

NARRATIVES OF ALTERITY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

**CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN THE REPRESENTATION OF
THE OTHER**

By

Georgian-Marius Ghincea

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of International Relations

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master in
International Relations

Supervisor: Prof. Paul Roe

Word count: 13313

Budapest, Hungary
2018

© The copyright of the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the CEU Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

I hereby declare that this thesis contains no materials accepted for any other degrees in other institutions and no materials previously written and/or published by another person unless otherwise noted.

Abstract

This thesis examines changes in the identity representations of the Other in international politics and how these take place. Firstly, the constructivist scholarship on identity formation and on the images of the Other has been divided into two strands with different meta-theoretical commitments and which consequently see different sources for changes in the representation of the Other in state identity. This thesis suggests a way to reconcile the two strands by providing a *via media* of constructivism, which includes both exogenous and endogenous sources of change as complementary sources. This middle ground uses the complementarity of the two approaches to provide a better understanding on how identity representations of the Other change. Secondly, it proposes four different representational typologies of the Other which provide a better and clearer understanding of how international actors are and can be imagined in a layered identity.

Acknowledgement

A bit over two years ago, when I received my acceptance letter from CEU's Department of International Relations in my email, I was asking myself what would CEU have to offer me and what I could offer in return. Two years later, the answer is as natural as possible. CEU offered me the opportunity to develop as a critical thinker, it opened my eyes to a diversity of views and made me aware of my own prejudices. It goes without saying that I graduate with a significantly richer and diverse baggage of knowledge about the field than I had two years ago. But this is insignificant comparatively to the analytical and critical thinking skills I have improved or acquired while studying here.

I want to express my gratitude to my supervisor, prof. Paul Roe, who patiently helped me with his kind and useful remarks, suggestions and guidance while writing this piece of scholarship. I also want to thank him for the countless hours spent in his classes on security theory and IR and for his patience during my often tedious comments in class. He was one of the reasons I decided to come to CEU two years ago and I do not regret for a second the decision I made.

I am also grateful to several faculty members from the Department and to the staff. I am indebted to many of them for their scholarly guidance and for their professionalism. I am also very grateful to CEU for the very generous scholarship package which covered all my expenses while studying here.

To all those named and unnamed people, together with my parents, that offered their kind assistance and patiently supported me and, in some moments, my spontaneous absence, I send my deep gratitude. It goes without saying that the inevitable shortcomings are fully mine.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Identity and Change in International Relations	9
Identity and the Other	9
Constructivism: between exogenous and endogenous sources of the Other.....	17
The problem of change in identity	21
Sorting Representations of the Other	24
Temporal representations of the Other	25
Spatial representations of the Other	28
Hierarchical representations of the Other	31
Situational representation of the Other	33
Exogenous Sources of Change	37
Interaction and socialization.....	38
Altercasting	41
Endogenous Sources of Change	44
Securitization	44
Ideational displacement & competition	49
Conclusion	52
Bibliography	56

Introduction

Social constructivists posit that states, through their decision-makers, need to make sense of the world they inhabit, of themselves in it and in relation to “meaningful Others”.¹ Constructivists of different pedigree argue that this happens through crafting representations of the world, of the Self, and of the Other that constitute interests and enable action, becoming inseparable. But how do these representations change and why? And limiting our focus on the representation of the Other, are these representations, that at times arrive to constitute a hegemonic ideational configuration, the product of internal or external processes?

This thesis seeks to examine what can trigger a change in the representation of the Other in foreign policy and how this may happen. In this regard, I focus on two main objectives. First, I propose a *via media* between critical and conventional constructivists. A more nuanced approach between these two conflicting but reconcilable constructivist analytical approaches regarding identity and the representation of the Other. This middle ground uses the complementarity of the two approaches to provide a better understanding on how identity representations of the Other change. This model includes both exogenous and endogenous sources and it shows how they interact.

¹ Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identity & Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 289; Felix Berenskoetter and Yuri van Hoef, “Friendship and Foreign Policy” in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*, ed. Cameron G. Thies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

Second, I propose four different representational typologies of the Other, which provide a better and clearer understanding of how international actors are and can be imagined in a layered identity. These typologies of the Other are instrumental in the process of constituting and changing identities. Social actors are not only represented by a single representational typology but by a set of different and complementary representations which are merged together and become sedimented over time. A changing representation of the Other may be limited just to a particular typology or may have an impact on multiple layered representations. Subsequently, new representations of the Other may also be productive, having the capacity to not only facilitate the constitution of other types of representations of the Other, but also to produce them.

Identity as a concept and identity representations as a phenomenon have enjoyed large degrees of interest and support as a theoretical tool to explain political and social events and processes at different levels of analysis in International Relations.² It is a core concept for all strands of contemporary Constructivism scholarship and has even been accepted as an important concept by scholars that align themselves with more 'traditional' or 'rationalist' schools of thought in IR.³ Nonetheless or maybe consequently to its popularity, the concept has received multiple and at times contradictory readings, even when scholars have sometimes strived to give identity a

² When referring to the field of study of International Relations, I will use the capitalized form of the name.

³ Jonathan Mercer, "Anarchy and Identity" in *International Organization* 49(2) (1995): 229-230.

core, common meaning.⁴ This made it an essentially contested concept. Constructivist scholarship on identity too often fails to account for its sources and have acquired a tendency for an amalgam of “essentialist argumentation” and the reification of identity that transforms a processual phenomenon into a static *thing*.⁵

The constructivist literature on identity and the Other in IR is defined by two dominant approaches: critical and conventional constructivisms. One focuses on the endogenous construction of images of the Other that are projected outwards and another one that focuses on the exogenous and relational construction of identity and representations of the Other.⁶ These two approaches, taken separately, create the risk of missing important factors in the constitution of the Other. Conventional constructivists (e.g. Wendt 1992, 1999; Katzenstein 1999) focus mainly on the exogenous dimension at the expense of ignoring the endogenous factors that impact and contest images of the Other, while critical constructivists that focus on state-level and endogenous processes (e.g. Campbell 1992; Weldes 1999; Hopf 2002) risk to neglect the exogenous dimension and reduce the representation of the Other as just

⁴ James D. Fearon, *What is Identity (As We Now Use the Word)?* (California: Stanford University, 1999); Rawi Abdelal *et. al.* “Identity as a Variable” in *Perspectives on Politics* 4(4) (December 2006); Felix Berenskoetter, “Identity in International Relations” in *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, ed. Robert A. Denemark and Renée Marlin-Bennett (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 3602-3.

⁵ Bernd Bucher and Ursula Jasper, “Revisiting ‘identity’ in International Relations: From identity as substance to identifications in action” in *European Journal of International Relations* 23(2): 394; Charlotte Epstein, “Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics” in *European Journal of International Relations* 17(2): 329-330; Rogers Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, “Beyond “Identity”” in *Theory and Science* 29(1): 6, 8-10.

⁶ Linus Hagstrom and Karl Gustafsson, “Japan and identity change: why it matters in International Relations” in *The Pacific Review* 28(1): 2.

an endogenous image that is imposed on Others without any acquiescence on their part.⁷

In order to build a sophisticated and more nuanced argument than the existing literature, I suggest that an appropriate understanding of how representations of the Other change requires a process-based approach that escapes the trap of essentializing identity, avoids anthropomorphizing the state, and adopts a holistic and complementary view of the internal and external dimensions as sources of representation. A nuanced and de-essentialized view of how representations change requires a look at both endogenous and exogenous sources, the processes of change, the different types of representations and how these interact. As Felix Berenskoetter argues, we need not overlook that identity representations in international politics are the product of a constant negotiation between endogenous representations of the other and adaptation to a different conception of identity crafted by external others.⁸

Or, as Ted Hopf argues,

“attention should be paid not only to how state’s identities are produced in interaction with other states, but also how its identities are being produced in interaction with its own society and the many identities and discourses that constitute that society”.⁹

⁷ Felix Berenskoetter, “Identity in International Relations’ in *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, ed. Robert A. Denemark and Renée Marlin-Bennett (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 3605.

⁸ Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3603.

⁹ Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policy, Moscow, 1955 and 1999* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 294.

In order to do so, as I will argue further in this thesis, we shall need to put into question some of the very basic ideas of mainstream constructivist theory in International Relations, such as the conception of the state as an anthropomorphic and essentialized actor which conventional constructivists support.

I propose a theoretical framework with two models for crafting and changing images of the Other, one that originates endogenously and another one that initiates exogenously of the state. The main purpose is to find a middle ground that will allow for a more nuanced perspective on the topic that includes both the internal and external dimensions in the conception of the Other and how it changes.

In the first model, the image of the Other is constructed at domestic level, projected outwards and subsequently negotiated with the Other at international level. At domestic levels, inside the state, we have a constant competition between narrative representations of the Other that is employed and promoted by different political or social groups, as well as what some call 'identity entrepreneurs' inside constant processes of persuasion and competition. At times, one such representation arrives to dominate all other and defines the way the Other is perceived. This provides a stable image of the Other that subsequently enables a specific foreign policy. Once a narrative of the Other becomes dominant by acceptance or coercion, it is projected outwards and this starts an interactive negotiation with the Other, the latter accepting or rejecting its representation by the Self.

If the Other rejects the representation and behaves in unprescribed patterns, the Self will suffer from ontological dissonance and will subsequently be forced to alter its original representation of the Other.¹⁰ When a stable and dominant narrative representation of the Other is challenged at domestic level by counter-narratives promoted by various groups, the process starts again until representational stability and ontological security are re-established.

