DE GRUYTER OPEN
LITHUANIAN ANNUAL STRATEGIC REVIEW
2013-2014, Volume 12

Dovilė Jakniūnaitė *
Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University

Critical Security Studies in the 21st Century: Any Directions for Lithuanian Security Studies?

This article focuses on recent developments and discussions in the field of security studies and aims to suggest new guidelines for the research of Lithuanian security policy. First it covers the main subjects of contemporary security discourse; next it provides evaluation and review of the critical tradition in security studies that frames presuppositions and is the means for analyzing specific security issues as well as that which fosters reflexive thinking about security. The third part deals with three topics of security research (analysis of security through the concepts of risk, exceptionality and media) which have become talking–points in recent years and which have provided innovative insights in security studies.

Introduction

What is the main focus of security policy, what should it be, and how to best conceptualize security – these and similar issues concern both practitioners and political analysts around the world. In our country reflections about security can be associated with two processes. The first is the restoration of the Republic of Lithuania and the efforts to comprehend and evaluate its security situation. However, these reflections cannot be dissociated from the effort to understand the Western tradition and debates on security. This second process allowed the developing of vocabulary to discuss security after the Cold War, as well as analytical tools and a general stance on what is secure and what is not. The ideas of national and collective security started to be applied in the Lithuanian context and gave rise to discussions about the creation of security community, strategic culture, security perspectives of a small country. The first years have

* *Dr. Dovilė Jakniūnaitė* is an Associate Professor of the Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Vilnius University. Address for correspondence: Vokiečių 10, LT-01130 Vilnius, Lithuania, e-mail: dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt

DOI: 10.2478/lasr-2014-0002
© Dovilė Jakniūnaitė, 2014
© Military Academy of Lithuania, 2014
Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

been clearly marked by an intention to learn basic concepts and traditions in the discipline of international relations and security studies.

Security studies in the West met their own challenges: they had to re–evaluate and make sense out of the post–Cold War situation and find newer tools. In the last decade of the twentieth century a new wave of theoretical disputes became visible. Former questions resurfaced such as how to analyze security and what the subject of such studies should be. These discussions meant broadening the concept of security, increasing the number of its subjects and referent objects; and there was a debate over sectors of security and regional security complexes. Later this debate was overshadowed by the securitization theory.[1]

In Lithuania this environment of turbulent discussion at first was observed at a safe distance and the first steps were timid – some basic ideas were presented and straightforwardly applied to the Lithuanian context.[2] A great shift in the thinking about security studies happened after the translation into Lithuanian of Barry Buzan's book *People, States, and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post–Cold War Era*.[3] This book remains one of the fundamental texts about national and international security for the security studies discipline (especially in Europe). It marks a shift from a narrow military approach to security towards its wider and deeper interpretation. In Lithuania this book not only proposed the first theoretical framework, but also encouraged innovative research on security sectors.[4] As securitization studies became more popular in the whole community of European security research in late 1990s, securitization studies also emerged in Lithuania.[5]

Another strong theoretical tradition developed in Lithuania that took interest in the analysis of Lithuanian security situation was geopolitics. Its

---

[1] Buzan B. & Hansen L., *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[2] Bagdonavičius V., ed., *Lietuvos nacionalinis saugumas: teorija ir realijos,* Vilnius: Filosofijos, sociologijos ir teisės institutas, 1994; Vareikis E. et al., *Skaitiniai apie nacionalinį ir tarptautinį saugumą, T. 1*, Vilnius: Ogamas, 2000; Prazauskas A., Bajarūnas E., & Žulys A., *Skaitiniai apie nacionalinį ir tarptautinį saugumą, T. 2,* Vilnius: Ogamas, 2001.

[3] Buzan B., *Žmonės, valstybė ir baimė: tarptautinio saugumo studijos po Šaltojo karo*, Vilnius: Eugrimas, 1997; in English – Barry B., *People, States, and Fear*, 1991.

[4] Jurgelevičiūtė D., *Saugumo samprata informacijos amžiaus tarptautiniuose santykiuose*, Vilnius, Vilnius University, BA thesis, 2004; Jurgelevičiūtė D., "The Issue of Occupation in Lithuanian–Russian Relations: Information Security Aspects," *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review* 18 (2), 2006, p. 56–82; Janeliūnas T., "Gegužės 9–osios problema saugumuziavimo teorijos ir komunikacinio saugumo požiūriu," *Politologija*, 2, 2005, p. 3–30.

[5] Miniotaitė G., "The Security Policy of Lithuania and the 'Integration Dilemma' ", *COPRI Working Papers 5/2000*, Copenhagen: Copenhagen Peace Research Institute, 2000; Miniotaitė G. & Jakniūnaitė D., "Lietuvos saugumo politika ir identitetas šiuolaikinių saugumo studijų požiūriu", *Politologija*, 3, 2001, p. 21–43; Janeliūnas, op.cit.; Jurgelevičiūtė, *op.cit*.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

representatives were engaged in the evaluation of the Lithuanian geographic situation, historical experience and partly of the contemporary situation. They tried to validate pro–Western foreign and security policy and emphasized the virtues of Western geopolitical orientation.[6] One more group of security studies was oriented towards the policy research and recommendations attempting to highlight Lithuanian security issues and perspectives. Those texts have rarely been integrated into more comprehensive discussions of security studies, remaining instead in the field of policy discussion.

