The Ontology of Security and its Implications for Maritime Security[*]

Güvenliğin Ontolojisi ve Deniz Güvenliğine Dair Çıkarımlar

Çağdaş DEDEOĞLU[**]

Abstract

A substantial number of state and non-state actors have published strategies for maritime security and governance in the last decade. These strategies have been criticized in the sense that they do not reflect the ever-changing nature of security context. The critics mostly deal with adaptation to new risks and threats from an anthropocentric perspective. This study instead focuses on the comparison of the classical and post-classical ontologies of security. It assumes that the classical ontology of security enables certain assumptions while ignoring others. Thus, an ontological critique appears to be a necessity to address the security concerns of the complex global security context adequately. With this, this paper contributes to Christian Bueger's maritime security matrix from a paradigm-oriented approach. As a result, the paper makes a case for the post-classical ontology of security and defines its main features as diffusion, interrelation, adaptation, non-linearity, and inclusiveness. This paper concludes that the ontological turn would be an asset for

sustainable maritime security governance.

*   **Keywords:** Anthropocene, Complexity, Ontology of Security, Maritime Security, Post-Classical Ontology.*

Öz

*   Devletler ve devlet-dışı aktörler, son on yılda, deniz güvenliği ve yönetişimi hakkında stratejiler yayımlamıştır. Ardından, bu stratejilerin, değişen güvenlik bağlamını yansıtmadığı hususunda eleştiriler ortaya çıkmıştır. Fakat bu eleştiriler, çoğunlukla, yeni risk ve tehditlerin insan-merkezci bir anlayışla stratejiye eklemlenmesiyle ilgilenmektedir. Bu çalışma ise, güvenliğin klasik ve klasik sonrası ontolojilerinin karşılaştırmasına odaklanmaktadır. Burada temel varsayım, klasik güvenlik ontolojisinin her zaman bazı varsayımları dikkate alıp bazılarını görmezden geldiği şeklindedir. Bu nedenle, ontolojik eleştiri, karmaşık küresel güvenlik ortamının güvenlik kaygılarına tam olarak yanıt vermek için gereklidir. Bu durum karşısında, bu çalışma, Christian Bueger'in deniz güvenliği matrisine de paradigma temelli bir yaklaşımla katkı sunmaktadır. Sonuçta, bu çalışma, güvenliğin klasik-sonrası ontolojisini öne çıkarmakta ve bu ontolojinin temel özelliklerini yayılma, karşılıklı ilişki, uyum, doğrusal olmama ve içerme şeklinde tanımlamaktadır. Böylesi bir ontolojik dönüşün, sürdürülebilir deniz güvenliği yönetişimi için elzem olduğu değerlendirilmektedir.*

*   **Anahtar Kelimeler:** Antroposen, Deniz Güvenliği, Güvenliğin Ontolojisi, Karmaşa, Klasik-Sonrası Ontoloji.*

Introduction

        Different conceptualizations of maritime security (or marine security) aim to selectively target some or all of various security concerns such as piracy and armed robbery, terrorism, sea trafficking —and human trafficking—, biological and chemical pollution, and climate change. These concerns continue to expand, and their character is hybrid, that is, they cannot be understood and responded by a conventional approach. In this respect, Maritime Security has taken shape in the interaction of national and international governance as

well as of various approaches and policies in the current global security situation.

Due to global dependency on maritime trade,[1] maritime security has received much attention, mostly in economic terms. States have presented individual and organized efforts concerning maritime governance. Although the academic literature and practical efforts on maritime security have been expanding, especially for the last decade,[2] the works focusing on diverse maritime security issues are still rare.[3] The main factor affecting institutional efforts has been the fear of maritime terrorism.[4] Such efforts have also considered additional factors based on their agenda. For example, NATO published its Alliance Maritime Strategy (AMS) in 2011, guided by the 2010 Strategic Concept.[5] However, the AMS has been later criticized by other authors. The critics state that the strategy does not reflect the dramatically changed security situation of the post-2011 era and draw attention to new risks and threats.[6] This study does not aim to make a similar list of maritime security challenges. Instead, it aims to focus on the ontological premises and the ways through which understandings of security have been constructed.

Two arguments have so far dominated the debate about the future of maritime security and governance. Some argue that the global

---

[1] The UNCTAD Secretariat, "Review of Maritime Transport 2011"; Chambers and Mindy Liu, "Maritime Trade and Transportation by the Numbers"; Zhang, "Chinese Capitalism and the Maritime Silk Road."

[2] Bekkevold and Till, *International Order at Sea*. Flynn, "The EU's Maritime Security Strategy." Denemark et al., "Diplomacy and Controversies in Global Security Studies."

[3] Algan, "Environmental Security in the Aegean Sea"; Cariou and Psaraftis, "International Symposium on Maritime Safety, Security and Environmental Protection."

[4] Martin N. Murphy, *Contemporary Piracy and Maritime Terrorism: The Threat to International Security* Routledge, London, 2013 https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203759318; Christian Bueger, "What Is Maritime Security?," *Marine Policy* 53, March 2015, 159–64, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.12.005.

[5] NATO, "Alliance Maritime Strategy."

