

By the West and for the West? A Critical Appraisal of Performativity and Eurocentric Predispositions in Security Analysis

Mariana Vieira

Abstract

This article deploys an anti-Eurocentric framework to examine the different approaches to the analysis of security. Drawing on the insights of postcolonial and critical scholarship, traditional realist approaches can be constructed as an analysis of security performed by the powerful (West) and for the powerful (West), as they constrain the examination of security at different levels and for different referent objects. The article then moves on to an assessment of Western predispositions in non-traditional approaches, albeit to a smaller extent. The argument stresses the limitations and implications of a security analysis imported from Western traditions and supports the critical project of problematizing the status quo. By exposing them to questions that the traditional agenda continues to marginalize, the aim of this article is to rethink security discourses and open the space for non-Western agency.

Keywords: Security, International relations theory, International Security, Eurocentrism, postcolonialism, eastern agency.

Introduction

From a critical theory point of view, the analysis of security is performed by someone developing a theory which is trying to achieve some goal, consistent with the historical situations experienced at the time.¹ Drawing parallels with Robert Cox's observation that 'theory is always for someone and for some purpose',² the analysis of security is always performed through the lenses of the specific theory adopted. In other words, theory does not exist in some absolute sphere, divorced from a standpoint in time and space. Instead, the power structures behind each theoretical standpoint translate into practices of everyday life and uncovering these becomes key to denaturalizing certain analyses that may appear common sense. Critical theorists such as Ken Booth and R. B. J. Walker uncover the relationship between security and deeper assumptions about the nature of politics and the role of conflict, which depend on a cultural explanation of who is performing security. A critical appraisal of performativity is then interested in security analyses that shed light on those who are made insecure by the prevailing order, furthering their emancipation.³

Drawing on critical and post-colonial perspectives, this article illustrates how the analysis of security is performed by the West and for the West, in both traditional and non-traditional approaches to security studies. Post-colonialism seeks to uncover the tendency to

¹ Robert Cox, "For Someone and For Some Purpose: An Interview with Robert. W. Cox," in Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima and João Nunes, eds., *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews and Reflections* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 15-34.

² Robert Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium* 10, no. 2 (1981): 126-155.

³ Richard Wyn Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory* (London: Lynne Rienner Publisher, 1999).

exaggerate the power of the West and to recognize the interactive relationship between East and West⁴ that the traditional agenda continues to marginalize. In critical theory, concepts such as emancipation need further examination, given the connotations with European Enlightenment. The first section sets out the conceptual framework of the post-colonial project, which will prove useful in the subsequent sections. The second section follows with an appraisal of the traditional analysis of security. The third section examines how critical international relations theories might suffer from Eurocentrism, perpetuating Western dominance through universalist ideas and state-centric features. The fourth and final section addresses the possible limitations of post-colonial analysis, contrasting the centrality of the European process of state-making in Ayooob's work with Hobson's argument for increased Eastern agency.

Post-colonial Concepts in IR and Security Studies

Post-colonial studies consist of a highly diverse body of theoretical perspectives that share an appreciation for the uniqueness and importance of colonialism as a series of global occurrences and phenomena.⁵ The interconnectedness of the colonial and post-colonial eras is crucial in understanding how different societies with different historical traditions were fused into a history which produced the juxtaposed colonizer and colonized identities. On one hand, the (colonizer) West is often portrayed as the embodiment of the standard of civilization, possessing exclusively progressive characteristics, including rationality and liberalism. On the other hand, the (colonized) East is imbued with all manner of regressive and antithetical properties, occupying of peripheral status in global politics.⁶

The identity-formation process alluded to here was pioneered by Edward Said in seminal work during the 1970s on Orientalism as a form of discourse construction in which the West defines the Self by what it is not—the East, onto which the imaginaries of Other are projected. Drawing on the work of Foucault and Gramsci, Said explored the negative literary representations of non-Europeans in the West, shedding light on their implications for the emerging knowledge that facilitated, extended and strengthened the West's growing hegemony over the Orient.⁷ Consequently, Said's work contributed to the central role of identity production in post-colonial frameworks, whereby knowledge and discourse are intimately connected to the structures and practices of power that have prevailed since the colonial times.⁸

Orientalism continues to validate a Eurocentric knowledge that elevates the Western self while demoting the Eastern other. Eurocentrism is then a crucial concept in post-colonial analysis of international relations, referring to the centrality of European experiences when considering the past, present, and future of world politics.⁹ John Hobson distinguishes between conscious and subliminal types of Eurocentrism. The former explicitly celebrates all things

⁴ John M. Hobson, "Orientalism and the Poverty of Theory three decades on: Bringing Eastern and Subaltern Agency back into Critical IR Theory," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 129-139.

