

THEORIZING THE JUST WAR: COMPROMISING REALISM AND IDEALISM WITH THE MIDDLE WAY OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOL AND GROTIAN RATIONALISM

Eylül Renin Tutu*

Abstract

War, which is one of the most important concepts of the discipline of International Relations, has been studied from different perspectives for many years, and has led to the formation of a rich literature on how it can be prevented, within the framework of which rules, how to end it and its results. At this point, the just war theory has gained importance and has been studied extensively, especially in the fields of law and theory. The Realism-Idealism debate, which is seen as the first great debate of the discipline, and the English School, which is described as a middle way of these theories, are very interested in the intellectual foundations of this subject. The English School is the middle way of Idealism and Realism, and the rationalism of Grotius, who is seen as the father of the just war theory, constitutes the middle way within the three traditions seen in the English School.

Keywords: *Just War, Idealism, Realism, English School, Grotius*

* Research Assistant at Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences Department of International Relations. ertutu@ankara.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8627-9361.

DOI :

Received: 7.07.2021

Accepted: 21.21.2021

Introduction

The emergence of International Relations as a discipline has been caused by a fundamental practical and normative problem, that called ‘war. Questions such as why wars broke out, how the war could be ended, how it should be done, and in which situations it might be legitimately formed the starting point of thinking about International Relations.¹ While the conjuncture of world politics in different periods of history was influential in the emergence of theories, it also determined the periods in which these theories would come to the fore.

The First World War, which went down in history as a great war, made it possible to avoid such a war again and bring the theory of Idealism, which prioritizes a peaceful international environment, to the agenda. However, although international organizations such as the League of Nations tried to establish peace, these attempts were unsuccessful. The Second World War, which would later be known as great destruction, took place. After this war, especially during the Cold War, Idealism left the stage for Realism to a large extent, and for many years, Realism was the dominant theory in the system.

The views of these two theories have been subjected to intense criticism like other theories, and these criticisms have led to the formation of a middle ground in the field. The English School, which embodied the views of both sides to a certain extent and emerged in the late 1950s, was seen as a middle ground between these two views. The

¹ İ.D Dağı, (2006), “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”, Dağı, D. D., Eralp, A., Keyman, E.F., Polat, N., Tanrısever, O.F., Yalvaç, F. ve Yurdusev, A.N., **Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 188.

English School, which has three traditions in itself, has a Machiavellian view similar to Realism, a Revolutionary view that seems similar to Idealism, and a Rationalist view, which is the middle way. In particular, this last view focused on in which situations the phenomenon of war, which has gained the most important and studied the most throughout the history of the discipline, will be justified and with what rules it should be carried out. These views are also critical in the history of the just war doctrine.

War is a situation in which the existence and freedoms of individuals are violated by other states, and it also has a feature that can lead to despotism at the national level and make a just and secure social project impossible as a legitimizing process.² The just war doctrine was developed after the Enlightenment and took its place among the basic texts of international law together with the Hague and Geneva Conventions.

In the first part of this study, the historical development process and principles of the just war theory will be emphasized, and a general perspective will be tried to be provided. In the second part, Idealism, Realism, and the British School and its traditions, which are seen as the middle way of these theories, will be emphasized, and in the last part, how the just war doctrine is examined within the framework of these traditions will be explained.

² *Ibid.*, 207

1. JUST WAR IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

The phenomenon of war is as old as human history. Although it is not known exactly how the first war started, the fact that half of the people were killed by violence in the Nubian Cemetery 12 thousand years ago is seen as the beginning of the history of war.³ Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War is thought to be the first written text on this area.⁴

There are many opinions and theories about what the war is exactly, how to define it, and for what reasons it broke out. Although there is no full consensus in this area, various definitions can be mentioned. Some define war as a form of collective violence as a result of living in communities, while others define it as a form of violence stemming from human nature. According to some, wars are a situation caused by differences in religious understanding, cultures and ideologies. As its aim, it is shown that the wishes that cannot be obtained by peaceful methods are obtained by using force or violence on a particular group of people.⁵

1.1. Historical Development Process of Just War Theory

A large number of people lose their lives in wars, are displaced, remain in very bad conditions, and the ever-growing inhumane

³ M. Başer, (2014), **İnsancıl Hukuk Yeni Savaşlar, Yapısal Sorunlar ve Korunmayan İnsan Hakları**, Ankara: Sonçağ Yayıncılık, 1.

⁴ M. Aydın, (1996). "Uluslararası İlişkilerde Yaklaşım Teori ve Analiz", **SBF Dergisi**, 51(1), 86.

⁵ Başer, **İnsancıl Hukuk Yeni Savaşlar, Yapısal Sorunlar ve Korunmayan İnsan Hakları**, 2.

behavior makes it necessary to set some rules in this area. In order to set these rules, it is necessary to make a clear and adequate definition of war and the concepts related to it. Grotius described war as "*a situation of conflict between the parties using force*". Clausewitz, on the other hand, defined war as an act of violence that forces one side to do the will of the other. According to him, "*War is the continuation of politics*" by other means.⁶ Hedley Bull said that "*war is organized violence between political units*". Hew Strachan, a professor of war history, said that for a situation to be considered as war, it must meet five conditions. These are the use of force, being based on a non-unilateral fight and argument, covering an intensity and duration, being social rather than personal, and being based on a purpose.⁷ One of the most general definitions of war was made by Quincy Wright. According to him, war is the contact of similar but separate structures using violence.⁸

The law of war or humanitarian law, which is related to the issue of setting the rules of war, started to be formed with traditions and bilateral agreements in the early stages of human history. The beginning of these rules can be traced back to Hammurabi's rules of war in 2000 BC. The Manu Rules in ancient India, which said to be compassionate and respected towards unarmed and wounded enemy warriors, and the traditional "Shoot but don't kill" rule of the Bantu in Africa, are

⁶ A. L. (2015), "Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz", Aydın, M., Brauch, H.G., Çelikpala, M., Spring, U.O. ve Polat, N., **Uluslararası İlişkilerde Çatışmadan Güvenliğe**, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 4.

⁷ Başer, **İnsancıl Hukuk Yeni Savaşlar, Yapısal Sorunlar ve Korunmayan İnsan Hakları**, 22-23.

⁸ **Idem..**

examples of the first rules established to limit the unduly destructive effects of war.⁹

The just war theory, which is accepted to have been established with the influence of Christianity in the Western world, experienced its cultural integration in the Middle Ages. For this reason, its historical development can be explained by starting from the medieval Christian thinkers. However, although it has very strong religious sources, it is not possible to say that it has only religious motives because it also has very serious secular sources.

At the beginning of the classical period sources of the just war theory, the Jewish tradition, and the practices of the Roman and German world were important. The intellectual contribution of Greek culture is also quite high. It is possible to find traces of the theory of just war in Plato, because he avoided describing the wars between the Hellenes as wars, used words such as conflict and emphasized that the conquered places could not be enslaved and people could not be killed. He stated that the entire population should not be seen as an enemy, since a certain and small minority caused the war to break out, and showed the distinction between the guilty and the innocent, and the warrior-civilian distinction of the just war. However, Plato used these evaluations only for the wars between the Greek sites among themselves, and all the wars against the outside were considered justified. In the Jewish tradition, the desire to be in peace while living in other societies and the need for violence in order to be able to stand against the attacks from them and

⁹ Idem..

to expand the lands they live in have been articulated, and a highly religious dimension towards war has been emphasized.¹⁰

One of the most important names of the just war tradition is St. Augustine. In his work, which is seen as the source of the theory of just war, he gave a detailed description of wars led by God. Augustine saw God-directed wars as unconditionally justified and used this view to legitimize Roman military power against pacifist Christians. It seems possible to base the "jus ad bellum" issues of the just war theory on Roman law. Reasons such as defense defined for a just war, reclaiming an unjustly taken place and punishing evil are largely defined in Roman law.¹¹ The warrior-civilian distinction developed in the Middle Ages largely derives from the knight-non-knight distinction.

Considered the father of just war theory, St. Augustine was greatly influenced by some of the views put forward in the early stages of Christianity. In particular, the Archbishop of Milan, St. Ambrose, is known as Augustine's mentor. St. Augustine focused more on the "jus ad bellum" part of his just war theory. He saw just or unjust war as an inevitable part of humanity. According to him, wars other than those of God, who are absolutely right, must be justified, must be based on a just cause, must be carried out by a legitimate authority, and must have good intentions. St. Augustine is also seen as the one who puts forward the condition of good faith, but his good faith stems from the love of God. Augustine, who also includes the element of love in the condition of just cause, states that the love of neighbor can force people to fight in

¹⁰ F. Ereker (2004), "İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı", **Uluslararası İlişkiler**, 1(3), 5.

¹¹ **Ibid.**, 6.

order to make up for injustice. Putting an end to suffering or injustice will create a just cause for war.¹²

The concept of just warfare was used in the 10th-11th centuries after Augustine. It has been ignored for centuries. The reason for this situation can be shown as the collapse of the Roman Empire and the lack of political unity in Europe. Although the church had some attempts about just war until the 12th century, it was with the Italian canon jurist Gratian that the theory gained integrity. Gratian, who emphasized whether Christians should be allowed to fight in his work named "Decretum", said that Christians can go to war for reasons such as reclaiming something that has been taken unjustly, punishing evil and taking revenge for the damage. After this work and the thinker, ecclesiastical lawyers who call themselves Decretists or Decretists focused on the boundaries of war and how to behave in war in the 12th and 13th centuries.¹³

In the 13th century, Thomas Aquinas added a political dimension to just warfare after Augustine and pondered whether some wars were permissible. Aquinas, who sees the existence of a just cause, good will and the existence of an authority that can organize and continue the war from a single center as the conditions of a just war, has made significant contributions to "jus in bello" in the killing of innocents. Aquinas, who suggested that the other party must be guilty for a just cause, thought that the just cause was related to the initiation of the war and stated that this crime should be a crime big enough to

¹² **Ibid.**, 7-9.

¹³ **Ibid.**, 11.

require punishment. The necessary conditions for good faith are not to act cruelly, maintain peace, and not harm innocents. Although death in war is inevitable, mere intent to kill and violation of the rules of war will render a just war unjust. While doing something legal and necessary, the accidental death of an innocent is not seen as a violation of natural, sacred or written law.¹⁴

The systematic integration of the just war theory coincides with the early modern period. As the modern period of the just war, we can start from Spain in the 1530s. In this period, just war has started to be established on the basis of international law. Here we first come across Francis de Vitoria with his work “De Jure Belli”. Establishing the connection of just war with natural law and preparing its normative basis, Vitoria worked for the articulation of just war with international law. Seeing just cause, legitimate authority and good faith as the reasons for a just war, Vitoria made an important difference from the Middle Ages and said that religious difference could not constitute a just cause.¹⁵

He also said that the desire to expand the territory of the empire and the desire of the prince to gain personal interest or glory could not be justified. According to him, the only justified reason for war is self-defense. In some cases, wars of aggression may also be justified, but they must be intended to punish previous wrongdoing. The good faith condition also includes only the compensation of the damage suffered.

