

WORLD SECURITY: Toward a 'Local' Research Agenda

"How can we as members of the global community of humans pursue security *together*?" Notwithstanding their differences, approaches to world security are united in answering this politically and morally challenging question. For these approaches, the concept of security is not *essentially* based on the exclusion and termination of who is constructed as 'the other' by oppressing 'the self' in the name of security. Security can be conceptualized differently through an ethical vision as 'an overarching moral and political 'Good'' based on pluralism, togetherness and responsibility. Perhaps contradicting its name, world security is practically concerned with individuals: their rights, freedoms, and their peaceful co-existence with each other and with other living and non-living environments. What constitutes 'world security' as an ethical global approach is the ontological primacy of individuals and their *togetherness*. This reconceptualization is not merely a moral or analytical exercise, but a political inevitability in a world where togetherness multiplies the effects of 'our' choices to pursue security over 'them'. In other words, thinking over ethical principles for our global survival is not a luxury, but a political and moral necessity.¹

In this chapter, the ontological and normative foundations of world security approaches (heretofore, WSAs) will be explored, with the objective of understanding the nature of these foundations in tandem with the necessity of introducing new foundations to render these approaches truly global, as well as local, so that contextual factors and differences can be accounted for. In other words, this discussion, first, reveals the foundational principles through which a world security analysis can be performed. Second, new principles will be discussed in order to update WSAs in consideration of emerging realities of global politics.

The first section explores how individuals, as members of multiple communities from the local to the global, become the ontological foundation for a world security analysis. In this section two dichotomies will be problematized: the self vs. the other and individual vs. community. This is followed by a second section in which the foundationality of security in different WSAs will be examined. WSAs differ especially in this particular ontological claim, although their differences can be less conflictual than presumed. Through these dual-foundational claims, security can potentially be freed from its exclusionary, aggressive, hostile, and masculine conceptualizations, which fail to deliver the promise of security. In the last section, the discussion will focus on a specific case, the mass protests in

Turkey in 2013, in order to enrich the foundations for WSAs ethical security in a changing world.

WSAs cannot be sufficiently explored without clarifying what they challenge politically and morally in the first place. In a nutshell, WSAs contest structures that claim hegemony over subjectivities and bodies, and individual and communal identities; and through this hegemony they become sources of insecurity for individuals and social groups. These structures entail, albeit not exclusively, statism (articulating the state as the highest level of institution to which individuals give their loyalty) (Booth, 2004: 5), capitalism, patriarchy, racism, and fundamentalism. Their global existence results in destructive 'life determining conditions' for the majority of world population. These structures constrain individual choices so human beings cannot flourish beyond mere survival. Even if they do, their demand for equality and recognition is structurally denied (e.g. through patriarchy, colonialism), so their choices are limited. The reason why Booth articulates emancipatory security as 'inventing humanity' (Booth, 2007: 112) is inextricably linked to the prioritization of human freedoms, so that humans are enabled to make choices regarding their lives in the spirit of co-existence with others.

Another reason for problematizing structures is that some structures normalize unjust behaviours. WSAs operate upon a certain ethic that opposes what has been articulated and hegemonized as 'good' through oppressive and unjust structures. For example, Catherine Lu reflects on colonial injustices and argues that they 'involved not simply wrongful acts by individual or state perpetrators. They also relied on social structural processes that enabled and even encouraged individual or state wrongdoing, and produced and reproduced unjust outcomes' (Lu, 2011: 262). This, for Lu (2004: 504), has rendered structures susceptible to moral scrutiny and judgement, as well as agents, given the idea that structures and agents are mutually constitutive. The moral and political responsibility of agents in reproduction or transformation of life-determining, unjust structures occupies a central place for WSAs. This is because individuals as agents can make *choices* to comply or to resist injustice and harm. This is a moral choice as much as a political one, and it 'renders our choices open to moral judgement' (Lu, 2004: 501). Booth identifies emancipation in terms of 'inventing humanity' as a moral choice, although these choices are not freed from structural constraints (Booth, 2007: 114). Constraint, however, does not mean total determination, as Burke concurs when he reflects on oppressive structures and argues that 'the gaming of global governance in the service of narrow state and corporate interests...comes to seem legitimate and inevitable, when these are in fact *choices* that create destructive dynamics and constraints.' (Burke, 2013: 15)

