

国際関係論、安全保障論、紛争学における 批判理論の応用に関する一論考

The Development of Critical Theory: Three Variants in International Relations,
Security Studies and Conflict Studies

門倉俊雄*

Toshio KADOKURA

概要

批判理論は、二〇世紀初頭からフランクフルト学派によって形成された学問的伝統で、人類を抑圧から解放することを目的としている。当初、批判理論の分析対象は、一国内の政策などにとどまっていたものの、1980年代の初頭から、国際関係論、安全保障論および紛争学に応用されはじめた。性質が共通していることから、これらの最新の批判理論の流れを、批判学と定義することが可能である。批判学の主な目的は、批判理論と同様に人類を抑圧から解放することであり、それぞれの分野において多くの研究者が、この批判学の発展に貢献してきている。批判学は、その理論的発展のみならず、特に9.11以後の世界において、抑圧に苦しむ人びとへの指針を提示できるという点で、大きな可能性がある。批判学の課題は、それぞれの分野における制度化の度合いが異なる現状に対して、いかに一つの学派として統合させることができるか、という点である。

Abstract

Critical theory is an academic tradition developed by the Frankfurt School since the early Twenty Century. The target of critical theory, the aim of which was to emancipate human beings, was domestic policy. Nevertheless, since the early 1980s this theoretical tradition started being applied to the fields of international relations, security studies and conflict studies. It is possible to define these latest versions of critical theory as critical studies as they share common characters. The main aim of critical studies is the same as that of critical theory: human emancipation, and many scholars has evolved into the development of critical studies. Critical studies also inherited the weaknesses of critical theory, such as abstract characters without any case studies. To development further it would be required to overcome this defect.

Introduction

There is a newly emerged school of study inspired by the work of critical theorists. It is revolved around international relations theory, security studies and conflict studies, and is defined as 'critical studies' in this essay due to

its character sharing inherited from the concepts and arguments of the Frankfurt School.

This theoretical tradition firstly emerged in the beginning of the 1980s in the study of international relations as a reaction against the realists' reasoning. In the 1990s, studies that employed

* 文教大学湘南総合研究所客員研究員

critical theory proliferated, not only in the study of international relations but also in security studies and the field of conflict analysis, and as a result, 'critical studies' has contributed to the revitalization of each respective field of study. One of the best analytical merits of 'critical studies' lies in the normative capacity which problematises existing political and social frameworks and envisages a transformation of the problematic structure for the emancipation of people who may suffer under unnecessary constraints underpinned by this structural questions.

This essay provides an overview of the development of 'critical studies' in international relations, security and conflict while tracing the path to its institutionalization. Study questions are as follows: What is critical studies? Who are the proponents of critical studies? What programmes of study do they offer? Do they argue only on the ontological level, or do they address the question of epistemology? What is the background of the emergence of critical studies? What are the subfields of critical studies? Who are the influential figures of critical studies? Does the degree of institutionalization differ among subfields? What are the arguments and concepts which they propose? What problems may critical studies face?

Three sections are provided in this essay. The first section defines the contemporary version of critical theory, which can be found in the realms of international relations, security and conflict as 'critical studies'. In the second section, the definition, the origins and general tasks of critical theory are briefly examined. The last section traces the development of three respective subfields of critical studies, these are the studies of international relations, security and conflict, while introducing the arguments and concepts of each subfield.

Critical theory and critical studies

In 1981 Cox published an epoch-making article called 'Social forces, states, and world orders: beyond international relations theory' in *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. It was an attempt to refute the argument of Waltz's neo-realism that had dominated the field of international relations since the publication of the book, *Theory of International Politics* in 1979, while employing the insight of critical theory which stems from arguments mainly of the Frankfurt School. Since then, especially since the beginning of 1990s, the literature supporting this theoretical position of critical theory started to proliferate beyond the existing realm of international relations and extended to the analysis of security and conflict. For example, the main works of these studies can be found in Hoffman (1987; 1992), Linklater (1990; 1998), Booth (1991; 2005), Wyn Jones (1995; 1999), Jabri (1996), Jones (1999) and Jeong (1999) and so on. It is fair to say that all of the above works have contributed to the revitalization of their respective field of studies for the critical insight which casted doubt on the validity of the arguments of existing theories and provided alternative analytical frameworks.

Although these studies draw on various sources it is clear that they have shared characters, for example, in the themes, methods and arguments of their research programmes and concepts which they employ due to the strong influence of the critical theorists of previous generations. Arguments and concepts which specialise in the analysis of ethnic conflicts have not emerged from this school of study yet. Nevertheless, the overall reasoning of the group does contribute to the critical analysis and interpretation of ethnic conflicts. The boundaries of each respective subfield of critical studies are

also ambiguous. Therefore, it is useful to define these studies in international relations, security studies and conflict studies which are inspired by critical theory by the general term of 'critical study' for technical reasons. The ultimate aim of critical studies is the emancipation from unnecessary constraints on human freedom which are inherited from the theme of ancestral work, and it is possible to say that critical studies are international, security and conflict versions of critical theory. Before examining the development of critical studies, we will briefly trace the origins and themes of critical theory, which have directly influenced the development of critical studies for coming generations.

The development of critical theory

The Frankfurt School was a group of scholars who belonged to the Institute of Social Studies in Frankfurt and was established in 1923 by the wealthy a businessman's son, Felix Weil, with an official relation with Frankfurt University.¹ The arguments developed by these scholars are called critical theory. As an Institution closely related with Marxism, they were in a position to reconsider Marxism in a context where some anomalies of Marxism were becoming obvious through the emergence of Stalin in the Soviet Union and the failure of the socialist revolution in the Western European regions, especially in Germany. Thus, the time of the establishment of this School could be regarded as part of the broader picture of Western Marxism represented by the work of Lukacs, who developed the rational and critical reading of Marx, not as a political dogma but just as a social theory which might need correction, and who also identified the inseparable nature of theory from ideology through the critical reading of Marx.²

Members of the Frankfurt School had been in

the middle of World affairs, such as the total control of Germany by the Nazis in 1933, which forced them to relocate the institution to the United States. The Holocaust, which could not be someone else's business since almost all of the scholars in the institute were Jewish, the World War II made it possible to return to Frankfurt, etc, and a series of these events influenced their theoretical development. There is a tendency to categorize this school of thought into two generations,³ and I shall follow this distinction. The main figures of the first generation are Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse. Habermas is the representative of the second generation after World War II. So what are their research themes and programmes? How had the social reality at that moment influenced their theoretical development? What are the differences and relations between the first and the second generation in terms of their contents?

The first generation

As mentioned, the Institute of Social Studies was established as a research centre for Marxism under the great influence of such Western Marxism as Lukacs. Although a few empirical studies focused around the analysis of economies were produced under the first director, Grunberg, the research themes of the Frankfurt School were not clearly argued and defined. It was not until the period under the directorship of Horkheimer from 1931 that tasks and methods of critical theory started to be discussed in an organised manner. These main themes of the School were to provide an alternative social theory for the emancipation to Marxism through the ontological and interdisciplinary research and the criticism of the positivistic and scientific methods of social studies via epistemological arguments. Therefore, some of

the key arguments by School members contributed to set these primary themes of critical theory and will now be briefly traced.

