bates around the trusteeship territories of British and French Togoland addresses the tripartite constellation of African, colonial, and UN actors, that is, the various levels of influence that legitimised political measures and interests during the period of decolonisation. The empirical analysis will show that constructions of (in)security were influential for the negotiation of trusteeship rule.

## 1.4   Relevance & Contribution

The study aims to contribute to literature in three key areas: historical Togoland research, statebuilding literature, and postcolonial perspectives in International Relations.

Regarding Togoland, the research delves into its significance as a site of historical precedents for postcolonial African states, such as being the location of the first UN-led independence referendum.[101] The study emphasizes the lack of comprehensive theory-driven perspectives on Togoland's decolonisation, highlighting its unique circumstances and the role it played in the international spotlight due to the reunification movement. In the realm of statebuilding literature, the research critiques the prevailing notion that deficits in statehood, often observed in postcolonial African states, pose direct threats to international security. It challenges the colonial continuity in contemporary state-building missions and emphasizes the need for a nuanced examination of securitisation moves and accountability bottlenecks in international statebuilding.

From a postcolonial perspective on International Relations and Critical Security Studies, the study explores the historical context of the UN Trusteeship System within 20th-century decolonisation. It advocates for incorporating postcolonial theory into Critical Security Studies, examining the conditions for success and failure in securitization moves and addressing the colonial legacy in the Togo-Ghana region. The study aims to bridge the gap between discourse approaches and sociological practices by analysing articulations of colonial fears and threat constructions in both public and behind-the-scenes forums. As this work is ultimately about a history of exclusion, it draws on guidance on how to promote more inclusion, both in ways that would expand the circle of who is speaking International Relations and Critical Security Studies,[102] as well as the inclusion of marginalized security speech.[103]

## 1.5   Outline

The work is structured as follows: After this introduction, Chapter 2 outlines not only the current state of research *on* but also the course *of* the academic debate on state- and peacebuilding as well as Critical Security Studies. This is followed by the state of research

---

101   Julius Heise, "United Nations Colonial Complicity in Decolonization Referenda," *Topos*, no. 1 (2021), available from journals.ehu.lt/index.php/topos/article/view/1048.

102   Meera Sabaratnam, "IR in Dialogue … but Can We Change the Subjects?," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (2011), https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829811404270.

103   Sarah Bertrand, "Can the Subaltern Securitize?," *European Journal of International Security* 3, no. 03 (2018), https://doi.org/10.1017/eis.2018.3.