5

SECURING THE MEDITERRANEAN, INVENTING THE 'MIDDLE EAST'

Pinar Bilgin

As a spatial conception, the Mediterranean has a centuries-long history. Mediterranean littoral peoples and societies were referred to as 'Mediterranean' in ancient Greece. Indeed, some findings suggest that the very first references to the 'West' as a political construct were to the lands surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, whereas the lands to the east and south of the Sea were referred to as the 'East' (Hentsch, 1992). Later, with the 'Arab' invasion of the territories to the south of the Mediterranean and later under Ottoman rule, the south of the Mediterranean got dropped out of the 'West' and was pushed into the 'East'. While both Egyptian and Lebanese intellectuals remained in touch with the Mediterranean identity of their respective countries, it took the agency of the European Union during the 1990s to construct the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a subject of security in counter-distinction to the 'Middle East' (see Moulakis, 2005).

The 'Middle East', in turn, is relatively new. It was invented at the beginning of the twentieth century as part of debates on securing the waterway to India for the purpose of furthering Britain's imperial interests. Throughout the Cold War, the United States' interests in this part of the world focused on securing the 'Middle East'. Notwithstanding the protests of some local actors who framed their insecurities in terms of another spatial construct, the 'Arab World' (as with Egypt, for instance), over the years many other local actors' discourses have come to be aligned with the US discourse and practices designed to secure the 'Middle East' (as with Saudi Arabia, Iran [until the revolution], Israel and Turkey) (Bilgin, 2005).

This chapter traces the entry onto the world stage of the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a subject of security in counter-distinction to the 'Middle East' in the 1990s. Where the latter prioritised insecurities as experienced by the United States and its local allies, the former was designed to address insecurities identified by the European Union. What is more, the former constituted a short-lived attempt to re-cast the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a region and a security community (Adler et al., 2006).

Before we proceed, a caveat is in order. The significance of tracing the emergence and evolution of spatial constructs such as the 'Euro-Mediterranean' and the 'Middle East' is not about the so-called 'artificiality' of 'regions', for all regions are 'artificial' (Lewis and Wigen, 1997). Rather, my aim here is to highlight insecurities that shape the construction of regions, and practices that have been shaped in line with these spatial constructs. Studying the 'Mediterranean', 'Arab World' or the 'Middle East' is no innocent task since 'our' spatial constructs are shaped as part of the attempt to respond to 'our' insecurities 'in here' while insecuring 'others' 'out there'.

Accordingly, defining regions and studying regional security in X or Y 'region' is a political act worthy of critical scrutiny (Bilgin, 2004).

Britain seeks to secure the route to India: inventing the 'Middle East'

The Levant (al Mashreq or 'the land where the sun rises' in Arabic) had been central to the imaginary of those belonging to the three Abrahamic religions. Crusades were organised to secure the Christian 'holy lands'. Muslim holy sites were captured and re-captured by Arabic and Ottoman forces throughout the ages. Jews fleeing persecution in Europe in the early twentieth century sought a home in Jerusalem and its surrounds. Those with more secular agendas also had their eyes on the Levant until the end of World War II – be it Italian city states or the Ottoman and British Empires.

The invention of the 'Middle East' hinted at a shift in policy focus from the Levant to the broader Arabian peninsula, thus signalling an adjustment in British imperial insecurity practices vis-à-vis this part of the world and (eventually) beyond. There is no consensus on the exact moment of 'origin' for the Middle East as a spatial construct (Koppes, 1976). There is more of a consensus on who it was that used the term 'Middle East' for the first time. That honour belongs to a military officer; either Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, US naval officer and public intellectual, author of several key works on naval strategy, or British General Sir Thomas Edward Gordon. In an article published in *The National Review* in 1902, Mahan suggested that Britain should take up the responsibility of securing an area that he labelled as the 'Middle East' by virtue of its strategic position on the route to the 'Far East' for the purpose of furthering its colonial interests in India and helping out with checking the Russian power in Asia (Mahan, 1902). Two years before that, writing for *The Nineteenth Century*, General Gordon had elaborated on the security of Britain's interests in India in an article entitled 'The Problem of the Middle East' (Koppes, 1976). Whether it was General Gordon or Captain Mahan, what is important for our purposes here is that the 'Middle East' was invented when thinking about securing British imperial interests in the early twentieth century.

