

## Yeni Türk Dış Politikasını Etkileyen Etik Dış Politika Yaklaşımının İncelenmesi

DOI NO: 10.5578/JSS.39347

Mustafa FİŞNE<sup>1</sup>

Geliş Tarihi: 07.11.2016

Kabul Tarihi: 01.12.2016

### Özet

*Etik Dış Politika terimi literatürde çıkarlar yerine etik ilkeler ve değerlere dayanan dış politika anlayışını ifade etmek için kullanılmaktadır. Dış politika alanındaki bu yeni yaklaşım Soğuk Savaş Sonrası Dönemde nispeten yaygınlık kazanmıştır.*

*Bu çalışma, 2002 sonrası izlenmeye başlanan Yeni Türk Dış Politikası üzerindeki etkisi dâhil olmak üzere, etik dış politika yaklaşımını tüm yönleriyle tanıtmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu bağlamda, daha spesifik olarak şu konular ele alınmakta ve herbiri için ulaşılan sonuçlar paylaşılmaktadır: 1) etik dış politika kavramı ve uluslararası alanda ortaya çıkışı 2) etik dış politika uygulamalarından iyi örnekler 3) dış politika karar alma sürecinde etik değerlerin yeri 4) etik dış politika yaklaşımının mümkünliğüne ve araçsal kullanımına ilişkin eleştiriler.*

*Çalışmada geniş bir literatür taramasına dayalı betimsel bir yöntem kullanılmıştır.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Etik Dış Politika, Değerler Temelli Dış Politika, Yeni Türk Dış Politikası, Dış Politika

## An Inquiry into The Ethical Foreign Policy as an Affecting Perspective On the New Turkish Foreign Policy

### Abstract

*The term “ethical foreign policy” is used in the literature to label foreign policy that is based on ethics or values rather than just interests. It is relatively a new foreign policy perspective which has flourished in the post-Cold War period.*

*This study aims to introduce ethical foreign policy with all related aspects together with its impact on the new Turkish foreign policy since 2002. More specifically, the following issues are discussed and reached conclusions related to the each are shared: 1) ethical foreign policy and its emergence on the international stage*

---

<sup>1</sup> Doç. Dr., Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, e-posta: fisne@aku.edu.tr

2) examples of the application of ethical foreign policy, 3) the influence of ethics during the foreign policy decision making process, 4) and finally, critics about the sincerity of ethical foreign policy as well as its instrumental use.

*A descriptive method depending on a huge literature review is used.*

**Keywords:** *Ethical Foreign Policy, Values-based Foreign Policy, New Turkish Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy*

### **Introduction**

The terms “ethical foreign policy” and “values-based foreign policy” are used interchangeably in the literature in order to label foreign policy that is based on ethics or values rather than just interests. Scholars note that a foreign policy perspective that prioritizes ethics or values has flourished in the post-Cold War period and has been implemented by some states from time to time. Their academic discussions examine the nature, meaning, implementation, and consequences of an ethical or values-based foreign policy. Given the fact that these terms are mostly interchangeable, only the former term will be used throughout the following pages for the purpose of simplicity.

Ethical foreign policy has become a popular subject of study in foreign policy literature in the last two decades due to the increased use of ethical rhetoric by many Western states, such as United States of America (USA) and United Kingdom (UK), to support their morally suspicious military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan. Similarly, their failure to intervene in Bosnia, Rwanda, Sudan in the recent past and Syria today has made moral challenges, complexities, and questions related to ethical foreign policy more obvious.

This study seeks to examine ethical foreign policy perspective which has also affected the Turkish foreign policy since 2002. Most of the studies after the given date have started to put the word ‘new’ as an adjective in front of the traditionally used phrase ‘Turkish foreign policy’ in order to underline its eye-catching differences from the former one from many respects, including the guiding principles, content, capacity as well as decision-making mechanism. The impact of ethical foreign policy perspective on the new Turkish foreign policy has also widely been mentioned as an important factor that differentiates this policy from the former one.