Contrary to structures such as statism that obscure the possibility of membership to multiple communities and normalize harm on 'the other', WSAs aim to offer new understandings of security that not only involves physical components (right to live, work, travel and more) but also revolves around ethical principles. These principles are acknowledgement of plural 'selves', rejecting construction and demonizing of 'the other', seeking ways of pluralistic co-existence with living and non-living environments, and building responsibility towards others. While they question the structures of insecurity which exist globally with local, daily, contextual implications, possibilities of security either in the form of Booth's emancipation or Burke's 'security after security' lie in individuals' ideas and practices. This is, perhaps, where the salience of world security is crystallized: its agents. World security is not analysed or exercised from top-down, but through the 'bottom-up' practices of individuals.

The Individual: Selves and Others, together

The first foundation of WSAs, which becomes their source of knowledge, practice, and politics, is the moral value of individuals as ultimate referents according to whom security policies are evaluated. The conceptualization of individuals as one of the foundations of WSAs, however, is a risky endeavour, as security studies has hosted considerable works that question liberal individualism as a universalistic tool of control and domination of the Westphalian politics of the West. The individual-centred focus renders WSAs a target of criticism that world security is a manifestation of the 'human security' approach and even further, an epistemological reproduction of Western, liberal, and violent interventionism (for example, Chandler and Hynes, 2011). Attributing universal ethical value to individuals can indeed oppress, or even exterminate, differences in favour of engineering them towards the Western, rational, middle-class, liberal man; yet, as Lu (2000: 253) argues, so can parochial ideologies. Therefore, WSAs, cosmopolitan or not, face the challenge of avoiding this hegemonic tendency. The main question is how to think about togetherness without paving the way for homogeneity and without producing 'the self' as opposed to 'the other'. The problematique will be addressed by examining conceptualizations of 'individual' in WSAs and exploring of individual-community relationality in WSAs.

With regard to the first issue, Ken Booth accepts individuals as the ultimate referent of security. Booth conceptualizes the individual not as the atomized and self-centric one of liberal individualism, which he explicitly rejects (Booth, 2007: 226). On the contrary, individuals cannot be thought without considering productive and constraining effects of historical and social contexts in which they live as social groups (Booth, 1999). Therefore, it is wrong to essentialize individuals analytically and politically. Their choices, ra-

tionality, and possibilities are context-dependent; more importantly, they are *interdependent*. Booth's expression of 'emancipation as a process of inventing humanity' nicely captures the principle that emancipation is not a tool to idealize the Western, liberal man as an endpoint. It is a process of exploration of conditions under which individuals can reinvent their humanity by extending their choices in the acknowledgement of relationality and responsibility.

If individual identities, subjectivities, bodies, and their possibilities and choices are contingent, WSAs cannot escape the question of community. It can be argued that for WSAs, including those which manifestly adopt the cosmopolitan spirit, the moral and political issue is not the *primacy* of global homogenous community consisting of 'rational' individuals that share universal reason and therefore, denying (and even worst cases, terminating) localities and differences by otherizing them. Rather, WSAs strongly oppose homogenous, monolithic, and exclusionary identity projects, whether they stem from 'the bottom' or from 'the top'. As Catherine Lu states, a cosmopolitan spirit:

does not assert that individuals should aim to be rootless; rather it portrays individuals as possessing multiple roots. Rather than being alienated or solitary, a cosmopolitan self acknowledges its *solidarity* with a multiplicity of others (Lu, 2000: 257).

This is a crucial point for WSAs, since it paves the way for conceptualizing ethical security. As will be discussed below, one of the fundamental problems of WSAs is the 'security' notions, which allegedly generate security for 'the self' at the expense of 'the other'; thus, one's 'security' becomes another's insecurity through being subjected to physical and non-physical violence. The ethical security vision of WSAs refuses this 'security' approach based on other-ing and violence in favour of an understanding that promotes relationality and responsibilities of individuals towards each other: refusing identity dichotomies in favour of 'togetherness'. To conceptualize security in this way requires the acknowledgement of a multiplicity of identities for individuals, from the local to the global. Likewise, Booth underlines the importance of communities as sites of security for individuals; 'a person's identity cannot be defined by one attribution, and people must be allowed to live simultaneously in a variety of communities' (Booth, 2005: 109). One can consider herself as a member of global human community while endorsing her identities stemming from local conditions (e.g. national identity). This partly illuminates why scholars of WSAs are highly critical to statism and the state-centric system, as these impose monolithic national identities and produce individual subjectivities and bodies through 'security technologies'. As Burke argues, reproduction of 'otherness' is a component of sovereign hegemony

(Burke, 2007: 31-2). WSAs acknowledge differences and the multiplicity of identity and pluralist co-existence in which security can be pursued in the spirit of 'togetherness'.

