WATER SECURITY CONCEPT AND ITS PERCEPTION IN THE EGYPT

Dr. Seyfi Kılıç

Center for Middle Eastern Strategic Studies,
Water Research Programme,
Süleyman Nazif Sok. 12/B Çankaya,
Ankara Turkey
Email: seyfikilic@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims to look the securitization process of the Nile River dispute between Egypt and Ethiopia. In order to reach this aim at first the history of security studies handled and then the securitization theory which is the most powerful criticism to the traditional security studies evaluated. After all, the recently emerged paradigm "water security" and its components are reviewed with the Egyptian authorities' declarations and statements about the Ethiopian dam to reveal how the Nile dispute became a security issue for the Egyptians.

Key words: Securitization Theory, Water Security, Nile River, Renaissance Dam.

1. Introduction

The word security is a powerful tool in claiming priority when it comes to competition for government or public opinion's attention. Since the introduction of the water security concept to the international arena in 1990s, many definitions have been issued. Many scholars, institutions, organizations and states have adopted the concept, and the term has begun to be perceived as a magic tool to address all water related issues. While there are many definitions on water security, no single definition has been accepted in the international system. Hence, each state and international organization takes the concept in a different fashion. In the Middle East, where security itself is politically a major concern area, water is treated in classical security terms.

As an arid and semi-arid region, the Middle East has water resources disputed among the states, the major ones being Nile, Euphrates-Tigris and Jordan Rivers. The disputed rivers, however, are not the only source of conflict in the region. In addition to rivers, groundwater resources have transboundary features as well, and the limited amount of water in the region has always been expressed as a source of conflict. However, the transboundary water situation in the region is not the only threat to the water security among the states. While access to safe and sufficient drinking water at an affordable cost is not achieved by all and the sanitation situation in the region is at an alarming level, the water security concept only takes attention by

the states in transboundary manner. In this study, the aim is to inquire the perception of water security concept in Egypt through the politics of the Nile River, i.e., the main source of water especially for Egypt and some other riparian countries. Although there are historical examples which refer to the importance of the Nile River, the main focus of this study is the period which begins with the declaration of Great Ethiopian Renaissance Dam in 2010 and the securitization process of the issue.

2. The Origins of the Security Studies

It is commonly expressed that the origins of security studies lie in the nuclear weaponry and the cold war. However, this approach does not reflect the reality on security studies. Before the cold war era, the early studies in international relations have also been interested in security issues even though some can claim that these studies do not have any theoretical approach to the security other than focusing on solutions to the current security issues in the post First World War period. Before understanding the impact of the cold war on thinking about the concept of national security, the pre-cold war studies on the subject must be examined. Security studies are generally "defined as the study of the nature, causes, effects, and prevention of war" (Baldwin 1995, 119). Thus, the period between World Wars cannot be handled as the period that security studies do not exist. However, the scope of the studies was different from those of the Cold war era. Sustaining the international peace and security can be promoted through the subjects such as democracy, national self-determination, disarmament, and collective security (Baldwin 1995, 119). The key difference between the two periods is that the military force was not the primary subject in the idealism of the post Second World War era; on the contrary, security studies focused on the prevention of war and arbitration (Fox 1949, 69). While some scholars such as Edward Mead Earle and Arnold Wolfers put emphasis on the military power as an instrument to the statecraft, the common understanding on security tended to neglect the military power as a tool (Baldwin 1995,120). Buzan, on the other hand, argues that works developed before 1945 are distinctive with respect to its main focus which is defence and war rather than security (Buzan & Hansen 2009, 1). Moreover, Baldwin (1995,) identifies four diagnostic features of the security studies written during the period of 1945-1955. According to Baldwin, security in these works is accepted, not as the primary goal, but as a "a derivative value" which has relative importance varying with time, space and state. The second feature of these works in the literature is that they viewed national security "as a goal to be pursued by both military and non-military techniques of statecraft". Thirdly, these works emphasize caution and prudence with respect to the military policy. Fourth and the last, these works pay greater attention to "the relationship between national security and domestic affairs, such as the economy, civil liberties and democratic political processes" (Baldwin 1995, 122).

