



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Political discourses and the securitization of democracy in post-1991 Ethiopia

Tessema, Y.N.

Citation

Tessema, Y. N. (2020, May 7). *Political discourses and the securitization of democracy in post-1991 Ethiopia*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87603>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/87603>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/87603> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Tessema, Y.N.

Title: Political discourses and the securitization of democracy in post-1991 Ethiopia

Issue Date: 2020-05-07

Chapter Two: A Theoretical Framework

2.1. Introduction

This chapter lays the foundations of the relationship between securitization, democracy and development in the context of post-1991 Ethiopia in an attempt to broaden the debate on the contentious issues linking the EPRDF doctrine (democratic centralism, developmentalism and ethnic federalism) and insecurity. As the Introduction briefly shows, for most Ethiopians, elite-centred analysis has ignored the security implications of the EPRDF doctrine. The chapter also reveals that securitization has a strong emphasis on discourse analysis, particularly what is referred to as the 'speech act'. It shows that as a speech act, securitization is an utterance that represents and recognizes phenomena as 'security', thus giving it special status and legitimizing extraordinary measures. Within this understanding, the utterance itself is the act (Buzan et al., 1998: 26), meaning that security exists within a discourse identified by the ruling elite as an extraordinary threat and, therefore, calls for emergency measures. In other words, the absence of democracy (authoritarianism) and underdevelopment can be considered referential points for securitization. Once the political elite declares these as sources of existential threat, they are securitized through speeches and become threats in elite discourses (Buzan et al., 1998: 1).

This chapter is divided into three sections: Section One briefly highlights the critical approaches to the field of security studies and introduces securitization theory. Section Two discusses securitization theory and its relationship to discourse analysis as a method and speech act. It further revisits the debate on whether as a discourse, securitization can exist outside the speech act, a view this thesis contests. Section Three elucidates the politics of securitizing democracy and development and its significance in explaining the pitfalls of securitizing development and democracy per the EPRDF doctrine. The chapter concludes that securitizing democracy and development reflects insecurity and resentment, thus problematizing post-1991 politics as it has been understood and practiced by the EPRDF and other political elites.

2.2. An Overview of Critical Approaches to Security Studies and Securitization Theory

The concept of security is so contentious some scholars have labeled it an 'essentially contested concept'(Baldwin 1997:7). Its discussion is often fraught with disagreements. The attendant issues, such as what constitutes the notion of security, who does security relate to, what is to be secured, and what are the causes of security, trigger a multitude of views and approaches to its study across time and in different places. The result is various temporal and spatial understandings of the concept of security, as seen in the history of its conceptual development. To facilitate the presentation of these varied approaches to the understanding of security one can broadly distinguish between the traditional approaches and critical approaches to the study of security studies.

This section sheds light on how the notion of security is conceptualized by the two major approaches to the field of security studies: the traditional approach and the critical security studies approach. It then focuses on securitization theory and presents the theory's conceptualization of security. It explores the problematic issues in securitization theory's conceptualization of security by linking it to the notion of democracy and democratization, with the aim of setting questions for the applicability of securitization theory in the context of post-1991 Ethiopia.

The traditional approaches to security studies are distinguished by their state-centric and militaristic understanding of the concept of security (Waever 1995, Buzan 1997, Krause and Williams 1997, Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2014, Collins 2018). They clearly focus on the state as the object of the study of security and military issues at the core of their conceptualization of security. Accordingly, any security issue has a meaning, if it is understood in relation to a state as a referent object – and issue wise – as a military threat. This means that for other issues to be considered a security threat or issue, they have to be understood in terms of a military agenda. This was a predominant approach in the era preceding the culmination of the Cold War period.

The critical approaches to security studies, on the other hand, contest this confinement of the conceptualization of security. Notwithstanding the differences within the critical approaches to understanding the notion of security, all such approaches attempt to expand the meaning of security beyond the traditionalist approaches. Following the post-Cold War developments around the 1980s, the critical approaches called for what was later termed a 'deepening' of the referent objects beyond the state and 'broadening' security issues (the agenda) beyond the military (Buzan and Hansen 2009). It was argued that given the phenomena of Cold War developments, the notion of security would be better understood if it could capture individuals, groups (society), and environments as referent objects, as well. Likewise, the broadening of the agenda was about a call for the inclusion of economic, political, environmental and societal factors, in addition to the military agenda. Hence, unlike the militaristic and state-centric traditionalist approaches, critical approaches to the conceptualization of security have deepened and broadened the notion of security.

