Kyriakos D. Kentrotis

From Sepúlveda to the Islamic State:
Sovereignty Monologues in International Relations[*]

> *Choisir le dialogue, cela veut dire aussi éviter les deux extrêmes que sont le monologue et la guerre.*
> – Tzvetan Todorov, *Nous et les autres*[1]

> *Macht ist sie, diese neue Tugend; ein herrschender Gedanke ist sie und um ihn eine kluge Seele; eine goldene Sonne und um sie die Schlange der Erkenntnis.*
> – Friedrich Nietzsche, *Also sprach Zarathustra*[2]

On February 1, 1979, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini returned to Tehran from Paris after 15 years in exile. The Iranian monarchy that under the Pahlavi dynasty had defended the post-war order on one of the front lines of the Cold War was replaced by the guardians of the Iranian revolution, who established the Islamic Republic of Iran. A few months later, on November 4, the international community would watch with trepidation the international balance of power and the rules of international law put to test as the staff of the American Embassy in Tehran were held hostage for 444 days. In the same city,

---

[*] An earlier short version of this paper was presented at the Annual Conference on International Law and International Relations, "International crises and recent developments. The place and the role of the UN," 19-21 December 2014, organized by the Hellenic Society of International Law and International Relations (HeSILIR), Panteion University, Athens, Greece.

[1] Tzvetan Todorov, *Nous et les autres: La réflexion française sur la diversité humaine* (Paris: Seuil, 1989), 15, as quoted in Iver B. Neumann, *Uses of the Other. "The East" in European Identity Formation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 1.

[2] "This new virtue is power; it is a dominating idea and, around, that idea, a wise soul: a golden sun and, around that sun, the serpent of knowledge." Friedrich Nietzsche, *Also sprach Zarathustra*, ed. and trans. Stanley Appelbaum (Mineola: Dover Publications, 2004), 68.

in 1943, the victors of World War II took the first steps toward constructing the collective security system proclaimed by the UN Charter. The basis for the decisions to be ratified at the Yalta Conference were laid at this "Big Three" Allied leaders' conference in Tehran.

Using the Islamic State as an example, this paper attempts to examine the nature and character of similar historical tests of international normality. The revival of the classical framework of confrontation between the West and other state entities is analysed in the post-war domination of Western discourse and model of power in contemporary international politics.[3] My main questions are: To what extent can the West, in all its forms of sovereign authority, legitimately denounce any other ground for the constitution of politics as incompatible with the universal values set by the post-war order? Could emerging forms of polity such as the Islamic State replace this order in international relations or would they, conversely, simply contribute to perpetuating the power regime they are opposing to.

A Genealogy of Sovereignty Monologues[4]

> *Later writers, such the great French Philosopher Montesquieu, also reflecting on the Spanish case in the eighteenth century, and the liberal political theorist Alexis de Tocqueville, reflecting on French Algeria in the nineteenth, would warn other generations of unrepentant imperialists that no one can afford for long to practice atrocities and tyrannies overseas without the evil seeping back to contaminate the homeland.*
> – Anthony Pagden, *Peoples and Empires*[5]

---

[3] See *Reframing the International Law, Culture, Politics*, ed. Richard Falk, Lester Edwin J. Ruiz, and R. B. J. Walker (New York and London: Routledge, 2002); Fred Dallmayr, *Dialogue Among Civilizations. Some Exemplary Voices* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

[4] See Jens Bartelson, *A Genealogy of Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[5] Anthony Pagden, *Peoples and Empires. A Short History of European Migration, Exploration, and Conquest, from Greece to the Present* (New York: Random House, Inc., 2001), 70.

The celebration of the seventieth anniversary of the United Nations (1945-2015)[6] as the guardian of post-war peaceful co-existence honours its survival despite occasional turbulences and aphorisms.[7] Still weighed down by the three chains anchoring its existence, that is, issues relating to security, solidarity and sovereignty,[8] the UN system still appears faithful to the paths it has travelled to date, with good and bad moments, periods of helplessness and despair. One such path is that which post-war normality has been following since the Iranian Revolution of 1979. The mapping of international politics directs current events in Kobane and Raqqa as well. The actions of the Islamic State on the historic soil of Mesopotamia revives facets of the distant, unresolved Eastern Question, the more recent (post-) colonial order, and an enduring special encounter between the West and other collective players on the world stage.

The origins of this special encounter can be found in another city –Salamanca– on a frontier separating two civilisations, the Spanish and the Arabs, the Christians and the Muslims, when starting in the 15th century the orderly European world would interact through war and conquest with the others, the non-Europeans, the *res nullius*. It was then that the theologians of the School of Salamanca composed their own monologue against the mediaeval order of theological and secular power, which was hostile to their positions. It was a moment of quest, when Dominican and Jesuit monks and theologians, like Francisco de Vitoria[9] (1480-1546) and Francisco Suárez[10] (1548-1617), essentially secularised with their writings and proclamations

---

[6] See *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

[7] According to 2nd UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld (1953-1961), "The UN wasn't created to take mankind into paradise, but rather to save humanity from hell."