⁵ Jonathan Hill, "Beyond the Other? A Postcolonial Critique Of The Failed State Thesis," *African Identities* 3, no. 2 (2005): 139-154.

⁶ John M. Hobson, "Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and For Western Imperialism? Beyond Westphalian Towards a Post-Racist Critical IR," in *Critical International Relations Theory after 25 Years*, eds. Ben Thirkell-White and Nicholas J. Rengger (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 91-116.

⁷ Jonathan Hill, "Beyond," 139-154.

⁸ Jonathan Hill, "Beyond," 139-154.

⁹ Pinar Bilgin, "The Continuing Appeal of Critical Security Studies," in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 159-170.

West, whereas the latter can be highly critical of Eurocentrism and yet fails to dispose of the assumption of Western centrality in the world. While a traditional analysis of security is more compatible with the former, critical analysis will show awareness of West's subliminal centrality in international relations. On top of these, Hobson has begun to develop the notion of Eurofetishism, which will be looked at with greater detail in the last section, where the argument will turn to the limitations of approaching security through the lenses of some post-colonial approaches.

In security analysis, post-colonialism highlights the importance of security as a construction of a radically different, inferior, and threatening other. Thus, the fields of International Relations (IR) and Security Studies provide 'particular solutions' to a long list of important questions concerning the identity of Self and Other.¹⁰ For post-colonialists, these solutions tend to exacerbate the division of the globe and constrain the understanding of global hierarchies of wealth and power. Likewise, the concept of Third World is important, as Arif Dirlik shows that an analysis of security based on three worlds of development is a product of Eurocentric mappings of the world that deal with the post-colonial situation.¹¹ When dividing the world between a relatively secure and conflict free (Western) zone and the Third World where conflict is endemic, this analysis of security is exclusively performed for the West. Here, the analysis of security often obscures the reasons intrinsic to the Third World regions that provide much of the raw material for conflict.¹² Moreover, the decisions made by colonial powers that resulted in the ethnic mix inherited by many post-colonial states, as well as their inability to prevent superpower rivalries and conflicts from penetrating the regions, are not included in traditional analysis of security.

Eurocentrism in Traditional Security Analysis

The resulting IR field allows for an analysis of security performed by an Anglo-American discipline based on a Western conception of the state, which in turn produces Eurocentric explanatory models of the world. Moreover, security in traditional IR discourses has been consistently analysed from a Western historical perspective: the conceptualization of security is a product of a particular intellectual tradition, faithfully reflecting a particular process of historical and political development that can be traced back to the Peace of Westphalia.¹³ In other words, the analysis of security is essentially concerned with states, authority and sovereignty, which is mostly informed by realist theoretical traditions. Furthermore, statism, militarization and a confrontational-oriented attitude stem from the importance of sovereignty and provide the foundation of traditional security studies.¹⁴ It should come as no surprise that during the Cold War, despite the widespread wars of decolonization, Strategic Studies and International Security Studies (ISS) were characterized by a militarized agenda focused on the use of nuclear weapons. The importance of great power politics should also be noted, here the key security events, including the Cuban Missile Crisis and the 9/11 terrorist attacks, reveal the narrowness of the realist security analysis: threats are essentially portrayed from the perspective of Western concerns.

¹⁰ Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, eds., *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), 66-100.

¹¹ Mark T. Berger, "After the Third World? History, Destiny and the Fate of Third Worldism," *Third World Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (2004): 9-39.

¹² Ayoob, "Review," 273.

¹³ Lloyd Pettiford and Melissa Curley, *Changing Security Agendas and the Third World* (London: Pinter, 1999).

¹⁴ Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, chapter 4.