This model offers several benefits, including the de-essentialization of identity representations and avoiding anthropomorphizing of the state. In this model, the state is seen more in Michael Mann's conception of polities as "multiple overlapping and intersecting sociospatial networks of power"¹¹, or as Xavier Guillaume summarizes it, states are networks, "a bundle of processes" that becomes institutionalized¹². The domestic "bundle of processes" is separated from the wider global network through an imperfect, permeable, and fluid border that separates the in-group from the out-groups (outer-bundles of processes). In this sense, as Guillaume argues, the

¹⁰ For an interesting account of ontological dissonance see Amir Lupovici, "Ontological dissonance, clashing identities, and Israel's unilateral steps towards the Palestinians" in *Review of International Studies* 38(4): 809-833.

¹¹ Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power: A history of power from the beginning to A.D. 1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 1.

¹² Xavier Guillaume, "Unveiling the 'International': Process, Identity and Alterity" in *Journal of International Studies* 35(3): 751. For a non-essentialist perspective that sees the state as a "speaking subject", in the Lacanian tradition, see Charlotte Epstein, "Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics" in *European Journal of International Relations* 17(2): 32. For an alternative view, see Alexander Wendt, "The State as Person in International Theory" in *Review of International Studies* 30(2): 289-316.

“international” is not a *venue* where actors *interact*, but it is itself “constituted by and constitutive of the material and ideational practices of a variety of social actors”.¹³

In the second model, the image of the Other is originating exogenously through processes of socialization and through interaction. Through interaction or socialization, the domestic elite that reproduces a dominant narrative representation of the Other can be persuaded to alter its image of it or can empower competitive counter-narratives promoted by domestic groups. Alternatively, the Other can employ an “altercasting” technique that projects inwards a self-representation that can induce the Subject to treat the Other *as if* it already changed its representation of it.¹⁴ If the domestic elites that reproduce the dominant representational narrative are convinced, they will subsequently alter their image of the Other, as long as this does not result in ontological insecurity or dissonance.

These two models do not exclude the conception of identity as a layered construct, with multiple representations of the Other existing at the same time and which may be deployed or changed in various contexts and separately or together. For example, the Self could conceive the Other as both inferior and threatening but a change in the image of the Other could only be limited to one of these two representations, without

¹³ Guillaume, *Ibidem*, 748.

¹⁴ Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics” in *International Organization* 46(2): 421; Akan Malici, “Reagan and Gorbachev: Altercasting at the End of the Cold War” in *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics*, ed. Mark Schafer and Stephen G. Walker (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), 127-149.

necessarily affecting the other one. The success of changing one of the representational layers of the Other will also depend on how sedimented and institutionalized it is.¹⁵

Forward, the first chapter provides a background to scholarship on identity and the representation of the Other in the social sciences and International Relations. It will cover an overview of IR scholarship on identity, with a focus on the constitution of the Other in the actor's worldview, and subsequently the problem of change in International Relations. The second chapter will provide an account on different types of representation of the Other in International Relations, sorting disparate images that constitute the layered representation of the Other. Further, the third and fourth chapters will offer an account of the endogenous and exogenous sources of change in the representation of the Other and what processes are involved. The thesis ends with some conclusory remarks that will put my research in perspective and offer directions for further work.

¹⁵ Ole Wæver, "Identity, communities and foreign policy: Discourse analysis as foreign policy theory" in *European integration and national identity: the challenge of the Nordic states*, ed. Lene Hansen and Ole Wæver (London: Routledge, 2002), 31, 33-42.

Identity and Change in International Relations

Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think instead of identity as a 'production', which is never completed, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view problematizes the very authority and authenticity to which the term, 'cultural identity' lays claim.

- Hall 1990, 222

Identity and the Other

The problem of the Other and the production of knowledge about the Other has represented a topic of debate in the social sciences and humanities starting back to Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, in Europe. In modern philosophy, Hegel introduces in his „master-slave dialectic“ the concept of the Other as a fundamental and constitutive element and counterpart of the Self.¹⁶ Husserl conceives the Other as an *alter ego*, just a representation of Self's consciousness, while Sartre argues that the appearance of the Other alters the world, being a psychological phenomenon for the Self, while not necessarily as a threat to it.¹⁷

Also drawing from Hegel's "master-slave dialectic", Simone de Beauvoir introduced in her *The Second Sex* book the idea of the "Other" that is opposed to the Self and in a dialectical process of co-constitution. In this process, the Woman was seen as *the Other*

¹⁶ Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, tr. A. V. Miller (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

¹⁷ Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, tr. Dorion Cairns (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999); Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology* (London: Citadel Press, 2001).

in relation to the Male, in a hierarchical process of differentiation and othering. In psychoanalytical theory, which influenced several IR scholars, Lévinas argued that the Other retains ethical priority over metaphysics and, drawing from Derrida's work, that the Other can be personified through ideational representations that classify and describe the world.¹⁸ For Lacan, another psychoanalytical scholar, "the Other must first of all be considered a locus in which speech is constituted", existing more like a symbolic order than as a subject.¹⁹

In Critical Theory, scholars associated with the Frankfurt School, especially Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, focus on the mass media and social representations and imaginary of the Other. For them, the Other is an ideational product used as a tool for agenda-setting and achieving particular political goals of domination and exploitation.²⁰ This enables the producer of knowledge about the Other to mobilize societal forces towards marginalization and exploitation. Similarly, for Michel Foucault the social production of otherness is strongly linked with power and knowledge production about the world and the social actors that inhabit it. He argues that otherness is a hierarchical phenomenon in which a group *others* another group by

¹⁸ Emmanuel Lévinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (New York: Springer, 1979), 39-43.

¹⁹ Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar. Book III. The Psychoses, 1955-1956*, tr. by Russell Grigg (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997), 274.

²⁰ Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 94-98.

pointing to perceived misgivings and weaknesses that put the *othering* group as superior and stronger in contrast with the *othered* group.²¹

Another set of critical theorists from cultural and post-colonial studies have investigated the production of images and representations of the Other in hierarchical and spatial dimensions between the West and the East. Edward Said's *Orientalism* epitomizes this kind of work, looking at how the West imagined and fetishized the Oriental Other in scholarship, popular culture, and mass media. These images of the Other were characterized by misrepresentations of the Other's culture and behavior and based on an ideational perspective that facilitated and justified the colonial dominance of the Western powers over the Orient.²²

While the concept of identity and the Self and the Other dichotomy in the humanities ignited lengthy and productive debates for decades, the concept entered the social sciences quite late, in the second part of the 20th century. It diffused from psychology to sociology, anthropology and so on.²³ While Erik Erikson was introducing the concept to psychology and sociologists transformed "the Other" and otherness into one of the cornerstone concepts of the field, scholars in International Relations took a rationalist turn towards systemic analysis under the influence of micro-economics.²⁴

²¹ William Connolly, "Taylor, Foucault, and Otherness" in *Political Theory* 13(3): 371; See also Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* (New York: Vintage, 1990).

²² Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).

²³ Felix Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3596.

²⁴ Christian Reus-Smit, "Constructivism" in *Theories of International Relations*, 3rd edition, ed. Scott Burchill *et. al.* (New York: Palgrave 2005), 189.

Two great debates emerged in IR between the (neo)realists, represented primarily by Kenneth Waltz, and (neo)liberals, represented primarily by institutionalists like Joseph Nye and Robert Keohane. These two schools while dissimilar in significant aspects, shared a commitment to “rationalism” and this commitment directed them to favor particular questions at the expense of others. Questions that fit into the ontological and epistemological framework of rational choice theory. An allegiance to rational theorizing and a preference for micro-economic explanatory models made neorealist and neoliberal scholars focus only on changes in one’s behavior and what are its causes. They essentialize ideational and identity factors as stable and exogenously pre-given. What matters for scholars like Kenneth Waltz or Robert Keohane is not the nature of the state, but its capabilities. States may change their behavior, but cannot change themselves.²⁵

Therefore, “rationalism offers a fundamentally behavioral conception of both process and institutions: they change behavior but not identities and interests,” while also focusing on material factors at the expense of ideational ones.²⁶ This left little space for investigating identity, images of the Other and their impact on world politics. With the notable exception of Karl Deutsch’s work on security communities, which

²⁵ Young Chul Cho, “State Identity Formation in Constructivist Security Studies: A Suggestive Essay” in *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 13(3): 305.

²⁶ Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics” in *International Organization* 46(2): 392.

suggested the significance of a “we feeling” and the role of self-images in international relations, and Robert Jervis’s interest in perception and cognitive bias.

This ended in the late 1980s and early 1990, when it became obvious that the “traditional” theories cannot explain the historical and silent cataclysm that was the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, which no scholar predicted.²⁷ Because of this and a constant challenge from critical theory and “reflectivist” scholars, the field suffered a profound reconfiguration from which it became more diverse and Constructivism emerged as a “mainstream” school in IR.²⁸

Although most constructivists share a commitment to ideational factors in international politics, taking concepts as “identity” and “culture” seriously, as constitutive of social reality, constructivist scholarship should not be considered as a homogenous approach.²⁹ As Price and Reus-Smit once stated, “there are many constructivists, and thus perhaps many constructivisms.”³⁰ And while a distinction between different typologies of constructivism may be performed in multiple ways, according to Ted Hopf “constructivism itself should be understood in its conventional and critical variants, the latter being more closely tied to critical social theory,” while “conventional constructivism is a collection of principles distilled from critical social

²⁷ Felix Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3596.

²⁸ Christian Reus-Smit, *Ibidem*, 195.

²⁹ Young Chul Cho, *Ibidem*: 300; Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3598.

