Article

EJIR

Security and secularization in International Relations

European Journal of International Relations
18(1) 177–199
© The Author(s) 2011
Reprints and permissions: sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1354066110396592
ejt.sagepub.com

Luca Mavelli
University of Surrey, UK

Abstract
What is the relationship between security and secularization in International Relations? The widespread acceptance of secularism as the paradigmatic framework that underlies the study of world politics has left this question largely unexplored. Yet, the recent challenges to the secularization thesis and the growing attention that is being devoted to questions of religion and secularism in international politics increasingly suggest the importance of undertaking this investigation. This article takes up this task in three main steps. First, it will explore how the limits of a widely accepted but nonetheless problematic account of the emergence of the modern Westphalian nation-state contribute to a dominant underlying assumption in security studies that implicitly associates security with secularization. Second, it will articulate a competing genealogy of security and secularization which suggests that rather than solving the problem of religious insecurity, secularization makes the question of fear and the politics of exceptionalism central to the state-centric project of modernity and its related vision of security. Finally, the article will examine how these elements inform and, most of all, constrain attempts to move beyond the traditional state-centric framework of security. The focus will be on three such attempts: human security, the securitization theory and Ken Booth's critical theory of security.

Keywords
Aquinas, critical approaches to security, Hobbes, religion, secularization/secularism, security

Introduction

Although the field of security studies has broadened its agenda from traditional military and state-centric approaches to questions of human security, gender, emancipation,

Corresponding author:
Luca Mavelli, School of Politics, Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, UK
Email: l.mavelli@surrey.ac.uk

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

health, the environment and the political theory of security (see, for instance, Williams, 2008), the connections between security and secularization remain largely unexplored. Such neglect can be explained by the paradigmatic status acquired by the theory of secularization within modern social sciences (Casanova, 1994: 14), which in the field of International Relations (IR) has gained a further normative overtone. In most accounts of IR, in fact, the Westphalian system of secular nation-states is described as the attempt to find a solution to the 'intolerance, war, devastation, [and] political upheaval' caused by conflicting religious worldviews (Thomas, 2000: 819). Secularization as the privatization and marginalization of religious belief is thus deemed essential for the possibility of modern politics. As a result, until recently, IR has tended to see religion as essentially peripheral and has developed its reflection 'as if it concerned an autonomous [secular] space that is not fundamentally disturbed by its presence' (Hatzopoulos and Petito, 2003: 14).[1] This is particularly true of the sub-field of security studies which has largely ignored the question of religion save for more recent publications which mostly frame it as a security problem.

For instance, in an introductory text on security studies, Peter Lawler (2008: 76) approvingly quotes 17th-century philosopher Pascal as saying 'Men never do evil so completely and cheerfully as when they do it from religious conviction'. Religion is indicted as a primary cause of violence because of its absolutist, divisive and insufficiently rational character (see Cavanaugh, 2009: 17). The idea that religion may have replaced ideology as the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War era (Huntington, 1993) appears in the writings of Mary Kaldor (1999), for whom the 'new wars' are increasingly marked by ethnic and religious differences, as well as in the work of David Rapoport (2001) and Peter Neumann, who claims that 'new terrorism' has in religion 'its most powerful motivational and ideological basis' (Neumann, 2009: 24). According to Mark Juergensmeyer (2003), we are witnessing a 'global rise of religious violence'. Unlike the means–ends, calculative rationality of secular acts of violence which are not aimed at causing more harm than needed, religious violence is characterized by 'acts of deliberatively exaggerated violence' aimed at maximizing their 'savage nature' and 'meant purposely to elicit anger' (Juergensmeyer, 2003: 121–122).

As has been observed, such debates over the connection between religion and violence can be understood as debates 'over the proper boundaries, character and role of religion in modern Western societies' (Frettingham, 2009: 18), and more specifically respond to the modern liberal imperative that religion 'be kept quite separate from politics, law and science' (Asad, 1993: 28). These perspectives, therefore, deem religion to be a potential security threat when the latter becomes involved in politics — when it goes public — thus crossing over from the private space to which it has been relegated by liberal-secular discourse. This view is effectively summarized by Ken Booth (2007: 418): 'Once fundamental spiritual beliefs become implicated in politics — the public sphere where ideally reasonable discussion, compromise, and consensus takes place — trouble can be expected'. According to this perspective, the public sphere needs to be secured from religion or, put differently, the security of the public sphere rests on its secular character. By establishing a connection between religion in its public and political manifestations and violence, these perspectives implicitly posit a positive relationship between security and secularization.[2]

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

The aim of this article is not to challenge the empirical dimension of those perspectives that posit such a positive relationship, but to problematize the ontological and epistemological assumptions on which they rest that hold secularization as an essential component of security. This idea, it will be contended, rests on weak theoretical and historical foundations. My goal, therefore, is not to question the possibility that religion in its political manifestations may be linked to violence, but to show how in postulating such a relationship what counts as 'religion' cannot be objectively determined and is ultimately the result of a state-centric logic of security. This idea draws on a recent body of scholarship that emphasizes the constructed nature of the religious and the secular and deems this construction an expression of power/knowledge regimes (McCutcheon, 2007; Salvatore, 2006, 2007; Shakman Hurd, 2004). Talal Asad (2003), in particular, has suggested that the modern construction of religion reflects the power of the secular as a dominant epistemic framework. The secular nation-state, Asad contends, is actively engaged in the construction of what counts as 'religious' and in the constant redefinition of 'the space that religion may properly occupy in society' (Asad, 2003: 210). Similarly, William Cavanaugh (2009: 4) has argued that the idea that religion is 'essentially prone to violence is one of the foundational legitimating myths of the liberal nation-state' as a secular pacifier of violent religious views. This myth, Cavanaugh (2009: 4) remarks, is used to strengthen state sovereignty by marginalizing internal groups, discourses and practices 'labelled religious' and casting external 'nonsecular social orders, especially Muslim societies, in the role of the villain'.

This article has three main objectives. First, to show how the idea of a positive relationship between security and secularization rests on a widely accepted but nonetheless problematic account of the emergence of the modern nation-state. Second, to explore how a competing genealogy of security and secularization suggests that rather than solving the problem of religious insecurity, secularization makes the question of fear and the politics of exceptionalism central to the state-centric project of modernity and its related vision of security. Finally, to examine how these elements inform and, most of all, constrain conceptual attempts to move beyond the traditional state-centric framework of security. The focus will be on three such attempts: human security, the securitization theory and Ken Booth's critical theory of security. This article will thus argue that to axiomatically associate security with secularization is not only conceptually and analytically problematic, but contributes to constrain the critical potential of those approaches that strive to move beyond the traditional state-centric framework of security. Furthermore, it will suggest that as the question of religion is an essential part of the genealogy of security, to simply ignore its relevance for contemporary security studies or bracket religion as a dimension of insecurity cannot but reinforce the state-centric logic which makes us objects rather than subjects of security.

