Abstract

Richard Ashley, introducing the second reading of the problem of anarchy, states that the heroic practice is a way in which anarchy in International relations articulates and operates in the production and reproduction of the means of discipline knowledges and doings in modern politics. So is the resolution of the problem posed by her own, as then a foundational problem: being the international system units of sovereign, anarchy appears as the opposition to the order, to sovereignty that is based on hierarchy and the structure of world politics is a number of states and domestic societies, each one with a sovereign presence. In a way, to feminist theory, these qualities and attributes would be inherently masculinized and based on domination and male domination and gender inequality. More than that, the heroic practice is part of an aesthetic representation of the political, as a narrative of the seizure of the real world, according to human nature and International Politics and not as it should be. Thus, this article seeks to observe the possible links between gender, aesthetics and international politics and how these issues are related to the practices and theories of International Relations.
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1 - Introduction

This paper aims to put some light on insights about the relation among aesthetical representations of sovereignty and masculinities. The question of departure is how the contribution of aesthetical turn in International Relations can add new views over the theme of the heroic practice, as an alternative to those that are in favor of mainstream and positivist theories. However, the research question presupposes that even in post-positivist theory, the issue of gender is badly solved.

So, the critics looks forward another approach considering the foundational work of Richard Ashley about the anarchy problematique. We preferred to focus on accounts of space as a matter of masculine and modern agency. The existence of sovereignty presupposes a spatial reality, some territory where the population is conducted. In this sense, Bachelard’s work about poetics of space can contribute to reveal how poetical imagination is a way to contain political modernity as we can see in International Relations. The subject of the heroic practice is created by a realism account of the self-preservation and power politics, which one is based on sublime representations: the representation of the great aspects, the great statesmen, the great heroes in war. This view consider that both (neo)Realism and (neo)Liberalism creates two kinds of ideal masculinity, hegemonic masculinities: the warrior-citizen and the bourgeoise-rational actor.

Our work must show how the sublime character of sovereign power and practice in International Relations is closed on determined poetical images over hero figure, then a masculinized agency.

2 - The Aesthetical Turn in International Relations

It is from Romanticism where it is included the appearance of most of all representation of nationalism, the nation, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It was in this period that the masses, the people, the society have become the great political agent of modernity and modernization. For International Poltics, an aesthetic approach, there were two traditions in the academic trajectory over the last century discipline could drink: the mimetic approach (mímesis) which ultimately is related to the origin of the discipline - realism, liberalism - where it is meant to represent the policy "realistically", ...
aiming to capture the world politics as it really is. In this scheme, the mimetic approach does not focus his attention between what represented and its representation. They are theories against representation (Bleiker, 2009; p. 21).

The second approach, the aesthetic approach (aisthesis) assumes that there is an analytical difference between the study object and its representation and it is this difference, that the politic space is located. More than that, there is a preference between patterns of events that are preferable rather than other, which, ultimately, is how it organizes the knowledge, the understanding of reality. We notice also that

“It is a process through which we organise our understanding of reality. Note as well that even if the ideal of mimesis – perfect resemblance between signifier and signified – were possible, it could offer us little political insight. It would merely replicate what is, and thus be as useless as ‘as a facsimile of a text that is handed to us in answer to our question of how to interpret that text’.” (BLEIKER, 2009; pg. 21)

On the implications of the aesthetic to the representation in realism, for example, we can illustrate its success in the job of moving the subjective values of a representation. The "realistic realism of reality" is based on a prior belief in her own essence. The "doxa" composed in its accomplishment, offer a only-way to problematize the power-knowledge in mimetic theories. The doxical science is the placement of scientific problems in a manner that while creates it, also gives the answer - the opening and construction of a reality already built - prints its transformation of knowledge into something devalued (Bourdieu, 1976). The transposition of the logic of anarchy - for Waltz - or containment of Nazism - in Carr and Morgenthau - into contingency forms of ahistorical and universal explanations are versions attributed to human nature and International Policy (Bleiker, 2009; pg 24); these are all ways of removing the aesthetic quality of the policy or the intermediary between her and the politics of aesthetics, or the development of a anti-aesthetical knowledge.

Discuss the significance of the problems of mimetic conventions becomes important because, first, it is believed to be possible to capture the essence of social relations and political human nature, and secondly, the positive knowledge erases the location of politics for the representation of what we fight struggles - the realization of the police order based on consensus to Rancière (1996).
So the thesis of aesthetical turn is that the sensibility – the sensible knowledge – can offer some further ideas to political dilemmas. To aesthetics the beauty is linked with harmony and pleasure, while the sublime is related to feelings as fear and pain, or deeper as violence and terror (Bleiker, 2009: p. 67). Bleiker, in special defends that the nature of global politics, in its traditional foundations is also based in the sublime way of aesthetics. Thinking about the mythical foundation of International Relations grounded on distinction of inside/ outside, order and anarchy, wars and conflicts, in sum, in violence, is enough to realize this nature. Briefly,

“But all too often the experience of dislocation wrought by the sublime is countered immediately with heroic and masculine understandings of the political, which seek to mobilise the unleashed energy for projects of mastery and control. The sublime appears to invite its own dissolution, as whole nations attempt to obliterate the conditions of possibility of ambivalent experiences.” (Bleiker, 2009: 68)

Therefore, sublime is a touchstone of human unconscious: dimensions that are shaped in literature, arts, music, poetry. But, why sublime is an important concept for politics? The sublime enables us to understand the representations within a political phenomenon. Its first characteristic is that it is grounded over a terrible event – actual or imagined -. The second one is the detachment from its events, revealing its contradictions, as the confusion of pain and pleasure. The last one is the relative problem of representation, the reality non-realizable, against realism concept of politics. This occurs meanly in such greatness of determined – not random tough – events, like wars or great fictions of national origins in History. This is the sublime character of heroic practice a History told by winners, by great architects of modern nation-state. On its opposite side is the subliminal representations as source of grounding the everyday life, as a practical matter of the ordinary order of life. The normality as foundation of life, where policy order realize the distribution of sensible where everyone has its own part in the whole inscribed in political community (Rancière, 1996). Finally as showed there is some analytical approximation among the heroic character of sublime and the masculinities practices meanly based on representations of politics.