[8] Anne-Marie Slaughter, "Security, Solidarity and Sovereignty: The Grand Themes of UN Reform," *American Journal of International Law* 99 (2005): 619-31.

[9] See Francisco de Vitoria, *Political Writings*, ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrance (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); David Kennedy, "Primitive Legal Scholarship," *Harvard International Law Journal* 27 (1986): 3-4, fn. 4; Bartelson, *A Genealogy*, 127-34.

[10] See Kennedy, *ibid*., 4, fn. 5.

the theological *Pax Christiana* for the legal apotheosis of the oncoming status quo between sovereign conquerors and conquered subjects. Their views sought to formulate the emerging reality between the *jus gentium* of the few existing states and the *jus communicationis* with the world's old and new "barbarians." The School of Salamanca prepared the rising global legal community, the *civitas maxima* of contemporary international law, establishing a bridge between natural law and the evolving positive law. Vitoria offered to the "barbarians" of the international society of his days the perspective of having full ownership of their lands, while the Spanish had no right either to take their lands by force or to compel them to convert to Christianity. While recognising Spain's right to travel to the New World, by the same token he persisted that the Indians had no right to prevent communication, a right enjoyed by all men. Any violation of the *jus communicationis*, the exchange of products and ideas, must be condemned, and consequently states are required to restore the natural condition of free communication.[11]

The first direct imprint of the representatives of the School of Salamanca marked the famous public controversy at Valladolid (Consejo des las Indias) (1550-51):

> the debate between partisans of equality or inequality reaches its apogee, and at the same time finds a concrete incarnation, in the celebrated controversy at Valladolid which, in 1550, sets the scholar and philosopher Juan

---

[11] Georg Cavallar, *The Rights of Strangers. Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), 108; Johannes Thumfart, "Das ius gentium als Form der translatio imperii: Francisco de Vitorias Legitimation des spanischen Kolonialismus im Kontext der Arbeiten Miguel de Ulzurruns, Hernán Cortés und Bartolomé de las Casas," in *Europa jenseits seiner Grenzen−Politologische, historische und juristische Perspektiven,* ed. Ingolf Pernice et al. (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2009), 15-39.

Ginés de Sepúlveda[12] [1489/90-1573] against the Dominican Bishop of Chiapas Bartolomeo de las Casas[13] [1484-1566].[14]

Before a panel of jurists and theologians, the heritage of Salamanca confronted the dominant discourse of Sepúlveda's, which supported the rightful subjugation of the barbarian peoples by any means. As M. Wight and A. Pagden have observed:

> It seems that Las Casas won. This 'great debate,' in the long run, transformed the Spanish Empire.[15]

> Sepulveda's little book, however, was not published until the nineteenth century, so in some sense Las Casas and the theologians of Salamanca could be said to have won.[16]

---

[12] "[He] wrote a […] book specifically for this debate [in Valladolid]: *Demócrates Segundo* (1545?). It bears the subtitle, *About the just Causes of the War Against the Indians*. In it, he made four different arguments in defense of the policies of the Spanish government. He brought to bear as evidence a long series of references […] Aristotle, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas Aquinas." Immanuel Wallerstein, *European Universalism. The Rhetoric of Power* (New York and London: The New Press, 2006), 4-5.

[13] "[…] he came to the Americas in 1502, and was ordained a priest in 1510, the first to be ordained in the Americas. He was initially favorable to and participated in the Spanish system of *encomienda*, which involved the assignment (repartimiento) of Amerindians as forced labor to Spaniards. […] But in 1514, he had a spiritual 'conversion' and renounced his participation in the encomienda system, returning to Spain to commence his life's work of denouncing the injustices wrought by the system." *Ibid*., 3.

[14] Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999), 151.

[15] Martin Wight, *International Theory. The Three Traditions*, ed. Gabriele Wight and Brian Porter (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1991), 69.

[16] Pagden, *Peoples and Empires*, 69.