The investigation will be informed by a critical approach revolving around two main assumptions. First, 'security is a derivative concept' of an underlying political theory (Booth, 2007: 109, 150), which means that 'questions about security cannot be separated from the most basic questions of political theory' (Walker, 1997: 63). Second, and accordingly, an investigation into the political theory of security requires us to 'denaturalize the modern state as the starting point for analysis and to initiate a serious examination of its historical genesis and evolution' (Williams, 1998: 205). The discussion will proceed as follows.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

In the next section I will explore the limits of a widely accepted narrative of the emergence of the modern Westphalian nation-state by discussing Michael C. Williams' seminal article 'Identity and the politics of security' (1998). This is, to my knowledge, the only self-reflective attempt to explore 'the largely unexamined historical background' which leads IR and security studies to posit a strong connection between security and secularization.[3] By considering some of the limits of the historical narrative that informs Williams' argument — which are indicative of a more general consensus in security studies — I will show how the idea that secularization is an essential dimension of security overlooks the possibility that insecurity may also be an outcome of the process of secularization and, as such, an essential component of the modern secular state-centric project and its related vision of security. To be sure, I will not argue that insecurity may have been 'created' by the process of secularization, but rather, in a Foucauldian perspective, I will contend that the emergence of insecurity as a political object — as the object of political strategies of power and knowledge — may be linked to the process of secularization. To explore this possibility I will consider a rarely discussed passage of *Writing Security*, where David Campbell (1998) considers how secularization contributed to breaking the horizontal bond between self and other which was made possible by a common belief in God, and replaced it with a system of 'vertical security' centred on the state and its discourse of danger revolving around the divide between 'us' and 'them'. Campbell, however, does not offer an argument on how to interpret the collapse of the Christian world-view and its related 'horizontal' and universal visions of security.

In the second section I will offer an account of this shift from 'horizontal security' to 'vertical security' by exploring the possibility that it may not be linked to the wars of religion, but may be the result of a crisis 'about the nature of God and thus the nature of being' (Gillespie, 2008: 14), which began three centuries before the Reformation and which may be considered the beginning of the process of secularization. This is the crisis of medieval scholasticism which eventually resulted in the triumph of the nominalist vision of the world. The latter turned the idea of God from an expression of love and reason to a manifestation of will and unbounded power separated from the world. Through a discussion of Thomas Aquinas — the father of scholasticism — and Thomas Hobbes — the first nominalist political theorist and, significantly, a 'founding figure' of security studies — I will discuss how this revolutionary transformation in the idea of God translates into an equally revolutionary vision of the world as marked by uncertainty and insecurity. This transformation, it will be argued, forcefully impacts upon the genealogy of security, making the question of fear and the politics of exceptionalism central to the secular state-centric project of modernity, and thus suggesting that a correspondence between security and secularization is untenable.

In the third and concluding section I will discuss how the pervasiveness of fear and exceptionalism in contemporary ways of thinking security casts limits on current conceptual attempts to advance beyond the state-centric logic of security. The initial focus will be on human security and how it may end up reproducing and amplifying the dimension of fear that underpins state-centric discourses of security. I will then discuss how the securitization theory's reliance on a politics of the exception results in an account of religion as a tool of legitimation of state power which eventually undermines its avowed goal to bring religion back into the study of international politics. Finally, I will consider

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

how the genealogy of security and secularization may be understood also as a genealogy of community. This argument will prompt epistemological and normative questions on the idea of 'horizontal security' and how it may contribute to contemporary cosmopolitan accounts of security. My focus will be on Ken Booth's critical theory approach which envisages in the transformation of the political community along Kantian cosmopolitan lines the possibility for a transformation of security beyond the state-centric framework. The analysis will concentrate on the limits of Booth's secularist assumption and how the possibility of cosmopolitan security may require discarding the notion that secularization is an essential component of security.

The security of secularization

According to Michael C. Williams (1998), the history of European modernity is marked by a distinctive 'quest for security' from the violence and insecurity of the 'religious wars' which eventually found a solution in the emergence of a secular 'liberal sensibility'. For Williams the emergence of modernity was not a disembodied intellectual endeavour, but a process that 'emerged in a context of fear, violence and conflict' of clashing religious world-views. Drawing on Steven Toulmin's *Cosmopolis*, he observes that religious confrontation reached such a paroxysmal level that for those involved in religious violence 'it ceased to be crucial what their theological beliefs were. … All that mattered, by this stage, was for supporters of Religious Truth to believe, devoutly, *in belief itself*' (Toulmin, 1990: 54, cited in Williams, 1998: 210–211). This blind, uncritical identification with belief made necessary the invention of a new epistemic liberal framework in which the noumenal was separated from the phenomenal and 'claims of faith' (which are absolute in nature and cannot be negotiated, and therefore can lead to violence) were separated from claims of knowledge (which are more opened to scepticism and therefore negotiable).

To achieve this separation, a new political realm 'secured from theological strife and contestation' was required: this is the liberal state, a pacified domestic domain in which individuals are separated from their religious beliefs (Williams, 1998: 213). Of course violence did not disappear, but was turned into an 'institutionalized, rule-bound and centralized' enterprise (Williams, 1998: 214). Equally, this changed the logic of security. Unlike the logic of the 'religious wars', competing sovereignties were no longer, by their very essence (that is, by being the bearers of competing religious world-views), a threat. 'Whether they were or not was held to be an empirical question susceptible to the newly defined form of reasoned discourse in a public realm and capable, in principle, of practical coordination between states' (Williams, 1998: 215). The secular liberal state thus becomes the institutional embodiment of a new condition of security which disciplines violence and makes it subject to reasonable calculation. The liberal state is the agent of the modern security of secularization.

Williams' account, I suggest, contains two contentious points. To start with, Williams posits a passage from religious intolerance to liberalism, glossing over the confessional state and its 'absolutist system of rule' that preceded the emergence of the 19th-century liberal constitutional state (see Poggi, 1978). Williams is not the only scholar to connect the end of religious wars with the birth of liberalism and the modern system of tolerance.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Scholars as diverse as Leo Gross, Terry Nardin, Stephen Krasner, Quentin Skinner, John Rawls, Judith Shklar and Jeffrey Stout all endorse similar narratives (see Cavanaugh, 2009: 130–141; Inayatullah and Blaney, 2004: 31). The problem, however, is what is meant by the term liberalism. As Cavanaugh (2009: 132) observes:

> If 'liberal principles' is taken to mean the toleration and privatization of religious practices, then liberal principles would have to wait — in some cases, for centuries — before being adopted by most European governments. Liberal principles were not adopted in France until after the revolution, nor in Spain until the twentieth century. Roman Catholics in England were not emancipated until 1829. In Germany, the Treaty of Westphalia instituted a qualified toleration at best. The treaty reinforced the policy of *cuius reius eius religio* in most Habsburg lands and allowed all rulers subject to the treaty to expel any dissenters with three years' notice.

Likewise, if liberalism is taken to mean the privatization and public irrelevance of religious belief, it can be argued that the state-system that emerged at Westphalia was more properly confessional rather than secular. There are two interconnected arguments here. On the one hand, there is what John Bossy labels 'the migration of the holy': after Westphalia the state became increasingly sacralized, with the monarchy borrowing 'wholesale sacred rituals and formulae from the church' (Cavanaugh, 2009: 174; see also Keane, 1993: 6; Elshtain, 2008: 49, 92). The construction of the state as a 'semi-religious' entity was essential to endow the *corpus morale et politicum* of the state with the transcendent authority proper of the *corpus mysticum* of the Church which may command the ultimate form of loyalty in the form of sacrifice of its subjects (Kantorowicz, 1951: 487–490).

On the other hand, there is the so-called confessionalization thesis. This perspective challenges the traditional argument, most famously formulated by Ernst Troeltsch, that Protestantism and more specifically Calvinism played a crucial role in the emergence of the modern state (Brady, 2004: 3),[4] and maintains that the *differentiation* of Catholicism, Lutheranism and Calvinism during the Reformation was paralleled by 'a *de-differentiation* among church, state, and society at the territorial level' (Gorski, 2000: 143; emphasis mine). According to this perspective, the process of differentiation between faiths began *before* the Reformation and was not merely a natural one brought about solely by theological disagreements, but was part of a strategy of state-building pursued by the ruling elites. They exploited the potential for social cohesion and the capacity to mobilize allegiances of religious tradition to sharpen the boundaries of the religious communities and make them coextensive with the boundaries of the state (Boettcher, 2004: 1–2; Hunter, 2001: 38).[5] To the extent that the state willingly contributed to amplifying confessional differences in order to establish its sovereignty it may be argued, along with William Cavanaugh, that the wars of religion 'were not the events which necessitated the birth of the modern State', but rather were themselves the means — 'the birthpangs' — through which the state came to life (Cavanaugh, 1995: 398; see also Cavanaugh, 2009: 162).