3 - The different masculinities in IR Theory
To proceed in our efforts, we must now “paint” the field of International Relations with some tendencies in theory concerning masculinities. Charlotte Hooper (2000) believes that masculinities archetypes can be observed through the field of International Relations. From that we can consider that theories are responsible or to construct or deconstruct these archetypes. Talking about the two mainstream theories in the discipline, is implied that both (neo)realism and (neo)liberalism are built over representations of masculinities and in the field struggle for dominance, either one and other dispute narratives of stronger and smarter males. The first is can be called as the Warrior-Citizen and the other as the bourgeois rationalist.

Is also possible to interpret International Relations Theory as a product of hegemonic masculinity, meanly to Realism, where this approach is most easy witnessed. The problem most be posed as the link with masculinity and militarism is seen as natural, as something given. Tatiana Moura (2010) believes that hegemonic masculinity is related and grounded by realist conception in International Relations in a sense that the preparation to war is the only way available to the states guarantee its national security, in one hand the citizenship here is grounded in the right to be a soldier, by the other hand, it depends on a devaluated femininity that needs to be protect (p. 93). As extensively denounced by feminism, the source of inequality in International Relations is a matter of how power is associated as a military capacity – or as all the discussion about the fungibility of power, how to transform economic power in military power, etc. – as a thing of a specific shape of masculinity and its performing space the public sphere.

In this sense, we can accept that social order prevailed on world order is based on a War System (Reardon, 1985). Thinking in this direction enable us to deconstruct how the legitimation of a specific role of gender focused on the hegemonic male has influence in the way violence is performed; deeper inside this system is truthful that power and war are continuauns of patriarchy in different levels of analysis and impact (Moura, 2010). Then the operation of this system works in distributing and multiplying essencializations that incorporate the gender identities and roles. We can realize it when confront how militarization of society not only occur during conflicts, but is perpetuated during peace time, formal or informal, so is visualized as a cultural term, nor only a political one, detaining a cultural effort (Enloe, 2000). Furthermore, these
essencializations of roles are constructed in the authorization and regulation of the conditions of possibility in Realism:

“The realist perspective of International Relations affiliates, in its base, a fixist comprehension of human nature, appealing frequently to the idea of natural or naturalized aggressiveness of man, or to biological features specifics to male sex that are responsible to its role as violent. These are the same arguments that suppose the inevitability or fatality of war (apud Pettman, 1996), the essencialists arguments.

Beyond the fact to consider all men as main perpetrators of violence and all women as main victims of this violence, this perspective in the analysis of armed conflict assigns the role of natural constructors of peace to women, as it they had a natural sense of pacifism in her femininities.” (Moura, 2010; p. 86)

However, how this masculinity and its agent that performs politics, - this hegemonic masculinity - are constructed by International Relations mainstream theory? Beginning with Realism, we can analyze it since its basement on the hobbesian state of nature where no women are cited in the war of all against all. The patriarchal view of life exclude the female participation. When excluded from political activity only rests the nurture occupation as the maternal relationship with society: “Presumably, the “invisible” women were in a state of nurture (producing the next generation); otherwise, life would have been nonexistent rather than merely “nasty, brutish and short” (apud Tickner 1991, 31). Women fared little better in the alternative, romantic, republican tradition, as in Rousseau’s state of nature, reason and understanding could be attained only by men (apud Grant 1991, 11).” (Hooper, 2000: p. 98) Mostly developed during the Cold War, Realism had its agency occupied by “tough-talking presidents and of John Wayne and James Bond” males (Hooper, 2000: p. 103). Partly, the rise of the realist men of Cold War was due to an achievement of emasculation of liberalism and conceptualizing of liberals as failed men. The debate in years of crisis in Carr’s work, before WWII, obviously was made through the struggle over ideal types of men that governed the power politics, as well as Morgenthau would argue the duties of the statesmen in his founding principles of theory.

With the détente during the Cold War, liberalism would counter-attack realism. The warrior-citizen is overcome by the bourgeois-rational experts. It is less aggressive, but more egalitarian and democratic. In one sense it works with the competitive individualism, reason and self-control – valued qualities of enlightenment – and qualities

1 Our translation.
that prove that bravery and strength can be outperformed by cooperation among states and societies and rules must be regulated to avoid “free riders” and “bandwagoning”. The relationship between this model of masculinity and women and feminism is structurally more complex than with Realism (Hooper, 2000: p. 98). The thing must pass by the agent of bourgeois rationalism: the rational actor, a figure that finally would extrapolate all theories after liberalism. However, the gender inequality can be observed in this structure of how to think on reason. The classical dichotomies of private and public spaces, reason and madness, mind and body, and last but not least, rational and emotional. It is from this source of structuralizing thinking that the rational acting of bourgeois-rational man is built masculinity:

“Feelings and emotions are seen as both imperiling masculine superiority and questioning the sources of masculine identity. The body, its desires and frailties, similarly poses a threat to masculinity and pure reason. Acting only from reason and duty serves to strengthen the autonomy of men. Otherwise they are in a position of servitude, when reason becomes a slave to the passions. Therefore self-control over one’s emotions and body have come to be hallmarks of masculinity.” (Hooper, 2000: p. 99)

With this we can consider that (neo)liberalism proposed another way to conceptualize men and masculinities in the movement to subalternalize the realist man produced after World War II. The détente in Cold War suggested that other way to think institutions and world order. In this sense, the increasing role of international organizations would be seen as a signal of demise of late Realism and politics of power:

“Statesmen, who followed the Machiavellian antidemocratic requirement of secrecy in diplomatic affairs, embodied a citizen-warrior masculinity, bolstered by patriarchal privilege. Such citizen-warriors and patriarchs were no longer what was required to run international affairs—but rather bourgeois-rational experts would usher in a new age of international cooperation. (idem p. 104)”

