



THE IDEALISM-REALISM DEBATE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND IDEALISTS' WAYS OF ENSURING THE PEACE

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLERDE İDEALİZM-REALİZM TARTIŞMASI VE İDEALİSTLERİN BARIŞI SAĞLAMA YOLLARI

Timuçin KODAMAN¹, Ekrem Yaşar AKÇAY²

Abstract

In 1919, Within the finishing of First World War, International Relations established as a dicipline and put many newnesses in the world. After First World War, people who saw the bad subsequents of war, didn't want to live such a bad thing once again. International Relations Dicipline didn't also become indifferent this situation and it became to one of the acceptors of this subject with a great debate. This was Idealism-Realism Debate. It tried to both remain the peace, to prevent the war and to brought in the identity to own dicipline.

Idealists who dated back to Stoicism themselves, brought forward assumptions that were logical in their own era to prevent the war, to ensure the peace and to resolve to problems. These were International Law that had hard sancions, everybody accepted and obeyed it, International Organization that included every states without making discrimination and Disarmament internationally. According to them, in such a situation, ensuring the peace will be easier and possible.

Realists who dated back to Peleponnesian War themselves, on the contrary to Idealists, maintained that war couldn't prevent, was unavoidable and necessary because of human nature and They criticized the Idealists.

This article will examine The, İdealizm , İdealists, their assumptions, Realism, its assumptions, Idealism-Realism Debate and Idealists' assumptions that brought forward to prevent the war, to ensure the peace and to resolve the problems.

Keywords: *First World War, International Relations Dicipline, Peace and War, Realism, Idealism.*

Öz

1919'da I. Dünya Savaşı'nın bitimiyle birlikte, Uluslararası İlişkiler bir disiplin olarak ortaya çıkmış ve dünyaya pek çok yenilik getirmiştir. I. Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra, savaşın kötü sonuçlarını gören insanlar, bir daha böyle kötü bir şey yaşamak istemediler. Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplini de bu duruma kayıtsız kalmadı ve

¹ Doç.Dr., Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, tkodaman@iibf.sdu.edu.tr

² Arş. Gör., Ankara Üniversitesi, ey_akcay@hotmail.com

büyük bir tartışmayla bu konunun muhataplarından biri oldu. Bu tartışma ise İdealizm-Realizm Tartışmasıdır. Bu tartışma hem barışı daim kılmaya hem savaşı önlemeye hem de kendi disiplinine bir kimlik kazandırmaya çalışmıştır.

Kendilerini Stao Okulu'na kadar götüren İdealistler, savaşı önlemek, barışı sağlamak ve sorunları çözmek için kendi dönemlerinde akla yatkın varsayımlar ileri sürdüler. Bunlar, herkesin kabul ettiği ve uyduğu, sert yaptırımlara sahip Uluslararası Hukuk, ayırım yapmaksızın her devleti içine alan bir Uluslararası Örgüt ve Uluslararası anlamda silahsızlanmadır. Onlara göre böyle bir durumda barışı sağlamak daha kolay ve mümkün olacaktır.

Kendilerini Peleponezya Savaşları'na kadar götüren Realistler ise İdealistlerin tam aksine insan doğası nedeniyle savaşın önlenemeyeceğini kaçınılmaz ve gerekli olduğunu ileri sürdüler ve İdealistleri eleştirdiler.

Bu makale İdealizmi, onun varsayımlarını, Realizmi, varsayımlarını, İdealizm-Realizm Tartışmasını ve savaşı önlemek, barışı sağlamak ve sorunları çözmek için İdealistlerin ortaya attıkları varsayımları inceleyecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: I. Dünya Savaşı, Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplini, Barış ve Savaş, İdealizm, Realizm.

1.INTRODUCTION

In 1919, after First World War finished, the world began to change. At the same time, this changing occurred the International Relations literature. After 1919, International Relations(IR) Discipline that is product of the war (Dunne, 1996: 1, Dunn, 1948: 145), established and people wanted to occur the peace. Because they didn't want to live such a bad thing like First World War(Little, 1999: 292).