The decline of Lithuanian academic security research during the last ten years is related to the changes in political situation.[7] The EU and NATO memberships have made it a disservice – attention was turned towards the analysis of these institutions and Lithuanian strategies in them. At the beginning of the twenty-first century terrorism became the main topic in international security research, but it was not so relevant in the Lithuanian context. The economic crisis of 2008 diverted researchers from the issues of security even more. Thus, it can be said that in the last few years, there has been little attention to the latest research, little discussion on contemporary security challenges, consequences of security policy for states structures and choices, their citizens and international environment, methodological problems or the application of the new instruments.

This article focuses on recent developments and discussions in the field of security studies and aims to suggest some newer ideas for the research of Lithuanian security policy. It provides a survey of the latest research in security studies and the ongoing theoretical debates. First it covers the main theoretical discussion from which the modern debates evolved. Second it provides evaluation and review of critical tradition in security studies that indicates assumptions and tools for analyzing specific security issues, as well as fosters reflexive thinking about security. The third part deals with three topics of security research (analysis of security through the concepts of risk, exceptionality and media). However, it should be noted that neither the topics chosen nor the theoretical approaches and authors discussed exhaust the field of contemporary security studies. Such coverage is beyond the scope of an introductory article.

---

[6] Laurinavičius Č., Motieka E. & Statkus N., *Baltijos valstybių geopolitikos bruožai. XX amžius*, Vilnius: Vilniaus istorijos institutas, 2005; Statkus N., Motieka E. & Laurinavičius Č., *Geopolitiniai kodai*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2004; Motieka E. & Statkus N., "Geopolitinių kodų struktūra ir dinamika," *Politologija*, 2003, 29(1) p. 60–110.

[7] It is likely that events in Ukraine of 2014 are going to intensify discussions about information security. It will be interesting to observe whether they will be transferred to the academic environment and serve as a basis for the developing the analytical tools for this concept.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

The choices made here provide a strong introduction of these issues to the readers of *Lithuanian Annual Strategic Review*; this article will familiarize those otherwise uninitiated readers with the current field of critical security studies.

1. Tradition, Widening and Securitization

In order to understand the security discourse of the last decade, first it is necessary to recognize the discussions upon which it is grounded. Three things are of importance in this context: critique of a traditional security concept, widening of this concept and the input of securitization theory. Debates around these issues have defined the first post–Cold War decade.

The traditional understanding of security is considered to be a narrow military view of security, grounded on the physical security and survival of a state rather than any other subject of international relations. According to Stephen Walt, security studies "explore the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states, and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war".[8] He particularly emphasized the military, materialistic approach to national security and the role of the security dilemma[9] in international relations. Walt does not see any point in discussing other security issues as it distracts attention from the central focus of the field and its fundamental issues.

The traditional conception of security is the main focus of the debate about changes in the discussions of security; moreover, this concept has been and is still highly criticized for its narrowness, paying too much attention to violence and war while their relevance is decreasing. The critics assert that such an attitude is no longer applicable to the contemporary world politics as the nature of threats is changing and the line between domestic and foreign is gradually disappearing since the state itself can become a threat to security.

As a consequence of this critique, security as a concept expanded. The term began to be applied to an increasing number of issues (so called "widening" of the concept started), adding more subjects of security (from individual to international, global security (the so called "deepening" of the concept)[10].

[8] Walt S.M., "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly* 35 (2), 1991, p. 212.
[9] The security dilemma is usually understood as a situation when the ambition of one subject to enhance its security creates insecurity for the other and consequently also motivates it to put a greater focus on its security. This kind of situation usually leads not to security, but to insecurity.
[10] Krause, K. & Williams, M. C., "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods", *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40 (2), 1996, p.229–254.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

A typical example of this tendency is the above–mentioned book by Buzan, where he distinguishes five sectors of security (military, political, economic, environmental and social) and discusses not only national, but also individual and international security.[11] He is convinced that only this complex approach can reflect and is the most suitable to interpret the situation after the Cold War.

In the context of the ongoing debate about which issues deserve to be regarded as security problems further questions have arisen – what happens when the number of security issues is increased and how do we distinguish these issues of security? These questions became the main concern and foundation of securitization theory. Thus, the third theoretical current that should not be overlooked in the evaluation of security discourse in the end of 20th century is the theory of securitization. Securitization theory is associated with Buzan and Ole Waever, and the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute where they and some other important contributors of this theory had worked.[12]

Securitization theory is based on three main concepts – securitization[13], security sectors[14] and regional security complexes.[15] The idea of securitization is what this school is mostly known for. When we talk about the issue of security, we talk about existential threats (i.e. what is the greatest menace) to some referential object. It means that in order to eliminate these threats, special measures may be taken that transcend the normal political space. If we want to understand security policy, we should seek to understand who is speaking and how. So, threats are born out of linguistic practices and security itself is a speech act uttered by powerful players, usually politicians, decision–makers. The process through which certain issues and concerns become security problems via speech acts is called securitization.[16]

According to this logic, there is no point in arguing whether threats were evaluated objectively or not; it is more significant to understand the process of threat construction. The issues themselves are not security issues or non–security issues. When they are identified as such and this identification is established in the political agenda, they become a part of security policy with all the usual

[11] Buzan, *op.cit*.