The setting of the first theme, that is, rethinking Marxism, can be found in Horkheimer's inaugural address in 1931, which was entitled 'The present situation of social philosophy and the tasks of an Institute of Social Research'. In this speech Horkheimer rejected the reductionism in the Marxist's mode of analysis in which social phenomena could be explained only by the one parameter of production and instead called for an investigation of the interconnection. For example, in economic life, the psychological system of individuals and the way of thought as a method of social analysis.⁴ Therefore, the importance of interdisciplinary study, which would unite economics, history, psychology and philosophy was advocated by him in order to overcome the defects of Marxism and the division of intellectual labour.⁵

In 1937 Horkheimer published an article called 'critical and traditional theory'. This is a significant document as the term of 'critical theory' was first indicated in it, and Bottomore regarded it as 'a founding document, or charter of the Frankfurt School'.⁶ In this article Horkheimer clearly sets the epistemological theme of the Frankfurt School, which was to reveal the connection between knowledge and purpose. He argued that theories of society that imported the method of natural science such as positivism and empiricism were inappropriate. His main reasoning was that it is impossible to make the distinction between subject and object or between facts and values, and this the prevailing argument of this kind of theory since theorists and theories are part of society.⁷ He indicated that this type of theory contributes to the reproduction of the existing order, which he

thought unjust for the structures of domination and manipulation of the human species, and therefore, rejected this kind of theorizing as a traditional theory.¹ What Horkheimer sought for was an alternative theory of society which canceled the weaknesses of the above traditional theorizing. He called this alternative formulation critical theory and would be the new approach to social research that could transcend the existing order and might contain domination by way of the emancipation of oppressed people by that structure.⁹

In short this article, which provided a dichotomy between traditional and critical theory, effectively criticized the traditional style of theorizing society which was based on the method of natural science and helped to define the character of the alternative theory of society, and as a result contributed to set themes of critical theory. Furthermore, although this article was written in 1937 the Institute had already moved to the United States to avoid pressure by the Nazis who had been in power since 1933, Horkheimer's view toward the possibility of progress and social transformation remained optimistic.

Nevertheless, this optimistic tendency toward social transformation was totally changed in a paper written in collaboration with Adorno, published in 1947. At this time human misery culminated in the form of the outbreak of the Second World War, the rise of fascism and the Holocaust. In this paper, entitled 'Dialectic of Enlightenment', they abstained from their previous position in which human reason could be utilized for emancipation from oppression, and instead argued that human reason itself was the source of oppression and human misery, such as the Holocaust. According to Horkheimer and Adorno, the domination by the nature of human

rationality, which was supposed to lead to an emancipated society, could result in the domination and manipulation of humanity through a technical characteristic of rationality they called 'instrumental reason'.

They argued that the most obvious example of this contradiction could be found in anti-Semitism and cultural industry, and therefore that, there was no escape route from this situation since 'instrumental reason' was so deeply embedded in our society.¹⁰ Under this circumstance Horkheimer and Adorno abandoned the original theme of the Frankfurt School aimed at reformulating Marxism as a social theory for human emancipation and instead went in the direction of philosophy a far cry from the original theme which was supposed to grip the real world.¹¹ Therefore, it is possible to say that as the members of the Institute were trapped in the harsh reality of the times they could not continue the primary theme of the Frankfurt School which promised to build an alternative theory to Marxism any longer.¹² It was not until after World War II that the first theme of the Frankfurt School, which was intended to reformulate the social theory of Marxism to a more adequate style, was reasonably developed in the form of Habermas's theory of communication. The main argument of this second generation of the Frankfurt School will now be traced.

The second generation

The double themes of the Frankfurt School were the contribution of the first generation and were the ontological theme, which aimed to provide an alternative social theory for human emancipation to Marxism, and the epistemological theme, which offered a criticism against the traditional forms of reasoning and the methods and procedures for critical theory via a dichotomy of

theories. Although the epistemological theme had been developed as a form of criticism against positivism, the first generation scholars failed to develop the ontological theme of rebuilding Marx's social theory mainly due to the difficult reality facing the World at that time. Nevertheless, Habermas's emergence had a great impact on the development of the Frankfurt School since he had successfully developed both of the original themes reasonably. Firstly, there was Habermas's argument about the relationship between knowledge and human interests, which can be regarded as a further development of the epistemological theme of the Frankfurt School introduced by the first generation and, secondly, his ontological argument around the reconstruction of Marx's social theory for emancipation. These developments will now be explored.

In *Knowledge and Human Interests*, as the title suggests, Habermas developed the epistemological theme of the Frankfurt School further while revealing the embraced values and interests within knowledge. While Horkheimer introduced a dichotomy of theories, the were traditional and critical theories in his argument on epistemology in 1937. Habermas, equipped with a trichotomy of knowledge, identified implicit interests called 'knowledge-constitutive interests'. The first type of knowledge is an empirical-analytic science, which it is possible to regard as the equivalent to positivism. This knowledge, derived from the nature of human beings as a tool making animal who has to produce what they need for survival from nature by way of controlling and manipulating objects, therefore, contains 'technical interests' aimed at controlling objects through work.¹³ The second knowledge, historical-hermeneutic or cultural science, contains a 'practical interest', which maintains mutual understanding and agreement via the

medium of language. This knowledge and attached interests stem from another aspect of human beings as a language-use animal who needs to communicate through the usage of language and who intersubjectively interprets symbols within a particular tradition.¹⁴

According to Habermas, these two types of knowledge have limitations as a theory of human society. Firstly, empirical-analytic science has the possibility to contribute to the domination and exploitation of society for a problematic worldview in which human beings are just the object for control and manipulation. Secondly, historical-hermeneutic science also contains the possibility to fuel this situation of human exploitation and domination while canceling the analysis of the subject of study even if the subject itself may express the distortion, such as domination and exploitation.¹⁵ The above indicates that these theories have an ontological weakness which facilitates domination and exploitation of society through a problematic worldview and an epistemological defect which means that both traditions address 'already existing bodies of knowledge',¹⁶ thus preventing a disclosure of the interests which the theories themselves contain implicitly beyond existing theoretical frameworks. In short, these sciences lack the capacity to analyze a distortion which the framework of sciences itself produces since the knowledge operates within a problematic structure.

To overcome the above weaknesses of empirical-analytic and historical-hermeneutic science, Habermas introduced a third kind of knowledge, a critical science which corresponds with psychoanalysis and a critique of ideology. While the previous two positions of science were rooted in the basic structure of social systems, such as work and communication, this third type of knowledge 'only arises through their distor-

tions'.¹⁷ Its origin allows critical theory to reveal embraced interests within knowledge, which the previous two positions fail to identify, and the distortion, which might be contained within methodological frameworks. Therefore, this type of knowledge has 'emancipatory interests' which are designed to free society from domination and exploitation through 'systematically distorted communication and thinly legitimized repression'.¹⁸

Habermas's trichotomy of knowledge can be regarded as a further development of the dichotomy of theory by Horkheimer, which made a great theoretical contribution in terms of not only the development of the epistemological theme which makes each position of knowledge clear, but also due to the construction of a base for the further development of the ontological theme, aimed at reformulating the programme for a emancipatory society represented by Marxism. Next, Habermas's ontological argument is a method of realizing emancipation through the introduction of undistorted communication.