After that also IR began to develop in this tendency and 3 Great Debates established in IR Discipline. These are;

- Idealism-Realism
- Traditionalism-Behaviouralism
- Modernism-Post-Modernism

We will try to examine the First Great Debate.

2.THE IDEALISM-REALISM DEBATE

Idealism-Realism Debate became to effect especially among 1919-1950. In addition, It gave an identity and showed its borders of IR Discipline (Calıs, Özlük, 2007: 226).

Actually, in this discipline, Realism became more effective, in fact it tried to definite the İdealizm and it called it as Utopians.(Eralp, 1996: 58-59) This name was given by E. H. Carr who was Realist and has book of What is History (Lebow, Kelly, 2001: 593, Tortola, 2005: 78-81).

When we examined the two theories, Realism dated back Pelleponessian War that was written by Thucydides and Kautilya's Arthasastra (Welch, 2003: 301, Spegele, 1987: 189). However, Idealism dated back Stoic School that considered destructive emotions to be the result of errors in judgment, and that a sage, or person of "moral and intellectual perfection," would not undergo such emotions. Zenon and Seneca are famous in this school and they occurred the link among state/leader and behaviour/moral (<http://www.shvoong.com>, 2010).

However, these theories had different opinion about state, IR, man, etc. For example, Realists explain the existing, Idealists explain the have to be exist.

Secondly, according to Realists, man is bad, selfish. (Herz, 1981: 39) Man always thinks to his/her own interest, but according to Idealists, man is good, some events such as war and some institutions like state made him/her the bad. (Falk, 1989: 20)

Thirdly, for the Realist, state is a main actor of International System. State can determine the everything. But for Idealists, state is not main actor. In this system, there are not only states but also NGO's, INGO's, in fact people. They have also effected the International System, so the state isn't main actor. (Ari, 2004: 88-96)

Forth, according to Idealists morality is very important the relationships between the states. But for Realists, it is not important for them, power, interest, security, anarchy, rational actor are more important than morality (Donnelly, 2000: 6-7).

Fifth, for Idealists, education of people especially leaders is important. If people want to end the war, leaders are educated, but this situation is not important for Realists, because according to Realists, man is bad and selfish. (Ari, 2004: 88-96)

Sixth, for Realists, there are two discriminations in the International System. These are High and low politics. High politics is power, interest, security, rational actor, anarchy, low politics is economy, diplomacy and morality. For Realists, high politics is more important than the other. But for Idealists both of them are important (Calis, Ozluk, 2007: 232).

Seventh, according to Realists, Internal Policy is hierarchic, Foreign Policy is anarchic, because there is no supreme power in the International System that will effect the everything. But according to Idealists this discrimination is wrong and unessential. Because an event in Internal Policy can effect the Foreign Policy (Hobben, 1999: 258, Scott, 2004: 71-88).

Eighth, diplomacy is important fir Idealist. If people want to ensure the peace and welfare, secret diplomacy must destry and replace the open diplomacy. Because, diplomacy, especially open diplomacy is a way of preventing the war (Burchill, 2001: 5).

Nineth, for Idealists, self-determination that is the free choice of one's own acts without external compulsion. In politics it is seen as the freedom of the people of a given territory or national grouping to determine their own political status and how they will be governed without undue influence from any other country. There are conflicting definitions and legal criteria for determining which groups may legitimately claim the right to self-determination,(Calis, Ozluk, 2007: 225-243)is necessary and important. If this right is given the states, it is possible to ensure the peace (Mayall, 1994: 85), but for Realists, it is silly. Because, Foreign Policy is anarchic and in this structure,establishing the self-determination is very difficult (Herz, 1950: 160-161).

The last one is war. According to Realists, war is essential and unavoidable in the IR System so that man is bad and selfish and foreign policy is anarchic. But for Idealists it is not unavoidable. If people want, war can be ensured. For this, namely for preventing the war, Idealists found 3 ways;

- To establish the International Organization
- To establish the International Law
- To ensure the Disarmament. (Eralp, 1996: 58-89, Kegley&Wittkopf, 1996: 20)

3.1. Ways of Ensuring The Peace of Idealists

According to Idealists, if people want to prevent the war, they must occur the International Organization that will ensure the peace and become to supreme power for everything. This opinion was effectuated in 1920 within the establishing the League of Nations that came into being after the end of World War One. The League of Nation's task was simple - to ensure that war never broke out again. After the turmoil caused by the Versailles Treaty, many looked to the League to bring stability to the world.