After the Second World War, the perception has changed rapidly because of the USA-USSR rivalry that causes the cold war. Buzan also draws attention to conceptual shift, the introduction of nuclear weaponry and the centrality of civilian element after the Cold War in the security studies literature (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, 1-2). While the international security concerns lost its dominance in the field, the national security studies became the main concern area. In the mid-1950s, the concern about the massive retaliation triggered the academicians' interest on the security studies. During this period, many courses on security have covered the academic area (Baldwin 1995, 121). Despite presenting itself as the neutral and the timeless, conventional security studies have been shaped by the politics of a particular time and place, namely the post-1945 Anglo-American world (Barkawi & Laffey 2006, 330).

2.1 The Golden Age of Security Studies

The period 1955-65 has generally been called as the "golden age" of security studies. In this era, security studies reached their peak and were dominated by nuclear weaponry and deterrence as well as other related concerns, such as arms control and limited war (Buzan & Hansen 2009, 123).

As a main concern in this era, the nuclear weapons and military issues have prominently been overemphasized regardless of historical, cultural and political contexts of the military power and its implementation (Baldwin 1995, 123). During this period, system theories, game theory and the quantification of security studies became vanguard in the literature and began to expand its influence to international relations literature (Buzan & Hansen 2009, 89). The main research focus of the security studies literature shifted to issues surrounding the use of armed force in this era due to nuclear weaponry's transforming capacity of the cost of war (Brendan 2012, 5). Scholars directed their effort to answer the question of how to use nuclear weapons as effective policy instruments, and, hence, four main approaches - balance of power, bipolar world, containment and deterrence- emerged in the golden age studies. (COT Institute for Safety 2007, 9)

This era continued till to the Vietnam War which drawn the attention from Soviet Union the cold war, to the Vietnam, the hot war. After the end of Vietnam War with Paris Peace Accords in 1973, security studies could not gain the previous importance and influence immediately (Baldwin 1995, 124). In the mid-1970s, new developments in international relations, such as environment, third world poverty, and North-South division, gained momentum. Additionally, the détente period in the cold war paved the way to discuss and find a place for aforementioned subjects in the international political arena (Brendan 2012, 6). Besides, the Arab oil embargo after the 1973 Arab-Israel War triggered the fears of the threats emanated from outside of the Soviet Union actions as non-military sources (Brendan 2012, 7).

2.2 The 1980s

While peace research found a room to expand during the détente period, security studies gained momentum with the end of the détente period in 1980s, with the invasion of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union and Ronald Reagan presidency and the revival of superpower tensions. Hence, there was a gradual shift from peace studies to security studies (Buzan & Hansen 2009, 135).

Stephen M. Walt claimed that the resurgence of security studies in 1980s as the "renaissance" of the field. (Walt 1991, 222) Walt defines the security studies as "the study of threat, use and the control of military force", and expands the context of it to statecraft and non-military elements such as "poverty, AIDS, environmental hazards, drug abuse, and the like". In addition to this contextual expansion, Walt also argues that renaissance of security studies represents an empirical turn for security studies whose scope was limited with theoretical discussions before (Walt 1991, 227). However, in the 1980s, the concept of national security was transformed and got a new form as international security (Baldwin 1995, 125). Despite the fact that there were undoubtedly new insights during the 1980s, the new international security studies remained similar to the national security studies that prevailed after 1955.

2.3 The End of the Cold War and the Globalization of National Security Studies

With the end of the Cold War, the security studies evolved to a new direction. While traditionalists argue that military security is the prime goal of nation-states because of the anarchy in the international political system (Walt 1991, 212), non-traditionalists claim that military security should not consistently dominate the agenda and expand the definition of security to encompass different threats faced by nations such as environment, migration and human trafficking (Baldwin 1995, 127).

In the post-cold war era, there were three points that emerged as new ways of thinking in security studies. First, the military force as a tool in international area is less applicable. Second, there is an urgent need to re-examine international relations and security studies given the failure of scholars in anticipating the end of the cold war. As the third and the last point, some scholars argued that there is a need for a broader approach of national security considering both the domestic threats and the international but non-military ones.[1]

The controversy on the context of security studies caused multidimensional debates, and in 1990s, scholars continued discussing whether these new transnational challenges could be regarded as security threats. For example, scholars such as Robert Kaplan argued that environmental degradation possesses initial threats to the existing order while scholars such as Marc Levy countered this argument and insisted that environmental issues could not be accepted as national security issues (Kaplan 1994,). On the other hand, the discussion over the context of security studies was eased with the attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, and the central focus turned into international terrorism (Brendan 2012, 13). As a result of these developments since the end of the cold war, the scope of the security studies expanded further to encompass a range of diverse issues from environment to terrorism.