Although the first generation of critical theorists shared the view that there were shortcomings in the arguments of Marxism and that a reformulation of historical materialism was needed, none of them had succeeded in overcoming this weakness. Habermas has challenged this ontological theme and made the theory of the society of Marxism reasonable in the modern context while sifting the focus of analysis from production to communication. The key to this reformulation lays in his identification of the distinction between labour and interaction as domains of human activity.

According to Habermas, Marxism tends to explain all activities of human beings in the single domain of production which mediates materi-

al exchanges.¹⁹ Habermas argues that this reductionism is a mistake since the emancipation of human beings, such as being set free from domination and discrimination, is not necessarily realized in the realm of production, for instance in the form of material well-being, though this material condition cannot be dismissed fully.²⁰ Rather, conditions for emancipation are found in the other realm of human activity, that is, what he calls 'interaction'. Therefore, he places his programme for realizing a emancipatory society not in the realm of work or production, which Marx emphasizes in his theory of historical materialism, but in this newly-identified sphere of human activities, that is, interaction or communication.²¹

Habermas argues that distortions in our communication, for example domination and discrimination, prevent the emancipation of human beings, and calls for a freeing from constraints on dialogue. He names such dialogue, free from distortion, 'an ideal speech situation'. This ideal environment for communication requires what he calls a 'general symmetry requirement', which ensures an equal chance for discussion among participants and an absence of domination.²² To realise an ideal speech situation, supposedly leading to emancipation, a transformation of the systems of distorted communication is required.²³ As mentioned above, the emancipatory interest or knowledge which emerges from the systematically distorted communication seeks an emancipation from domination, and this preference is the guiding interest of critical theory.²⁴ The concept of an ideal speech situation should be regarded just as an ideal as these conditions rarely exist in the real World.²⁵ However, it can be useful for measuring the degree of distortions in our communications and for criticizing these distortions.²⁶

Nevertheless, Habermas's argument also has

been subject to criticism in spite of his contribution to theoretical developments. The main criticism is that his analysis still stays at the level of abstraction or concept, and the application of the concepts to particular historical or social cases are lacking.²⁷ Since the beginning of the 1980s we have witnessed the emergence of critical studies being applied to research programmes in the fields of international relations, security studies and conflict studies were methods, concepts and arguments of critical theory are applied. A part of the answer to the question of abstraction and the lack of the application in Habermas's arguments can be found in the literature of these critical studies. In the next section, the development of critical studies is discussed in association with the arguments in this section.

The development of critical studies

As has been defined in the first section, critical studies is the international, security and conflict version of critical theory which developed from Cox's work in 1981, especially since the beginning of the 1990s. Therefore they share the normative character and themes of critical theory which were introduced in the previous section. So what are the arguments and concepts of critical studies? How is the origin and development of critical studies related to the critical theory of the Frankfurt School? What are the relations among these subfields of critical studies? What is the contribution of critical studies? In this section the origins and development of each subdivision, such as international relations, security studies and conflict analysis, are traced and the contribution to each respective field of studies is evaluated in terms of the theoretical development and its institutionalisation as a school of study.

International Relations

In 1981 Robert Cox published an essay entitled 'Social forces, states, and world orders: beyond international relations theory'. As this was the first attempt to apply critical theory to the field of international relations, the publication itself was a significant event in the development of critical studies. Since then many researchers have applied critical theory to the study of international relations. Nevertheless, as length is limited here I shall focus only on the arguments by the main architects of this international relation's strand of critical studies, Cox, Hoffman and Linklater. In this seminal article Cox clearly indicates the potential for the epistemological and ontological arguments in the field, which had been previously neglected in the literature of critical social theory.²⁸ Firstly, his epistemological argument that uncovered the hidden value of theories is introduced, and next, the ontological programme, which advocates an analysis of the World order with multi-parameters and through this the concept of hegemony is traced.

The article by Cox in 1981 emerged as a challenge against neo-realism, which had been dominant in the field since the publication of Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* in 1979. Epistemologically, Cox challenged neo-realism from two directions. In the first place, he revealed the value-ridden character of neo-realism which was thought to be value-free as well as positivism, and described that 'theory is always for someone and for some purpose'.²⁹ Cox continued this argument and identified the inescapable connection between particular time and space and theorizing while indicating that '(w)hen any theory so represents itself, it is the more important to examine it as ideology, and to lay bare its concealed perspective'.³⁰ This posi-

tion is echoed by Hutchings who argues that theory (of international relations) 'is not only about politics, it also is itself political'.³¹

In the second place, he followed Horkheimer's distinction between traditional theory and critical theory while introducing two types of theories, problem-solving theory and critical theory.³² According to this distinction, problem-solving theory takes the present order, formed by the social and political relationships and given institutions, and aims for the smooth function of these relationships and institutions within the given frameworks without reflecting the problem of the framework itself.³³ On the contrary, critical theory does not take the present political and social relationships and institutions for granted but questions them while seeking the origins of order and frameworks.³⁴

Further to his landmark epistemological argument, problem-solving theory is for the people who are comfortable with the existing order and for the purpose of the preservation of the present order,³⁵ and therefore, tends to serve dominant 'national, sectional, or class interests' under the existing order³⁶ while critical theory is for the people 'whose objective interests are currently denied' under the present circumstances³⁷ and for the purpose of emancipation by transforming the existing system. The above indicates that problem-solving theory has a conservative character,³⁸ whereas critical theory has a radical tendency. Cox, therefore, argues that neo-realism can be categorised as a 'problem-solving theory' for the conservative nature which stabilises present social and political systems, and calls for a critical approach to the study of international relations which seeks alternative structures.³⁹

Cox ontologically challenges the argument of neo-realism relating to state. In the analysis of neo-realism, state is the only parameter to be

analysed in the study of international relations or World order. Furthermore, state itself tends to be taken as given and historical, illustrated as a 'billiard-ball' that seems to be immutable. Cox opposes this interpretation and argues that state is a social and an historical construct and tends to take different forms during different periods.⁴⁰ Cox also introduces social forces, such as industrial workers, as well as considering state as parameters which form the World order in his analysis of 'hegemonic order', for example *pax britannica* in the mid-Nineteenth Century and *pax americana* in the era after World War II.⁴¹ As an agent contesting with this 'hegemonic order', Cox proposes a concept, 'counterhegemony', for example the coalition of Third World countries.⁴² According to Cox, whenever there is a hegemonic structure 'critical theory leads to look for a counter-structure by seeking out its possible bases of support and elements of cohesion'.⁴³ In short, Cox played an enormous role in the development of critical studies while contributing to both epistemological and ontological arguments.