³⁰ Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism” in *European Journal of International Relations* 4(3): 264.

theory but without the latter's more consistent theoretical or epistemological follow-through."³¹

Conventional constructivism in International Relations has been especially represented by the analytical framework elaborated by Peter J. Katzenstein in *The Culture of National Security* and Alexander Wendt in his *Social Theory of International Politics*. In contrast, critical constructivism has been represented by scholarship like David Campbell's *Writing Security* and Jutta Weldes *et. al.*'s *Culture of Insecurity*, as well as by European scholars from the Copenhagen School as Lene Hansen or Ole Wæver and so on.³² Other scholars writing on identity, to name a few, are Richard Ashley (1984; 1987), Friedrich Kratochwil (1989), Nicholas Onuf (1989), Cynthia Weber (1995), Iver Neumann (1999), Roxanne Doty (1996), and Xavier Guillaume (2011).

The two strands of constructivism summarize different meta-theoretical commitments that complement the basic constructivist commitment to the significance of ideational factors as constitutive of social reality.³³ Among them, the difference is nowhere as significant as over the formation of identity.³⁴ For conventional constructivists,

³¹ Ted Hopf, 'The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory' in *International Security* 23(1): 172, 181.

³² Ted Hopf, *Ibidem*: 182; Young Chul Cho, *Ibidem* 2012: 300.

³³ Karin M. Fierke proposed a third strand of constructivism, called "consistent constructivism" and which differs and is critical of the two other strands from a linguistic perspective. It focuses on how language is put to use by social actors in their endeavor to construct their world. For more see Karin M. Fierke, "Constructivism," in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, eds. Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 177-194.

³⁴ Ted Hopf, *Ibidem*: 184; Felix Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3598-3600.

identities can be seen as explanatory variables, due to their epistemological positivism, but for critical constructivists identities are indispensable to make sense of the world and knowledge production of world affairs.³⁵ While critical constructivism borrows heavily from critical theory and philosophy, including the Hegelian master-slave dialectic, conventional constructivists adopts at times a psychoanalytical account of identity and sees identity as highly relational and exogenously given.³⁶

Conventional constructivists, being primarily interested in systemic-level analysis of world politics, adopted a lite essentialist view of state identity, while critical constructivists are committed to a non-essentialist ontology. This leads to different epistemological and theoretical approaches in empirical cases. This is maybe the crucial element where conventional and critical constructivists diverge, their commitment to some degree to foundationalist theory. Scholars like Alexander Wendt propose that states have a “corporate identity” akin to individual identity, which is “constituted by the self-organizing, homeostatic structures that make actors distinct entities”.³⁷ Therefore ascribing to state actors some essential, anthropomorphic properties that are stable and pre-social. A state’s corporate identity becomes “a site or platform for other identities”.³⁸ This represents a significant concession to rationalism, from a critical perspective, even if Wendt’s constructivism rejects

³⁵ Young Chul Cho, “Conventional and Critical Constructivist Approaches to National Security: An Analytical Survey” in *The Korean Journal of International Relations* 49(3): 76.

³⁶ Ted Hopf, *Ibidem*.

³⁷ Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 195-198, 201, 225.

³⁸ Alexander Wendt, *Ibidem*, 245.

rationalist ontology of the state, arguing that what rationalism thinks are inherent properties of the state, are in fact just contingent on the 'culture' of the international system.³⁹

Compared with this, critical constructivists reject any form of essentialization of the state and adopt a thick non-essentialist conception of the state as open, contingent, and in constant process of reproduction. For critical constructivists, states cannot exist outside the discursive practice that brings them into existence. As David Campbell argues, "states are never finished as entities [...] states are (and have to be) always in a process of becoming".⁴⁰

"The problematic of identity/difference contains, therefore, no foundations which are prior to, or outside of, its operation [...] [T]he constitution of identity is achieved through the inscription of boundaries which serve to demarcate an 'inside' from an 'outside', a 'self' from an 'other', a 'domestic' from a 'foreign'."⁴¹

For critical constructivists, states are primarily ideational and discursive products that are reproduced. They are "imagined communities"⁴². This brings us to the important question, for this research, of what are the sources of identity constitution and change.

³⁹ Young Chul Cho, *Ibidem* 2012: 309.

⁴⁰ David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 12.

⁴¹ David Campbell, *Ibidem*, 8.

⁴² For more on the debates on national identity formation in nationalism studies see Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism* (London: Routledge, 1998); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1991).

Due to different ontological and meta-theoretical commitments, the two strands of constructivism tend to focus on the constitution of identity at different levels of analysis, therefore finding different sources.

Constructivism: between exogenous and endogenous sources of the Other

Due to their different analytical interests, conventional and critical constructivisms theorize the sources of identity formation and change from different angles, that at times can be seen as complementary.⁴³ Conventional constructivism, which usually performs systemic analysis, conceives identity as exogenously given as a result of social interaction and relationships.⁴⁴ Therefore, the images of the Other, being a result of social relationships, can change as a result of exogenous mutations and changes in the interactions between the Self and the Other, as well as changes in the 'culture' that characterizes and enables or constrains a particular behavior in the international system.

In his *Social Theory of International Relations*, Alexander Wendt suggests that international anarchy is the product of the culture emerging from state interaction, not an intrinsic characteristic of the system. Therefore, he argues that actor's roles in the system can be redefined through re-scripting the social interactions and therefore

⁴³ Young Chul Cho, *Ibidem* 2012: 312; Iver B. Neumann, *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 35-6.

⁴⁴ Felix Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3603; Ayse Zarakol, "Ontological (In)security and State Denial of Historical Crimes: Turkey and Japan" in *International Relations* 24(1): 6.

changing the representation of the Self and Other.⁴⁵ For constructivists like Wendt, the images of the Other are the result of social interaction and cannot cope with unstable and processual identities. As Maja Zehfuss argues, Wendt renders state identity as circumscribable and stable, which “threatens to undermine the possibility of his constructivism” because he cannot provide an answer to how are corporate identities constituted themselves.⁴⁶ From this, we can get that while conventional constructivism may be useful at understanding exogenous identity conceptions of the Other, its usefulness to how the state crafts non-social images of the Other is highly limited.

Alternatively, critical constructivists argue that because the state is always in a process of becoming, special attention should be afforded to endogenous processes of knowledge production about the Self and the Other. They investigate the performative practices that produce the state through processes of differentiation and othering, which subsequently enables or constrains foreign policy at internal level.

Among the valuable research done on the endogenous sources of identity construction and images of the Other, David Campbell’s *Writing Security* illustrates how the U.S. foreign policy is an instrument of identity building. A tool to define the borders of the US polity through a thick differentiation between the Self and the Other, building radical images of the Other, especially in times of crisis. Through its foreign policy,

⁴⁵ Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapters 6 and 7; See also Berenskoetter, *Ibidem* 2010, 3603.

⁴⁶ Maja Zehfuss, “Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison” in *European Journal of International Relations* 7(3): 316.

says Campbell, the state constructs an idea of a distinct group and images of the Other.⁴⁷

Similarly, Jutta Weldes *et. al.* (1999) shows that the U.S. foreign policy establishment framed the Cuban missile crisis in order to rearticulate the U.S. national identity. It reemphasized the dichotomy between the U.S. Self-identity and the radical representation of the Soviet Other. It crafted an image of the Self as masculine and aggressive in opposition to a secretive and aggressive totalitarian Other.⁴⁸ This was the result of an endogenous process inside the U.S. society and elite circles, where three narratives competed to acquire dominance and to enable a particular foreign policy. Scholarship like this showcase the agency of political leaders and domestic elites and how they instrumentalize certain readings of identity and images of the Other to achieve pre-established policy objectives or to enable action.

A similar debate can also be found among scholars interested in ontological security, which are essentially focused on state identity. Ontological security, a concept introduced in the social sciences by Anthony Giddens and in International Relations by Jef Huysmans, concerns itself with the preoccupation for identity stability and coherence of social actors.⁴⁹ In this debate, Jennifer Mitzen, in her 2006 article, lines

⁴⁷ David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 12.

⁴⁸ Jutta Weldes, "The Cultural Production of Crises: U.S. Identity and Missiles in Cuba" in *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 36-40.

⁴⁹ Jef Huysmans, "Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier" in *European Journal of International Relations* 4(2).

herself with conventional constructivism by arguing that the ontological security of an actor is socially dependent and derives from relationships with the Other.⁵⁰

Siding with the critical constructivists, Brent J. Steel adopts a discursive approach to build an alternative interpretation of ontological security that situates the sources of identity representations in the internal domain. In his view, this endogenous process of identity production enables or constrains foreign policy, reframing the debates in Great Britain about an intervention in the U.S. Civil War, after Abraham Lincoln issued his Emancipation Proclamation.⁵¹

Between them, Ayşe Zarakol and Caterina Kinnvall propose a middle way that allows both endogenous and exogenous sources for constituting state identity. They acquiesce to Steele's argument that states are in a quest for a stable narrative that derives endogenously, but this quest and the subsequent stabilized narrative must necessarily consider "the intersubjective ordering of relations" and that "internalized self-notions can never be separated from self/other representations and are always responsive to new inter-personal relationships."⁵²

Therefore, while the conventional and critical approaches towards identity and its sources are divergent and based on different ontological and epistemological

⁵⁰ Jennifer Mitzen, "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma" in *European Journal of International Relations* 12(3): 341-370.

⁵¹ Brent J. Steel, "Ontological Security and the Power of Self-Identity: British Neutrality and the American Civil War" in *Review of International Studies* 31(3): 519-540.

⁵² Caterina Kinnvall, "Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security" in *Political Psychology* 25(5): 748; Ayşe Zarakol, "Ontological (In)security and State Denial of Historical Crimes: Turkey and Japan" in *International Relations* 24(1): 6.

conceptions, there is visible complementarity between the two. A complementarity that, if instrumentalized properly, can allow for a more nuanced and clear image of how identity, or the representations of the Other, are constituted. An approach that takes into consideration both the internal and external dimension of identity representations of the Other may provide a better analytical framework of investigating changes in how the representation of the Other in international politics takes place.