Taken together, these arguments raise questions about the conventional narrative of the liberal nation-state as a secular pacifier of violent religious views and expression of an epistemic framework in which claims of faith are separated from claims of knowledge and confined to the private sphere. This argument, let us remember, constitutes the

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

backdrop of the thesis of an intimate relationship between security and secularization. What this brief sketch suggests is that the state that emerges at Westphalia can neither be considered liberal, nor properly secular. Moreover, its origins seem to pre-date 1648 and are part of a process of centralization of sovereignty and territorial demarcation that, following the confessionalization thesis, appears to be itself involved in the production of violence and therefore in the production of insecurity.

This is the second problem of the conventional narrative of Westphalia that emerges from Williams' argument. The idea that the liberal state is the agent of the modern security of secularization does not take into account the possibility that the secular state may also be an agent of insecurity. To be sure, the ambivalence of the state as a provider of both security and insecurity and, more generally, the question of how state-centric discourses of security ultimately demand and actively construct a mirror-like domain of insecurity, is a central tenet of critical and postmodern approaches to security, including Williams' account.[6] This ambivalence, however, has not been explored in connection with the process of secularization and the emergence of the modern state. A notable exception to this can be found in a rarely discussed passage of the otherwise widely cited *Writing Security* by David Campbell.

According to Campbell, the social formations of Christianity and modern sovereign communities are in a substantial relation of continuity. Their primary function is to provide a framework which may secure identity in a world of difference. However, he contends, there are important differences in how they understand and deliver security. Christianity located 'difference within a larger framework of order centred on God as the ultimate point of identity' (Campbell, 1998: 44). The social system based on Christianity that preceded the emergence of the modern nation-state was thus characterized by 'loyalty to a universal authority that transcended particular social structures'. This 'universalist and radical element' was made possible by an idea of God as an agent of mediation between self and other, as the underlying unity in which difference could be recomposed. In this condition, then, identity was secured in its encounter with difference through 'vertical intensity' (Campbell, 1998: 44–45).

With the decline of the Christian world-view, the problem emerged of 'how to handle contingency and difference in a world without God'. Drawing on the work of Hans Blumenberg (1983), Campbell contends that two main transformations take place. First, the teleology of divine providence is replaced by the idea that the world lacks an underlying unity and order and therefore is ambiguous, uncertain and dangerous. Second, the sovereign state replaces divine omnipotence as the primary dimension of security (Campbell, 1998: 47). However, these transformations are not without consequences. The sovereign state is by definition a bounded community that cannot replicate the universal quality of Christianity. As a result, the state 'requires discourses of "danger" to provide a new theology of truth about who and what "we" are by highlighting who or what "we" are not, and what "we" have to fear' (Campbell, 1998: 48).

The argument advanced by Campbell questions in an important way the conventional narrative of the security of secularization. It highlights how the security delivered by the state is grounded in and necessitates a contextual production of insecurity as it lacks the 'horizontal extensiveness' of the Christian idea of security. This argument, however, is not immune from problems. Campbell's picture of Christian universalism is certainly

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

overstated, glossing over all kind of exclusions and conflicts, and somehow instrumental to maintain the supposedly ontological necessity of discourses of danger in modernity.[7] Moreover, it is difficult to reconcile his argument with the rest of his analysis where he contends that '[d]anger might … be thought of as the new God for the modern world of states, not because it is peculiar to our time, but because it replicates the logic of Christendom's evangelism of fear' (Campbell, 1998: 50). With this latter term, Campbell refers to the period between the Black Death of 1348 and the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, when 'the church relied heavily on discourses of danger to establish its authority, discipline its followers, and ward off its enemies' (Campbell, 1998: 48). It is unclear from Campbell's account whether the 'evangelism of fear' is coeval with Christian universalism (and then it is difficult to see how the two could possibly be reconciled) or whether the 'evangelism of fear' follows the demise of Christian universalism, in which case the questions would be: is it possible to offer such a historical and philosophical periodization of this transformation? And if so, what contributed to the decline of the Christian world-view and of its related horizontal and universal vision of security, which paved the way for the 'evangelism of fear', the sectarian religious confrontations and the ensuing emergence of a state-centric, territorially-bounded vision of security based on fear and discourses of danger?

From 'horizontal' to 'vertical' security

To account for these questions we can go back to Williams' opening insight that modernity is marked by a distinctive 'quest for security' and follow a slightly different path from the one he takes. Williams embraces Toulmin's argument that modernity was not a purely intellectual endeavour, but a vision that emerged as a response to the turmoil, fear and violence of the religious wars, in particular the Thirty Years' War. The idea that the genesis of modernity is in a fundamental epistemic crisis is also shared by Michael Allen Gillespie. For Gillespie, however, the crisis in question precedes the Reformation and the wars of religion. This is the metaphysical/theological crisis of Christianity 'about the nature of God and thus the nature of being' (Gillespie, 2008: 14), which eventually took the shape of the nominalist challenge to scholasticism. Without any pretence of completeness, let us consider the most important features of this argument for our discussion.

Scholastic medieval thought was based on ontological realism. The scholastic God was *logos*, that is, 'reason, meaning … — a meaning … that is relationship, that is creative' (Joseph Ratzinger [Pope Benedict XVI], cited in Elshtain, 2008: 3). Reason made possible the relationship between man and God and therefore represented an essential dimension of the scholastic idea of faith, which contemplated reason and faith as two distinct domains of human experience which conjured up the same Truth (see Nash, 1999: 170). The world was the manifestation of divine love and reason, and was characterized by an underlying order which man could grasp, albeit only partially, through language, which expressed a correspondence between knowledge and an externally God-given order. This order, in turn, reflected a conception of God as ordained power (Oakley, 1998: 445). This means that for medieval scholasticism, God did not act outside the law he had himself established, and his infinite love and goodness were the expression of a

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

substantive understanding of the good. Put differently, in the scholastic perspective 'an immanent understanding of the good sustained by the strength of reason provide[d] the measure of God's will' (Mavelli, 2008: 277).

For nominalism this view was untenable. God's power was not ordained, but absolute: God was neither constrained by his previous actions, nor by any immanent understanding of the good, but only by the principle of non-contradiction. In this perspective, what was good was good not in itself but simply because God willed it (Gillespie, 2008: 23). Ontologically, then, nominalists did not believe in universals; there was no underlying order to discover through language simply because God could not possibly commit to any existing order. Language, therefore, was no longer the expression of an immanent order (Elshtain, 2008: 106). Concepts such as freedom or justice lost any substantive content and no longer reflected an underlying meaning fixed in the order of creation, which thus turned into a fragmented disorder.[8] As Gillespie points out, this theological revolution was the reflection of a number of events — from 'the Great Schism, [to] the Hundred Years War, [to] the Black Death, [to] the development of gunpowder, [to] the dislocations wrought by urban development, social mobility, and the Crusades' — which contributed to a widespread sense of insecurity (Gillespie, 2008: 19, 25).