¹⁴ **Ibid.**, 13.

¹⁵ H.H. Erkiner (2012), “Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinde Klasik Öğretinin Kuruluşu: Hugo Grotius ve Postgrotien Yazarlar Samuel Pufendorf, Richard Zouche, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek ve Samuel Rachel’e İlişkin İnceleme ve Değerlendirme”, **Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi**, 18(3), 27.

It should not be forgotten that the war is fought for justice and the criterion of benefiting from it after the victory should also be taken into consideration.

Vitoria focused on the innocent and civil immunity. The innocent were defined as those who did not help the unjust and do not carry weapons, and children, women, peasants, foreigners and clergy were seen among the innocent as long as they were not guilty. If there is no way, it is considered legal. Since the enemy cannot be defeated otherwise while the conflict continues, it is legal to kill the entire non-civilian enemy. The real problem is how to act after victory. Here, Vitoria considers it legal to kill the fighting enemy even after the victory is achieved, because the war is made for the recovery, revenge and punishment of the lost.

Vitoria laid down three rules for just warfare. The first of these is that the power to declare war rests with the princes, the second is that when war is declared for a just cause, it is necessary to act not to destroy the enemy but to ensure justice in order to ensure peace and security, and finally, when victory is won after the war, it is appropriate to take advantage of the victory according to Christian humility.¹⁶

Suarez, who wrote his works at the same time as Vitoria, focused on the question of whether Christians could fight or whether war was a sin for Christians. He says that if wars are not allowed, worse results will occur because this will lead to an unjust peace. While Suarez

¹⁶ H.H. Erkiner, "Grotius Öncesinde İlk Modern Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinin Oluştugu Tarihsel Koşullar ve Erken Klâsik Dönemdeki Öğreti", **Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi**, 18(1), 108.

sees individual sovereignty as identical with state sovereignty by ignoring the differences in individual will within national borders, he sees state sovereignty as absolutely independent in the international environment.

Although Suarez put forward three conditions for a just war and said that they were just caused, legitimate authority and good faith, he adopted the term "appropriate way to wage war" instead of good faith. He did not count prestige and wealth and religious differences as a just cause for war. Although he said that a just war could only be waged for the purpose of defense, he argued that the war waged to punish evil could also be justified. Suarez, who did not see the chance of success as a reason for a just war like the theorists before him, considered it possible to inflict all kinds of harm on the enemy until victory was achieved, and described the innocent as those who did not commit a crime by helping the wrong side and those who could not carry weapons ¹⁷ Be compassionate, never harm innocents and ambassadors.¹⁸

When we look at the recent war law, Hugo Grotius is a very important name in this field, who came to the forefront with his work *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis, Libri Tres* (On the Law of War and Peace), which revealed the atrocities he saw in the Thirty Years' War. Grotius, which will be discussed in detail in the last chapter, explains in this

¹⁷ Ereker, "İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı", 17-19.

¹⁸ Erkiner, "Grotius Öncesinde İlk Modern Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinin Oluştugu Tarihsel Koşullar ve Erken Klâsik Dönemdeki Öğreti", 120.

work the obligations to comply with the rules of war necessary for the conduct of a just war.¹⁹

The Renaissance that took place in the 15th and 16th centuries and the Reformation Process that followed and the religious wars led to the rejection of religion as a just cause, and with the emergence of the modern state and the acceptance of state sovereignty in the 16th and 17th centuries, the just war theory was pushed into the background.

By the 16th century, the humanist thinkers of the Renaissance put forward ideas similar to the early pacifists of Christianity, in which even just warfare was not fully embraced. Thomas Moore, one of these thinkers, argued that the Utopians fought only to defend their country, to save the lands of their friends from the enemies or tyrants, and to avenge the evil done to them before, and said that the noblest war was for the protection of the weak. While Erasmus said that none of the wars in Europe fit the criteria of just war and should be prevented, all humanist pacifists suggested that states abandon their expansionist ambitions and adopt political isolationism.²⁰

When we come to the 18th century, we see that with the effect of the progressive and optimistic mentality of the Enlightenment, universal peace plans were emphasized. These universal peace plans often focused on ideas of a universal world assembly and police force. Although Penn and Cruce are important names in these peace plans,²¹ the most famous peace plan of this century belongs to Immanuel Kant.

¹⁹ Başer, **İnsancıl Hukuk Yeni Savaşlar, Yapısal Sorunlar ve Korunmayan İnsan Hakları**, 5.

²⁰ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 25.

²¹ Aydın, “Uluslararası İlişkilerde Yaklaşım Teori ve Analiz”, 87.

Kant rejected it, thinking that just war could never really be justified, but at the same time, he saw the war as an instrumental for peace. While he saw war as the source of all evil and corruption, he also described it as a bad shortcut for asserting a right by force. Kant, who compared the relations between states to the lawless relations in primitive times, stated that the Enlightenment would lead to the establishment of civil relations between people, but that civil relations should be established between states in order to establish a world ruled by peace. Although he was aware that states were not ready for this when he wrote his works, he argued that the only rational way for societies to come together is the establishment of a world state. For the establishment of a lasting peace, he considered it necessary to understand the forcing and destructive effects of wars.²²

The 19th century represented a period when the just war theory was abandoned as a doctrine. With the Hague Peace Conference, which held in the first years of the 20.th century, rules that can be seen as comprehensive regarding the implementation of the war were established without dealing with the justification of the war. If we look at the concepts of just war theory, first of all, regarding the status of civilians and warriors related to the innocent-criminal distinction, those who are commanded by their subordinates, act according to the rules and customs of war, and have an emblem visible from a distance are described as combatants. The classical doctrine of proportionality is that pillage and confiscation of the enemy's property, which are deemed legitimate to intimidate and achieve victory, are expressly prohibited in

²² Ereker, "İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı", 27.

The Hague. While the classical just war considered killing prisoners of war to be related to whether they were guilty or not, in The Hague, it was decided to keep prisoners of war away from the battlefield, be treated well, and be replaced by agreement at the end of the war.

Despite all the attempts to reduce the destructiveness of the war, the start of the First World War and the great destruction it caused led the direction of the studies in this field to the relevant rules of "jus ad bellum". The League of Nations (MC) and the Briand Kellogg Pact were among the attempts to ban war. On September 24, 1927, the MC General Assembly took a decision. In this decision it was revealed that wars of aggression cannot be applied to resolve international disputes, that war of aggression is an international crime and all wars of aggression are or will be prohibited. The prohibition of war as an international obligation was realized with the Briand Kellogg Pact. With the Paris Agreement or the Briand Kellogg Pact, which was signed by fifteen states on August 27, 1928 and entered into force on July 24, 1929, the states, while condemning the war, accepted the obligation of peaceful settlement of disputes and not resorting to war. The effect of Idealism in the first legal regulations regarding resorting to war is quite high.

In the 20th century, developments on war became the subject of international law and the just war theory began to disappear. However, after the second half of this century, there was a revival in the USA's discourse of just war with the reactions to the Vietnam War.

1.2. Principles of Just War Theory

It is possible to come across ideas about war since ancient times. When considered as a dimension of thinking about war, just war is a thought that aims to determine when it is justified to use force for political purposes in Western culture and to include all thoughts and practices that work to limit the use of force even in a just situation. This concept emerges as a product of the development of various cultural resources over the centuries, especially in Western culture. For this reason, it constitutes a concept that includes legal and military theories and practices, philosophical and religious moral thought, behavior patterns, beliefs and attitudes seen in the development process of a culture such as international law.²³ It examines that it is legitimate to apply, on the other hand, what are the legitimate tools that can be used in war.²⁴

The main purpose of the law of war, whether the war is legitimate or not, is to ensure that a minimum level of civilization is achieved when war is in question and to prevent unnecessary destruction of values.²⁵ It is accepted that states have the right to wage war. But this right does not include allowing the war to continue. Long before the League of Nations and the UN were established, states gave great importance to the cause of the war, even if it was based on political, religious and moral reasons. For this reason, they made a distinction between just and unjust war. Since there is no body above the states, this distinction, again made by the states, reflects the concerns of the government and legislators. The end of this distinction,

²³ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 2.

²⁴ Dağı, “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”, 209-210.

²⁵ A.N. Tütüncü (2006), **İnsancıl Hukuka Giriş**, İstanbul: Beta Basım, 12.

which has been made since the Pope and the Empire period, came with the emergence of equal and sovereign states.²⁶

It is possible to talk about two different dimensions of the just war theory. The first of these is the “jus ad bellum” principle, which sets out the criteria that ensure the justification of the war in order to determine whether the war can be justified in a certain situation. The use of force does not cause harm beyond its purpose or proportionality, the use of war as a last resort, the aim of achieving peace, and the chance of success in war.²⁷

If we examine the criteria for just war one by one, just cause appears as the first and most important condition of jus ad bellum. The vast majority of just war theorists state that wars waged for the purpose of aggression cannot be justified. In this respect, it can be said that the reason for a just war can only be defense. However, this situation can cause yawning about which action can constitute an unjust attack, because just war theorists sometimes include offensive wars in the scope of defense. Just war theorists generally mean the sovereign power of the state by the condition of legitimate authority. If this sovereign power is legitimate, it is thought that this legitimate government may have the right to declare war. According to the just war theory, only the lawful authority can declare war.

When we come to the condition of lawful faith or good faith, it is generally accepted that the war should be for the public good and not based on personal interests or expansion of the country. If the national

²⁶ **Ibid.**, 14.

²⁷ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 2.

interest is used as an excuse for the attack, the war is seen as unjustified. However, if the only way to achieve peace is attack, it can be accepted. In addition, the chance of success in the war is also an important criteria. The most important point of this criteria is to prevent human and economic resources from being wasted for a movement that has no chance of success. Finally, the proportionality condition is a condition about not causing harm beyond the purpose of the use of force.²⁸

The other dimension of the just war theory is the “jus in bello” principle. This principle has two important conditions. The first of these is civil immunity and deals with the question of who is the right target in war. According to this principle, failure to discriminate between targets in a just war will damage the justness of the war because when this distinction is not made, non-combatants and innocents will also suffer. Although it was considered appropriate for the combatants to be targeted because they joined their armies as a result of their conscious choices, civilians or innocents did not make a choice in this sense. However, it is also accepted that in some cases, the killing of civilians may be inevitable. According to this situation, which the just war theorists explain with a double effect, it is stated that the death of civilians was not intended in the war, but in some cases, accidents can occur. In a sense, this leads to a situation where the killing of civilians can also be justified.

The other condition of jus in bello is proportionality. Proportionality tries to determine to what extent and how the use of violence in a just war would be compatible with moral values.