[12] Securitization theory is often called the Copenhagen School – after the place where it was created. This name was given by Bill McSweeney. Apart from the above–mentioned scholars, Lene Hansen, Jaap de Wilde also contributed to the Copenhagen School.

[13] Waever O., "Securitization and Desecuritization" in R. D. Lipschutz, ed., *On Security*, Columbia University Press, 1995, p. 46–86.

[14] Most clearly developed in Buzan B., Waever O., & Wilde de J., *Security: A New Framework for Analysis,* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1997.

[15] Buzan B. & Waever O., *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[16] For a more detailed discussion see Buzan, Waever & Wilde, *op.cit*.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

consequences. Thus, securitization theory suggests an intersubjective approach to security and its threats. Researchers do not question the purpose of security, but rather analyze concrete linguistic practices and aim to understand what makes the practical discourse of security.

Securitization theory has cast a strong doubt on the already rooted conception – the more security (problems), the better.[17] The dominance of security rhetoric creates an unnecessary situation of singularity and tension, and endows the state and its institutions with very extensive powers which would not have been acceptable in the usual democratic political process. In some sense security is a political failure to cope with problems under usual political procedures. Because of that, desecuritization (especially in Waever's conviction) should be a long–term strategy; it should be about the problems to be solved in public and not about the creation of more and more security issues.[18] Growing popularity of the idea of securitization has been closely related to "constructivist turn" in the international relations discipline. A renowned phrase of Alexander Wendt that "anarchy is what states make of it"[19] has paved an alternative way for the research intended to understand how we as players of international politics and security practices construct the world through our language and practices.[20]

In the USA, the events of September 11, 2001 (hereinafter – 9/11), when terrorist attacks killed more than three thousand people, became another symbolic date marking a new stage in discussions about security and security research. Certainly, this date is arbitrary and at the same time a symbolic choice that is convenient for the evaluation of the recent developments in the field of security studies. Theoretical discourse and discussion is rarely so closely related to certain historical events. Usually they function as a certain marker that enables the identification of tendencies more clearly rather than drawing clear lines for discussion. However, the reflection of 9/11 events and the evaluation of post–9/11 political decisions and practices has become an important motif for many considerations and topics that will be discussed later. Therefore the further discussion lies in the field of security research of approximately last fifteen years with a special focus on critical security studies.

---

[17] With an argument that in a way it reflects our more complex everyday world and enables to focus on the existing problems.

[18] Waever, „Securitization and Desecuritization".

[19] Wendt, A., "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics", *International organization*, 46 (2), p. 391–425.

[20] More about the input of constructivism see Jakniūnaitė, D. & Nekrašas, E., „Kaip tirti tarptautinius santykius konstruktyvistiškai: filosofinių prielaidų ir teorinių nuostatų analizė", *Politologija*, 59 (3), p.29–58.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

2. Critical Approaches to Security

One can say that the field of security studies is divided into two camps – advisors and critics of the establishment.[21] Security studies are closely related to political practice and policy making. Since the start of the Cold War security analysts have greatly contributed to political vocabulary as well as to justification and validation of security policy practices.[22] If we stick to this division, then the first camp mostly deals with the already established issues of security, follows objectivist and rationalist approach to security, sees most political practices as something to be taken for granted and more or less maintains *status quo* of the system.

Robert Cox divided theories into problem solving and critical. According to him, problem solving theories regard "prevailing social and political relationships and the institutions into which they are organized" as a matter–of–course.[23] They perceive the world as stable, and all its players and problems seem obvious to them, so the purpose of research is to ensure effective operating of the world without any disturbances. This aforementioned camp of security studies would belong precisely to Cox's problem solving theories. This part of the article, however, presents the main critical stances that challenge traditional, established approaches. What are the benefits of critical discourse and why it is the focus of this article?

First of all critical analysis means doubting the effectiveness of established thinking traditions and assumptions they rely on. Reluctance to analyze assumptions implies the risk to overlook certain phenomena and problems. Theories not only describe the world, they create it, define its objects of analysis; it is not possible to formulate value neutral knowledge. By indicating what has to be observed, analyzed and by defining our object of analysis we formulate our theoretical stance. Theorizing happens in a certain space and time and depends on the position (place, education, class, values and many other characteristics) of a person as a social being. Therefore Cox stated that "theory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose".[24]

Critical perspectives of security research are based on the common

[21] C.A.S.E. Collective, "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto," *Security Dialogue* 37 (4), 2006, p. 462.
[22] Lawrence P. K., "Strategy, Hegemony and Ideology: The Role of Intellectuals," *Political Studies* 154, 1996, p. 44–59.
[23] Cox R. W., "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium,* 10 (2), 1981, p. 128.
[24] Ibid.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

critical and reflexive attitude towards security practices; they do not accept assumptions of political decision as something that cannot be questioned, and analyze how certain conceptions and attitudes are formulated and established through security practices, and what the consequences of these processes are. Hence, this article focuses on the critical discourse that tries to unfold more different spaces of security studies. Critical positions encourage practitioners to be more reflexive about their activities and provide ways how to act and think in the pluralistic and contradictory environment comprised of different truths, theories, and forms of knowledge.