This middle ground is not taken because it is “easy”, but because it provides a real analytical usefulness and combines two approaches that look at narrow and different sides of the same coin. It allows for a more nuanced and holistic view of how identity representations are constituted and changed. It allows for an approach that complements the strongest elements of both conventional and critical constructivisms.

The problem of change in identity

I have discussed about how Constructivism conceives identity and what are the different sources for crafting and changing identity and images of the Other for different strands of Constructivism scholarship. But to have an answer to how these changes interrelates or affects identity, and what is change in the first place.

We can discern two contradictory views on the significance of change in constructivism theory. Ted Hopf argues that “constructivism is agnostic about change”, while Emanuel Adler posits that “if constructivism is about anything, it is

about change”.⁵³ Furthermore, Adler and Pouliot state that “change not stability is the ordinary condition of social life”.⁵⁴ Even more important, considering that critical constructivists like David Campbell argue that “states are (and have to be) always in a process of becoming”, ensues that states may be in a constant process of *change*, it is in their very nature to change. If this is the case, then how can someone investigate a social phenomenon that is characterized by change? Can we investigate changes in the images of the Other without reifying identity representations?

To answer this dilemma, I suggest that Xavier Guillaume’s conception of identity as a social continuant may provide an interesting answer. Identity is a series of meanings, a flow of intersubjective understandings about the Self and Other that possesses “a certain internal order composed of actual and possible occurrences, that is a series of subordinate processes”.⁵⁵ Identity itself is a superordinate process, one that is performed and reiterated so as to provide ontological stability, to define boundaries, and to give a sense of “naturalness”.⁵⁶ When we talk about images of the Other, we refer to a constant iterative process, with an internal logic, that perpetuates a dominant narrative of the Other that is performatively rearticulated through narratives and practice.

⁵³ Ted Hopf, “The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory” in *International Security* 23 (1): 180; Emanuel Adler, “Constructivism and International Relations” in *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 102.

⁵⁴ Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot, “International Practices” in *International Theory* 3(1): 16.

⁵⁵ Xavier Guillaume, “Unveiling the ‘International’: Process, Identity and Alterity” in *Journal of International Studies* 35(3) 749.

⁵⁶ Guillaume, *Ibidem*.

Therefore, seeing identity as a constant performative and reiterative process, it can be said that a “change” in the image of the Other represents an event that displaces the narrative process that defines a particular representation with another one or with none. A change in the representation of the Other signifies the transformation in the way the Self conceives and understands the Other. A change necessarily transforms or eliminates the internal logic of an iterative representation of the Other.

Changes in the representation of the Other can emerge both endogenously inside the state and exogenously from the international or regional level. Internally, identity representations of the Self and Other can be contested and replaced by identity entrepreneurs, securitizing actors, or even cataclysmic regime changes. Externally, the image of the other can change because of socialization, interaction or altercasting processes.

Sorting Representations of the Other

I have already alluded earlier in this thesis to the existence of different typologies of Otherness, to a variety of images of the Other which can be sorted and categorized. These categories of representations of the Other represent useful analytical tools when discussing changes that can displace certain representations. At the same time, sorting the social images of the Other can clarify identity as a layered concept that can include several representations for the same actor. As I have shown in the introduction, identity is a performative process that can assemble multiple representations of the Other, existing at the same time and which may be deployed or changed in various contexts and separately or together. These multiple representations can also play a productive function, being used to produce other images of the Other.

In the context of this thesis, we can sort and categorize identity representations of the Other in four large categories. The images of the Other can be either temporal (the Other as one's past or present), spatial (inside v. outside), hierarchical (inferior v. superior), or situational (friend v enemy or non-threatening v. threatening). Bahar Rumelili also argued that there is a multidimensional variety of representations of the Other, as well as interactions between the Self and the Other. She recognizes that there can be a coexistence between temporal, spatial, situational, and other typologies of othering.⁵⁷ Similarly, Pertti Joenniemi (2008), and Sergei Prozorov (2010) also propose

⁵⁷ Bahar Rumelili, "Constructing Identity and Relating to Difference: Understanding EU's Mode of Differentiation" in *Review of International Studies* 30(1).

that multiple modes of representation and identity relationships exist, sometimes at the same time and at times alternating.

These images can be part of a layered meta-representation of the Other, it can include one, two or more of them. Also, as Hagstrom and Gustafsson argue, these individual representations, once becoming part of one's conception of the Other, become to sediment and interact with (or build on) previously established representational layers.⁵⁸ As time passes and if they are not challenged, the process of ideational sedimentation makes them more resilient and slowly become *naturalized* and taken for granted. Some layers of the representation of the Other may change while Others may not be affected. As Wæver shows, "the deeper structures [of discourse] are more solidly sedimented and more difficult to politicize and change, but change is always in principle possible since all these structures are socially constituted".⁵⁹

Temporal representations of the Other

A first representational typology of the Other focuses on temporal distinction from the Self. Temporal images of the Other are the product of processes that conceive the Other as the past or even present of one's memory. In International Relations scholarship, Ole Wæver (1996; 1998; 2000) and Thomas Diez (2004, 2005) as some of

⁵⁸ Linus Hagstrom and Karl Gustafsson, "Japan and identity change: why it matters in International Relations" in *The Pacific Review* 28(1): 6.

⁵⁹ Quoted in Nicholas Onuf, *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in social theory and international relations* (London: Routledge, 2013), 46; Ole Wæver "Identities, Communities, and Foreign Policy: Discourse Analysis as Foreign Policy Theory," in *European Integration and National Identity*, ed. Lene Hansen and Ole Wæver (London: Routledge, 2003), 32;

the Constructivist scholars that investigated processes of “temporal othering”. These scholars argue that, in the case of Europe, the main dichotomy that defines its identity is based on a temporal representation of the Other that frames Europe’s own past as a radical Other.

Ole Wæver contends that the dominant identity narrative that defines EU’s identity is based on a temporal dichotomy that constructs a contemporary Self in opposition, and avoidance, to the Other that is defined as Europe’s own bloody past. By doing so, he argues that Europe successfully relinquishes the logic of territoriality (inside-outside) and constructs its own Self in opposition to ‘its own past which should not be allowed to become its future’⁶⁰ EU constructed its identity against the relapse to the old ‘Westphalian’, confrontational, Europe and in favor of a ‘peaceful project’.⁶¹

Similarly, Thomas Diaz (2004) argues that postwar Europe’s main mode of identity construction was based on temporal Other rather than on a spatial one. As a self-reflexive project of engaging with its own past that does not require a geographical delimitation or ‘locus of alterity’ to ascertain one’s identity. Furthermore, Diaz asserts that a temporal Other afforded Europe the possibility to construct its own identity in non-exclusionary terms and less antagonistic by eliminating the territorial Others whom it may come into conflict and instead undertook a transcendental process of

⁶⁰ Ole Wæver, “Insecurity, security, and asecurity in the West European non-war community” in *Security Communities*, ed. Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 90.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, 100.

overcoming its past and avoiding repeating it in the future. In this sense, Europe's temporal Other was against its own memory of 'spatial othering' that characterized the Westphalian system.

Even though both Wæver and Diaz emphasize the preeminence of a temporal Other in Europe's process of constituting its post-war subjectivity, they acknowledge that more recently the European identity narratives that focus on spatial differentiation (internal-external dichotomy) may gain more resonance. Wæver even argued that a "more substantial foreign and security policy" for the EU may represent an attractive option for fostering a stronger sense of European identity that may be based on spatial Other(ing) rather than on a temporal one.⁶² In a similar vein, Diaz states that the re-geopoliticisation of European identity, that was visible at the time he was writing his piece, may result in a transition towards modes of spatial and geopolitical representations of the Other, even though he maintains his belief that the identity project based on temporal othering is still viable.⁶³ In a critique of both, Sergei Prozorov also argues an alternating representation of the Other that derives that an actor's reflexive transcendence from its own past "leads to the need for its delimitation from Others and the resurgence". Therefore, to a spatial, ontological differentiation by building borders between the Self and alternative spatial Others.⁶⁴

⁶² Ole Wæver, "European Security Identities" in *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(1): 263.

⁶³ Thomas Diaz, "Europe's Other and the Return to Geopolitics" in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17(2): 328-333.

⁶⁴ Sergei Prozorov, "The other as past and present: beyond the logic of "temporal othering in IR theory" in *Review of International Studies* 37: 1273-1293.

Spatial representations of the Other

A second representational typology of the Other focuses on the spatial distinction from the Self. Spatial images of the Other are essentially the ones that define the borders of identity by identifying an in-group from an out-group. Among Constructivist scholars, David Campbell (1998), Iver Neumann (1998, 1999), Christopher Browning (2003), Lene Hansen (2006), Stephanie Anderson (2008) could be identified as main scholars that have approached identity representations of the Other from this a more spatial perspective. These scholars, while not disregarding the temporal processes of constructing Others, emphasize the primacy of spatial othering. In his investigation on the role of the U.S. foreign policy, David Campbell (1998) argues that foreign policy should be considered a practice of making foreignness, creating the Self/Other dichotomy by defining the borders of the Self, differentiating the inside from the outside. He contends that statehood is maintained through regulated performative processes that create stable identities mainly through spatial differentiation. As I have already shown, for him states are never finished entities and their *raison d'être* is the articulation of danger to have a purpose to exist.⁶⁵ Therefore, foreign policy and the “international” exist because of topological distinctiveness between the actors in the system that is created through these performative processes of differentiation.⁶⁶ While Campbell work focuses on the United States, which he

⁶⁵ David Campbell, *Ibidem*, 18.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, 80-81; See also Sergei Prozorov, “The other as past and present: beyond the logic of ‘temporal’ othering in IR theory” in *Review of International Studies* 37: 1274.

argues is a “special case” due to the centrality of these performative practices in the United States, Thomas Diez (2004) and Iver Neumann (1998) have shown that that is not necessarily the case. They argue that it may very well be also applied to Europe or Russia, respectively.