As Sözen (2010: 113) points out, the end of the Cold War brought a new spirit to the world politics, by which new norms and values, such as democracy, human rights, market economy, and environmental awareness and sustainability became globally popular and almost universally endorsed in the 1990s. However, being unable to successfully adapt its policies to these new norms, Turkey mostly followed its Cold War conservative and narrow-visioned foreign policy in the given period. It was the accession to power of

the Justice and Development Party (JDP) in 2002 that this conservative doctrine of foreign policy was replaced with a more liberal one, dubbed commonly as the new Turkish foreign policy (Bertrand, 2013: 63)

İpek (2015) suggests that new Turkish foreign policy can not adequately be explained without referring the convergence of normative values and political strategies under a set of suitable conditions. It is this convergence that constituted policy change during the 2000s, limiting certain foreign policy choices and legitimizing others. Those conditions are given by the author as the majority government of the JDP and the foreign policy elite's access to key decision makers, particularly Prime Minister Erdoğan. Consequently, in the words of İpek, "the principled beliefs are translated into foreign policy goals reflecting ethical values based on a broader narrative of the history and culture of Eurasia together with material interests in a social context" (İpek, 2015: 182, 84, 190). A similar conclusion is made by Kalin (2011: 11-12, 16) that JDP governments have synthesized such values as democracy, human rights, and the rule of law with the traditional, conservative values of Turkish-Islamic culture, both in domestic and foreign policy fields. As a result, Turkey has adopted a values-based approach in the foreign policy sphere and advocated respect for fundamental freedoms as a cornerstone of a peaceful and secure regional order since 2002.

The newly added ethical dimension of the new Turkish foreign policy under the influence of the ethical foreign policy perspective has been observed by a number of other recent studies in this field, including Grigoriadis (2014); Panayircı and İşeri (2014); Davutoğlu (2013); Fidan (2013); Zarakol (2012); Akbaş and Düzgün (2012), Warning and Kardaş, (2011); and Bozkurt (2011). These observations have been made not only on the basis of speeches but also of some specific foreign policy practices. Being among the former group and observing Turkey's appearance as an emerging moral power basing its foreign policy on values and not just interests, Grigoriadis (2014: 166-167) cites from Prime Minister Erdoğan who emphasizes strongly the normative base of Turkish foreign policy as follows: "...this is what we have emphasized in our foreign policy. We defend justice, peace, law, and democracy in every area. We, as a conservative and democratic party, are struggling to hold both real and normative policy together." Interpreting the frequent emphasis on the principle of justice and equality by the Turkish foreign policy elite's as their desire to make a balance between ethical values and political necessities, Kalin (2011: 14-15) also cites from Erdoğan who declares that Turkey "[acts] with a sense of 'real politik' as well as 'ideal politik' in that [it strives] to uphold the principles of justice, equality and peace as the backbone of national and global politics". Another citation in the same direction from Erdoğan is made by Panayircı and İşeri (2014: 62) as follows: "We, as Turkey, will continue to defend peace in our region and emphasize human values. We will continue to

contribute to peace and stability in our region through our principled, coherent, resolute, honorable foreign policy. In this connection, it is not surprising that the article with a content analysis method by Panayırıcı and İşeri (2014: 69, 72) finds morality frame as highly employed frame in Erdoğan's speeches along with national interest and economic consequences frames.

As Warning and Kardaş (2011: 151, 159) point out, there are many other leading officials of the JDP who have advocated for reforms related to democratization, rule of law, and human rights in the Muslim World, which differs from previous governments. The authors give the example of then Foreign Minister Abdullah Gül's address to the Islamic Conference Organization (OIC) during a summit in Tehran in May 2003, in which he stressed the need for Muslim countries to democratize and pay greater attention to human and women's rights. As Fidan (2013: 92) points out, the number of such foreign policy statements by Turkey in the direction of defending the principles of democracy and human rights in the region has largely increased in recent years, especially in the context of so-called Arab Spring process. Finally, it should be underlined that the humanitarian aspect of diplomacy and the human-based approach to global and regional crisis has frequently been stressed by Ahmet Davutoğlu (Davutoğlu, 2013: 866), even long before he was empowered in the foreign policy making process, initially as chief advisor and later as minister of foreign affairs by the JDP governments. (İpek, 2015: 188).

Regarding the latter group of observations on the ethical dimension of the new Turkish foreign policy on the basis of some specific foreign policy practices, the related literature is very satisfactory. The mentioned practices performed by Turkey under the influence of ethical foreign policy perspective range from the clear stand taken by Turkey against the dictatorial regimes in Syria, Libya, and Egypt despite considerable material costs (Zarakol, 2012: 739; Kalin, 2011: 16, and Bozkurt, 2011: 148) to the rows with Israel for the rights of Palestinians (Warning and Kardaş, 2011: 168), the huge increase in its annual amount of humanitarian aid and development assistance (Fidan, 2013: 94-95), and its pro-active attempts to play a mediating role in regional and international conflicts as well as contributions to peacekeeping operations (Öniş, 2011: 62-63 and Akbaş, 2012: 66, 71).