[6] Horrell, Nordenman, and Slocombe, "Updating NATO's Maritime Strategy."

maritime domain is an anarchical one,[7] while the others approach to maritime affairs from the perspective of international order.[8] Most understandings of maritime security have been developed based on new risk perceptions. In this sense, they reflect the general trend of the field of international security studies, that is, they largely disregard "*analytical, philosophical, normative and epistemological assumptions.*"[9] However, there are rare yet comprehensive attempts in the field of security studies in general,[10] and particularly, in maritime security studies.[11] As a contribution to the latter, this paper addresses the ontological dimension of the hegemonic paradigm of security. It assumes that the classical ontology of security shapes mainstream understandings of security by allowing certain assumptions while excluding others. With this, this paper proposes an inclusive approach to maritime security. Based on the paradigmatic relationship between individual ontologies[12] and security, a debate on the ontologies of security may have some implications for an inclusive maritime security strategy at the global level.

1. On the Ontology of Security

This study assumes that existing works in the field of security studies rely on different paradigms such as positivism, post-positivism, constructivism, and critical theory.[13] Understanding this reliance is crucial since paradigm functions as a riverbed through which various theories flow. Paradigms are metaphysical forms that include specific positions on ontology (our belief about the nature of reality),

---

[7] Sloggett, *The Anarchic Sea: Maritime Security in the 21st Century*.

[8] Bueger and Edmunds, "Beyond Seablindness."

[9] Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009, p. 21.

[10] Michael C. Williams, "Identity and the Politics of Security"; Mitchell, "Only Human?"

[11] Bueger, op. cit.

[12] In this study, "ontologies" is used in plural form since individual ontologies differ.

[13] For a comparison of these paradigms, please see Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln, "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences."

epistemology (our belief about our knowledge of reality), axiology (the effects of ethics and values on our knowing), and teleology (our belief about the direction and outcome of our research). They are, therefore, cosmological statements. Theories, on the other hand, are statements that exist within specific paradigms.[14] Thus, paradigm limitations also restrict the theory. Keeping Thomas Kuhn's concept of paradigm shift[15] in mind, a theory explains any (social) phenomena within a paradigm in a normal science activity, but when it cannot do it effectively, this is either because the theory or the paradigm that this theory rests on are lacking. Then, there will arise the necessity for improving the theory. Unless such improvement occurs successfully, the moment will soon arrive for a paradigm shift.

For Mertens et al., a paradigm shift is also an ethical obligation when social justice issues that affect marginal groups motivate the researcher to question the metaphysical foundations of researching the "*real*" world. What Mertens et al. aim to reach as a result of paradigm shift is the transformative paradigm, a new paradigm that seeks "*to bring visibility to members of (marginal) communities.*"[16] A discussion about the transformative paradigm is beyond the scope of this article. Nevertheless, the study of security at the paradigmatic level can also be regarded as an ethical obligation since there is a link between hegemonic security discourse and the study of security. This link is integral to the legitimacy of governments and their policies since security discourses are implemented to determine which values are essential to be secured.[17] With these concerns, this study focuses on the concept of security from an ontological aspect.

---

[14] For the details of the personal communication with Denzin and Lincoln, see Mertens et al., "Utilization of Mixed Methods for Transformative Purposes."

[15] Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

[16] Mertens et al., op. cit., p. 5; Donna M. Mertens, "Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice," *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1, no. 3, July 2007, 212–25, https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807302811.

[17] Matt McDonald, "Climate Change and Security: Towards Ecological Security?,"

In the related literature, two different terms combine the words of ontology and security. The first term, "*ontology of security*", is widely used in computer science, particularly in web applications. The second term, "*ontological security*," is common in security studies[18] and has a different meaning than the ontology of security or security ontology. While the former corresponds to the security of individuals and sometimes of institutions concerning their survival concerns, the latter points out the metaphysical foundations of security-related assumptions of individuals, groups, or societies. Although the ontologies of security have not become a prominent debate in the field of security studies so far,[19] some studies question the metaphysics understandings of security and its related discourses. For example, Matt McDonald compares the prevalent discourses of security, such as national security, international security, and human security, and draws attention to the position of ecological security discourse.[20] These discourses differ in terms of security referent (nation-state, international society, or people), threat perception (sovereignty, global stability, or individual livelihood), agent (state, international organizations, or states, NGOs, and the international community). McDonald uses this classification to show how the discourses diversify regarding their positions about the securitization of climate change, but such a

International Theory 10, no. 2, July 2018, 153–80, https://doi.org/10.1017/ S1752971918000039, p. 158.

[18] Jennifer Mitzen, "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma," *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3, September 2006, 341–70, https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066106067346; Bahar Rumelili (ed.), *Conflict Resolution and Ontological Security: Peace Anxieties*, Routledge, 2014, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315796314.

[19] The syllabus of the Ph.D. course, named "Security Ontology," taught by David A. Welch, is an exception. In this syllabus, Welch states that the course is an opportunity "to explore and explain whether you think we should understand 'security' in a way that privilege human beings above all." I think the question that Welch asks is ontological, therefore, corresponds to the position of this paper. For details, David A. Welch, "GGOV630/PACS634/PSCI678: Security Ontology."

[20] McDonald, op. cit.

classification also has implications for security studies. Both scientific and non-scientific communities' approval of a specific security discourse is dependent on the balance of power among competing interest groups. This dependency also implies to what extent governments and societies affected by politics welcome a security paradigm. Ecological security discourse thus challenges the other three discourses in three aspects. First, ecosystems constitute its primary referent. Second, its threat perception focuses on the balance between current political, social, and economic forms. Third, its primary agent is people with their raising political awareness. With this, the ecological security discourse may respond to climate change differently than the discourses mentioned above. This outcome is closely related to the ontology of security as the working mechanism behind security discourse. The ever-changing global security context today constitutes a challenge for the classical ontology of security and its related security discourses and creates a demand for change. To better understand this challenge, the next section will discuss how the global security context has changed.