In 1987, six years after the publication of Cox's seminal article, Hoffman published an article, 'Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate' in the same journal as Cox's.⁴⁴ In the article Hoffman introduces the development of critical theory while indicating epistemological arguments by Horkheimer and Habermas who had developed the consciousness of the relationship between knowledge and interests. Hoffman also outlines Cox's argument and suggests the possibility of the critical approach to international relations. It is quite rare for the arguments of critical theorists, such as Horkheimer and Habermas, to be introduced in specialist journals of international relations, except for a few articles including Cox's work in 1981. It, therefore, can be said that Hoffman made a unique and

important contribution to the development of critical studies. The publication of this article stimulated debate on the critical approach of international relations and its institutionalization in the coming decade.

As has been traced, the international relations strand of critical studies appeared in Cox's article in the early 1980s, and its development may have been accelerated by Hoffman's argument in the latter part of the decade. Nevertheless, the most robust account of the School is provided by Andrew Linklater in his 1998's book called *The Transformation of Political Community*. As the title suggests this book, which is a virtual extension of his previous works, mainly argues the problem of modern states, which he calls 'political community' to highlight his view that a modern state is just one form of political institution that has existed in World history. Although he pays scant attention to the epistemological arguments unlike Cox, Linklater's ontological arguments identified the problem of modern states, tracing their origins and transformation and envisaging new forms of political institutions. This view effectively discredited the reasoning of neo-realist which is represented by the 'immutability thesis' that tends to support the reproduction of the existing and unchanged order and to dismiss the possibility of the transformation of state and state-system. After a brief introduction of his epistemological argument, his analysis of 'political community' and reconstruction attempts to will now be traced.

Linklater follows Cox's epistemological analysis and argues that neo-realism can be regarded as a problem-solving theory which facilitates the reproduction of a problematic structure, and it would not benefit 'systematically excluded groups such as the global poor and refugees, minority nations and the world's

indigenous peoples' but the 'the great powers and the dominant groups within the global system'.⁴⁵ Further, Linklater calls the argument of neo-realism 'the immutability thesis' for the denial of the possibility of the transformation of state and the state-system and reveals the ideological nature exercised 'in the politically neutral observation of an independent reality' while claiming that it supports the status quo, structured inequalities of power and wealth, which are alterable in principle.⁴⁶ Linklater also indicates that critical social theory 'has been interested in ideologies which convert historically-contingent and socially-produced phenomena into natural and unalterable facts',⁴⁷ while problem-solving theory tend to stress 'political necessity and historical inevitability'.⁴⁸

According to Linklater, what is problematic in the neo-realism argument is a lack of an adequate analysis of modern state.⁴⁹ Actually, neo-realists tend to treat state as a given unproblematic and natural entity, and as a result they focus only on the relationship between states without reflecting on an analysis of the framework of state itself. He argues that state is neither unproblematic nor a natural entity and calls for an investigation of state as a political framework. The phenomenon which makes the state problematic is a process called the 'totalising project' in which states seek to construct homogenous national communities which are sharply distinguished from the outside and largely unconcerned about the interests, not only of outsiders, but also of sub-national groups.⁵⁰ In the totalising project four elements, such as territory, sovereignty, citizenship and nationality, are coupled together, and as a result a political community which systematically excludes aliens and subaltern groups from decision-making is built.⁵¹ This situation leads to inter-societal estrangements including

war and conflicts.⁵² Therefore, he argues that interpreting international relations through the neo-realists position means supporting this outcome of the totalising project⁵³ and the critical approach is the enterprise of reversing the totalising project.⁵⁴

So how can we overcome the problem of political community constructed by the totalizing project? Linklater envisages new forms of political community to protect the voices of marginal groups and aliens. This form of political community does not force one dominant national identity but recognises the supremacy of a single political authority⁵⁵, allowing multiple political allegiances and authorities.⁵⁶ In this new type of political community four elements tied by the totalising project must be uncoupled and this is the 'more effective structure to reconciling the claim of universality and difference'.⁵⁷ According to Linklater these new forms of political community have the capacity to develop a universal communication community, which is the ideal type of community.⁵⁸ In a universal communication community the moral importance of national identity is diminished and political decision, without considering systematically excluded groups, lacks legitimacy.⁵⁹

Following Cox's arguments, Linklater developed his original approach to the study of international relations mainly by way of an analysis of political community which the neo-realist's inquiry lacks. This normative analysis of the problem of political community, a historical-sociological investigation, debunks the immutability thesis of neo-realism and his Habermasian conclusion, focusing on the importance of undistorted dialogue to overcome the limitation of modern states, made his argument unique within critical studies of international relations. As a result, his arguments have received remarkable responses

and helped to institutionalize the critical approach to the study of international relations.⁶⁰ Therefore, it is possible to say that his contribution to the development of critical studies has been enormous.

Security Studies

In 1991, a decade after the publication of Cox's seminal article, critical approach arrived in the field of security studies. This new way of thinking about security, initiated by Ken Booth, appeared in *Review of International Studies* and his short article called 'Security and emancipation' can be regarded as the origins of the security strand of critical studies. Around the middle of 1990s this School started to be termed 'critical security studies' and has been developed further mainly by Richard Wyn Jones. As both Booth and Wyn Jones are scholars in Aberystwyth, University of Wales, the School is labeled the 'Welsh School'.⁶¹ Although the term 'critical security studies' may also include some alternative security thinking in addition to the Welsh School, such as the work of Krause and Williams, I will focus only on the arguments of the Welsh School which have tended to be inspired by the idea of critical theory.⁶²

In his short essay in 1991, Booth clearly indicates the contents and the character of this new wave of security thinking while criticizing traditional security thinking. According to him, traditional security thinking 'has been associated with the intellectual hegemony of realism', and as the nature of neo-realism indicates a traditional approach to security, tending to focus on military threats and the security of state.⁶³ Booth criticizes the former theme and argues that 'the threats to the well-being of individuals and the interests of nations across the world derive primarily not from the neighbour's army but from other chal-

lenges, such as economic collapse, political oppression, scarcity, overpopulation, ethnic rivalry, the destruction of nature, terrorism, crime and disease'.⁶⁴ He also criticizes the danger of a state-centric approach to security which may reinforce one's own section at the expense of the other section while regarding such an approach as 'ethnocentrism'.⁶⁵ He continues that 'people are more threatened by the policies and inadequacies of their own government than by the Napoleonic ambitions of their neighbour's'.⁶⁶

Booth, therefore, argues that 'the next stage of thinking about security' should move from a realist's camp to that of critical theory and envisages a new thinking of security based on critical theory though he does not quote any critical theorists such as Horkheimer and Habermas in his article.⁶⁷ In this new thinking, security is defined as 'the absence of threats' which means the absence not only of military threats to states, such as war, but also of other threats to the well-being of humanity like 'poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on'.⁶⁸ Emancipation is central to new security thinking instead of power and order in realist's arguments which are 'at somebody's expense', and Booth indicates that security can only be realized 'by people and groups if they do not deprive others of it'.⁶⁹ Following the World Society School he shifts the focus of security studies from the traditional style of national security to the critical fashion of human security while insisting that 'individual humans are the ultimate referent'.⁷⁰

Although there is no detailed epistemological discussion in this publication, Booth's argument is insightful for his contribution to the construction of the new image of security. He located the concept of security not in the neo-realist's sense but in the broader definition while criticizing the traditional security thinking based on neo-real-

ism. This cosmopolitan way of thinking which focuses not on the national security but on human emancipation, thus not sacrificing the security of others is the most remarkable strength of his argument, an aspect shared with the international relations' strand of critical studies. Finally, it can be said that Booth's contribution to security studies is outstanding, and therefore, it is possible to regard him as a pioneer of the security strand of critical studies.