This argument, read in conjunction with our previous remarks on the limits of the conventional narrative of Westphalia, provides the outline of a different interpretative framework of the modern 'quest for security'. The possibility that I am considering is that this quest may not have been the result of the Reformation and of competing religious views which radicalized into violence, but the outcome of the earlier crisis of scholasticism. It is the emergence of the nominalist image of the world — a world characterized by chaos and lacking an underlying unity — which marks the beginning of the eclipse of God from human affairs and therefore, arguably, can be considered as the event that launches the process of secularization. The modern 'quest for security', in other words, may be the result of the process of secularization and not what made the process of secularization necessary. In this perspective, secularization may thus be considered the process that turns security into the object of political strategies of power and knowledge.

To better appreciate how the shift from scholasticism to nominalism represents a crucial moment in the construction of modern state-centric security we can briefly examine how the notion of security changes from Aquinas, the father of scholasticism, to Hobbes, the philosopher who offers the first and most systematic political translation of nominalism and who, significantly, is also recognized as a 'founding figure' of security studies (on this latter point, see Campbell, 1998; Kolodziej, 2005; Krause and Williams, 1997), and by some also as the first truly secular thinker (Lilla, 2007). A clarification, however, is in order. Aquinas' vast writings do not encompass a specific treatment of security simply because, consistent with the thesis advanced in this article, security as a political object emerges after scholasticism, that is, with the emergence of the nominalist understanding of the world that marks a defining moment in the process of secularization. This, however, should not prevent us from reflecting on Aquinas' not yet objectified idea of security which, as we shall see in a moment, is also a distinctive idea of community. Similarly, Hobbes' singling out of the problem of security informs an equally distinctive and *different* idea of community.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Indeed, Aquinas' 'notion' of security is crucially linked to his conception of man as 'a political and a social animal' and therefore naturally oriented 'to live in association with his fellows' (Aquinas, 1988: 14). For Aquinas, man is the bearer of natural goodness and moral virtue, and the political community is a natural human dimension in which men can pursue the good life (Aquinas, 1988: 27; see also Keys, 2008: 59). In such a community, the role of a just ruler is to conduct society according to the law of nature (the immanent order of God) through the active promotion of virtues (Aquinas, 1988: 27). An unjust ruler, on the other hand — what Aquinas calls a 'tyrant' — hinders the virtuous development of his subjects and prevents the bond of friendship from developing among them. A tyrant has an interest in keeping his subjects in mutual fear as this will perpetuate his power as the only provider of security (Aquinas, 1988: 19).

According to Aquinas, men display a horizontal natural sociability because they enjoy the security of a reasonable and lovable God. Difference is not perceived as a threat because the plurality of differences is seen as originating from an underlying unity in God. Hence, God makes possible that 'we love all our neighbors with the same love … since what we ought to love in our neighbor is that he may be in God' (Aquinas, 1920 [1274]: II/II, 25.1).[9] For Mary M. Keys (2008: 193) Aquinas' natural law attends to a universal human fellowship that goes beyond political allegiances. Together with horizontal universal security, God's natural law also attends to vertical security by keeping earthly rulers in check. It limits their will to power and will to place themselves above the law by providing the ground for their removal should they violate the law of nature. Natural law takes precedence over a political regime and provides the standards of justice to which the ruler under every circumstance needs to abide (Aquinas, 1920 [1274]: I/II, 95.2). This latter point is particularly relevant in relation to recent debates on the state of exception. As Giorgio Agamben (2005: 25–26), John Milbank (2008: 127, 130, 135) and Jean Bethke Elshtain (2008: 58–59) have pointed out, the notion that a suspension of the law may be required for the preservation and the advancement of the common good does not belong to the medieval scholastic world.[10] Elshtain also remarks how the concept of absolute rule was alien to the scholastic medieval order, which indeed encompassed a specific 'right of resistance' against illegitimate and unjust rule. Key to this right was an idea of community characterized by a transcendent and an immanent source of authority in which the former would provide a measure of the possibilities and limits of the latter (Elshtain, 2008: 58–59).

The nominalist Hobbes turns the scholastic horizontal vision of security on its head. Men for Hobbes are fragmented, self-contained particles in a constant clash that threatens their physical well-being. The natural sociability that characterized Aquinas' Aristotelian account is replaced by a natural state of war 'where every man is enemy to every man' (Hobbes, 2008 [1651]: 84). The only way to escape this condition is the establishment of an all-encompassing idea of sovereignty, the Leviathan, the 'mortal God' to whom subjects owe their unconditional allegiance. In Hobbes' construction, the scholastic dual system of sovereignty disappears. For Hobbes, in fact, a fundamental 'Law of God' is 'that we should not violate our Faith, that is a commandment to obey our civil sovereigns' (Hobbes, 2008 [1651]: 392). This means that the sovereign is not only the earthly ruler but also the 'Supreme Pastor' and that the dual system of loyalty which accounted for the 'just law' and the right of resistance in Aquinas' system fades away as

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

the transcendent and the immanent sources of authority are both absorbed in the figure of the sovereign (Elshtain, 2008: 112; see also Beiner, 1993).

The ensuing shift from the insecurity of the state of nature to the security of the state, however, does not eliminate fear, but actually takes place within the same presupposition of fear (Esposito, 2010: 25) — that is, from the fear of the nominalist God to the fear of the Leviathan, whose power cannot be questioned, constrained or taken away to the point that whatever he may do to his subjects, even taking their lives, may never be considered unjust or wrong (Hobbes, 2008 [1651]: 141–142).[11] It follows that the idea that a law may be just or unjust as it was for Aquinas makes no sense for Hobbes. The starting point of the law is not a principle of justice anchored in divine love and goodness, but a natural unsociability based on an equally shared capacity of men to kill each other. This demands an absolute power to tame this natural inclination.

The secular political horizon described by Hobbes is shaped by an overarching security concern informed by the chaos of the nominalist vision of the world. In order to domesticate the fear originating from a collapsed theological order, the state internalizes this fear, making it the foundation of its system of security. From the presupposition that 'the relation between men is in itself destructive', Hobbes draws the logical conclusion that the only way to escape this condition is 'the destruction of the relation itself' (Esposito, 2010: 27). The Leviathan state thus destroys the 'bond of friendship' on which Aquinas' system of horizontal security relied. The secular security inaugurated by Hobbes rests on the vertical compliance of atomized individuals with a Leviathan state, with fear as the motor of obedience.

Some implications for security studies

The investigation carried out in the previous sections suggests that the conventional assumption of secularization as a natural dimension of security is untenable and reframes the question in terms of *how* the process of secularization has informed the genealogy of security. In particular, it suggests a broad shift from a 'horizontal' Thomistic vision of security based on a universal notion of community, one in which difference is mediated by a common unity in God, to a 'vertical' nominalist vision of security, based on an overall 'desocialization of the communitarian bond' (Esposito, 2010: 28) where the state is the source of security from the fear of an unfathomable 'other', but also the 'other' to be feared.

This shift, to be sure, should not be overstated, nor should it be thought as a radical break from a condition of universal harmony free of exclusion and violence to one of chaos and generalized conflict. The Thomistic notion of horizontal security that preceded the Christian 'evangelism of fear' and the ensuing state-centric vision of security was still potentially exclusionary as it was based on the universalization of the Christian ideal. Moreover, Aquinas' account of dual sovereignty (the idea that the sovereign has to comply with the universal law of God) certainly did not eliminate the problem of power: who interprets natural law? Who is entitled to decide whether an earthly ruler is transgressing it? As has been observed, for Aquinas it was the Church which he believed attracted those most endowed and thus had the monopoly over interpretation, effectively

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

barring the uneducated peasant from deciding whether or not the sovereign was violating the law (Fink, 1981: 18).