The answer of (neo)realism side came with Kenneth Waltz. He finally tried to mix both traditional visions about standards of masculinities. His attraction to scientific rigor to follow parsimony and elegance within theory was responsible to build a realist type of a rational warrior-citizen. In order to fend off the threat of bourgeois rationalism, Waltz was trying to incorporate it into a realist perspective, to regain realism’s historic postwar ascendancy.” (idem). The question posed by Charlotte Hooper is in what extent
Waltz looks forward to feminize liberal and pluralist perspectives when attacking, as his parcimony enables, analyzees with multiple variables and different levels of analysis. His journey moving against interpretive theories can be observed as a fugue over the

Theoretical overcomplication that creates confusion is akin to so-called feminine woolly mindedness, in signifying lack of masculine reason and purposefulness. Lack of parsimony and the wild proliferation of variables is akin to a feminine propensity for uncontrolled verbosity and indulgence, and signifies a lack of masculine self-control. Such failings contrast neatly with Waltz’s own punchy, curt, and slightly aggressive prose. (Hooper, 2000: p.105)

With the advent of neorealism Reagan would crown this new archetype. To cite this case, briefly, it is not curiously and coincidence that the Ronald Reagan arise as American president in the 1980s could engage in these two images. He was the statesmen of the neoliberal reforms, of the Washington consensus at the same time he capitalized the efforts and struggles of a second cold war against Soviet Union with great appeal to popular culture symbols as was his project of the Star War defense program (The Strategic Defense Initiative Organization). At the same time, Reagan represented the male figure in Hollywood cinema as popular star and achieved liberalization of American economy. His work behind the scenes during 50s and 60s as President of the Screen Actors Guild was reminded on the intense contribution with the McCarthy program to find and persecute “communists” actors and personalities in culture industry; in this period it was a way to conform the identity of those loyals and unloyals to the American state (Neocleous, 2008). Being elected as California governor twice, he was a personal charismatic figure in Republican Party, reaching presidency in his first trying. The liberal male frame, detached from feminist theory, so has meanly appeared in his first discourse as president: “In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.” The impact of his economical approach to reassure American order can be seen when is told about “reaganomics” – a way to conduct economics with low state regulation, expenditure and taxes -.

The initial critics of feminists against realism had been meanly on Tickner work. The Morgenthau principles of realism only would be demise in the 1990s, when Ann Tickner (1988) – written in the same year of Ashley’s article - wrote about the unsustainable of his concepts about political realism and rationalism: to her the Morgenthau’s principles were not rationalized as presupposed in scientific rigor once
the reason is a masculine category. So, the great advance of feminist is to consider that the personal is also political, as a hallmark of (re)demarcation of the private and public spaces. Or at last instance, the personal is also international (Tickner, 2001)

Considering the hegemonic masculinity in (neo)Realism and (neo)Liberalism now we can visualize some blank areas over the post-structural theory. Charlotte Hooper reiterates her attention to the lack of gender based analysis in this group of theories. Although the main purpose of this approach is to establish how power and knowledge are constructed and not naturally given, gender is not a common variable discussed by these authors (Hooper, 2000; p. 106-107). This is the way to find the problem of this paper: We arrive in Ashley and his lecture on the heroic practice of sovereignty.

4 - Ashley’s heroic practice

With Ashley, we could meet the practice of sovereignty as a condition of possibility in realism. The subject of sovereignty actually is the hero, the person that at the same time is foundational and whose behavior is shaped by international system. For us the term “heroic practice” is not coincidently posed, as explicated above, it has important implications to gender theory in International Relations:

“He has exposed and deconstructed the paradigm of “sovereign man” (Ashley 1989) that lies behind the concepts of sovereignty, anarchy, and states as rational actors. In a widely used analogy, the state is treated like an individual, who as an autonomous rational actor is implicitly a male individual (discussed above). The state’s territorial integrity is seen as analogous to an individual’s bodily integrity, and its sovereignty is analogous to an individual’s autonomy.” (Hooper, 2000; p. 107)

The modern statecraft is based on a sovereign man that externalizes the dangers and threats in the international anarchy, in the presence of “otherness”, a constant feminine other. However, he has few words about how this citizen warrior is constructed. To Hooper, he is grounded in the bourgeois-liberal conceptions of the autonomy of self: “However, because of his focus on the totalizing discourses of modernity, Ashley sadly has less to say about the citizen-warrior model of masculinity that also informs such “heroic” constructions (so that sovereign man equates with
sovereign statesman...” (Hooper, 2000: p. 108). So the question that must be posed is how conceive this sovereign man as an agent of hegemonic masculinity, such ideal type of masculinity that enables the conditions of possibility of heroic practice. For us the key concept to be understood is to the poetical relation of space with the state and the man.

Richard Ashley (1988) after all, in his most famous article - inaugural of post-structuralism theories -, proposes to examine the anarchy problematique by two ways: check how the speech acts, as has been recognized as a powerful representation that acquires qualities of strength – the monological reading. And as the discourse expounded their own rhetorical strategies diminishing the role of other foundations – the dialogical reading. Says him that the procedures of the anarchichal problematique in International Relations regards to some powerful representations of sovereignty that articulates an amount of discourses, interpretations and meanings that turn itself a coherent whole:

"Its representations are powerful because they replicate on the plane theory of some of the most effective interpretive dispositions and practical orientations by which women and men, statesmen and entrepreneurs go about their business, interpret ambiguous circumstances, impose meaning, discipline and exclude resistant interpretations, and participate in the construction of the conditions, limits, dilemmas, and prevailing ways of knowing and doing that we take to be the familiar truths of global life”(Ashley, 1988; pg.228)

The issue of anarchy must be understood, not as a necessary condition of realistic conduct of politics, but as an arbitrary political construction. The anarchy, in itself, solve its own problem: the lack of a non-officer in order - the absence of an ordering agency - and that the structure of world politics consists of a number of states and domestic unities, each with a presence sovereign. States are simply a process of solution. Modernity understands the reason for the order of everyday life, the demarcation of the border, the coordinated actions.

