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ABSTRACT

The study on bases and meanings of Copenhagen School such as ontological and epistemological concepts as well as the concepts of security intersubjective meaning, securitization, and national security may put proper evaluation on security and its studies at our disposal. As an intermediary way in security studies, the aforesaid school might answer to scientific and appropriate analysis on study of security and many questions in this regard to great extent. We will explain about the concept of securitization that is one of the major concepts in this school. Securitization is a theory that has been purposed by Copenhagen School to analyze security related issues. We express the factors, levels, and consequences of military intervention in politics by means of securitization theory and sociological-political theories and test our hypothesis.
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The review on fundamentals and concepts of Copenhagen School, including concepts such as intersubjective security meaning, securitization, and societal security may purpose us proper evaluation about security and its studies to us. As an intermediary way in security studies the given school could give answers to many of questions in this field with taking scientific approach and suitable analysis in security study to great extent. We explore the concept of securitization, which is one of the main concepts in this school, in this essay. Copenhagen school mainly notices to security studies regarding post-cold war and wide developments, which have occurred in the field of security. Theorists of this school are Bill McSweeney, Ole Oever, and Barry Buzan as well. Buzan argues that Copenhagen school assumes it enjoys realistic techniques for perceiving international relations per se and it is tried to acknowledge the contemporary structure of International Community and role of Great Powers. Of these important concepts in this school one can refer to securitization and regional security that Buzan supposes these two concepts as scientific centroid in this school (Buzan, 2006).

Copenhagen School is a term that has been employed by McSweeney for works and viewpoints from Barry Buzan, Ole Oever, and Jaap De Wilde et al. In other words, the given school includes security studies, which are considered as features of post-cold war period and it has isolated post-cold war from strategic studies field and put it under security studies in International Relations and strategic studies. This effort made by Buzan et al indicates their attention to isolation of security issues from military restricted circle (Abdollahkhani, 2003:131). Other characters such as Ole Oever and Jaap De Wilde have also highly contributed to perceive and develop the concept of security from view of Copenhagen School, of course (Buzan and Waver, 1997:241).

Our theory in this essay is based on this point that the military men provide the ground for their own to intervene in politics under certain social and political conditions like political instability, the existing foreign threat, and or political inefficiency of statesmen in management of the country with securitization of non-security related affairs and through isolating political affairs from the routine trend and embedding them
into security route and employ special procedures to manage societal phenomena. With respect to an overall vision from Copenhagen school, we deal with trans-theoretical topics of Copenhagen school and review theory of securitization. Similarly, we also employ theories from political sociologists.

Securitization and Copenhagen school

Securitization is a theory that has been presented by Copenhagen theory to analyze security issues. This theory has formed based the concept of speech act and it is claimed that security is a speech-based concept and it is created only after declaration. Theory of securitization explores various related issues to this theory within this framework with purposing some concepts like securitizing actor/agent, reference object, and audience. This theory is further based on structuralist and realist epistemology. Accordingly, it seems that theory of securitization to be a managerial theory rather than an analytical theory with evaluator and rater. In other words, the way of management on security is mainly considered by means of this theory. The concept of securitization has been used by Copenhagen theory and especially by Waver to describe a security theory in the field of security studies. This theory emphasizes at first place in that securitization means exiting of phenomena and or subjects from the normal status into the extraordinary mode. In other words, securitization denotes exiting of phenomena from normal politics or public politics and entering them into security area.

It can be inferred from content of this theory that securitization of phenomena or subjects is further due to urgency than arbitrary status. In other words, securitization signifies that security agent or actor concluded that s/he could not normally encounter that phenomenon and managing that situation requires considering extraordinary condition for the given phenomenon. Therefore, it can be concluded that securitization of any phenomenon or normal subject serves as a parameter to evaluate the rate of insecurity in every system. Of course, this does not mean that one should avoid from securitizing of any phenomenon or subject since securitizing only signifies accepting the given symptom (disease) and it should be dealt with its treatment quickly. Thus, one could not treat a disease by denial of its presence and its consequences may be probably further widened and they may cover the more areas. Accepting of securitization may lead us to accept this point that exiting issues and phenomena from secure status may also securitizing for them. Namely, it can be assumed as appropriate parameter to evaluate rate of security.

With respect to these cases, it may be concluded that prevention from securitizing of phenomena and subjects is not considered as requisite for their securitizing and on the other hand recognizing phenomena accurately and properly requires securitization and within this framework, successful securitization of them is necessary at first step to avoid from creation of false insecurity and at the next step to prevent from spreading insecurity and their management. After securitizing the phenomenon, it requires making effort for managing them in order to achieve the favorable objective (omission, neutralization, control, change and transformation) in order to thwart phenomenon of insecurity and thus increasing security level.