3.   The Copenhagen School: Securitization and De-securitization

The most powerful opposition to the traditionalist security studies came from Europe with the securitization theory mainly developed by Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, i.e. a body of work called the ''Copenhagen School'' (Williams 2003, 511). Barry Buzan's book "Security: A New Framework for Analysis" is indeed generally acknowledged as the key text of the securitization studies (Buzan, Wæver & Wilde, 1998).

Though the securitization theory has many controversial points, the theory provides prominent research frameworks for contemporary security studies, and any subject can easily be labelled as a security issue such as environment, migration, fresh water scarcity and energy. The Copenhagen School focuses mainly on the nature of the securitizing actor and the process of the act of securitization (McDonald 2008, 563).

The security studies have been challenged after the cold war to shift the main discourse from the confined approach of state and military security to global concerns such as the environment, concerns that have often been ignored or at least called as low politics within a traditional state-centric and military conception by deepening the concerns of the sub-state actors (Williams 2003, 513). Hence, the Copenhagen School developed a very distinctive approach to the security studies by analysing the social construction of security with a special focus on speech-acts. This focus links the securitization theory with the social constructivism. Yet, the Copenhagen School slightly differs from the constructivism by taking speech-acts as specific kinds of act, makes a particular speech-act a security act and therefore opens the path to extraordinary measures that lead to shifts from the routine political agenda. The main argument of the securitization theory can be summarized as follows:

> "[I]n international relations an issue becomes a security issue not because something constitutes an objective threat to the state (or another referent object), but rather because an actor has defined something as existential threat to some object's survival. And by doing so, the actor has claimed the right to handle the issue through extraordinary means to ensure the referent object's survival" (Wæver 2004).

Stating that an object is threatened in its existence, the securitizing actor, especially the state, sees the right to take extraordinary measures to ensure the referent object's survival. Hence, the issue falls into the field of emergency politics and is being dealt without the normal rules and regulations in the political area (Taureck 2006, 56).

---

[1] See especially the essays by T.C: Schelling Petterson, "The Global Dimension" and Peter G. Peterson,"The Primacy of Global agenda", in Rethinking America's Security edt. by Allison and Treverton, 1991, New York: Norron.

In securitization theory, security is treated as the output of a process called speech-acts. Therefore, the theory claims that security issues are socially constructed by a special social process. At the end of this process, an issue becomes a security issue not because that it is but because it is brought into a security situation by speech-acts (Williams 2003, 513).

An inevitable result of this conceptualization on the meaning of security is that it becomes anything that the securitizing actor claims, not the given meaning. Wæver explains the security as follows:

> "What then is security? With the help of language theory, we can regard ''security'' as a speech act. In this usage, security is not of interest as a sign that refers to something more real; the utterance itself is the act. By saying it, something is done (as in betting, giving a promise, naming a ship). By uttering ''security'' a state representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it." (Wæver 1995, 55)

Though the securitization theory contributes with a very different approach to the realist based security thinking, it also chooses a state-centric position. This position presents itself in the formulation of speech-act process that is fundamental to the securitisation theory. As Wæver argued (1995: 55), "the utterance itself is the act . . . by uttering 'security', a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means necessary to block it."

In order to reach a successful securitization of an issue, the first step must be the securitizing move. Theoretically, the securitizing move is open to any actor. However, securitization is not open to all actors in practice. The structural difference of the actors, mainly about making socially effective claims and largely based on power and capability of actors, determines the acceptance of the move by the relevant audience (Williams 2003, 514). Continuously expressing an issue as a security matter makes the issue gain importance for national security in the public domain (Biswas 2011, 3). Naturally, the securitizing actor has to present something as an existential threat to convince the targeted audience. After the acceptance of the audience, the securitized issue can be moved from the sphere of daily politics and pave the way to take extraordinary measures. Here, it should be noted that Wæver is critical to this procedure and offers desecuritization of the issues. According to Wæver "security should be seen as a negative, as a failure to deal with issues of normal politics" (Buzan, Wæver & Wilde, 1998, 29).

Traditionally, in a nation-state, the government is the primary driving force behind the securitization process. Government usually plays the role of the speaker for and the promoter of security for a society and a state. Therefore, the securitization theory is criticised as a state-centric approach that does not take into account the role of the other actors that prevail in international system or in national level, such as international organisations and NGO's. Additionally, being state-centric is not the only criticism to the securitization theory. The Copenhagen School is also criticized for the basic idea of security is deemed as a speech act only. It is claimed that speech-acts can rarely explain the overall process of the security concept at best (Stritzel 2007, 568). However, it is beyond the borders of this study that whether the securitization theory is theoretically consistent. The building of security concept by the official discourse in Egypt on the Nile River and the Ethiopian Grand Renaissance Dam (GERD) is the main concern of this study.