Throughout the twentieth century, the 'Middle East' remained an object of security for external powers: initially Britain, later the United States and their local allies. Still, while the term itself became popular in the usage of British and US policy practitioners, for many decades there remained widespread confusion as to where the 'Middle East' began and ended. So much so that a well-respected scholar of the region asked 'Where is the Middle East?' (Davison, 1959). Another scholar pushed further: 'Is there a Middle East?' (Keddie, 1973). In later decades, it became customary for those discussing the affairs of this part of the world to delimit what they meant by the 'Middle East'.

That said, not all those who have addressed the question 'Is there a Middle East?' have considered it to be a purely academic question that can be pushed aside by coming up with a clear definition delineating one's research focus. For, such ostensibly depoliticised discussions on delineating 'regions', however useful they may be in identifying the 'cartographic slipperiness' (Lewis and Wigen, 1997: 71) of the Middle East, have, at the same time, distracted us from focusing on the political dynamics behind such slipperiness: the changing insecurities and shifting practices of actors – local and global. Put differently, the question 'Is there a Middle East?' cannot be answered in seminar rooms, in apparent isolation from policy debates on how to secure this part of the world. Insofar as policy-makers have constructed a 'Middle East' via their discourses of security, our task, as students of world politics, becomes one of understanding the relationship between the invention of regions and the security practices of relevant actors.

Over the years, some critics have pointed to the British colonial and US imperial interests behind lumping together this part of the world in the mind's eye and labelling it as the

'Middle East'. As will be seen later, the proponents of the 'Arab World' as a subject of security have pointed to this eventuality. Still, over the years, a significant number of local actors adopted the Middle East discourse in discussing their insecurities. Notable among them are Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia (and also Iran until the revolution). This, in turn, suggests a gradual aligning of some local and global actors' insecurities. Yet, some others resisted, as with the proponents of the 'Arab World' as a subject of security.

Resisting the security agenda of external actors, insisting on the 'Arab World'

The 'Arab World' is a spatial construct that inscribes the 'Arabness' of this part of the world. Inscribing the 'Arabness' of this part of the world comes across as uncontested insofar as many people in this area self-identify as 'Arab'. However, 'Arabness' is only one of the identities of people living in this part of the world. In the years that immediately followed decolonisation, it was far from being obvious that the leaders of the newly independent states would locate themselves in the 'Arab World'. Where early designations distinguished between the 'Maghreb' (the 'West') and the 'Mashreq', the 'Arab World' as a subject of security lumped together all the Arab states in the region, glossing over the ethnic, religious and socio-economic differences. As such, 'Arab World' was (re)constructed following decolonisation as a subject of security in counter-distinction to the 'Middle East'.

The emergence of the 'Arab World' as a subject of security in counter-distinction to the 'Middle East' can be traced in the foreign policy discourses of Egyptian policy-makers (Nasser, 1955). From the mid-1950s until the late 1960s, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser was the most prominent voice behind constructing the 'Arab World' as a subject of security. That said, in the early twentieth century, Egyptian identity was characterized by fluidity. During the 1920s and 1930s many Egyptian intellectuals also favoured a Mediterranean identity which they viewed as 'neither completely European or Western nor completely divorced from the Arab–Islamic world' (Salem, 1997: 38). It was only in the second half of the 1950s, when a choice was made under President Nasser to firmly locate Egypt in the 'Arab World', that Egypt's 'Arabness' came to be emphasized and the Mediterranean de-emphasized.