If the individual in WSAs is contextual, ever-changing, and unpredictable, then is this not a shaky ground to base world security? For Lu, the reason of ontological focus on individuals lies in the fragility of humans. She argues that humans are the perpetrators and victims of 'cruelty' and they are united in fragility against cruelty (Lu, 2000: 252-6). Conceptualizing them as a foundation of ethical security facilitates an analysis of individuals not only as victims but also as performers of cruelty: both as a referent and agent. Booth's pragmatic answer to the question revolves around the idea that while all social and political structures are changing, individuals remain permanent actors who construct, and in turn affected by, structures. For example, for Booth, it would be misleading to accept the state as the ultimate referent of security as the institution has existed only for the last 300 years (Booth, 2007: 205).

However, his moral answer is more appealing. According to Booth, individuals (and the groups they form) seek freedom from oppressive processes and structures, so they make choices other than those that are imposed on them. However, it would be a very simplistic to read this 'freedom inherent in human consciousness' as ahistorical and apolitical, as the self-interested liberal individual's quest for liberty and property, or simply that all individuals have 'free will' (Booth, 1999). Rather, it is an acknowledgment and praise of individuals' propensity to resist domination and oppression that limit their choices. After all, as Foucault (1982) states, where there is power, there is resistance; and as Arendt argues, individuals are endowed with qualities of thinking and natality (Owens, 2007: 30-1), which render them critical to the social world and able to pursue novelties. Accepting individuals as the foundation of WSAs is a way to rethink world security based on their *own* resistance to oppression and their pursuit of freedoms. This does not cancel out Lu's argument about human fragility against cruelty. However, possibilities for ethical world security can be explored in human agency as well, which operates on the principle of multiple selves without otherness as a source of insecurity.

Security: A Self-Reflexive Foundation

When Ken Booth tied security to emancipation as 'freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do' (Booth, 1991: 319), this provoked criticisms with alleged West-centrism, liberalism, and presumed neglect of oppressive, controlling, and exclusionary dimension of security (Aradau, 2004 and 2008; Neocleous, 2008; True, 2011). However, from the 1991 article onwards, one of Booth's main motivations has been to problematize

the institution of the state and its top-down approach that repeatedly produces insecurity for individuals inside and outside. He clearly argues that as security is a politically instrumental concept that can be employed by different types of political interests (Booth, 2007: 105-10), it is too important to leave to the states. Booth's commanding problematization of the state as an end of security, which is a source of insecurity for those both inside and outside, enables him to conceptualize an alternative, a cosmopolitan one, to counter security fed by fear, control, and extermination.

Booth is not alone in his critical stance towards the state and state system. Simon Caney similarly considers the state as a problematic institution *if* and *when* it becomes a source of violence (mainly, physical) towards its citizens, which, for him, requires a 'humanitarian intervention'. The violation by the state constitutes the 'just cause' for intervention that must be proportionate 'in comparison to the internal wrongs which the intervention is supposed to address' (Caney, 2005a: 248). Furthermore, he argues that the intervention should be authorized by 'impartial transnational political authorities' (Caney, 2005a: 250). Andrew Linklater similarly problematizes the state when it (or individuals in the 'modern state-system') causes 'unnecessary harm' to outsiders. He also concludes that the state system has evolved to criminalize 'physical cruelty' from the states towards its citizens, and both states and NGOs are now better equipped to address 'unnecessary suffering' (Linklater, 2002: 336-8). Setting questions such as 'is it possible to have an impartial transnational authority?', 'what makes a transnational institution legitimate and for whom?', 'what is "necessary" harm and suffering' aside as they are beyond the scope of the present analysis, these approaches attempt to regulate, and therefore, reproduce the state system along with cosmopolitan ethical principles, so that states can collectively become a means to the end of individual security, regardless of their nationality, religion, ethnicity, class, gender and sex.