On the other hand, there are three cases in which the related Turkish foreign policy is criticised for the observed double standards and inconsistencies with the ethical foreign policy perspective. These cases are listed in the literature as Turkey's initial silence regarding the Libyan uprising in the context of so-called Arab Spring and its initial opposition to any sort of international intervention (Panayırıcı and İşeri, 2014: 71); Turkey's maintained good economic and political relations with Sudan during the Darfur crisis in the west of the country that attracted international concern due to alleged war

crimes and genocide (Grigoriadis, 2014: 167-168); and Turkey's unreserved foreign policy towards Iran without taking into account the authoritarian nature of the Iranian regime, e.g. its earlier congratulations of President Ahmedinejad for his electoral victory despite some questions regarding its legitimacy (Öniş, 2011: 61). The attitude of Turkey towards the given cases are seen inconsistent with ethical foreign policy perspective and thus created some doubts on the effectiveness of this perspective upon the new Turkish foreign policy.

Within this scope, this study aims to introduce ethical foreign policy perspective with all related aspects. More specifically, the following issues will be discussed: 1) ethical foreign policy and its emergence on the international stage 2) examples of the application of ethical foreign policy, 3) the influence of ethics during the foreign policy decision making process, 4) and finally, critics about the sincerity of ethical foreign policy as well as its instrumental use.

### **1. Emergence of Ethical Foreign Policy Perspective**

Place of ethics and values in foreign policy has traditionally been controversial given the fact that foreign policy is mostly considered to depend on power and national interest. The dominant position of this realistic perspective has placed considerable restrictions on the introduction of ethics and values into the foreign policy sphere (Gaskarth, 2006: 332). As a result, ethical foreign policy has been seen utopian, unrealistic and potentially very dangerous for a very long time (Bulley, 2009: 116). Contrary to this traditional perspective, contemporary foreign policy is increasingly perceived to be about values rather than interests in the post-Cold War period. In other words, once marginal, ethics now play a central role in foreign policy, making it a moral enterprise (Werthes and Debiel, 2006: 7; Heins, 2007:50). Consequently, many words reflecting an idealistic perspective, such as morality, values, ethics, and universal principles, have taken root in the USA, UK, and EU foreign policies in particular and in world politics in general (Bulley, 2014: 165).

In practice, ethical foreign policy has fundamentally changed the traditional priorities of foreign policy. Instead of power and national interest, ethical foreign policy emphasizes democracy promotion, human rights, freedom, social welfare, and the needs of other populations (Chandler, 2007: 161; Gropas, 2006: 54). Deterring or catching war criminals, excluding authoritarian governments from arms transfers and foreign aid, toppling tyrannical regimes, committing troops to peacekeeping missions, and accepting debt relief are some other important elements of an ethical foreign policy mentioned by different scholars (Heins, 2007: 50; Cunliffe, 2007: 71;

Bulley, 2009: 1). More importantly, ethical foreign policy has led to the legitimization of humanitarian intervention, even via military means (Gropas, 2006: 54). Among such interventions in recent decades are military operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, former Yugoslavia, East Timor, and Sierra Leone. As a result of these involvements, humanitarian intervention has become a significant way of implementing ethical foreign policy.

Despite the fact that Western powers have not always put this principle into practice, as 1994 Rwandan genocide (Colonomos, 2007: 209) and the recent Syrian tragedy demonstrates, there has been a growing consensus on the importance of ethical foreign policy today (Chandler, 2007: 162). In addition, pursuing ethical foreign policy has become more possible due to the fact that the old theoretical obstacle excluding ethics and values from foreign policy sphere have recently been overcome. However, the need for greater understanding of ethical foreign policy still continues. As Bulley points out, “a full digestion of its meaning” is now more important than ever (2014: 166).

### ***1.1. Reasons for the Emergence of Ethical Foreign Policy Perspective***

Scholars offer a number of explanations for the recent tendency towards ethical foreign policy. At least seven such explanations can be extracted from the related literature (Chandler, 2003: 297-299; Bulley, 2009: 1; Bain, 2007: 224-225; Heins and Chandler, 2007: 8-12; Heins, 2007: 51 and 63; Chandler, 2007: 166).

The first explanation is a gradualist one which sees the tendency towards ethical foreign policy as part of the evolutionary trend of universal human rights concerns since 1945. In other words, ethical foreign policy perspective constitutes a recent stage in the development of human rights understanding.