2. The Governance of Complex Insecurities and Some Ontological Questions

In 1957, Picasso finished an extended series of variations on Las Meninas (The Maids of Honor) that was originally painted by Velazquez in 1656 (Figures 1 & 2). The series was both a confrontation with one of the essential works in the history of Spanish painting and commentary on the events in Spain, observed by Picasso from his exile in France. From a different point of view, both works were representatives of their zeitgeist. The subject-object relationship differs between different zeitgeists, and this is reflected by the ontologies penetrating the lives of artists and scientists. Therefore, the comparison of the two versions may be helpful comprehend the transformation of global politics and international relations in three centuries. While the former Las Meninas was produced in the Westphalian period, the latter was done during the Cold War. Many differences can be found between these two works; however, it is important to note that the depiction of reality

is extremely conditioned by their times. It appears that while Velazquez portrayed a much clearer web of relations, Picasso did not or could not prefer to do this. This comparison helps to imagine complexity as the defining feature of the second half of the 20ᵗʰ century and the 21ˢᵗ century's first two decades. This feature translates into questions about the governance of complex insecurities.

Figure 1. Velazquez's Las Meninas (1656)   **Figure 2.** Picasso's Las Meninas (1957)

The advanced techno-industrial systems reinforced the complexities of our age, especially regarding the relationship between humans and their environments. Human influence over ecosystems has dramatically increased since the industrial revolution. Some scholars, therefore, posit that the Earth has entered a new geological epoch, the Anthropocene.[21] Some others make a particular emphasis on "*the great acceleration*" of human-induced environmental change since 1945.[22] What these different accounts point to is the wide spectrum of risks

---

[21] Paul J. Crutzen, "Human Impact on Climate Has Made This the 'Anthropocene Age,'" *New Perspectives Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (2005): 14–16, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5842.2005.00739.x.
[22] McNeill and Engelke, *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*.

such as ocean pollution, climate change, and biodiversity loss. However, the questions related to the concept of security —security of whom, how much security, and security through which instruments— still consider the issues of governance from a human-centered perspective and fail to adequately address these risks. This outcome is not surprising when someone considers the transformation of governance systems.

The emergence of state apparatus, as we know it, coincides with the advent of positivism in natural sciences, which is followed by increased anthropogenic activities. Since the late 17th century, the positivist paradigm and rationalism, have dominated the formation of modern national systems and the international order.[23] As Walker puts it, state sovereignty was, in a sense, a response to the dilemma caused by the Cartesian challenge to pre-modern belief in divine hierarchical order.[24] While the human mind has become "*rationalized*" during the modern era, its hierarchical character has remained almost unchanged. This one-dimensional rationalization[25] was also consistent with the transition from imperialism to colonialism and capitalism. These developments paved the way for the two world wars and, eventually, the "*new*" world order. However, this order has never been an inclusive one due to the hegemony of modernist, rationalist national security discourse. The journey of the concept of security, in Latin *securitas*, towards a collective meaning,[26] has also echoed these positivist trends. With this, Keohane differentiates the rationalistic and reflective approaches to international institutions and insists that most of the realist and liberal works belong to the rationalistic camp.[27]

---

[23] David Chandler, *Resilience: The Governance of Complexity* Routledge, London, 2014, p. 21.
[24] Walker, "Security, Sovereignty, and the Challenge of World Politics.", p.10.
[25] For a conceptualization of one-dimensionality, see Herbert, *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*.
[26] Emma Rothschild, "What Is Security?", p. 63.
[27] Robert O. Keohane, "International Institutions: Two Approaches," *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (1988): 379–96, p. 382.

Buzan and Hansen also emphasize that international security studies did not reflect the elaborative theoretical concerns, especially during the superpower relations of the Cold War.[28] As any concept developed by the Cartesian thinking, the concept of security was guided by a modernist, isolated, and linear understanding of reality. This understanding has served the reproduction of colonialisms in a postcolonial milieu[29] such that national security is a discursive reflection of this postcolonial colonialist ontology. In this context, Sangarasivam states that:

"*National security is an ontological and epistemological reality founded on settler colonial logics. Security becomes a state of existence and a way of knowing democracy as predicated on an indefinite sense of insecurity, which in turn authorises a monopoly on legitimate violence to preserve and persevere in the demonstration of citizenship and national belonging to white nation states that are forged in histories of colonial invasion, genocide, theft of land, slavery and the protracted occupation of indigenous territories.*"[30]

"*Settler colonial logics*" that Sangarasivam emphasizes can also be read as a critique of classical ontology. In classical ontology, there remains a huge gap between subject and object. This gap triggers an "*indefinite sense of insecurity*" and allows the implementation of "*legitimate violence*" in response to uncertain insecurities. In other words, the term security dilemma reflects in the classical paradigm with its onto-epistemological assumptions, although theorists have long defined it as an unsolvable issue of the global security context. This is even true for critical analytical works. For instance, in a recent report, the authors state that "*once the essence and concept of security have been delineated, it is, in a third step, possible to think about the*

---

[28] Buzan and Hansen, op. cit., p. 35.
[29] Sökefeld, "From Colonialism to Postcolonial Colonialism."
[30] Yamuna Sangarasivam, "Ecological Ontologies of Sovereignty and Insecurity: Settler Colonial Logics of National Security," *Critical Studies on Security* 5, no. 2, May 4, 2017, 203–6, https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2017.1320880, p. 203.

pursuit of security."[31] However, they do not wonder what motivates the researcher to decide on the essence and concept of security. It is the ontology that manifests itself as a distinct concept rather than philosophy. While philosophy can be taught through specific pedagogies, it is not easy to teach ontology. It is about how and under what terms we define our existence. It is performed on various occasions. It is embedded in the complex web of life in which we try to survive. Accordingly, this complexity prevents a step-by-step security analysis similar to what those authors attempted.