²⁸ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 2-3.

According to this criterion, the violence applied in a just war must be in accordance with the desired goal. This proportionality, which is different from the proportionality in jus ad bellum, is a criterion aimed at minimizing the violence and destructiveness of war.²⁹

The implementation of Jus in Bello depends on the initiation of the conflict. What is important here is not whether the conflict is legitimate or whether we have the right to resort to war. That's why jus ad bellum and jus in bello are linked. Both of these concepts are part of international law. The origin of jus ad bellum can be considered new. UN Charter and its art. 2/4 of the prohibition of the use of force and the right to self-defense in Article 51, which is the exception to this prohibition, and Article VII of the UN Charter.³⁰ Self-defense as a right that every state naturally possesses, that it will apply to protect itself from invasion or attack and that it will decide on its own when the necessary conditions are met, emerged with the 1928 Briand-Kellogg Pact, but in 1945.³¹

1. THE FUNDAMENTALS OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOL

The English School is seen as a middle ground between the theories of Idealism and Realism. The distinction between Idealism, which gained effectiveness in the interwar period, and Realism, which formed the theory that dominated the system for a long time, stems from

²⁹ F. Yalvaç (2007), "Savaş ve Barış" Eralp, A.(Ed.), **Devlet ve Ötesi Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Kavramlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 267.

³⁰ Tütüncü, **İnsancıl Hukuka Giriş**, 13.

³¹ F. Keskin, (1998), **Uluslararası Hukukta Kuvvet Kullanma: Savaş, Karışma ve Birleşmiş Milletler**, Ankara: Mülkiyeliler Birliği Vakfı Yayınları, 43-50.

different perspectives on human nature. According to realism, anarchy and warfare are indispensable, and interstate relations are a power struggle, and power is seen as a right. Since there is no other sovereign over the states, interstate relations have turned into anarchy.³² According to idealists, although interstate relations have an anarchic structure, peace is an attainable goal. They see misunderstandings, undemocratic governments and autocratic regimes, not conflicts of national interest, as the cause of wars. The war between states can be put to an end by means of international law, international organizations, the collective security system and the spread of democratic regimes.³³

Martin Wight is one of the most important representatives of the English School. In his famous article titled "Why Isn't There an International Theory?", he emphasizes that intrastate life is very different from interstate life. And Wight goes to a triple classification instead of Realism and Idealism and makes this distinction as realism, rationalism and revolutionism. According to him, these traditions can be identified with the thoughts of Machiavelli, Grotius and Kant, respectively.³⁴

2.1. Idealism

Since the First World War was the most significant war ever seen, efforts have been made to prevent such a disaster from happening again, to prevent wars and to establish peace. In the emergence of wars, especially the oppressive governments of the countries, the lack of

³² Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 252.

³³ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 253.

³⁴ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 258.

democratic responsibilities of the leaders and the scarcity and inadequacy of international mechanisms to prevent conflicts were seen as the reasons. While these reasons show that reforms should be made in the national and international arena, these reforms brought the ideas of establishing democracy and strengthening international law to the fore. Basically, these views take their source from the idea of progress brought by the Enlightenment and that the mind is the most important tool in this regard. At the same time, liberal thought, which became widespread in the 19th century, also stands out in the perspective of Idealism on human nature.

Idealists realized the political pioneering of the discipline of International Relations, which has a normative concern such as preventing wars and establishing peace, at the beginning of the twentieth century. The most distinctive feature of the idealists has been their belief that peace can be achieved through law and international organizations that will institutionalize the law.³⁵ According to idealism, natural peace is unnatural war, and wars are waged by militarist and undemocratic states for the protection of their own established interests. The people are essentially peaceful in nature but are driven into war by leaders who fail to represent them.³⁶

Idealists believed that a peace order could be achieved in the world, in which all hostilities ended and all disputes were resolved by peaceful means. They thought that human nature is suitable for peaceful coexistence and argued that the reasons that led states to war would

³⁵ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 195.

³⁶ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 268.

largely disappear with the people's right to self-determination and developments in international trade. They argued that as democratic governments and international organizations increased, international disputes could be resolved peacefully and stated that the possibility of resorting to armed force would decrease.³⁷ The idea of international society based on international law comes from Kant and Grotius. Kant understood international relations beyond interstate relations, linked politics with morality, and his utopian style showed itself in Idealism. Grotius' idea of international society and the understanding that this society has laws, norms and traditions are also seen in Idealism.³⁸

We have stated that, according to idealists, war is not caused by human nature or conflicts of interest but by misunderstanding and calculations. At the same time, the arms race leads to war. In order to prevent war and ensure peace, it is necessary to establish trust, and this will be possible by reducing armament. Since most of the wars are caused by misunderstandings, a negotiation framework should be provided by bringing the parties together and an international organization should be established to ensure this. The League of Nations was founded on these idealists' ideas.³⁹

The understanding of progress brought by the Enlightenment, with the influence of liberal, Kantian and Grotian thoughts, brought up the issue of the mind's solution to the problems in the international arena

³⁷ A. Sandıklı and E. Kaya (2013), "Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim", **İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Dergisi**, 12(23), 61.

³⁸ A. Eralp (2006), "Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Oluşumu: İdealizm- Realizm Tartışması", Dağı, D. D., Eralp, A., Keyman, E.F., Polat, N., Tanrısever, O.F., Yalvaç, F. ve Yurdusev, A.N., **Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 62.

³⁹ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 197.

after the disaster of the First World War. At this point, Woodrow Wilson's thoughts were influential, and he advocated the organization of the national system with the principle of democracy and the international system with open diplomacy and a new international institutionalization. For these ideas, he played a leading role in the establishment of the League of Nations. He argued that with this initiative, which he thought would be based on the understanding of collective security, the old balance of power systems would disappear and a peaceful world order would be established. With such an international institutionalization, basic rationality will be built in the international environment and progress in international life will be in question.⁴⁰

One of the basic assumptions of idealists is that there is no inevitable conflict of interest between human societies and states. This optimistic atmosphere that there is a social harmony, which is also reflected in International Relations, shows itself in the principles of Woodrow Wilson.⁴¹

Another important assumption of idealism is the belief that there can be an objective understanding of justice. This approach, which advocates the supremacy of Cartesian reason, believes in the existence of an absolute and universal morality criterion independent of time, society and culture. This optimistic belief, which has the power of reasoning and the will to act on the axis of the truths that this reasoning

⁴⁰ Eralp "Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Oluşumu: İdealizm- Realizm Tartışması", 63.

⁴¹ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 196.

brings, was influenced by the idea of progress. According to idealists, people are too rational to allow disasters and they believed that logically explained solutions would be adopted by the public.

Idealists put trade in the foreground for international peace and thought that the increasing trade between countries would serve common interests among states with the worldwide validity of the free market economy. Mutual economic interests will reduce the tendency of states to resort to war and increase the tendency to maintain peace. The importance of this view can also be seen in the fact that one of Wilson's 14 principles for the realization of international peace is on international free trade.⁴²

While the idea that the legal and institutional conditions for peace created by the balance of power politics should be ready in the post-World War I period was accepted in the theoretical field, initiatives such as the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact showed that it started to reflect in the practical field.

This optimistic approach to international politics lost its power and support with the failure of the League of Nations to maintain peace and the start of the Second World War, but it did not disappear completely. The emphasis of Idealism, whose traces are seen in many studies after the Second World War, on the United Nations and integration issues, on subjects such as objective justice, progress and rational human being can be felt. Peace studies, peace movements,

⁴² Sandıklı and Kaya, “Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim”, 61.

Third World formations and environmental movements are seen as contemporary forms of Idealism.

2.2. Realism

While Europe, which was heavily destroyed in the Second World War, tried to heal its wounds, the bipolarity of which the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) formed their sides and dominated the international system. The hostility, competition and regime export policies between the two poles have dragged the world into a Cold War period that will last for many years. In this period, which lasted for about 45 years, as it is generally accepted, the dominant ideology was Realism. While the two poles struggled for dominance in the international system, Realism took the throne in the field of theory. While idealism offers a normative perspective, Realism, which is under the influence of positivist-empiricist epistemology, has paved the way for positivist thought to be effective in the discipline of international relations.

When we look at the literature on the origin of realism, we first come across Thucydides' work called the *Peloponnesian War*, in which he describes the war between Athens and Sparta. Thucydides tried to show how power politics affects interstate relations and conflict rather than cooperation and moral values in this work.⁴³ While this work is mentioned as the first work, Hans J. Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations* is counted as the most important work.

⁴³ P.R. Viotti and M. V. Kauppi (2010), **International Relations Theory**, Pearson Education Inc., 37.

If we look at the basic propositions of realism, we first come across the emphasis on the evil nature of the human element. According to realism, man is inherently evil, aggressive, self-seeking and sinful. The thing he values most in his relationships is power and his ambition is intense. He can do anything to keep what he has, to be strong and to survive. According to realism, states, like individuals, put their own interests above everything else and follow their interests. While individuals defend their own interests, the state has determined the national interest as the main target. Every state must protect its national interests at all costs. Therefore, conflicts in the international system are inevitable.

According to realism, the most important actor of the international system is the state. It is unlikely that another actor as important as the state can take part in world politics. The state has absolute sovereignty over the territory on which it is established and the people living there. For this reason, the final say in any problem that may arise belongs to him. In the field of international politics, both the basic analysis level and the basic analysis unit are the state. Realists see the state as a united and holistic actor and think that even though there are many different ideas and understandings inside, it will reflect as a single voice against the outside world.⁴⁴

In the international arena, domestic and foreign political structures differ from each other in many respects. According to Realism, which attaches great importance to the distinction between domestic and foreign policy, the rules applied in domestic politics

⁴⁴ **Ibid.**, 42.

cannot be valid in foreign policy. The biggest reason for this is; while there is a legitimate superior authority to whom individuals delegate their powers in domestic politics, such a formation cannot be mentioned in foreign policy. In other words, there is no central government in foreign policy. This points to another of the main propositions of Realism: anarchy. Here is a situation similar to what Hobbes talked about in the state of nature. While in domestic politics there is a central government that can tell individuals what to do and what not to do, and a system of rules that can impose sanctions if these rules are not followed, it is not possible to speak of an actor that can issue binding orders in the international system. In this anarchic environment, insecurity prevails and states cannot rely on any actor to maintain their existence. Realism defined the concept of security through the state of not being safe and a constant insecurity. According to some realist writers, this is the state of not being a threat to the values gained.⁴⁵ At this point, every state is responsible for ensuring the security of itself and its nation. The states themselves are the only chance for survival, and in the anarchic international system portrayed by realism, “self-help” – the principle of self-help – is valid. Unlike Hobbes's natural and endangered individuals, states do not want to renounce their sovereignty and allow others to have a say over them.