From a post-colonial perspective, Charles Tilly and Krause argue that a state-centric security analysis is problematic given the particular European history of state formation that understands security as oriented towards external threats.¹⁵ While traditional security assumes the realist ideal of a unified and homogenous state, various non-Western states have followed a different trajectory of state formation based on colonial boundaries that do not respect local communities, resulting in a radically different set of political, economic and cultural structures.¹⁶ Indeed, Ayoob argues that in post-colonial states, the military has a mostly internal security role, concerned with the processes of state and nation building.¹⁷ Moreover, Ken Booth warns from a critical standpoint that the ‘state’ is a social construction and not a ready-made textbook unit. A state-centric analysis of security treats the state as the only deserving referent and precludes analysis of insecurity experienced by individuals or groups, preserving the hegemony.¹⁸ Equally problematic is the purported positivist, value free and objective analysis of traditional security, which can be considered a cloak for status quo thinking: seeing the world as ‘it is’ through Eurocentric lenses of masculinized, capitalist and nationalist mind-sets.¹⁹ Consequently, traditional realist approaches can be constructed as an analysis of security performed by the powerful (West) and for the powerful (West), as it constrains the examination of security at different levels and for different referent objects.

Here, Arms Control discourses provide a powerful example of how widespread realist Western security culture is. Particularly, Krause explores the importance of identity and cultural considerations in constructing security issues such as potential enemies and allies, and the dominance of ethnocentric cultural standpoints.²⁰ Likewise, most analysts of arms control and disarmament are steeped in East-West or European history, which allows for the Western performance of nuclear weapons security analysis. Here, the individual and collective interests of Western states are assumed and threats to those interests are considered self-evident.²¹ The analysis of security regards western policies as rational and benign, considering the West more responsible and trustworthy. Different arms control measures take place according to the distinction between West and non-West, in the sense that ideas such as democratic peace dictate relations between western states while verification and compliance-monitoring are privileged in agreements ‘not involving gentlemen.’²² Moreover, the possibility that the West’s nuclear arsenal might be seen as threatening by others is not admitted.²³

In the context of the post-Cold War formal multilateral arrangements to counter proliferation, the use of specific metaphors illustrates the Western referent object of security analysis, whose concerns and interests are exclusively taken into consideration. Early in 1992, the UN security council declared proliferation a threat to international peace and security, opening the door for multilateral military responses that paved the way to the 2003 Iraq debacle. The threat to security was framed around proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and excessive accumulations of conventional arms, which shaped the debate around the problem

¹⁵ Buzan and Lene, eds., *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), 66-100.

¹⁶ Buzan and Lene, eds., *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), 66-100.

¹⁷ Ayoob, “Review,” 278.

¹⁸ Pettiford and Curley, *Changing Security Agendas and the Third World*, see chapter 6, 118-131.

¹⁹ Ken Booth, “Three Tyrannies,” in *Human Rights in Global Politics*, eds. Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler (Cambridge: University Press, 1999), 31-70.

²⁰ Keith Krause, *Culture and Security: Multilateralism Arms Control and Security Building* (New York: Frank Cass, 1999), 23-54.

²¹ Keith Krause, *Culture and Security*, 23-54.

²² Keith Krause, *Culture and Security*, 23-54.

²³ Keith Krause, *Culture and Security*, 23-54.

and possible solutions.²⁴ On the one hand, the metaphor of proliferation highlighted the source-spread-recipient nature underlying the process of arms production and distribution. On the other hand, proliferation downplayed the multitude of reasons for procuring weapons and related technology that could scarcely be seen as directly targeting the West: regional military threats, internal regime support and economic development.²⁵ Thus, on top of prioritizing the ‘spread’ of technology without grasping the problems of economic development which may spur the creation of an arms industry,²⁶ the conservative stress on the stability of regional balances of power illustrates a status-quo orientation towards the problem at hand, explored in light of Western interests. As a result, when the analysis of security is performed by the West and for the West, the resulting discourses of Third World restrict its access to nuclear weaponry.

The notion of Third World imposes a dubious homogeneity on a large and diverse area of the world, represented as dangerous in traditional security analysis. The post-cold war context saw an increased interest in third world security after the oil crisis in 1973, which showed that Third World countries held bargaining power.²⁷ Consistently, several Third World countries were constructed as threats in order to occupy the place of ‘evil’ others, occupied by the Soviet Union in earlier security analyses. Indeed, before China emerged as the most suitable other currently available, the spotlight during 2000s fell on countries in Africa and the Middle East, shifting uneasily in and out of focus according to the rise of terrorism and human rights agendas.