The heroic practice is, then, the "ideological" Anarchy ability to articulate, produce and reproduce - as a theoretical framework of the plasticity of anarchy - and thus discipline the knowledge and actions of modern life. The heroic practice constitutes a hierarchical dichotomy, sovereignty against anarchy. Sovereignty is understood as a
regulative ideal sense, within a hierarchically ordered unity, with a coherent "self" markedly against external otherness presence. Anarchy belongs to the external domain characterized by difference and discontinuity. Ambiguity that can be understood only by the lack of a coherent and intelligible reality (here it should be noted Kant's influence on the intelligible knowledge and that sensitive, aesthetic. Incidentally, it seems that the aesthetic representation of the heroic practice and therefore that hero rests on this distinction between realities). Anarchy is a system failure: this the specific reading that resume “failed states” into the logic of the danger of disorder, the danger of anarchy.

The modern political discourse invokes the presence of sovereignty as an original voice that legitimizes a truth and their meanings. For the problematic discourse of anarchy, the principle of sovereignty assumption is an interpretation of state and domestic society. The state then becomes the essential point. In this sense, the state appears like a necessary relation to the heroic practice: the independent origin cannot be out of their own representations.

However, as explicated by the commitment of this paper, we must realize in which aspects and how the hero and the heroic practice acts by a masculinity agency, based on poetical representations of sovereignty, and, at last of state. We believe that we can achieve this objective through the sublime character of sovereign and how it is captured by poetics images of space; poetics images that confront the territorial and bodily representations of statecraft.

5 - Representations and the sublime

Why journey across the poetry and poetical images kingdom? First, to accept the relation imposed by language to discourse. Without it, the forms of domination through speech act would not exist. And, second even the image superposing other aesthetical forms of representation (Bleiker, 2009), there is a complex relation among language and images, so that is the imagination, the poetical imagery. So we focus on poetry because it

“…is the art form that engages most explicitly with language. Poetry is, in fact, all about language, about engaging its core and stretching its boundaries so that it becomes possible to think and dream again. It is in
So poetry is able to open up the political dimension, not directly compromised by it, but imagining the contemporary dilemmas in society. Texts, narratives and words are mobilized in order to think subjectively about the world in shaping and therefore in International Relations. As engaged on transformations, Roland Bleiker works on how aesthetics coordinates the move from sublime to subliminal “…from an almost exclusive preoccupation with the heroic aspects of international relations – with wars and terrorism and the actions of state and statesmen – towards a broader understanding of where the international is located and how it functions.” (p. 86) In this sense, our work is to show how the sublime character of sovereign power and practice in International Relations is closed on determined poetical images over hero figure, then a masculinized agency.

First of all we have to establish the relation with space and the sensible to admit the possibility of the heroic practice. The condition of it is that to be heroic the political practice of sovereignty must operate in aesthetical representations in modernity. This can be witnessed through the great modern narratives of states as imagined communities (Anderson, 1991; e Campbell, 1992 e 1996) in order to accomplish the political promise of nationalism. As for Campbell, the national identity is constructed in the roots of the threats and dangers that are – although real or not – discursively mobilized in the name of security:

“If all states are “imagined communities”, devoid of ontological being apart from the many and varied practices that constitute their reality, America is the imagined community par excellence, about which it has been said that it consists of a rhetorically United States of nonetheless mainly unresolved borders” (Campbell, 1996: 166)

In fact, to the author there is a kind of economy of speech in which the parties are to follow a specific reason the field of power. One must remember that the speech in these terms, establishes the representation and the constitution of the real; is the
management of a moral space in which the conditions of possibility that allow some joints to excel over others - hence the need for "internal consistency" to "external reality". Says Campbell (1992, p.6), the investment in that economy is based on interpretations of identities: dividends on the interests, setbacks in representations that show ambiguous in certain situations but which cuts across the relationship is. ".. participation in the discursive economy is through social relations that embody an unequal distribution of power."

In realist narrative and mainstream international relations the security of state must be pursued in the light of the self-preservation. Even to Morgenthau, Waltz or Mearsheimer, the national security is a theme that states must not forgo in a self-help system where balance of power is tracked as the politics of rational actor model – or statesmen model -. So the theme of self-preservation profoundly marked by Hobbesian political theory is entrenched to sovereign reason, sovereign practice.

Thus is with Edmund Burke, in his “Philosophical Enquiry” (1998), that the relation with power, sublime, astonishment and fear is linked with the sensible reality. The fear of pain and death is the driving feeling that enables social life in political communities. As the Hobbesian allegory of state of nature, the citizens donate part of their liberty in exchange to the protection. In the beginning of his enquiry, he tries to separate the two major feelings of the human being. Pain and pleasure usually were interpreted as the opposite of the other. Burke thinks that most of the time we actually are indifferent about the world around us. There is no any necessary relation among the end of suffering and the consecutively begin of happiness or the end of pleasure and the following appeasement. In this sense, pain is not a negative concept, or pleasure a positive one.

In this sense, both pain and pleasure operates with passions and emotions. They are what moves human sensitiveness and emotions. To pain we could have danger, sickness and death, whereas life and horror would be identified with pleasure. Those referred with pain “…are the most powerful of all the passions.” (Burke, 1998; p.36). In his aesthetical theory, the decrease of painful feelings is the sensation of delight, when pain and danger are removed from the individual perspective of representations.

Collectively, Burke separates those feelings that regard self-preservation and those responsible to multiplication of society – the sex, the biological reproduction -. 
The first one, which matters to us, is related to danger and pain, is the solitude of violence, the anxiety of the day before of a battle. In the last instance is this world Hobbes is painting to us, with all the danger of a state of nature that perceives the individuals as the enmity of the neighbor, the incertitude of world where liberty is spread by anyone of the citizens; the Leviathan comes to reorganize that world, and to count with each one the amount of liberty that is received to keep the ordainment of society.