The second explanation connects the emergence of ethical foreign policy with the drastic changes in international society at end of the Cold War period. According to this explanation, the changes that freed the Western states from the structures of superpower rivalry provided them a new environment suitable for pursuing ethical foreign policy.

The third explanation focuses on problems, such as poverty, systematic human rights abuses, endemic war, and human misery, arising from the failure of some states in different parts of the world. The increasing needs of populations in these states required an ethical foreign policy as the value of common humanity asked to do so.

The fourth explanation emphasizes the role of the shifting sensibilities among Western publics about the importance of improving the

global environment, combating world hunger, democratizing other nations and protecting weaker nations against aggression. Such kind of moral feelings shared by the majority of Western publics started the rise of ethical foreign policy.

The fifth explanation stresses the role of the Western leaders who suffered from a ‘crisis of meaning’ after the end of the Cold War. Searching for a sense of global mission and a meaning in history, these political elites concentrated their efforts on ethical foreign policy.

The sixth explanation on the emergence of ethical foreign policy is about the needs of domestic political systems in Western states. Following ethical foreign policy was seen as a way of giving their nations a sense of identity, mission, coherence, and purpose by some Western governments to compensate for the observed moral shortcomings and ineffectiveness of their domestic politics. In short, ethical foreign policy was needed to strengthen moral authority of the state in those countries.

The seventh and final explanation mentions the failure of Western states in dealing with the humanitarian crises in ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda during the early the 1990s as the main reason for the emergence of ethical foreign policy perspective. The resultant ethnic cleansing in Bosnia and the genocide in Rwanda raised a number of questions regarding the acceptability of the traditional foreign policy perspective that focuses narrowly on the ‘national interest’. Consequently, a search for a new perspective in foreign policy sphere started to prevent such humanitarian catastrophe, introducing new concepts like ethical foreign policy.

### ***1.2. Examples for the Application of Ethical Foreign Policy***

Following the introduction of ethical foreign policy due to the above mentioned reasons, the time came to implement this perspective. NATO’s Kosovo intervention and the United Nations’ peacekeeping operations after the Cold War have mostly been seen as the initial good examples for an implemented ethical foreign policy. Therefore, it would be useful to remind these examples.

For Chandler (2003: 296, 301), the military intervention of NATO in the 1999 Kosovo war constitutes the clearest expression of ethical foreign policy since it lacks any motivation related to national interest or power politics. Indeed, there were no oil fields, territorial demands or threat for any member of NATO in Kosovo. The alliance went to war just because of concerns for the fate of others who were under the risk of the systematic and state-directed murder. In order to support his argument, the author cites from then British Prime Minister Tony Blair who described intervention in Kosovo

as “a battle for humanity because their cause is a just cause, it is a rightful cause”.

Cunliffe (2007: 74-77) mentions UN peacekeeping operations with a changed nature in the post-Cold War period as another example for the application of ethical foreign policy. While the traditional peacekeeping operations aimed to prevent the restart of a cease-fired conflict between opposing armed forces with their consent, supervising their withdrawal, and helping to repatriate prisoners of war, new peacekeeping operations undertook some new tasks in addition to these traditional ones. They include conducting elections, forming civil administration, ensuring the repatriation of refugees, and protecting humanitarian convoys. The author also points out the expansion in the number of peacekeeping contributors (from 26 in 1988 to 76 in 1994) as an implication for the effect of ethical foreign policy perspective, stressing that 41 out of 76 contributing nations had never previously participated in such operations. Despite the observed retreat from peacekeeping in the 1996-99 period, the number of contributors 1997 was still not less than that of 1993. The trend was sustained well into the first decade of the twenty-first century.

### ***1.3. The Role of Ethics in the Foreign Policy Process***

It would also be useful to discuss the role of ethics in the foreign policy decision-making process to have an improved understanding of factors that make ethical foreign policy as an alternative choice. For this purpose, we need to refer to the recent literature in the field of foreign policy analysis (FPA), a sub-discipline of International Relations (IR) that theorizes foreign policy, focusing mainly on the process rather than the outcomes.

The investigation in the context of FPA includes the individual decision makers (agency) as well as internal and external conditions (structure) that affect foreign policy decisions. Despite investigating the impact of subjective factors on foreign policy decisions, as Bulley (2009) points out, it is a fact that FPA has traditionally ignored the role of ethics in foreign policy decision-making process to a large extent. Indeed, most approaches of FPA have given a marginal place for ethics in their analyses in the past. Similarly, current thinking in FPA seems closed to questions of ethics (Bulley, 2014: 118). This is not to say that leading approaches of FPA is not currently dealing with the role of ethics in foreign policy process in an indirect way as discussed below.