These caveats notwithstanding, the epistemic shift caused by the emergence of the nominalist vision of the world and its relevance for contemporary understandings of security should not be discounted. This shift points to three important transformations in the genealogy of security. First, rather than solving the problem of religious insecurity, secularization elevates the category of security to a central role in the political lexicon of modernity, with the effect that insecurity and fear become not only central, but *essential*, to the modern secular state-centric project. Second, and accordingly, state sovereignty becomes the power capable and authorized to decide on the state of exception. In this perspective, security concerns can justify (and to some extent make desirable) a suspension of the law. Third, the transformation of security — from the scholasticism of Aquinas to the nominalism of Hobbes — reflects a transformation in the idea of community, which means that security can be understood and approached as a derivative concept of the idea of community. To appreciate the importance of this genealogy for contemporary security studies, I will now examine how its Hobbesian secular legacy continues to play an important role even in those approaches that strive to move beyond the state-centric logic of security. The focus will be on human security, the securitization theory and Ken Booth's critical theory of security.

Human security, fear and the individualization of security

Human security is a concept that experienced an extraordinary success in the 1990s and that, despite a burgeoning debate that has stressed its vagueness and lack of analytical depth (see, for instance, Paris, 2001), still enjoys remarkable attention. The reason is its humanistic promise. The primary object of security is no longer the state, but the individual: an individual who may eventually enjoy 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' (UNDP, 1994). A human security approach recognizes that in some cases fear and want may be engendered by the state, which is thus seen as a potential source of insecurity. There is the risk, nonetheless, that a human security discourse may be taken over by the logic of fear that underpins the secular Hobbesian framework.

State-centric security, it was argued above, is grounded in and necessitates a contextual production of insecurity and fear among political communities as it lacks the 'horizontal extensiveness' of the Christian idea of security and relies entirely on the 'vertical intensity' of the state–citizen relation. By focusing on the atomized self and the threats to its individual well-being, human security can multiply 'the protective apparatus that is concentrated in the unitary figure of sovereignty' and install it in every single individual (see Esposito, 2008: 63). This individualization of security, unmediated by a recovery of the horizontal bond of sociability, risks multiplying also the perceived sources of insecurity as it locates potential 'otherness' not just at the level of the state, but also at the level of other individuals *within* the state. This latter move brings the state back in as the primary provider of security along with its logic of fear (Berman, 2007: 41; see also Burke, 2002; De Larrinaga and Doucet, 2008). Hence, rather than attenuating the dissolution of the communitarian bond that characterizes the Hobbesian account of security, human security may actually amplify this dissolution by calling for the state

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

to securitize expressions of human life previously governed by different forms of rationalities and sensibilities. This expansion of the domain of security may appear positive as far as the provision of basic needs (such as food, water, shelter) is concerned, but becomes more controversial for other spheres of human experience, such as health or migration.

For instance, expanding an argument put forward by Stefan Elbe (2006: 129), it could be suggested that considering HIV/AIDS as a matter of human security may 'remove … the issue from the more cosmopolitan and altruistic frameworks of health and development' and activate a 'threat-defence logic' that works against the attempt 'to normalize social perceptions regarding persons living with HIV/AIDS'. Hence, a human security approach may force us into a confrontational logic where the question becomes 'whose individual security is supposed to be sacrificed' (Aradau, 2004: 399): that of the people living with the disease or that of those who do not have the disease? The risk is that a human security concern may result in responses such as quarantines, travel restrictions or attempts to bar people with HIV/AIDS from working in state institutions (see Elbe, 2005: 411). Such invasiveness into the realm of biological life by state power suggests the extent to which human security may function as a form of biopolitics by 'introducing a break into the domain of life that is under power's control: the break between what must live and what must die' (Foucault, 2003: 254; see also Berman, 2007; De Larrinaga and Doucet, 2008; Duffield, 2007: 111–132).

What may turn human security into a biopolitical technology is the dimension of fear that propels nominalist Hobbesian accounts of security. It is important to stress, as R.B.J. Walker (1997: 68) insightfully does, that Hobbes remains a crucial figure for contemporary security approaches (including human security) 'not because of his supposed insights into the permanent condition of human insecurity', but because of his concern 'with the constitution of particular societies'. In this perspective, human insecurity is a product of the particular, the singular and the individualized (be it embodied by the state or the individual): these are dimensions that human security, in the absence of horizontal discourses of solidarity and cooperation, could contribute to magnify. The problem, then, is not human security per se, but how it is understood and instantiated: as a form of biopolitical technology that promises to immunize the individual from risk, or as a horizontal articulation where security *is* in the encounter with the other, with an acceptance of all the risks that this may entail. As long as the former approach continues to take precedence over the latter and, therefore, the logic of particularity remains central to contemporary ways of thinking about security, the Hobbesian legacy in contemporary security studies can hardly be overestimated.

Securitization theory, sovereign exception and the re-securitization of religion

As discussed, the Hobbesian notion that a security concern can justify and to some extent make desirable a suspension of the law is a secular novelty brought forward by the nominalist vision of the world. The extent to which the desirability of the exception pervades contemporary security discourses can be observed with reference to the ambiguous attitude of the securitization theory towards the concept of desecuritization. Securitization has been defined as a move from 'the realm of normal politics' to a

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

politics of extraordinary measures, and, therefore, is often marked by a suspension of the rule of law (Buzan et al., 1998: 24). Desecuritization, conversely, is the process whereby things are removed from the often undemocratic dimension of urgency and necessity of security and returned to the 'normal [democratic] haggling of politics' (Buzan et al., 1998: 29). However, the Hobbes-inspired Schmittian framework that characterizes the securitization theory (see Huysmans, 1998: 571; Williams, 2003) results in a certain 'indecisiveness concerning the desirability of desecuritization' (Aradau, 2004: 389). Consider Ole Wæver's (2000: 251) remark:

> In some democratic perspective, 'de-securitization' is probably the ideal, since it restores the possibility of exposing the issue to the normal haggling and questioning of politicization, but if one is actually concerned about something, securitization is an attractive tool that one might end up using — as a political actor.

The implications of this argument are particularly interesting in relation to Carsten Bagge Laustsen and Ole Wæver's (2000) goal to employ the securitization theory in 'bringing religion back in' to the study of international politics. In their article 'In defence of religion: Sacred referent objects for securitization', Laustsen and Wæver use as a starting point the question of defining religion. Drawing on the writings of Kierkegaard, Hegel and Bataille, they suggest that religion is 'a discourse insisting on being unique', which 'deals with the constitution of being as such' and therefore 'one cannot be pragmatic on concerns challenging this being'; religion involves 'fear and trembling', and is 'founded in groundless decision'; it is also 'a suspension of the ethical' whose point of departure is 'animality'; unlike 'morality [which] is grounded in reason … religion is grounded in hyperbolic gestures of faith' (Laustsen and Wæver, 2000: 711–719). For Laustsen and Wæver, religion in the political sphere becomes ideology and ideology can be understood as religion securitized. Hence, they conclude, the goal is 'de-securitizing ideology, or in other words respecting religion as it is' (Laustsen and Wæver, 2000: 726).

This account presents two main problems. First, Laustsen and Wæver present as universal and timeless a rather narrow definition of religion as sensuality, emotionality and irrationality. This understanding, however, shares very little with the Thomistic understanding of faith as reason and God as *logos* that, for instance, informs the doctrine of the Catholic Church or the writings of Alasdair MacIntyre. Similarly, it shares very little with the argument of the potential rationality of the moral intuitions of faith recently advanced by Jürgen Habermas (2008). Second, from this narrow definition of religion they conclude that religion in its political manifestation can be inherently prone to violence, but that this is not true religion, but religion securitized, that is, ideology. Desecuritizing religion-turned-ideology, however, does not mean shifting religion from security to politics, but shifting religion from the security realm *above* politics to the private sphere *beneath* politics — that is, where traditional accounts of security claim religion should be confined because religion in the public sphere represents a potential security threat. Religion is thus actually re-securitized.