So the constitution of society is mostly appraised with the sublime, the possibility of suspension motions, the complete astonishment of something so horrible that our feelings are concentrated on it. The problem of space is posed here as the landscape of contemplation of this sublime. This is the theme of the paint of Caspar David Friedrich, “Wanderer above the sea of fog”, where a man is painted in the top of a cliff and below him the fog the immensity of fog that cannot allows us to perceive how height he is. The man only contemplate the astonishing vision.

So the next step is to relate the sublime with the great spaces, great narratives of nations and states.

6 - Poetics of space

The immensity of space and International Relations, a priori, has no relation with, whereas we do not take into account the poetics of space that enables the sovereignty practice of the state heroes. In Bachelard’s work about space as a poetical image, we can find some useful approaches to space.

He is concerned with the fenomenological problem of a direct ontology: to him, the generation of images is not a casual relation among the poetry and poetic, but it is its inverse, it is a repercussion. And when feeling the repercussion one can determine the being of this image. To accomplish this movement, he says, “…this should be understood a study of the phenomenon of the poetic image when it emerges into the consciousness as a direct product of the heart, soul and being of man, apprehended in his actuality.” (Bachelard, p. xviii)
The most important step to Bachelard is to develop a fenomenology based on imagination and creativity. In poetry, the capacity to communicate creatively is what takes part in vital necessity. The good speech is the good life. Specially, considering his fenomenological accounts the poetical image is an emergence of the language and is far from being a signifier. Here the relation among the poetical imagery and language occurs in a distinct manner other than the common accounted by aesthetical and political philosophy:

The poetic image is an emergence from language, it is always a little above the language of signification. By living the poems we read, we have then the salutary experience of emerging. This, no doubt, is emerging at short range. But these acts of emergence are repeated; poetry puts language in a state of emergence, in which life becomes manifest through its vivacity. These linguistic impulses, which stand out from the ordinary rank of pragmatic language, are miniatures of the vital impulse. (Bachelard, xxvii)

So, at last instance, poetics is what can suspend the language, can disrupt a series of new meanings constantly as its own nature. Following, poetry can be considered a great influence when is responsible, by creativity, in reactivating, innovating and sanctioning new knowledge as well as possible political relations. Whereas poetry develops political relations and political itself, the poet is assumed to associate images, to link them as they were disposed to enact representations and feelings that the normal language could not achieve; so, the poetical image is the overcoming of the sensible. As a power mechanism of emergence – of the unexpected – of language emergence, it

“It awakens images that had been effaced, at the same time that it confirms the unforeseeable nature of speech. And if we render speech unforeseeable, is this not an apprenticeship to freedom? What delight the poetic imagination takes in making game of censors I Time was when the poetic arts codified the licenses to be permitted. Contemporary poetry, however, has introduced freedom in the very body of the language. As a result, poetry appears as a phenomenon of freedom.” (Bachelard, idem)

In this sense, image and imagination can be grounded. Bachelard believes that the human nature cannot be characterized by its faculty on painting images, on contrary, we must think on imagination as a “function of unreal” as a mean of production. Overall, Bachelard intends to overcome anyone a conception of space other than an evidence of geometry and hence a poetical one (Bachelard, 1994; p. xxxix). Hence he
categorizes some aspects of poetical images of space as the house, the universe, the nook, the nest, the intimate immensity and the interior/exterior dialectics, etc. For our purpose, we consider the foreground the problems of intimate immensity space to be more useful in our approach over the heroic practices contained in sovereignty.

On his 8th chapter, he analyzes how the intimate immensity can be developed by a special notion of space. Here, contemplation, resonance, the sea and the plain is related to daydream. To imagine is to daydream. In Baudelaire, for example, the wildness will assume the sign of the vast. So the poetical imagery of the intimate space is symbolized by the its vastness:

The opium-eater must have "a vast amount of leisure" to derive benefit from his soothing daydreams. Daydreaming is encouraged by "the vast silence of the country." The "moral world opens up vast perspectives filled with new clarities." Certain dreams are laid "on the vast canvas of memory." And elsewhere, Baudelaire speaks of a man who was "the prey of great projects, oppressed by vast thoughts."

Describing a nation, he wrote, "Nations . . . (are) vast animals whose organization is adequate to their environment"; and returning later to the same subject, "Nations (are) vast collective creatures." Here there is no doubt that the word vast increases the tonality of the metaphor; in fact, without this word, to which he attached importance, he would have perhaps hesitated because of the indigence of the image. But the word vast saves everything and Baudelaire adds that readers will understand this comparison if they are at all familiar with "these vast subjects of contemplation." (Bachelard, 1994; p. 191-192)

In this sense, what can told is that whenever there is a intimate immensity it is an intensity of being. This being is transposing the immensity of the world to an intensity of the intimate. Bachelard write this movement with the Baudelaire critique to a Wagner's opera Lohengrin: the warrior is issued the mission to protect kingdoms without kings; in his solitude track the vastness is built gradually until the appearance of the Grahal as “…it sinks into ecstatic adoration as though the whole world had suddenly disappeared”. Hence there is a direction that the narrows the spatial image, as the world vastness increases so does the intimate immensity.

Vast is also the nation: "Nations . . . (are) vast animals whose organization is adequate to their environment"; and returning later to the same subject, "Nations (are) vast collective creatures." (idem ; p. 191) Without the metaphor of space as vast, to
Bachelard, Baudelaire would lose completely the force of language once the vastness of nation is also a matter of contemplation, as supposed above by Burke hypothesis of the relation among astonishment and sublime. The intimate immensity hence is a category of intensity. Each time deeper it measures the intensity of the being, because of it the world is immense and its immensity is transformed by personal intimate experience. As long as the poet experiences the intimate immensity of the world the immensity, the vastness itself transcends as a first value:

“So immensity is not necessarily something huge, large, great, but only when is accompanied by the intimate immensity of vastness.