However, what if the system endemically reproduces insecurities to pursue security and problem-solving cosmopolitan attempts perpetuate the problem?² Burke (2007: 68) takes a step further in questioning the state as not solely about the institution, but about modern political ontologies 'that connect security, sovereignty, belonging, otherness, and violence in ways that may appear like enduring political facts, inevitable and irrefutable'. Indeed, for example, feminist works in security studies have so far showed that the sovereign possessiveness of the 'motherland' in former Yugoslavia (Bilgic, 2014), or 'Western civilization' in the case of War on Terror, feminizes the 'inside' and hypermasculinizes the 'outside' by naturalizing the hegemonic power of certain actors who adopt gendered security discourses (Agathangelou and Ling, 2007: 15-31). Boundaries of otherness are continuously redrawn by recourse to claiming the security of 'the self'. 'The other' can be repeatedly recon-

structed either as a threat to 'the self' or as a 'distant stranger', who need 'the self's savings. In both cases, security and otherness are inherently linked in a way that reproduces the state as the security agent; in both, 'the self' claims paternalistic, masculine authority over 'the other'.

Therefore, Burke's earlier scepticism towards some cosmopolitan elements of WSAs is well-founded, and these are crucial to revising WSAs along a line that enables them to challenge power hierarchies between genders, races, classes, and sexes. These hierarchies are constitutive to the structures that (re)produce insecurities in the name of security. However, it is also misleading to argue that this critique rejects any type of foundational conceptualization of security. This is security not derived from the alienation of others and the construction of and violence towards 'the other'; instead, it is grounded in the relationality of local human histories, geographies, identities, and futures, and in *responsibility* as the limiting test for security towards living and non-living environments (Burke, 2007: 22). Ethical security in WSAs is not a dream or fantasy, but a possibility whose contingent conditions can be sought in relationality and responsibility insofar as we are critical to masculine, sovereign possessiveness.³

Regarding the ontology of security, it must be explicated that Booth's WSA is not as foundational as Caney or Linklater's, while Burke is not as anti-foundational as poststructuralist security approaches. Both scholars are united in the principle of self-reflexivity about foundational claims of security. Booth explicitly represents emancipation as a philosophical anchorage. 'Anchorages for knowledge do not allow the settling of ultimate answers, but they do give the opportunity for asking the big questions (as much as possible at the time) about directions of thinking, about what is real, what we can know, and what might we do' (Booth, 2007: 235). Given the definition of security-as-emancipation above that is open to contextualization and historicization, emancipation, albeit originated from the Enlightenment, is also far from being a moral and political foundation to be universalized as a tool of a West-centric and liberal framework of imposition on individuals. It is more of an ethical standard, a reminder for self-reflexivity when security ideas and policies are evaluated: to what extent they promote security as freedoms of individuals in their collective existence. Similarly, Burke (2013: 14), in his explanation of security cosmopolitanism, articulates norms of relationality, responsibility, and recognition as parameters of transformation of security policies and ways to 'keep them under continual scrutiny'. In other words, WSAs offer different foundations for ethical security at the global level, but some strands endlessly target this foundation through reflexive thinking by rendering these foundations open to change.

A Research Agenda for WSAs: Bodies, Spaces for 'Local' World Security

The last section will focus on the conditions under which WSAs can be operationalized in contemporary global politics. It aims to offer a possible research agenda by introducing bodies and spaces in their own localities as new foundations of a world security analysis. The question then arises: how can this security analysis, which is both global and local, both individual-centred and communal, both utopian and realistic, be performed? This section will argue that WSAs can pay attention to urban-based resistance movements that have recently flourished in Cairo, New York, Istanbul, and Rio, to name a few. The Gezi Park protests, which took place in Istanbul in May-June 2013, will be an example of the operationalization of an ethical security of WSAs, although this brief discussion may not do justice to the political, economic, and social structures that led to the country-wide protests. These protests in Turkey not only illustrate security notions discussed above, revolving around freedoms, relationality, and responsibility; they also enlighten a possible way through which WSAs can be re-thought beyond the institution of the state, liberal identities, counterproductive individual-community dichotomy by incorporating urban settings, spaces, bodies, and subjectivities in their own localities. Therefore, ethical world security can be sought in 'the everyday' of local relations.⁴