Another implication of Sangarasivam's claim is that there should be a distinction between the ontology of security and security as an ontological status. While the ontology of security indicates the study of metaphysical issues that affects the conceptualization of security, security as an ontological status corresponds to the conceptualization of security as an existential phenomenon. The historical processes, mentioned above, have resulted in investing more in developing new strategies from anthropocentric paradigms, and less in the ontological understandings of security. However, these processes have shaped the current worldviews of researchers and practitioners. Since they are about knowledge production, they may also have some epistemological implications. For example, pedagogies and teaching materials heavily relied on the ideological dualism of the Cold War period, and this prevented international relations students from developing multidimensional and multilevel perspectives. At that time, the perspective largely reflected in the ongoing legacy of classical ontology in social science circles.

On the other hand, the classical ontological position has started to lose its hegemony within the scientific community due to scientific developments of the 20th century, e.g., the ones in physics. Since then,

---

[31] Marc von Boemcken and Conrad Schetter, "Security: What Is It? What Does It Do?," The Reflection Group "Monopoly on the Use of Force 2.0?" Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Berlin, 2016, p. 2.

the approaches to the depiction of reality have changed. For instance, David Chandler depicts the new world as "*more fluid, more interconnected, and complex.*"[32] This new condition does not allow reductionist, modernist analyses to be successful. Here, the post-classical ontology may be an alternative to the classical one since the former does not treat the subject and object distinctly. Further, the subject does not stand at the center of governance. Mutual constitution and transformation[33] are keywords in the post-classical ontology. The post-classical ontological position, therefore, radically affects the perception of security. While adaptation to the changing security context is considered possible in classical ontological assumptions, such adaptation efforts contain the risk of creating new vulnerabilities according to the post-classical approach.[34]

Concerning the post-classical ontology of security, Chandler's discussion of chaos theory and complexity theory helps to discover some conceptual possibilities. Although both derived from scientific developments of the 20th century, chaos theory sticks to "*the deterministic ontology of chaos*" while the complexity theory rests on an "*emergent causality.*"[35] Their distinction stems from their disciplinary origins. The chaos theory, originated from quantum mechanics, assumes an unforeseeable character in any spatiotemporal context. On the other hand, the complexity theory, rooted in the principles of thermodynamics, evolutionary biology, and computational mathematics,[36] focuses on the possibility of governing any entity within its causal relations. For Chandler, the complexity theory explains today's world politics better, and the governance of its complexity necessitates a post-classical ontology.

---

[32] David Chandler, op. cit., p. 22.
[33] Henry Farrell and Martha Finnemore, "Ontology, Methodology, and Causation in the American School of International Political Economy," *Review of International Political Economy* 16, no. 1, February 16, 2009, 58–71, https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290802524075, p. 59.
[34] David Chandler, op. cit., p. 11.
[35] ibid. p. 25.
[36] ibid., p. 26.

The same is true for the ontology of security. Indeed, the expanding literature on security and particularly on maritime security, shows that authorities choose to govern the complexity in practice. However, without focusing on the security paradigm that guides minds and actions, governance practices cannot become more inclusive and effective.

Today's security context continues to be explained through a modernist, dualist paradigm which marginalizes some groups of wider security community including animals, workers, natives, and women. The use of the term "*security environment*" also reflects such a modernist position. Under this ontology, we place ourselves at the center of the universe. Accordingly, we value our priorities and analyze the surrounding issues. However, this ontology always excludes some others. In line with Mertens et al.'s emphasis on the visibility of marginal communities, this paper suggests a paradigm change can help to improve this ontology.

3. A Secure Understanding of Maritime Security?

In the previous two sections, I approached the concept of security from an ontological point of view and attempted to show that the mainstream assumptions about security are not independent of modernist, dualist understandings of reality. Following this, I suggested an ontological turn towards a post-classical position to capture the complexity of today's insecurities. What might this turn offer for the understanding of maritime security? Following the previous comments on the contested nature of security,[37] Bueger also emphasizes the contested nature of maritime security.[38] This study proposes that the acceptance of an ontological turn in security studies will enable the researchers to reach a consensus on the nature of maritime security. Also, this will be the first step to create both inclusive and effective doctrines for maritime security governance.

---

[37] W. B. Gallie, "Essentially Contested Concepts"; Buzan, People, States and Fear; McDonald, "Climate Change and Security."
[38] Bueger, op. cit.

The contested nature of the concepts used in international politics leads to both "*the salience as well as disagreements*" according to Bueger.[39] The author states that such disagreements can trigger crises. Maybe, they do. It may be better to have crises rather than to ignore them, or not to pay enough attention to them. Because even if our ontological position prevents us from paying enough attention to the crises, they are with us. For example, human trafficking or the rise of sea levels are two facts, causing security problems independently from our acknowledgment of them. Individuals can ignore or try to tackle them. This decision is related to the connections between the ontologies and discourses. For instance, Bueger asks whether climate change and sea disasters are maritime security issues.[40] The answer to this question depends on how the nature of security is understood, and this understanding is rooted in individual ontologies and has epistemological, methodological, and axiological consequences. In short, the answer is about the security paradigm. The security paradigm may allow us to accept climate change and disasters at sea as maritime security issues or not. It also enables us to see climate change and interruption of maritime trade routes as equally important security threats or not. Their level of importance is also independent of our judgment.