Indeed, global actors' insecurities shaping the 'Middle East' were questioned by none better than President Nasser when he asked, in response to US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' invitation to join the Northern Tier scheme, designed to help contain the Soviet Union: 'How can I go to my people and tell them I am disregarding a killer with a pistol sixty miles from me at the Suez Canal to worry about someone who is holding a knife 5000 miles away?' (quoted in Brands, 1991: 277). In this question, President Nasser highlighted US and allied insecurities that shaped the Northern Tier scheme, but pointed to the fact that these insecurities did not head the Egyptian agenda. For Egypt was preoccupied with other insecurities including the Israeli treatment of Palestinian peoples that took highly militarised forms.

Still, Nasser's concerns began to take an institutionalised form only after global actors insisted on organising local actors under the umbrella of the Middle East Defence Treaty or Organisation, designed as an anti-Soviet grouping of local actors. Turkey played an active role in its formation, enlisting the participation of the Shah's Iran and the newly independent Kingdom of Iraq. The so-called Baghdad Pact was established in 1955. As Turkey's leaders pushed for Egyptian and other Arab participation, President Nasser made the case for the need to organise under the Arab League, thereby underscoring the different insecurities shaping these two spatial conceptions, the 'Middle East' versus the 'Arab World'. Where the former reflected insecurities as experienced by the US and its local allies, the latter reflected the concerns of

Egypt and its allies. Where the former focused on containing Soviet expansionism, the latter prioritised decolonisation, achieving full sovereignty and addressing the Palestinian predicament (Bilgin, 2012).

It is significant to highlight here that insecurities tied up with developing statehood were prioritised by all local actors. Yet, they differed in their responses. Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Iran framed their insecurities within the Cold War framework, identifying their enemies as 'communists' and seeking security through close alignment with the United States. They found themselves a place in the Middle Eastern fold. Egypt, on the other hand, framed its insecurities outside the Cold War framework. President Nasser was one of the leaders of the non-aligned movement that met in Bandung in 1955. When President Nasser articulated the insecurities that shaped the 'Arab World' as a subject of security, he was also resisting US pressure to join the Middle Eastern fold. Indeed, 'neither East nor West' was the guiding principle of this movement long before Iranian Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini turned it into a foreign policy slogan for revolutionary Iran in 1979 (Adib-Moghaddam, 2005).

President Nasser's death in 1970 marked the beginning of the decline of the 'Arab World' as a subject of security. During the early 1970s, even as it fought yet another Arab–Israeli war, Egypt no longer seemed committed to addressing Egyptian insecurities within an Arab versus non-Arab framework. That said, scholarly articulations of the 'Arab World' as a subject of security persisted through the 1980s. The most powerful of these articulations came from two Egyptian scholars, Ali Eddin Hillal Dessouki and Jamil Matar, who registered their opposition to the 'Middle East' as a subject of security when they wrote that

> (1) the term Middle East does not refer to a geographical area but rather it represents a political term in its creation and usage; (2) the term is not derived from the nature of the area or its political, cultural, civilizational and demographic characteristics; . . . (3) the term tears up the Arab homeland as a distinct unit since it has always included non-Arab states.
>
> *(Dessouki and Matar quoted in Abdel Aal, 1986: 197–8)*

As such, Dessouki and Matar identified the insecurities that shaped the construction of the 'Middle East' as a subject of security from the perspective of the US and its allies, and reclaimed the agency of local actors by offering the 'Arab regional system' as an alternative. Needless to say, this spatial construct was shaped by a state-centric conception of security and rested on the Arab/non-Arab divide, assuming insecurities to be stemming from outside the 'Arab World' thereby overlooking those that originated from within or across the inside/outside divide (Bilgin, 2012). That said, by way of critiquing the 'Middle East' as a spatial construct and as a term, Dessouki and Matar laid bare the relationship between insecurities and spatial constructs in a way that had not been done before in the literature on regional security (Bilgin, 2005).