In addition, realists, who see international politics almost entirely as a struggle for power and national interest between nation-states, have a very pessimistic perspective on international cooperation.

⁴⁵ A. Eralp (2005)., **Devlet ve Ötesi: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Kavramlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 108.

According to Realists, who give importance to game theory, international relations is a zero-sum game. What is meant by a zero-sum game is that not everyone in the system can achieve maximum gain, and one actor's gain will mean the other's loss at that rate. For this reason, maximizing their own interests and being the winner is the most desirable situation.

Another feature of realism is its emphasis on rationality. In the international environment where insecurity prevails, the state must rely on reason and take decisions accordingly. The state will determine and evaluate all the alternatives that may occur in the face of events and targets and will reach the decision that will provide the highest benefit with the lowest cost.⁴⁶

Realists are of the opinion that universal moral rules are not compelling for states. States and statesmen can be exempt from many moral rules for the survival of the state. Social values such as morality and ethics are limited to the interior of the state and cannot be applied to international politics.⁴⁷ Although realists accept that rules and morality are a part of world politics, they have believed that respect for these rules can only be achieved when they are supported by the threat of power.

Among all these phenomena of national interest, survival, and insecurity, the most valued issue is power. In the international environment determined by anarchy, national interest is identified with power. While insecurity is portrayed as the most important problem, the

⁴⁶ Viotti and Kauppi, **International Relations Theory**, 43.

⁴⁷ H.J. Morgenthau (1978), **Politics Among Nations**, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 13.

most important weapon to prevent this situation is power. In this case, international politics is a manifestation of the struggle for power. The only way to be strong in the international environment is to constantly increase power and capacity. The human instinct for survival and the desire to have the best make conflicts constant and inevitable. While in domestic politics there are rules that states can set based on their authorities and sanctions that can be implemented if they are not implemented, the absence of this situation in international politics, in short, anarchy, is the most important reason that causes wars. According to realism, the only way to bring order and peace to this situation is “*si vis pacem para bellum*” – to always be ready for war.⁴⁸

Idealism sees the establishment of certain norms and rules at the state-specific and interstate level to ensure international peace. On the other hand, realism allows for a limited and relative international peace around the concepts of power and interest.⁴⁹

A radical distinction that can be constructed between history and theory, between doing and becoming, can serve to legitimize a structure. Such a justification function has often been attributed to Realism. Realism places the modern state and the security problems of the modern state at the center of its international concept. Here he shows and rationalizes the brutality and tyranny of the modern territorial state as a natural extension of a sovereign concept of man-self. With the concept of human nature, the concerns and strategies of the modern

⁴⁸ A. Sandıklı (2012), **Teoriler Işığında Güvenlik, Savaş, Barış ve Çatışma Çözümleri**, İstanbul: Bilgesam Yayınları, 73.

⁴⁹ Sandıklı and Kaya, “Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim”, 61.

state have an inevitable quality. Realist discourse reifies and dehistoricizes the modern state.

2.3. The English School as a Middle Way and the Three Traditions of Thought

Although the discipline of International Relations appears to be of American origin, it actually emerged in British universities at the end of the First World War when it was questioned how the international system could be transformed into a peace-based system rather than anarchy-based one. It is assumed that it became a social science when American social scientists tried to examine international relations with scientific methods. Although the origins of the English School can be traced back to the interwar period, its first systematic emergence coincides with after the Second World War. In the late 1950s, a group of academics in England argued that international relations could not be studied with the methods of natural sciences and began to argue their claims within the British International Politics Committee, which they established. According to Buzan, 1959, when the British Committee on the Theory of International Politics held its first meeting, is considered a reasonable date for the beginning of the English School.⁵⁰

Hedley Bull, Adam Watson, Martin Wight and Herbert Butterfield are seen as key actors by Barry Buzan, while members of the British Committee are counted on as to who the members of the English School are. Other authors outside the British Committee,

⁵⁰ B. Buzan (2015), *Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu*, Çev. Özdemir, Haluk., İstanbul: Röle Akademik Yayıncılık, 5.

Charles Manning and E.H.Carr, are also very important writers in this field. Martin Wight, Hedley Bull, John Vincent and Adam Watson are counted as early members, later Tim Dunne, Nicholas Wheeler and Robert Jackson, and later in the late nineties Barry Buzan, Richard Little, Andrew Hurrell and other scholars are in the UK as members of the School.

As a result of the attempts of one of the late writers, Suganami, until the 1970s and 1980s, it turned into a network of academics rather than a club. Buzan broadly defined the English School and said that it is "a great conversation formed by everyone who wants to talk about the concepts of international and world society and who has a meaningful connection with the basic literature on these subjects".⁵¹

Tim Dunne called family resemblances for the characteristics that made the English School a theory and made its thinkers see themselves as members of the school. The first of these similarities is that they gather themselves under a separate theoretical roof and work with common assumptions and concepts, the second is that they criticize the behavioral methodology in international relations and replace it with a historian-interpretive methodology, and the third is that they see international relations as a normative theory unlike realism.

It is said that the English School was fed from two intellectual sources. The first of these is the historian approach of the German historian Arnold Hermann Ludwid Heeren, who approached the normative structure of international society with a historical perspective

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

at the beginning of the 19th century. Heeren considers that the international community is constituted by a system of states with a common interest in respecting each other's independence. The English School takes this idea further, emphasizing the ordering effect of common norms beyond common interests. The second of these intellectual sources is British historian Arnold Toynbee's comparative approach, which analyzes international systems in different times and places and is shaped around the concept of civilization.⁵²

When we look at the emergence of the English School, we initially see only the idea of the society of states/international society. The most important and central concept of the English School is the international community. Bull states that when the international community creates a society, states that are aware of certain common interests and common values in terms of sharing the management of a certain set of rules and common organizations that bind them in their relations with each other, the society of states or the international community emerges.⁵³

This idea has a more historical, philosophical, legal and sociological way of thinking than the mechanical international system thought that became dominant in the USA in the Discipline of International Relations after the Second World War. The idea of international society put forward by Wight suggested a middle ground between the realist and liberal ends of international relations.

⁵² M. S. Palabıyık (2014), “İngiliz Okulu”, Gözen, R. (Ed.), **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri** içinde, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 220.

⁵³ B. Devlen and Ö. Özadamar (2010), “Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu Kuramı: Kökenleri, Kavramları ve Tartışmaları”, **Uluslararası İlişkiler**, 7(25), 63.

The English School opposes realism's exaltation of the concept of the state by exalting it too much, and tries to find out under which historical conditions the concept of the state emerged and how it changed over time. In other words, he criticizes the timelessness of realism.⁵⁴ In addition, unlike the Behavioral approach, the British School thinks that when examining society and a subject related to it, the examiner cannot make an analysis independent of value judgments. The examiner is a part of the studied and therefore they define themselves as participant observers. The English School also differs from the America-based Behavioral approach. They dislike dilemmas and try to provide flexibility to develop syntheses instead of dilemmas and evaluate two different elements together. For this reason, the British School tried to find a middle ground in the Realism-Idealism debate, which is the first major discussion of international relations.⁵⁵

The main claim of the English School is that sovereign states form a society. This society is anarchic as states do not succumb to the monopoly of a higher power that could compel them to abide by global rules. Although there is no coercive authority in this society, interstate violence is thought to occur surprisingly little. Members of the English School do not ignore the importance of force and violence, but think that international law and moral principles limit this violence to a large extent.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Palabıyık, "İngiliz Okulu", 220.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 226.

⁵⁶ A. Linklater (2013), "İngiliz Okulu", Burchill, S., Linklater, A., Devetak, R., Donnelly, J., Nardin, T., Paterson, M., Reus-Smit, C. and True, J., **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 124.

Although English School thinkers are critical of utopians who believe that eternal peace can be achieved because they do not think that violence can be completely eliminated, they argue that the international system is more civilized and orderly than realists claim.

Four main arguments form the basis of the English School. The first of these is that the primary actors of international relations are sovereign states. These states are city-states or nation-states. Secondly, there is a system of states in international relations as long as there are relations between two or more states and they can influence each other's decisions sufficiently. Third, the international system is anarchic, and anarchy means no common government.

Anarchy is one of the most basic concepts used to explain both the history of international relations and the structure of the international system. According to Hedley Bull, the creator of the concept of anarchic society, anarchy is the most basic fact of international life and the starting point of developing theory about international relations, they exist in an international society formed by rules and institutions that are carried out together.⁵⁷

While realists say that there is an unbridgeable distinction between domestic and international politics, utopian and cosmopolitan thinkers dream of a world order in which the disconnection between these two is reduced. This was also one of the disagreements between realism and idealism. Bull argued that both perspectives are valuable here, but that the common interests of limitation of force cause states to

⁵⁷ Devlen and Özdamar, “Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu Kuramı: Kökenleri, Kavramları ve Tartışmaları”, 48.

turn to diplomatic harmony and reconciliation that makes the international community possible.⁵⁸

The English School portrays thought patterns passed down through generations as tradition. The transfer of this intellectual heritage as tradition instead of theory is a reaction to the separation of the idea of international relations from its historical, philosophical and legal foundations. The three traditions debate at the English School has been identified with Martin Wight's lecture notes published by his students after his death, namely "International Theory: The Three Traditions". While Martin Wight distinguished the traditions of international thought as realism, rationalism and revolutionism, he identified realism with Macchiavelli and Hobbes, rationalism with Grotius and revolutionism with Kantian view. It can be traced back to the debates between those who support positive law and Grotius' middle path, which combines the elements of both.⁵⁹

The first of these traditions is Realism, which takes its origins from Hobbes and Macchiavelli. According to Wight, realism is concerned with what is rather than ideal and what should be, not with obligations, but with facts. It is very difficult to maintain order in this structure. The international system, which is mentioned together with Hobbes, Macchiavelli and realism, deals with the power politics between states and positions the structures and processes of anarchy in the international arena at the center of its theory, is based on state ontology, and is handled with materialist and rational methods together

⁵⁸ **Ibid.**, 126.