Theory of Securitization

Copenhagen theory takes a historical perspective toward societal phenomena and focuses on role of norms, rules, and culture. Buzan and Waver argue that security is not always based on objective reference and human relations and role of norms and standards are important and effective. In other words, it is based on considering the subject of norm that identity and security are related mutually to each other. The members of the given school argue that language, history, culture, and even race, and political borders are important in determination of identity and then security. Buzan warns regarding the complicated governmental intervention in identity and here societal security is tied with government security. Namely, national security of the government may be destabilized by its domestic community therefore societal security is
considered very important as an essential subject in Copenhagen theory (Waver, 1995:89).

The security can be noticed as a speech act by the aid of linguistic theory. In this case, security is not considered as something that refers to a very real object, but expressing security is a type of measure and practice and with its interpretation, something is done. Any governmental official may exert a certain change in certain field by declaration of security and for this reason s/he asks for a certain right to use any device for prevention and avoidance of that right (threat). (Waver, 1995: 55)

For the sake of multidimensionality of security, the effect of culture, ecosystem geography, civilization, and religion and more importantly identity should be perceived. Copenhagen theory has rejected the views from those, who consider security only within objective framework and isolated from individuals’ minds and thoughts and it defines this issue as an intersubjective theme. Buzan introduces the starting point of security subject as subjective and based on actors’ decision. He implies that subject of security is identified in community since actors may refer to it while some may look at phenomena as threat and compel others to follow up securitized status and its requirements. Thus, it does not seem such issues exist only in the closed minds but they are a societal characteristic (Abdollahkhan, 2003:126).

The practical security is self-referential since it is deemed a practice that is subjected to conversion into a security issue. In other words, securitization of subject is not necessarily related to the presence of a real threat and it may originate from introducing it as subject of threat. Security trend is something that is called speech act in theory of language and this practice is not necessarily to show real thing and this is speech, that is, which considered as (dramatic) practice. By expressing words something is done (7). This is due to this point that Copenhagen theory assumes language (speech) as performative and for this reason it is maintained that the previous status may be changed by expressing term of security. Accordingly, Waver concludes that security is not purposed as a sign or symbol that stands for some real thing, but speech is a type of measure and practice per se. More clearly, what assumed important and determinant for security is the same as what speech may build. Finally, security is not an objective and external phenomenon, but it is the product of certain societal process (Williams, 2003: 513-514).

Theory of securitization assumes security as intersubjective and self-referential issue with rejection of objectivity of security issue. Intersubjective issue refers to this important matter that security is built among the relationship among securitizing actor and his/ her audience (Balzacq, 2005: 176-178). Therefore, if securitizing actor securitizes a phenomenon and his/ her audience accepts it, that phenomenon has been securitized. Hence, what it plays role in this trend is mind, perception, and attitude of actor and audience. On the other hand, self-referential concept refers to this important point that the situation may change with expression of security term by securitizing actor and a phenomenon enters from public or political field into security area and or at least this field is changed by security speech act. Thus, the phenomenon may enter a special field by expression of security.

Expression of security contributes simultaneously to developing and restriction of security plan within the framework of speech act, self-referential, and intersubjective areas. This situation is followed by unlimited developing of security plan at first place. Accordingly, not only the field of possible threats may become wider, but also actors and threatened subjects and agents can be developed in order to include actors and agents beyond military and state- territorial areas. Alternately, this theory is synonymous to prevention from any type of risk or damage and what are assumed as hazardous by security. Therefore, it assumes only certain phenomena deserving for securitization. According to viewpoint of Copenhagen theory and theory of securitization, security is not created exclusively based on any type of speech act or any form of structure. Accordingly, securitizing of any phenomenon forms based on two internal and external rules. The internal rule is linguistic and
grammatical and it requires follow up and observing rules of speech act. Accordingly, normal and convenient procedures should exist and speech act should take some measures thereby the given act can be made. Within this framework, the given persons and conditions should be appropriate for certain procedural application in certain case (Buzan, 1998:32).

Accordingly, successful securitization in any phenomenon depends on successful application of constructive rules of speech act. This issue is subjected to status of securitizing actor at first place. Although principally securitization process is done totally clearly and openly and every security actor may try for securitization of any agent and subject, this process is practically subjected to various potentials of actors to express their claims efficiently in such a way that such claims depend on empirical factors or situations in order to be accepted by audience. In this framework, it can be admitted that all claims could not be efficient and also all actors have not strong position for securitization of phenomena. Therefore, situation, position, potential, and internal rule, namely speech influence and type of speech rules, which have been used by securitizing actor will be crucially important in successful securitization.