According to Knutsen,[17] Las Casas won this duel with his victory in a debate on legal theory and moral philosophy. In contrast, Wallerstein is of the opposite view:

> The Consejo de las Indias that met in Valladolid did not report his verdict. Hence, Sepúlveda won. It is still not reporting its verdict, and as such, Sepúlveda is still winning in the short run. The Las Casas of this world have been condemned as naïve, as facilitators of evil, as inefficacious.[18]

In the real world, however, the Indians continued to be massacred. Moreover, while in 1481 the Grand Inquisitor Tomás de Torquemada (1420-1498) sought to deliver Spain from the Arabs, the Moors and the Jews, a little later, in 1492, the gates of the world would open themselves to trade, especially for the colonial powers, and thus to the expansion and entrenchment of their sovereignty.[19] Wallerstein sums up in an emphatic way:

> For a very long period, going more or less from the long sixteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century, the Sepúlveda doctrine[20] –the legitimacy of violence against barbarians and the moral duty to evangelize–predominated, and the Las Casas objections represented a distinctly minority position.[21]

[17] Torbjørn Knutsen, *A History of International Relations Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 66-7.

[18] Wallerstein, *European Universalism*, 28-9.

[19] "[…] and the year 1492 […] is also the one that sees the publication of the first grammar of a modern European language–the Spanish grammar of Antonio de Nebrija. […] [He] writes in his Introduction these decisive words: *Language has always been the companion of empire*." Todorov, *The Conquest*, 123.

[20] "As one can see, these are the four basic arguments [natural servitude, eradicate idolatry and human sacrifices, free innocent people from being sacrificed, propagation of the Christian religion] that have been used to justify all subsequent 'interventions' by the 'civilized' in the modern world into 'noncivilized' zones-the barbarity of the others […]." Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, 5-6.

[21] *Ibid.*, 15.

> In theory and in practice, in policy and in law, the rapacity and crusading zeal of the *conquistadores* quickly gave way to a sane, conscientious and prudent imperialism which could face its critics boldly and with confidence. Partly for that reason, the conquest proved remarkably enduring.[22]

The views of Their Catholic Majesties were weighted by their strong dependence on theological discourse and their persistence to justify divine precedence over the secular state and the positive law it generated. This may have made their legal thought seem primitive,[23] yet it rendered them forerunners of contemporary international law.[24] Essentially, their innovative thinking would not be acknowledged before nearly the end of the nineteenth century.[25] Until then, the Protestant urge to conduct international relations through economic growth as regards the exploitation of the colonies rested primarily on the writings and the spirit of Hugo Grotius and his successors, e.g., Samuel Pufendorf (1632-1694) and Emmerich de Vattel (1714-1767), as the founders of contemporary international law.

> A new trinity replaces –or rather puts in the background, for it must always remain ready to intervene– the old-style soldier-conquistador: it consists of the scholar, the priest, and the merchant.[26]

There followed the various –and familiar– phases of the development of the Westphalian structure through the deadly national egotisms of the several European states. The gradual introduction of new

[22] John Horace Parry, *New Cambridge Modern History*, vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 589.

[23] Kennedy, "Primitive Legal Scholarship," 1-98.

[24] Bartelson, *A Genealogy*, 128-34.

[25] See Ernest Nys, *Les origines du droit international* (Brussels: Alfred Castaigne, Paris: Thorin et Fils, 1894), accessed February 10, 2016, http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k24370b; James Brown Scott, *The Catholic Conception of International Law. Francisco de Vitoria & Francisco Suárez* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1934).

[26] Todorov, *The Conquest*, 175.

actors from the colonial states into the existing system of sovereignty and self-determination would activate manners and practices of communication between the preceding single or fragmented dominant Western whole and the new players on the international stage. Industrialisation and the democratisation of international relations *de facto* increased the demand for raw materials and energy resources, in conjunction with increased consumption in the prosperous Old World societies of the historic Great Powers.

> These Spaniards apparently seek to collect as much gold as possible in the shortest amount of time, without trying to find out anything at all about the Indians.[27]

Economics and liberalism divided the West into competing versions of power, especially in the '70s and '80s. From the mid-1970s on, the US–EEC/EU–Japan triad formed the hard core of the Western world, the post-war economic and geopolitical First World. In the context of the Cold War, a peculiar "Cold Peace" was achieved within this Western triad. The post-1970s period was marked first and foremost by the competition among these three centres of accumulated prosperity and wealth "exporting unemployment" to one another, while at the same time increasing their own national wealth. The outcome of this policy was that each side, in turns, had a decade of dominance, the EEC in the '70s, then Japan in the '80s and, finally, the USA in the '90s. On the other side of this divide, the countries of the Second World of existing socialism followed, at their own pace, their own inward-looking course on the rails of the Soviet Union, as did the non-aligned and other countries fighting colonialism, poverty and underdevelopment.