With Maria Rilke, the vastness could be turned into the emulation of the grandeur, the space always grows, at last instance the space is a verb, is a plain which end cannot be seen. By the immensity of the intimate space and of the world space that both touch each other. This is the Leibniz philosophy of the coexistence in space, both space of intimacy and space of world are turned consonant. “Any sentiment that exalts us makes our situation in the world smoother” (idem; p. 203).

So the intimate immensity of space is infinite, is something that always is increasing even if it is small or compact, it is an incidental expansion that paradoxically are limited: the individuals are themselves universes, ontologically separated (Le Breton, 2002). In political literature the intimate that is able to see the world space is the Leviathan, although physically it is finite, bounded, its intimate space is always growing, increasing, developing over technics and strategies of power. There is nothing and no one that aren’t over statecraft authorization and exclusion, from it derives the political capacity of sovereign, of statesmen (Walker, 1993).

The own term “image” as Waltz proposes in place of the level of analysis is etimologically directly embedded with imagination. The matter of the level of analysis is a matter of the aesthetics.

As Waltz himself would admit, in the last preface of the Man, the State and War,
“The word "image" suggests that one forms a picture in the mind; it suggests that one views the world in a certain way. "Image" is an apt term both because one cannot "see" international politics directly, no matter how hard one looks, and because developing a theory requires one to depict a pertinent realm of activity. To say "image" also suggests that in order to explain international outcomes one has to filter some elements out of one's view in order to concentrate on the presumably fundamental ones. In relating the first and second images to the third, I viewed the third image as "the framework of state action" and "as a theory of the conditioning effects of the state system itself." Explaining international outcomes requires one to examine the situations of states, as well as their individual characteristics.” (Waltz, 2001: p. ix)

In his seminal work, Waltz looks forward a theory of the causes of war or how to predict the peace – as the direct opposite of war -. The first image, the image of the man is conclusive of a vision based on state of nature, engaged in view of reality permeated by selfish individuals whose actions are the root of evil. And there is to the second image: the state and the problem of the internal structures, as like with the socialist Soviet Union, or the role of them after the WWI. The last one, with the international anarchy, operates with the relation among the balance of power and the absent of an authority ordering.

7 - State, space and poetics

The narrative of the space, of the immensity of state, is far from be unrelated by literature. Jorge Luis Borges when wrote the litte story about “rigor in Science” captured the dream of all Science to access reality and truthness: there was an empire where a great development of cartography made possible to write a province map seizing a whole city and a map of empire occupying a province. By the time, it was not enough to represent reality and the cartographers achieved a such big map that everything in this empire could be pointed. Nevertheless, the next generations would think cartography as a useless Science and discarded it. Interestingly, coincidently or not, this fable was published as pseudonym Suarez Miranda and as part of “Viajes de Varones prudentes, libro cuarto, cap. XIV, Lérida, 1658.” or “travel of prudent males”. It is not a coincidence to be part of an imaginary guide from prudent males. The intimacy of space is, as seen in Bachelard, completely coadunated by the poetic
experience and in last instance dictates the personal vision from poet to his exterior, linking progress among the intimate space to wildness space.

This linking progress is given in the history of the State – as a social phenomenon – itself. The modernity of state is constructed and supported by these poetical imagery: the intimate space, the intern/extern dialectics, and so on. To our work this is the last step in order to achieve the sovereign practice constituted as a masculinity effort to enable and disable certain series of rules, patterns, and others political and social actions. Now we can consider how the state is imagined. Mark Neocleous (2003) on his consideration about the State as an imagined figure of modernity, detach 4 principles that surround it: the body, the mind, the personality and its home. For our purposes, we can analyze the first and the last.

The state imagined as a body contains the body politic as a collective of bodies. Unlike some considerations about modernity and the emergence of bourgeoise, Neocleous believe that the imagined body of state has its role in political order, especially in legitimizing the exercise of state power and sovereignty, and did not disappeared during the XIX century, and has its apogee with the fascism (2003; p.4). Trying to write a genealogy of the body politic as an antique concept, we can get since the Greek philosophers: …the argument in Plato’s Republic, for example, hings on the shift Socrates males from the individual body to the state and back again; and for Aristotle the state is comparable to a ‘whole body’ produced by nature.” (idem: p. 11)

From the body of the Republic, the Republic of philosophers, the body cross centuries and is recovered by Christianity when represents itself as self-centered on the Pope image as the earthly head of the Christ Kingdom and church his body. As it was, all princes and kings must be authorized and be obedient to him. To recognize the different functional roles in its Universal Empire, the apostles, prophets, priests, administrators, etc. the church finally transposed the idea to the secular world:

“But such attempts came to be of crucial importance in identifying the nature of the new political bodies that were then emerging as historical actors. For as the idea of the corpus mysticum gradually came to describe the body politic (corpus iuridicum) of the Church, so by transference corpus mysticum came to be applicable to any body politic, either religious or secular. Indeed, once the idea of a political community endowed with a ‘mystical’ character had been articulated by the Church, the secular state was almost forced to follow the lead and ape the language of corporeal unity upon which theological universalism appeared to rely.” (p.13)
In other words, we can tell about another transformation on this occasion: since we can consider the idea of the church composed by a body – all the bureaucracy, the people follower, etc – and a head – the Pope and his power – now we can also consider a variety of different bodies each one with its own head: England, Portugal, France, Spain and others.

Insofar the personal accounts of political communities from medieval age was being transformed in imagined communities of impersonal states the body emerge as a special metaphor that creates the condition of possibility to bound some kind of unity and integration in a diversity of political communities. We must remember that until the end of 19th century city-states and others amount of sovereign power still existed (Spruyt, 1994). So the imagination of state as a body provided a specific manner to inscribe political community coherently in order to mobilize historical and origin narratives that could explain successfully its trajectory as were living beings with its own organizational and structural specificities (Neocleous, 2003: p. 14).