Bueger's maritime security matrix meets almost every criterion related to maritime security governance.[41] The matrix, on the one hand, facilitates the researchers and practitioners who work on maritime security issues. On the other hand, it frames their understanding of maritime security and limits the analyses. So, in a Kuhnian sense, Bueger's paradigm helps to overcome analytical problems, but it also promotes a specific way of thinking. This does not mean that Bueger's paradigm is good or bad. However, one should consider under which circumstances this paradigm, or any other, might work effectively, and

---

[39] Bueger, op. cit., p. 160.
[40] ibid., p. 159.
[41] ibid., p. 161.

ask whether an alternative might be possible.

Considering the four dimensions of the matrix (marine environment, economic development, national security, and human security), it is not clear how two different issues given under two different dimensions, e.g., inter-state disputes of sea power and pollution of blue economy, will be reconciled in practice if the inter-state dispute is a significant contributor to marine pollution. Bueger appears to be aware of this challenge since he discusses "*security practices and communities of practice*" separately and in a detailed way.[42] Elsewhere, Bueger and Edmunds focus on the example of the western Indian Ocean and examines maritime security innovations at three levels of epistemic, coordination, and operational.[43] I attach importance to their use of the concepts of the maritime security community and epistemic level to elaborate my question of reconciliation. In any community, whether it is a security community or another one, e.g., a residential community, there always are negotiations about knowledge and how to handle things. Under some circumstances, especially when consensus is not reached, a conflict exists. For example, a residential community may face some difficulties in handling waste management and recycle activities of the building if the necessary measures potentially affect the interests of some residents. Particularly if those residents have more power to influence the decision-making process, it may be harder to achieve inclusive and effective decision-making. Moreover, the same may be right for the accepted forms of knowledge about the health outcomes of waste management.

Similarly, it may be costly to reconcile the interests of some members of the global security community. A recent comparative study on sea powers indicates this challenge. According to Denemark et al., the sea powers, namely the UK and the USA, produced more cases of violent action between 1816 and 1914, also in the post-1946

---

[42] ibid., p. 162-3.
[43] Bueger and Edmunds, op. cit., p. 1302.

period, caused fewer death situations in their actions, though, compared to the land powers such as China and Russia.[44] This finding also implies that the possession of sea power had previously been about having the power to exploit overseas territories, and it has later become relevant to the competition in global trade. Such competition, which is inherited from the colonial-imperial past, means that any measures to prevent overexploitation and marine pollution and to regulate international trade in a fair way will potentially affect the companies registered in these sea and land powers. In this sense, the Arctic rivalry showed by Russia's sovereignty claims or by the confrontation between Canada and Denmark,[45] and the importance Greenland for the USA and Denmark[46] are yet other consequences of security practices and policies sanctioned by the classical paradigm and its ontological beliefs. This is a governance problem, but it is primarily an ontological one. This ontological problem shows itself in the distribution of roles and responsibilities as well as in the member profiles of international governing bodies. For example, the UN Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, whose members are only selected among geologists, geophysicists, and hydrographers, redefine and reshape the Arctic's future. This commission deals with sovereign rights on the Arctic. However, the Arctic glaciers may completely disappear soon,[47] and this may change the rules of the game for all stakeholders.

---

[44] Denemark et al., op. cit.

[45] Voronkov, "The Russian Claim for an Extended Continental Shelf in the Arctic."

[46] Nils Wang, Damien Degeorges, *Greenland and the New Arctic: Political and Security Implications of a Statebuilding Project* (Cph.: RDDC Publishing House, 2014).

[47] Ashifa Kassam, "Canada's High Arctic Glaciers at Risk of Disappearing Completely, Study Finds," The Guardian, July 17, 2018, sec. World news, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jul/18/canadas-high-arctic-glaciers-at-risk-of-disappearing-completely-study-finds; Aslaug Mikkelsen, *Arctic Oil and Gas: Sustainability at Risk?*, 1st ed. (Routledge, 2008), https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203893746."

Discussion: The Post-Classical Ontology and Maritime Security

In its classical formulation, the ontology of security is anthropocentric. The classical ontology of security is a definitive characteristic of the Anthropocene, and this is not a coincidence: The Anthropocene is characterized by human domination as a reflection of hierarchical subordination. In this epoch, security is defined in the relationship between "*us*" and "*our environment.*" Thus, the conceptualization of security is based on a friend-enemy distinction. In such a distinction, "our environment" consists of both human and non-human enemies. Although multiple challenges of the current global system have been forcing the governments to reconsider their security strategies, the main question has remained unanswered: Is an anthropocentric security approach based on the classical ontology capable of maintaining sustainable security?

National security policies supported by the ideological parameters of Cold War conflict focused on how one state might achieve superiority over the other. Although different voices have been raised since the mid-Cold War period, they could not create a real challenge for the hegemonic security paradigm. As a result, the attempts at developing an alternative ontology of security have remained weak. They also stuck in the anthropocentrism of the actors within the global system. Under these circumstances, security policies only lead to the securitization of new issues without adequately questioning the conditions that generate security concerns for all the members of the Earth community from a multi-dimensional perspective. Thus, the answer to the above question is "*no.*"

To better address the irreconcilability between different issues such as the inter-state dispute and marine pollution and to ensure the sustainability of ecosystems, one should primarily focus on the concept of security at the paradigmatic level. Then, the next step will be the paradigm shift as an extension of the ontological turn. In this way, the holistic thinking may be a possibility for maritime security. The holistic thinking will enable a decentralized approach that considers all different issues as parts of the maritime domain. In this way of thinking, maritime security is not located at the center of its

surrounding environment as the classical ontology suggests. In addition, none of the issues are of top priority in the strategy. For example, sovereignty rights in the Arctic cannot be considered more important than the wellbeing of all living things in that region in the post-classical ontology.