By the end of the 1980s, the 'Arab World' no longer seemed to be considered as a subject of security by any state-level actor. Indeed, in the immediate aftermath of the Iraq war of 1990–91, the 'Arab World' seemed to be in free fall. That one Arab country (Iraq) invaded another Arab country (Kuwait) and threatened another (Saudi Arabia) was the first decisive development of this period. That Saudi Arabia asked for US help for securing the Muslim holy sites was a second. That many Arab countries joined the US-led alliance in the war against Iraq was a third decisive development that fuelled commentary regarding 'the shattered consensus' in the 'Arab World' (Said Ali, 1996; also see Karawan, 1994). Accordingly, to EU policy-makers' eyes, the circumstances seemed suitable for offering an alternative spatial construct – more aligned with EU insecurities.

The European Community/Union joins the fray: constructing the Mediterranean

The 'Euro–Mediterranean' as a subject of security has taken shape, from the 1970s onwards, through the European Community's (EC) attempts to formulate its own approach to securing this part of the world as distinct from the other global actor with interests in this part of the world, the United States. The European Community's attempt to distance itself from US-led policies toward the 'Middle East' evolved in a context where the differences between US and EC insecurities vis-à-vis this part of the world became apparent to EC leaders. The most immediate context was the 1973 OPEC oil embargo and the 1973 Arab–Israeli war and the sensibilities both events generated among the Arab and/or Muslim diaspora in EC member states. During this period, a re-thinking on the part of some EC/EU leaders led to the emergence of a more equivocal attitude toward the Arab–Israeli conflict, culminating in the establishment of the Euro-Arab dialogue in 1973 (Jawad, 1992).

The relationship between EU and the geographically close Mediterranean states was institutionalised with the so-called Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EMP) scheme, also known as the Barcelona Process, after the Barcelona Declaration of 1995. The tripartite set-up of the Barcelona Declaration covering 'politics and security', 'economics and finance' and 'social, cultural and human affairs' revealed a prime EU concern to prevent southern problems from becoming northern problems. As such, the EMP constructed the Euro-Mediterranean as a subject of security for the European Union.

While the EMP was constructed as a partnership between the EU and the 'Mediterranean', the set-up was riddled with a tension from the very beginning. The Mediterranean was viewed by some EU actors as entering this partnership as the 'other' of the European Union. Accordingly, Mediterranean littoral EU members were written out of the 'Mediterranean' and into 'Europe', while overlapping 'European' and 'Mediterranean' identities were de-emphasised. To be fair, several enthusiastic attempts were made to construct the Mediterranean as a shared (civilisational) space (Adler et al., 2006). However, this tension was never resolved in favour of a more inclusive spatial construct (Demmelhuber, 2006; Holm, 2004; Malmvig, 2005). Put differently, the 'Euro-Mediterranean', by way of delineating 'Europe' and the 'Mediterranean' as distinct regions and/or civilisations, has served to pull further apart 'Europe' and the 'Mediterranean' while seeking to bring them closer.

Another tension within the EU's approach to the Mediterranean became apparent through the years: was the EU pursuing common security with the Mediterranean or security against the Mediterranean? The common security understanding behind the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) model was underlined by the attempts to construct the aforementioned inclusive Mediterranean 'we', that could, in turn, be the foundation of 'a Euro-Mediterranean security community' (Calleja, 1992). By then, security through non-military means (even though it was not explicitly identified as a 'security policy') had become a trade-mark of aspects of policy-making by the EU as a so-called 'normative power' (Manners, 2002; Adler and Crawford, 2006; compare with Bicchi, 2006), which gave it a different stance in world politics. However, by the mid-2000s, with the transition to the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), the EU no longer seemed to be pursuing common security (Joenniemi, 2008). The country-to-country cooperation that became the trademark of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) finally resolved this tension (Bicchi, 2011). By the mid-2000s, the EU was increasingly viewed as seeking to secure itself against the Mediterranean (Bilgin et al., 2011).

The point here is that, if the CSCE model did not work in the context of the Mediterranean, and the attempt to construct the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a subject of security was not successful,

this had to do not only with a southern lack of willingness over democratisation (as frequently argued) but also with EU ambivalence in its relations with the south, and indecisiveness regarding the best way to approach insecurities in this part of the world (Holm, 2004; Malmvig, 2004). There are two related points.