At the beginning of the 21st century, this special Western triad is still struggling to develop centrifugally rather than centripetally. The Western world would return to some form of unity after the '90s, to face its contestation on the part of other value-systems from the global fringe, a contestation that it had itself fostered and underpinned. Those contesting the supremacy of the Western model included,

---

[27] *Ibid*., 98.

on the one hand, China, Russia and India, chiefly with regard to their economic clout within the capitalist system.[28] On the other hand, Islam emerged as a new expression of contestation in its post-Cold War version, with all the old threads inherited from geography, history and culture and with new skeins already wound. The structures of the social formations of its tribes, colonialism, the right of selfdetermination, imperfect nationalism, Islamic revival movements, in conjunction with democratisation and geopolitical relationships, they all confront the historic added-value of Islam, which contests the superstructure of the West in all its political-economic and cultural making:

> If Moors or Turks had come with the same injunction [Requerimiento] declaring Mohammed the ruler of the world, were they [the Spaniards] to believe it?"[29]

Newer Islamic sub-groups curse the whole modernity of the West, and particularly its modern, neoliberal form. Their generations are the product of Western Enlightenment and liberalism. They take action within the multiplicities of their community, actions such as national liberation movements for self-determination and state creation, seizing power to impose a change of regime, urban guerrilla warfare, civic strife with incidents in underprivileged neighbourhoods, activism via social and hybrid networks. Constituting the new, radical ideology of militant Islam, and carrying different experiences, they envision ideal polities, proposing changes in institutional, socio-economic, legal and spiritual models.[30] Guided by the surplus- value of Islam, its culture is fragmented and applied to contexts apt to

---

[28] See Andrew F. Cooper and Ramesh Thakur, "The BRICS in the New Global Economic Geography," in *International Organization and Global Governance*, ed. Thomas G. Weiss and Rorden Wilkinson (London: Routledge, 2014), 265-78.

[29] Todorov, *The Conquest*, 162.

[30] See Peter Mandaville, *Transnational Muslim Politics. Reimagining the Umma* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001); Malise Ruthven, *A Fury for God: The Islamist Attack on America* (London: Granta Books, 2002); Olivier Roy, *Globalized Islam: The Search for the New Ummah* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004).

strengthen those groups that control the community of their faithful through their knowledge and interpretation of it.

The practices of war and domination have been the key elements in shaping the course of international relations. Nonetheless, because of the prevalence of more profitable forms of government, they no longer belong to the hard core of political analysis employed by the active players in global politics. The predominant discourse of applied international politics is forged within the specialised knowledge and unlimited possibilities of technology for states and institutions, designating new positions as "natural," indeed essentially as new versions of the truth of power. In this new view of international politics, we view the antithesis of the dogma that knowledge is power. In this new type of power, all the available tools, processes, techniques and goals constitute its new "natural" anatomy. The technology of power is built on a continuously changing network of pregnant relations and actions and is not based on obedience solely and simply through oppression:[31]

> This homogenization of values by money is a new phenomenon and it heralds the modern mentality, egalitarian and economic.[32]

In the context of globalisation, diversified competition increases the states of insecurity. The new forms of government that favour maximising profits through the promise of mutual advantages for participants, exploit the collective institutional structure, particularly of the United Nations, and the consensual decision-making as its basic characteristic. Power in international issues becomes productive because through its mechanisms it manages to prove itself productive, building up networks and penetrating the relations they produce so that the wealth created is fully in harmony with the rules governing the construction of the new version of all areas and subjects

---

[31] Jon Simmons, *Foucault and the Political* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 27-30.

[32] Todorov, *The Conquest*, 143.

beyond their natural content. The technology of power exploits specialised knowledge and the language of Right in the conventions it generates, offering new views and versions of the reality of international politics as regards the productive utilisation of the capital generated. The sovereign discourse of international institutional normality produces, organises and at the end consumes constructions advancing the prospect of the gradual replacement of fixed geographical borders resulting from war by the new bio-political borders of desired freedoms for more cooperation and a greater and more profitable productivity of power:[33]

> Since the period of the conquest, for almost three hundred and fifty years, Western Europe has tried to assimilate the other, to do away with an exterior alterity, and has in great part succeeded. Its way of life and its values have spread around the word; as Columbus wished, the colonized peoples have adopted our customs and have put on clothes.[34]

While in creative Western societies power is exercised through the monitoring and interpretation of individual and collective identities in interaction, in the theological societies of the different versions of Islam the power of the dominant discourse is constructed on the exclusivity of its hierarchical narrative. Western societies take shape and are monitored through the invocation and observance of a whole mechanism of laws and institutions that serve an egalitarianism of freedoms and rights.