Although the protests were provoked by the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality's attempt to demolish Gezi Park, next to Taksim Square, and rebuild the historical Topcu Barracks, which in fact, would be a shopping mall in the cloak of old barracks, there were fundamental political and economic processes that underpinned the resistance. The ruling Justice and Development Party (JDP) engaged in a hegemonic project of appropriation of political Islam within the parameters of a neoliberal model, as a practice of social engineering.⁵ Economically, Turkey has been following an aggressive urbanization process concentrated on the construction sector, which is manifested as 'the wholesale restructuring of urban landscapes' through grand projects such as Canal Istanbul (an artificial canal connecting Marmara Sea and Black Sea) and public housing projects (through TOKI - Housing Development Administration). The commodification of urban settings, including its environmental components such as the forests, is accompanied by excessive consumerism manifested in shopping mall inflation (in 2011 there were 279 in Turkey, 109 only in Istanbul).⁶ However, this so-called 'development' was far from solving the unemployment problem, especially among the university graduates, who were also 'losing' the city to which they had contributed to create. Many protestors expressed their economic grievances. For example, Ela, an urban planner, stated that 'even when we get to find work, for example in a municipality's planning office, we cannot put in practice our creativity, as the proposed

projects go against the requirements of the financial and real estate speculations' (Farro and Demirhisar, 2014: 179-80).

Politically, the government's particular policies were increasingly regarded as state intervention into the private lives of citizens (such as restrictions of alcohol sale, attempts to criminalize abortion). Male and, even more so, female bodies were targeted by this conservative project. Another protestor, Ali, stated that:

I am fighting for my dignity. I do not want to be controlled by a condition of employment that does not correspond to my aspirations. But I participate in events because I do not want to be told by the government how I should behave in my private life, how I should behave in the street, or when I see my friends (Farro and Demirhisar, 2014: 180).

Indeed, the number of protestors increased quickly when other societal groups marginalized by patriarchy, state-sponsored Sunni Islam, and nationalism joined. While the protests spread to the whole country, Taksim Square was respatialized as a home of pluralist resistance. Among the protestors, members of LGBTQ communities had immense contributions to the resistance through their presence in the square, and contributed to the resistance through 'the everyday' activities. They distributed food, collected the rubbish, and helped in the infirmary. Their bodily presence contributed to transcending their 'otherness'; protestors, who had previously othered these individuals, started to develop a sense of responsibility towards members of the LGBTQ community. As one of them stated:

LGBTQ individuals who participated in the resistance could reach people and make them understand that we are not three-eared, five-eyed weirdos or freaks... A participant of a large soccer fan organization, *Çarşı*, told one of our trans friends that he used to swear at prostitutes and transvestites before, but now he will never do that again, since he came to know them and they were able to touch each other (Daloglu, 2013).

What does the Gezi experience tell us about WSAs? Surely the objective of the introduction of the Gezi Park protests is not to articulate overarching and universalistic blueprints for world security, as the case itself would be obviously insufficient to make generalizations about security problems in global politics, from 'humanitarian' intervention to the role of supranational institutions. Furthermore, it does not offer a guideline how the state, if possible, should be re-organized to address oppressive structures.

That being said, the Gezi protest does illustrate how individuals *choose* to resist 'life determining' political, economic, and social structures, which generate multiple insecurities for them. Neoliberalism, capitalism, patriarchy, conservatism, statism, and xenophobia are not particular to Turkey, and social groups in their diversities and their own localities have globally reacted to them: from global anti-war protests in 2003 in the wake of US-led coalition's intervention in Iraq to the squares of Tahrir, Syntagma, Taksim, Plaça de Catalu-

nya, and the streets of Rio de Janeiro. In some of these cases, such as in Taksim, individuals claimed a public square to resist structural conditions that limited their freedoms, imposed certain identities, constructed 'others', and produced subjectivities and bodies through the productive power of state-sponsored ideologies. They pursued their individual security (such as members of LGBTQ community) *together* revolving around relationality, responsibility, and freedoms. It is not surprising that Booth (2011: 473-9) praises the Tahrir protests as individuals' pursuit of 'dignity, freedom, and bread', as their security 'anchored in Tahrir Square'. Indeed, Tahrir and Gezi became the micro-cosmos of WSAs for a week without sovereign possessiveness, otherness, exclusion, violence, and fear.