Lene Hansen (2006) mostly supports Campbell’s reasoning in this matter, implicitly emphasizing the territorial Other as essential in foreign policy, but without discounting other types of differentiation. She argues that “foreign policy relies upon representations of identity, but it is also through the formulation of foreign policy that identities are produced and reproduced” and that “[t]he ontological conception of identity as both a precondition for and as constituted through foreign policy has epistemological consequences”.⁶⁷ We cannot understand foreign policy without knowing towards whom it is directed, who are its subjects, how they differ from the Self and how they can be transformed, therefore designing forms of special othering. As she continues, “foreign policies need to ascribe meaning to the situation and to construct the objects within it, and in doing so they articulate and draw upon specific identities of other states, regions, peoples, and institutions as well as on the identity of a national, regional, or institutional Self.”⁶⁸

Iver Neumann, in his long scholarship on identity and the Other in international politics, has also emphasized the role of geopolitics in delineating the inside from the

⁶⁷ Lene Hansen, *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War* (London: Routledge, 2006), 1, 20.

⁶⁸ Lene Hansen, *Ibidem*, 6.

outside. He also focused and the importance of spatial exclusion, the role of foreign policy in defining state's frontiers, and the role of Russia as a spatial and cultural Other.⁶⁹ Christopher Browning, in his discussion of the "external/internal security paradox" characterizing the European foreign policy, also engages in the construction and reconstruction of boundaries through the practice of foreign policy. Studying the case of Kaliningrad, he argues that the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy "give the EU a unified political subjectivity in external affairs" and "in order to be an actor and subject in world politics, one needs to have clearly defined boundaries". And while he recognizes, drawing from Kelstrup and Williams, that in EU has a somewhat ambiguous relationship with this territorial logic, in "EU's own external relations, much the same logic is often reproduced".⁷⁰ For him, borders are not the impermeable edges of a predefined subjectivity, but sites of interaction where subjectivity is actually negotiated. Or, as Paasi puts it, borders are not simply lined on the ground but are also "manifestations of social practice and discourse."⁷¹

Other scholars, as the prominent work of Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations*, conceive the Other by distinguishing the Other from the Self, in an in-group v. out-

⁶⁹ Iver Neumann, "Russia as Europe's other" in *Journal of Area Studies* 6(12): 26-73; "Self and other in international relations" in *European Journal of International Relations* 2(2): 139-174; "The Geopolitics of Delineating "Russia" and "Europe". The Creation of the "Other" in European and Russian Tradition" in *Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe. Security, Territory, and Identity*, ed. Ola Tunander, Paul K. Baev, and Victoria Ingrid Eingel (London: PRIO, 1997); *Uses of the Other: "the East" in European identity formation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); "European identity, EU expansion, and the integration/exclusion nexus" in *Alternatives* 23(3): 397-416.

⁷⁰ Christopher Browning, "The Internal/External Security Paradox and the Reconstruction of Boundaries in the Baltic: The Case of Kaliningrad" in *Alternatives* 28: 558.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*: 563; Anssi Paasi, "Region and place: regional identity in question" in *Progress in Human Geography* 27(4).

group, at civilizational level. He constructs Latin-American immigrants and Islam as unassimilable and threatening Others that are securitized. His representation of the Other is substantially spatial, delimitating the West as a cultural and territorial entity from the Other. At the same time, he implicitly differentiates the Self as superior to an inferior Other, showcasing a multiple and layered image of the Other.

Hierarchical representations of the Other

A third representational typology of the Other rests on the hierarchical distinction from the Self. Hierarchical images of the Other are essentially the ones that define the status of the Self in the international system. It does so by defining the Other in relation to the Self as inferior, superior, equal, or as having an ambiguous and unsettled power/status. Hierarchical representation of the Other play a fundamental role in the international identity of the Self, enabling or constraining an expansion of the Self and enhancing or diminishing one's self-esteem and confidence. Hierarchies are systems which organize actors into "vertical relations of super- and subordination", from which identity status roles emerge.⁷² Drawing from Hagstrom and Gustafsson, it can be argued that, usually, a hierarchical representation vis-a-vis Other represents a structural part of one's self-representation. It constitutes, in many cases, one of the most sedimented representations of the Other in relation to its own status in the international community of states.

⁷² Janice Bially Mattern and Ayse Zarakol, "Hierarchies in World Politics" in *International Organization* 70(3): 627.

In the social sciences, post-colonial and International Relations scholars have been interested in the “superior-inferior” identity dichotomy in the relation between the West and the East in politics, culture, and so on. Hierarchical representations of the Other in international politics are interlinked with power structures in the system, be it economic, military, or cultural. Power maintains and imposes hierarchical representations of the Other, safeguards and propagates accepted identity representations, while at the same time marginalizes and excludes alternative images.⁷³

For instance, in Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, which investigates the production of knowledge about the Other, we can see how social international relations are defined hierarchically through the use of power. Orientalism as a knowledge production phenomenon perpetuates a hierarchy of domination and subordination, or weakness and strength, between the Occident as Self and Orient as Other.⁷⁴ His account of how the West constituted the image of the non-Western Other is defined by a hierarchical and dichotomous differentiation. The Other is depicted as inferior, weak, uncivilized, feminized, in total contrast to the superior, strong, civilized, masculine, and rational West. This depiction of the Orient enabled the Western powers imperialism and colonialism by rationalizing a *natural* hierarchical relationship of domination and submission. And by using the “civilizing mission” of the West as a justification of imposing colonial rule over the South. Hierarchical representations of the Other are a

⁷³ Richard N. Lebow, “Identity and International Relations” in *International Relations* 22(4): 476.

⁷⁴ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

productive force in international politics, enabling or constraining foreign policy by the way the Self-conceives itself and how it represents the Other in relation to itself.⁷⁵

Another case is European Union's description of as a "normative power". Edward Keene shows that Ian Manners' so popular scholarly and policy concept arises from a hierarchical conception of the world by defining Europe's Other as inferior. The EU is imagined as having a sort of entitled leadership as an international actor which behavior, values, and norms should be followed by the other actors in the system. By imagining the Other as *in need* of adopting European norms and Europe as an entitled social actor to persuasively promote its norms, the EU constructs for itself a representational model to which other international actors must implicitly defer to.⁷⁶

Situational representation of the Other

A fourth and last representational typology of the Other rests on the situational differentiation from the Self. By "situational representations" I essentially understand the way an actor conceives its relations to the Other in terms of affability or hostility. It describes the Other in threatening or non-threatening terms. Situational representations of the Other tend to be contextually-dependent and at times ambiguous. These representations refer to temporal and contextual subject positions that shape the meaning of action and their roles. In the end, affable or hostile

⁷⁵ See more on the productive nature of hierarchies in international politics and how borders must also be seen as sites of power, inequality, and production of hierarchies in Jutta Weldes, *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

⁷⁶ Edward Keene, "Social status, social closure and the idea of Europe as a 'normative power'" in *European Journal of International Relations* 19(4): 950.

representations of the Other depend significantly on the decision and incentives of foreign policy elites to focus on the similarity (relationality) or distinctiveness (individuality) from the Other.⁷⁷

Regarding situational representations of the Other, constructivist International Relations scholarship is split into two theoretical approaches. On the one side, there is the swath of scholars that conceive the Other as threatening, in opposition to the Self, adopting a dualist conception of good v. evil in theorizing identity difference. Scholars like David Campbell conceive the Other in necessarily negative terms, as for him the identification of a radical Other is a prerequisite for manifesting national identity delimitating boundaries.⁷⁸ For Campbell, the radical Other is an endogenous product crafted in order to guard and define Self-identity, with little input from the Other itself. This position has been highly criticized for conceptualizing the Other as monolithic and because it reifies state identity (“states need enemies”).

Similarly, but from a more sociological perspective, Jennifer Mitzen also emphasizes the routine practice of constructing hostile and threatening Others in order to maintain or achieve ontological security.⁷⁹ For her, the need for “ontological security leads states to become locked into relationships of rivalry”⁸⁰. Last, Copenhagen School

⁷⁷ Felix Berenskoetter, “Friends, There Are No Friends? An Intimate Reframing of the International” in *Journal of International Studies* 35(3): 657.

⁷⁸ David Campbell, *Ibidem*.

⁷⁹ Jennifer Mitzen, “Ontological Security in World Politics. State Identity and the Security Dilemma” in *European Journal of International Relations* 12(30):341–370.

⁸⁰ Quoted in Felix Berenskoetter, “Friends, There Are No Friends? An Intimate Reframing of the International” in *Journal of International Studies* 35(3): 659.

scholarship, especially by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, has dedicated significant space to processes of constructing the Other as an existential threat through endogenous processes of securitization, enabling action and changing the worldview of an audience.⁸¹

On the other side, another group of constructivist scholars has shown that framing Others as friends is also a common practice that may result from socialization processes or perceived common bonds. Felix Berenskoetter, in his work on friendship and foreign and security policy, shows that affable images of the Other are quite common at bilateral levels, visible in multiple *friendship* agreements, public declarations about “special” relationships and so on.⁸² While international friendships are based on a common normative and emotional bond that allows for common or similar behavior and interests, these are facilitated by identity representations of the Other.

While the radical representation of the Other can emerge from both endogenously and exogenously sources, positive representations tend to emerge usually through exogenous sources, especially by interaction and socialization. Similarly, Lene Hansen, disagreeing with David Campbell, gives the example of the Northern identity, which has adopted a non-radical, positive representation of their *significant*

⁸¹ Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework of Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998).