Critical approaches claim that security is a derivative notion that originates and is closely related to the conception of the world order and politics.[25] Indeed, it is easy to accept that security means the absence of threats. However, this definition is misleadingly simple. In order to eliminate threats to the world, first we need to be aware of them. Also we need to know what we are protecting. Critical perspectives see individual as the main referential object of security. Most issues discussed by the wideners of security concept primarily affect people, their lives, and not the states. States are communities of people, and therefore the security of these people should be a priority.

The discussions about the nature of political threats are dominated by two approaches – the Welsh School and the Paris School.[26]

The Welsh School is associated with Ken Booth[27], Keith Krause, Mike Williams[28], and Richard Wyn Jones.[29] They strongly criticize the traditional approach, focused on military security and conflict resolution. The idea that war is a substantial, fundamental issue of international politics is problematic in itself. Such attitude implies that world is static. And this justifies the *status quo*. And for a great number of people living in the less developed countries the state itself and its institutions present the greatest threat to their rights and security, the source of poverty and misfortune. Because of that the Welsh School is seen as a theory that consciously aims at redefining not only the notion of security and security studies, but also political security practices. It attempts

[25] After Peoples C. & Vaughan–Williams N., *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, London and New York: Routledge, 2010, p. 22–23.

[26] These names were suggested by Ole Waever – Waever, "Abersytwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: New 'Schools in Security Theory and Their Origins between Core and Periphery", presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal, 2004.

[27] Booth K., "Security and Emancipation", *Review of International Studies* 17 (4), 1991, p. 313–26; Booth K., *Theory of World Security*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[28] Krause K. & Williams M. C., "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods," *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40 (2), 1996, p. 229; Krause K. & Williams M. C., eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Strategies*, Routledge, 1997.

[29] Wyn Jones R., *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

this by encouraging and even demanding that we think not in terms of states, but rather of individuals, the quality of their community, and the elimination of constraints to their well–being.

The Welsh School emphasizes emancipation; it regards this as the main objective of security studies. If we see the world through the perspective of the state and national security, we ignore the relationship between the state, its institutions, and people. Then we tend to overlook the fact that state itself is often the greatest problem.[30] The idea of emancipation is a way to circumvent the focus on the state. Booth explains this as follows:

> Security means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constrains which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and the threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation, not power or order, produces true security. Emancipation, theoretically, is security.[31]

Fewer wars, less poverty and oppression means greater freedom for people. That is why the notion of security must be widened. It is not possible to achieve emancipation as it is not a finite process, and even if the order improves, emancipation will not be absolute. Security must deal with real people; therefore security studies should reveal existing constraints, obstacles that disturb human activity and expression. Security studies should analyze practices supporting these constraints.

Although the Welsh School changes the referent of security, it still uses the concept in a classical sense – it applies the concept to identify "actual" threats to the individual rather than "alleged" threats that concern states. Therefore this tradition of research sometimes comes close to the objectivist tradition; just the assumptions about the security concerns differ. However, it is definitely the position of resistance that consciously seeks to represent people without voice, representation, and power.

The security tradition of the Paris School is associated with Didier Bigo,[32] Jef Huysmans,[33] and the journal *Cultures et Conflits*. Differently from the Welsh School's meta–theorizing, this approach engages in comprehensive empirical research: it analyzes the operating of various security agencies, practices they

[30] Ibid, p. 23.
[31] Booth, "Security and Emancipation", p. 319.
[32] Bigo D., *Polices en Réseaux. L'expérience Européenne*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 1996.
[33] Huysmans J., *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and the Asylum in the EU*, London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

create, and how they formulate official security discourse and regulate variety of processes; it examines close relationship between internal and external security, how different institutions compete and create new threat images, especially through public discourses on immigration, organized crime, and terrorism.[34] Bigo claims that such practices create insecurity rather than security, which is the result of security policy and security discourse. Analysis of bureaucratic practices is an excellent way to disclose these processes[35]. It can be said that the individual remains the main referential object for the representatives of the Paris School, though s/he is entangled in a number of institutional practices and becomes their subject.

The most analyzed are security practices of the European Union where the national, European, and transnational networks are overlapping, where professionalism, technocracy is dominating, and where you have to have a certain social position in order to be able to "make", "create" security.[36] For instance, the effectiveness of practices for reinforcing security can be noticed: reassuring speaking, security technologies (e.g. surveillance cameras) or different police measures. However, they do not necessarily enhance security or trust in politics; these are practices for providing the feeling of security. But usually is the contrary – these practices create spaces of insecurity, draw lines of fear and uncertainty for the individual and community[37].