> Egalitarianism, of which one version is characteristic
> of the (Western) Christian religion as well as the ideol-

---

[33] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Volume 1: *An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990), 139-40.
    [34] Todorov, *op. cit.*, 247-8.

ogy of modern capitalist states, also serves colonial ex-
pansion: here is another, somewhat surprising lesson of
our exemplary history.[35]

Multilayered sets of tools, techniques, procedures, application lev-
els and targets composed a whole institutional and legal technology
in Western normality, which constitutes the new physics, the new
anatomy of power between the sovereign and the non-sovereign. In
the West, power through surveillance is not the privilege of a ruling
class. Thanks to the possibilities offered by the system, its authorised
agents also have a sense of power and sovereign discourse through
the idealisation of the individual who chooses freedom and its iden-
tity. In feudal, hierarchical structures like the Islamic State, by con-
trast, the mechanics of power operates in the name of absolute theo-
logical truths. This was, of course, a familiar situation in Europe until
the discovery of the New World and the arrival of the age of Enlight-
enment. The intermediary interpreters and holders of the truth of Is-
lam monitor the faithful in the context of a god-sent hierarchy with-
out the illusion of Western individuality and its life choices. In the
final analysis, it offers them an idealised past of a polity of harmony,
solidarity and innocence, since in their Westernised present not only
is there no equality in their everyday existence but that life is in fact
unliveable.

Models of security

> *If you want total security, go to prison. There you're fed,
> clothed, given medical care and so on. The only thing lack-
> ing... is freedom.*
> — Dwight D. Eisenhower

What path versions a vision of an imagined polity takes is linked
first and foremost to specific, selective models of security set by
whoever holds the political clout and scientific knowledge. The post-

---

[35] Todorov, *The Conquest*, 248.

war, and especially the post-Cold War period in international rela-
tions has been supposedly based on dialogue and cooperation, but its
course to date has been established primarily on monologues of
power, sometimes conventional, sometimes *sui generis* as regards
the broader operating framework of the whole international system.

Conventional institutions entrenching the post-war peace, among
them the UN and NATO, were constructed as monologues against
the international community[36] in the then small worlds of interna-
tional relations. The UN as the universal epitome of the triptych of
post-war normality –development, peace, democracy– stands out as
the guardian of secure and peaceful co-existence, with political crite-
ria set on a universal plane and consensual procedures.[37] It is telling
that in the UN Charter the words "peace" and "security" are almost
exclusively used together (33 out of the 49 times that the word
'peace' appears). As the sole security organisation remaining after
the end of the Cold War, NATO is moving towards acquiring the
same sort of universality as the UN, but without the assent of two at
least of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council,
Russia and China, and other rising political–economic powers. In the
text of the 14 articles of the North Atlantic Treaty (4 April 1949), the
words 'peace' and 'security' are virtually inseparable (used together
in 6 of the 7 occurrences of the word 'peace').

[36] According to Trouillot: "I think of [the international community] as a sort of
Greek chorus of contemporary politics. No one has ever seen it, but it is singing in
the background and everyone is playing to it." Michael-Rolph Trouillot, "The
North Atlantic Universals," in *The Modern World-System in the Longue Durée*, ed.
Immanuel Wallerstein (Boulder: Paradigm Press, 2004), 230.

[37] According to Mazower, [he] "present[s] the UN as essentially a further chap-
ter in the history of world organization inaugurated by the League and linked
through that to the question of empire and the visions of global order that emerged
out of the British Empire in particular in its final decades." Mark Mazower, *No
Enchanted Palace. The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United
Nations* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), 14; see further-
more, Ramesh Thakur, *The United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective
Security to the Responsibility to Protect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2006).

The point upon which attention needs to be focused for the serious student of international affairs is that the United Nations does not represent a break with the past, but rather the continued application of old ideas and methods with some changes deemed necessary in the light of past experience. If people would only recognize this simple truth, they might be more intelligent in their evaluation of past efforts and more tolerant in the appraisal of present efforts.[38]

The ECSC and later the EEC, which as the EU pursued larger and more profitable forms of governance, originated as specific monologues against the established international superstructure of states and intergovernmental organisations. The trade pattern established with the ECSC led to its economic equivalent in the EEC, as the result of the arrangement between the ECSC-merchant and the EEC-manufacturer. Politicians and businessmen cashed in the added value of supranational experiments, while the peoples of Europe enjoyed more of the promised added value of those experiments in the goods of consumer democracy.[39]

If, due to the bipolar opposition between the US and the USSR, the post-war period offered more democracy at the national and supranational level within the community structure, in the post-Cold War period there has been only a quantitative improvement within and without the structures of the EU, while, at the same time, self-evident rights and privileges within those same structures have been lost or curtailed. The direct outcome of these developments is the creation of a fortress mentality[40] in international relations within the

---

[38] Leland M. Goodrich, "From League of Nations to United Nations," *International Organization* 1 (1947): 5.

[39] See Ian Manners, "Global Europa: mythology of the European Union in world politics," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48 (2010): 67-87; David Buchan, *Europe: The Strange Superpower* (Sudbury: Dartmouth Pub Co., 1993).