The leading approaches in this category include the Welsh School (Critical Security Studies), critical feminist and gender approaches, post-colonial perspectives, international political sociology (The Paris School) and the poststructuralism and securitization theory (The Copenhagen School). While these critical approaches problematize the traditional militaristic state-centric conceptualization of security, they all differ in the alternative perspectives they expound. For instance, except for securitization theory, all the other approaches focus on highlighting the issues that have been missed – either in the form of a referent object or security agenda – in the traditional conceptualization of security.

The Welsh School of critical security studies is opposed to the state-centric understanding of security. It brings human beings (individuals) to the epicentre of (in)security discourses with the goal of freeing or emancipating humans from any constraints in exercising their freedom (Booth 1991, 2005, 2007, Wyn Jones 1999, Floyd 2007a). The feminist and gender approaches, in all their varieties, call on an understanding of (in)security that can address the marginalized issues of women and gender in the conceptualization of security and practices (Sjoberg 2009, Tickner 1992, Enloe 2000, 1989). The post-colonial perspectives question the lack of a grasp of the concerns of 'Third World' perspectives

(Ayooob 1995, 2002, Acharya 1997, 2002), while the international political sociology approach brings to the fore the problematic illiberal security practices that arose in the aftermath of the 'war on terror', as a crucial part of the conceptualization of (in)security – particularly in the context of the Western world (Bigo 2008, 2014). Similarly, the post-structuralist approaches, among others, emphasize the importance of the intersubjective processes involved in the construction of the meanings of (in)security as, for instance, the way identities are formed and reformed (Campbell 1992, Hansen 2006). The foci of securitization theory, however, are different: securitization theory focuses on the processes involved in the way in which certain issues become security issues or not. As such, the focus is not on the issue itself. Its conceptualization of security is not centred on the issues that are missing in the understanding of (in)security (as is the case with most of the other critical approaches discussed above), but rather in explicating how a security issue becomes such. Accordingly, its goal (as discussed below) is an analytical one (Floyd 2007b). It attempts to understand security by analyzing its processes, which are referred to as securitization/desecuritization in the terminology of this school of thought. It is this goal of securitization theory that makes it compatible with this study's goal and serves as a framework of analysis in the study.

Accordingly, this chapter further discusses securitization theory's approach to security studies with the aim of tracing its intellectual origins, the conceptualization of (in)security, and the processes of securitization and desecuritization. Furthermore, it examines the theory's logic of (in)security by linking it with the notion of democracy and democratization generally, and specifically to the context of post-1991 Ethiopia. The aim here is to set out the issues/questions this study attempts to grapple with and thus contribute to the discussion on the conceptualization of security/desecurity and its interactions with the concept of development and democracy in the context of countries such as Ethiopia.

2.3. Securitization Theory, the Speech Act and Discourse Analysis

Securitization theory was developed in the late 1980s by writers associated with the Centre for Peace and Conflict Research (later called the Conflict and Peace Research Institute or COPRI) in Copenhagen, the Danish capital. The widely published authors, Barry

Buzan and Ole Waever (Huysmans 1998a, McSweeney 1996, Taureck 2006) were responsible for developing and popularizing this theory. Buzan et al. published a seminal paper in 1998 entitled 'Security: A New Framework for Analysis'. Although these authors and Waever (1993, 1995) are seen as being at the core of this school of thought, their contributions have been enriched and consolidated by different ideas from, and debates by, various scholars and researchers.

Securitization theory, as a novel way of thinking about security, emerged against the backdrop of debate between the 'traditionalist' and 'wideners' camp (i.e., all emergent critical approaches). The traditionalists were concerned about the wideners' 'continuous expansion of the notion of security because they felt it might result in a lack of intellectual coherence in the study of security. Securitization theory, by acknowledging this concern of the traditionalists, offers the alternative of considering the contributions of the wideners when evaluating the concept of security. Instead of asserting the traditionalists' solution to the problem of a lack of intellectual coherence, its proponents assert:

“we seek to find coherence not by confining security to the military sector but by exploring the logic of security... The need is to construct a conceptualization of security that means something more specific than just any threat or problem. Threats and vulnerabilities can arise in many different areas, military and non-military” (Buzan et al. 1998:4-5).

