to Michael Williams, there are three featured sides of the Copenhagen School. First, they actually come from the realist tradition although the School adopts a form of social constructivism. Second, the core claim of securitization theory is speech-act, which is located in the realm of political argument and discursive legitimation. The third one is the Copenhagen School's key emphasis on communicative action embedded within televisual images in security practices. [16] The process of securitization needs some elements in order to operate it. Securitization is not possible without politicization before. Because there should be recipients that able to get the message. It may be acknowledged that "securitization can thus be seen as a more extreme version of politicization". [17] In order to establish securitized realm, it is required to be speech-act, the mass that is ready to accept (audience), urgency emphasis and extraordinary precautions. These are utterly a kind of *the valves* as mentioned above. Without accepting of the audience, securitizing to any issue is not possible. "The distinguishing feature of securitization is a specific rhetorical structure", which consists of "survival" and "priority of action", because –the discourse says that- "if the problem is not handled now, it will be too late, and we will not exist to remedy our failure. In the security discourse, any issue is dramatized and presented as an issue of supreme priority" [18] and there should be an audience to believe the necessity of extraordinary precautions immediately to their lives.

Securitization may be seen also the process changing the normal issues and making it as a security issue. It is possible only if applying a specific discourse. The security discourse operates in particular channels. The medium of speech, televisual images or other linguistic channels serves only to create apprehension and to manipulate the masses. The operating logic of this process is same, but the discourse varies substantially depending on circumstances. The spectrum may change from state to state. [19] It operates with such a medium legitimizing the use of force and ensuring people demand security, or "it has opened the way for the state to mobilize, or to take special powers, to handle existential threats". [20] Additionally, the Copenhagen School emphasizes to the subjectivity of the process of securitization. According to the

theory, security is not an issue depending on the objective condition; it is in need of specific social process. There is social construction of security issues, which generated threats should be become represented and recognized. [21]

5. The Securitization Beyond Security: “The Night Workers”

While discussing security and securitization theoretically, looking a literary text taking strength from fiction, which is *Night* written by Bilge Karasu, avails understanding how securitization is built in society. The novel is constructed on symbols in polysemous structure, which is a unique example in order to show how to generate fear sense applying artificial symbols in society. It is also meaningful for the processes of securitization. However, it should be noted that security institution in *Night* refers previous forms of security institution like anatomo-politics instead of biopolitics.

During the flow of the novel, there is only a protagonist: “The night workers”. Night evokes to fear; it does not illuminate like a day. “For horses to gallop on this land, the vestiges of man have to be still further erased from the earth and the sky.” [22] The night workers appear after sunset. Their main goal is causing people fear. There are some methods of doing that. The night workers are designed entirely from head to foot for reminding the sense of fear. “The tools they bear are fashioned of iron, cut from welltanned hides, carved from choice timber, or molded from pliant resins. They serve to pound, tear, pierce, gouge, twist, and snap off. Also to burn and to break.” [23] And in the realm that the night workers patrol, violence, and homicide is so ordinary: “If the great, enveloping night is prefigured by human beings’ doing away with one another in vengeful cold blood, without a twinge of conscience, with steady hands, knowing full well that their turn to be killed may come tomorrow.” [24]

The process of generating fear is also happened by means of profiling people. It is therefore necessary to identify their interlocutors for making their missions precisely. The night workers try to recognize people, to know their habits and regular practices well. In the novel, profiling people is symbolized through the shapes of loaves.

“The night workers walk the alleys, watching into which houses the round, rectangular, oval, and long loaves make their way. Although they proceed rather casually, those who observe carefully will from time to time see one of them go up to a door and put an unobtrusive mark on it somewhere or other. The keen observer is puzzled. In the houses so marked, square bear is never eaten, yet the marks give no clue as to shape of the loaves consumed. Indeed, the doors have been marked somewhat at random. Or, at least, so it seems.” [25]

In a word, the night workers do their actions while spreading fear like speech-act or televisual images in securitization theory. In different language channels, they generate fear. After sensing fear by people, they believe the night workers’ mysterious reality although they cannot

understand. Such a fear is that “in the present situation, people like to believe whatever is less terrifying”. [26]

6. Conclusion

This article seeks to provide insight concerning security, securitization and particularly how security institution differentiates from previous forms to complex forms. It is a fundamental point that security and following securitization policies are not independent processes. They rely on a paradigm, which is a part of the global story called globalization and glocalization. It can be already noticed that securitization policies become complicated in parallel with rising neoliberalism. Indeed, biopolitics covers to all fields of politics, which modern paradigm dominates. It is not restricted only security issues or current politics; biopolitics is related to everything, which there are people and it is a tool to develop approaches on behalf of absolute power. Therefore, it is possible to say that that securitization is part of security mechanisms of biopolitics. As expressed clearly in words above, it should be beneficial in order to grasp the today’s security phenomena that thinking biopolitics and securitization concept together is likely.

References

- [1] M. Foucault, “25 February 1976,” in *Society Must Be Defended*, Trans. D. Macey. New York: Picador, 2003. p. 242.
- [2] *Ibid.* p. 240.
- [3] *Ibid.* p. 241.
- [4] M. Schuilenburg, *The Securitization of Society: Crime, Risk and Social Order*. Trans. G. Hall. New York: New York University Press, 2015, p. 67.
- [5] M. Foucault, “25 February 1976,” in *Society Must Be Defended*, Trans. D. Macey. New York: Picador, 2003. p. 245.
- [6] *Ibid.* pp. 245–246.
- [7] M. Foucault, “11 January 1978,” in *Security, Territory, Population*, Trans. G. Burchell. New York, Picador, 2007. p. 2.
- [8] *Ibid.* p. 4.
- [9] *Ibid.* pp. 4–6.
- [10] *Ibid.* p. 5.
- [11] A. M. Stefan, *Democratization and Securitization: The Case of Romania*, Ed. M. P. Amineh, Leiden: Brill, 2009. p. 34.
- [12] Z. Bauman, *In Search of Politics*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1999, p. 20.
- [13] B. Buzan, O. Wæver, and J. d. Wilde, “Security Analysis: Conceptual Apparatus,” in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998. p. 21.
- [14] M. Schuilenburg, *The Securitization of Society: Crime, Risk and Social Order*. Trans. G. Hall. New York: New York University Press, 2015, pp. 97–98.

- [15] K. Booth, "Security and emancipation," *Review of International Studies*, vol. 17, no. 4, October 1991. pp. 313–314.
- [16] M. C. Williams, "Words, images, enemies: securitization and international politics," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 47, no. 4, December 2003. p. 512.
- [17] B. Buzan, O. Wæver, and J. d. Wilde, "Security Analysis: Conceptual Apparatus," in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998. p. 23.
- [18] *Ibid.* p. 26.
- [19] *Ibid.* p. 24.
- [20] *Ibid.* p. 21.
- [21] M. C. Williams, "Words, images, enemies: securitization and international politics," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 47, no. 4, December 2003. p. 513.
- [22] B. Karasu, *Night*. Trans. G. Gun. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994. p. 15.
- [23] *Ibid.* p. 4.
- [24] *Ibid.* p. 21.
- [25] *Ibid.* p. 5.
- [26] *Ibid.* p. 11.