In the EU context we can see the apparent intertwining of internal and external security. For instance, some security agencies that usually have not received much attention in security discussions (police, customs, border protection, immigration offices) are increasingly found at the center of security field. They have the power to respond to contemporary challenges and to make decisions that affect our security or, as the representatives of this perspective would say, create our sense of insecurity. Bigo describes this intertwining using a Mobius ribbon metaphor – "the location of agents (inside/outside) is not fixed" – inside and outside always depends on the perspective.[38]

The Paris school has its ground in the securitization theory, but also expands it by emphasizing the importance of analyzing practices, not only

[34] Waever, "Abersytwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: New 'Schools in Security Theory and Their Origins between Core and Periphery."

[35] E.g. Bigo D. & Tsoukala A., eds., *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty : Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11*, Routledge, 2008.

[36] C.A.S.E. Collective, op.cit., p. 449–450.

[37] Huysmans, *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and the Asylum in the EU*.

[38] Bigo D., "The Möbbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security" in Albert M., Jacobson D. & Lapid Y., eds., *Identity, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001, p. 91–116.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

speech acts. For example, they are interested in how borders are monitored, how decisions on whom to accept and whom to reject (and this means deciding which identities are dangerous) are made as well as how the rules are created and applied. Paris School analyzes governance techniques[39], addresses the consequences of power games, the contexts that enable and restrict emergence of certain governmental forms[40], and examines the networks of security professionals, their competition and institutional context.

We can see that the critical perspectives of security studies also embrace a variety of strategies taking great interest in the assumptions of thinking, and reflections on the role of security in the lives of states and individuals. The Welsh School consciously chooses the political strategy and their critical analysis is based on the normative aspiration for emancipation and the wish to protect individual from the state. In the case of the Paris school, choosing institutional practices and security networks as an object of analysis enables the unraveling of the mechanics of how certain or even all individuals become subjects of security, to examine the emergence not only of different issues of security, but also new players of security and new power mechanisms.

3. Security Research

The goal of this part is to analyze three groups of security research: security and the practices of risk, relationship between security and exceptionality, and the analysis of security–media nexus. The research reviewed here is related with the broader theoretical position presented in the previous part of the article. It is connected through a common understanding that security practices are inseparable from political practices and decisions, and that it is important to analyze the assumptions of thinking and the effect of practices. They aim to distinguish and analyze different mechanisms of power that create and make use of the relevant security practices. Each direction of research is presented by analyzing its main questions and proposed insights.

[39] Draws from Foucault's governmentality studies, see Foucault M., "Governmentality," in Burchell G., Gordon C.& Miller P., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991, p. 87–104.

[40] Bigo D., "Security and Immigration: Towards a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease", *Alternatives*, 27 (1suppl), 2002, p. 63–92; Huysmans J., "A Foucauldian View on Spill–Over: Freedom and the Security in the EU", *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7 (3), 2004, p. 294–318; Balzacq T., "The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience, and Context", *European Journal of International Relations*, 11 (2), 2005, p. 171–201.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

3.1. Security and Risk

Society at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first centuries is a society of risk. Certainly, it is not that we have only now realized that we are living in uncertainty. However the aspiration to control this risk, to measure it, and to make judgments about the future, to reflect the possibility of wooing it, and the scope of doing this is really immense. The evaluation of risk is initially to be found in the rationalist paradigm. There is an assumption that risk can be classified, it is quantifiable, can be predicted to a certain degree, and can be eliminated by rational means. This kind of research has been carried out in the field of economics for a long time; it has been often applied in order to formulate threat scenarios in the strategy studies, also in business, particularly in the insurance market.

Another approach is found in the theory of Ulrich Beck. Beck claims that in the era of late modernity we cannot insure against risks. Risk is one of the fundamental characteristics of society. It is not calculable as there is always the possibility of disasters, the consequences of which cannot be predicted or compensated for. For instance, 9/11 could not have been predicted. That was the accident that revealed the limits of the modern insurance industry. The same can be said about the Asian financial crisis, Chernobyl, or global warming. The same applies to many processes that are happening now (research of human genome, nanotechnology)—their consequences cannot be predicted.[41] Risks are global, but it does not mean they are evenly distributed. Beck particularly stresses the transnational nature of the problems and a need to solve them collectively.[42] Danger and insecurity is the inevitable structural threat which can be resolved only by cosmopolitism and negotiations over the norms.[43]

Beck's ideas lead to reflexive security research that aims to conceptualize how the transnational risks are controlled.[44] For example, Mikkel Vedby Rasmussen tries to demonstrate that 9/11 attacks were the new expression of globalism that enabled the "other" world to intervene into the Western space. Moreover, he is convinced this disaster is the realization of scenarios generated in great abundance and in different shapes after the Cold War, during the

[41] Beck U., "The Terrorist Threat World Risk Society Revisited", *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (4), 2002, p. 41–42.
[42] Ibid, p. 42; see also Beck U., "The Silence of Words: On Terror and War", *Security Dialogue* 34 (3), 2003, p. 255–267.
[43] For more see Boyne R., "Cosmopolis and Risk: A Conversation with Ulrich Beck", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18 (4), 2001, p. 47–63.
[44] Rasmussen, M.V., "`It Sounds Like a Riddle': Security Studies, the War on Terror and Risk", *Millennium,* 33 (2), 2004.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

last decade of the twentieth century. Finally, 9/11 revealed the ontological insecurity of the modern world in which threats can spread in the same way as commerce – with no borders.[45]

After 9/11, the traditional security dilemma has given way to the "reflexive security dilemma". Currently the West is not facing any major danger from any power, thus there is no need to discuss the necessity to enhance security on somebody's expense (it is the issue of classical security dilemma). However, discussions about conflicts and security issues are becoming an important condition of our security. An example of this can be the questions regarding whether and when it is generally worthwhile to take any security measures and why they are called security measures. This kind of reflection is the focus of contemporary thinking and shaping of security policy.[46] In other words, reflections about security increasingly define us and our contemporary society.