4. Broadening the Realm of Security Studies: From Environmental to Water Security

It is commonly accepted that the 1972 Stockholm United Nations Conference on the Human Environment is the cornerstone of the environment-international relations link. After this conference, environmental issues became one of the important debates in international public opinion. Additionally, issues such as depletion of ozone layer, climate change and deforestation and the response of the international system to those

developments paved the way the shift of international security concerns from traditional military issues to a more broad concept. Environmental concerns opened a wide range of study areas for the security studies.

With the end of the Cold War in 1990, the traditional notion of state-centric and realistic approach to security, typically defined by military aspects, was insufficient to explain emerging threats such as poverty, environment, and intra-state conflict. Hence, the security discourse shifted from traditional to non-traditional security. Considering the environment as a threat to individual, national or global security has created a new agenda in the discourse of security studies, and the range of international security studies today embraces issues such as environmental degradation, global warming, and climate change. Environmental security studies try to find answers to some particular questions. These questions are simply "What is security?", "Whose security?", "How can security be achieved?" (Williams 2008, 5).

In this context, understanding environmental security has two layers: First, the theoretical changes and developments of the concept of security must be considered. Then, the link between environmental change and human society must be taken into consideration. With these two layers of environmental issues, the security studies on environment will be more perceptible and explicable.

On the other hand, parallel to the end of cold war, in the first half of the 1990's, the fresh water disputes gained attention in the academic field. However, fresh water disputes in that era were tackled especially among the states level, and the internal level of the water issues was usually ignored. As a consequence of this approach, the fresh water issues were investigated largely from a confrontational perspective. The most prominent study on this issue was the book titled "Water Wars: Coming Conflicts in the Middle East" by John Bulloch and Adel Darwish published in 1993, addressing the Middle Eastern water issues with an approach of conflict and security. This tendency remained from 1990s to the new millennium. In these years, the water was assumed, not only by states but also by many academicians, as a tool in relative power relations (Gleick 1993). The cooperative and the interstate aspects of the water issue were remembered after this period.

The first mention of the term water security was seen at The Hague in March 2000, the Ministerial Declaration of the second World Water Forum titled "Water Security in the Twenty-First Century". The declaration listed the challenges that hinder to achieve water security as follows: (1) meeting basic needs; (2) securing food supply; (3) protecting ecosystems; (4) sharing water resources; (5) managing risks; (6) valuing water; and (7) governing water wisely (Ministerial Declaration of The Hague, 2000).

In the United Nations system water security is defined as "the capacity of a population to safeguard sustainable access to adequate quantities of acceptable quality water for sustaining livelihoods, human well-being, and socio-economic development, for ensuring protection against water-borne pollution and water-related disasters, and for preserving ecosystems in a climate of peace and political stability" (UNESCO-IHP, 2012).

Different institutions and academicians have different definitions on water security. Global Water Partnership defines water security "at any level from the household to the global, […] that every person has access to enough safe water at affordable cost to lead a clean, healthy and productive life, while ensuring that the natural environment is protected and enhanced" (Global Water Partnership 2000, 13). Grey and Sadoff describe the water security as the reliable availability of an acceptable quantity and quality of water for health, livelihoods and production, coupled with an acceptable level of water-related risks (Grey & Sadorff, 2007, 549). Additionally, Falkenmark's definition on water security is more comprehensive. According to Falkenmark, water security is "linked to a safe water supply and sanitation, water for food production, hydrosolidarity between those living upstream and those living downstream in a river basin and water pollution avoidance, so that the water in aquifers and rivers remains useable, i.e. not too polluted for use for water supply, industrial production, agricultural use or the protection of biodiversity, wetlands, and

aquatic systems in rivers and coastal waters" (Falkenmark 2001, 553). Although there is a broad range of definitions in the literature, the core elements necessary to achieving and maintaining water security are listed in the UN Water, the main water institution of the UN:

"Access to safe and sufficient drinking water at an affordable cost in order to meet basic needs, which includes sanitation and hygiene and the safeguarding of health and well-being; Protection of livelihoods, human rights, and cultural and recreational values; Preservation and protection of ecosystems in water allocation and management systems in order to maintain their ability to deliver and sustain the functioning of essential ecosystem services; Water supplies for socio-economic development and activities; Collection and treatment of used water to protect human life and the environment from pollution; Collaborative approaches to transboundary water resources management within and between countries to promote freshwater sustainability and cooperation; The ability to cope with uncertainties and risks of water-related hazards, such as floods, droughts and pollution, among others; and Good governance and accountability, and the due consideration of the interests of all stakeholders through: appropriate and effective legal regimes; transparent, participatory and accountable institutions; properly planned, operated and maintained infrastructure; and capacity development" (United Nations University 2013, 2).

