

# Summary

The central problem this dissertation aims at addressing is legitimate violence in international order. Starting from the assumption that discourse carries a tremendous creative power and that much of State violence in this order is discursively legitimized by *othering* its Subject as „Terrorist“, to bring to fore the invisible practices of power and knowledge that reify the object of terrorism in discourse it employs a hitherto underdeveloped method of critical inquiry, Foucault’s *genealogy*, to the discourse of terrorism among States.

It is a critical project insofar as it does not aim at formulating a new theory of the Terrorist. Instead, to use Michel Foucault’s words, it strives to make facile gestures difficult, by challenging the dominant narratives in the field of terrorism knowledge, insensitized and insensitizing at the same time to the fake realism of the object and to the practices of power that make it possible, thus reproducing societal narcosis toward those practices of government(ality). As a particular kind of history, a history of the present, it uncovers reifying practices of terrorism by proper *historicization* of the discourse which enables the object’s forgetting and by extension preserving and furthering (assuming the constitutive relationship between power and knowledge) the possibilities of political reconfiguration. Therefore, unlike standard histories of terrorism, it does not look for an immutable essence of terrorism or depict its linear evolution from the origin (Nietzsche’s *Ursprung*) to the present state. On the contrary, it concludes that there is no such origin of terrorism. Having demonstrated its origin in the discourse of States as accidental and contingent on present power constellation (*Weltkonjunktur*) conceptualized by using Carl Schmitt’s theoretical framework it traces later continuities and discontinuities in States’s discourses of terrorism and internal and external conditions of their order to historicize the present discursive formations.

In the first chapter (*Concerning Method*), theoretical and methodological assumptions are articulated and key concepts such as, among other, Foucault’s concepts of *discourse*, *power* and *genealogy* (the last inspired by Nietzsche) and Schmitt’s concepts of the *nomos* and *global civil war* are established. A detailed research design drawing upon those assumptions is constructed. It delimits the scope of the discourse in terms of *loci* (international fora of League of Nations and the United Nations) and time (three discursive series: 1930s, the 1970s and the 2000s). It also defines the technique of „reading of terrorism“, concentrating on *law of rarity* and basic discourses of Self/Other as internal discursive conditions for articulation of statements; links to other discourses of power; and finally the nexus of power and knowledge, the archaeology of which, focused on object, enunciative modalities, concepts and discursive strategies, is performed for each discursive series. An overview of Poststructuralist literature in International Relations, including the heretofore use of genealogy as a method of critical inquiry is also provided.

The second chapter (*Overture: Against Ursprung*) demonstrates multiplicity of meaning of terrorism in the general discourse of the period preceding the 1930s. It is done at once to undermine the *Ursprung*-based standard histories of terrorism and to prepare ground for the conclusion that when terrorism emerged in the discourse among States in the 1930s, the unity of the concept (embracing assassination of protected persons and mass explosion) was purely accidental when contrasted to the variety of violence (both political and nonpolitical, or individual and structural) with which it had once been associated.

The two following chapters, *Emergence/y (1930s)* and *Division (1970s)* inquire into the conditions of (re)emergence of the discourse of terrorism among States in the 1930s and the 1970s, and into the internal and external rules for enunciation of statements in those discursive series. In both cases it is concluded that the emergence was a *status quo* reaction to what was seen as impending implosion of the established order and regime of legitimate violence linked to state interests. The discourse of terrorism was a disciplinary device uniting the (fictional) international community in a coalition against a new and unprecedented threat to its continued survival, hence requiring an exceptional response. Since the constellation of power differed in each case, however (due to the provisional restoration of Schmitt’s *nomos* during the Cold War), in the latter period there finally obtained not a single, but dual order of discourse featuring two sets of rules for statements’ articulation. These are identified as First World’s discursive order and (autonomizing) Third World’s discursive order. The Second World States did not shy away from the battle about terrorism which broke out due to the autonomizing Third World’s resistance and which turned around the poles of *nonstate revolutionary* and *state systemic* violence. Yet no discrete discursive order could be analytically derived from the multiplicity of their statements, and they tended to borrow from both of the above, but – betraying a conservative preference for the new provisional *nomos* – more from the First World’s discourse (that despite the Third World’s *epistémé* underlying its statements being fundamentally the same as that of the official Second World’s propaganda).

While presenting historically relevant conclusions in their own right (e.g. about the legitimization by States of violence that they themselves considered „terrorist“ in the 1970s Third World’s discursive order), the historical chapters’ key role lies in historicization of the present discourse put forward in the last chapter, *Enclosure (2000s)*. In definite absence of *nomos* and as a manifestation of the global civil war, the present, historically contingent discourse of terrorism reaches its monumental excess. It features, similarly to the discourse of the 1930s, an accidental unity of the object that enables subjectification of a wide array of actors as Terrorists – their disparate and disconnected locations, agendas and strategies notwithstanding – forming one *global terror network* with which *rogues states*, outcasts of the *civilized mankind*, can also be unproblematically associated. Once more, terrorism is conceived as an unprecedented threat with possibly apocalyptic consequence. Dehumanization and depoliticization of the Terrorist, present in the previous series, has reached its extreme in statements articulated in the historically familiar basic discourses of *order / chaos* and *civilization / barbarism* of the 1930s and the 1970s and new discrete discourses of *humanity / inhumanity* and *good / evil*. Depoliticization is carried through also by rendering terrorism a disease, a discursive practice which finds its roots generally in the paradigm of sovereign (and excluding) reason, and more specifically in the discourse of disease encountered in the 1970s series; or by an exclusive focus, the roots of which too are found in the 1970s, on (inhumane)

*means* the Terrorist employs rather than any possible (legitimate or not) *ends* he may pursue. The construction of Terrorists as thousands of potentially omnipresent madmen, Conradesque „ticking time bombs“ has finally been sustained by the dominant practices in the field of knowledge, particularly by those related to the concept of *new terrorism*.

The Terrorist Subject thus constructed conditions a new *discourse of action* – one dominated by the image of war. The roots of this image may be located in the linkage between the general discourse of terrorism among States in the 1970s and the discourse of international humanitarian law (yet another conservative attempt at preservation of the existing limits of legitimate violence in the international order), where terrorism was conceived only within the narrowly defined borders of armed conflict. Henceforward, for example, in the discourse of both power and knowledge the concept of victims of terrorist violence as *civilians* would be normalized. But the present war against terrorism is far from any traditional war: depoliticized, dehumanized and reduced to a disease of the international body politic, the Terrorist comes to represent a total enemy against whom and his associates, including rogue states, a (surgical) social pest control is performed. In contrast to the 1930s, the discourse of terrorism is linked to a set of disciplinary and normalizing nondiscursive practices. Thus it forms a part of a true *dispositif* or power management apparatus of global politics, which serves at once as a means of America's hegemony and more generally of management of global disorder by other States disciplining their domestic realms.

Since „terrorism“ is a useful power management apparatus for States, unless there comes a fundamental change in terms of collapse of States's international order it is likely to remain in place for a foreseeable future. Therefore, it is concluded, the critique of the discourse of terrorism as part of the *dispositif* continues to matter. This dissertation's main contribution to this project lies in employing genealogy as a promising but so far underdeveloped method of critical inquiry, the conclusions of which are reached using a potentially reproducible research design constructed with the aim of providing for a transparent and intellectually disciplined Poststructuralist discourse analysis, and are sustained by extensive mass of archival material and literature.