This way, traditional security allows for new security threats based on the notion of rogue states. This attributes countries a certain degree of menace amplified by the Orientalist, centuries-old symbolic cultural representations of non-Western societies as irrational and impervious to reason.²⁸ Here, it becomes evident how the traditional analysis of security is not performed for the Third World, as it does not include the security concerns of non-Western actors and further perpetuates the status quo that generates a great deal of insecurity in the non-Western world. The overlap of power and security in traditional security analysis has implications for the marginalization of the Third World, given its powerlessness. A move away from Western predispositions can open the way to exploring a range of non-traditional sources of insecurity, such as ethnic divisions, weak economies, and debt burdens.²⁹

Informed by the focus of what Robert Cox groups under problem-solving theories, the main limitations of traditional analysis of security are two-fold: it is unable to reflect on the Eurocentrism of the *problem* considered and unreflectively focuses on the *solving*. In contrast, critical theories point to the myriad overlooked problems and consequently are able to highlight the inadequacy of the solutions pursued. Within this broad umbrella, structuralist scholarship is particularly useful in analysing how the neo-liberal economic structure exacerbates inequalities and increases the relative security of the West at the price of chronic insecurity elsewhere.³⁰ Thus, it becomes possible to reflect on the biased categorization allowing for a dichotomy between the (self)-core and the (other)-periphery at the heart of traditional divisions of Global North and Global South. Thus, from a performativity standpoint, the analysis of

²⁴ David Mutimer, “Reimagining Security: The Metaphors of Proliferation,” in *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, eds., Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (UCL Press, 1997), 187-222.

²⁵ Mutimer, “Reimagining Security”, *Critical Security Studies*, 187-222.

²⁶ Mutimer, “Reimagining Security”, *Critical Security Studies*, 187-222.

²⁷ Buzan and Lene, eds., *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge: University Press, 2009), 66-100.

²⁸ Keith Krause, *Culture and Security*, 23-54.

²⁹ Pettiford and Curley, *Changing Security Agendas and the Third World*.

³⁰ Jones, *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*, chapter 4.

security is predisposed towards the self-interested neo-liberal economic order, and the interests of Western societies, excluding experiences originating outside the non-West world.

The (Un)critical Theories

In contrast, critical approaches to security are bound with the concept of emancipation which translates into a critique of the established way of thinking. The concept itself was first developed by Ken Booth and the Welsh School of critical security studies, to expose the traditional emphasis on military threats and to provide an alternative way of incorporating non-state centric sources of insecurity, from economic collapse to climate change or overpopulation. Questioning whose security comes first, Booth defined emancipation as ‘the freeing of people from those physical and human constraints which stop them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do’.³¹ For critical theorists, emancipation highlights the unfulfilled potential that already exists in a society, combined with a commitment to equity and justice, recognising of the need for transformation.³² Thus, the analysis of security ought to be performed for common humanity with the purpose of emancipation.³³

Nevertheless, the question of who performs it remains open. Mustapha Pasha argues that critical theory analyses security through post-Enlightenment lenses of progress and civilizing process.³⁴ Indeed, the modern conception of emancipation took shape during the Enlightenment, as the secular equivalent of redemption. This historical and cultural contingency makes the universalization of emancipation’s referent object problematic, as it overshadows its particular attributes. Furthermore, equating universal emancipation with security precludes subjectivities arising in other locales, with different political desires or religious views, from being included in the analysis of security.³⁵ As the possibility of other pathways outside the spatio-temporal horizon of Western modernity is scarcely entertained, critical IR allows little space for political desires expressed in forms that escape the emancipatory logic of Western Reason.³⁶ Ultimately, the critical analysis of security is not neutral nor culturally vacuous, which undermines the universality of emancipatory projects. Similarly, Welsh scholars are charged with denying other’s otherness through the promotion of universalist ideas that have emerged from several centuries of Western emancipatory ideas.³⁷

Despite acknowledging the global capitalist system as a source of structural inequality and thus insecurity, the emancipation project is foregrounded on Western agency: as long as emancipated individuals use their achieved emancipation to help emancipate others, it is acceptable. Given the (Western) interveners’ level of emancipation and their ‘duty’ to use their emancipation to support others on their emancipating journey, security as emancipation provides grounds for humanitarian interventions that legitimize the status quo of emancipation/security in the West at the expense of (temporary) insecurity elsewhere.

In common with emancipatory frameworks, the human security analysis shares a focus on the individual and illustrates how traditional security practices contribute to insecurity. This

³¹ Ken Booth, “Security and Emancipation,” *Review of International Studies* 17, no. 4 (1991): 313-326.