First, during the Cold War, the CSCE insisted on human mobility and the right to leave one's country as 'human rights'. The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, on the other hand, denied that very right. People-to-people diplomacy and cultural exchanges were designed to keep southern peoples in the south. Whereas the CSCE sought to work with people in an attempt to influence governmental behaviour, the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership sought to work with governments to influence people's migratory behaviour. There is no mistaking the differences in the philosophical outlook of the two efforts.

Second, the CSCE rested on the assumption that peoples could work together only if the obstacles created by the governments could be overcome. A similar pattern did not emerge in north–south interactions in the Mediterranean in that in EU actors' interactions with their southern counterparts, the very identity and value system of the 'south' was often identified as a source of insecurity. It is not only the southern governments (as was the case with the eastern bloc during the Cold War) but also the southern peoples (or their 'Muslimhood') that were viewed as contributing to the tension between the two shores of the Mediterranean. In the CSCE framework, when 'western' citizens looked to their 'eastern' counterparts, they saw potential partners. Now, the northerners when they looked to the south, saw people who were impossible to co-exist with and therefore had to be kept where they were. When southerners looked to the north, in turn, they saw former colonial actors who spoke about the virtues of 'European values' while failing to uphold them when the referent of security happened to be located in the south of the Mediterranean, and not the north (Bilgin, 2016a).

The point here is that the 'Euro-Mediterranean' was constructed by the European Union as a subject of security to address its own insecurities in counter-distinction to the 'Middle East' which was viewed as prioritising the insecurities of the US and its local allies. What was not clear was how these insecurities were going to be addressed: 'with' the Mediterranean or against it? Through pursuing common security or not? Over the years, the tension built into the EMP was resolved when, in the mid-2000s, EU policy-makers dropped the CSCE model of common security. The EMP's replacement, the ENP, was launched in a political context characterised by the shortcomings of the former, a heightened sense of insecurity in the EU in relation to immigration within the context of the 'global war on terror', and the global ambitions of the Union (Bilgin et al., 2011).

Writing more than a decade ago, I concluded that, while the EU's policies toward securing the 'Euro-Mediterranean' prioritised the security interests of the EU and had very few backers in the 'Middle East', it did not have many enemies either; and that this might eventually turn out to be its greatest strength, especially if the EU policy of actively engaging with civil societal actors on its side were to bear fruit in the long run (Bilgin, 2005). This is no longer the case. Indeed not even the European Union seems to be interested in the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a subject of security. While it is the European Neighbourhood Policy that is often blamed for this eventuality, arguably it is the European Union's externalisation of its security practices (Wolff, 2006) and state-to-state cooperation across the Mediterranean, which involved close collaboration with some of the most authoritarian regimes of the region, that brought the demise of the Mediterranean perspective. Owing to this latter kind of cooperation, northern partners are viewed as having made use of the weaknesses of their southern partners to the detriment of individual citizens on both sides (as well as citizens of third countries who are in transit to the north) (Bilgin et al., 2011).

Needless to say, it is not only EU actors whose practices deserve scrutiny. During the 2000s, with unfolding security cooperation between some EU member states and their Mediterranean counterparts, some authoritarian regimes assumed the role of enforcers of EU anti-terrorism policies vis-à-vis their own citizens and immigrants in transit to the EU. Some authoritarian Mediterranean leaders (not all of whom survived the Arab Spring) also made use of the context of the 'global war on terror' to pursue their own security agendas at the expense of their citizens' security (Bilgin, 2016b).