Hence, those phenomena or subjects should be securitized that they can be placed within the framework of concept of existential threats and in other words they should be competent for attribution of such a concept. Such a condition may cause the extraordinary measures become necessary beyond daily political efforts. Within this framework, the claims about security and threats by expressing existential threat as well as their admission as a security subject by audience leads to success in securitizing phenomena. Overall, Copenhagen theory summarizes successful securitization in three factors. First is adaptation of phenomenon to existential threat, the second is necessity for taking urgent measure regarding exposure to that phenomenon and in other words urgency of exposure to that phenomenon, and finally the effect on relations among units. Accordingly, any subject can be securitized provided that it can be reached to the point that it is admitted as an existential threat. In this sense, Waver claims that national security is focused on survival of government in classic tradition and theory of securitization, it is also concentrated on survival, but survival is assumed synonymous with existential threats and in other words it is considered as the situations regarding maximization of risk (Waver, 1995:51).

From Waver’s view, any sector (not only military sector) may be the center of concerns for threats, vulnerabilities, and defense at all times. Under such condition, logic of security can be developed without ignoring the specificity of its concept. The mechanism, which this development may accept and make it possible, is recognizing security by logic of existential threats and finally the necessity and urgency (Waver, 1995:51). Unlike Schmidt who assumes exposure to urgent condition based on governmental decision making, in Copenhagen theory it is claimed on presence of certain rules to determine urgent conditions and it is argued that decision making is only done to determine this point that whether the current conditions are urgent based on the predetermined rules or not.

With respect to theory of decision making, Copenhagen theory assumes securitization as decision making based on urgent condition (force majeure), breaking normal regulations, and suspending normal policies. Decision making is the basic reality of securitization and it includes three statuses. First status: creation of security condition following to successful securitization of a phenomenon; second status: Failure in securitizing a phenomenon that was necessarily urgent for securitization; and third status: Securitizing a phenomenon that lacked urgent conditions. Subject of occurrence of security is the essential issue in theory of securitization. Namely it assumes security not as an objective situation, but as speech act and linguistic agent and security will occur by expressing it by a new securitizing actor. Thus, from viewpoint in theory of securitization, the securitizing actor plays very key, sensitive, and extensive role since concept of security has not ever been used for the phenomenon before this
actor and therefore nothing is created essentially under title of security. Thus, expressing it by a securitizing actor is the only condition for contingency of security.

What does security mean in theory of securitization? This theory regarding concept of security is a function of interpretative method. Accordingly, unlike concepts in natural sciences, concepts of social science are some parts of realities, which exclusive explain or interpret the facts. Accordingly, it is argued in theory of securitization that meaning of any social concept, including security concept is latent in its application and it is not something that can be defined analytically and or philosophically based on what it should be the optimal one. Thus concept of security cannot be described based on normal method as well. From Copenhagen theory viewpoint, security concept is not positioned within the framework of what the people are thinking about deliberately, but it depends on that how to use them implicitly or explicitly used or on some occasions they may not utilize it. Therefore, according to this school, security is a performative concept. Alternately, in Copenhagen school this statement is not accepted that “the higher security the better its quality” and it is assumed that security should be seen essentially as negative and it should be supposed as a failure in encountering the problems and issues in normal political field. Thus, at a favorable status, the politics should be able to manage and control phenomena and subjects routinely and without increasing threats abnormally at the given level and levels of necessities and exceptions.

Who does securitize political and social phenomena? From the view of Copenhagen school, anyone can securitize the phenomenon; for instance, press and or leaders of political groups. This issue is a very important point that any actor to have the least securitizing conditions and the possibility of securitizing of phenomena not to reach at urgency levels and at the same time there is a possibility for a securitizing process of a phenomenon not to be terminated all the time since various securitizing actors with different positions and statuses have several teats and interests and values and for this reason insecurity may always serve as a serious threat for selfish securitizing processes in communities.

When a phenomenon is securitized successfully? From Copenhagen school perspective, securitizing of any phenomenon includes three parts: securitizing actor, security phenomenon (agent) and audience. Within this framework, achievement depends on linguistic-grammatical and contextual-social agents. Linguistic-grammatical agent is related to securitizing actor and his/her potential in using words and concepts. Contextual-social factor is ascribed to temporal and spatial conditions in which it is located and rate of congruence and homogeneity in its relationship with context and texture where that phenomenon occurs.