A common and working concept of water security has potential to provide the incorporation of the water issues to the international development dialogue by setting a new course. This new course will help save the water issues from a confrontational approach to a more cooperative one among the riparian states. Additionally, the internal aspects of the water management are emphasized more broadly in the water security concept.

There are many factors affecting the situation of water from the fields such as biophysics, infrastructure, finance and politics. The water security concept is located at the intersection point of these fields (Zeitoun 2011, 290). Hence, to reach a water-secure world, interdisciplinary cooperation and coordination is a sine qua non requirement across the water related sectors, interstate communities and transboundary relations. This kind of relationship between different sectors is assumed to be prevented or at least managed (Wouters, Vinogradov & Magsig 2009, 101).

Water security involves the sustainable use and protection of water systems: the protection against water related hazards, the sustainable development of water resources, and the safeguarding access to water functions and services for humans and the environment. In this context, measures to increase water security are primarily concerned with human interventions in water systems and/or a wise utilization of water and water-related environmental services. These are aimed at the enhancement of the beneficial and sustainable uses of water for various purposes such as water supply, irrigation, drainage, navigation, hydropower, environmental control, and the protection against water related disasters such as floods and droughts.

5. Securitization of Nile River by the Egyptian Officials

It is commonly known that Nile River is vital for Egypt. The river carries 84 billion cubic meters of water annually. All the water utilization activities namely agricultural, industrial and domestic utilizations are depend mainly on this source. Because of this fact, all Egyptian governments concerns about the obstruction or delay of the rivers flow before reaching to the Egyptian territories. This tendency emerged at the end of 19th century while the Egypt was under the British control as a colonial power. British Empire made lots of arrangements in order to guarantee Egypt's utilizations not only under its influence areas in the basin but also with other colonial powers in the basin.[2]

---

[2] For more information for the Agreements in the basin see Seyfi Kılıç *Egypt-Ethiopia Dispute on the Blue Nile River* avaliable on http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/WaterResources/showAnalysisAgenda.aspx?ID=2334

However, after the independence of basin countries, they preferred to announce that they do not recognize the agreements which were made on their behalf by colonial powers. Despite the announcements that do not recognize the arrangements (Hultin 1995,34; Soffer 1999,61), the upstream countries in the basin could not develop any big water projects due to the lack of financial and technical sources until 1990's.

In the cold war era, Egypt and Ethiopia took place at the East-West divide. At the Nasser regime while Egypt was pursuing anti-American and anti-Israel policies, the emperor of the Ethiopia, Haile Selassie was a popular figure and an ally of the so called free world. As a result of this divide, American institutions conducted water development plans in Ethiopia to impose press to Egyptians (Jovanovic 1985, 84; Schiffler 1998, 141). After the Nasser era, Egypt turn to United States as an ally and the coup d'état in Ethiopia in 1974 reversed the situation in the basin. This time, Soviet Union started to conduct projects to research water and land resources of Ethiopia (Beschorner 1992, 60). However, despite the cold war tensions any development project was not implemented in the Ethiopia.

In this regard Ethiopia, which is one of the poorest countries, has aspirations to generate hydroelectricity to sustain development and gain foreign exchange by selling to neighbouring countries. Hence, Ethiopia started to build Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam at April 2011, which was used to call Millennium Dam. The timing of the construction was concurrent with the period in Egypt which Mubarak regime has been toppled and finally, the Muslim Brotherhood came to power.

Egyptian answer to the Ethiopian Dam was indeed shows the long term policy of Egypt to hinder any upstream utilization in the Nile Basin. Despite the fact that, this policy does not fit today's complex hydropolitic and economic requirements, Egypt seeks to pursue this policy.