Finally, NATO also came to assume an evolving role in the Mediterranean following the Cold War. NATO had a 'southern flank' approach to this part of the world throughout the Cold War, focusing mostly on the threat of Soviet expansionism. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall but especially since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, NATO has come to be interested in a wider variety of military and non-military threats emanating from parts of the world that, in an earlier era, would have been considered as 'out of area'. As a collective defence organisation, NATO is designed to address threats directed against its members. Re-definition of NATO as a security community in the post-Cold War era also meant seeking to address insecurities that are not directly threatening the security of members but generating insecurities for security in Europe, as defined by NATO. NATO-led interventions in Kosovo and Libya were undertaken within this evolving context (on NATO as a security community see Williams and Neumann, 2000). That the Libya intervention was endorsed by the Arab League crystallises not only the evolving role of NATO in the Mediterranean but also the decline of the 'Arab World' as a spatial construct shaping (and being shaped by) the insecurities of self-identified Arab actors. In contrast, the African Union resisted giving its stamp of approval to the NATO-led intervention, underscoring the different insecurities of its members as shaped around concerns with external interventionism (Grovogui, 2011).

Thus, by the mid-2000s the 'Euro-Mediterranean', as a spatial construct and a potential security community, was in decline. At the high-time of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, the European Union contributed significantly to the strengthening of civil society in the south of the Mediterranean, reviving civil societal activism and empowering a variety of civil-minded actors (Aubarell et al., 2006; Bayoumi, 2007; Kandil, 2011). Yet, by the end of the 2000s, the significance of European Union good deeds had diminished through its allying with repressive regimes of the south as part of the north's externalisation policies (Bilgin et al., 2011).

Arguably, while EU practices have not been successful in constructing the 'Euro-Mediterranean' as a subject of security, they may have, albeit unintentionally, contributed to the persistence of the 'Arab World' among non-state actors, but in a different way. As noted above, the EU has significantly contributed to civil society activism across the Arab World. However, during the 2000s the EU increasingly cooperated with authoritarian regimes through its externalisation practices while at the same time allowing state-to-state north–south cooperation, utilising the failures of southern partners in the process. Still, as the European Union lost its appeal as a champion of civil society activism, Arab civil societal actors have increasingly turned to each other for solidarity and collaboration. Since the decline of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership, civil societal activism is reported to have further increased in the Arab world, with actors focusing on political reform, democracy, freedom and human rights (Kandil, 2011: 43).

Conclusion

Now that the EU's rival spatial construct, the 'Euro-Mediterranean' has declined and the 'Arab World' has no state-level backers, does this mean that the 'Middle East' as a subject of security remains unrivalled? Given the upheavals that have characterised this part of the world since the

US-led war on Iraq in 2003, no analyst that pays attention to politics below the state level can comfortably reach this conclusion. While state-to-state level interactions point to the 'Middle East' as the subject of security for most Arab states, and many EU members as well as Turkey and Israel align themselves closely with the United States, non-state actors are increasingly voicing their opposition to the practices adopted by their own regimes as warranted by their superpower ally's 'war against terrorism'. Writing in 2005, one author pointed to the decline of US 'soft power' in the 'Middle East' (Aysha, 2005) insofar as regional regimes were increasingly facing protests from their own citizens regarding their cooperation with the United States. Put differently, since 2003, if not before, the 'Middle East' as a subject of security has been in decline as viewed through the prism of non-state actors in this part of the world (Fattah and Fierke, 2009).

Furthermore, the Arab uprisings have been a serious source of inter-state tension for the 'Middle East' as a spatial construct (Korany, 2011). Until the uprisings, Egypt was a linchpin of policies designed to secure the 'Middle East', and received a significant amount of US aid. In the aftermath of the removal of Muslim Brotherhood from power, Saudi Arabia stepped in to support the new regime in Egypt, thereby sustaining its stability-focused security policies in the Middle East. Yet, throughout the Arab uprisings, Saudi policy-makers were critical of their US allies for failing to take the lead in maintaining 'regional stability'. In particular, they were worried that the 'United States is more concerned about being on the right side of history, instead of standing by its friends and working to advance stability in the region' (Boucek, 2011). In other words, since the Arab uprisings, Saudi leadership has been critical of their US counterparts for not fulfilling the precepts of their own regional security perspective: states, regimes and their stability come first, peoples can wait. The rift between the two major actors, the United States and Saudi Arabia, and what they decide to do about this rift, is likely to shape insecurities in the 'Middle East' in the foreseeable future.

