

President Jokowi's Securitization in Countering Terrorism

Seniwati, Dwia Aries Tina Pulubuhu, Rahmatia, Patrice Lumumba, Adi Suryadi Culla, Khairul Amri
Hasanuddin University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.801128>

Received: 07 January 2024; Accepted: 14 January 2024; Published: 13 February 2024

ABSTRACT

Terrorist actions that occurred in Indonesia have caused many people to die and be injured and infrastructure was destroyed. The purpose of this study is to analyze President Jokowi's policies in dealing with terrorism in Indonesia. This article applies the securitization approach. The securitizing movement allows actors to violate normal political rules and take extraordinary actions in dealing with threats to the object of reference encountered in the securitization process. Terrorism is an existential threat to a state that has been securitized by the Indonesian government. Securitization is a process where an issue that was initially considered as an ordinary political issue is raised to become a security issue that requires special handling. This article focuses on Jokowi's policy, which analyzes Jokowi's rhetoric by urging lawmakers to speed up the revision of anti-terrorism law no.15/2003 for being inadequate to face contemporary challenges. This securitization process is a form of President Jokowi's awareness that terrorism is a threat. The novelty in this research is Jokowi's policy analysis in combat terrorism based on securitization theory.

Keywords: Indonesia, Jokowi, political, securitization, terrorism.

INTRODUCTION

The terms terrorism and radicalism became famous since the bombing at the World Trade Center (WTC) in the United States in 2001 caused many people to die and get injured and the infrastructure was badly damaged. Various bombings carried out by terrorists then occurred in various countries in the world such as Bali bombing in Indonesia, mass shootings and suicide bombings in Paris, and Marathon Bombings in Boston (Fatkhuri & Juned, 2017). The terrorist attack that brought down the WTC in the United States in 2001 or also known as the 9/11 incident has become the worst terror in American history. This incident has attracted international attention at that time. Security all over the world was tightened at that time, especially flight paths as a form of anticipation of further attacks. The 9/11 incident that was carried out by al-Qaeda seemed to be a signal for the birth of other acts of terror in the world. This condition makes governments from various parts of the world make policies to prevent and deal with terrorism.

Indonesia has been the target country for several terror attacks. This condition certainly makes the Indonesian people feel threatened and fear that is always there when going out of the house. The first attack occurred in 2002 when the first Bali bombing killed 202 people consisting of 88 Australian citizens and 28 British citizens. This terrorist attack is the largest bomb attack with the largest number of victims in the history of terrorism in Indonesia (Fatkhuri & Juned, 2017). Indonesia as a country with a large population and territory in the world is one of the countries where terrorist actions often occur. The Bali bombing first have become the biggest attack in history in Indonesia because of the many victims of foreign citizens, especially Australia, who became victims. This condition created fear for foreign tourists to travel to Indonesia at that time (Seniwati, Pulubuhu, Unde, & Alhaqqi, 2019).

Various efforts to combat terrorism have been made by the Indonesian government but the number of cases of terrorist actions continues to occur. The last terrorist action occurred in 2021, a suicide bombing occurred

at the Cathedral Church in Makassar City on March 28 2021. The perpetrator of this suicide bombing was the terrorist group Jamaah Ansharut Daulah (JAD). There were 26 suspected terrorists in this incident consisting of seven people from Gorontalo and 19 people from Makassar who were members of JAD. The bombing case was then brought by Densus 88 to Jakarta for further investigation (Nasution, 2021). Various efforts have been made in combating terrorism, but the number of cases of terrorism and radicalism spreading in Indonesia is still continuing. The movement that emerged developed in various forms. One of them is the suicide bombing that occurred at the Makassar Cathedral Church in 2021.