The complexity of problems in the maritime domain demands equal consideration of different security issues at the ontological level. This constitutes an essential stage of sustainable maritime security governance. Moreover, there are enough reasons to develop a paradigm that provides the tools to see the complex connections between a human being and an Arctic bear. In such a complexity, the new paradigm must go beyond the ontology of security based on the "*us-other*" distinction.[48] This study has, therefore, attempted to examine the post-classical ontology of security. The central tenets of this ontology are diffusion, interrelation, adaptation, non-linearity, and inclusiveness.

1. *Diffusion* means that the security referent should not be at the center of governance.

2. *Interrelation* means that the security of a state or an international body cannot be isolated from the security of Others.

3. *Adaptation* means that the security referent always adapts to new conditions; however, this may be very costly.

4. *Non-linearity* means that the causality cannot be taken from a linear analytical perspective because unforeseen factors may intervene and change the outcome.

5. *Inclusiveness* means that biocentric ethics enables an inclusive epistemology that understands security not as a zero-sum game but as an everlasting quest for sustainability.

To conclude, the ontology debate has two implications for maritime security research and practices. First, the ontologies of

---

[48] For a detailed discussion on "the other-as-enemy" see: Odysseos, "Radical Phenomenology, Ontology, and International Political Theory."

researchers shape the prospects of scientific thinking. Second, the ontologies of practitioners shape the making of international relations. An ontological questioning is, therefore, crucial at both theoretical and practical levels. In academic circles, the scholarship about maritime security should be judged based on scientific evidence. Also, governments should support the development of the post-classical ontology of security as a way of peacemaking. Such a transformation may take time; however, the recent changes in both military and civilian circles have made clear that the paradigmatic transformation derived from an ontological turn has appeared on the horizon for both security studies and the field of maritime security. More research is still needed on the political-economic and socio-cultural factors affecting ontologies of security.

Özet

Devletler ve devlet-dışı aktörler, son dönemde, deniz güvenliği ve yönetişimi hakkında stratejiler yayımlamaktadır. Deniz güvenliğinin farklı kavramsallaştırmaları korsanlık ve silahlı soygun, terör, insan kaçakçılığı da dahil olmak üzere deniz kaçakçılığı, biyolojik ve kimyasal kirlenme ve iklim değişikliği gibi güvenlik kaygılarının bir veya birkaçını hedef almaya çalışır. Söz konusu kaygıların artmakta oluşu ve melez karakteri düşünüldüğünde, klasik bir yaklaşımla anlaşılıp yanıt verilmesinin artık mümkün olmadığı söylenebilir.

Ancak küresel ekonominin büyük oranda deniz ticaretine bağımlı oluşu nedeniyle deniz güvenliği hala öncelikli olarak ekonomik kaygılar temelinde şekillenmektedir. Bir yandan devletler tekil olarak veya birbirleriyle iş birliği içerisinde deniz güvenliğine ilişkin birtakım çabalar ortaya koymakta, diğer yandan akademik alanda önemli bir birikim oluşmaktadır. Fakat gerek kavramsal boyutta gerekse uygulama boyutunda deniz güvenliğine yönelik farklı kaygıları dikkate alan çabalar sınırlı kalmaktadır. NATO'nun 2011 İttifak Deniz Stratejisinde görülebileceği gibi, bu çabalar daha çok teröre odaklanmakta ve uluslararası güvenlik ortamının sınırlı bir analizinden beslenmektedir. Bu stratejilerin eleştirileriyse güvenlik kaygısı listesini

uzatmak seçeneğine yönelmektedir. Ancak sunulan alternatifler, uluslararası güvenlik ortamının üzerine bina edildiği ontolojik, yani gerçekliğin algılanışına dair, kabulleri yeterince dikkate almamaktadır.

Bugün, deniz güvenliğine bakışta iki ana hat öne çıkmaktadır. İlki denizlerdeki küresel gerçekliği anarşi üzerinden okurken diğeri bu gerçekliği uluslararası düzen çerçevesinde ele almaktadır. Bu iki kutup arasında dağılım gösteren görüşlerin çok azı, yeni risk ve tehditleri analizlerine dahil ederken "*analitik, felsefi, normatif ve epistemolojik varsayımları*" dikkate almaktadır. Christian Bueger'in deniz güvenliği matrisi bunu yapan ender çalışmalardan olup denizlerde uluslararası düzenin sağlanması noktasında farklı kaygıları çerçevelemeye çalışmaktadır. Bu makale, hâkim güvenlik paradigmasının ontolojik bir analizini yapmak suretiyle Christian Bueger'in deniz güvenliği matrisine de katkı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Burada temel varsayım, hâkim güvenlik paradigmasının klasik ontolojiden beslenmekte olup her zaman bazı varsayımları dikkate alırken bazılarını görmezden geldiği şeklindedir. Ontoloji ve güvenlik arasındaki ilişki temelinde, bu çalışma, güvenliğin ontolojik bir incelemesine odaklanarak deniz güvenliğiyle ilişkili meselelerin de başarılı bir biçimde güvenlikleştirilmesinin yollarını tartışmaktadır.