Much deeper the bounded community around the emergence of the body is articulated with problem of order in the beginning of capitalism. Since the feudal propriety should not anymore be seen as part of the sovereign body, we can see an disruptive of power relations in feudal society. So we can observe that

“an ascendant class of private property owners, whose property had been freed from the body of the monarch, was beginning to clash with a new class of ‘free’ wage-labourers. In this sense, the sovereign ‘body’ of the state emerges as an attempt to resolve or defer what turns out to be the fundamental crisis of modernity. Concomitantly, the image of the body of the state emerges as a way of imagining order amidst this crisis.” (idem)

The problem of order is better observed when we note that the king has two bodies as told by Kantorowicz’s as argument (1998): the king has in him, two bodies. One natural and the other political. The first mortal, and the other invisible. So the sovereign power abided in this both bodies. When dead, the sovereignty passed to the next prince in lineage and the political body would not be lost and the space-time relation reorganized and sovereignty maintained. This is the hypothesis in Foucault’s History of sexuality of the relation of blood and sovereign power.

“Michel Foucault once commented that ‘we need to cut off the King’s head: in political theory that has still to be done’. This was his way of
signalling an attempt, taken up with a vengeance by his followers, to move the debate about power beyond the question of sovereignty.” (Neocleous, 2003: p. 18)

This is also the problem in governamentality: the sovereign power must be kept and keep alive, the biopolitics is a way to conduct the conduction in a manner that every-body, all the bodies are alived. In this sense, the state itself is an organism that by its own reason, the *raison d’Etat* is eternal, owner of a timeless space. Hobbes toughfully inscribed the Leviathan in this discourse. In his master book, the leviathan appears as 4 figures: a huge artificial man, a huge artificial animal, a huge artificial machine, and as a “mortall god”. The artificial quality of it is a way to think that we must constantly bring it into life: “It is a body but not mortal, and no mortal body personifies it sufficiently to symbolize its downfall. Despite its corporeality, the state is here imagined as something that cannot – will not – die: the sovereign world is thus a world in which the limit of death is done away with.” (Neocleous, pp. 18).

It will be with liberal philosophy that the body would pretend to disappear. With Locke, Smith, Rousseau and others during the 18th century mainly after the France Revolution and the advent of Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen the state as a body would be rethought, turning it to social body: “By representing themselves as a political community united in one single body, the revolutionaries did not reject the image of the state-body, but *rethought* it to help facilitate the shift from one regime to another: they moved from the ‘body of the king’ to the ‘body of citizens’ – that is, to the ‘social body.’” (*idem*: p. 27)

The individualism in liberal theory separated the bodies and to rejoin them was necessary to recall society. Because of the social body that “society must be defended”. The people, the nation and the intimate immensity are the key categories that evolves the social body with the poetics of space. It is because of that Baudelaire called the nation the vast collective beings!

Also we must think real doxa of modernity: every piece of land in Globe is territory or is encapsulated by the state reason. Neocleous, here, remember us that the word “state” is etymological hybrid. It comes from “…*estate*, referring to land and the property rights over that land, and *status*, referring to authority and rights associated with a certain standing” (Neocleous, 2003; p. 98). The state in absolutism theory was the property rights of sovereign monarchs in a *dominium*, and *dominium* itself has a
determinant specificity: it is both domain of a space and domination in a power stance (idem).

Considering it, the political modernity will operate in both categorical circumstances. To the dominium of a bounded territory and to the domination over an exclusive identity and membership to this unity. So, we have the specific condition – a condition sine qua non - on which sovereign power would act and all discussions of the Westphalian model to International Relations, the regulatory power over a territory. This is why this setting enables and claimed to poets to create a new environment to poetical images, specially on the phase of romanticism and latter modernism. It is this movement that creates the external/internal and the intimate immensity, those figures that permeate poetical practices of politics. It is through space that body and territory embedded in sovereignty are discursively matched as coherent histories of nations, of the people

“The practical consequence has been that the earth’s surface is inscribed in a new way – according to the territorial ambitions of the modern state. The intellectual consequence has been that space assumes an absolute priority in the statist political imaginary. The ‘imagined place’ of the body politic (Hobbes) thus takes on political meaning as a clue to the nature of the state. Without this essential conjunction of space and politics, sovereignty would lose its meaning. As such, we might say that the statist political imaginary is necessarily a territorial imaginary.” (Neocleous, 2003; p. 103)

Therefore is not random that Fernando Pessoa uses its language when composing Portuguese allegory. The first poem that of first part “Coat of Arms” of book “Message”. Portugal assumes a part of European body, actually its face:

“Europe lies, reclining upon her elbows: From East to West she stretches, staring, And romantic tresses fall over Greek eyes, reminding.

The left elbow is stepped back; The other laid out at an angle. The first says Italy where it leans; This one England where, set afar, The hand holds the resting face.

Enigmatic and fateful she stares Out West, to the future of the past.

The staring face is Portugal.” (Pessoa, 1998; p. 179)

Poems of Fernando Pessoa
Fernando Pessoa’s book – without one of the various heteronyms – looks forward the reappearance of the lost king Dom Sebastião, vanished right after the battle of Alcácer-Quibir. The vastness of the sea, treated by Pessoa as the immensity trajectory of Portuguese nation stands as the space of decadence of Portugal’s decadence. With it, Pessoa still awaits his return, the return of the legitimate sovereign, and it is not such a coincidence to be written in the beginning of 20th century, when Portuguese monarchy fell down.

All this appoints us to be said that the territory and body constitutes the notion of community, of homeland. In one hand this is achieved by violence, by the monopolizing effect of power over a determined space, the territory. Again, the etymology calls attention to the fact that territory derives even from *terra* and *terrere*, latin word to frighten, as well as region is a space that is regulated. This is the formula *par excellence* of the founding resolution of state territory, the violence: “the force necessary for the production of space and the terror crucial to the creation of boundaries. It is not just that sovereignty implies space, but that ‘it implies a space against which violence, whether latent or overt, is directed – a space established and constituted by violence’.” (Neocleous, 2003; p. 102). This is the situation that Gaston Bachelard turned above in his poetics of space. The space is cut by geometrical metaphysics, the here and there are not symmetrical, actually its geometry is not measured by distance, but by the vastness or remembrance that intimate is not able to reach. And so we return to the problem of the astonishing feeling of vastness, of the exterior space that, although sometimes reduced is vast. So the vastness is source of sublime, is felt and feared like something threatening to self-preservation.