America entered World War One in 1917. The country as a whole and the president - Woodrow Wilson in particular - was horrified by the slaughter that had taken place in what was meant to be a civilized part of the world. The only way to avoid a repetition of such a disaster, was to create an international body whose sole purpose was to maintain world peace and which would sort out international disputes as and when they occurred. This would be the task of the League of Nations. After the devastation of the war, support for such a good idea was great except in America where isolationism was taking root (<http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk>, 2010).

Second one became to establish the International Law. If people can occur the law rules that will conclude the everybody and imply the some sanctions when they don't obey these rules, at that time people can dedicate the peace. To ensure this situation, in 1921, European Continuan Justice Court occured and Briand-Kellog Pact that signed Aug. 27, 1928, condemning "recourse to war for the solution of international controversies." It is more properly known as the Pact of Paris. In June, 1927, Aristide Briand, foreign minister of France, proposed to the U.S. government a treaty outlawing war between the two countries. Frank B. Kellogg, the U.S. Secretary of State, returned a proposal for a general pact against war, and after prolonged negotiations the Pact of Paris was signed by 15 nations which were Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, the Irish Free State, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Poland, South Africa, and the United States. The contracting parties agreed that settlement of all conflicts, no matter of what origin or nature, that might arise among them should be sought only by pacific means and that war was to be renounced as an instrument of national policy. Although 62 nations ultimately ratified the pact, its effectiveness was vitiated by its failure to provide measures of enforcement. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was given an unenthusiastic reception by many countries. The U.S. Senate, ratifying the treaty with only one dissenting vote, still insisted that there must be no curtailment of America's right of self-defense and that the United States was not compelled to take action against countries that broke the treaty. The pact never made a meaningful contribution to international order, although it was invoked in 1929 with some success, when China and the USSR reached a tense moment over possession of the Chinese Eastern RR in Manchuria. Ultimately, however, the pact proved to be meaningless, especially with the practice of waging undeclared wars in the 1930s (e.g., the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, and the German occupation of Austria in 1938). was made in 1928(<http://www.infoplease.com>, 2010).

The last one was Disarmament. If people can decrease the armament, they can prevent the war. To ensure this situaiton, in 1992 Washington Naval Treaty that set specific tonnage limits on the signees as well as restricted armament size and expansion of naval facilities. The core of the treaty established a tonnage ratio that permitted the following:

- **United States:** Capital Ships - 525,000 tons, Aircraft Carriers - 135,000 tons

- **Great Britain:** Capital Ships - 525,000 tons, Aircraft Carriers - 135,000 tons
- **Japan:** Capital Ships - 315,000 tons, Aircraft Carriers - 81,000 tons
- **France:** Capital Ships - 175,000 tons, Aircraft Carriers - 60,000 tons
- **Italy:** Capital Ships - 175,000 tons, Aircraft Carriers - 60,000 tons

As part of these restrictions, no single ship was to exceed 35,000 tons or mount larger than 16-inch guns. Aircraft carrier size was capped at 27,000 tons, though two per nation could be as large as 33,000 tons. In regard to onshore facilities, it was agreed that the status quo at the time of the treaty's signing would be maintained. This prohibited the further expansion or fortification of naval bases in small island territories and possessions. Expansion on the mainland or large islands (such as Hawaii) was permitted, in 1930 London Naval Treaty that was an agreement between the United Kingdom, the Empire of Japan, France, Italy and the United States, signed on April 22, 1930, which regulated submarine warfare and limited naval shipbuilding. Under the Treaty, the standard displacements and gun calibres of submarines were restricted for the first time, thereby putting an end to the 'big-gun' submarine concept pioneered by the British M Class and the French Surcouf. The Treaty also established a distinction between cruisers armed with guns no greater than 6.1 inches (155mm) calibre from those with guns up to 8 inches (203 mm) calibre. The number of heavy cruisers was limited - the US were permitted 18 with a total tonnage of 180,000, the British 15 totalling 147,000 and the Japanese 12 totalling 108,000 tons. For the light cruisers no numbers were specified but tonnage limits were 143,500 tons for the US, 192,200 tons for the British and 100,450 tons for the Japanese, were signed about disarmament on the sea (<http://militaryhistory.about.com>, 2010).