As the above quote shows, securitization theory takes a different path in its conceptualization of security. Its approach differs from the traditionalists as it seeks to widen the security agenda beyond military issues. It also differs from the wideners, as it does not focus on bringing in those issues that need to be considered in the conceptualization of security. Instead, securitization theory is interested in spelling out the criteria to be fulfilled for a certain issue to become a security issue. To be more specific, it is a 'formula' for security, or an analytical tool that aims to uncover a particular logic of security, as is spelled out below:

“...to count as a security issue, they have to meet strictly defined criteria ...they have to be staged as existential threats to a referent object by a securitizing actor who thereby generates endorsement of emergency measures beyond rules that would otherwise bind” (Buzan et al. 1998:5).

Securitization theory’s understanding of security is based on the traditional conceptualization of security, and hence, it essentially understands security as a survival issue. If an issue is staged as posing an existential threat to a particular referent object – which could be a sovereignty issue or a certain a group – then that issue becomes a security issue that justifies the use of emergency measures.

Furthermore, according to securitization theory, security is ‘the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics ’(Buzan et al. 1998: 23). In line with this conceptualization of security, securitization theory posits that issues move from the ‘ordinary ’or ‘normal ’ state, first to a political issue that is debated within the public realm as a matter of public policy, then to a securitized issue, thereby moving it above politics. In other words, the issues exist in a realm of normal politics but can be debated in the realm of exceptional politics, wherein they are perceived as an existential threat requiring and justifying an emergency response or actions that suspend normal politics. Examples include the declaration of a state of emergency by the ruling elites.

Figure 2.1 The spectrum along which issues become a public threat per securitization



Source: Adapted from Buzan et al. (1998).

In Figure 2.1, an issue moves from a non-politicized to a security issue; one interesting element with far-reaching consequences in the conceptualization of security is the staging or presentation of an issue by a securitizing actor. According to securitization theory, the meaning of security lies in this staging or presentation – implying an intersubjective process involved in the construction of ‘threats’ or, simply understood, of the meaning of security. Proponents argue that the meaning of security is constituted in its use.

“‘Security’ is thus a self-referential practice, because it is in this practice that the security issue becomes a security issue – not necessarily because a real existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat.” (Buzan et al. 1998:24)

As discourse consists of utterances of a verbal, written, audio or visual nature, it becomes obvious the utterance itself is an act-securitizing act (Wæver 1995). Therefore, in conceptualizing security, securitization theory borrows speech act theory from linguistic studies, specifically from the work of Austin, to whom speech act theory is attributed. According to speech act theory, by saying the words (utterance) itself, an act is done, such as is the case of naming a ship or declaring a promise during a marriage ceremony, acts which signify the performative role of language (Austin 1962). At the core of speech act theory and significant for securitization theory is the fact that it is with performative utterances that we do something by saying something, and thus the utterance itself is an act. As a consequence of this understanding of security as a discursive undertaking, methodologically, its approach to security studies is stated as follows:

“The way to study securitization is to study discourse and political constellations: when does an argument with this particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieve sufficient effect to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed? If by means of an argument

about the priority and urgency of an existential threat the securitizing actor has managed to break away free of procedures or rules he or she would otherwise be bound by, we are witnessing a case of securitization” (Buzan et al. 1998: 25).

A discursive speech act alone, however, is not sufficient for successful securitization to happen. Securitization theory provides that some preconditions, which Weaver calls ‘felicity conditions’ (2000: 252), have to be fulfilled for successful securitization. The first condition is that the logic of security as propounded by the theory needs to be presented; there must be an existential threat to a specific referent object that needs emergency measures. The second condition is that there has to be a securitizing agent with authority; and that authority does not need to be an official one. Rather, it has to do with the social and political capital (acceptance) one has. The last condition that may facilitate successful securitization is the nature of the threat itself; if, for instance, there are historical hostile sentiments attached to the invoked threat, then that issue can easily be securitized.