⁵⁹ Buzan, *Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu*, 12.

with positivist epistemology. Since this movement is fully matched with realism and neorealism, it is perceived outside the English School.⁶⁰

Revolutionism, whose intellectual foundations are based on Immanuel Kant and Karl Marx, speaks of a globality that puts people in its focus and transcends the borders of the state, taking into account the universality of ethical rules. This view is seen as revolutionary because it sees the already existing state society as a stage of transition to a cosmopolitan world society that includes all humanity.⁶¹ The world society associated with Kant and revolutionism consists of individuals, non-state organizations and while it deals with the global mass as a whole by putting it at the focal point of global social identity and regulations, it also places the transcendence of the state system at the center of international relations theory. Revolutionism is often associated with universalist cosmopolitanism, and although it has parallels with transnationalism, it is seen more connected with normative theory. Although it is not based on the state ontology, it cannot be defended that it is based on the individual ontology. Critical theory identifies some of the approaches to this and, in Wight's way, has been associated with historically active images of alternative general international systems rather than dealing with the non-state aspects of this system. On the other hand, Bull summarized these views as the Machiavellian people of blood, iron and immorality, the Grotians as the people of law, order and keeping their word representing the

⁶⁰ **Idem..**

⁶¹ M. Wight (1991), **International Theory: The Three Traditions**, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 7.

perspective of international fiction, and the Kantians as destructive, liberating and missionary people.⁶²

The international society, which is expressed together with Grotius and rationalism and is sometimes referred to as the system of states or the interstate society, has been concerned with the institutionalization of mutual interests and identities among states, and has put the creation and continuity of common norms and rules at the center of the theory of international relations. Rationalism represents a broad middle ground between realism and revolutionism. Even though states are in a state of nature, they are in a socialized structure and form an anarchic society in which there are common interests, albeit weak ones, and moral and legal norms limit their behavior. The international society in this view is a real society with institutional shortcomings. If we look at the basic idea about the international society here, they want to tell that they live in an international society shaped by and shaped by states, just as people both shape and shape them as individuals.⁶³ The international community is not similar to the society in a country and therefore has to be handled differently. The English School is generally handled with constructivist epistemology and historical methods, and some points are also examined as social structure.

These three traditions bring with them three orders and three responsibilities for the English School. According to them, realism draws a political framework for order and argues that order can only be achieved with a balance of power, while revolutionism puts the order

⁶² Buzan, *Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu*, 14.

⁶³ Buzan, *Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu*, 13.

in an ethical framework and argues that this order will give people the right to self-determination. On the other hand, rationalism draws a legal framework for order and says that order can be achieved through international law guaranteeing the respect that states have for each other's sovereignty. Buzan, on the other hand, identifies these three traditions with three responsibilities. Realism is national, revolutionism is international, and rationalism emphasizes responsibilities towards people. At this point, Bellamy states that realism leaders are responsible for ensuring the welfare of citizens, revolutionism is ethically responsible for ensuring the welfare of individuals beyond borders, and rationalism states that states are responsible to each other within the framework of international law.⁶⁴

When we consider the distinction between three different traditions and three different structures introduced by the English School, the international system represents the anarchic international system that Realism defines. According to Buzan, the international system is related to power politics between states, it has an almost entirely state-centered nature and is generally studied with positivist epistemology. In the international community, there are more components than the international system. In Bull's view, if a group of states that are aware of some common interests and values feel bound by common rules in their relations with each other and come together around common institutions, the international community will emerge. Here, we are talking about a certain level of interaction and a relationship or order defined around common values and common

⁶⁴ Palabıyık, "İngiliz Okulu", 230.

interests. According to Buzan, states can live in an international society with the adoption of common identity and common rules, just as individuals can live in the societies they both shape and are shaped.⁶⁵ According to the definition of this concept, the institutionalization of common interests and identities among states and the common norms, rules and institutions of states constitute a structure. This structure, which means the international community, is very important in shaping the international system.

The English School adopts methodological pluralism to explain this tripartite structure. As a result, there are differences of opinion at the analysis level. When examining the international system, it can be mentioned that there are units of analysis that are more state-centered, in which the state is left in the background for the international community and more global for the world community.⁶⁶

In his writings on the evolution of modern international society, Hedley Bull has argued that the notions of human justice in natural law doctrine historically brought ideas of interstate or international justice to the fore and provided the major intellectual foundations on which these latter were built from the outset. While this seems similar to Wight's emphasis on cultural unity in the emergence of international society, Bull thinks that a society of states can exist without linguistic, religious or cultural unity. What is effective is the establishment of

⁶⁵ B. Buzan, (2004), **From International to World Society?: English School Theory and The Social Structure of Globalisation**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7.

⁶⁶ Palabıyık, "İngiliz Okulu", 227.

states by interacting and at least acting as parts of a whole.⁶⁷ According to the British School, the international community is fragile and there is no guarantee for its survival. It is thought that the English School should have both sides, the realist side, which is always sensitive to detecting international threats, and the cosmopolitan side, which seeks ways to make this society more responsive to the needs of the vulnerable and weak.

English School thinkers and writers think that states can benefit from the benefits and opportunities of being a society without transferring their sovereign privileges to a higher authority. They also think that the international community may have many religions and denominations and different cultural and administrative ideas. The growing multicultural and multi-religious character of the world society, on the other hand, shows the meaning of the English School's effort to understand the complex relations between social and political forces and national ideologies and the organization of international society. One is the concept of international society. This concept emerged with the discussion of whether order can be achieved in an anarchic international system. Although the international system and world society accepted the existence of concepts and categories, they did not dwell on them as much as the concept of international society.

The writers of the English School have been intensely concerned with the norms and institutions that prevent the collapse of civilization and erode restrictions on military power, and the processes

⁶⁷ Linklater, "İngiliz Okulu", 131.

that transform the system of states into a society of states.⁶⁸ Bull has repeatedly emphasized the difficulties in resolving tensions between order and justice, but he has argued that his aim was to maintain order in the human society as a whole. He argued that the order not only between the society of states, but also among all humanity is the most valuable.

The English School accepts Alexander Wendt's idea that anarchy is something that states construct. He argues that sovereignty does not constitute a static and unchanging reality and its meaning differs depending on changing ideas such as the place of human rights in the international community. As Bull said, states have the chance to create an international society or international system in a state of anarchy. Nothing is predestined at this point, it all depends on how states portray themselves as separate political communities and how they understand their rights and duties to the rest of humanity. In order to meet on a common ground here, patience and common sense as well as their views on using diplomacy and their degree of preparation are also very important.⁶⁹

The British School emphasized the importance of limiting power, promoting understanding between different cultures, resolving political differences and exploring the chances of spreading global justice through cooperation, and prioritized diplomatic dialogue between states. Examining the successes achieved in this diplomatic dialogue and how the community has changed, pacifying the struggle

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 135.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 151.

for power and security, building bridges between cultural differences, was of greater importance than how the international community should be organised.⁷⁰ His interest in such problems is an indication of his original contribution to the study of world politics.

3. EXAMINATION OF JUST WAR THEORY BY THREE TRADITIONS OF THOUGHT

3.1. Machiavellian Realism and the Just War

Although Realism was developed by 20th century thinkers such as E.H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, its origins are based on Hobbes, Machiavelli, Thucydides, Hegel and Rousseau, and it was used to express the tradition of state reason-wisdom.

Realists see war as a constant threat, not as a temporary deviation like idealists, and consider preventing war as the most important field that the art of statesmanship will reveal. Realists see moral values as very dangerous in terms of resorting to war and argue that the decision to resort to war should be based on strategy and policy, not moral values. Realists, who focus on pragmatic and political reasons on *jus in bello*, think that since war is a means, not an end, the limitation will come automatically.⁷¹

The moral theory of realism is based on the view that interstate anarchy is indispensable. In cases where war is indispensable, morality only acquires the quality of a war morality. According to Hobbes, nothing is immoral in this environment, because where there is no general power, there will be no law, and where there is no law, there

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 152.

⁷¹ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 31.

will be no injustice. The moral understanding that finds its expression in realism is the theory of just war.⁷² This is the only area where there is still a theory from the Middle Ages in the field of contemporary moral philosophy, and these views form the basis of the international law of war.

In the past, the existence of empire meant order, peace and law for many, while its absence meant division, disorder, chaos and war between states. If there are no independent different forces, these forces to fight will have no meaning. Therefore, the important thing is whether you have the power to establish the empire. However, these views have collapsed all over the world, especially in Europe, with the modern world. The birth of capitalism and the balance of power between the newly emerging nation-states caused the imperial ideal to lose its prestige. In these periods, while the wars were going on, the question of how to ensure a long-lasting peace without an empire came to the fore, and thinkers such as Niccolo Macchiavelli, Jean Bodin, Hugo Grotius, Emeric Crucé and Immanuel Kant carried out intensive studies on this subject.⁷³

Macchiavelli, who is one of the representatives of Realism in this field and one of the important thinkers about just war, has revealed a secular and pragmatic understanding of sovereignty in contrast to the divine power understanding of the Middle Ages. It has secularized the

⁷² Yalvaç, “Savaş ve Barış”, 266.

⁷³ B. Ünlü(2010), İmparatorluk Fikrinin Gelişimi, **Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, 65(3), 241.

state, brought religion under the control of the state, and is seen as a tool of power because it is an instrument of social balance.

Although Macchiavelli envisaged the absolute rule of power in his famous work, *The Prince*, he could not use the concept of sovereignty in its modern sense in terms of identifying power with the Prince. Macchiavelli, who focused on seizing the state and maintaining the sovereignty rather than questioning the source of sovereignty, defended the need to gather the administration in one hand and the monarchy, and rejected the limitation of the powers of the Prince. Macchiavelli was mainly concerned with how the Prince would maintain this power rather than the source of power. When we look at his political philosophy, we come across the idea that it is legitimate to use even immoral methods if it is necessary to obtain and protect the power necessary for the state when it comes to the management of the nation. Politically, his views represent a break from the Christian tradition, on the one hand, and on the other hand, reveal that the sovereignty of the Prince is the sole and unlimited power over all segments.

Macchiavelli's words, "War is right for whomever is necessary, and weapons are sacred, since they are the only hope" shows what kind of perspective he has on just war.⁷⁴ Macchiavelli thought that the most important issue was the survival of the state and argued that war was a necessary tool for the prince or political authority to achieve their goals. When it comes to the security of the country, who is right and who is

⁷⁴ M.S. Taflıoğlu (2013), Liberalizm ve "İnsan Hakları" Karşısında Zayıflayan Devlet Egemenliği, **International Journal of Social Science**, 6(1), 1356.

wrong, merciful or cruel, laudable or shameful loses its importance, and the country must be defended in some way, whether it be with glory, infamy or shame.

The realist or Machiavellian view rejects the existence of an international community. Macchiavelli, who is said to not care about moral values, is in the 15th-16th century, a period when the just war theory gained a systematic character and wars began to be limited. He lived and worked in the 20th century Europe period. During or after this period, justifying war in the name of the nation-state or national interest was one of the main determinants of war, the princes fought whenever they saw that it was necessary, and they lived in a sovereignty where these decisions could not be judged. Since it is no longer possible to talk about the adoption of a law on the state, it is possible to ignore the generally accepted rules on the conduct of the war for victory.⁷⁵

3.2. Kantian Idealism and Just War

While Immanuel Kant owes his intellectual development to the German Enlightenment (Aufklärung), on the other hand, he has a mindset that criticizes some of the Enlightenment's beliefs and arguments. Kant published his work “The Critique of Pure Reason” in 1781, and brought the innovation he called Copernican revolution to the Enlightenment philosophy.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ Ereker, “İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı”, 23-24.