³² Mustapha Kamal Pasha, “The ‘secular’ subject of Critical International Relations Theory”, in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 105-114.

³³ Ken Booth, “Challenging the ideas that made us: An interview with Ken Booth,” in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 59-81.

³⁴ Pasha, “The ‘secular’,” *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 105-114.

³⁵ Pasha, “The ‘secular’,” *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 105-114.

³⁶ Pasha, “The ‘secular’,” *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 105-114.

³⁷ Booth, “Three Tyrannies,” 31-70.

critical approach allows for greater agency for non-actors, as well as consideration of the non-Western ‘other’. While this approach is important in adopting a critical view of the state, human security can easily be performed by the West and for the West. First, the narrative of human security is explicitly grounded in Western ideals such as liberal individualism and the pursuit of development as crucial for achieving security.³⁸ For instance, human security analysis is able to justify certain development and security policies that are predisposed to the status quo and aligned with the rules of the game: ‘long defined, northern, masculinized liberal system’.³⁹ This way, security is analysed according to a specific Eurocentric value-based discourse that purports to benefit the universal values of less civilized and less democratic others.

Finally, securitization theory analyses security as a discursive action. Similar to post-structuralist approaches to the discursive nature of threats, securitization explores the ways in which political issues are constituted as extreme, by securitizing actors with institutional and social power to move the threat at question beyond the realm of normal politics.⁴⁰ Here, security is performed through speech acts that invoke discourses of danger and assert the importance of a particular issue. An issue becomes successfully securitized when the target audience agrees on the nature of the threat and supports extraordinary, often undemocratic, measures in response. The Global War on Terror offers a good example of threat magnification and the legitimization of measures from surveillance, the use of torture and the hallmark Guantanamo detention camp.⁴¹ Crucially, securitization highlights how security analyses produce uneven power relations, as security is administered by some and received by others. However, securitization is not without its own Western predispositions: this analysis of security has been criticized for its state-centric origins and elite-centric aspects, focusing exclusively on security performed by the powerful. Furthermore, securitization theory is unwilling to question the traditional meaning of security, struggling to analyse the complexity of political life and insecurity at the margins.⁴²

What Way Forward?

The post-colonial work of Mohammed Ayoob focuses precisely on the analysis of security issues at the margins of Western security. Traditional security analysis developed for the West is based on three major characteristics that are ‘thoroughly diluted’ in the Third World: external orientation, links to systemic security and importance of alliance blocs.⁴³ In addition, Ayoob incorporates time as a crucial variable in analysing security concerns from a non-Western perspective. Contemporary Third World state-makers have been pressured to complete the costly and complex process of state-making in less than four decades, while European development lasted over three hundred centuries.⁴⁴ When encapsulating the various phases of state and nation building into one all-encompassing phase, Ayoob argues that the

³⁸ Ryerson Christie, “Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique?,” *Security Dialogue* 41, no. 2 (2010): 169-190.

³⁹ Edward Newman, “Critical Human Security Studies,” *Review of International Studies* 36, no. 1 (2010): 77-94.

⁴⁰ Clara Eroukhmanoff, “Securitisation Theory: An Introduction,” in *International Relations Theory*, eds., Stephen McGlinchey, Rosie Walters and Christian Scheinpflug (Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing, 2018), 104-110.

⁴¹ Eroukhmanoff, “Securitisation Theory,” *International Relations Theory*, 104-110.

⁴² Richard Wyn Jones, “The test of practice: *An interview with Richard Wyn Jones*,” in *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 82-104.

⁴³ Ayoob, “Review,” 257-283.

⁴⁴ Ayoob, “Review,” 257-283.

magnitude of internal security problems stems from the lack of legitimacy commonly found in new states. Nevertheless, Ayoob's subaltern realism has been criticized for exhibiting a form of Eurocentrism in adopting a certain understanding of Western European history as the norm and then sketching the trajectory for the rest.⁴⁵ Hence, Ayoob's argument leads to the claim that post-colonial analysis often treats history as inherently Eurocentric: the decolonization process is analysed through a Eurocentric perspective whereby national liberation movements reflect Western ideals of freedom.⁴⁶