On 8 June 2016, prior to the Makassar bombing in 2021, Detachment 88 discovered a bomb storage area. The bomb is planned to be detonated on June 22, 2016 to coincide with the 17th of Ramadhan in several strategic places in Surabaya (Nasution, 2021). This plan is a continuation of the Thamrin Jakarta bombing tragedy. Mobile brigade special forces (Gegana Team) managed to secure evidence of improvised explosive devices and long-barreled firearms at the house of Priya Hadi Purnomo who is a suspected terrorist. Densus 88 arrested four suspected terrorists namely Jefri, Feri Novendi, Sali and Priya Hadi Purnomo. Terror acts also occurred in Tangerang, precisely at the Cikokol police post. This action was carried out by Sultan Aziansyah who was the only perpetrator of this attack and was the JAD group that collaborated with ISIS (Nasution, 2021). Fortunately, the planned bombings in 2016 were prevented before the action was carried out. The actions that occur are a continuation of the actions that have occurred before. This plan involved not only the use of bombs but also firearms. You can imagine how terrorists can endanger society by using multiple weapons in the form of bombs and firearms which will result in many victims falling if the authorities do not prevent them..

The number of terror incidents and arrests from 2016 to 2020 can be described as follows: there were five terror incidents in 2016. Then, the number of incidents doubled in 2017. In 2018, there was a gradual increase with 16 acts of terrorism, but decreased in 2019 to 10 cases. Accordingly, the number of terrorist or suspected terrorist arrests in 2016 reached 163 cases, which then increased to 176 cases in 2017. In 2018, the number of arrests reached 395 cases, then decreased in 2019 to 320 cases, and in 2020, there were 232 cases of arrests (Nasution, 2021). Based on these data, from 2016 to 2020 there were recorded several terror incidents and hundreds of arrests of terrorists or suspected terrorists from year to year. Even though terror incidents in 2020 are said to have decreased, that doesn't mean government can turn away from similar threats in the future.

This fact shows that terrorist movements are still a threat in Indonesia, and are generally carried out by young people who are still in their productive age. Some cases of terrorism are even committed by outstanding students at school or university (Nasution, 2021). Young people in their productive age are often considered as actors in terrorism movements. This condition illustrates that radical notions have entered the educational environment in Indonesia. This situation could be caused by children and adolescents in their productive age who receive less attention regarding the prevention of radical ideas and they are easily influenced because they are in a period of searching for identity.

Terrorism is a dangerous threat to the Indonesian state or political stability in Indonesia because terrorist actions have a high risk of happening again. Terrorist actions have the capacity to disrupt the political system and cohesion of local communities, exacerbate political polarization and contribute to religious tensions (Temby, 2020). Terrorist actions can threaten the political system and relations between local communities and exacerbate political polarization and create tensions between religious communities in Indonesia. Therefore, terrorist acts become a dangerous threat, so that terrorist movements are something that cannot be tolerated.

A series of terror incidents that occurred in Indonesia from 2002 to 2021 (Seniwati, 2021; Nasution, 2021) shows that cooperation between the community, the military, and the government needs to be further enhanced. Strategies or policies that have been issued by the government, ranging from government

regulations to laws to prevent and deal with terrorist actions, but without cooperation involving all parties, terrorist actions will continue. Threats from radical groups should be prevented if the government establishes good synergy. The government in this case is the government, military and state intelligence agencies. These three stakeholders are considered as the pillars of national defense and security. Therefore, if one of the stakeholders does not carry out their duties properly, this will also affect other stakeholders and have an impact on the stability of state security. The purpose of this study is to analyze President Jokowi's policies in dealing with terrorism in Indonesia. The novelty in this research is to analyze Jokowi's policy in preventing terrorist actions from occurring through a securitization approach.

THEORY

This article applies the securitization approach. The use of securitization theory has often been applied by scholars in analyzing issues related to traditional security ((Barkawi, 2011; Donnelly, 2013; Floyd, 2011; Hayes, 2009; Roe, 2008; Sjöstedt, 2007; Van Rhythoven, 2015; Vuori, 2008; Waever, 2011). Securitization focuses on the objective elements of security and refers to the construction of an intersubjective understanding between securitization actors (enunciators) and the public that something is an existential threat. This intersubjective understanding allows actors to take extraordinary actions in dealing with threats to the object of reference. In this way, the pacification movement allows actors to violate normal political rules. An important element of the securitization movement is the speech act of security, where the word itself is the act. These words have the power to construct an issue as a security issue by labeling it as action. Speech acts work in relation to securitization actors, securitization gestures, and conditions historically associated with threats. However, a number of scholars have criticized the Copenhagen school for placing too much emphasis on security semantics. Scholars suggest that in addition to discourse, scholars need to explore social context, culture, practice, and power relations and focus on audiences and their identities. Scholars emphasize the importance of external conditions that facilitate successful securitization (Lupovici, 2019).