⁷⁶ A.L. Karaosmanoğlu (2015), “Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz”, Aydın, M., Brauch, H.G., Çelikpala, M., Spring, U.O. ve Polat, N., **Uluslararası İlişkilerde Çatışmadan Güvenliğe**, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 5.

Kant is known as the Philosopher of Peace. However, although he describes war as the greatest evil and sees wars of interest as the greatest obstacle to eternal peace, he does not think that wars can end immediately. Even Kant, one of the greatest peace thinkers, says that only war can end war in the secret plan of nature.⁷⁷ Therefore, he tended to organize wars and set rules about it. For Kant, war is not a normal human activity, but what is practical is to ensure that this existing problem is carried out at least reasonably and fairly in the short run. Kant's approach to war consists of three basic points which also forms a part of Kant's Eternal Peace project:

*A peace treaty with a secret war reservation cannot be considered valid; no conditions of war can justify actions that would make it impossible to establish mutual trust in peacetime; states cannot forcefully intervene in the administrative structure and process of other states.*⁷⁸

Although Kant is similar to previous world state projects, he rises based on a completely new moral and historical philosophy. His political philosophy can be summarized as republican government and international organization.⁷⁹ The ideal of eternal peace is a state theory built on morality and law, where peace depends on law and law depends on reason. Kant speaks of a move towards a free, rational and peaceful world order.

⁷⁷ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 252.

⁷⁸ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 208.

⁷⁹ Karaosmanoğlu, "Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz", 6.

Although the state of war cannot be abolished, Kant, who emphasizes the law in order to bring it into some order, also attaches great importance to the republic. According to Kant;

Since states, like people, do not want to give up their wild and unruly freedoms, if everything is not wanted to be lost, there remains the idea of a permanent alliance that can only divert the war, even if it is negative, and prevent the floods of this unjust and inhuman passion: but it will always be lived in the nightmare of breaking this alliance.⁸⁰

Kant is the name that most effectively represents the cosmopolitan thought with his work *Eternal Peace*. Kantian ethics has a universalist dimension and purpose. He thinks that in a cosmopolitan world society formed by individuals, states and other actors and each actor behaves ethically and rationally, universal law will be possible and eternal peace can be reached in this way. According to Kant, the nature and form of internal political order and foreign relations cannot be separated from each other. Without solving the problem of conducting foreign relations within the framework of law, it is not possible to establish a perfect constitutional order at home. For this reason, in Kant's view of *Eternal Peace*, there is a republican element that protects the rights of the individual against the state, international law that regulates the rights of a state against other states, and a

⁸⁰ I. Kant, (1960), **Ebedi Barış Üzerine Felsefi Deneme**, çev. Y. Abadan ve S. L. Meray, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, 26.

cosmopolitan moral dimension that legitimizes and grounds the rights of the individual who is a part of the general world of humanity⁸¹

Despite all his cosmopolitanism, Kant defended a society of sovereign states, which is based on the principle of sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. The cosmopolitan approach has a universalist perspective and argues that individuals have human rights not because they are members of society, but because they are autonomous moral beings. They say that rights emerge as a result of these autonomous statuses of individuals, and therefore it is not possible to separate rights from individuals.⁸² The cosmopolitan approach also states that interfering in the internal affairs of a state can be justified for some reasons, such as the protection of human rights and social justice. This approach, which considers equality from an individual point of view, touches upon the need for the mediation of social institutions in order to ensure the necessity of justice throughout the world.⁸³

Immanuel Kant says that the state can gain state status with the community that determines its own power. The fact that one state is under the domination of another state makes sustainable peace impossible. According to this, the world federation that Kant envisaged for the establishment of permanent peace consists of independent states that can choose their own direction.⁸⁴

Kant is the most important representative of Idealist theory in the international arena. Kant's was the closest approach to resolving the

⁸¹ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 193.

⁸² Z.A. Bakan (2002), Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Arasında Normatif Teorinin Yeri ve Kapsamı, **Avrasya Dosyası**, 8(2), 439.

⁸³ Karaosmanoğlu, "Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz", 7.

⁸⁴ Sandıklı and Kaya, "Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim", 62.

contradiction between man's moral life and his political behavior. According to Kant, even if history itself is not moral, it is moving towards a moral end. But there are also realist elements in Kant's views. Kant also sees interstate relations as a state of war. He did not prioritize the good nature and rationality of man and said that the natural state between people is not a peace even though it has not been declared, but a state of war that can explode at any moment. Kant is a thinker of both the Enlightenment and critical philosophy, and the effects of both realism and idealism are seen in his thoughts.⁸⁵

In his *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant examines international relations and the war-peace dichotomy in the pre-Eternal Peace period. Starting from the assumption that the state of nature is permanent war, Kant was of the opinion that neither international law nor the balance of power could provide a solid guarantee for peace. If a state perceives that it has been harmed by another state or sees that that state has become stronger in a way that poses an imminent threat, it will be able to resort to war.⁸⁶ States can form alliances to protect against encroachments. Even in the state of nature, states have a moral obligation to pave the way to Eternal Peace, and federations of republics strive for this. According to Kant, states that make it difficult to establish international peace with their actions and discourses and block the way to eternal peace are unjust states. It can be said that these states violate the interests of all other states and pose a threat to their freedom.

⁸⁵ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 269.

⁸⁶ Karaosmanoğlu, "Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz", 7.

It may be necessary to deprive them of their power in order to prevent this behavior of unjust states.

Wight considered Kant to be included in the revolutionary group in his triple classification. Kant foresaw a universal peace in which interstate relations would change, but he thought that the way to achieve this would not be through the establishment of a world state, but through a system based on international rights and law. Although Kant created a realistic picture, unlike the rationalists about the international system, it did not prevent him from making a universal peace plan. Rationalists foresee the transition from the system of states to the community of states through international law and cooperation. On the other hand, Kantian cosmopolitanism examines how to pass from a community of states to a cosmopolitan world society and under which conditions eternal peace can be achieved.⁸⁷

3.3. Grotian Rationalism and Just War

The basis of International Relations is a normative concern such as war and peace. From this point of view, anti-war movements and current problems of war fall within the scope of normative theory. Normative theory has its origins in classical philosophers. It can be taken from Plato and Aristotle to Grotius, Vatten, Wolff, Pufendorf, Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Mill and Rousseau, who specifically focused on international problems.⁸⁸

The classical approach, represented by international theorists such as Grotius, Pufendorf, and Vatten, is based on natural law and

⁸⁷ Yalvaç, “Savaş ve Barış”, 270.

⁸⁸ Dağı, “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”, 191.

social contract concepts. The view of natural law, which gained a secular content and institutionalized with reference to nature over time, was expanded in a way that the source of law also included representatives on earth as a result of the fact that the worldly power prevailed over the otherworldly power and became the main political determinant. With the enlightenment process, the mind was taken to the center and even started to be seen as the only means of knowing. As a result of this, man, the state and therefore power emerged as the discoverer of law. Arguing that natural law exists and is valid even if there is no God, Grotius argued that everyone has the right to trade in all seas, which are the common property of all and open to all. In accordance with this approach, which reflects the basic characteristics of the modern period, states are obliged to find, discover and apply the a priori rules that exist in nature in their relations with each other, or at least not to make regulations contrary to such natural laws.⁸⁹

This approach, which believes in the individual and his ability to distinguish between good and evil, has a rationalist origin. These features make him a source of inspiration for the Idealism that came to the fore in the interwar period. The classical approach does not give absolute moral priority to the state and national interest, but instead focuses on the idea of international society. The basic idea here is that morality is something separate from self-interest. *“The state was a complete community of free people united with one another for the peaceful enjoyment of their rights and the pursuit of their common*

⁸⁹ E. Denk (2011), Uluslararası Hukukun Dayanağına İlişkin Görüşlerin Dönemsellikleri Sorunu: Doğal Hukuk Görüşü Örneği, **Bilge Strateji**, 3(5), 104.

interests.” the words belong to Grotius.⁹⁰ It refers to a community of states that are related to each other through the international community, tradition, norms and principles.⁹¹ Grotius states that sovereignty is not absolute, divine law, natural law, states. This natural law discourse, which was put forward in the face of state sovereignty, gave priority to protecting the individual against the state.

The most important innovation brought by Grotius is his claim that a natural law independent of God and based on human nature is binding on nations. Grotian rationalism stands somewhere between the other two frameworks, and the English School sees itself rather from this tradition. Influenced by the Dutch 17th century legal philosopher Hugo Grotius, this movement speaks of a society or international society created by states in international relations. Its main assumptions are that states are potentially solidary, which creates an international society in which the law is enforced.⁹² The ultimate global peace project of idealism is based on the rule of international law. At this point, Grotius says that states should abide by international law not only for the continuation of peace but also because of their interests.⁹³ While legal problems could not be answered at the beginning of the 17th century without involving religious concepts, Grotius argued that legal problems should only be answered according to legal rules. According to him, these legal rules will be sought not only in the written ones, but

⁹⁰ H.R. Ertuğ (1943), Büyük Hukuk Bilgini Hugo Grotius, **Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, 295.

⁹¹ Dağı, “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”, 192.

⁹² Devlen and Özdamar, “Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu Kuramı: Kökenleri, Kavramları ve Tartışmaları”, 45.

⁹³ Sandıklı and Kaya, “Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim”, 62.

also in the light of reason and awakened in the thoughts of the wise person.⁹⁴

It is possible to see the common assumptions of Realism and Idealism in Grotius's rationalism. In this view, represented by English School thinkers such as Wight, Bull, Vincent and Watson, states form an anarchic society or community in which there are common interests, albeit weak ones, and their behavior is limited by moral and legal norms.⁹⁵ The power politics that realism emphasizes leaves its place to the principles of cooperation in anarchy in rationalism. Rationalists, like Realists, adopt both the idea that states are an international society and the revolutionary view that this order is temporary and not legitimate. In other words, according to this view, international society shows the characteristics of a society beyond the power struggle portrayed by realism, but with less moral homogeneity than that advocated by the cosmopolitan view. The Grotians criticize both the realist view that the conflict of states determines world politics and the utopian approach of the revolutionaries. They define international politics within the framework of states society or international society.⁹⁶ According to the British School, society constitutes a whole of social and economic relations in which conflict and cooperation can be seen together.

⁹⁴ Erkiner, “Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinde Klasik Öğretinin Kuruluşu: Hugo Grotius ve Postgrotien Yazarlar Samuel Pufendorf, Richard Zouche, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek ve Samuel Rachel’e İlişkin İnceleme ve Değerlendirme”, 15.

⁹⁵ Yalvaç, “Savaş ve Barış”, 257.

⁹⁶ Devlen and Özdamar, “Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu Kuramı: Kökenleri, Kavramları ve Tartışmaları”, 46.

According to Bull, Grotian thought is based on the existing and potential solidarity of the states that make up the international community in terms of law enforcement. It is possible to see this point of view reflected in Grotius's difference between just and unjust war.