In order to facilitate an analysis of security performed by those in need of emancipation, John Hobson emphasises the importance of bringing back Eastern agency: when the Eastern agent is robbed of agential capacity to resist the West, there is little chance for emancipatory change. Thus, traditional, and critical analyses of security stand to gain from a post-colonial examination of Eastern agency that avoids the Eurocentric representation of West's monopoly of progressive agency.⁴⁷ When granting agency to the East, analyses of security can overcome the traditional winner/loser logic by revealing the processes and effects of Eastern agency in shaping the West as well as global politics. Underlying this perspective is an effort to favour historicism in order to reveal the social forces behind change in world history. For instance, security analysis could benefit from a broader historical perspective that connects the current processes of globalization with the first global economy of 1500-1850. Here, the East had a predominant influence over the West, not in the context of a threat to security, but rather as the near centre of a thriving trade network where Europeans sought to insert themselves.⁴⁸ Hence, Hobson advocates for a focus on Eastern agency and the dynamic interactions that took place before the brief, but world changing, interlude of Western dominance, from 1850-2008.⁴⁹

In the context of the on-going 'China threat' debate, where security analysis is performed by the West and for the West,⁵⁰ this dialogical process can be instrumental in desecuritizing the crisis management language deployed alongside the assumption that Chinese agency is contingent on US action through policy-formation. Highlighting the flow of ideational, technological and institutional ideas allows for new hybrid civilizational identities that reveal the Other in the Self and vice-versa. This is central to the post-colonial project seeking to disrupt the Westphalian narrative of globalization, Third World and security analysis. Last, it is worth mentioning that an effort to overcome Eurocentric security analysis does not imply an adoption of Eurofetishism.⁵¹ Here, the binaries of moral superiority are reversed so that the West goes from benevolent to inferior and the barbaric evil East is endowed exclusively with innocence. Instead, doing away with homogenous categories that foreground the referent object of security can give away to an alternative conception of agency where Western and non-Western agency coexist overtime and along the same continuum.

⁴⁵ Bilgin, "The continuing appeal," *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*, 159-170.

⁴⁶ Hobson, "Orientalism," 129-139.

⁴⁷ Hobson, "Orientalism," 129-139.

⁴⁸ John M. Hobson, *Multicultural Origins of the Global Economy: Beyond the Western-Centric Frontier* (Cambridge University Press, 2020), 22-27.

⁴⁹ Hobson, *Multicultural Origins*, 22-27.

⁵⁰ For a post-structural critique of the 'China threat' debate see Weiqing Song, "Securitization of the 'China Threat' Discourse: A poststructuralist Account," *The China Review* 15, no.5 (2015) 145-169. For an analysis of the importance of identity in the analysis of security performed by the US in the 'China threat' debate, see Chengxin Pan, "The 'China Threat' in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics," *Alternatives* 29 (2004), 305-331.

⁵¹ Hobson, *Multicultural Origins*, 22-27.

⁵¹ Although a relatively recent concept, the debate around Eurofetishism in postcolonialism has been taken up by others. See Audrey Alejandro, *Western Dominance in International Relations? The Internationalisation of IR in Brazil and India* (Oxon: Routledge, 2019), 137-168.

Conclusion

This article has examined the Western origins and predispositions of the different analysis of security. An examination of critical and post-colonial bodies of work highlighted the implications of Self and Other identities, resulting from historical processes that lay at the base of an analysis of security performed from a Western perspective and focusing on Western concerns. Here, the analyses of traditional security displayed the greatest degree of Western influence, both in their historical background as well as dominance of key contemporary security discourses. The traditional realist analysis overemphasizes the Eurocentric nation state system, which works to marginalize a range of security concerns, namely the non-military, intrastate, economic and structural sources of insecurity of the non-Western world. The critical attempts to analyse security have succeeded to a great extent in opening up the space for an agenda that prioritizes emancipation. Nonetheless, as it has been shown, these attempts still suffer from a degree of Western-centrism that stems from a lack of engagement with and questioning of their own theoretical and geographical origins.

It is therefore crucial to remain aware of the historical and cultural influence that Eurocentric assumptions exert on the analysis of security, especially where the Other's agency is concerned. For the purpose of keeping the critical project alive, it is necessary to challenge the ideas that inform the analysis of security that has contributed to an insecure world for a large portion of the globe. Here, the inclusion of other (non-Western) perspectives and agency, stemming from different societal contexts, has a two-fold role. On the one hand, perspectives are crucial in expanding the performance of security and, on the other hand, agency is key to overcome the dangerous and homogenizing binaries that can easily be inverted to produce an equally counterproductive analysis of security.