4.CONCLUSSION

Idealism-Realism Debate that became to effect from 1919 to 1950, made its mark on the IR Discipline. Because this debate brought in the identity to IR Discipline. While Idealist opinion especially after 1930's, destroyed and discouraged, they added the different dimension on the IR Discipline and from time to time, it showed its own effect.

5.REFERENCES

1. ARI, T., (2004), *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Dış Politika*, 5. Baskı, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
2. BURCHILL, S., (2001), "Realism and Neo-Realism", *Theories of International Relations*, (ed.) Scott Burchill, Palgrave, New York.
3. CALIS, S. OZLUK, E.,(2007), "Uluslararası İlişkiler Tarihinin Yapısökümü: İdealizm-Realizm Tartışması", *Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, No. 18, (225-243).
4. DONELLY, J., (2000), *Realism and International Relations*, Cambridge University Pres, Cambridge.
5. DUNN, F.S., (1948), "The Scope of International Affairs", *World Politics*, Vol.1, No. 1, October, (142-146).
6. DUNNE, A.P., (1996), *International Theory: To The Brink and Beyond*, Greenwood Pres, Westport.
7. ERALP, A. (1996), "Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Oluşumu: İdealizm-Realizm Tartışması", Atilla Eralp (ed.), *Devlet, Sistem, Kimlik: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar*, İletişim Yayınları, İstanbul.
8. FALK, R. A., (1989), "Normative International Politics: A General Introduction", *World Politics Debated*, (ed.) Herbert M. Levine, McGraw-Hill Book, New York.

9. HERZ, J.H.,(1981), “Political Realism and Human Interests”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 2, June, (204-236).
10. _____, (1950), “Idealist Internationalism and Security Dilemma”, *World Politics*, Vol.2, No.2, January, (157-180).
11. HOBDEN, S., (1999), “Theorising The International System: Perspectives from Historical Sociology”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25, No.2, (257-271).
12. KEGLEY, C.W.W., EUGENE, R., (1996), *American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process*, St. Martin Press, New York.
13. LEBOW, R.N., KELLY, R., (2001), “Thucydides and Hegemony Athens and the United States”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 27, Issue 4, (593-610).
14. LITTLE, R., (1999), “Historiography and International Relations”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol.25, Issue 2, (291-299).
15. MAYALL, J., (1994), “Nationalism in the Study of International Relations”, *Contemporary International Relations; A Guide to Theory*, (ed.) A.J. Groom, Margot Light, Pinter Publisher, London.
16. SCOTT, S.V., (2004), “Is There Room for International Law in Realpolitik?: Accounting for the US Attitude Towards International Law”, *International Studies*, Vol. 30, No.1, January, (71-88).
17. SPEGELE, R. D., (1987), “Three Forms of Political Realism”, *Political Studies*, Vol. 35, Issue 2, June, (189-210).
18. TORTOLA, D., (2005), “Twenty Years’ Crisis by Edward H. Carr”, *Crossroads*, Vol. 5, No.1, (78-81).
19. WELCH, D. A., (2003), “Why International Relations Theorists Should Stop Reading Thucydides”, *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 29, Issue 3, July, (301-319).
21. <http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/leagueofnations.htm>, (11.04.2010).
22. <http://www.infoplease.com/ce6/history/A0827317.html>, (13.04.2010).
23. <http://militaryhistory.about.com/od/militarystrategies/p/washingtontreat.htm>,(15.04.2010).
24. <http://www.shvoong.com/society-and-news/news-items/61476-philosophy-luck/>, (16.10.2010).