[40] See Michael Dillon, *Biopolitics of Security in the 21th Century: A Political Analytics of Finitude* (London: Routledge, 2010); *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, ed. Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998).

national and supranational "interiority" of the EU member-states, either because of the opposing presence of the enemy, or because this "enemy" (after 1990) uses the same means to increase its economic gains in the name of the advance[41] of democracy around the globe. Essentially, they actualised President Kennedy's rhetorical "Ich bin ein Berliner," expressing the reality of the new Germany and the EEC. The new institutions functioned as "EEC Berliners," combating both isolation and self-complacency and cultivating the vision of a European identity with steady economic growth, democratic governance and the prospect of supranational integration.

> The final Sepúlveda argument was the right and duty to evangelize, and the presumed obstacles to that posed by the Amerindians. The equivalent in the twenty-first century is the right and duty to spread democracy.[42]

In the context of the Cold War and given the means and possibilities of the times, any entrenchment of security the world experienced was achieved through passive information and the acquired speed of transmission of legitimacy to the dominant discourse of the leading elite. In the first decade following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the national enthusiasm of states and peoples sacrificed the qualitative integration of the European Union to functional balancing acts and the prospect of quantitative expansions with economic potential. The second decade of the 21st century continues to carry the perspective of greater intensification for those "walled" within the polity of the

---

[41] Dimitrios E. Akrivoulis, "'Walled states' at the intersection of neoliberalism and neoconservatism: the 'march of freedom' and the collapse of democracy," in *The State in the International Community of the 21st Century*, ed. Stelios Perrakis (Athens/Brussels: Sakkoulas/Bruylant) (in print), accessed January 15, 2016, http://www.academia.edu/6227340/Akrivoulis_DE._Walled_states_at_the_inters ection_of_Neoliberalism_and_Neoconservatism_the_march_of_freedom_and_th e_collapse_of_democracy.

[42] Wallerstein, *European Universalism*, 25-6.

European community (countries, peoples, citizens), but with the same nerveless structures and the patently ambiguous wills of its members.[43]

For the EU, the post-Berlin reality is composed of unfinished structures within its borders and buffer areas without, forming the new walls[44] for privileged and unprivileged nation-states as members of the EU. New walls have been built within the community structure, either because of internal weaknesses or because of external threats. The EU of today, the EU of the Lisbon Treaty, is the institutional outcome of an adapted transformation of an accumulation of increased democratisation and transparency, where the national share is growing and the European becoming more limited. A new virtuous circle of reciprocal gift-giving is being shaped, as the collective self-centredness of the victors of WWII is replaced by the isolated self-centredness of national navel-gazing. The citizens of the old First World in Europe, and of the Western world in general, enjoy freedoms within the nation-state through the legislative safety valves of the rule of law, making the State the protector of individual and social rights, and at the same time the guarantor of economic development individually and collectively through increased consumer power:

> Fortresses are sometimes useful, then, and sometimes not; it depends on the circumstances. Moreover if they help you in some respects, they will be harmful in others. The subject may be clarified in the following way; if a ruler is more afraid of its own subjects, he should build fortresses, but a ruler who is more afraid of foreigners than of his own subjects should not build them.[45]

---

[43] See M. Corner, *The European Union. An Introduction* (London-New York: I. B. Tauris, 2014); J. McCormick, *Understanding the European Union* (Palgrave, Basingstoke 2002); T. Risse–Kappen, "Exploring the Nature of the Beast: International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34 (1996): 53-80.

[44] See Wendy Brown, *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Zone Books, 2010).

[45] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Quentin Skinner and Russell Price, trans. Russell Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 75. See Bartelson, *A Genealogy*, 111-27.

Today, in the vast worlds of globalisation, with the interaction of technology and the social networks, the system itself has increased the chances and essentially the prospects of its own contestation. The period of Cold War guilt and tolerance as regards the safety valves of international normality have given way more to its management through the selective application of one-way policies. The few examples of specific Cold-War narratives were multiplied and reinforced beyond all measure in the post-Cold War environment, where conventional, specific and hybrid agencies (e.g., states, organisations, international players, communities and networks) display interregional particularities.

In IR Theory (as opposed to the practice of international politics) the new wars between the two powerful monologists of the global structure, the neorealists and the neoliberals, are recorded in detail. According to Waltz,[46] the states form entities of a similar kind. On the one hand, these entities are characterised by a standard internal organisation based on the hierarchical model in their interior structure. On the other hand, their common objective as regards the external environment is maximum security, and not simply a barren accumulation of strength. Their primary concern is to build and reinforce all those security conditions that will help them protect themselves. Essentially, since their actions take place in an anarchic environment, they do not afford guarantees of survival to each state unit. This framework of uncertainty of the international system spotlights the famous security dilemma as regards the motives and power prospects of the other state actors and how far they are connected simply by reinforcing their own security or with expansionist views of implementing geopolitical scenarios of increased strength.