Another approach sees risk as a governance tool rather than the governing principle of our lives. This thinking draws inspiration from the writings of Michel Foucault about governmentality. This concept considers government as governing with persistent intention to create an orderly and effective society. Questions are raised about justifications, calculations, rationalizations of various governmental techniques, about the evidence and language used to talk about government and its justification, and about the nature of power at work.[47] Therefore, the main focus of such analysis are political rationalities and political technologies. The former are systematic ways that define problems and their possible solutions and the latter are technical means and practices that enable political rationalities to become actions of the government striving to expand its power.[48]

Analyzing security and risk from this perspective implies the study of instruments and ways that the risk discourse is applied, spread and practiced. Baker and Simon describe two strategies of risk expansion.[49] The first is risk spreading. It implies efforts to cope with social problems by employing the concept of risk. This takes place in finance management, social policy, the police and army, environmental policy. The second is risk embracing strategy, by which individuals are increasingly encouraged to accept risk (e.g. growing

[45] Rasmussen M.V., "'A Parallel Globalization of Terror': 9–11, Security and Globalization," *Cooperation and Conflict*, 37 (3), 2002, p. 323–49.
[46] Ibid, p. 328.
[47] Dean M., *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, 2nd ed., Sage, 2010, p. 24–25.
[48] Merlingen, M., "Foucault and World Politics: Promises and Challenges of Extending Governmentality Theory to the European and Beyond", *Millennium*, 35 (1), p.183–184.
[49] After Baker T. & Simon J., "Embracing Risk," in Baker T. & Simon J., eds., *Embracing Risk: The Changing Culture of Insurance and Responsibility*, University of Chicago Press, 2010, p. 2–5.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

popularity of private pension funds, gambling, and extreme sports). In this case subjects acquire their value because of their ability to control risk. Risk can be controlled and different mechanisms of control can create security. It is done by depoliticizing the context of security or by transposing the security discourse into the market context or by imparting via individual responsibility. In both cases security is no longer about threat management and analysis; instead, it becomes displaced by the technocratic and calculative discourse.

Security based on threat analysis emphasizes the importance of the intentions of players and conflicting parties, and the actions of intelligence institutions in threat elimination. Security based on risk analysis focuses on the system and its characteristics – citizens, environment – and requires a lot of data and modeling.[50] The goal is not so much to eliminate risk, but to create strategies of living with it. We do not exterminate dangers, but rather mobilize different practices that emanate from the striving to construct, interpret, and only then to control contingency.

Hence, the inclusion of risk management analysis into security studies changes the logic of security. There is a shift from standard focus on identities, territoriality, constructing relationships with others to concrete situations bound in time and attempts to cope with different futures. Actually, security has always had this temporal dimension – the aim has always been to protect against future threats. Such risk analysis contributes to the illusion of controlling time by diverting attention away from speaking about dangerous future to technologies and strategies that help to create future which is calculable, measurable, and manageable.

By paying attention to the intensifying discourse of risk, earlier dominated by politics with a focus on threats, security studies shift our focus to the consequences of such thinking: domination of technocratic economized speaking, distancing of government from some security practices, and the necessity of reflexive thinking in the times of "reflexive modernity".

3.2. Security and Exceptionality

Research on the relationship between security and exceptionality focuses not on the depoliticization of the security concept, but on the spreading application of the security techniques. The new policy of a "global war against terrorism" that has for some time dominated the security agendas in many

[50] Aradau C., Lobo–Guerrero L., Van Munster R., "Security, Technologies of Risk, and the Political: Guest Editors' Introduction", *Security Dialogue*, 39 (2/3), 2008.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

countries, triggered reflections on the exceptionality inseparable from security practices. This policy has not only started the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also lead to the tightening of airport security, intensified surveillance of citizens, profiling, emergence of the new technologies of identification and control. Scholars have also started to emphasize a growing fear and distrust, prioritization of security rather than liberties and rights. Such statements as "the rules of the game have change", "it is a new kind of war", or "the exceptional times need exceptional measures" became prevalent.

Exceptionality or rather its rhetoric has been and still is used to justify different practices of violence (as demonstrated by the events in the Guantanamo or Abu Ghraib prisons), but it also enables restrictions on migration, limitation of civil rights, torture practices, and similar methods. These tendencies encouraged scholars to start analyzing the concept of exceptionality as a radical state of insecurity itself and through its usage to highlight the changes in security policy and the challenges of liberal democratic countries that, on the one hand, aspire to remain liberal, and on the other aspire to protect itself and its citizens from the challenge of illiberal societies.