In order to hinder the construction of the dam, Egypt tried to stop funding of the Ethiopian dam in international field and succeeded in its aim. Thus, Ethiopia funded the construction by issuing bonds. Additionally, Egyptian officials made statements on the issue by securitizing the Nile River controversy by both Muhammad Mursi who is toppled by Egyptian Army at July 3th of 2013 and Abdel Fattah el-Sisi the recently elected President of the Egypt. The tendency to securitize the controversy on Nile River has two folds. First, by declaring the issue is a natural security issue and secondly, by using the term water security, a newly developing term, to attract international attention.

Historically, Nile River importance for the Egypt is expressed many times. The very first example known on this issue is called "Hymn to the Nile", which is considered to be written around 2100 B.C. In the hymn Nile is praised and viewed as keeping Egypt alive (Thatcher, 1907, 79-83). Also Greek historian Herodotus called Egypt as "the gift of Nile" (Herodotus, 2014,).

In modern times, the importance and vital position of the Nile is also expressed by especially Egyptian statesmen. After the 1973 Yom Kippur war with Israel, the peace negotiations paved the way for Camp David Peace Treaty in 1979. After the peace with Israel the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, declared that "water is the only issue that could take Egypt to war" which has been referred many times in hydropolitics literature (Starr 1991). Additionally, Boutros Boutros-Gali's (Egyptian Foreign Minister, then Secretary General of United Nations) prediction on Nile River and war issue that "the next war in our region will be over the waters of Nile not politics" is also quoted many times. These two statements in one way reflects the importance of the Nile River for Egypt and another, a political rhetoric which was intended to show the political shift of Egypt from Arab-Israel conflict.

The latest developments in the Nile basin till 2010 caused concerns in Egypt for the future utilizations of the Nile River. In 2010 Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Tanzania signed The Cooperative Framework Agreement which recognized the riparian countries utilizations on equitable and reasonable manner in accordance with the 1997 UN Convention on Non-navigational Uses of International Watercourses. In 2011, Sudan which is historical ally of Egypt on Nile River politics divided and

cornerstone of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam is laid. Additionally the Arab Spring spread to Egypt and long term presidency of Hosni Mubarak toppled down by a popular movement.

However, the new era did not maintain the stabilization in the country. As the popular movement increases the Mursi government tried to convert the interest of the people to a foreign threat by using the Ethiopian dam. In his statement Mursi declared that "Egypt's water security cannot be violated at all" and "As president of the state, I confirm to you that all options are open." (Egyptian warning, 2013).

As seen in the statement, Mursi used the term "water security" with a threat of using military force to sustain it. The timing of the statement is also worth to mention that, the popular movement against the Mursi government gained momentum. Furthermore, Mursi gathered the political parties to discuss the ongoing crisis with Ethiopia. In this meeting it is revealed that some political party leaders proposed a sabotage to the Ethiopian Dam without aware of they are on air (Caught on camera, 2013). As a result of intensive rhetoric of that Ethiopian Dam consist a direct threat to the Egypt's survival, the public opinion in Egypt, in securitization theory the audience, gave reaction and made a demonstration in front of the Ethiopian Embassy in Cairo. The interesting and noteworthy point in this demonstration was, the demonstrators both call for the halt for the dam and fall of the Muslim Brotherhood regime (Ethiopia silent as Egyptians attack, 2013).

Here it is worth to mention the specifications of the Ethiopian Dam on the Blue Nile. The dam is planned to produce hydroelectricity. There is not any water consuming plan such as irrigation or domestic use. Producing hydroelectricity through tribunes by using gravitational force does not divert the flow of the river, promotes more regulated water flow which in turn an advantage to the downstream. Hence the Egyptian accusation on the dam that it will reduce the flow that reaches Egypt and affect the amount of water to the Egypt is baseless except the evaporation loses. However, evaporation loses at Aswan dam is calculated as 10 million m^3 in 1959 Agreement between Sudan and Egypt (Agreement Between The United Arab Republic And The Republic Of Sudan, 1959). It is expecting that the Ethiopian dam on the Blue Nile will cause less evaporation lose since the climatic and topographical conditions (Haytham 2010).

After the Mursi term the discourse of the Egypt did not change on the Nile Waters issue. On April 1th 2014 Foreign Ministry spokesman declared that:

> "An integrated action plan is being implemented gradually to protect Egypt's water security interests in regards to the construction of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam" (No new policy on Ethiopian dam, 2014).

The clause in this statement "integrated action plan" is clearly refers to the use of military force and used "water security" phrase out of its meaning, despite the fact that water security concept involves much larger and comprehensive meaning as mentioned above.