In terms of widening the security agenda, securitization theory identifies five sectors of possible social interaction for applying its security logic to determine how issues can become security issues. The five sectors include the military sector, environmental sector, economic sector, societal sector and political sector. In the case of the military, when an issue is perceived as an existential threat to a state, its population, territory or military capacity (in the form of military mobilization), then it can become a security issue. Similarly, if an issue is perceived as posing a threat to the biosphere, species or the natural environment, it can result in the securitization of an environmental issue. The same works for the economic sector; issues perceived as an existential threat to markets, finances or resources can be securitized. The dynamics of securitization of societal and political issues appear when, in the case of a societal issue, a collective identity is existentially threatened. An example of this would be a threat to its language or culture. Similarly, in the case of a political issue, if the relationship of an authority, governing state or recog-

nition is at stake, it can result in securitization of the relevant issue. This is the case particularly if there is an existential threat to sovereignty, organizational stability or the ideology of a social order.

Whilst securitization theory expands the security agenda to these five sectors, it is important to note that the theory's approach to the study of security is orientated towards methodological collectivism; it does not study security at the individual level, unlike the Welsh School, whose approach is at the individual level. Securitization theory's analysis in non-military sectors is thus at the collective level.

Table 2.1 Sectors and forces of securitization in the security logic ('equation') of securitization theory

Sectors	Forces of securitization in the security logic of securitization theory
Military	Existential threat to a state/population/territory/ military capacity
Environmental	Existential threat to biosphere/species/natural environment
Societal	Existential threat to a collective identity/culture or language
Political	Existential threat to the organizational stability of states, systems of government, ideology of an order
Economic	Existential threat to access to resources, finance and markets

Source: Adapted from Buzan et al. (1998).

Finally, two points concerning securitization theory are worth mentioning. The first relates to the enunciator, the securitizing actor. According to the security understanding of securitization theory, “someone – some group, movement, party, or elite – who acts with reference to the nation and claims to speak or act on behalf of the nation” (Buzan et al. 1998: 41) is regarded as a securitizing actor. Thus, apart from an official authorized security actor representing a state, other actors (non-state) can also be securitizing actors. This can be better illustrated when elites claim to speak on behalf of a certain social group, such as a specific ethnic group. Political elites, either in the ruling camp or opposition camp, are often interested in becoming securitizing actors. The second crucial point in the conceptualization of security by securitization theory is the issue of desecuritization, which is the process of shifting or moving back a security issue from the status of a securitized to a non-security issue. It normalizes a security issue by bringing it back to the realm of normal politics. Apart from its goal of providing an analytical framework through which security can be understood, securitization theory also engages in normative judgment, and questions the ‘securityness’ of the securitization process itself. It essentially questions whether too much security is good or can lead to the achievement of security – the quality (feeling) of being secured. In this regard, it clearly takes a stand, privileging desecurity over security. The argument goes that, because securitization often results in a particular mode of thinking (of urgency and exception), this situation of emergency politics restricts the space for normal politics (debates, bargaining etc.). In a militarized mode of thinking one cannot expect normal politics to happen and hence, securitization theory advocates for ‘desecuritization, the shifting of issues out of emergency mode and into the normal bargaining processes of the political sphere’ (Buzan et al. 1998: 4).

While securitization theory offers an innovative approach to the conceptualization of security, which differs from the other critical approaches discussed above, there are also

problematic issues that need to be discussed in relation to its understanding of security/desecurity in general and also as it relates to this study. The next part of this chapter will elaborate on these problematic issues.