Before hastily celebrating these global social movements as 'cases' of WSAs, the caveat is that resistance movements to structures of insecurity surpass the theoretical confinements of WSAs. The points below not only require expanding the analytical scope of WSAs, but also call for alternative methodologies.

One of the most important directions that the new global social resistance movements against the structures of insecurity (capitalism, statism, patriarchy, racism, and xenophobia) can facilitate for WSAs, is that bodies cannot be neglected in the politics of security. One reason is that as Burke clearly argues, bodies are often the targets of 'security technologies' which naturalise the results of such exercises of social and disciplinary power. Bodies are racialized, gendered, sexed, and commodified, and the 'otherness' of certain groups is reproduced through/on their bodies, subjecting them to physical and non-physical violence (e.g. Agathangelou, 2004). In particular, female bodies often become sites of political struggle in wars through rapes and also targets of patriarchal social engineering projects as in case of Turkey. However, bodies are also sites of resistance. Rather than being a mere tool to carry political messages, the body is mutually constitutive with social meanings that reflect and reproduce values and ideas. More importantly for the purposes of present discussion, the 'protesting body' itself is a political message (Sasson-Levy and Rapaport, 2003). The presence of LGBTQ bodies in Taksim was a performance that not only destabilized and challenged the oppressive structures, but also became a discomforting reminder for other members the collectivity: a reminder of what it means to be 'the other'. While dismantling identitarian dichotomies, responsibility towards those who were previously 'othered' emerged in terms of respect, recognition, and acceptance. However, bodies have not been integrated into WSAs, which reproduce the modern 'cognition versus body' dichotomy while prioritizing the former. This is a foundational setback for an approach that claims to concentrate on individual (in)securities. Bodies can be a source of rethinking what world security means in theory and practice, whether it is conceptualized as emancipation or as recognition and responsibility.

Bodies are not the only materiality that WSAs can integrate to the security analysis. Bodies 'redeploy [public] space in order to contest and negate the existing forms of political legitimacy', as Butler (2011: 1-3) argues. In their protests, individuals respatialize streets and squares as the spaces of resistance where a pluralist collectivity is constructed, as in the case of Taksim. In these new political spaces re-owned by the people engaging in 'the everyday', individuals find traces of freedom, recognition, acceptance, empathy, and care; an elusive, temporary security. Regarding the members of LGBTQ in respatialized Taksim,

[t]his holds true especially for our trans-friends, who are the most recognizable and whose visibility in public space doesn't come with nice experiences at all. Their memories are "bejewelled" with non-recognition, denial, hatred, and murder... The reason Şevval calls this experience "one of the most interesting experiences in her life" is because such a moment, which is touched with effects of recognition and reliance, contravenes the general themes of collective memories of trans individuals in Turkey: the themes of insecurity, of misrecognition or of not being recognized at all (Daloglu, 2013).

In non-urban settings, space can also become a site of security for individuals and communities without reproducing sovereign possessiveness feeding into 'otherness'. For example, Matt McDonald (2011) explicitly shows in his emancipatory environmental security framework how security of the Amazon forests becomes one with the security of local communities. In other words, relationality in WSAs cannot be solely explored between identities, histories, and geographies, although it is a crucial analytical and political practice to challenge mystifications and 'otherness'. Relationality between the security of individuals and the space they construct (if we accept that all material constructs are social products too) should be explored. Similarly to bodies, spaces are also sites of political struggles and of political resistance where WSAs seek what world security means.

Scholars of WSAs have so far produced considerable and powerful analyses about what security means, how individuals and communities become insecure on a global scale, and how we can demystify the givens of a contemporary political system such as sacredness of sovereignty, statism, borders, capital, and masculine dominance. They have also not shied away from offering ethical standards to reorder global political relations and processes so that individuals can invent their lives through the spirit of freedom, responsibility and recognition, in *togetherness*. However, when answering macro questions about the state, state-system, sovereignty, and the ethical principles of interstate relations and state-society relations, it should be remembered that macro politics has reverberations for individuals who create their own ways of dealing with repercussions in their own localities. For WSAs, the need to refer to individuals as referents and agents of world security in different local contexts is an analytical and political imperative. This is necessary not only because of continuous criticisms towards WSAs regarding its alleged West-centrism and liberalism.