Discussing the war legally, Grotius asks himself four questions at the beginning of the just war part of his work *De jure prædæ*. These questions are: “*Is any war justified?*”, “*Is there any just war for Christians?*”, “*Is there any just war between Christians against Christians?*”, “*Is there any just war between Christians in the whole legal order? Is there a point of view?*”. Grotius states that war is not per se illegitimate and unjust and is not per se forbidden to Christians.

Grotius built his legal thinking processes on the determination of four elements to answer whether a concrete war is just or unjust, by feeding on the tradition before him in the legal thought in Christian Civilization. These elements are the person who carried out the war (*causa belli efficiens*), the cause of the war (*materia*), the way the war was started and conducted (*forma belli suscipiendi gerendique*) and the target of the war (*finis belli*).⁹⁷

According to the first element, the person who carries out the war can be a private person or a state, because it is natural for everyone to defend their rights. The state will also be able to wage a public war to defend itself. Grotius, who made such a distinction between private and public wars, argued that private wars could only be fought for the purpose of defense, but that it would be justified for states to fight to

⁹⁷ Erkiner, “Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinde Klasik Öğretinin Kuruluşu: Hugo Grotius ve Postgrotien Yazarlar Samuel Pufendorf, Richard Zouche, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek ve Samuel Rachel’e İlişkin İnceleme ve Değerlendirme”, 20.

avenge the injustices they suffered or to punish those who did them. It may be justified for a state to wage a war of aggression indirectly, such as the continuation of the previous crime, before a definitive attack takes place, even if this event is remote.

Emphasizing the question of whether it was justified to go to war, Grotius initially attempted to prove that war was neither natural, holy, nor contrary to international law. From its natural principles, war is nothing to be condemned, in fact, everything is in favor of allowing war. He is of the opinion that war, which he considers appropriate for the principle of nature, is not contrary to international law, since they are fighting to protect their assets.

Although he accepted that war based on divine will has contradictions, he tried to justify war in terms of all types of law. According to him, God did not initially recognize Christians to use force in the face of an unjust attack due to an unfair interpretation of the Bible. At this point, Grotius said, "*The Bible commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves, not more than ourselves...*" and said that war is not against the holy law. According to Grotius, the reasons justifying the war are defending something that is ours, protecting the property, trying to obtain something owed to us and punishing.⁹⁸ The war against those who commit these acts, those who ally with them, and the

⁹⁸ H. Grotius (1967), **Savaş ve Barış Hukuku**, Çev. Seha L. Meray, İstanbul: Say Yayınları, 51.

nationalities who serve as a tool in the execution of these acts, is a just war.⁹⁹

As for the declaration of war, Grotius says that if the authority of our own state has disappeared and is not in a position to fight to protect our lives and rights, if our self-defense has become urgent, there is no need for the formality of a declaration of war since the special right of war will come into play. It is not necessary in case of an urgent necessity in public war, but it is necessary to declare war outside of these situations.¹⁰⁰

Enmity in war must remain within the limits required by the attainment of the right, within which force may be used against the main enemies of those who fight, their allies, the state, and their subjects fleeing their obligations of reparation. When using force, the fighting authorities should be careful not to be treacherous and to keep the promises made.

He called the reasons that could not be considered justified as illusory reasons, and these reasons were the fear of the strengthening of a neighboring state, the desire to acquire more fertile lands, trying to obtain what is in the hands of others as if they were the first to find them, subjugating them with the excuse of doing good to others, the Emperor or fighting with the belief that the Church has the universal

⁹⁹ Erkiner, “Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinde Klasik Öğretinin Kuruluşu: Hugo Grotius ve Postgrotien Yazarlar Samuel Pufendorf, Richard Zouche, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek ve Samuel Rachel’e İlişkin İnceleme ve Değerlendirme”, 21

¹⁰⁰ **Idem..**

right to command, going to war for personal interests, and fighting for the independence of a subjugated people.¹⁰¹

Explaining that everything done in an unjust war is unjust, Grotius also emphasized the limits of just wars. Grotius, who said that there is a limit to revenge and punishment, first talked about the innocent people who should not be killed in the war. In order for a person to be killed, a just punishment must require it or there must be no other way to protect his life and property.¹⁰² Scientists dedicated to dealing with sciences useful to humanity are the people who should not be killed. Farmers, even those of the enemy's nationality, traders, workers, and craftsmen, whose jobs are not related to the war, are among those whom he thinks should not be killed in wars. Prisoners of war should not be killed unless they commit a major crime or break their promise on an important issue after being taken prisoner. Finally, Grotius said that it is the right thing to do, especially for a good Christian, when the opportunity to establish a secure peace arises.¹⁰³

3.4. Just War According to the Writers of the English School

The just war theory has been a derivation of international obligations from the rights to national sovereignty and is based on the right of states to self-determination and the right to protect their sovereignty when necessary, even by fighting. Arguing that war can be legitimate in certain situations, this theory, on the one hand, wants to

¹⁰¹ Grotius, **Savaş ve Barış Hukuku**, 156-160.

¹⁰² **Ibid.**, 229.

¹⁰³ **Ibid.**, 231-233.

limit the war, on the other hand, it justifies it. Thus, it forms the legal structure of the war system.¹⁰⁴ One of the most important steps taken to prevent war and ensure peace and security is the establishment of the United Nations in 1945 and the United Nations Pact. After this date, the source of Jus ad bellum, which is one of the principles of just war, is the UN Charter and especially art. 2/4 of the prohibition of the use of force and the right to self-defense in Article 51, which is the exception to this prohibition, and Article VII of the UN Charter.

On the other hand, the English School is seen as the only approach that succeeds in synthesizing all three of the traditions of realism, rationalism and revolutionism and creating a unique framework. Due to the characteristics of these three traditions, it stands out as a tool capable of understanding and analyzing both the analytical and normative aspects of the discipline of international relations.¹⁰⁵ These thinkers, who especially had important ideas about war and peace, greatly influenced the members of the School who came after them. The views of these names, especially on the just war, were of great importance.

Michael Walzer, William O'Brien, Paul Ramsey and Robert Tucker have been seen as just war theorists of the 20th century and beyond. These names did not ignore international law, and tried to critically examine the practices put forward by the discourse of humanitarian intervention and preventive self-defense, mostly within the scope of national independence movements during the Cold War

¹⁰⁴ Yalvaç, "Savaş ve Barış", 266.

¹⁰⁵ Wight, **International Theory: The Three Traditions**, passim.

period. These theorists, more interested in nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence, accepted the view that just war theory is a synthesis of both idealist and realist conceptualizations.

Although it is said to have been largely abandoned in the 20th century, it is possible to come across views on when a war can be justified in the works of the writers of the English School after 1945, such as Machiavellian, Kant and Grotius. For example, if we refer to the views of Martin Wight, one of the early writers of the English School, the English School, which is generally seen as a modern interpretation of historical thought patterns, comes to the fore in Wight's writings with this aspect. Wight quotes Grotius's famous work, *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis*, that people who believe that all is permissible in war are as mistaken as those whose use of force is never justified. Grotius imagined here an international society where violence between Catholic and Protestant states could coexist in relative peace. Wight defined the tradition to which Grotius belongs as a middle ground somewhere between realism and radicalism, which is used to describe utopian perspectives that think that world peace can be achieved, albeit in a distant time.¹⁰⁶

Since Wight was one of the early writers, it may be thought that he did not have the full reflection of the change that took place in 1945. However, when we look at the authors of the recent period, we come across works written on the just war. One of the most important examples of this is Michael Walzer. Walzer's book "Just and Unjust

¹⁰⁶ Linklater, "İngiliz Okulu", 125.

Wars" and his article "The Triumph of Just War Theory (and the Dangers of Success)" are among the important works written in this field.

In his comprehensive work "Just and Unjust Wars", Walzer brought a philosophical and contemporary dimension to moral perspectives on war. He did not characterize the war as completely amoral, but tried to explain under which conditions it could be legitimate. His theory of legitimate warfare revolves around the right to resist aggression, the fact that the aggressor is punished, and the possibility of preventive warfare. Walzer, who started his theory with the acceptance of the existence of an international society formed by the existence of independent and morally autonomous states, provides them with some rights within the international community. It qualifies as aggression to interfere with the territorial integrity of the state and the right to political sovereignty. Aggression is a crime and justifies the self-defense war of the attacked and the acts of forcing the aggressor to international law by the attacked party or the international community. He also states that the attacking state can be punished after it becomes passive militarily.¹⁰⁷

In his article "The Triumph of Just War Theory (and the Dangers of Success)", Walzer says that some theories hope they die and go to heaven, and some hope they die and go to hell. But some theories have a long life in this world, and they mostly serve the powerful. The theory of war began in the service of power. Walzer interprets Augustine's success in this regard by replacing the radical rejection of the Christian

¹⁰⁷ Dağı, "Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları", 209.

Pacifists with the activation of the Christian soldier. Now the Christians could fight for the imperial peace, for the earthly city. From the Christian point of view, the first war was only an excuse, a way of making war morally and religiously possible. According to Walzer, this is the function of theory.¹⁰⁸ Theory has a critical place from the very beginning. Soldiers would have to fight in wars of conquest and, after winning the war, resist or avoid standard military practices of rape and plunder. However, the war at that time had a worldly character in every sense and continued to serve worldly interests against Christian radicalism. Only war has been shaped as a secular theory of the religious center against pacifists, on one side for holy warriors, and on the other because of their enemies, and this is another way of explaining worldliness.¹⁰⁹

The rulers of this world embraced the theory and did not fight it without justification. Or they said they were fighting for peace and justice by hiring intellectuals to enlighten this. Walzer said that this explanation was often hypocritical, and that aid was a tribute to which virtues paid. The theory gave worldly reasons to go to war, but limited the reasons because they had to be worldly.¹¹⁰

According to Walzer, writers such as Grotius and Pufendorf incorporated the just war theory into international law, but the rise of the modern state and the legal and philosophical acceptance of state sovereignty pushed the theory into the background. The political floor

¹⁰⁸ M. Walzer (2002), The Triumph of Just War Theory (and the Dangers of Success), **International Justice, War Crimes, and Terrorism: The U.S. Record**, 69(4), 925.

¹⁰⁹ **Ibid.**, 926.

¹¹⁰ **Ibid.**, 926.

has been occupied by Machiavellian princes and those who claim to be defending the state interest by tough men or women. The princes of the world continued to defend their wars, at least in part, using the language of war, the language of international law. States and their rulers claimed that they had the right to fight when they saw it necessary, and no one could subjugate the sovereignty of the rulers. The rulers didn't just fight when they wanted to; They returned to the old Roman claim that saw war as an illegal activity.¹¹¹

In the 1950s and 1960s, just war theory was introduced into the religious departments of universities, theological seminaries, and a few Catholic universities. Even in places as isolated as from the political world, theory has been pressed towards realistic positions.