⁸² Felix Berenskoetter and Yuri van Hoef, “Friendship and Foreign Policy” in *Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*, ed. Cameron Thies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Other.⁸³ The Scandinavian countries have successfully forged a collective identity that emphasizes the similarities between the actors at the expense of focusing on what differentiates them.

Situational representations of the Other are significant and quite usual in international politics, deriving from both endogenous and exogenous sources. Nevertheless, friendly images of the Other may originate more frequently from exogenous sources, but an endogenous interpretation is still a prerequisite for this to happen. These representations are performative and productive, being built upon older and more sedimented representations. At the same time, these have the capacity to enable the production of new images of the Other, like spatial representations.

⁸³ Lene Hansen, *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War* (London: Routledge, 2006).

Exogenous Sources of Change

As I have shown, the representations of the Other in international politics can have exogenous and endogenous sources, originating from social dynamics inside the state or outside of it. The exogenous sources of change in the images of the Other are significant in the constitution of identity representations, though not the only ones and these do not exist in a vacuum. The borders between the domestic and the international are, as I have mentioned somewhere else in this thesis, imperfect, permeable, and fluid. Therefore, it would be unjustifiable to think that exogenous sources of change cannot influence endogenous productions of change and the other way around. Exogenous and endogenous productions of knowledge about the Other are in a constant interdependence and may co-constitute each other.

In this chapter, I will discuss about exogenous sources of change in the representation of the Other and how these changes may appear. In this regard, I will focus on emphasizing two social processes which I consider to be the ones throughout which change can happen. These two are socialization and altercasting processes, which appear and exist as a consequence of the social interaction between multiple actors in the international system. Further, I will show how these two constitutive and performative processes function and how they produce changes in one's representation of the Other.

Interaction and socialization

Socialization as a concept represents one of the central and most essential theoretical tools for constructivists. Socialization is a dynamic process through which identity is constituted and changed through the internalization of norms, values, modes of behavior, and ideational representations. Through socialization, actors are altering their own conception of social reality and their self- and other identity representations.

Socialization processes presuppose an interaction between structure, processes, and agency. These three play important roles in the process of norm internalization which facilitates and conduces change. Therefore, socialization has constitutive effects, changing the identity of the actor and consequently its representation of the Other, through re-categorization.⁸⁴

When discussing the socialization of international actors like states, analysts need to consider the nature of the state and its agency. As I have shown earlier, here is the disjunction point between conventional and critical constructivists. Conventional constructivist, adopting a lite essentialization of the state, prefer to anthropomorphize the state, giving it human-like characteristics. This allows scholars like Alexander Wendt to basically ignore the endogenous domain, focusing only on international social interaction.⁸⁵ On the other hand, critical constructivists look at the state, not like

⁸⁴ Trine Flockhart, "Complex Socialization: A Framework for the Study of State Socialization" in *European Journal of International Relations* 12(1): 91.

⁸⁵ See Alexander Wendt, "Collective Identity Formation and the International State" in *American Political Science Review* 88(2): 388-89.

an anthropomorphic entity, but as a constituted abstraction that is represented and in which name several individuals act.⁸⁶ Therefore, the socialization process presupposes that the individuals that are representing the state become socialized, are socializing each other until the point when the new ideational and representational framework becomes institutionalized and naturalizes by changes in behavior, policy, legislation, and identity perceptions. As Jutta Weldes argues, “the meaning which objects, events and actions have for ‘the states’ are necessarily the meaning they have for those individuals who act in the name of the state”.⁸⁷

And if we look at states not only as abstract entities but also as networks of processes, in which different domestic social groups compete to represent the state, then we can build a processual socialization model that draws from Social Identity Theory. Social Identity Theory emphasizes social perception and interdependence as catalysts underlying situational differentiations and cleavages in a social environment.⁸⁸ Social actors throughout the socialization process become to develop a “wee feeling” that changes the identity representation that the actor had about the other actors’ part of the socializing collective and adopts a common conception of the Other. By adopting a common set of meanings which are derived from “associate levels of identification, salience, and knowledge within- and out-group membership”.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Trine Flockhart, *Ibidem*: 93; Constance Duncombe, „Foreign policy and the politics of representation: The West and its Others” in *Global Change, Pace & Security* 23(1): 32.

⁸⁷ Jutta Weldes, *Ibidem*, 280.

⁸⁸ Gail Maloney and Ian Walker, *Social Representations and Identity: Content, Process, and Power* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan 2007).

⁸⁹ Henry Tajfel and John Turner quoted in Constance Duncombe, *Ibidem*: 36.

While interaction and socialization originate exogenously to the state, the process of internalization of meanings, values and identity representations is also having an endogenous component. Interaction and socialization processes produce knowledge about the Other that is interpreted domestically and different internal groups can interpret the same interaction in a different way. Therefore, internalization and socialization that results in a change in the representation of the Other depend not only on the exogenous process of interaction but also by the endogenous process of interpretation. Inside the state, different social groups may compete to impose their own interpretation of events and the underlying reasons for the behavior of the Other. Altercasting attempts can promote a variety of representations, but I would argue that are most effective when they attempt to change situational and hierarchical representations of the Other.

The recent Ukrainian conflict reflects very well the role of interaction in defining identity representations of the Other. When Russia started a hybrid war in Ukraine and annexed the Crimea Peninsula, in 2013, the underlying reasons for its actions received different interpretations from social groups in the West, especially from the United States. Some social groups, represented by individuals like Henry Kissinger, interpreted the Russian actions as benign in nature, driven by security concerns and a desire to avoid encirclement from the West. Other groups have interpreted Russia's actions as a malign and driven by a revisionist desires. While the sources of the changing image of Russia have been exogenous in nature, these are mediated by

endogenous interpretations that subsequently alter the representation of the Other and enable a particular policy congruent with the dominant interpretation.

When it comes to socialization processes, the “Europeanization” process undertaken by the European Union and NATO in Central and Eastern Europe represents such an example of creating a ‘wee feeling’. The Europeanization process presupposed the adoption, by the Central and Eastern European states of a new representational category for the members of the EU, as a “we-group”, and to differentiate them from the rest of members of the international system. Socialization, and in this case Europeanization, consists in adopting a sense of belonging to a community with a similar worldview and with which the actors focus on the similarities, not the differences between them. These processes change not only the representation of the Others that become part of the “we group”, but also the representation of third actors, which becomes common for the group.⁹⁰

Altercasting

Altercasting as a persuasion process in international relations represents another exogenous source for representations of the Other. Altercasting is a process of strategic interaction which leads to the construction of new identities. It could be described as “where alter casts ego in the role that alter wants ego to play and acts according to this script in the expectation that, by acting in this way, ego will exhibit the desired

⁹⁰ Trine Flockhart, “‘Complex Socialization’: A Framework for the Study of State Socialization” in *European Journal for International Relations* 12(1): 95. See also Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) for a larger study on security communities and the constitution of a “we feel” in international politics.

behavior”⁹¹ and if this attempt is successful, ego adopts a new identity. Therefore, we can understand altercasting as an attempt to induce a social actor to adopt a new identity, and consequently a new representation of the Other, by “treating it as if it already had that identity”.⁹² If the actor acquiesces, then it will adopt a new intersubjective representation of the Other. In this way, both actors are mutually co-constituting each-others identity. An actor can do this through both changing behavior and deliberately distorted propaganda which can influence the foreign policy elites of the targeted actor.

In our model, the Other attempts to change the representation that the Self has by adopting a new behavior and employing other strategic techniques. Consequently, the Self will observe a discrepancy between the behavior prescribed by its representation of the Other and the actual behavior. This will result in a representational dissonance which will require a reassessment of Self’s representation of the Other. The reassessment is an endogenous process which presupposes a competition between different interpretations, promoted by different domestic social groups, which will subsequently construct a new representation of the Other. But because there is a competition between distinct and sometimes contradictory interpretations, altercasting attempts are not necessarily always successful. If the new representation

⁹¹ Nicholas J. Wheeler, *Trusting Enemies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 128-9; See also Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics” in *International Organization* 46(2): 402-4, 421; *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999), 346.

⁹² Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics” in *International Organization* 46(2): 421.

is not the one desired by the Other, the two actors become engaged in a process of negotiating identities. Therefore, an altercasting attempt does not take away the agency of the Self, which still needs to acquiesce to the new representation and this acquiescence results from endogenous processes of competitive interpretation.

Endogenous Sources of Change

As I have already argued, exogenous and endogenous sources of change represent the two sides of the same coin and are complementary. Representations can equally emerge from endogenous sources, as a consequence of domestic social interactions. These domestic images of the Other arrive to define foreign policy behavior as representations that are originating exogenously, and no domestic representation of the Other is constituted in a vacuum. An interdependence exists between endogenous and exogenous sources, co-constituting each other and building on previous representations, which have become more sedimented in the state imaginary.

In this chapter, I will discuss about endogenous sources of change in the image of the Other and how this change as a result of domestic discursive and social interaction, practices and structural changes in form of the state and society. In this regard, I will focus on two social events that emerge domestically and which have the potential to alter the representation of the Other. These two are securitization processes and ideational displacement that results from domestic regime changes. Further, I will show how these two performative and productive processes function and how the representation of the Other changes consequently to them.