According to two foregoing rules, the successful speech act is a composition of language and community that covers both intrinsic and internal properties of speech and a group that allows this speech to be purpose and recognized it formally. In this framework, if a subject is considered as a threatening issue generally it is potentially capable to be converted into the existential threats. Within such a format, when a securitizing actor uses phrase of existential threats and subsequently remove an issue from normal political conditions we are exposed to a securitized status. Thus, the start point of process of securitizing any phenomenon or subject is formed by subjective creation of existential threat. Nevertheless, according to Copenhagen school, it cannot be accepted that speech act of security is defined with expression of security word by actor, but the vital point is to determine and declare existential threats, which require taking necessary and immediate measures. In addition to reliance of beginning of securitizing process on lever of existential threat-not expression of security word-the features, potentials, and capabilities of securitizing actor are also crucially important in determination and declaration of existential threat. Here, lingual-grammatical agent of power and capability of securitizing actor in properly and duly application of this factor is also extremely important.
In this framework, securitization is formed only based on that class of existential threats, which legitimate breaking of rules. Therefore, those phenomena which could not legitimate legal daily norms may not also pass us through securitization process. And finally, in securitization process, Copenhagen school assumes audience as the final phase for completion of securitization and it believed in that the audience is the sufficient condition in this process. Therefore, securitization is completed when it is accepted by audience. Acceptance of this point in Copenhagen school is not the product of democratic discussion, but it is composed of consent-compelling.

What does securitization mean? 
Securitization means exclusion of a phenomenon from the general field and including it into specific area. General field is where the normal rules and procedures govern on this area, but some normal rules and procedures are set aside in special zone and some special rules and procedures are used to expose the phenomenon. Therefore, from perspective of Copenhagen school, there are several fields, which include securitization of a phenomenon into the special zone and accordingly it is possible the given phenomenon to return to the same field or other areas. In this regard, there are several concepts such as public politics and normal politics as non security areas. On the other hand, meaning of low politics field depends on democratic rules and processes of decision making and high politics field is related to features of priority for urgency and death and life subject that has been purposed by Buzan where the first is related to non-security phenomena and the second is concerned with security phenomena (Buzan, 1998:21). In other point in the position of presenting classification for securitization process, Buzan argues that securitization is final version for politicizing. Accordingly, any subject may be defined on a three-degree spectrum. The first degree includes non political issues namely those subject with which the government is not concerned and they never require the necessity for public discussion and decision. The second degree consists of the politicized subjects i.e. those subjects which form some part of public politics and they need to government decision and allocation of resources and or communal governance and eventually third degree comprises of securitized issues namely those subjects which have been defined as existential threats and they necessitate required measures and justifiable activities out of political process (Buzan; 1998:23).

When is a phenomenon securitized? Copenhagen school assumes securitization as a type of process and a function of predetermined rules. Accordingly, the criterion for competency of a phenomenon for securitization is similarity of a phenomenon to existential threat while urgency i.e. requirement is at high level. In fact, these rules and parameters are necessary for securitization of a phenomenon. What is the basis for security logic in theory of securitization? The security logic is based on exceptional decision making in Copenhagen school.

Where does security phenomenon form? No subject is basically security problem since security is considered as linguistic factor. Security or insecurity is not objective in any status namely the situation that occurs before speech. Security is not a signal to refer to more real object but it expresses the security of that measure and activity. Thus, what considered as important and decisive for security is what the language may make. Securitization is an intersubjective process and security cannot be placed within objective frameworks. Various governments and nations possess different security thresholds. This is a political fact that will be followed by some outcomes since it compels securitizing actor to act different from what s/he had. In this framework and according to rule of intersubjectivity of security, it has been seen for several times in a certain political community that securitization of a phenomenon to be assumed legitimate while securitizing of that phenomenon may be considered irrational and or even insane for those ones out of that political community. Therefore, it may be concluded that security phenomenon is formed as intersubjective manner namely it is the product of relationship among actor and audience.

What are some types of securitization? Securitization may be both situational and
internalized. Accordingly, if there is a type of existential threat all the time and constantly that is followed by internalization of a type of sense of necessity regarding it; we are exposed to internalized securitization. This status of course exists in military sector in which governments are always exposed to long term threats and in response to them, they have established administrative systems and systematic military trends and organizations to counter against such threats. Alternately, if a phenomenon is converted into an existential threat but it does not originated in the past and or a relatively long term period is not sequentially repeated in this trend, such existential threats are mainly transient. Thus, we encounter ad hoc securitization.

In general, one can extract several results from topic of security. First is that securitization is a political alternative. Secondly, security is not a discoverable phenomenon, but it is built and thirdly securitization signifies a type of necessity or oriented selection in problem solving and at fourth place securitization differs from concept of affirmative security (Buzan; 1998: 30).