At the heart of this paradoxical conclusion lies a 'vertical' and state-centric idea which ultimately interprets security as a tool of legitimation of secular state power against the threat represented by religious 'others'. The securitization of religion is thus

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

an exceptional measure that removes religion from 'the realm of normal politics' in order to preserve the latter's secular character. The failure of the securitization theory to account for the multiple and multifaceted roles and meanings of religion in contemporary international politics is a vivid illustration of the limits of uncritically accepting the idea that secularization is a natural component of security. The construction of religion in the public sphere as a security threat can thus be considered a particular manifestation of the centrality of the Hobbesian secular perspective in the genealogy of security. It is for this reason that the question of the relationship between security and secularization is relevant also when religion does not seem to be at stake as our discussion of human security indicates.

Ken Booth's critical theory of security, cosmopolitan community and beyond: The case for horizontal security

Although central, the Hobbesian perspective should not be considered the only tradition within security studies. As R.B.J. Walker (1997: 73–78) has observed, security studies have long been framed (and to some extent constrained) by two competing discourses: Hobbesian realism and Kantian idealism. Whereas the former has framed as natural an idea of security as the product of a politics of particularity, the latter has cultivated the 'hope of reconciling all particularities in the perpetual peace of universal reason' (Walker, 1997: 78). A most notable expression of this latter perspective is represented by Ken Booth's (2007) critical theory of security, which envisages the possibility of the transformation of security beyond its statist framework in the transformation of the political community along Kantian cosmopolitan lines. Booth has forcefully argued that the possibility of a security able to 'celebrate the possibility of human equality' and 'common humanity' which may move us beyond the failures and fears of state-centric accounts of security requires taking up the Gandhian challenge of reconciling the 'singular *I* with the plural *we's*'; it requires a cosmopolitan community of universal solidarities sustained by the idea of an 'I-that-is-another' (Booth, 2007: 138–140). Booth, however, has equally forcefully argued against any involvement of religion in the public sphere — deemed as a potential source of 'trouble' as mentioned in the introduction — embracing the widespread understanding of religion as a security problem:

> When faith asserts itself there is a tendency for people to allocate themselves roles (or have them allocated) in traditional and comforting narratives rather than embed themselves in the uncertainties of reason. It is common to hear people introducing a sentence with the words 'As a …' ('Muslim' or 'Christian' or whatever). Such discursive practices reveal a preference for conversational role-playing … rather than dialogue through rational discussion; it involves listening but not hearing, and speaking to a script that cannot be rewritten without destroying the narrative that gives it meaning. (Booth, 2007: 418)

As in the case of Laustsen and Wæver, Booth embraces an idea of faith as irrational identification that prevents reasonable discussion. Faith is about being, not learning, and, as Laustsen and Wæver observed, 'one cannot be pragmatic on concerns challenging this being'. Booth, similarly, maintains that this is 'a script that cannot be rewritten',

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

and therefore when questioned in its prerogatives faith's only option may be violence. Again, this idea shares very little with the Thomistic idea of faith as reason. Hence, the genealogy explored in this article raises the question of whether Booth's (2007: 150) commitment to understanding security as a derivative concept of political theory should consider more carefully how representations of religion as a security threat may be instrumental to preserve the state-centric framework of security. As observed in our discussion of the confessionalization thesis, the active involvement of the state in defining the roles and functions of religion, in exploiting its potential for social cohesion, and in disciplining its proper boundaries, was not just aimed at curbing a potential form of internal dissent which might mobilize loyalties beyond national boundaries, it was also and more importantly a political strategy through which the modern secular state-centric framework realized itself. A state-centric framework, it is worth reminding, that according to Booth (2007: 36, 141) has contributed to generate 'insecurity externally', legitimized 'insecurity internally' and 'helped to bring about the totalitarian and tyrannical horrors of the state system of the twentieth century'.

Booth's position reflects, in many respects, the Kantian framework he adopts. The question is Kant's famous promise to King Frederick William II to stop writing on religious issues following the latter's evocation of 'unpleasant measures' should the German philosopher persevere in his 'obstinacy' (Kant, 2001 [1798]: 240). In a letter received on 1 October 1794, Kant was accused of having used his 'philosophy to distort and disparage many of the cardinal and basics teachings of the Holy Scripture and of Christianity' (Kant, 2001 [1798]: 240). According to Talal Asad (1993: 204), Kant's reply to 'refrain altogether from discoursing publicly, in lectures or writings, on religion, whether natural or revealed' (Kant, 2001 [1798]: 242) does not contradict his duty of public exercise of critical reason because religion for Kant does not represent 'knowledge', but merely 'belief' and, as such, its truths 'stand independently of public argument'. It is for this reason, Asad concludes (1993: 204–205), that Kant considers that 'public expressions of personal belief … must always defer to that public authority which is known as the state'.

If Asad's interpretation is correct, it could be argued that Kant, similarly to Hobbes, conceives that one of the roles of religion is to serve as a tool of legitimation of state power.[12] Whereas Hobbes maintains that it is a fundamental law of God to obey the sovereign, Kant regards it as appropriate to refrain from engaging with (and critiquing) religion in the public discourse should this contribute to undermining the sovereign (a secular sovereign that, in a confessional setting, employs faith as a disciplining tool). These perspectives are the intellectual antecedents of the view that axiomatically regarding religion in the public sphere as a source of 'trouble', implicitly, and maybe unwittingly, risks reifying the state-centric logic of security. These reflections suggest that, at least from the perspective advanced in this article, the main limit of Kantian-inspired accounts of security such as Booth's is the inability to offer us an understanding of the religious (and the secular) that escapes the traditional state-centric framework of security — that is, an understanding that escapes the Hobbesian secular legacy.

Conclusion

This argument lends support to the idea that the construction of religion in the public sphere as a security threat is a particular manifestation of the centrality of Hobbes'

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

state-centric secular view to security studies. As discussed in the first and second part of this article, this construction rests on weak theoretical and historical foundations and, as emerges from this final section, it ultimately contributes to constraining the critical potential of those approaches — such as Booth's critical theory, human security and the securitization theory — that strive to advance beyond the traditional state-centric framework of security. This article has thus attempted to show how the question of religion is an essential part of the genealogy of security, and how to simply ignore its relevance for contemporary security studies or superficially dismissing religion in its political manifestations as a security threat risks reinforcing the state-centric logic revolving around discourses of fear and the politics of the exception which makes us objects rather than subjects of security.

It may be tempting, at this point, to look at Aquinas' notion of horizontal security as a perspective that, despite its limits and contradictions, may contribute to advance the debate beyond the constraints of the Hobbesian state-centric logic of security. The question, of course, would not be to 'apply' Aquinas' horizontal idea of security to contemporary problems — after all, as Foucault (1984: 343) once pointed out, 'you can't find the solution of a problem in the solution of another problem raised at another moment by other people' — but to use it as a source of ontological, epistemological and normative critique, which is what this article has attempted to do. A critique which may help us recognize the limits of current accounts of security and secularization and envisage new forms of political community and security.