Securitization

Securitization processes represent one of the most significant endogenous processes which can alter societal and state representations of the Other. Securitization is a social process that transforms an un-political or politicized issue into a security matter, a

threat, through an interactive and discursive presentation and negotiation between a securitizing actor and an audience about its representation of the Other.⁹³

For the Copenhagen School, which proposed the concept, security is contingent on the way an issue is constructed as an “existential threat” to a referent object in a particular context. In this sense, security is a form of self-referential practice that is contextually contingent, discursively constructed, and performative. For securitization scholars, an issue becomes a security matter when it is rhetorically declared as an existential threat to the survival of something valued by a referent object, which takes it out of the reach of “regular” politics and into the sphere of the extraordinary.⁹⁴

For this to be done, A securitization process requires a securitizing actor that initiates a *securitization move*, a referent object to be protected by the securitizing actor, and an audience to be convinced by and which needs to acquiesce to the representational narrative performed by the securitizing actor. If the securitization process is successful, the audience and the decision-makers adopt a new ideational representation and this enables the security actors to use extraordinary measures to deal with the perceived security threat. Due to the prominence of the state as a provider of the three types of security (physical security, ontological security, and

⁹³ Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework of Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998), 18.

⁹⁴ Buzan *et. al.*, *Ibidem*, 23-24; Michael C. Williams, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics” in *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 513.

social security) and central role in international politics, it remains the main referent object in securitization attempts, even if it is may not be the only one.⁹⁵

Therefore, we can see that the concept of securitization is inseparably linked to identity and ideational representations about the world and the Other, representing the cornerstone of concept. In the case of identity representation, a domestic actor can initiate a securitization process with the intention of changing the representation that the audience, formed by the legislature or the general public, has about the Other, in order to facilitate a specific foreign policy action. Securitization moves promote, primarily, alternative situational and spatial representations of the Other. It redefines the Other as an existential threat (situational representation) to the Self or something valued by the Self and by doing so it reconstitutes the borders of Self-identity by excluding the Other as not part of the “we” group (spatial representation).

Therefore, the situational representation promoted by the securitizing actor is not only performative but also productive in the sense that it produces also other representations. David Campbell argued similarly when he stated that states are using “radical othering” (e.g. securitization of the Other) as a mechanism of redefining the borders of the Self in moments of an identity crisis.⁹⁶ And while securitization processes are contextually dependent and are built on pre-conceptions about the Other, there is no required interaction between the Self and the Other until the

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*, 36.

⁹⁶ David Campbell, *Writing Security* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

securitization move has been successful and the state representation of the Other changed. Therefore, the sources of change in the representation of the Other are endogenously and only after the securitization move is successful the exogenous factors start to play a significant role.

When a securitization process is successful and the new representation of the Other enables a new state behavior, the interaction with the Other gains significant relevance. The acceptance by the Other of the role assigned by the Self is instrumental in the success of the new securitized representation. The Other must explicitly accept the new role or at least must not actively contest its new representation. The acceptance of its new representation reinforces the identity of the Self and its basic assumptions. But if the Other refuses to acquiesce to the role representation assigned by the Self and behaves in erratic and unprescribed ways, then the Self will start to suffer from dissonance.⁹⁷ If the behavior prescribed by the identity representation does not match with the actual behavior, then the Self will find itself in need of reassessing its own representation and assumptions of the Other, starting again the domestic process of imagining the Other.

Examples of such cases abound in international relations, such as the securitization of terrorism by the George W. Bush administration, after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when

⁹⁷ Elisabeth Johansson-Nogues, "Is the EU's Foreign Policy Identity an Obstacle? The European Union, the Northern Dimension and the Union for the Mediterranean" in *European Political Economy Review* 9: 26-7; Alexander Wendt, "On constitution and causation in International Relations" in *International Studies* 24(5).

the U.S. discourse divided the world between the liberal and law-abiding “We” and the barbaric, terrorist-sponsor and dictatorial Other.⁹⁸

Another explanatory case is the relationship between the U.S. and North Korea. Gradually after the end of the Cold War, the United States attributed to North Korea the role of one of the most important rivals in the world. Consecutive U.S. administrations have securitized North Korea and its nuclear program as an existential threat to the U.S. possessions and allies in East Asia and to world peace. While these securitization processes originated endogenously and sometimes were for domestic consumption, this representation of North Korea is reinforced by the defiant and rejectionist foreign policy adopted by Pyongyang. The North Korean regime thrives by receiving so much attention from the U.S. and it allows the Pyongyang regime to maintain its own radical representation of the U.S. as its main enemy and threat, enabling an antagonistic and highly dysfunctional interaction between the two states. Another such example is the securitization of Iraq’s Saddam Hussein regime as an existential threat to the U.S., the United Kingdom, and international peace before the 2003 Iraqi war, which changed the situational and spatial representation of Iraq as a threat (situational representation) and an outcast of the international community (spatial representation).

⁹⁸ Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia, *Frontiers of Fear: Immigration and Insecurity in the United States and Europe* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press 2012); Bryan Mabee, “Re-imagining the Borders of US Security after 9/11: Securitization, Risk, and the Creation of the Department of Homeland Security” in *Globalizations* 4(3).

Therefore, securitization processes are a significant modern strategy for changing identity representations of the Other by crafting radical otherness and redefining the borders that differentiate the Self from the Other. While this thesis does not have the purpose to investigate the origins of interests that securitizing actors have, we need to note that securitization processes show that interests may constitute identity and therefore it puts into question the main constructivist axiom which argues that identity constitute interests and not the other way around. Further research may be needed to establish if maybe identity and interests are not co-constituting each other in larger social processes that include material factors.

Ideational displacement & competition

Another endogenous event which can initiate a change in the representation of the Other is what I call “ideational displacement”. An ideational displacement can take place in two ways: as a result of a revolution or a polarizing domestic competition that results in the marginalization of the dominant worldview. Both are similar, requiring a significant revamp of the domestic power structures.

Firstly, an ideational displacement may happen because of an event of cataclysmic dimensions which destroys the paradigmatic conception of the world and the identity of the Self. An ideational displacement at the state level can be represented by a structural political and social revolution which changes the ideational paradigm dominant until that moment and the identity representations of the Self and the Other. A change that is substantially different from the previous ideational structure that

defined the culture, identity, and consequently the foreign policy behavior of the state. Such events which have caused ideational displacements that changed the foreign policy representation of the Other have been the October Revolution in Russia, the Islamic Revolution in Iran, and, to some degree, the French Revolution.⁹⁹ While in all these cases exogenous factors played a role in the subsequent changes in the representation of the Other, the core of these events had endogenous sources.

Secondly, ideational displacements may occur because of domestic competition between different social groups which engage in a political and social confrontation over the representation of the Other, part of a larger confrontation over foreign policy. This type of ideational displacement is different from the previous one due to its limited impact on overall state policy and on the society. It affects more the policy and political elite more than the entire structure of the society, even though it requires input from larger social groups, especially in liberal democracies.

Different groups, with different world views and representations of the Other, may arrive to achieve policy dominance as a consequence of larger societal transmutations which may not necessarily be linked with foreign policy. A long-term economic recession may alienate the electorate against the status quo elite and bring into power marginal political groups, for domestic economic reasons, which also results in a

⁹⁹ For the effects on the Russian foreign policy of the October Revolution see Richard K. Debo, *Revolution and Survival: The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia 1917-18* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979). For the Iranian case see Shahram Akbarzadeh and James Barry, "State Identity in Iranian Foreign Policy" in *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 43(4): 613-629; Mhdi Mohammad Nia, "Discourse and Identity in Iran's Foreign Policy" in *Iranian Review of Foreign Affairs* 3(3): 29-64.

redefinition in the endogenous image of the Other. While exogenous factors may place various roles in this process, the main core remains endogenously. Therefore, the representation of the Other changes may be just epiphenomenal and linked with other, primary social or political processes.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I sought to discuss the changes in the representations of the Other that actors involved in international politics have. To that end, the thesis was concerned with two issues. The first one referred to the meta-theoretical debate between conventional and critical constructivists on the sources of constitution and change of identities and the representations of the Other. The two constructivist approaches have adopted different ontological and epistemological assumptions, which created a scholarship cleavage by focusing on different aspects of identity creation.

These differences must not be necessarily being considered irreconcilable but more as complementary. Therefore, I proposed a middle ground between the two approaches, a *via media* of constructivism, which includes both approaches in a bifurcate theoretical model that allows for exogenous and endogenous sources of change in identity and the representation of the Other. This new theoretical framework allows for a more nuanced perspective that takes into account the variety of sources which can constitute and change identity and how they interrelate. It sees both exogenous and endogenous sources as possible prime originators of change but also as important factors which can affect changes that initiate from alternative sources.

In this regard, I illustrate my argument by analyzing two exogenous and two endogenous potential sources of change in the representation of the Other. Socialization and altercasting as exogenous originators of change and domestic

securitization processes and ideational displacement as endogenous sources. These should not necessarily be considered as the only ones.

The second one considers the existence of a multilayered set of representations of the Other which is part of the identity of an actor. These layers of representations can be differentiated in several typologies, each one of them offering a particular image of the Other and building on older, more sedimented, representations. The four typologies (temporal, spatial, hierarchical, situational) I propose provide a clearer understanding of how states represent the Other. It provides an answer to why sometimes some aspects of an actor's overall perception of the Other changes without affecting other aspects. Changing a situational representation of the Other may not necessarily result in a change in other, more sedimented, representations (e.g. hierarchical). I also expose not only the performative character of these representations but also their productive nature. Their ability to constitute or to facilitate the production of new representations of the Other.

Another issue that arouses from this thesis is if there is a difference between constitution and change of what it is already constituted. While I acquiesce that most the literature covered in this thesis refers primarily to the constitution of identity and some may question a distinction between the constitution and change, my preference for the concept of change has some basis. My primary reason rests on my doubt that the *primordial* process of constituting identity, because of both exogenous and endogenous sources or separately, is the same with the social process of re-

constitution that takes place when actors already have an identity. I am unsure that we can talk about the re-constitution of one's identity as if there is nothing before it, because it is. Older representations may still play a role in the process of changing them, which cannot be said about the *primordial* process because we assume that there was nothing before, no representation of which remnants may influence the new construction.