Speculations on these issues have motivated the return to texts of German legal theorist Carl Schmitt.[51] He began his *Political Theology* with the now much overused phrase: "sovereign is he who decides on the exception".[52] According to Schmitt, exceptionality is a situation of radical danger that has no law, procedure, or suitable response. It is a dangerous moment that has no precedent; there is no knowing it beforehand and it is not possible to predict what will happen. Exceptionality enables the creation of a fundamental existential necessity for the sovereign's unlimited actions and decisions. It is not just some addition to "normal" politics; it is a more authentic expression of political power that is able to create new political and legal order.[53]

When reflecting on the place of exceptionality in the situations of contemporary security policy, Schmittian logic is not followed, but rather criticized—first of all by showing that Schmitt's logic is successfully applied in the national security discourses. They seem to reproduce his scheme entirely: exceptional times – exceptional measures. Of course, the main problem lies in the fact that a sovereign (or his institutions) himself declares this exceptional situation and also defines it.

[51] Schmitt C., *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010; Schmitt C., *The Concept of the Political: Expanded Edition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
[52] Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 5.
[53] Schmitt, *Political Theology*.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

An exceptional situation as well as a threat in securitization or risk in risk analysis does not arise from objective, natural causes, but rather from the power that defines exceptionality, which sooner or later inevitably involves authoritarian means, and dubious political decisions and practices. Because this legitimate power emanates from the sovereign, this creates the necessity to analyze the conditions of its application.[54]

Reflections on exceptionality and its consequential constraints on freedom can be associated with the analysis of surveillance techniques and its consequences. The EU research project funded by the 7th Framework Programme for Research "Challenge: Liberty & Security"[55] is one of the most prominent attempts in recent years to comprehend how the discourse of insecurity and surveillance technologies affects the limits of citizen freedom (first of all in the EU)[56]. The project's researchers created the term "illiberal practices" to describe situations in which the rhetoric of security and exceptional situation is chosen in favor of freedom.[57]

It is evident that practices of suspicion are intensified when the police are not accountable to judicial power, and surveillance technologies are spreading, being used not only by the government to observe its citizens, but among the citizens themselves (for instance, the surveillance systems in the houses where all inhabitants have access to surveillance cameras).[58] Security cannot be separated from surveillance and in this way exceptionality becomes the norm.

Any necessity in politics is a political decision and not an existential condition. It is not obvious what the response should be to a certain event or situation; there are no objective criteria indicating the need to apply some exceptional measures, for instance, civil rights restrictions. It is a political decision and should be regarded as such without surrendering it to the bureaucratic discourse. Therefore, researchers encourage inquiry into how an exceptional situation is defined as exceptional and how practices of exceptionality are acknowledged and authorized. What institutional, communicative and social practices contribute to this? And finally, what are political consequences of all these processes?

By starting from the expansion of exceptionality and critique of governmental power, those who analyze exceptional situations still discern a

---

[54] C.A.S.E. Collective, p. 465.

[55] Challenge – it is an achronym of the project that is deciphered as "The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security".

[56] Information about the project on the internet: www.libertysecurity.org, 2013 11 21.

[57] Bigo and Tsoukala, *op.cit.*

[58] Didier Bigo et al., *The Changing Landscape of European Liberty and Security: Mid–Term Report on the Results of the CHALLENGE Project*, Research Paper, Challenge: Liberty & Security, 2007, http://libertysecurity.org/IMG/pdf_ChallengeMidReport.pdf, 2013 11 21.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

similar tendency in the risk researchers noticed – how in the discussions about security situations the power of political decisions is changed by technologies or the power of specialized discourses and practices; and how in this context the concept of citizen liberties vanishes and is lost in the networks of computer algorithms and bureaucratic practices.

3.3. Security and Media

Discussions about the impact of media and new technology on security practices and their interrelationship were started by Jean Baudrillard in his book *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*.[59] Baudrillard in some sense reversed a famous phrase by the 19th century war theoretician Carl von Clausewitz by noting that "politics is the continuation of war by other means". As Saddam Hussein was not fighting the joint forces, but rather used his fighters to keep his power, the joint forces were also just dropping bombs as if to prove they are fighting the enemy. Western media greatly contributed to this game of imitation by showing war "real" time and reusing the same images of war as if to demonstrate to everybody that coalition lead by the USA was really fighting war with Iraq. Baudrillard claims this has never happened. Iraq hasn't been weakened and in general nothing much has changed after the war or because of it. So, in this sense the war did not take place, although we did observe it.