Richard Wyn Jones, who had been a colleague of Ken Booth in Aberystwyth, has also published several articles and a book around the critical approach to security studies. Although Booth called for a shift in security studies to the critical approach, he did not cite any critical theorists in his article in 1991. Booth also paid little attention to the epistemological argument. Wyn Jones virtually reinforces the work of Booth who identified the shortcoming of traditional security thinking and envisaged a new thinking about security while introducing an epistemological discussion. In the following section criticisms against the traditional reasoning of security, including epistemological arguments will be traced first of all. Secondly, the new approach to security, which does not share the defects of traditional thinking, is introduced.

Following Horkheimer's dichotomy of theories, Wyn Jones terms mainstream security studies in the post-war era, such as strategic studies and national security studies, as 'traditional security studies' and the new thinking of security as 'critical security studies'.⁷¹ Under the strong effect of the Cold War traditional security studies focuses on the military side of security, like superpower rivalries and nuclear manifestations.⁷² Their approach tends to employ 'the scientific objectivist conception of knowledge' and the state-centric view of security as well as neo-

realism.⁷³ Nevertheless, Wyn Jones criticizes the shortcoming of the objectivistic claim while identifying the ideological nature of traditional security studies, and following Cox's epistemological argument, he indicates that traditional security studies are 'for states, and especially for the ruling elites within them'⁷⁴ and for the purpose of legitimizing 'the prevailing *status quo*'.⁷⁵ He also criticizes the statism of traditional security studies while following Booth's argument indicating that policy based on national security may lead to contradictory outcomes. He, therefore, argues that 'the sovereign state is one of the main causes of insecurity: it is part of the problem rather than the solution',⁷⁶ and indicates the evidence of contradictory results of state-based security, for example 'the widespread pattern of state-sanctioned political oppression, human rights violations and torture'.⁷⁷

To overcome these defects of traditional security studies Wyn Jones introduces the concept of 'critical security studies' that are sensitive to the relationship between knowledge and interests and which do not have a state-centric view. He explains that critical security studies challenges 'the hegemonic security discourse and the prevailing practice of global (in)security',⁷⁸ and it is for those who are insecure under the existing order and for the purpose of their emancipation while following the arguments of Cox.⁷⁹ New studies of security also reject the state-based approach of traditional security studies which emphasise the role of the military, and instead focuses on 'individual human beings',⁸⁰ or grass-roots actors, such as peace movements which engage in 'the struggle for human rights and the survival of minority cultures, and so on'.⁸¹

Basically Wyn Jones's work around the study of security can be regarded as the extension of

Booth's article in 1991 with theoretical fortification. Firstly, he introduced the dichotomy of security studies following Horkheimer's distinction between traditional and critical theory, and termed mainstream studies of security, 'traditional security studies', and alternative security thinking as 'critical security studies'. Secondly, Wyn Jones debunked the ideological nature of traditional security studies, which supports existing political and social structures and clearly defines the purpose of critical security studies, that is the emancipation of powerless people under the existing order while applying Cox's famous epistemological argument about the nature and purpose of theories. Following Booth's argument, he clearly describes the defects of the state-centric view in traditional security studies while revealing the negative role of state in terms of the security of its citizens. Finally, we may be able to say that Wyn Jones has made an important contribution to the development of the security strand of critical studies.

We have traced the development of the security strand of critical studies. Booth opened the gate for the critical approach to security studies in his seminal essay in 1991, which revealed the defects of realism-based traditional thinking. Although there were not epistemological arguments in the article, his cosmopolitan thinking shifted the focus from national security to human security and made the original contribution to the development of a critical approach to security studies. Wyn Jones reinforced Booth's arguments while introducing epistemological arguments and quoting predecessors of critical theory, such as Horkheimer and Cox. As a result of their efforts, this strand of critical studies has started to be expanded by the emergence of case studies that have applied this critical approach and by the publication of a text book,⁸² though

this strand may have been theoretically less developed than the strand of international relations. In short, it is possible to say that this security strand has contributed to the development of critical studies while extending the definition of security in a new era.

Conflict Studies

Early attempts to apply critical theory to the study of conflict were made by Hoffman and Rothman independently in 1992. Hoffman, who contributed to the development of the international strand of critical theory, indicated the possibility of the application of critical theory, such as the theory of communication by Habermas, to conflict studies while Rothman briefly introduced epistemological arguments.⁸³ As both scholars have stimulated the development of critical studies in the field of conflict analysis their contribution should not be underestimated. The substantial developments of this strand of critical studies, nevertheless, have been progressed by scholars such as Vivienne Jabri and Deiniol Jones since the middle of the 1990s. Therefore, in the next section we will focus on the works of the latter researchers.

In the mid 1990s Vivienne Jabri published a series of arguments including a book entitled *Discourses on violence* in 1996. She mainly applies the theory of structuration by Anthony Giddens and the theory of communication by Jurgen Habermas for developing a critical analysis of conflict. As a result Jabri has succeeded in developing a new approach to conflict studies. These original developments are represented by an analysis criticizing existing approaches for their inadequate investigations of power asymmetries and by an argument relating to the roles of social discourse and institutional formation in

the production of exclusionist identities that regenerate social orders reinforcing conflicts and war. In the following section the former epistemological argument is traced. The introduction of the latter argument about the relationship between hegemonic discourses underpinned by the political framework of state system and violent conflicts is followed.

According to Jabri there are two kinds of existing approaches to the mediation of conflicts. The first is the 'power-political' approach that uses coercive means such as threat and reward to induce a settlement. The advocates of this method tend to employ the realists' interpretation of international relations, and the technique itself can be 'another tool within the diplomats remit'.⁸⁴ The second is the 'facilitative' approach, which appoints a non-official third party whose ultimate role is to remove the psychological barrier to a resolution.⁸⁵ This method aims at mutual understanding; recognition of each other's position; causes of conflict, and uncovering the structural constraints to resolution.⁸⁶ Jabri, however, was not satisfied with either of these approaches to conflict resolution since they do not supply 'an adequate conception of power which takes into account both relation and structural factors and the means through which different types of intervention address asymmetry'.⁸⁷ She advocates a critical approach to conflict resolution which is based on the theory of communication by Habermas which urges symmetry power relationships among adversaries through undistorted dialogue instead.⁸⁸