Makale yukarıdaki kaygılar temelinde üç ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. Girişin ardından gelen birinci bölüm güvenliğin ontolojisine odaklanmakta ve bir kavramsal tartışma sunmaktadır. Bu bölüm, güvenliğin ontolojisini, ontolojik güvenlikten ayrı bir kavramsallaştırma olarak sunarken, ekolojik güvenlik paradigmasının (ya da paradigma olma ihtimali taşıyan yorumunun) ve buna bağlı ontolojik ve epistemolojik kabullerin, hâkim güvenlik paradigmasını güvenlik göndergesi, tehdit algısı ve aktör gibi unsurlar açısından nasıl zorlamakta olduğunu göstermektedir. İkinci bölüm, uluslararası güvenlik ortamının, araştırmacıyı sormakla yükümlü bıraktığı ontolojik sorularla ilgilenmekte ve bunu yaparken David Chandler'ın klasik ontoloji ve klasik-sonrası ontoloji ayrımına başvurarak güvenliğin klasik-sonrası ontolojik yorumu için zemin hazırlamaktadır. Bildiğimiz anlamda devlet aygıtının ortaya çıkışı, geç 17. yüzyıl sonrasının pozitivist, rasyonalist eğilimleriyle örtüştüğü için ontolojik kabulleri de

Kartezyen dünya görüşünün sömürgeci emellerle kaynaştığı insan-merkezci bir gerçekliğe işaret etmektedir. Ancak bu gerçekliğin sürdürülebilir olmadığı artık birçok açıdan kanıtlanmış durumdadır ve bunun deniz güvenliği açısından da yansımaları söz konusudur. Bu nedenle çalışmanın üçüncü bölümü, yeni bir kavramsal zeminde Christian Bueger'in deniz ortamı, ekonomik gelişme, ulusal güvenlik ve insan güvenliği dörtlüsüne oturan deniz güvenliği matrisini masaya yatırmaktadır. Söz konusu matrisin dört boyutuna dair varsayımları birbiriyle uzlaşma olasılıkları açısından gözden geçirip klasik-sonrası bir ontolojik konumdan tartışmak bu bölümün temel amacını oluşturmaktadır. Bu tartışma, deniz güçlerinin küresel ölçekteki çatışma alanlarını yansıtan güncel örneklere dayanmaktadır.

Sonuçta makale ekosistemlerin çalışma ilkelerinin, denizlerde meydana gelen devletlerarası anlaşmazlıklar ve ortaya çıkan kirlilikler gibi birbiriyle uzlaşmaz ve pazarlık konu olamayacak durumları kaldıramayacağını göz önünde bulundurarak güvenliğe paradigma seviyesinde yaklaşmakta ve daha temel bir uzlaşma için çözüm aramaktadır. Çözüm için öncelikle güvenlik meselelerinin ontolojik seviyedeki eşitliğini dikkate almak gerekmektedir. Bu nedenle, çözüm olarak güvenliğin klasik-sonrası ontolojisine odaklanmakta ve bu ontolojinin temel özelliklerini yayılma, karşılıklı ilişki, uyum, doğrusal olmama ve içerme şeklinde özetlemektedir. Yayılma, güvenlik göndergesinin yönetişimin merkezinde olmayışını; karşılıklı ilişki, bir devletin veya uluslararası oluşumun güvenliğinin başkalarının güvenliğinden ayrı düşünülemeyeceğini; uyum, güvenlik göndergesinin yeni durumlara her zaman uyum sağlayabileceğini ama bunun maliyetinin bazen çok fazla olacağını; doğrusal olmama, her zaman yeni etkenlerin devreye girdiği bir ortamda nedenselliğin doğrusal analitik bir bakış açısıyla anlaşılamayacağını; içerme ise biyo-merkezci bir ontolojinin güvenliği sıfır toplamlı bir oyun olarak değil, bir sürdürülebilirlik arayışı olarak çerçeveleyen, dahil edici bir epistemolojiyi mümkün kılacağını anlatır. Nihayetinde deniz güvenliğinin klasik-sonrası bir ontoloji temelinde analizinin en azından iki sonucu bulunmaktadır. İlki, araştırmacıların ontolojileri deniz güvenliğine dair akademik yazını şekillendirmektedir. İkinci olarak da uluslararası

aktörlerin ontolojileri, düzen veya düzensizlik şeklinde, uluslararası sistemi belirlemektedir. Dolayısıyla gerek akademide gerekse uluslararası yönetişim çevrelerinde bilimsel gerçeklikler hesaba katılarak söz konusu klasik-sonrası ontolojinin sesine kulak verilmelidir.

Bibliography
Books
ALGAN, Nesrin. "Environmental Security in the Aegean Sea." In *Turkish-Greek Relations: The Security Dilemma in the Aegean*, edited by Mustafa Aydın and Kostas Ifantis, 185–210. London: Routledge, 2004.

BEKKEVOLD, Jo Inge, and Geoffrey Till, eds. *International Order at Sea: How It Is Challenged, How It Is Maintained*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

BUEGER, Christian. "What Is Maritime Security?" *Marine Policy* 53 (March 2015): 159–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.12.005.

BUEGER, Christian, and Timothy Edmunds. "Beyond Seablindness: A New Agenda for Maritime Security Studies." *International Affairs* 93, no. 6 (November 1, 2017): 1293–1311. https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix174.

BUZAN, Barry. *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books, 1983.

BUZAN, Barry, and Lene Hansen. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Articles
CARİOU, Pierre, and Harilaos N. Psaraftis. "International Symposium on Maritime Safety, Security and Environmental Protection." *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs* 7, no. 1 (April 2008): 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03195121.