Predominant on the side of the neoliberals[47] –given the "natural" bent of the players participating in the system towards progress and cooperation– is the conviction that not only the states but also the

---

[46] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International* Politics (New York: McGraw Hill, 1979).

[47] Steven L. Lamy, "Contemporary mainstream approaches: neo-realism and neo-liberalism," in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, ed. John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 5th edition, 115-29.

structures and mechanisms of the global economy provide the guarantees of international security. The global system is more like a tissue of relations of increased interconnection and interaction, where other basic players of different weights and thematic substance rise to prominence. Alongside the erstwhile all-powerful state there are now other pieces on the international chessboard, such as international institutions and regulations, the free market, non-governmental organisations, and interest groups. These contribute for their part to increasing the possibilities of international cooperation and to guaranteeing world peace, in other than military terms. In contrast to the neorealists, for the neoliberals the international system and its structure cannot remain cramped within the framework of a zero-sum game.

What has become known in the respective literature and in current politics, as the Neo-Neo debate may at first glance retain something of the old polarity, but in essence it is more of a family affair within the sovereign Western normality.[48] In any case, in the practice of international politics the neorealists swear in the name of eternal geopolitical interests, adapting their policy to areas and subjects that recall old-style camps and counter-productive battlefields. The neoliberals, on the other hand, swear in the name of the primacy of freeing the economy from everything that shackles it and of the unlimited possibilities of cooperation in the pursuit of mutual benefits, converting spaces and subjects into profitable and innovative goldmines of corporate governance.

The social contract of international co-existence and cooperation through imposition, acceptance and consensus in the international relations of the recent past is reworked into a machine for the articulation of a standardised discourse comparable to an industrial production line. Extreme versions in economic practice elicit respective extreme versions in democracy and culture. Violent change in the conditions of economic production through unending profit-seeking causes equally violent changes in the daily life of states and citizens, where this violence emerges and persists as the only means of solidarity and for replacing the security regime. The fear and violence caused, primarily in Western societies, by the extreme applications

---

[48] *Ibid.*,123.

of governance on political economy terms are matched by corresponding dimensions of fear and violence from the rise of extreme right-wing, quasi Fascist or Nazi, versions of politics preached by corresponding communities of like-minded identities, ideologies and power systems. Irrespective of whether this is a question of the dominant Western conceptualisation of international relations and humanity as a whole or the outcome of new power projects from geographical, political and cultural areas of the world, outbidding in violence of every sort revives old, familiar and polarised visions of the world. Irrespective of whether these are concerned with domestic policy and the security of state citizens or with the interaction of the world as the result of globalisation, violence aims at the same outcome: the known and the same are always familiar, accepted and civilised; the different and the foreign are barbarous, unacceptable, and uncivilised. As Eric Delumeau so strikingly puts it:

> Here are so many factors that, gathered together, create a climate of anxiety in our civilization which, in certain respects, is comparable to that of our ancestors between the time of the plague and the end of wars of Religion. We have re-entered this 'country of fear' and, following a classic process of 'projection,' we never weary of evoking it in both words and images… Yesterday, as today, fear of violence is objectified in images of violence and fear of death in macabre visions.[49]

Conclusion

> *Las Casas had expressed this in eschatological, apocalyptic, prophetic terms, warning Spaniards that if they did not soon mend their ways, God would destroy them as he had done once before, by sending the Muslims to conquer them in 711.*
> – Anthony Pagden, *Peoples and Empires*[50]

---

[49] Quoted in David Campbell, *Writing Security. United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 50.

[50] Pagden, *Peoples and Empires*, 70.

In the new reality shaped by the unchecked coupling of politics and economics, colonisers and former colonies are now, with the tolerance of economics, living a new and unusual phase of historic migratory flows. In the West, states and citizens are trapped, like so many migrants, by the peculiar war of monsters from pathogenic and bureaucratic institutions and ultra-competitive management politics and live essentially as social outcasts and political exiles. In the colonies, political, economic and social emigrants from their own nation-states or from foreign –and culturally alien– countries try to create their own modernity within their own culture, using the technology of blood, fear and violence, just as happened in the good old days of the European nation-state.

> Machiavelli […] writes a short time later in his Discorsi: *Both ancient and modern instances prove that no great events ever occur in any city or country which have not been predicted by soothsayers, revelations or by portents and other celestial signs.*[51]

Every fairy tale has its dragon which in the end is redeemed by goodness.[52] Monsters, demons and ghosts encircle like guardian angels the threatened sovereign order of the Self, Civilisation and the Good, providing assurance that in the end the Other, the Barbarian, and the Evil will be conquered.