Against this possibility it could be objected that Aquinas' theistic universalism and the related notion of horizontal security draw on rationalities, intuitions and sensibilities that are somehow foreign to our current 'secular age'.[13] Yet, to use this label as a shorthand to dismiss the role and relevance of religion in shaping modern subjectivities or to marginalize those who do not comply with the dominant secular canon would be to simplify and most of all distort a much more complex reality. A reality that has defiantly resisted the predictions of the secularization thesis, in which religious traditions continue to display an unabated dynamism (Casanova, 2007), and where the question of faith, particularly in relation to the limits of secular reason, continues to be at the heart of the socio-political debate (see, for instance, de Vries and Sullivan, 2006; Habermas, 2008). Moreover, and possibly more importantly, this objection would overlook that it is precisely by engaging with the political theory behind the Thomistic-inspired notion of horizontal security that the genealogy articulated in this article has exposed how the construction of religion in the public sphere as a security problem may serve as a tool of legitimation of state-centric accounts of security. The relevance of this argument for critical approaches to security and, in particular, for cosmopolitan accounts such as Booth's cannot be dismissed, and raises crucial questions for security studies' capacity to engage with its 'constitutive other', that is, religion.

Further investigation into the state's 'historical genesis and evolution' along the genealogical lines indicated by Michael C. Williams and David Campbell and drawing on cognate fields such as history and religious studies will be required to understand the complexity of the relationship between security and secularization and how it contributes to shaping our attitudes towards religion and our thinking towards security. This article hopes to have participated in advancing this understanding and to have offered a perspective which may serve as a source of ontological, epistemological and normative

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

critique, a critique in line with James Der Derian's (1998: 26) hope that 'in the interpretation of the most pressing dangers of late modernity we might be able to construct a form of security based on the appreciation and articulation rather than the normalization or extirpation of difference'.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ken Booth, Ed Frettingham, Matt McDonald, Fabio Petito, Harmonie Toros, the editors and the two anonymous reviewers of the *EJIR* for their helpful comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this article. My greatest debt is to Mike Williams, who read through several drafts of this article and offered invaluable suggestions and encouragement. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Conflict and Security Research Series, School of Political Science and International Studies, University of Queensland, Australia, 17 September 2010. I would like to thank all those who attended and contributed to improving this article through questions and suggestions.

Notes

1 Recent publications on religion and IR include Petito and Hatzopoulos (2003), Carlson and Owens (2003), Fox and Sandler (2004), Thomas (2005), Salvatore (2007) and Shakman Hurd (2008).
2 According to sociologist of religion José Casanova (1994, 2006), the term 'secularization' can refer to three interrelated but analytically distinct processes: the privatization of religion, the decline of religious beliefs and practices, and the differentiation of the secular spheres (state, economy, science). In this article I focus on the first of these meanings and therefore I use the term secularization as synonymous with the privatization of religion.
3 For a recent analysis that employs Williams' framework to explore the question of 'an intimate historical relationship between secularism and security' in the context of Turkey, see Bilgin (2008).
4 For an illustration of this argument with reference to IR, see Philpott (2000).
5 The limits of the confessionalization thesis should not be overlooked. For instance, Daniel Nexon (2009: 284) observes that confessionalization processes did not always proceed in a top-down manner, and that large sections of populations were not affected by, or even rejected, such a disciplinary process. These limits, however, do not question the main point of our discussion, namely, that the emergence of the modern state did not result in the privatization and public irrelevance of religious belief, but in the de-differentiation of Church, state and society of the confessional state.
6 See, for instance, Krause and Williams (1997), Dillon (1996), Walker (1993, 1997), Der Derian (1998) and Burke (2002). See also the discussion in CASE-Collective (2006).
7 I am grateful to Mike Williams for bringing this point to my attention.
8 It should be noticed that Foucault's famous critique of the modern subject as caught in a constant tension between the empirical and the transcendental — the 'analytic of finitude', in *The Order of Things* (1970) — rests on the identification of a similar mechanism engendered by the dissolution of the God-given order. In the classical episteme, Foucault contends, knowledge was the expression of a 'transparent relation between being and representation and thus man had no role other than identifying the correspondences between language and objects' (Mavelli, 2009: 146). This identity becomes untenable with the decline of the theological order and prompts the emergence of Man as the ambiguous entity which is 'at once, and for the first time, object of knowledge within the order of things, but also a transcendental source of that very order' (Mavelli, 2009: 146). Although for Foucault the watershed that prompts this revolution is not the passage from scholasticism to nominalism, but the emergence

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

of the principle of subjectivity most famously embodied by Kant's philosophy, the logic at work is the same and so is its outcome, that is, a crisis of meaning.

9 All references to Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* use the format: Part/Part, Question.Article. Hence the above reference reads: Second Part of the Second Part, Question 25, Article 1.

10 Milbank (2008: 130) importantly remarks that Carl Schmitt's famous argument that 'the doctrine of modern sovereignty is a secularization of … theological authorizing of absolute rule' should specify that the theological in question is that represented by voluntarism, a term that in the context of his argument can be taken to have the same meaning as nominalism in this article. This should not obscure the minor, but nonetheless important, difference between these two terms. Nominalism is a perspective on properties, namely, against realism, the idea that there are no universals but only particulars (for example, there is not a universal idea of justice but only discreet dimensions which, depending on the context, can be said to represent the idea of justice). Voluntarism is a perspective about God's power, namely, the idea that it is absolute rather than ordained. In this article, following Jean Bethke Elshtain (2008) and Michael Allen Gillespie (2008), I use the term nominalism to cover both meanings.

11 The challenge that the secular sovereign brings to the medieval right of resistance should not be considered an exception of the world of extremes created by Hobbes, but an important feature that, albeit in milder forms, animates the Enlightenment project. Immanuel Kant, for instance, considers the sovereign to be above the law for 'he alone is not a member of the commonwealth, but its creator or preserver, and he alone is authorised to coerce others without being subject to any coercive law himself' (Kant, 1991 [1793]: 75). Contra Hobbes, Kant clarifies that this does not mean that subjects do not have 'inalienable rights' against the sovereign, but these cannot be 'rights of coercion' (Kant, 1991 [1793]: 73–75, 84). For a discussion of Kant on the 'duty never to resist the sovereign', see Nicholson (1976).

12 This, of course, neither means that Hobbes' and Kant's understandings of religion are similar, nor that they can be reduced to tools of legitimation of state power. What is merely suggested here is that with regard to the question of the relation between faith and state power, they both tend to see the former as an element that should contribute to strengthening the moral authority of the latter.

13 *A Secular Age* is the title of Charles Taylor's (2007) recently published magnum opus.

References

Agamben G (2005) *State of Exception*, trans. Kevin Attel. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Aquinas T (1905 [1264]) *Of God and His Creatures [An Annotated Translation with Some Abridgement of the Summa Contra Gentiles]*, ed. and trans. Joseph Rickaby. London: Burns and Oates.

Aquinas T (1920 [1274]) *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne.

Aquinas T (1988) On kingship or the governance of rulers (The Regimine Principum, 1265–1267). In: Sigmund PE (ed.) *St Thomas Aquinas on Politics and Ethics*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 14–29.

Aradau C (2004) Security and the democratic scene: Desecuritization and emancipation. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7(4): 388–413.

Asad T (1993) *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Asad T (2003) *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Beiner R (1993) Machiavelli, Hobbes and Rousseau on civil religion. *The Review of Politics* 55(4): 617–638.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Berman J (2007) The ‘vital core’: From bare life to the biopolitics of human security. In Shani G, Sato M and Pasha MK (eds) *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*, New York: Palgrave, 30–49.

Bilgin P (2008) The securityness of secularism? The case of Turkey. *Security Dialogue* 39(6): 593–614.

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

Boettcher SR (2004) Confessionalization: Reformation, religion, absolutism, and modernity. *History Compass* 2(1): 1–10.

Booth K (2007) *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brady TA Jr (2004) Confessionalization — The career of a concept. In: Headley J, Hillerbrand HJ and Papalas AJ (eds) *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 1–20.