The concept of securitization refers to the construction of inter subjective understanding between securitizing actors and audiences that something is an existential threat. The securitizing movement allows actors to violate normal political rules and take extraordinary actions in the face of threats to objects of reference. One important element of the securitizing movement is the security speech act. Those words are actions. The excerpt also includes criticism by some scholars of the Copenhagen school's overemphasis on security semantics and suggests that scholars need to consider social context, culture, practice, and power relations and focus on audiences and identities.

According to Rita Braahmsen as a researcher in African Politics and security studies that Securitization is a process rather than a single ritual. Regarding to the definition, it is important to consider the political context in which the securitizing movement is integrated on the one hand and its political effects on the other. In other words, it is not only the identities, beliefs, and norms of the actors that influence the securitizing movement, but also the previous securitizing movements. In addition, the securitizing movement affected the creation and constitution of the former and could be repeated in different ways. However, what is important is that politics, both domestic and international, is affected by securitization efforts and by the results of securitization whether successful or not(Lupovici, 2019). The explanation given by Abrahamnsen regarding the concept of securitization is not only emphasized on the concept of identity and norms of the actors who are able to influence securitization movements and patterns, but securitizing movements that have occurred before have also influenced and become a security threat.

Securitization theory allows us to capture and understand effectively the dynamics of adoption of deterrence strategies, challenging the traditional assumption that adoption is a defined process. In contrast, we can think of the adoption of a deterrence strategy as a securitizing move. In this movement, securitizing actors

who implement deterrence strategies or issue deterrent threats in a domain or in certain ways, for example cyber or nuclear, can legitimize the adoption of these strategies by constructing threats as existential threats. These conditions can refer to specific threats posed by adversaries or to broader changes in the international arena. For example, the implementation of nuclear retaliation is an extraordinary act that requires justification, as seen during the Cold War when the enunciator built the other side and its nuclear capabilities as an existential threat (Lupovici, 2019).

Related to the explanation above, Lupovici explained that securitization theory makes it possible to understand and explain the dynamics in adopting deterrence strategies. This theory challenges the traditional assumption that this process is clear and certain. In securitization theory, adopting a preventive strategy can be understood as a securitizing move. These moves are carried out by actors relying on deterrence strategies or issuing deterrent threats in a specific domain or manner (e.g. cyber or nuclear). This movement legitimates the adoption of this strategy by constructing the threat as an existential threat. This condition can refer to specific threats faced or to broader changes in the international arena. For example, taking nuclear countermeasures is an extraordinary action that requires justification, as seen during the cold war when securitizing actors constructed adversaries and their nuclear capabilities as existential threats.

According to Buzan, Waever and Wilde that when a securitization actor uses the rhetoric of an existential threat by describing a phenomenon that is inconsistent with normal politics, then it becomes a securitization case (Mohammed, 2021). Mohammed explained about the concept of securitization in security studies. Securitization can occur when an actor uses the rhetoric of existential threats to take an issue out of the normal political realm. In this context, securitization is a process in which an issue that was initially considered an ordinary political issue then turns into a security problem that requires special handling.

Balzacq argues that a collection of articulated practices in which heuristic artefacts (metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stereotypes, and emotions) are contextually activated by securitization actors, who work to encourage target audiences to build coherent implication networks (feelings, sensations, thoughts, and intuitions) about the critical vulnerability of a reference object, which is in line with the reasons for the choices and actions of the securitization actor, by giving the intended subject an impression so frightening and threatening as never before, that immediate steps must be taken specifically to prevent the development of threats (Mohammed, 2021).