> The intervenors, when challenged, always resort to a moral justification–natural law and Christianity in the sixteenth century, the civilizing mission in the nineteenth century, and human rights and democracy in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries.[53]

---

[51] As quoted in Todorov, *The Conquest*, 75.

[52] See Richard Devetak, "The Gothic scene of international relations: ghosts, monsters, terror and the sublime after September 11," *Review of International Studies* 31 (2005): 621-43; Richard Kearney, *Strangers, Gods and Monsters. Interpreting otherness* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003).

[53] Wallerstein, *European Universalism*, 27.

In today's reality of the special "communication" described above between sovereign Western-style normality and its contesting cultural expressions, an updated version of Vitoria's fundamental argument returns. The sovereign world does not have the right to oppress and through specific models of discourse forcibly convert all others, who do not belong to the West and are not compatible with Western rationalism, nor can those others refuse the right of communication.

> Constructing world legal constraints on crimes against humanity has little virtue if these constraints are not as applicable to the powerful as to those whom they conquer.[54]

The difference, however, in relation to the small world Vitoria lived in is that the daily evolution of communications technology has eliminated time distances in all areas, conflating the global and the local into a "glocal" plane. This is the reality of technological possibilities, which do not merely facilitate the specific communication between sovereign normality and all other abnormalities. Essentially, the mechanisms of communication have metamorphosed into an end in itself, requiring each side to compose its narrative solely and exclusively through them, since only then can those narratives maintain their true substance. In this mass framework of industrial communication and culture, all invoke their rights, which however rotate around the construction of a narrative of violence, from the point of view both of the side that shapes it and of those who transmit it. Each individual formulates his own monologue of sovereignty according to the rules of a blood-stained zero-sum game, essentially considering the other side as the monster that has to be eliminated:

> [I]n the best of cases, the Spanish authors speak well of the Indians, but with very few exceptions they do not speak to the Indians. Now, it is only by speaking to the other (not giving orders but engaging in a dialogue) that *I* can acknowledge *him* as subject, comparable to what I

---

[54] *Ibid.*, 28.

am myself. […] unless grasping is accompanied by a full acknowledgement of the other as subject, it risks being used for purposes of exploitation, of 'taking;' knowledge will be subordinated to power.[55]

In the contemporary narrative of international relations, the "institutional monster" of the state of exception[56] is recalled to duty to protect structures and subjects from the specific threat of the Islamic State, concomitantly investing in the politico-economic realities of the sovereign system, as shown in the case of the compromise of the Iranian Revolution. In the secularised system of international relations, the *deus ex machina* still devises solutions, rescuing it from risks of collapse. This time it has to deal with a different interpretation of the fragmented culture of Islam, which calls upon the real god of its faithful to exterminate the infidels of a material world that has reduced them to the status of emigrant refugees, redeeming them in its own polity of peace and security. For the present, the duellists of today's international political reality, those "peculiar rationalist monsters," feel secure only in the structures of logic and the power of the guiding and controlling culture and secularised theological concepts.[57] As Carl Schmitt once emphatically remarked:

All significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts, not only because of their historical development […] but also because of their systematic structure.[58]

---

[55] Todorov, *The Conquest*, 200-1.

[56] See Giorgio Agamben, *State of exception*, trans. Kevin Attel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

[57] See Giorgio Agamben, *Stasis. Civil War as a Political Paradigm, (Homo Sacer II, 2)*, trans. Nicholas Heron (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015); idem, *The Kingdom and the Glory. For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government (Homo Sacer II, 2)*, trans. Lorenzo Chiesa with Matteo Mandarini (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015).

[58] Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. G. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 36.

On the one hand, the rulers of the terrestrial Rome[59] are apparently content to see in their dreams St Augustine conjuring the barbarians outside the city walls with passages from the *Civitas Dei*;[60] on the other, matching verses from sacred texts containing promises of celestial joy and harmony justify the struggle of the representations of Islam fighting the infidels. In any case, Nietzsche had already taken the prospect of this strange communication for granted:

> Wer mit Ungeheuern kämpft, mag zusehn, dass er nicht dabei zum Ungeheuer wird.[61]

[59] "Gentibus est aliis tellus data limite certo, Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem" (For the other nations the earth has fixed boundaries: Rome's city and the world are the same space), Ovid, *Fasti, 2*, 683-4.

[60] As Mandaville mentions: "Much has been written about manifestations of political Islam in various national, historical and sociopolitical contexts. Several 'grand theories' about Islam's place in a global scheme have also been advanced; sadly, however, too many of these have been fairly crude, essentialising hypotheses of the 'clash of civilisations' variety." Mandaville, *Transnational Muslim Politics*, 2.

[61] "He who fights monsters should look to it that he himself does not become a monster." Friedrich Nietzsche, *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*, in *Kritische Gesamtausgabe VI. 2*, ed. Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1968), 98, Aph. 146.