Burke A (2002) Aporias of security. *Alternatives* 27(11): 1–27.

Buzan B, Wæver O and de Wilde J (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Campbell D (1998) *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Carlson JD and Owens EC (2003) *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Casanova J (1994) *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.

Casanova J (2006) Rethinking secularization: A global comparative perspective. *The Hedgehog Review* 8(1–2): 7–22.

Casanova J (2007) Public religions revisited. In: de Vries H (ed.) *Religion: Beyond a Concept*. New York: Fordham University Press, 101–119.

CASE-Collective (2006) Critical approaches to security in Europe: A networked manifesto. *Security Dialogue* 37(4): 443–487.

Cavanaugh WT (1995) ‘A fire strong enough to consume the house’: The wars of religion and the rise of the state. *Modern Theology* 11(4): 397–420.

Cavanaugh WT (2009) *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Larrinaga M and Doucet MG (2008) Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue* 39(5): 517–537.

Der Derian J (1998) The value of security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche, and Baudrillard. In: Lipschutz RD (ed.) *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 24–45.

de Vries H and Sullivan LE (eds) (2006) *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Dillon M (1996) *Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought*. London: Routledge.

Duffield M (2007) *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Elbe S (2005) AIDS, security, biopolitics. *International Relations* 19(4): 403–419.

Elbe S (2006) Should HIV/AIDS be securitized? The ethical dilemmas of linking HIV/AIDS and security. *International Studies Quarterly* 50(1): 119–144.

Elshtain JB (2008) *Sovereignty: God, State, and Self*. New York: Basic Books.

Esposito R (2008) *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy*, trans. Timothy Campbell. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Esposito R (2010) *Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Fink H (1981) *Social Philosophy*. London: Methuen & Co.
Foucault M (1970) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Tavistock Publications.
Foucault M (1984) On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In: Foucault M and Rabinow P (eds) *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books, 340–372.
Foucault M (2003) *'Society Must Be Defended': Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*, ed. Bertani M and Fontana A, trans. Macey D. New York: Picador.
Fox J and Sandler S (2004) *Bringing Religion into International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Frettingham E (2009) Security and the construction of 'religion' in international politics. PhD Thesis, Aberystwyth University.
Gillespie MA (2008) *The Theological Origins of Modernity*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
Gorski PS (2000) Historicizing the secularization debate: Church, state, and society in late medieval and early modern Europe, ca. 1300 to 1700. *American Sociological Review* 65(1): 138–167.
Habermas J (2008) *Between Naturalism and Religion: Philosophical Essays*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hatzopoulos P and Petito F (2003) The return from exile: An introduction. In: Petito F and Hatzopoulos P (eds) *Religion in International Relations: The Return from Exile*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–20.
Hobbes T (2008 [1651]) *Leviathan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hunter I (2001) Westphalia and the desacralisation of politics. In: Hindess B and Jolly M (eds) *Thinking Peace, Making Peace*. Canberra: Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, 36–44.
Huntington SP (1993) The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22–49.
Huysmans J (1998) The question of the limit: Desecuritisation and the aesthetics of horror in political realism. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 27(3): 569–589.
Inayatullah N and Blaney DL (2004) *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. New York: Routledge.
Juergensmeyer M (2003) *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Kaldor M (1999) *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Kant I (1991 [1793]) On the common saying: 'This may be true in theory, but it does not apply in practice'. In: Reiss H (ed.) *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 61–63.
Kant I (2001 [1798]) The conflict of the faculties. In: Wood AW and Di Giovanni G (eds and trans.) *Immanuel Kant, Religion and Rational Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 233–327.
Kantorowicz EH (1951) *Pro patria mori* in medieval political thought. *American Historical Review* 56(3): 472–492.
Keane J (1993) Nations, nationalism, and the European citizen. *CSD Perspectives* 2. Available at: http://www.johnkeane.net/pdf_docs/nations_nationalism_citizens.pdf.
Keys MM (2008) *Aquinas, Aristotle, and the Promise of the Common Good*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kolodziej EA (2005) *Security and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Krause K and Williams MC (eds) (1997) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Laustsen CB and Wæver O (2000) In defence of religion: Sacred referent objects for securitization. *Millennium* 29(3): 705–739.

Lawler P (2008) Peace studies. In: Williams P (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 73–88.

Lilla M (2007) *The Stillborn God: Religion, Politics and the Modern West*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mavelli L (2008) Political Church, procedural Europe, and the creation of the Islamic other. *Journal of Religion in Europe* 1(3): 273–301.

Mavelli L (2009) Beyond secularism: Immanence and transcendence in the political thought of William E. Connolly. In: Finlayson A (ed.) *Becoming Plural: The Political Thought of William E. Connolly*. London: Routledge, 144–164.

McCutcheon RT (2007) 'They licked the platter clean': On the co-dependency of the religious and the secular. *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 19: 173–199.

Milbank J (2008) Paul against biopolitics. *Theory, Culture & Society* 25(7–8): 125–172.

Nash RH (1999) *Life's Ultimate Questions: An Introduction to Philosophy*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Neumann P (2009) *Old and New Terrorism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nexon DH (2009) *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires, and International Change*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Nicholson P (1976) Kant on the duty never to resist the sovereign. *Ethics* 86(3): 214–230.

Oakley F (1998) The absolute and ordained power of God in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theology. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59(3): 437–461.

Paris R (2001) Human security: Paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security* 26(2): 87–102.

Petito F and Hatzopoulos P (eds) (2003) *Religion in International Relations: The Return from Exile*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Philpott D (2000) The religious roots of modern international relations. *World Politics* 52(2): 206–245.

Poggi G (1978) *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*. London: Hutchinson.

Rapoport D (2001) The fourth wave: September 11th in the history of terrorism. *Current History* 100(650): 419–424.

Salvatore A (2006) Power and authority within European secularity: From the Enlightenment critique of religion to the contemporary presence of Islam. *The Muslim World* 96(5): 543–561.

Salvatore A (2007) *The Public Sphere: Liberal Modernity, Catholicism, Islam*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shakman Hurd E (2004) The political authority of secularism in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations* 10(2): 235–262.

Shakman Hurd E (2008) *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Taylor C (2007) *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Thomas SM (2000) Taking religious and cultural pluralism seriously: The global resurgence of religion and the transformation of international society. *Millennium* 29(3): 815–841.

Thomas SM (2005) *The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: The Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Toulmin SE (1990) *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity*. New York: Free Press.

UNDP (1994) *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015

Wæver O (2000) The EU as a security actor: Reflections from a pessimistic constructivist on postsovereign security orders. In: Kelstrup M and Williams MC (eds) *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge, 250–294.

Walker RBJ (1993) *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walker RBJ (1997) The subject of security. In: Krause K and Williams MC (eds) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press, 61–81.

Williams MC (1998) Identity and the politics of security. *European Journal of International Relations* 4(2): 204–225.

Williams MC (2003) World, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics. *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 511–532.

Williams P (ed.) (2008) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Biographical note

Luca Mavelli is a lecturer in International Politics in the School of Politics at the University of Surrey. His research focuses on questions of religion, secularity, postsecularity, and security in international politics. He has contributed articles to the *Journal of Religion in Europe* and *St Antony's International Review*, and will be the co-editor of the 2012 *Review of International Studies* Special Issue on 'The Postsecular in International Politics'. His first book, *Europe's Encounter with Islam: The Secular and the Postsecular* is forthcoming with Routledge, Interventions Series, in March 2012.

Downloaded from ejt.sagepub.com at Bobst Library, New York University on January 13, 2015