Securitization and Military Intervention In Politics

The army and politics relationship is one of the purposed subjects in political sociology. From political sociology point of view, the relationship among army with community and social groups and forces on the one hand and with political power system on the other hand is important. In other words, what it matters from political sociology is the role, which played by armies as the intermediate agent among social classes and groups on the one hand and with government on the hand. As an instrument for execution of governmental power and hostility, army usually lacks political responsibility but it is possible in practice for several reasons that it takes the responsibility of power enforcement directly or indirectly because of different reasons. Naturally, the way and rate of influence or intervention by armies differ from each other in dictatorial and totalitarian regimes and or parliamentary democracy. For example, during twentieth century, in communist nations the high-ranking army officers were active both in governing party and in factional organizations inside the army on the other hand. Or in some democratic governments like United States of America there has been special relationship among army officers and some national industries along with profitable military contracts.

Direct military intervention by army in politics has been extremely obvious in Developing Countries where of the paramount reasons for this process one could refer to prominent role that has been played clearly by many armies often as guard of independence and preserving national identity by their participation in anti-colonialism campaigns. From political sociology point of view, it is important that when army intervenes in politics it may support from interest of which social groups. Army intervention in politics is often typically related to providing interests for social groups, especially as military coup. The military governments may extremely vary in terms of social basis and tendencies of social classes. Hence, review of personal and collective and ideological relations among army and social classes is the main theme in political sociology for militaristic governments (Bashiriyeh; 2011:262).

Political Sociology Theories

Before investigation on nature of relations among military and civil groups, it necessitates discussion about the prevalent theories regarding military intervention in politics. Inter alia, one of the prominent theories in comparative studies and political sociology was purposed by Johnovitz in which he declares military intervention both as sign of political instability and one of the reasons for political instability. Due to impression of political elites toward their role as professional ones and experts in military technical activities, as the government becomes more complicated and some organizations are established for public mobilization and public participation in politics, the possible military intervention is reduced more in politics (Lotfian; 2009: 225).

Theory of professional army was purposed by some experts like Pearl Mutter,
Nordelinger, and Huntington and accordingly military intervention in politics is going to be reduced since political system have established the needed institutions for public direct participation and restricted the independence of the Executive. Therefore, establishment of civil community leads to reduced military intervention at high levels of political development. But if this reduction does not occur and military forces interfere in politics despite of the existing development of democratic organizations, political instability will be increased further. Huntington claims that of professionalism of armies is developed one should be afraid of military intervention in politics. In contrast, Johnovitz deduces that proficiency of these group leads to their adverse political intervention since the high-ranking officers will tend to preserve their own interests all the times (Lotfian; 2009:230). Luntal expresses if military internalization overtakes development and evolution in civil parties and factions, the military forces may probably play political role and they may even be substituted with non-military regime by coup. Farcao also declares that such professionalism of new type may lead to create a national security doctrine that suppresses all opposite sides under the name of fighting against hypocrisy and communism in Latin America. Collier has emphasized on importance of measurement type of regime as an effective variable on relationship among military intervention and political instability. Variable of type of regime, which has been created with study on nature of political institutions, is identified in any country. In democratic political regimes, military intervention is at low level so political disorder will be lesser (Lotfian; 2009:230).

Among comments of critiques, one can refer to Evans and Bolen. They suggest that to explore nature of economic and political structure along with economic and political development level in countries in order to make us capable to identify the accurate relationship among political development, economic development, and political role of military forces. The other factor that should be addressed is type of development including dependent/ independent and balanced/imbalance. Some argue that democratic supervision of civil group over military forces is the requisite condition to strengthen unstable bases of newly-established democracies (Lotfian; 2009:231).

In contemporary world, militarization is a global problem. About 40% of technical and engineering scientists and experts in northern countries are active in military sector. Some of criteria which are employed for measurement of the rate of militarization in the countries are as follows: The important political leadership positions can be put at disposal of military officers; presence of military government in the country; illegal legislation and authority of military courts versus civil courts in the country; lack or shortage of political regulation by civil group on military forces and military occupation of a country by foreign forces. The main reasons for growing quasi-professional forces in Developing Countries are as follows: population rapid growth, urbanism growth, paying attention to importance of public participation in activities of army and police forces particularly to control urban rebellions and chaos. We have witnessed growth of militia forces in parallel with normal military forces in the Middle East in this regard. In some of these nations, occupation acts as a device for political encouragement and bonus of adherents of political regimes among quasi-professional forces. Instead of potentials in military forces, political loyalties were the basis for promotion and determination of missions. The top commanders and officers are replaced often in a cycle so that they could not establish close relation with their loyal subordinate soldiers and officers (Lotfian; 2009: 232).

In general, composition, variety, and mixture of certain economic, social, and cultural conditions in communities with special properties of politics cause military intervention in politics. Anyway, military intervention in politics is interrelated with the level community’s growth. Also this point has been implied in theory of securitization and more clearly what is considered important and determinant for security is the same as what is made by language. Security is neither an objective phenomenon nor relating to external
field, but it is the product of certain social process (Williams; 2003: 513-514). Therefore, if a securitizing actor securitizes a phenomenon and audience accepts it as well, that phenomenon has been securitized.