After Mursi forced to leave presidency and General Sisi became the sixth president of the Egypt, the discourse of Egypt did not changed despite tripartite negotiations among Egypt, Sudan and Ethiopia. Before the elections that carried General Sisi to the presidency, Sisi visited Russia and also declared the military option for the Ethiopian dam (Johnson, 2014). Additionally after the coup d'etat, General Sisi as Commander in-chief threatened Ethiopia by using military force in the dam issue (Egyptian General Sisi Warns Ethiopia, 2013). Egyptian position on the Nile River controversy has direct impact on the Egyptians since the historical emphasis on the river. In addition, the ongoing discomfort that prevails in the country till 2011, lead the Egyptian administration to securitize the Nile controversy easily and effectively.

6. Conclusion

In this study, the evolution of security studies is examined in order to explain the interaction between traditional security approach and water security concept. Furthermore, securitization approach, which is the

most powerful challenge to the traditional approach, is discussed to reveal how the Nile issue became a security issue by the Egyptian authorities using the water security concept which is recently developed.

Despite the fact that Ethiopia contributes %85 of the total volume of Nile flow by Blue Nile, it does not benefit from the waters of the river. However, after a long period which the first inquiries have conducted, the country planned to construct a dam and hydroelectric power plant at the Blue Nile basin, to increase the standard of living for the people which are one of the poorest nations in the world. Additionally, Ethiopia purposes to gain foreign exchange by providing the electricity to the neighbouring countries.

From Egypt's point of view, it seems that Egypt cannot pursue the existing policy to benefit the waters of the Nile River almost unilaterally. Egypt's objection to the construction of the Renaissance Dam is inevitable result of the ongoing policy to hinder any upstream utilization. However, it can be argued that, this policy cannot be followed in contemporary hydropolitics situation. However Egypt securitizes the Nile controversy, to justify the extraordinary measures that may be taken and put the Egyptians in a state of emergency.

References

Agreement Between The United Arab Republic And The Republic Of Sudan For The Full Utilization Of The Nile Waters, Signed At Cairo, November 8, 1959 And Protocol Concerning The Establishment Of Permanent Joint Technical Committee Signed At Cairo, (1960 January 17), Available: http://internationalwaterlaw.org/documents/regionaldocs/UAR_Sudan1959_and_Protocol1960.pdf

Baldwin, David A. (1995). Security studies and the end of the cold war. World Politics, 48, 117-141.

Barkawi T., & Laffey M., (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. Review of International Studies, 32, pp. 329–352.

Beshorner, N. (1992) Water and instability in the Middle East, Adelphi Paper: 273.

Biswas, Niloy R. (2011). Is the environment a security threat? Environmental Security beyond Securitization. International Affairs Review. XX, (1), 1-22.

Brendan T. (2012). The evolution of national security studies. Australian National University, National Security College, Acton, A.C.T.

Buzan, B, Hansen, L.,(2009) The evolution of international security studies, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., Wæver O., & Wilde J. D, (1998). Security: A new framework for analysis, London: Lynne Reinner.

Caught on camera: Egyptian politicians talk covert Ethiopia attack. [Online] (2013, June 04). Available: http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2013/06/04/Egyptian-politicians-suggest-sabotaging-Ethiopia-s-new-Nile-dam.html

COT Institute for Safety, Security and Crisis Management (2007). notions of security: shifting concepts and perspectives, COT/European Commission

Egyptian General Sisi Warns Ethiopia Of Military Action Over Dam", (2013August 25). [Online] Available: http://www.durame.com/2013/08/egyptian-general-sisi-warns-ethiopia-of.html

Egyptian warning over Ethiopia Nile Dam. (2013, June 10). [Online] Available: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-22850124

Ethiopia silent as Egyptians attack her embassy, official flag in Cairo", (2013,May 31). [Online] Available: http://hornaffairs.com/en/2013/05/31/ethiopia-silent-egyptians-attack-embassy-official-flag-cairo/

Falkenmark, M. (2001). The greatest water problem: the inability to link environmental security, water security and food security. Water Resources Development 17, 539-554.

Falkenmark, M.(1986), Freshwaters as a factor in strategic policy and action. In Arthur H. Westing (ed.) Global Resources and International Conflict, (pp. 85-113), Oxford University Press.

Fox, William T. R. (1949). Interwar international relations research: the American experience. World Politics, 2, (1), 67-79.

Gleick, P. (1993). Water and conflict. International Security, 18, (1), 79-112.