Table 1. Securitization Actor

Actor in Securitizing	Object of Reference	Audience	Current Threat	The Impact to Audience
Decision maker	Maintaining national security	People	Security threat	Sense of security
State leader	Building an image of security	Foreign people	Radicalism and terrorism issue	Freedom from fear

Regarding Balzacq’s explanation that in securitization practices, a securitization actor uses various heuristic artefacts, such as metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stereotypes, and emotions to build implication networks about critical vulnerabilities of reference objects. This securitization actor seeks to move the audience to build a network of these implications, so that the audience feels threatened and feels that special security measures must be taken immediately to prevent the development of the threat. In this securitization practice, the reference object is invested with the impression of an unprecedented threat and adjusted policies must be taken immediately to deal with the threat.

METHODOLOGY

This article implements a qualitative method through literature review. This method focuses on reading sources that can be used to analyze more thoroughly the object of study. The reading sources that have been collected are then selected based on the relationship between one literature and another. The benefits of this method include that the object of study is clear, researchers have reading sources from various references such as research journals, magazines, newspapers, books, government documents, and the internet. The reading sources used as references can be traced online. Then, the researcher combines the literature review that has been collected with the theoretical framework that is relevant to the research objectives. This method can also prevent researchers from committing plagiarism because reading sources are examined more closely.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Regarding the juridical context, Indonesia issued an anti-terrorism law, namely Government Regulation Number 1 of 2002, which was later changed to Law Number 15 of 2003 concerning Eradication of Terrorism Crimes, and then changed to Law Number 5 of 2018, with include several points including the involvement of the Indonesian National Armed Forces in efforts to eradicate terrorism, as well as changing the definition of the concept of terrorism which includes the phrase political and ideological motives in acts of terrorism (Kusuma et al., 2019).

Lupovici emphasizes the concept of securitization on a phenomenon in securitization when there is an intersubjective construction of understanding between securitizing actors and the public that there is a condition which constitutes an existential threat. Where Indonesia's condition makes terrorism a threat to the existence of the country itself, so that in this case terrorism is an object of securitization. Then, another emphasis expressed by Abrahamnsen regarding the concept of securitization is that it is not only emphasized on the concept of identity and norms of the actors who are able to influence securitization movements and patterns, but securitizing movements that have occurred before have also influenced and become a security threat. Regarding terrorism in Indonesia, terrorism is an existential threat to a state that was securitized long before Jokowi's administration. This condition can be proven through changes to laws that continue to be made as an effort to securitize terrorism, such as from Government Regulation No. 1 issued in 2002, then the government changed it to Law Number 15 which was issued in 2003. Then, the contents of this law in 2003 were regarding the Eradication of Terrorism Crimes. Furthermore, in 2018 the government changed it to Law Number 5 of 2018.

The Jokowi government has issued a strategy in dealing with terrorism. Jokowi urged lawmakers to expedite the revision of the anti-terrorism law because Law no. 15/2003 was deemed inadequate to deal with contemporary challenges following the 2018 bombings in Surabaya, East Java. Debate over a new law has continued for more than two years since it started after the Sarinah Mall bombing in Jakarta in 2016 (Anindya, 2019). Regarding the concept of securitization that securitization can occur when an actor uses the rhetoric of existential threats to take an issue from the normal political realm. In this context, securitization is a process in which an issue that was initially considered an ordinary political issue is raised to become a security issue that requires special handling. Regarding Jokowi's policy, Jokowi's rhetoric by urging parliamentarians to accelerate the revision of the anti-terrorism law, Law no. 15/2003, which is seen as inadequate to face contemporary challenges is a form of President Jokowi's awareness that terrorism is a serious threat so that the pressure that the president continued to intensify after the Sarinah Mall bombing in 2016 continues to be carried out as a form of awareness of a real threat.

Members of the people's representative council approved the passage of Law No.5/2018 on terrorism a few

days after the terrorist attack in Surabaya, East Java. Based on this new legal framework, the government through the security forces will collaborate with the public, including former terrorist convicts, to participate in government programs to prevent and deal with terrorism (Anindya, 2019). Regarding the application of securitization theory, it can be explained that a securitization actor uses various heuristic artefacts, such as metaphors, policy tools, image repertoires, analogies, stereotypes, and emotions to build implication networks about critical vulnerabilities of reference objects. In this case the policy tool used was the stipulation of Law No.5/2018 on terrorism. This law can be used as an effort to build a network of securitization movements. President Jokowi’s continued pressure on parliamentarians is seen as an emotional drive and a stereotype that terrorism is a serious threat to the country and must be strongly securitized.