Following these two main issues, this thesis has been divided into three chapters. The first one covers the intra-constructivist debate between the conventional and critical strands of scholarship that encompass this approach. I have illustrated the main differences, similarities, and conflicts of current scholarship on identity and the representation of the Other while showing their complementary role and possibility for building an integrated theoretical framework that permits for a more holistic view of the issue. The second chapter covered different typologies of representations of the Other, following the argument I presented earlier. The four typologies showcase their instrumentality, productive nature, but also their interrelation. Where possible, I have illustrated them with historical or contemporary examples. The third and last chapter covered the two types of sources of change in the representation of the Other, exogenous and endogenous. Here again, historical and empirical cases help us understand better how these social processes initiate changes in the images of the Other.

Finally, this thesis shows not only how representations of the Other may change, but also that these changes are part of larger social dynamics which are not yet fully theorized. This allows for further inquiry into the nature of identity constitution and change, as well as into how other social processes or non-social factors may affect changes in the structure of identity. Are interests deriving only from one's identity or is there also a co-constitutive dynamic? Why are some representations become sedimented and institutionalized while others do not? These are just a few of the questions which may require further inquiry.

Bibliography

- Abdelal, Rawi, Yoshiko M. Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and McDermott Rose. "Identity as a Variable." *Perspectives on Politics* 4, no. 4 (2006): 695-711.
- Adler, Emanuel. "Constructivism and International Relations." In *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Adler, Emanuel, and Vincent Pouliot. "International Practices." *International Theory* 3, no. 1 (2011): 1-36.
- Akbarza, Sharham, and James Barry. "State Identity in Iranian Foreign Policy." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 43, no. 4 (2016): 613-629.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Berenskoetter, Felix. "Friends, There Are No Friends? An Intimate Reframing of the International." *Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 3 (2007): 647-676.
- Berenskoetter, Felix. "Identity in International Relations." In *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, by Robert A. Denemark, & Marlin-Bennet Renée, 3594-3607. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Berenskoetter, Felix, and Yuri van Hoef. "Friendship and Foreign Policy." In *Oxford Encyclopedia of Foreign Policy Analysis*, by Cameron G. Thies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Browning, Christopher. "The Internal/External Security Paradox and the Reconstruction of Boundaries in the Baltic: The Case of Kaliningrad." *Alternatives* 28, no. 5 (2003): 545-581.
- Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. "Beyond 'identity'." *Theory and Science* 29, no. 1 (2000): 1-47.
- Bucher, Bernd, and Jasper Ursula. "Revisiting 'identity' in International Relations: From identity as substance to identifications in action." *European Journal of International Relations* 23, no. 2 (2017): 391-415.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework of Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1998.
- Campbell, David. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

- Chul Cho, Young. "Conventional and Critical Constructivist Approaches in National Security: An Analytical Survey." *The Korean Journal of International Relations* 49, no. 3 (2009): 75-102.
- Chul Cho, Young. "State Identity Formation in Constructivist Security Studies: A Suggestive Essay." *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 2012: 299-316.
- Connolly, William E. "Taylor, Foucault, and Otherness." *Political Theory*, 1985: 365-376.
- d'Appolonia, Ariane Chebel. *Frontiers of Fear: Immigration and Insecurity in the United States and Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Debo, Richard K. *Revolution and Survival: The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia 1917-1918*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Diaz, Thomas. "Europe's Other and the Return to Geopolitics." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17, no. 2 (2004): 319-335.
- Duncombe, Constance. "Foreign policy and the politics of representation: The West and its Others." *Global Change, Peace and Security* 23, no. 1 (2011): 31-46.
- Epstein, Charlotte. "Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 17, no. 2 (2010): 327-350.
- Fearon, James D. *What is Identity (As We Now Use the Word)?* Stanford: Stanford University, 1999.
- Fierke, Karin M. "Constructivism." In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, & Steve Smith, 177-194. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Flockhart, Trine. "Complex Socialization: A Framework for the Study of State Socialization." *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 1 (2006): 89-118.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Guillaume, Xavier. "Unveiling the 'International': Process, Identity and Alterity." *Journal of International Studies* 35, no. 3 (2007): 741-759.
- Hagström, Linus, and Karl Gustafsson. "Relations, Japan and identity change: why it matters in International." *The Pacific Review* 28, no. 1 (2015): 1-22.
- Hansen, Lene. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.

- Hopf, Ted. *Social Construction of International Politics: Identity and Foreign Policy, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Hopf, Ted. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory." *International Security* 23, no. 1 (1998): 171-200.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999.
- Huysmans, Jef. "Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier." *European Journal of International Relations* 4, no. 2 (1998): 226-255.
- Johansson-Nogues, Elisabeth. "Is the EU's Foreign Policy Identity an Obstacle? The European Union, the Northern Dimension of the Union for the Mediterranean." *European Political Economy Review* 9 (2009): 24-48.
- Keene, Edward. "Social status, social closure and the idea of Europe as a "normative power"." *European journal of International Relations* 19, no. 4 (2013): 939-956.
- Kinnvall, Caterina. "Globalization and Reoligious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security." *Political Psychology* 25, no. 5 (2004): 741-767.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar. Book III. The Psychoses*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1997.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay of Exteriority*. New York: Springer, 1979.
- Lupovici, Amir. "Ontological dissonance, clashing identities, and Israel's unilateral steps towards the Palestinians." *Review of International Studies* 38, no. 4 (2012): 809-833.
- Mabee, Bryan. "Re-imagining the Borders of the US Security after 9/11: Securitization, Risk, and the Creation of the Department of Homeland Security." *Globalizations* 4, no. 3 (2007): 385-397.
- Malici, Akan. "Reagan and Gorbachev: Altercasting at the End of the Cold War." In *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics*, by Mark Schafer, & Stephen G. Walker, 127-149. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- Maloney, Gail, and Ian Walken. *Social Representations and Identity: Content, Process, and Power*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.

- Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power: A history of power from the beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Matterns, Janice Bially, and Ayse Zarakol. "Hierarchies in World Politics." *International Organization* 70, no. 3 (2016): 623-654.
- Mercer, Jonathan. "Anarchy and Identity." *International Organization* 49, no. 2 (1995): 229-252.
- Mtizen, Jennifer. "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and Security Dilemma." *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3 (2006): 341-370.
- Neumann, Iver B. *Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Neumann, Iver. "European identity, EU expansion, and the integration/exclusion nexus." *Alternatives* 23, no. 3 (1998): 397-416.
- Neumann, Iver. "Russia as Europe's other." *Journal of Area Studies* 6, no. 12 (1998): 26-73.
- Neumann, Iver. "Self and Other in International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 2, no. 2 (1996): 139-174.
- Neumann, Iver. "The Geopolitics of Delineating "Russia" and "Europe". The Creation of the "Other" in European and Russian Tradition." In *Tunander, Ola; Bævre, Paul K.; Eingel, Victoria Ingrid, by Territory, and Identity Geopolitics in Post-Wall Europe*. Security. London: PRIO, 1997.
- Nia, Mahdi Mohammad. "Discourse and Identity in Iran's Foreign Policy." *Iranian Review of Foreign Policy* 3, no. 3 (2012): 29-64.
- Onuf, Nicholas. *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in social theory and international relations*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Paasi, Anssi. "Region and place: regional identity in question." *Progress in Human Geography* 27, no. 4 (2003): 475-485.
- Price, Richard, and Christian Reus-Smit. "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism." *European Journal of International Relations* 4, no. 3 (1998): 259-294.
- Prozorov, Sergei. "The other as past and present, beyond the logic of temporal othering in IR theory." *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 3 (2011): 1273-1293.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. "Constructivism." In *Theories of International Relations*, by Scott Burchill. New York: Palgrave, 2005.

- Rumelili, Bahar. "Constructing Identity and Relating to Difference: Understanding EU's Mode of Differentiation." *Review of International Studies* 30, no. 1 (2004): 27-47.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness*. London: Citadel Press, 2001.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Steel, Brent. "Ontological Security and the Power of Self-Identity: British Neutrality and the American Civil War." *Review of International Studies* 31, no. 3 (2005): 519-540.
- Wæver, Ole. "European Security Identities." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34, no. 1 (1996): 103-132.
- Wæver, Ole. "Identity, communities and foreign policy: Discourse analysis as foreign policy theory." In *European integration and national identity: the challenge of the Nordic states*, by Lene Hansen, & Ole Wæver, 5-45. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Wæver, Ole. "Insecurity, security, and asecurty in the West European non-war community." In *Security Communities*, by Emanuel Adler, & Michael Barnett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Weldes, Jutta. *The Cultural Production of Crises: U.S. Identity and Missles in Cuba*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Collective Identity Formation and the International State." *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 2 (1994): 384-396.
- Wendt, Alexander. "On constitution and causation in International Relations." *International Studies* 24, no. 5 (1998): 101-117.
- . *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Wendt, Alexander. "The State as Person in International Theory." *Review of International Studies* 30, no. 2 (2004): 289-316.
- Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391-425.
- Wheeler, Nichlas. *Trusting Enemies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Williams, Michael C. "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (2003): 511-531.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. "Theorizing identity: beyond the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy." *Patterns of Prejudice* 44, no. 3 (2010): 261-280.

Zarakol, Ayse. "Ontological (In)security and State Denial of Historical Crimes: Turkey and Japan." *International Relations* 24, no. 1 (2010): 3-23.

Zehfuss, Maja. "Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison." *European Journal of International Relations* 7, no. 3 (2001): 315-348.