Securitization and Military Intervention

The presence of military forces in political scene and their direct interference in governmental affairs have been so normalized in developing countries that it is assumed as an integrate element in political and social life in these nations. Now, this question may be raised that what factors may cause military forces to undertake securitization performance in the community. The foremost factors which affect on military intervention in politics are as follows:

1) Professionalism in military forces and possession of exclusive use of instrument to exert hostility and high technology

Professionalism is the paramount researching subject for Huntington that implied in book of “Soldier and government” and according to Huntington’s belief, professionalism is the foremost factor in prevention of military forces from politics since as army becomes more professional, the military forces will be far away political affairs further because of a lot of business so that they assign political affairs to statesmen. In other words, Huntington deduces that encouraging them for full professionalism is the more reliable way to prevent military forces from political intervention. If military forces are organized based on military goals, armed forces will act as obedient servants for the government and they will certainly do their tasks under control of civil and state officials (Azghandi; 1995:70).

Generalization of Huntington’s theory is the paramount weakness of this theory. Unlike Huntington’s attitude, there are several historical cases about performance of Japanese, Italian, and German military forces, which have intervene in politics despite of enjoying specialties at very high level in army and as the real meaning of professionalism.

2) Composition of social classes and type of governing ideology over political sector

The other issue is that military intervention in politics also closely related to level of political growth in people and community. Whereas military forces (army) reacts to political affairs based on several phases political growth in the community, under suitable conditions, army can interfere in politics without direct intervention only by establishing strong political organization. In any case, there are several political factors including intensifying domestic conflicts, discord among various governmental factions, the presence of ethnic and national severe dissatisfaction, and elites’ dissatisfaction with a dictatorial regime, and lack of any political and social mobility and motive. All these factors may prepare the ground for military intervention in political affairs jointly and or individually. In such crisis-creating communities, new forces gradually enter on this scene and purpose new requests, which the government cannot meet these requirements as a result the ground become prepared and appropriate for military intervention and the governing crisis is terminated by declaration of military regime (curfew) (Azghandi; 1995:71). According to theory of securitization, under such circumstances, not only the field of probable threats is widened, but also the actors and the threatened agents and subjects may be developed as well so that to comprises actors and subjects beyond military, state-territorial fields. Alternately, this theory avoids from expressing security as synonymous with any type of risk or damage and or what is assumed as hazardous. Therefore, it considers only certain phenomena (kike what it mentioned above) deserving for securitization.

3) Tastes and interests of military class

Military intervention in politics, which affected by personal tastes and interests, occurs in some countries where there are some conflicts in social classes and social gap. In such communities, majority of military class originate from micro bourgeoisie and rural groups and they use any opportunity to meet their interests as dynamic forces in the community. In other words, preservation for independence and providing group’s interests is one of the main reasons for military intervention in politics. This communal
tendency in army may exactly create dispute among military forces and government in some countries like Pakistan where the armed forces originated from certain region and this factor of state and regionalism paradigm may accelerate military intervention in politics. One of the other factors, which lead to military intervention in political scene is the clearly incompetency of civil elements to defend from their own authenticity and rights. When the custom of preservation and maintenance of governmental power in political scenes is removed versus military sector, the ground and scene of politics will open to military forces with the equal and similar status (Aghasi Esfahani; 1992:139).

4) Constant political instability in community and inefficiency of statesmen in management of the country

The other factor, which may contribute to military intervention in politics, is when the politicians have stopped in deadened and the system has lost its legitimacy and the community was subjected to crisis and sometime anarchy. Lack of legitimacy in political system will lead to lack of public participation in political affairs and their presence in political and social scene. In other words, military intervention in politics is required when there is no legal and constructive link among people and statesmen and the frustrated people become indifferent to political affairs in their community and in some systems without political legitimacy, statesmen invite military forces to interfere in politics to preserve their own interests. In addition, the possibility for military intervention in politics may be increased if there are lot of difference and conflict among political requests and goals of statesmen with ideal commitments of military forces. According to theory of securitization, under such conditions securitizing actor (army) may securitize the phenomenon and audience also accepts it therefore that phenomenon has been securitized.