CHAMBERS, Matthew, and Mindy Liu. "Maritime Trade and Transportation by the Numbers." Bureau of Transportation Statistics, nd. https://www.bts.gov/archive/publications/by_the_numbers/maritime_trade_and_transportation/index.

CRUTZEN, Paul J. "Human Impact On Climate Has Made This the 'Anthropocene Age.'" *New Perspectives Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (2005): 14–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5842.2005.00739.x.

DAVİD A. Welch. "GGOV630/PACS634/PSCI678: Security Ontology." University of Waterloo, 2013. https://uwaterloo.ca/political-science/sites/ca.political-science/files uploads/files/P678-1139.pdf.

DAVİD Chandler. *Resilience: The Governance of Complexity*. London: Routledge, 2014.

DENEMARK, Robert A, Hasan Yonten, Jean-Francois Belanger, and Matthew J Hoffmann. "Diplomacy and Controversies in Global Security Studies: The Sea Power Anomaly and Soft Balancing." *Journal of Global Security Studies*, October 22, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogy025.

EGON G. Guba, and Yvonna S. Lincoln. "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, Third., 191–216. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005.

EMMA Rothschild. "What Is Security?" *Daedalus* 124, no. 3 (1995): 53–98.

FARRELL, Henry, and Martha Finnemore. "Ontology, Methodology, and Causation in the American School of International Political Economy." *Review of International Political Economy* 16, no. 1 (February 16, 2009): 58–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290802524075.

FLYNN, Brendan. "The EU's Maritime Security Strategy: A Neo-Medieval Perspective on the Limits of Soft Security?" *Croatian International Relations Review* 22, no. 75 (August 1, 2016): 9–37. https://doi.org/10.1515/cirr-2016-0001.

HERBERT, Marcuse. *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

HORRELL, Steven, Magnus Nordenman, and Walter B Slocombe. "Updating NATO's Maritime Strategy." Issue Brief. Atlantic Council Brent Scowcroft Center on International Security, 2016. http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/resources/docs/Updating_NATO_Maritime_Strategy_0705_web.pdf.

KUHN, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

MARC von Boemcken, and Conrad Schetter. "Security: What Is It? What Does It Do?" The Reflection Group "Monopoly on the Use of Force 2.0?" Berlin: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2016.

MCDONALD, Matt. "Climate Change and Security: Towards Ecological Security?" *International Theory* 10, no. 02 (July 2018): 153–80. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752971918000039.

MCNEİLL, J. R., and Peter Engelke. *The Great Acceleration: An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.

MERTENS, Donna M. "Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 1, no. 3 (July 2007): 212–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807302811.

MERTENS, Donna M., Katrina L. Bledsoe, Martin Sullivan, and Amy Wilson. "Utilization of Mixed Methods for Transformative Purposes." In *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*, edited by Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie, 193–214. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2010. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335193.n8.

MİCHAEL C. Williams. "Identity and the Politics of Security." *European Journal of International Relations* 4, no. 2 (1998): 204–25.

MİTCHELL, Audra. "Only Human? A Worldly Approach to Security." *Security Dialogue* 45, no. 1 (February 2014): 5–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010613515015.

MİTZEN, Jennifer. "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma." *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 3 (September 2006): 341–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066106067346.

MURPHY, Martin N. *Contemporary Piracy and Maritime Terrorism : The Threat to International Security*. London: Routledge, 2013. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203759318.

NATO. "Alliance Maritime Strategy," 2011. https://www.nato.int/cps/ua/natohq/official_texts_75615.htm.

ODYSSEOS, Louiza. "Radical Phenomenology, Ontology, and International Political Theory." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27, no. 3 (July 2002): 373–405. https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540202700305.

ROBERT O. Keohane. "International Institutions: Two Approaches." *International Studies Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (1988): 379–96.

RUMELİLİ, Bahar. *Conflict Resolution and Ontological Security: Peace Anxieties*. 1st ed. Routledge, 2014. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315796314.

SANGARASİVAM, Yamuna. "Ecological Ontologies of Sovereignty and Insecurity: Settler Colonial Logics of National Security." *Critical Studies on Security* 5, no. 2 (May 4, 2017): 203–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2017.1320880.

SLOGGETT, Dave. *The Anarchic Sea: Maritime Security in the 21st Century*. New Delhi: Pentagon Press, 2014.

SÖKEFELD, Martin. "From Colonialism to Postcolonial Colonialism: Changing Modes of Domination in the Northern Areas of Pakistan." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 64, no. 04 (November 2005): 939–73. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021911805002287.

The UNCTAD Secretariat. "Review of Maritime Transport 2011." Geneva: United Nations Publications, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004180048.i-962.602.

VORONKOV, Lev. "The Russian Claim for an Extended Continental Shelf in the Arctic." *Environmental Policy and Law* 47, no. 2 (September 21, 2017): 88–94. https://doi.org/ 10.3233/EPL-170018.

W. B. Gallie. "Essentially Contested Concepts." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56, no. 1 (1955): 167–98.

WALKER, R B J. "Security, Sovereignty, and the Challenge of World Politics." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 15, no. 1 (1990): 3–27.

WANG, Nils, Damien Degeorges, and Forsvarsakademiet. "Greenland and the New Arctic: Political and Security Implications of a Statebuilding Project." Cph.: RDDC Publishing House, 2014.

ZHANG, Xin. "Chinese Capitalism and the Maritime Silk Road: A World-Systems Perspective." *Geopolitics* 22, no. 2 (April 3, 2017): 310–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2017.1289371.