According to Martin Shaw, the Gulf War led to the realization that wars can be fought by making use of the media; it is not necessarily a disturbance; it is possible to make war despite of it, even without showing many casualties or suffering.[60] Mediatization of war and conflict has become an inseparable part of conflicts. This even led to a new concept – spectator sport war—which ironically indicates that Western states fight war from a distance and try to involve as few of their soldiers as possible. Society does not take part; it watches at a distance. As with the sports crowd, not everybody watches the same way – some watch only with one eye, while others observe the tactics and strategies. But most importantly, all of their experiences are distanced. They feel a collective sympathy and hate, they can even feel empathy, but the experience is distanced and impalpable.[61] Therefore, distancing and battles of representation create their own conceptions and requirements of security; also they create the ardor that translates others' experiences of insecurity not only into its own perception of

[59] Baudrillard J., *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*, Indiana University Press, 1995.
[60] Shaw M., *The new western way of war: Risk–transfer war and its crisis in Iraq*, Polity, 2005, p. 37.
[61] McInnes's idea presented after Peoples & Vaughan–Williams, *op.cit.*, p. 153.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

(in)security, but also into entertainment, an object of consumerism.

A bit later James Der Derian will call this social system (made of war, technology, media, and us watching) the MIME network (m*ilitary–industrial–media–entertainment*).[62] Growing war mediation impels us to speak about the virtual war. According to Der Derian, the intensifying technological war mediation has given rise to a virtual war. War becomes a virtual war not only for the observers, but also for its participants; for instance, when technology operators, administrators take part in the virtual reality. Der Derian sees virtuality as constructing the world not out of nothing, but out of the machine – there has never been anything before. This echoes Baudrillard's idea of the world as simulacra. The main characteristic of virtuality is to mimic and create reality from information that can be quickly transmitted and differently simulated by means of the new technology. It increasingly becomes more important to operate at a distance, which means dependence from accurate information, accurate interpretation of signals, images and data on the computer screen.

It is where the talks of "security of meaning" start. Der Derian tries to emphasize that virtual war has tangible consequences for its "receivers", i.e. those who test all this technology (so called collateral damage) and its virtuality for some does not make it less real for others. And for the others, who are not present here and now, media eliminates the distance and makes the war safer and simpler, soldiers are distanced from the cruelties of war, they are not people any more, just blinking spots on the screen. War mediation is not limited only to the Western world. Images of war are used, consumed, and broadcasted in all parts of the world. Media management becomes an important part of security and military practices. It is not that media is involved in the narratives about wars and conflicts, what has changed. It is the scope and nature of it. Therefore, while reflecting on states and conditions of security, scholars of this tradition analyze the techniques of representation, different forms of mediation and how the majority of critical approaches endeavor to show the importance of security practices in daily life and routine state practices.

Concluding Remarks

Despite still relevant "traditional" threats, it becomes difficult to survive in the twenty-first century by applying the framework of the national security

[62] Der Derian J., *Virtuous War: Mapping the Military–Industrial–Media–Entertainment–Network*, Routledge, 2009.

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

paradigm. Even if a narrow military approach to security is abandoned, the widening of security issues leads not only to the inflation of security itself, but more importantly, this impels us to think about the practical consequences of security policy. Security policy practitioners see the field of theoretical discussion as a remote, closed, sometimes even hermetic space. However, security studies are inseparable from practical issues and are really closely related to practical challenges and their reflection.

Probably the most important part of the discourse of security studies is related to theoretical reflections and analysis of assumptions of political practices. In this way those who engage in security policy are encouraged to become more reflexive and to evaluate their own thinking about their activities, routines, and their consequences. Critical perspective demonstrates how it is possible to live amongst different truths, positions, and technical knowledge, how they complement or contradict each other, what the consequences of different practices are, how to think in the pluralistic, contradictory environment full of different truths, theories, and forms of knowledge. There is also the insistent encouragement to raise ethical questions, such as: why we regard something as a security issue, what happens when we come up with a new security issue and why, and how are such decisions arrived at.

In the context of Lithuanian security policy research we can raise the same questions about the purpose of national security policy, the change in the relationship between internal and external security, which national institutions take care of security, how they do this and how their competition affects their own practices and attitude towards their citizens. How have Lithuanian security institutions got themselves into the network of EU institutions and what are the possible challenges? What are the tensions between the power of national institutions versus security and the liberties of the individual? If there are none, then why is that so? What discourses of exceptionality are used to justify and validate the strategies of national security and the choices of foreign policy; also, what kind of openness is permitted and to what extent? How is our understanding of security changed by new technology and the media in particular? How do we speak and evaluate the risk of living in a country and amongst neighbors?

The analysis of security reviewed here suggests new spaces of security research, new questions, problems and challenges. It seems natural that ensuring security of an individual must be regarded the ultimate goal of all political practices. However, the fact that security has to deal with real people also means that security studies must analyze the constraints and obstacles in everyday social

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM

life that limit human activity and expression. A great number of social practices discussed by the researchers of risk, on the one hand, burden the individual with a greater responsibility for his life and choices, and on the other, by means of a wide institutional network they create plenty of constraints and restrictions that need to be analyzed. The creation of the exceptional situation and the intention of authorities to control society through technology and to create security namely through control makes it absolutely essential to understand the purpose of exceptionality in contemporary politics. Finally, media, virtual spaces, remote control technology, and biopolitics are phenomena which critical analysis can help us to understand—not only the growing effectiveness of warfare means, but also the consequences of security policy entering our everyday life and security institutions getting closer to people's personal space and control of their lives.

Vilnius, April 2014

Authenticated | dovile.jakniunaite@tspmi.vu.lt author's copy
Download Date | 1/13/15 10:08 AM