Jabri argues not only the methodology but also the ontology, mainly of the mechanism of legitimating war underpinned by state. Firstly, following Giddens, she defines state as a container of power of a highly administrated and militarized system and, therefore, as 'a central location

for the institutionalization of the machinery of violence'.⁸⁹ Although state seems to acquire internal pacification, Jabri indicates that it does not end militarism since the military concentration of power directs against another state(s).⁹⁰ The realization of internal pacification also sounds vulnerable for the demands for ethnic secession, and so on.⁹¹ Secondly, she identifies the character of 'hegemonic discourses' that emerges in times of war and conflict. Hegemonic discourses have a totalizing tendency as they 'seek to subsume multiple subjectivities into singular modes of identity requiring conformity and allegiance'.⁹² Nationalism is regarded as one hegemonic discourse for articulating exclusionist identities, which is implicated in the mechanism of violence. Jabri explores roles of national symbols such as languages, flags and monuments of the symbolic order contained in nation and state.⁹³ Jabri suggests that such exclusionist discourses generate 'counter-discourses, resistance and non-conformity',⁹⁴ and that for the resolution of conflict the undoing of totalizing tendencies of hegemonic discourses (these are the recognition of diversity, the articulation of multiple subjectivities and the production of cross-cutting modes of discourse) are required.⁹⁵

Although scant attention to epistemology was paid and it was a little bit too theoretical without any case studies, Jabri nevertheless has built the foundation for the critical analysis of conflict. Firstly, she developed the criticism not only of the power-political model of conflict resolution but also of the facilitative approach in terms of inadequate analysis of asymmetric conflicts, while making the identity of critical approach clearer by way of the application of Habermas's theory of dialogue. Secondly, she identified the mechanisms of conflict, which revolve around the accumulation of power in the institution of

state and the emergence of exclusionist identities articulated by hegemonic discourses that are implicated in violence. Finally, it is possible to say that Jabri is a key contributor to the development of critical studies of conflict.

Jabri's arguments have been developed further by Deiniol Jones whose ideas appeared in a book entitled *Cosmopolitan mediation?* and a series of articles around the new Millennium. Although Jabri built the theoretical platform for critical studies of conflict she did not provide case studies for testing and enshrining her arguments. It has been argued that critical theory lacked the application of the theory to concrete cases.⁹⁶ Following a trichotomy of approaches to conflict resolution originally developed by Jabri, namely power-political (geostrategic), facilitative and critical, Jones applies these positions to the analysis of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict while expanding the theoretical arguments of the above three methods for mediating disputes. Firstly, his criticisms against theory and practice of two traditional approaches to mediation are traced; secondly the arguments around critical approaches are outlined in the following section.

According to Jones the geostrategic style of international mediation is 'the most prominent form of third-party intervention' in the modern history of the world'.⁹⁷ It is working at a states' executive and administrative level under conditions of international anarchy and within a framework of control and the manipulation of society.⁹⁸ He indicates that the foreign policy of the United States during the Cold War, especially its policy on the Middle East in 1970s which saw Israel start to become involved in regional operations on behalf of the United States' interests and was to create a local power balance among the super powers, fits this geostrategic mediation.⁹⁹ Jones criticizes this method for the following

three reasons: the ideological character which serves the super power, relating purely to security interests and sacrificing regional dynamics,¹⁰⁰ the *status quo* orientation which tends to reproduce the existing order,¹⁰¹ and a state-centric nature which does not penetrate into the 'hard shell' of sovereignty due to the nature of sovereignty itself, are the issues in many conflicts.¹⁰²

The second approach to mediation Jones indicates is facilitation. This approach focuses on neutrality, communication, the socio-psychological process and the role of non-state and individual actors in the setting of problem-solving workshops.¹⁰³ In spite of the good intention of avoiding ideological biases, typifying the geostrategic approach, Jones argues that the facilitative style of mediation also fails to address substantial issues, such as power asymmetries and structural inequalities, in separating the practice of conflict resolution from the wider context of conflict.¹⁰⁴ He maintains that as a result of this failure facilitation is a 'false dialogue' or a 'false asymmetry' and the outcome is the same as that of the geostrategic approach, that is, the reinforcement of existing structures that embrace inequality.¹⁰⁵ Jones explains that the Oslo Process of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in 1993, realized by Norwegian intervention, is an example of this facilitative approach since the process enforced the existing structure of power in the Region without addressing substantial issues, like structural inequalities, though there was some progress such as mutual recognition.¹⁰⁶

The problem with the above two methods of mediation are that these approaches do not grasp the context of conflict and ignore the local dynamics in favour of the interests of the super powers in the geostrategic case, and power asymmetries in favour of the socio-psychological process which is enhanced by unofficial dia-

logues in the facilitative case. Both approaches, therefore, result in the reproduction of structural inequalities in social and political relationships without transforming the problematic structure. Jones tries to overcome defects of these traditional methods while introducing the third approach to mediation, critical or cosmopolitan mediation, based on Habermas's undistorted communication.¹⁰⁷ This method takes the context of conflict seriously while problematizing the intransigence of the stronger group and searches for a change in the distribution of power among related parties by the empowerment of the weaker group.¹⁰⁸ In this critical form of mediation, not the super powers or an un-official mediator but 'the coalition of states', such as the EU, is expected to play the role of mediator.¹⁰⁹

As Jones followed a trichotomy of approaches to conflict resolution developed by Jabri, his work can be regarded as an extension of Jabri's arguments. Nevertheless, while Jabri did not provide any case studies and the arguments remained at a quite abstract level, as well as that of Habermas and other critical theorists, Jones introduced excellent case studies on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict into the analysis. As a result, not only was an indepth analysis of the conflict, equipped with the concepts and arguments of critical theory achieved but also the testing and refinement of theoretical arguments in critical studies were also realized. Therefore, it may be possible to say that Jones has opened up a new horizon for critical studies of conflict.

As we have traced, this section of the paper introduced the conflict strand of critical studies. Around the middle of the 1990s Jabri developed the foundational argument of critical studies of conflict and at the end of the 1990s Jones developed this strand further while employing case studies. What was shared by these two scholars

was the application of a trichotomy of approaches to conflict resolution, these were, power-political (geostrategic), facilitative and critical methods. While the first two approaches were criticized for negating an analysis of the context of conflict, Jabri and Jones emphasized the importance of the last approach which was based on Habermas's arguments. Although there has not been strong evidence of the institutionalization of this strand, unlike the previous two strands, further theoretical developments seemed to emerge from this camp of critical studies.¹¹⁰ Finally, it may be possible to say that this strand, in which the context of conflict can be properly analyzed, has made a unique and important contribution to the whole development of critical studies.

In this section the origins and development of the respective subfields of critical studies were outlined. Cox's article at the beginning of the 1980s, which was categorized into the strand of international relations, was regarded as the origin of critical studies. In 1990s the development was expanded into the realm of security and conflict studies mainly due to the end of the Cold War¹¹¹ and related events, such as the emergence of the Oslo channel in the Middle East,¹¹² etc. All of the arguments of critical studies emerged as a reaction against prevailing theoretical traditions, for example neo-realism for the international relations strand; traditional security studies for the security strand; traditional conflict studies, including the power-political or geostrategic approach, and the facilitative approach for the conflict strand. As all of the strands inherited characters from critical theory, they are sensitive to the relationship between value and knowledge, and to constraints on human freedom both in theory and in practice. Although differences in the degree of institutionalization can be observed

among respective subfields, criticisms against traditional approaches that debunked epistemological and ontological defects, helped to develop the critical approach to the theory and practice of respective strands. Therefore, it may be possible to say that all strands have contributed well to the development of critical studies.