It is also because the main foundations of WSAs about individual security, individual-community relationality, security based on relationality, responsibility, and freedom can be illustrated in micro practices, such as internal dynamics of the Gezi protests. More importantly, these micro analyses would also enable to comprehend the gaps in WSAs as the importance of bodies and spaces as new foundations for WSAs has been discussed in the present analysis.

Turning to the individual requires certain methodological approaches that feminist security studies can offer to WSAs. For Hoogenson and Stuvoy (2006: 221), 'the way to understand and establish knowledge about security in empirical terms is to enter people's life-worlds'. Maria Stern (2006: 183) concurs that security is 'embedded in their [individuals] representation of themselves as political subjects'. These may initially appear contradictory to the security foundation of WSAs with its moral and political principles. However, it must be noted that this foundation is also a self-reflective one, an anchorage. It is a theoretical prism through which individual ideas and practices of security are evaluated. Individual and collective security notions are surely put to a test of WSAs. However, this is only a part of the story. WSAs are also put to a test through analyzing the experiences of individuals in the politics of security. Inefficiencies cannot be addressed without a true *praxis*. That is why, as scholars of feminist security argue, a methodological 'bottom-up' approach is a requirement (Hoogensen and Stuvoy, 2006). Only through this path Booth's idea of security of 'real people in real places' can be operationalized: ethical security at global level for WSAs is to be sought in individuals.

The discussion concludes by offering a research agenda for ethical security of WSAs. In addition to macro questions of IR, the research agendas of WSAs should include micro settings as urban, rural, and within and beyond the borders of states. In the age of *Empire*, sovereignty and its destructive 'security technologies' are reproduced in deterritorialized ways in the Mediterranean, the shores of Australia, walls separating peoples, streets, squares, and forests interacting with capital movements (Hardt and Negri, 2000). How global insecurities are materialized in micro settings and with what types of peculiarities are analytical challenges that WSAs cannot escape. This also entails exploring new ways of insecurity with the objective of examining how individuals address these insecurities in their local contexts. Finally, when the individual can be reconceptualized to examine the role of bodies and spaces in the reproduction of subjectivities and identities, the foundation of security might remain shaky without losing sight of the fact that it is always momentary and subject to challenges in practice.

Bibliography

- Booth, K. (2007) *Theory of World Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Burke, A. (2013) 'Security Cosmopolitanism', *Critical Studies on Security*, 1(1): 13-28.
- Burke, A. (2005) 'Against the New Internationalism', *Ethics and International Affairs*, 19 (2): 73-89.
- Caney, S. (2005b) 'Cosmopolitan Justice, Responsibility, and Global Climate Change', *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 18 (4): 747-775.
- Richmond, O.P. (2010) 'Resistance and the Post-liberal Peace', *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 38 (3): 665-692.
- Bedirhanoglu, P. and Yalman, G. (2010) 'Neoliberal Transformation in Turkey: State, Class and Discourse', in *Economic Transitions to Neoliberalism in Middle-Income Countries Policy Dilemmas, Crises, Mass Resistance*, ed. Saad-Filho, A. and Yalman, G. (London: Routledge):107-127.
- Birkiye, S.K. (2009) 'Changes in the Cultural Policies of Turkey and the AKP's Impact on Social Engineering and Theatre', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15 (3): 261-274;
- Blad, C. and Kocer, B. (2012) 'Political Islam and State Legitimacy in Turkey: The Role of National Culture in Neoliberal State-Building', *International Political Sociology*, 6 (1): 36-56.
- Booth, K. (2004) "Realities of Insecurity: Editor's Introduction", *International Relations*, 18 (1): 1-8.
- Booth, K. (2005) 'Community' in Booth, K. (ed) *Critical Security Studies in World Politics*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Booth, K. (1999) 'Three Tyrannies', in Dunne, T. and Wheeler, N. J. (eds.) *Human Rights in Global Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 31-70.
- Lu, C. (2011) 'Colonialism and Structural Injustice', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 19 (3):261-281.
- Lu, C. (2004) 'Agents, Structures and Evil in World Politics', *International Relations* 18 (4): 498-509.
- Lu, C. (2000) 'The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism', *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2): 244-267.