Vietnam changed all this, but it took some time to register the change at the theoretical level. The change first took place in the field of practice, and the war became the subject of political discussions.

Concepts in a theory, such as characters in a novel, shape the narrative or argument. When the war was over, just war became an academic subject, political scientists and philosophers discovered the theory, it was written about in journals and it was taught in universities and American military academies and war colleges.¹¹² It is a losing battle, according to Walzer, and the brutality involved in the battle certainly contributed to the defeat. Justice becomes the key to conscience in a battle for "hearts and minds" rather than land and resources. So the just war theory once again appears to be a worldly

¹¹¹ **Ibid.**, 927.

¹¹² **Ibid.**, 929.

doctrine. Here Walzer says that the deepest reason for the contemporary triumph of theory lies, that the state now has reasons to fight justly. It could almost be said that justice has become a military imperative.

Vietnam is the first war in which the practical value of *jus in bello* is revealed. According to Walzer, the "Vietnam syndrome" is often brought to the fore to reflect a different element. Wars that are unpopular at home and to which we do not want to commit the resources necessary for victory should not be fought. In fact, there is another lesson that is not connected with the "syndrome". Wars that are questionable about justice should not be fought and, once involved, should be fought fairly so as not to win the enmity of the civilian population, whose support is essential for military victory. The reason for losing the war in Vietnam is the loss of hearts and minds of the Vietnamese.¹¹³

In Walzer's views, the just war theory is the doctrine of people who are expected to use force and to use force, even when seeking strong criticism on certain states of war. We can think of this as a doctrine of radical responsibility, because it holds political and military leaders accountable primarily for the welfare of their own people, but also for the welfare of innocent men and women. Its defenders stand up to those who would not think realistically about defending the country they live in and rejecting those who do not recognize the humanity of their opponents. They insist that there are things that are morally unacceptable even to do to the enemy. However, they also say that the

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 930.

struggle itself cannot be morally unacceptable.¹¹⁴ A just war is a war that should be, will happen and can be fought.

CONCLUSION

The just war theory has a starting point that has religious foundations in the beginning, basing the justification of war on the will of God, and where everything is permissible for this purpose. M.S. 4-5. The theory of just war, which began to develop in the centuries, was originally developed by St. Ambrose. It was studied by early thinkers such as Augustine, Thomas of Aquino, and later by ecclesiastical lawyers in the 11th and 12th centuries, and over time, the theory left its religious character and began to gain a secular character. During this period, Vitoria, Suarez and Grotius formed important names.

The Renaissance that took place in the 15th and 16th centuries and the Reformation Process that followed and the religious wars led to the rejection of religion as a just cause, and with the emergence of the modern state and the acceptance of state sovereignty in the 16th and 17th centuries, the just war theory was pushed into the background. The classical studies of the just war theory, which remained in the background in the 19th century, were not focused on since the developments related to war in the first half of the 20th century

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 935.

constituted the subject of international law. But with the World War II, the Cold War in the following period, and especially the reactions against the Vietnam War, the idea of just war has started to be emphasized again.

The British School, which rises above the efforts to synthesize the theories of Idealism, which was at the forefront in the inter-war period, and Realism, which was effective after the Second World War, and the thought of international society, aimed at international relations not as a direct chaos, but as a kind of society, that is, a group of states that interact according to certain conventions. These practices have been international law, diplomacy, the balance of power, the effects of great powers and perhaps most controversially, the war itself.¹¹⁵

The three thought traditions of the English School and the thinkers on which these traditions were built on their intellectual foundations were also very important in just war. Macchiavelli, Kant and Grotius, who have been influential in the historical process of just war theory, have gained a great place in the Machiavellian realist tradition, Kantian revolutionary tradition and Grotian rationalist tradition of the English School. In particular, Grotius has a great value both for the traditions of the English School, which is the middle path of Idealism and Realism, and for the development of international law. While these three traditions helped shape the thoughts of the School, they also contributed to the development of views on just war.

¹¹⁵ Aydın, “Uluslararası İlişkilerde Yaklaşım Teori ve Analiz”, 93.

This concept, which is of great importance in the development of today's international law, has actually been used as a means of legitimizing war. As seen in the last section, although it is still possible to come across traces of this view in the recent periods of the English School and it is mostly seen within the right of self-defense in the field of law, when we look at all the international law sources and practices that exist today, it is seen that the classical form of the theory is no longer valid, but is still being considered. It is possible to say that it seems to continue to be considered.

REFERENCES

Aydın, M., (1996), “Uluslararası İlişkilerde Yaklaşım Teori ve Analiz”, **SBF Dergisi**, 51(1), 71-114.

Bakan, Z.A., (2002), Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri Arasında Normatif Teorinin Yeri ve Kapsamı, **Avrasya Dosyası**, 8(2), 427-444.

Başer, M., (2014), **İnsancıl Hukuk Yeni Savaşlar, Yapısal Sorunlar ve Korunmayan İnsan Hakları**, Ankara: Sonçağ Yayıncılık.

Bull, H., (1995), “Society and Anarchy in International Relations”, James Der Derian (Ed.), **International Theory: Critical Investigations**, Londra: Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire.

Bull, H., (2013), “Uluslararası Teori Klasik Yaklaşım Üzerine İnceleme”, Esra Diri (Ed.) **Uluslararası İlişkilerde Anahtar Metinler**, İstanbul: Der Yayınları, 249-265.

Buzan, B., (2015), **Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu**, Çev. Özdemir, Haluk., İstanbul: Röle Akademik Yayıncılık.

Buzan, B., (2004), **From International to World Society?: English School Theory and The Social Structure of Globalisation**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dağı, İ.D., (2006), “Normatif Yaklaşımlar: Adalet, Eşitlik ve İnsan Hakları”, Dağı, D. D., Eralp, A., Keyman, E.F., Polat, N., Tanrıseven, O.F., Yalvaç, F. ve Yurdusev, A.N., **Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 185-227.

Denk, E., (2011), Uluslararası Hukukun Dayanağına İlişkin Görüşlerin Dönemsellikleri Sorunu: Doğal Hukuk Görüşü Örneği, **Bilge Strateji**, 3(5), 99-126.

Devlen, B. and Özdamar, Ö., (2010), Uluslararası İlişkilerde İngiliz Okulu Kuramı: Kökenleri, Kavramları ve Tartışmaları, **Uluslararası İlişkiler**, 7(25), 43-68.

Eralp, A., (2006), “Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Oluşumu: İdealizm- Realizm Tartışması”, Dağı, D. D., Eralp, A., Keyman, E.F., Polat, N., Tanrısever, O.F., Yalvaç, F. ve Yurdusev, A.N., **Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 57-89.

Eralp, A., (2005)., **Devlet ve Ötesi: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Kavramlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Ereker, F., (2004), İlkçağlardan Günümüze Haklı Savaş Kavramı, **Uluslararası İlişkiler**, 1(3), 1-36.

Erkiner, H.H., (2012), “Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinde Klasik Öğretinin Kuruluşu: Hugo Grotius ve Postgrotien Yazarlar Samuel Pufendorf, Richard Zouche, Cornelius Van Bynkershoek ve Samuel Rachel’e İlişkin İnceleme ve Değerlendirme”, **Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi**, 18(3), 3-143.

Erkiner, H.H., (2012), “Grotius Öncesinde İlk Modern Uluslararası Hukuk Düşüncesinin Oluştığı Tarihsel Koşullar ve Erken Klâsik Dönemdeki Öğreti”, **Marmara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Hukuk Araştırmaları Dergisi**, 18(1), 51-146.

Ertuğ, H.R., (1943), Büyük Hukuk Bilgini Hugo Grotius, **Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, 695-702.

Grotius, H., (1967), **Savaş ve Barış Hukuku**, Çev. Seha L. Meray, İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Kant, I., (1960), **Ebedi Barış Üzerine Felsefi Deneme**, Çev. Y. Abadan ve S. L. Meray, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.

Karaosmanoğlu, A.L., (2015), “Muhteşem Ortaklık: Kant ve Clausewitz”, Aydın, M., Brauch, H.G., Çelikkpala, M., Spring, U.O. ve Polat, N., **Uluslararası İlişkilerde Çatışmadan Güvenliğe**, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 3-17.

Keskin, F., (1998), **Uluslararası Hukukta Kuvvet Kullanma: Savaş, Karışma ve Birleşmiş Milletler**, Ankara: Mülkiyeliler Birliği Vakfı Yayınları, Tezler Dizisi: 4.

Linklater, A., (2013), “İngiliz Okulu”, Burchill, S., Linklater, A., Devetak, R., Donnely, J., Nardin, T., Paterson, M., Reus-Smit, C. and True, J., **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 123-155.

Macchiavelli, N., (1994), **Prens**, Çev. Nazım Güvenç, İstanbul: Anahtar Kitapları Yayınları.

Morgenthau, H.J., (1978), **Politics Among Nations**, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Palabıyık, M.S., (2014), “İngiliz Okulu”, Gözen, R. (Ed.), **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri** içinde, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 217-257.

Sandıklı, A., and Kaya, E., (2013), “Barış Kavramına Teorik Yaklaşımlar ve Küresel Yönetişim”, **İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Dergisi**, 12(23), 59-79.

Sandıklı, A., (2012), **Teoriler Işığında Güvenlik, Savaş, Barış ve Çatışma Çözümleri**, İstanbul: Bilgesam Yayınları.

Taflıoğlu, M.S., (2013), Liberalizm ve “İnsan Hakları” Karşısında Zayıflayan Devlet Egemenliği, **International Journal of Social Science**, 6(1),1347-1364.

Tütüncü, A.N., (2006), **İnsancıl Hukuka Giriş**, İstanbul: Beta Basım.

Ünlü, B., (2010), İmparatorluk Fikrinin Gelişimi, **Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi**, 65(3), 237-266.

Yalvaç, F., (2011), Uluslararası İlişkiler Kuramında Anarşi Söylemi, **Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi**, 8(29), 71-99.

Yalvaç, F., (2007), Savaş ve Barış, Eralp, A., (Ed.), **Devlet ve Ötesi Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Kavramlar**, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 251-287.

Viotti, P. R. and Kauppi, M. V., (2010), **International Relations Theory**, Pearson Education Inc.

Walzer, M., (2002), The Triumph of Just War Theory (and the Dangers of Success), **International Justice, War Crimes, and Terrorism: The U.S. Record**, 69(4), 925-944.

Wight, M., (1995), “Why is There No International Theory?”, James der Derian (der.), **International Theory: Critical Investigations**, Londra: Houndsmills, Basingstoke, Hampshir.

Wight, M., (1991), **International Theory: The Three Traditions**,
Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Wight, M., (1987), **An Anatomy of International Thought**,
Review of International Studies, 13(3), 221-227.