Conclusion

We have traced the origins and development of critical theory and critical studies. Critical theory was developed by the scholars from the Institute of Social Studies in Frankfurt and was related to Frankfurt University. It focused on the emancipation from constraints on human autonomy. As their arguments emerged as a part of an intellectual movement of Western Marxism, they were interested in the reformulation of Marxism via the critical and rational reading of Marx. Although the first generation of scholars set the original themes of critical theory, namely the epistemological theme which aimed to reveal implicit values in knowledge, and the ontological theme which was intended to reformulate historical materialism, they failed to develop an alternative theory of society to historical materialism due to the severe reality of the world at that time. A scholar of the second generation, Habermas succeeded in transforming theoretical tradition from one that was production-based to a communication-based one, while replacing the original epistemological argument of critical theory that introduced a dichotomy of knowledge and interests with a trichotomy of cognitive interests in knowledge. Nevertheless, Habermas was criticized for his abstract arguments without empirical studies for testing his argument in reality.

Since the beginning of the 1980s studies employing the arguments and concepts of critical theory have emerged in the field of international

relations, security studies and conflict analysis. They were defined as critical studies due to their shared and inherited characteristics, such as critical to traditional theories and practice, sensitivity to the relationship between knowledge and interests, and the aim of emancipation from unnecessary constraints on human freedom. As Habermas was criticized for his abstract arguments, critical studies shared the defect of lacking empirical arguments. Nevertheless, emerging case studies and historical-sociological analysis have started to overcome Habermas's weakness. The other challenge of critical studies is that there is also a difference in the level of institutionalization among the respective subfields and there have been few attempts to unite these subdivisions as a school of study. Finally, it may be possible to say that critical studies as a variant of critical theory has contributed to the theoretical development of its respective fields of study while introducing new insights derived from the Frankfurt School.

Notes

- 1 For an overview of the Frankfurt School, see: Held, David, *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas* (London: Hutchinson, 1980); Bottomore, Tom, *The Frankfurt School* (Chichester: Ellis Horwood, 1984); Wiggershaus, Rolf (trans. Michael Robertson), *The Frankfurt School: its history, theory and political significance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994)
- 2 Bottomore, *op cit.*, p. 14. For a detailed survey around the influence of Lukacs on the development of critical theory, see Feenberg, Andres, *Lukacs, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory* (Oxford: Robertson, 1981)
- 3 For example, see *Oxford Concise Dictionary*

- of Politics second edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) p. 128.
- 4 Held, *op cit.*, p. 33.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- 6 Bottomore, *op cit.*, p. 16.
- 7 Wyn Jones, Richard, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999) pp. 19-20.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 9 *Ibid.*, p. 20.
- 10 *Ibid.*, pp. 29-50.
- 11 *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.
- 12 Nevertheless, Wyn Jones indicates that we cannot reduce the reason for this theoretical stagnation only due to a difficult historical situation, though he does not dismiss the strong influence of the historical situation on theorizing by members of the Institute. He argues that some problems were contained in 'Traditional and Critical Theory', in which the authors formulated arguments to equalize the manipulation and control of nature with human emancipation. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-49.
- 13 Held, *op cit.*, p. 255.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 255.
- 15 Roderick, *op cit.*, p. 55.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 56.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 56.
- 18 Habermas, Jurgen, 'A Postscript to Knowledge and Human Interests', *Philosophy of the Social Science*, p. 214. Quoted in Roderick, *op cit.*, p. 56.
- 19 McCarthy, Thomas, *The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1978) p. 34.
- 20 *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- 21 Rederick, *op cit.*, p. 137.
- 22 Held, *op cit.*, pp.343-4.
- 23 McCarthy, *op cit.*, pp. 87-88; Held, *op cit.*, p. 256.
- 24 Held, *op cit.*, p. 319.
- 25 Roderick, *op cit.*, p. 78.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 79.
- 27 Bottomore, *op cit.*, p. 73; Outhwaite, William, *Habermas: a critical introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994) p. 62.; Wyn Jones 1999a, *op cit.*, p. 64.
- 28 Devetak, Richard, 'Critical Theory,' in Burchill, Scot *et al.* (eds), *Theories of International Relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1996) pp. 147-8.
- 29 Cox, Robert W., 'Social forces, states, and world orders: beyond international relations theory', in Cox, Robert W., *Approaches to world order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) p. 87.
- 30 *Ibid.*, p. 87.
- 31 Hutchings, Kimberly, *International political theory: a rethinking ethics in the global era* (London: SAGE, 1999) p. 87.
- 32 Cox, *op cit.*, p. 88.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 88.
- 34 *Ibid.*, p. 88.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 90.
- 36 *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.
- 37 Hutchings, *op cit.*, p. 69.
- 38 Cox, *op cirt.*, p. 89.
- 39 *Ibid.*
- 40 Devetak, *op cit.*, p. 159.
- 41 Cox, *op cit.*, pp. 97-109.
- 42 *Ibid.*, p. 115.
- 43 Cox, Robert W., 'Social forces, states, and world orders: beyond international relations theory', in Williams, Howard, Moorhead Wright and Tony Evans (eds), *A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory* (Buckingham: Open University Press 1993) p. 294.
- 44 Hoffman, Mark, 'Critical Theory and the

- Inter-Paradigm Debate,' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 16, no. 2 (1987) pp. 231-249.
- 45 Linklater, Andrew, *The Transformation of Political Community: ethical foundation of the post-Westphalian era* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1998) p. 21.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 19.
- 48 *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 51 *Ibid.*, Chapter 5.
- 52 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 53 *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- 54 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 55 *Ibid.*, p. 181.
- 56 *Ibid.*, p. 200.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 200.
- 58 *Ibid.*, p. 220.
- 59 *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- 60 One of the issues of *Review of International Studies* which is the journal of the British International Studies Association contains a forum on the book by Linklater to discuss its contents. Five scholars from various backgrounds, including Linklater himself, contributed to this forum. 'Forum on *The Transformation of Political Community*', *Review of International Studies* 25, no. 1. (1999) pp. 139-175. Two textbooks of international relations is clearly conscious of the critical approach while providing an independent section: Burchill, Scott *et al.*, *Theories of International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996); Baylis, John and Smith, Steve (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- 61 Smith, Steve, 'The Contested Concept of Security', in Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005) p. 41.
- 62 About broadly-defined 'critical security studies', see *Ibid.*, pp. 40-46.
- 63 Booth, Ken, 'Security and Emancipation,' *Review of International Studies* 17, no. 4. (1991) p. 318.
- 64 *Ibid.*, p. 318.
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 318.
- 66 *Ibid.*, p. 318.
- 67 *Ibid.*, p. 321.
- 68 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 69 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 70 *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- 71 Wyn Jones, Richard, 'Message in a Bottle?' Theory and Praxis in Critical Security Studies', *Contemporary Security Studies* 16, no. 3. (1995); Wyn Jones, Richard, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999); Stamnes, Eli and Richard Wyn Jones, 'Burundi: A Critical Security Perspective', *Peace and Conflict Studies* 7, no. 2. (2000)
- 72 Wyn Jones 1999, *op cit.*, p. 102; Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 38.
- 73 Wyn Jones 1999, *op cit.*, p. 102.
- 74 Wyn Jones 1999, *op cit.*, in Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 38.
- 75 Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 39.
- 76 Wyn Jones 1995, *op cit.*, p. 310.
- 77 Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 42.
- 78 Wyn Jones 1995, *op cit.*, p. 309.
- 79 *Ibid.* pp. 310-11; Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 42.
- 80 Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 42.
- 81 Wyn Jones 1995, *op cit.*, p. 311.
- 82 For the example of case studies, see Booth,