5) Military forces’ concern and some of military force in acceleration of industrialization trend

Similarly, military intervention in politics may occur in those communities in which the elite are not capable to rule over people and managing the community through social and political changes and transformations. In this case, as the most professional and united institute in society, the army tries to bring more efficient, more modern, and more capable government to power by military intervention in politics. The reasons for the tendency of military forces to intervene in politics are very complex and various, of course, but at the same time this pivotal factor forms the main reason for tendency of this agent and that is army and military forces’ awareness of their own identity and their assigned mission. This mission on the one hand isolates them from politicians and civil people and despite of their incongruous identity it compels them for common living with statesmen, on the other hand. This self-consciousness causes the military forces to assume unique mission for their own and that is nothing except national interests, national development, and national security. Under such conditions, military forces tend to securitization. At first place, this theory emphasizes on that securitization denotes exiting phenomena and or subjects from the normal status and enter them into urgent and extraordinary condition. In other words, securitization means to exclude phenomena from normal political fields or public politics and including them in to security area. Namely, securitization signifies that speaker or securitizing actor (especially army) concluded that s/he could no longer be exposed to that phenomenon under normal conditions and managing of this phenomenon requires allocation of extraordinary status to the given phenomenon. For instance, the phenomenon like national interests is a sample in this kind as it mentioned above.

Level of Securitization by Military Forces

Potential of military intervention in politics depends on many social factors. This is practically means that such an intervention has various forms, which will make it higher or lower intensified. With respect to type of the governing political culture over that community, Finer explores military intervention in politics at four levels (Bashiriyeh; 2011:273). These forms can be interpreted as follows:
Influence

The first level comprises of influence on national politicians to allocate higher military budget and participation in militaristic decisions, which reflect in community with mature political culture. The role of military forces does not highly differ from role of an interest group at two lower levels. For example, influence instrument is utilized when members of military force ask for increase in their available sources or they satisfy the politicians with their influence and pressure to change policy. There is no effort to adjust the relationship among actors in this scene even less for positions and appointments.

Threat or blackmail

The second level is threat and or frightening of statesmen to lack of defense from them against their enemies and or taking measure against them if they do not address their requests, which this level is formed in communities with evolved culture that have organized public opinions and resistant against threats by military forces. The threatening and blackmailing activities are purposed for avarice and excessive exploitation like change in policy for public affairs and especially diplomacy and or in domestic affairs. Their instruments include various threats, particularly threats for abdication or resignation, which are expressed by them to indicate civil authorities that they could not resist and stay in their positions which have been taken by them since it seems improbable and or impossible for them to implement those policies. An example of threat and blackmail operation was related to some of British officers before World War I. They indicated their opposition versus the purposed policies by liberal government regarding Ireland by threatening them to relinquish from power (Moosavi; 2004:204).

Replacement

The third level is dismissal of the ruling political leaders and replace of them with the politicians, who try in the course of interests of military forces. This type of intervention takes place in communities with lower level of political culture where the public opinions have not been organized against military intervention and they act weakly. If threat and blackmailing could not act successfully, the next step that may be taken is to replace the current government and substituting it with the government that is expected to be further subordinate for them. The intensity of replacement may vary. At one end of this spectrum, the goal can be only replacement of a governmental group with another group. Thus this activity is a type of arbitration and it is like the case that has been already enforced by military force in some Latin American Nations, especially Brazil.

Supplantation

Eventually, military intervention is intended to seize governmental positions in which militaristic leaders are supplanted with politicians. This intervention level occurs in communities with political culture at minimal level where the institutions of civil communities have not been organized the military forces are the only efficient active power. Supplantation is an obvious military rule in which members of armed forces, who act as a single group, were supplanted by a civil government and come to power. This is a communal activity by members of army and activity of army is not solely done by an individual even though this person is a military officer. According to theory of securitization, such conditions may lead to necessitate taking extraordinary measures beyond daily political affairs by the army. Within this framework, purposing of claims about security and threats through declaration of existential threat as well as its acceptance by audience as a security-related issue may lead to success in securitization of phenomena. The military measure that has been taken by General Parviz Musharraf in 1999 and coming to power in Pakistan is a good example of this kind (Moosavi; 2004:204).

Consequences of securitization by military forces

Restriction of freedom

Power monopoly by military forces will be priced at cost of limitation of freedom and political rights for people and political groups and
weakness of political life in the community and under such conditions the military forces not only can act as a guiding force in community but also it will operate as deterrent power there. To survive their power on political scene, the military forces put pressure on civil organizations, parties, and groups and or even ban their activity. Similarly, during military force ruling, right of people for participation in political affairs is usually ignored and despite of this fact that the military forces promise the people to hold free elections usually at the beginning of taking reign of power but if they hold any election they influence in this election to achieve their political intentions.

Establishment of Dictatorial Government

In a political system where the military force directly comes to power after direct and indirect interventions in politics and at last with coup and resorting to coercive power, the disorder conditions occur and the military force take control over political and administrative positions to consolidate their own stand. Under these conditions, to develop their plans and for retention of their power, the military forces take hostile measures further and since all legal alternatives have been seized for the people to indicate their satisfactions and protests thus they have no option to react violently in response to these hostilities.