Although securitization theory's explanatory power has been widely praised as innovative (Knudsen 2001, McDonald 2008), there have been concerns raised about its conceptualization of (in)security. The problematization of the school's understanding of security ranges from fierce criticism to sympathetic moves aimed at consolidating its explanatory power as a theory. Criticism of its conceptualization of security in the former category, among others, relates to whether its conception of speech act captures all political discourses (Williams 2003), its focus on dominant actors (McDonald 2008, Hansen 2000), whether it is constructivist enough (McDonald 2008) and the 'exceptional politics' that are associated with the school's understanding of security/desecurity (Aradua 2004, 2006, Williams 2003, Huymans 1998b). Sympathetic criticism aimed at consolidating securitization theory's understanding of security includes the works of Balzacq (2005, 2011), Balzacq et al. (2016) and Stritzel (2000, 2011). Balzacq's work focuses on contributing to the conditions under which a speech act can be successful, while Stritzel's work is concerned with consolidating the internal coherence of the theory. In line with this latter group of works, and also dictated by the aim of this study, the following part of this chapter attempts to highlight those issues pertaining to the problematic conceptualization of security by securitization theory that has a bearing on the issue of democracy/democratization. As such, it is a selective one in its approach to discussing issues and dilemmas associated with securitization theory's notion of security/desecurity. Thus, the aim here is not to present all issues/criticisms targeting securitization theory.

The rationale for wanting to be selective can further be justified in the approach this study employs. This approach applies the security conceptualization of the theory in the context of post-1991 Ethiopia to thoroughly examine how (in)security/desecuritization interacts with the country's democratization processes. It aims to take securitization theory out of the Western context, specifically the European context which gave birth to it, and move

it to the context of the developing world to make sense of its political processes and realities in general. By so doing, it also aims to contribute to discussions on consolidating the theory from the empirical findings this study intends to generate.

But before raising the issue of operationalization of the theory by applying it to an empirical case, one needs to ask if securitization theory can be applied as a framework of analysis to the Ethiopian case. In other words, an explication of whether securitization theory can travel to Ethiopia as it is or so, need to be provided. This question of contextualizing the theory needs to be tackled first, in light of debates in the literature on the utilization of the theoretical framework on issues outside the Western, or more specifically, the European domain.

The relevance of this debate often rightly arises from the nature and evolution of securitization theory itself. The theory was developed within the context of European security dilemmas, and as such the conceptions and understandings that constitute the theory are obviously highly influenced by the socio-political context that gave birth to it (Vouri 2008, Wilkinson 2007). A good illustration of this Europeanness of the theory is its conceptual commitment or 'bias' towards liberal democracy anchored in the rule of law, among others. This can be easily noticed from its conceptualization of normal versus exceptional politics, exceptional measures justified by law, and political and legal legitimacy of the process of securitization, for instance. Despite this inbuilt 'bias' of the theory towards Western/Europeanness of the socio-political conceptualization, the utility of the theory's application to the non-Western context is now becoming clear for a number of reasons⁶ (Greenwood and Waever 2013, Bigin 2011, Herington 2010, Wilkinson 2007).

⁶ See for instance, Wilkinson C. (2007) 'The Copenhagen School on tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is securitization theory useable outside Europe?' *Security Dialogue* 38(1): 5-26. Bilgin, P. (2011). 'The politics of studying securitization? The Copenhagen School in Turkey'. *Security Dialogue*, 42 (4-5), 399-412. Herington, J. (2010). 'Securitization of infectious diseases in Vietnam: The cases of HIV and avian influenza'. *Health Policy and Planning* 25(6): 467-475. Emmers, R., Caballero-Anthony, M. and Acharya, A. (eds) (2006) *Studying Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Trends and Issues*. London: Marshall Cavendish Academic. Emmers, R., Greener, B. K. and Thomas, N. (2008). Securitising human trafficking in the Asia-Pacific: Regional organisations and response strategies. In: Curley, M. G. and Wong, S-l (eds) *Security and Migration in Asia: The Dynamics of Securitisation*. London: Taylor and Francis, 59-81. Greenwood, M. T. and Wæver, O. (2013). Copenhagen-Cairo on a roundtrip: A security theory meets the revolution. *Security Dialogue*, 44(5-6), 485-506.