The South Jakarta district court also issued a decision to ban JAD, thereby enabling the Indonesian police to arrest people with links to JAD. This move later resulted in a series of arrests. The police acknowledged that they had arrested 81 suspected terrorists from January to May 2019 (Anindya, 2019). The concept of securitization refers to the construction of intersubjective understanding between securitizing actors and audiences that something is an existential threat. The securitizing movement allows actors to violate normal political rules and take extraordinary actions in the face of threats to objects of reference. The intersubjective understanding is that the South Jakarta district court and the police have made terrorism a securitized existence because it threatens to make decisions to ban and arrest people who have a network with the JAD group.

Law No.5/2018 on terrorism also provides a strong legal basis for the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT) to coordinate 36 government institutions in efforts to eradicate terrorism. The BNPT was established through a Presidential Regulation (Perpres) in 2010 (Anindya, 2019). Regarding the concept of securitization that is not only emphasized on the concept of identity and norms of the actors who are able to influence securitization movements and patterns, but securitizing movements that have occurred before have also influenced and become a security threat. Securitization movement efforts have been made by establishing the BNPT in 2010, but this formation is considered weak due to several factors, one of which is the weak legal instrument of the BNPT. This then influenced the implementation of securitization movements by formulating Law No. 5/2018 concerning terrorism which was able to strengthen the securitization movement which was proven by the formation of this new law which then provided a strong legal basis for the National Counterterrorism Agency (BNPT). so as to be able to coordinate 36 government institutions in efforts to eradicate terrorism.

Table 2. Securitization Actor in Indonesia

Actor in Securitizing	Object of Reference	Audience	Current Threat	The Impact to Audience
President Jokowi	Establishing BNPT	Indonesian People	Terrorism actions	Sense of security
President Jokowi	Issuing law No.5/2018	Indonesian People	Radicalism issue	Freedom from fear
President Jokowi	Signing of the MoU with the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs.	Ministry official	Radicalism and Terrorism issues	Increasing cooperation

Table 2 above explains that securitization is not only a symbol in the form of a strategy, but the strategy or policy must be implemented and have a positive impact on the audience (Dillon, 1989; Joenniemi, 1989; Luke, 1989; Vuori, 2016). In Jokowi’s administration, the BNPT made efforts to increase inter-agency cooperation such as signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the Ministry of Social

Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs. The involvement of the Ministry of Social Affairs has brought attention to the development of a more flexible approach to counter-terrorism. The Ministry of Social Affairs is responsible for providing rehabilitation programs for deported terrorist suspects and child survivors of bombs in East Java (Anindya, 2019). The securitization actor seeks to move the audience to build a network of these implications, so that the audience feels threatened and believes that special security measures must be taken immediately to prevent the development of the threat. In this case efforts to mobilize the audience were carried out by the Jokowi government by encouraging the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs. The presence of the Ministry of Social Affairs has provided a more adaptive approach in counter-terrorism efforts. The Ministry of Social Affairs provides a rehabilitation program for deported terrorist suspects and children who survived the bomb attack in East Java as a form of preventing the development of the growing threat of terrorism.

CONCLUSION

Based on the explanation above, we conclude that the securitization approach can be implemented in analyzing in detail the policies carried out by a country's leader in dealing with security in a country. Jokowi as the president of the Republic of Indonesia has carried out securitization efforts in dealing with terrorism in Indonesia. Jokowi invited the audience through the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of Home Affairs. Then, Jokowi also carried out securitization efforts by formulating Law No.5/2018 and establishing the BNPT in 2010. Securitization emphasized a process and the impact of policies on society so that to measure President Jokowi's success in combat terrorism, of course, it was seen from the securitization process that had done. Various actions or securitization policies have been carried out by President Jokowi.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research received funding from Hasanuddin University in the Collaborative Fundamental Research (PFK) program with a contract number No:00323/UN4.22/PT.01.03/2023.