- Ken and Peter Vale, 'Critical Security Studies and Regional Insecurity: The Case of South Africa', in Keith Krause and Michael Williams (eds), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997) and Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.* The textbook is below: Booth, Ken (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005)
- 83 Rothman, Jay, *From Confrontation to Cooperation: resolving ethnic and regional conflict* (London: Sage Publications, 1992); Hoffman, Mark, 'Third Party Mediation and Conflict Resolution', in Baylis, John and N. J. Rengger (eds), *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)
- 84 Jabri, Vivienne, 'Agency, Structure and the Question of Power in Conflict Resolution,' *Paradigms: The Kent Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 2. (1995) p. 55.
- 85 *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- 86 Jabri, Vivienne, *Discourses on Violence* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996) pp. 153-4.
- 87 Jabri 1995, *op cit.*, p. 63.
- 88 Jabri 1996, *op cit.*, pp. 160-6.
- 89 *Ibid.*, pp. 110-4.
- 90 *Ibid.*, pp. 113-4.
- 91 *Ibid.*, pp. 113-4.
- 92 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 93 *Ibid.*, pp. 120-40.
- 94 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 95 *Ibid.*, p. 184.
- 96 Jones, Deiniol, *Cosmopolitan mediation?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999) p. 81.
- 97 *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- 98 *Ibid.*, p. 157; Jones, Deiniol, 'Mediation, conflict resolution and critical theory', *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 4. (2000) p. 649.
- 99 Jones 1999, *op cit.*, p. 34 and chapter 3.
- 100 *Ibid.*, p. 34, 46.
- 101 *Ibid.*, p. 53, 158.
- 102 *Ibid.*, p. 35, 42.
- 103 Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 650.
- 104 Jones 1999, *op cit.*, pp. 72-76; Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 653.
- 105 Jones 1999, *op cit.*, chapter 4; Jones 2000, *op cit.*, pp. 653-655.
- 106 Jones 1999, *op cit.*, chapter 7.
- 107 *Ibid.*, chapter 5.
- 108 *Ibid.*, p. 96.
- 109 *Ibid.*, p. 96.
- 110 For example, Jeong expands a similar line of argument to the above two scholars while exploring the significance of power asymmetries in conflict resolution. See Jeong, Ho-Won, 'Research on Conflict Resolution,' in Jeong, Ho-Won (ed.), *Conflict Resolution: dynamics, process and structure* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999)
- 111 Wyn Jones 2000, *op cit.*, p. 37.
- 112 Jones 1999, *op cit.*

Bibliography

- Baylis, John and Smith, Steve (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Booth, Ken, 'Security and Emancipation,' *Review of International Studies* 17, no. 4. (1991)
- Booth, Ken and Peter Vale, 'Critical Security Studies and Regional Insecurity: The Case of South Africa', in K. Krause and M. Williams (eds), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (Minneapolis: University of

- Minnesota Press, 1997)
- Booth, Ken (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005)
- Bottomore, Tom, *The Frankfurt School* (Chichester: Ellis Horwood, 1984)
- Burchill, Scott et al., *Theories of International Relations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996)
- Calhoun, Craig, *Critical Social Theory* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995)
- Cox, Robert W., 'Social forces, states, and world orders: beyond international relations theory', in Cox, Robert W., *Approaches to world order* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- Devetak, Richard, 'Critical Theory,' in Burchill, Scot et al. (eds), *Theories of International Relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1996)
- Feenberg, Andres, *Lukacs, Marx and the Sources of Critical Theory* (Oxford: Robertson, 1981)
- Habermas, Jurgen (trans. Christian Lenhardt and Shierry Weber Nicholsen), *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990)
- Held, David, *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas* (London: Hutchinson, 1980)
- Hoffman, Mark, 'Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate,' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 16, no. 2 (1987)
- Hoffman, Mark, 'Third Party Mediation and Conflict Resolution', in Baylis, John and N. J. Rengger (eds), *Dilemmas of World Politics: International Issues in a Changing World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)
- Hutchings, Kimberly, *International political theory: a rethinking ethics in the global era* (London: SAGE, 1999)
- Jabri, Vivienne, 'Agency, Structure and the Question of Power in Conflict Resolution,' *Paradigms: The Kent Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 2. (1995)
- Jabri, Vivienne, *Discourses on Violence* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)
- Jeong, Ho-Won (ed.), *Conflict Resolution: dynamics, process and structure* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999)
- Jones, Deiniol, *Cosmopolitan mediation?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999)
- Jones, Deiniol, 'Mediation, conflict resolution and critical theory', *Review of International Studies* 26, no. 4. (2000)
- Linklater, Andrew, *Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1990)
- Linklater, Andrew, *The Transformation of Political Community: ethical foundation of the post-Westphalian era* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1998)
- Mautner, Thomas (ed.), *The Penguin Dictionary of Philosophy* (London: Penguin Books, 1997)
- McCarthy, Thomas, *The Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas* (London: Hutchinson, 1978)
- McLean, Ian and Alistair McMillan, *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics second edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Roderick, Rick, *Habermas and the Foundations of Critical Theory* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Publishers, 1986)
- Rockmore, Tom, *Habermas on Historical Materialism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989)
- Rothman, Jay, *From Confrontation to Cooperation: resolving ethnic and regional*

- conflict* (London: Sage Publications, 1992)
- Ryan, Stephen, *Ethnic Conflict and International Relations second edition* (Aldershot: Dartmouth, 1995)
- Smith, Steve, 'The Contested Concept of Security', in Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005)
- Stamnes, Eli and Richard Wyn Jones, 'Burundi: A Critical Security Perspective', *Peace and Conflict Studies* 7, no. 2. (2000)
- Wiggershaus, Rolf (trans. Michael Robertson), *The Frankfurt School: its history, theory and political significance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994)
- Wyn Jones, Richard, 'Message in a Bottle?' Theory and Praxis in Critical Security Studies', *Contemporary Security Studies* 16, no. 3. (1995)
- Wyn Jones, Richard, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999)