Global Water Partnership. (2000). Towards water security: a framework for action. [Online] Available: http://www.gwp.org/Global/ToolBox/References/Towards%20water%20security.%20A%20framework%20 for%20action.%20Mobilising%20political%20will%20to%20act%20(GWP,%202000).pdf (September 25, 2014)

Grey D., & Sadoff, Claudia W. (2007). Sink or swim? Water security for growth and development. Water Policy 9 (6), 545–571.

Haytham, A, (2010). Integrated Water Resources Management of Aswan High Dam Reservoir in Egypt. paper presented at the symposium The First JE-HydroNet Symposium on the Nile River System and the Delta of Egypt. Kyoto University.

Herodotus, (2014).Histories, translated by Mencsh, Indianapolis: P. Hackett Publishing

Hultin, J. (1995) The Nile: Source of life source of conflict. In Leif Ohlsson (Ed.) Hydropolitics, (pp. 29-54) London: Zed Books Ltd.

Johnson K. (2014). Troubled waters. Foreign Policy. [Online] Available: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/03/06/troubled_waters (August14, 2014)

Jovanovic, D. (1985). Ethiopian interests in the division of the Nile River waters. Water International. X, (2), 82-85.

Kaplan, Robert D. (1994). The coming anarchy. The Atlantic Monthly. [Online] Available: http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1994/02/the-coming-anarchy/304670/?single_page=true (July 26, 2014)

Kılıç, S. (2013), Egypt-Ethiopia dispute on the blue nile river. [Online] Available: http://www.orsam.org.tr/en/WaterResources/showAnalysisAgenda.aspx?ID=2334 (July 22, 2014)

McDonald, M, (2008) Securitization and the construction of security. European Journal of International Relations, 14, (4), 563–587.

Ministerial Declaration of The Hague on Water Security in the Twenty-First Century, (2000 March 20), The Hague, The Netherlands. [Online] Available: http://www.worldwatercouncil.org/fileadmin/world_water_council/documents/world_water_forum_2/The_ Hague_Declaration.pdf (July 23, 2014)

No new policy on Ethiopian dam: Foreign ministry, [Online] Available: http://www.dailynewsegypt.com/2014/04/01/new-policy-ethiopian-dam-foreign-ministry/, (2014, April 01).

Oliver J. Thatcher, (ed). (1907). The Library of Original Sources Vol. I: The Ancient World (Milwaukee: University Research Extension Co., 79-83. retrieved from: Ancient History Sourcebook: Hymn to the Nile, c. 2100 BCE. [Online] Available: http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/ancient/hymn-nile.asp (September 01, 2014)

Schiffler, M. (1998). Conflicts over the Nile or conflicts on the Nile. In Waltina Scheumann & Manuel Schıffler (Eds.), Water in the Middle East (pp. 137-150), Berlin: Springer.

Soffer, A. (1999). Rivers of Fire: The Conflict over water in the Middle East. Maryland, USA: Rowmen & LittleField Publishers

Starr, J. (1991) Water wars, Foreign Policy, (82) ,17-36.

Stritzel, H. (2007). Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. European Journal of International Relations, 13(3), 357–383.

Taureck R. (2006). Securitization theory and securitization studies. Journal of International Relations and Development, 9 (1), 53 -61.

UNESCO-IHP, (2012, June 4-7). Final Report. 20th Session of the Intergovernmental Council. Paris, France: UNESCO, [Online] Available: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002173/217383e.pdf (July 25, 2014)

United Nations University. (2013) .Water Security & the Global Water Agenda, A UN-Water Analytical Brief [Online] Available: http://www.unwater.org/downloads/watersecurity_analyticalbrief.pdf (

WÆVER, O. (1995). Securitization and desecuritization. In, R. Lipschutz (ed.), On Security, (pp. 46–86). New York: Columbia University Press.

Wæver, O. (2004). New schools in security theory and the origins between core and periphery, paper presented at the ISA Conference, Montreal.

Walt, Stephen M. (1991), Renaissance of security studies, International Security Quarterly, 35, (2), 211-239.

Williams, Michael C. (2003). Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. International Studies Quarterly, 47 (4), 511–531.

Williams, Paul D (ed). (2008) Security studies - An introduction, New York: Routledge

Wouters, P., Vinogradov, S. & Magsig, B. (2009). Water security, hydrosolidarity, and international law: a river runs through it. Yearbook of International Environmental Law, 19, 97–134.

Zeitoun, M. (2011). The global web of national water security. Global Policy 2(3), 286-296.