To conclude, considering the insecurities that shape the construction of regions, and practices that were shaped in line with these spatial constructs, is no mere academic task. Highlighting the insecurities shaping the 'Middle East' or the 'Euro-Mediterranean' is not to pose 'artificial' versus 'natural' regions. For all spatial constructs (we call them regions) are 'artificial'. As discussed earlier, the 'Arab World' is no more 'natural' as a subject of security than the 'Euro-Mediterranean'. It is only through becoming aware of the insecurities shaping particular spatial constructs that one can identify different insecurities, our own culpability in the re-inscription of our differences and construction of insecurities, and recognise the potential for adopting common security approaches. Contra popular representations of the 'Middle East' as an 'artificial' region, its failures are rooted in the top-down ordering of the insecurities of superpowers and their regional allies while marginalising insecurities voiced by non-state actors.

References

Abdel Aal, A. M. S. A. 1986. The Superpowers and Regional Security in the Middle East. In: Ayoob, M. (ed.) *Regional Security in the Third World: Case Studies from Southeast Asia and the Middle East*. London: Croom Helm.

Adib-Moghaddam, A. 2005. Islamic Utopian Romanticism and the Foreign Policy Culture of Iran. *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies*, 14, 265–92.

Adler, E. and Crawford, B. 2006. Normative Power: The European Practice of Region Building and the Case of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership. In: Adler, E., Bicchi, F., Crawford, B. and Del Sarto, R. (eds), *The Convergence of Civilizations: Constructing a Mediterranean Region*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Adler, E., Bicchi, F., Crawford, B. and Del Sarto, R. (eds) 2006. *The Convergence of Civilizations: Constructing a Mediterranean Region*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Aubarell, G., Olivan, H. and Rovira, M. 2006. *The Barcelona Process Ten Years On. An Assessment from the Point of View of Civil Society*. IEMed: CIDOB.

Aysha, E. E.-D. 2005. September 11 and the Middle East Failure of US 'Soft Power': Globalisation contra Americanisation in the 'New' US Century. *International Relations*, 19, 193–210.

Bayoumi, S. 2007. Egyptian Views of the EU: Pragmatic, Paternalistic and Partnership Concerns. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 12, 331–47.

Bicchi, F. 2006. 'Our Size Fits All': Normative Power Europe and the Mediterranean. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13, 286–303.

Bicchi, F. 2011. The Union for the Mediterranean, or the Changing Context of Euro-Mediterranean Relations. *Mediterranean Politics*, 16, 3–19.

Bilgin, P. 2004. Whose Middle East? Geopolitical Inventions and Practices of Security. *International Relations*, 18, 17–33.

Bilgin, P. 2005. *Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective*. London: Routledge Curzon.

Bilgin, P. 2012. Security in the Arab World and Turkey: Differently Different. In: Tickner, A. and Blaney, D. (eds), *Thinking International Relations Differently*. London: Routledge.

Bilgin, P. 2016a. How Not to Think about the Mediterranean Refugee Crisis. Center for Contemporary Middle East Studies, SDU, News Analysis [Available online at http://www.sdu.dk/-/media/files/om_sdu/centre/c_mellemoest/videncenter/artikler/2016/bilgin+article+(feb+16).pdf?la=en].

Bilgin, P. 2016b. Temporalizing Security: Securing the Citizen, Insecuring the Immigrant in the Mediterranean. In: Agathangelou, A. M. and Killian, K. D. (eds), *Time, Temporality and Violence in International Relations: (De)Fatalizing the Present, Forging Radical Alternatives*. London: Routledge.

Bilgin, P., Lecha, E. S. and Bilgic, A. 2011. *European Security Practices vis-à-vis the Mediterranean: Implications in Value Terms*. Copenhagen: Danish Institute for International Studies.

Boucek, C. 2011. US–Saudi Relations in the Shadow of the Arab Spring. Online article. [Available online at http://carnegieendowment.org/2011/06/21/u.s.–saudi-relations-in-shadow-of-arab-spring/1il Accessed 20 May 2014].