REFERENCES

1. Anindya, B. C. R. (2019). Indonesia's Counterterrorism Policy : An Appraisal. RSIS Commentary, September(188).
2. Barkawi, T. (2011). From War to Security: Security Studies, the Wider Agenda and the Fate of the Study of War. *Millennium*, 39(3), 701–716. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829811400656>
3. Dillon, M. G. (1989). Modernity, Discourse and Deterrence. *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 12(2), 90–104.
4. Donnelly, F. (2013). *Securitization and the Iraq War: The rules of engagement in world politics* (1st ed.). Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
5. Fatkhuri, & Juned, M. (2017). Mapping of Islamic Firqa Terrorism Movement in Indonesia. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and ...*, 2(3), 64–71. Retrieved from <http://www.msocsciences.com/index.php/mjssh/article/view/49>
6. Floyd, R. (2011). Can Securitization Theory be used in Normative Analysis? Towards a Just Securitization Theory. *Security Dialogue*, 42(4–5), 427–439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010611418712>
7. Hayes, J. (2009). Identity and Securitization in the Democratic Peace: The United States and the Divergence of Response to India and Iran's Nuclear Programs. *International Studies Quarterly*, 53, 977–999.

8. Joenniemi, P. (1989). Deterrence a Story in Decline? *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 12(2), 45–46.
9. Kusuma, A. J., Warsito, T., Surwandono, S., Muhammad, A., Hidayati, M., & Madani, M. (2019). The Construction of the Indonesian Government's Repressive Counter-Terrorism Policy. *Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 9(2), 107–125. <https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v9i2.1845>
10. Luke, T. W. (1989). What's Wrong with Deterrence? A Semiotic Interpretation of National Security Policy. In *International/Intertextual Relations* (pp. 207–229). New York, USA: Lexington Books.
11. Lupovici, A. (2019). Toward a Securitization Theory of Deterrence. *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(1), 177–186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqy045>
12. Mohammed, K. (2021). Is Terrorism a Domestic or an International Security Threat?: Historical Experiences and Securitization in the Aftermath of Islamic Terrorist Attacks in France and the UK. Uppsala. Retrieved from <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1561420>
13. Nasution, K. (2021). The Roles of Families in Combating Drugs Uses, Violence and Terrorism. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, 5(1), 23–46. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v5i1.9512>
14. Roe, P. (2008). The 'Value' of Positive Security. *Review of International Studies*, 34(4), 777–794. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40212502>
15. Seniwati. (2021). Indonesian Muslim Women: Jihad, Radicalism, Terrorism. *GJAT* (Vol. 11).
16. Seniwati, Pulubuhu, D. A. T., Unde, A. A., & Alhaqqi, M. S. (2019). Women and Entrepreneurship: Lesson and Implications for Empowerment of Women in Combatting Terrorism. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 25(4), 1–7.
17. Sjøstedt, R. (2007). The Discursive Origins of a Doctrine: Norms, Identity, and Securitization under Harry S. Truman and George W. Bush. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 3(4), 233–254. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24907233>
18. Temby, Q. (2020). *Terrorism in Indonesia after 'Islamic State' (First)*. Singapore: ISEAS Yusof Ishak Institue. Retrieved from <http://bookshop.iseas.edu.sg>
19. Van Rythoven, E. (2015). Learning to Feel, Learning to Fear? Emotions, Imaginaries, and Limits in The Politics of Securitization. *Security Dialogue*, 46(5), 458–475. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010615574766>
20. Vuori, J. A. (2008). Illocutionary Logic and Strands of Securitization: Applying the Theory of Securitization to the Study of Non-Democratic Political Orders. *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(1), 65–99. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066107087767>
21. Vuori, J. A. (2016). Detering Things With Words: Deterrence as a Speech Act. *New Perspectives*, 24(2), 23–50. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26470144>
22. Waever, O. (2011). Politics, Security, Theory. *Security Dialogue*, 42(4–5), 465–480. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010611418718%0A>