The foremost reason is the fact that the theory itself is regarded as a research program that can be further developed and thus, the utility of its framework's application in various settings, including the non-Western context, falls in that space for intellectually developing and further enriching the theory. One of the leading theorists credited with co-developing the theory, Waever, states that "there is by now a surprising amount of empirical studies done with the full or partial use of securitization theory. These do not follow a standardized format and it is possible to focus on different phases of the process and different levels of aggregation" (2003:21). Also related is the fact that the democratic ideas embedded in the conceptualization of the theory arguably do exist in non-Western countries, albeit in restricted forms. In this regard, Vuori (2008) argues that the legitimacy issues emphasized in the securitization process of the theory also exist and are taken seriously in non-democratic countries. He uses the case of China, adapting the theory to the context of the country, specifically by focusing on the theory's concept of 'audience' and 'special politics'. Thus, he argues that the theory can aptly be applied in non-democratic contexts too. Moreover, the cases above cite empirical studies⁷ from non-Western contexts that concur with this view, although they all focus on different aspects of the process and the different levels involved in the (in)security conceptualization of the theory as they apply to the different contexts under consideration. It is this path that this study plans to follow, to bring securitization theory to Ethiopia and use its explanatory power in examining the post-1991 political process.

Those issues related to securitization theory's understandings of security and the particular type of politics associated with it will form the scope of the study and subsequent discussions in this thesis.

2.4. Politics of Securitizing Democracy and Development

An issue often raised against securitization theory's understanding of security with regard to the securitization process is the exceptional politics associated with it. According to

⁷ See the above cases mentioned under footnote 1 above.

the theory, the logic of security is the presentation of political problems (issues) as existential problems requiring urgent measures. As discussed above, it is an act of moving issues from the sphere of normal politics to emergency politics, thereby constraining the conduct of normal politics. Consequently, this results in the curtailment of the political space. This understanding of politics, informed by the Schmittian conception of exceptional politics, is often questioned (Hansen 2012)⁸. The state of affairs of exceptional politics is characterized by urgency, constructions/perception of threats and exceptional measures. It is a conception in which politico-legal tensions are created, the consequence of which is a suspension of the normal legal norms that in turn result in the suspension/limiting of normal political life. It is predicated on the idea that an emergency situation of an existential nature that threatens the survival of a certain referent object (a political order, sovereignty, for example) requires extraordinary measures, and hence necessitates a loosening of the rules of law to allow for the use of force. Examples include a declaration of emergency, states of siege etc. The logic of exceptional politics is indeed underpinned by the discretionary power of the executive (particularly the security apparatus of the state), a militaristic mode of thinking, prioritizing (in)security over politics, the use of force and the abrogation of civil and political rights. This notion of exceptional politics/politics of the extraordinary has been the subject of heightened debate both by scholars and political practitioners about the kind of political/governance envisioned. A concern here is that historically and, arguably after the events of 9/11, there seems to be

⁸ Carl Schmitt wrote a series of publications during the time of Germany's Weimar Republic (and afterwards) in which he questioned the efficacy of parliamentary/liberal democracy in response to crisis situations, such as in the case of a siege state, and advocated for emergency power which meant the suspension of a legal/democratic order to preserve political order. The invocation of this idea seems to have re-emerged in the wake of the 9/11 Twin Tower attacks in Manhattan. For more on Schmitt's understanding of a state of exception, see Schmitt C. (1985a). *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. G. Schwab. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Schmitt C. (1985b). *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, trans. E. Kennedy. Cambridge: MIT Press. Schmitt C. (2007). *The Concept of Political*, trans. G. Schwab. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Schwab G. (1989). *The Challenges of the Exception: An Introduction to the Political Ideas of Carl Schmitt between 1921 and 1936*, 2nd ed. New York: Greenwood. Particularly useful for a comprehensive and systematic introduction to Schmitt's thinking on the subject is the Oxford Handbook on Carl Schmitt (see Meierhenrich J., and Simons O. (Eds.) (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Carl Schmitt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. In addition Giorgio Agamben's writing on a state of exception seems useful (see Agamben G. (2005). *State of Exception*, trans. K. Attell. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