Brands, H. W. 1991. *Inside the Cold War: Loy Henderson and the Rise of the American Empire, 1918–1961*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Calleja, J. 1992. Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean. *International Journal on World Peace*, 9, 17–29.

Davison, R. H. 1959. Where is the Middle East? *Foreign Affairs*, 38, 665–75.

Demmelhuber, T. 2006. The Euro-Mediterranean Space as an Imagined (Geo-)Political, Economic and Cultural Entity. ZEI Discussion Paper C 159. [Available online at https://www.zei.uni-bonn.de/dateien/discussion-paper/dp_c159demmelhuber.pdf].

Fattah, K. and Fierke, K. M. 2009. A Clash of Emotions: The Politics of Humiliation and Political Violence in the Middle East. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15, 67–93.

Grovogui, S. N. 2011. Looking beyond Spring for the Season: An African Perspective on the World Order after the Arab Revolt. *Globalizations*, 8, 567–72.

Hentsch, T. 1992. *Imagining the Middle East*. Montréal and New York: Black Rose Books.

Holm, U. 2004. The EU's Security Policy towards the Mediterranean: An (Im)possible Combination of Export of European Political Values and Anti-Terror Measures? DIIS Working Paper 2004/13 [Available online at https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/18446/EU_Security_Policy_Mediterranean.pdf].

Jawad, H. 1992. *The Euro-Arab Dialogue: A Study in Collective Diplomacy*. Reading: Ithaca Press.

Joenniemi, P. 2008. Re-negotiating Europe's Identity: The European Neighbourhood Policy as a Form of Differentiation. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 23, 83–94.

Kandil, A. 2011. An Attempt to Evaluate the Development of Arab Civil Society. In: Korany, B. (ed.) *The Changing Middle East: A New Look at Regional Dynamics*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

Karawan, I. 1994. Arab Dilemmas in the 1990s: Breaking Taboos and Searching for Signposts. *The Middle East Journal*, 48, 433–54.

Keddie, N. R. 1973. Is there a Middle East? *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 4, 255–71.

Koppes, C. R. 1976. Captain Mahan, General Gordon, and the Origins of the Term 'Middle East'. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 12, 95–8.

Korany, B. 2011. Looking at the Middle East Differently: An Alternative Conceptual Lens. In: Korany, B. (ed.) *The Changing Middle East: A New Look at Regional Dynamics*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press.

Lewis, M. W. and Wigen, K. 1997. *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mahan, A. T. 1902. The Persian Gulf and International Relations. *The National Review*, September, 38–9.

Malmvig, H. 2004. Cooperation or Democratisation? The EU's Conflicting Mediterranean Security Discourses. Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS) Working Paper 2004/8 [Available online at http://pure.diis.dk/ws/files/55832/WP_2004_8_Final.pdf].

Malmvig, H. 2005. Security through Intercultural Dialogue? Implications of the Securitization of Euro–Mediterranean Dialogue between Cultures. *Mediterranean Politics*, 10, 349–64.

Manners, I. 2002. Normative Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 40, 235–58.

Moulakis, A. 2005. The Mediterranean Region: Reality, Delusion or Euro–Mediterranean Project? *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 16, 11–38.

Nasser, G. A. 1955. The Egyptian Revolution. *Foreign Affairs*, 32, 199–211.

Said Ali, A. M. 1996. The Shattered Consensus? Arab Perceptions of Security. *International Spectator*, 31, 23–52.

Salem, P. 1997. Arab Political Currents, Arab–European Relations and Mediterraneanism. In: Guazzone, L. (ed.) *The Middle East in Global Change: The Politics and Economics of Interdependence versus Fragmentation*. London: Macmillan.

Williams, M. C. and Neumann, I. B. 2000. From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia, and the Power of Identity. *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 29, 357–87.

Wolff, S. 2006. The Externalization of Justice and Home Affairs to the Southern Neighbours: The EU's Dilemmas in the Fight against Terrorism. EuroMesCo 2006 Annual Conference. Istanbul.