Inefficiency of Armed Forces

One of the consequences for military intervention in politics is weakening potential of armed forces and exactly their inefficiency. In any community in which there are usually several opposite political parties and groups and they always campaign against each other the peak point of their performance includes wide promotional attacks, broad-based arguments, and physical conflict to each other at most severe status, which can be certainly controlled by police forces, but if the military forces are placed at one side of these conflicts instead of political factions and pr parties and the military forces support from one of the conflicting parties then conflict and disputes may exit from normal position and it may be converted into an all-out domestic battle by coming military power of the armed forces. For this reason, if armed forces are involved in political affairs, the military energy and costs will be consumed for political conflicts after short period of time and this will not result in anything except for wasting military potential. Under such circumstance, not only national military power has not been employed for consolidation of national security, but also rather than creation of anarchy in the society, the needed opportunities have been wasted for improvement of the level of military knowledge (Soleimani; 2000:121). For this reason, in Copenhagen school this idea is rejected that the higher level of security, the better and it is argued that securitization should be essentially observed as negative impact and it should be considered as a failure in exposure to the issues in the field of politics. Thus, under favorable condition, politics should manage and control issues and subject in community according to normal routine and without increasing the level of threats abnormally within the limit and frameworks of necessities and exceptions.

1) Growing adventurous and ambitious policies at regional and global levels can be seen in oil crisis and leading the country to interaction with world community.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the present article, we mainly focused on subject of securitization and military intervention in politics. Military intervention in politics is a global phenomenon but this phenomenon has various types in which at its lowest and widest level, the characteristic of military intervention is exertion of various pressures, which rarely distinguish military forces from other institutions of lobby (pressure group). Military intervention may lead to a full predominance over the government at highest and most acute point of intervention because military forces possess professional fields and tools and due to this fact that many communities exercise domestic serious conflicts. With interpretation of theory of securitization and other sociological theories and composition of these two theories in this essay, we tried to indicate that under which social conditions and at which level, military forces intervene in politics and how they manage
social conditions in order to make us capable to test our hypothesis. In fact, the main consequence of securitization by military forces and intervention in political and social scenes is securitizing of civil and non security issues, the subjects like artistic and literary issues, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), guild unions, universities and academic centers, social movements (students- workers- women), national and ethnic issues, newspapers, sites and weblogs, and resorting to authoritarian security and military measures and encounter to such issues. Securitization denotes exiting a phenomenon from public field and entering it into special area. The public area is where normal rules and procedures govern over the phenomenon, but in the special area, the normal rules and procedures are set aside and some specific rules and procedures are employed to encounter the given phenomenon. At first place, this condition results in unlimited development of security plans. Accordingly, not only the field of possible threats may be widened, but also actors and the threatened subjects can be developed as well to include actors and subjects beyond military, state- territorial aspects. Therefore, according to Copenhagen school point of view, there are several zones, which include securitization of phenomenon into their specific areas and based on which it is possible for the given phenomenon to return to the same field or other areas. In this regard, there are various concepts including public politics and normal politics as non security related fields. Alternately, meaning of low politics depends on democratic rules and processes of decision making and concept of high politics which is related to features of preference and urgency and death and life issue that has been purposed by Buzan where the first concept is concerned with non securitized phenomena and the second is related to securitized phenomena (30). At first place, theory of securitization emphasizes that securitization denotes excluding phenomena and subjects from normal situation and including in extraordinary condition. In other words, securitization is mainly due to urgency not arbitrary condition. In other words, securitization signifies that speaker (agent) or securitizing actor concluded that s/he could no longer encounter that phenomenon under normal conditions and managing that phenomenon requires including that phenomenon in special condition.

The complexity of today communities makes it difficult for direct military intervention, although the army may be probably advanced; the governmental network and other public institutes are also so extensive and dispersed in an advanced community that successful military intervention is required occurrence in several points at the same time. Nevertheless, military supplantation does not lead to stability for government mainly because of this fact that military rulers enjoy no necessary professional expertise to manage complex communities and to develop deep-rooted relations with people. Finally, as it implied, military intervention in politics is accelerated when the nations are exposed to domestic problems. In fact, those nations, which suffer from political instability with civil community and independent social forces from the government, lack adequate capability to affect on political and social trend and their economic conditions are not favorable as a result the idea of military intervention is not assumed improbable as the most organized social group. Overall, weakness of civil community and lack of activity by social groups and forces may provide the grounds for military intervention as the most coherent group. Likewise, finally it can be implied about theory of securitization that securitization is mainly a managerial theory rather than an analytical and evaluative assumption. Namely, based on this theory, the method of security management can be further addressed. In other words, this theory plays strategic role further than interpretative role for security subjects.
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