a tendency to adopt this type of exceptional politics as a policy option in established Western democracies. This has been problematized by various scholars for the inherent illiberal and undemocratic practices that accompany the adoption of exceptional politics⁹. It is logical then, for one to ask whether this type of politics is desirable at all. In this regard, Aradua (2004:393) rightly asks: ‘Do we want politics of exceptional measures’? The concern is even more plausible if one brings in the context of countries new to the practice of political democracy, such as Ethiopia. In particular, the securitization of issues in the political and societal sectors, raises the level of concern in democratizing polities or political processes that attempt to portray themselves as such. Often the political elites are highly divided on what constitutes a threat to a political system/structure, or on what ought to be an organizing ideology. Post-1991 Ethiopia can arguably be seen as a more complicated and delicate situation if seen in that context. At the beginning of the 1990s the country had just exited a protracted civil war and had vowed to depart from its undemocratic past and launch a political process aimed at 1) rebuilding a post-war political and legal order, and 2) simultaneously build a democracy. As obvious as it is, this is a serious task, the success of which can only be guaranteed to the extent that it enjoys the participation of all political stakeholders, is inclusive and commands legitimacy in the diversified political context of the country. The following chapters investigate whether these ambitious goals can be attained in a state of exceptional politics or otherwise.

⁹ See, for instance, Huysmans J. (2004). ‘Minding exceptions: the politics of insecurity and liberal democracy’. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 3(3), 321-341. Huysmans, J. (2008). ‘The Jargon of Exception – On Schmitt, Agamben and the Absence of Political Society’. *International Political Sociology*, 2 (2), 165-183. Williams, M. C. (2003). ‘Words, images, enemies: Securitization and international politics’. *International Studies Quarterly*, 47(4), 511-531, Bigo, D. (2006). ‘Security, exception, ban and surveillance’. In *Theorizing Surveillance* (pp. 60-82). Willan. Bigo, D. (2002). ‘Liaison officers in Europe: New officers in the European security field’. *Issues in Transnational Policing* (pp. 81-113). Routledge. Levi, M., and Wall, D. S. (2004). ‘Technologies, security, and privacy in the post-9/11 European information society’. *Journal of Law and Society*, 31(2), 194-220. Neal, A. W. (2009). *Exceptionalism and the Politics of Counter-terrorism: Liberty, Security and the War on Terror*. New York: Routledge. Aradua, C. (2007). ‘Law transformed: Guantánamo and the ‘other’ exception’. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(3), 489-501. Neocleous, M. (2006). ‘The problem with normality: Taking exception to “permanent emergency”’. *Alternatives*, 31(2), 191-213.

Also of interest to this study, is the examination of how the politics of exception interacts with the notion and practice of democratization, understood here as a transition to democracy and its consolidation, in a situation where the characteristics of normal politics are absent. The life of normal politics is inherently rooted in debate, compromise and bargaining on public policy issues. It is these essential ingredients that characterize the building of a democratic system. In his study on the process of democratization in about three dozen countries, ranging from Africa and Europe to Latin America, Huntington observed that democracy is hardly possible without what he calls 'the method of democracy'. He refers specifically to the negotiations and compromises that make democratization possible. " *How were democracies made? They were made by methods of democracy; there was no other way. They were made through negotiations, compromises, and agreements.*" (Huntington 1991:164)

Similarly, the process of desecuritization, of shifting back issues from the sphere of emergency politics to the sphere of normal politics, equally activates the same concern. The school sees security as a failure of normal politics, and consequently advocates for desecuritization – a belief grounded in the logic of 'less security, more politics '(Waever 1995:7). At this point, the Theory ceases to be only an analytical tool as it clearly engages in normative analysis too. However, apart from the normative privileging of desecuritization over securitization, the theory does not offer much in unpacking the details of desecuritization processes, and is thus aptly regarded as 'undertheorized '(Aradua 2004:22) and of having an 'underdeveloped status '(Hansen 2012: 527). While the normative privileging of desecuritization can be taken positively, the process of desecuritization should not be approached only in terms of a normative nexus political analysis, but should also be weighed against the rule of law as a process. In other words, one has to think about whether the process of desecuritization is just the prerogative of political elites, especially the ruling ones, who, motivated by political gain, normatively engage with the process of depoliticizing security issues, or whether this process should also be considered in the light of legal and ethical issues too. Therefore, the process of securitization/desecuritization can be very consequential to the type of politics that comes with it and to the democratization process.

Using the analytical framework of securitization theory, the following chapters scrutinize how democracy and development are securitized. The chapters also discuss the political elites' narrative, which attempts to de-securitize Ethiopia's official democracy and development discourses post-1991. Specifically, the chapters examine the "speech acts" and discourses of the political elites, the interplay of the discourses and how that in turn interacts with the doctrines guiding their vision of democracy.