- Burke, A. (2007) *Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence*, (London: Routledge).
- Booth, K. (1991) 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies* 17 (4): 313-326.
- Chandler, D. and Hynes, N. (eds) (2011), *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations* (London: Routledge).
- Foucault, M. (1982). 'The Subject and Power', *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4): 208-226.
- Owens, P. (2007) *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- True, J. (2011) What is Critical about Critical Theory Revisited: The Case of Four International Relations Scholars and Gender. In: Brincat S, Nunes J, Lima L (eds) *Thirty Years of Critical Theory in World Politics* (London: Routledge)150-158;
- Neocleous M. (2008) *Critique of Security*. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Aradau C. (2004) 'Security and the Democratic Scene: Desecuritization and Emancipation', *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7(4): 388-413.
- Aradau C. (2008) *Rethinking Trafficking of Women: Politics out of Security* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Caney, S. (2005a) *Justice Beyond Borders: A Global Political Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Linklater, A. (2002) 'The Problem of Harm in World Politics: Implications for the Sociology of States-Systems', *International Affairs* 78 (2): 319-338.
- Bilgic, A. (2014) 'Exploring 'What's Good about Security': Politics of Security during the Dissolution of Yugoslavia', *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*,16 (2): 266-270.
- Agathangelou, A. M. and Ling, L.H.M. (2007) *Transforming World Politics: From Empire to Multiple Worlds* (London: Routledge).
- Farro, L. A and Demirhisar, D., G.(2014) 'The Gezi Park Movement: A Turkish Experience of the Twenty-first-century Collective Movements', *International Review of Sociology*, 24 (1): 176-189.
- Daloğlu, T. 'LGBT Turks Seek to Capitalize On Gezi Good Will', *AI-Monitor*, July 02, 2013, <http://www.ai-monitor.com/pulse/tr/originals/2013/07/turkey-lgbt-gezi.html>. (Last accessed 23.11.2015)

- Booth, K. (2011) 'Anchored in Tahrir Square', *European Security*, 20 (3): 473-479.
- Agathangelou, A. (2004) *The Global Political Economy of Sex: Desire, Violence, and Insecurity in Mediterranean Nation States*. (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Sasson-Levy, O. and Rapoport, T. (2003) 'Body, Gender, and Knowledge in Protest Movements: The Israeli Case', *Gender and Society*, 17 (3): 379-403
- Butler, J. (2011) 'Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street'. *#Occupy Los Angeles Reader*.
- McDonald, M. (2011) *Security, Environment and Emancipation* (London: Routledge).
- Hoogensen G and Stuvoy K (2006) 'Gender, Resistance and Human Security', *Security Dialogue* 37(2): 207-228.
- Stern M (2006) Racism, sexism, classism, and much more: reading security-identity in marginalized sites. In: Ackerly B, Stern M and True J (eds) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 174-198.
- Hardt M. and Negri A. (2000) *Empire* (London: Harvard University Press, 2000).

¹ Ken Booth's *Theory of World Security's* (2007) last two chapters 'The New Twenty Years' Crisis' and 'A Long Hot Century' powerfully show that ethical approach of World Security is not a moral utopia, but becomes a condition of humanity's common survival and flourishing in peace. Anthony Burke (2013: 17) also underlines a necessity of a global ontology of 'security cosmopolitanism' as human lives are interconnected with each other and also other life-forms.

² For Burke's criticisms towards 'new internationalism', which normalizes and justifies violent interventionism that destroys its own objective, peace, see Burke, 2005.

³ 'Responsibility' occurs repeatedly as a common thread binding WSAs. While in some cases responsibility is employed in order to reveal the role of agents in reproduction structural injustices (Lu, 2011), some studies examines the responsibility of burden sharing to address issues that victimize individuals and groups globally as a matter of justice, see Caney, 2005b

⁴ 'The everyday' is used in the way that it is conceptualized by Oliver Richmond, see Richmond, 2010

⁵ The neoliberal and neo-Ottomanist project has been studied extensively even before the Gezi Park protests in 2013. See Bedirhanoglu and Yalman, 2010); Birkiye, 2009; Blad and Kocer, 2012

⁶ Turkiye'nin AVM haritasi aciklandi, <http://www.evagyd.com/WebSite/Homeltems.aspx?HomeItemID=24>