Therefore we have finally the rhetorical approach of the heroic practice. When grounded in nation-state and national citizenship, political modernity also creates the figure of foreigner, this one that is ultimately a source of disorder, of danger. In this sense is we can talk about a moral cartography of enmity, of threatens, the cartography that elaborates determined spaces in maps. And maps, as smartly noticed by Borges never were made to represent reality, but a part of it, or if we believe in discursive practices, maps conclude resistences and struggles in the field:

“The map became the perfect symbol of the state. To map a territory means to formally define space along the lines set within a particular epistemological and political experience – a way of knowing and
Evidently the political capacity to inscribe space on power relations is not arbitrary in fact of maps and its cartography of dominance. It implies that sovereignty is able to recreate, readequate, transform physical reality, forms and extensions in a coherent operative function of its power. The most traditional deconstruct of imperialism in maps is to question inside its logical what is the north and what is the south of it, if the earth position in solar system is also unknown. That is the reason of dispute among the poetics of space, the “natural” space of the hero in our mythical accounts of nationalism. If Charlemagne had not ridden in frank empire or Ulysses as founder of Lisbon, as an extension of Greek civilization, or even the American cross through the extreme west could not have been consolidated, the own shape of space would be apolitical. And it is not what we observe. When shaping space transforming it in territory, ultimately is accessed the social order, the partition of the sensible that tells us Jacques Rancière. The political dilemma is that

“Sovereignty does not just imply space, it creates it; left to itself, the landscape has no political form. We need to therefore appreciate the political function of maps in constructing rather than merely reproducing the world and in creating rather than merely tracing borders. Borders are constructed through a socio-political process; to the extent that the map helps create the borders, so it helps create the thing which is being bordered: the geo-body created literally on paper.”
(Neoleous, 2003; p. 120)

The attempt of modern politics in constructo its borders over territories can be characterized by the creation such of violent cartographies, in Michael Shapiro’s words. For him (1997) modern politics based on statecraft are permeated by notions of necessity, enmity and exclusion, as reverberated in Hegel work, for example, where the negation of alterity is a way to strengthens the autonomy and internal coherence of self. The war in this sense is not necessarily something negative or destroying, claiming for integration and sacrifice, it does that the citizens reinforce its ethical commitment to state. Therefore there is a statecraft of warring bodies by bodies politic. After all this is the discussion of the good polis, the good management of political life. Opening this reflection is to admit, in Hegel logics, that in Peace the unity of the political body as individuals would act by particular ends, not universal ones. In Clausewitz, this is given as the promotion of military way of life in statecraft. The citizenship is a right to those
that compromise their lives to keep the state alive. The production of self is given therefore by a virtuousistic and viril subjectivity as an expression of spiritual power of sovereignty.

“What emerges from the way that Clausewitz figures war is a passionate ontological commitment rather than cool political reason. Whereas epistemologically, war for Clausewitz is purely a form of acting in response to externally perceived threats in order to achieve subsequently educed objectives, ontologically, war is a major aspect of being. It creates the conditions for the production, maintenance, and reproduction of the virtuous self, a way (for men) to achieve an ideal form of subjectivity as individuals and for the state to achieve its ideal form of collective subjectivity, as an expression of spiritual power and virility.” (Shapiro, 1997; p. 54)

Finally we find the key core of the relation among the space and political imagination of state based on masculinized confrontations. The feminist denouncing bring attention to the social character of the conflict and violence attributed to state. As an issue of patriarchy and machismo they develop a spiral of violence. The social construct of self and otherness has its roots also in the constitution of the dualities of modernity, without them, as expressed largely by post-positivist theorists, the condition of possibility of power relations would demise. In this sense the hero – heroic practice – grounded in sublime responds on the war system construction: the sex and gender social order in society enables a series of exclusions and permissions that are extensively distributed in it (Moura, 2010).

A specific series of dichotomies appears to maintain these roles: man/woman, subject/object, reason/emotion, war/peace, formal/informal, etc informs such a hierarquized society. Realism is grounded on this hegemonic masculinity that permeates the conception of security as a constant preparation of state to war, to perform its self-prophecy on the “tragedy of great powers”, by militarizing citizenship and valuing strengthen, protection, virility over the feminilization of those turned passives, to be protected (Tickner, 1992)

8 - Conclusion

We could stand the relation among the heroic practice and gender representations on simple analysis and considerations. In a first view almost all heroes in western society are associated with wars, independence, revolutions or great crisis are
men, even real as fictitious. Also if we only noticed the problem that poetry be mostly a male art, we would lose the most precious technics that fogs this inequality. This evidence tough hides some pervasive and deeper relations on how we conceal sovereignty with the state and society. This relation overcomes the simple practice of real: it is grounded on the sensible, on efforts to elaborates representations of the world that is lived. However, we believe that much more were(is) in game.

As presented aesthetical approach has much more to contribute and reflect to the field of International Relations. With it we could realize that the problem of the gendered heroic practice – paraphrasing Ashley – poses more questions than an overview can observe. The problem is justly how politics and poetics are blended when we consider the production of power and knowledge. Encountering through space, the intimate space, both social body and territory are faces of the masculinized practice of sovereignty. It is under the eyes of social body of political community that hero with sovereign rules its nation, its society, its population. It is this sovereign practice that opposes the anarchy of international system, that deplores the outsider as a source of threats and dangers, as, finally, a female space to be dominated.

This is the hegemonic masculinity function in operation on the state regulatory system over a world full of threats and disorder. In this way the self-preservation feeling brought by Burke is successful when thought as a constant presence in the constitution of modern state.