As Alden and Aran (2012) states, placing a stronger emphasis on agency, the behaviorist approach of FBA studies recognize the centrality of subjective factors, such as beliefs, biases and stereotypes of decision makers, in shaping foreign policy choices. This means that decision makers make

foreign policy based upon their perceptions rather than a pure rationality. In other words, different leaders bring their own personality to office and can exercise dramatically different influences over their countries' foreign policies. The authors give the example of Tony Blair, former prime minister of UK, whose commitment to invade Iraq in 2003 has been tied by some scholars to his 'messianic' personality. In taking this decision, his role as prime minister may supersede the role of the individual as a self-confessed churchgoer and a morally concerned human being, but does not nullify it completely (Alden and Aran, 2012: 23-24, 36). Similarly, the constructivist approach attuned to the subjective factors, due to its focus on the social context within which decision makers operate, still generally avoids dealing with ethics directly. However, this approach of FBA explores the role of values and norms in foreign policy, accepting them as the part of domestic structure, and thus connected to the foreign policy process (Bulley, 2014: 166, 168, 170).

Political regime type, size of the state's power, and regime change are other related aspects of domestic structure that affect the foreign policy decisions. Contributing to a re-examination of the core values of a state's foreign policy, changes in these factors can produce new foreign policy orientations and outcomes. For example, it is generally accepted that stable constitutional liberal democracies do not engage in wars with one another and middle power foreign policies are usually multi-lateralist, bridge-building and concerned with the promotion of norms. Finally, being the part of external structure, international institutions can also affect the foreign policy process in a state, making pressure to ensure the compliance of its particular decision with the collective values, such as human rights (Alden and Aran, 2012: 51-52, 100 and 103).

This short discussion shows us that the decision to pursue an ethical foreign policy is closely connected to values and norms, either through their effect on the personality of decision makers or being part of social context in which they operate. It can also be argued that pursuing of an ethical foreign policy depends on such more concrete factors as political regime type and size of the state's power. In this connection, it may require existence of stable constitutional liberal democracy or a formative shift from authoritarianism to democracy as well as having a middle power size.

## **2. Critics of Ethical Foreign Policy**

After discussing the literature in favor of ethical foreign policy above, it would now be better to mention some critics that question the sincerity of ethical foreign policy. Such critics can be discussed under two main groups:

those questioning the possibility of ethical foreign policy and those arguing instrumental use of ethical foreign policy for some domestic and external purposes.

### ***2.1. Critics Regarding the Possibility of Ethical Foreign Policy***

According to Cuncliffe (2007), who seems to be in the former group, the inability to realize ethical foreign policy derives from the fact that such normative aspirations mostly lacks the will to achieve them. More clearly, ethical ideology, from which ethical foreign policy arises, has got a demonstrative aspect that exhausts its substance. In other words, the priority is given to the demonstration of an ethical concern than actual fulfillment of an action oriented towards overcoming that concern. In his own words, “the structure of the normative act entails that the outcome is less significant than the gesture of having attempted to act. Consequently, normative foreign policy is not goal-oriented, but, rather, aimed at demonstrative activity” (71 and 82-83).

On the other hand, Bulley (2009) stresses impossibility of a genuinely ethical foreign policy, concentrating on the worst consequences of eight years of morally charged US foreign policy under George W. Bush. Reminding the serious human rights violations in Abu Ghraib prison, detention of suspects in Guantanamo Bay and the rendition flights of CIA, he comes to conclusion that “a genuinely ethical foreign policy may look to be as far away as ever”. As a supporting proof for this idea, the author cites from Peter Singer that when he told friends he was writing a book about ‘Bush’s ethics’, two responses were common: either the phrase was an oxymoron or his book would be very short indeed (2).

Finally, Perkins and Eric Neumayer (2010) describes Western political leaders’ self-declared ethical foreign policy over the past two decades as an ‘organized hypocrisy’. Using the example of arms exports to developing countries, the authors show that “the major Western arms supplying states - France, Germany, the UK and the US - have generally not exercised export controls so as to discriminate against human rights abusing or autocratic countries during the post-Cold War period.” This finding is obviously contrary to the expectation from an ethical foreign policy, “wherein far greater weight is given to protecting the rights and freedoms of extra-territorial citizens” (247).

### ***2.2. Critics Regarding the Instrumental Use of Ethical Foreign Policy***

The critics in the latter group considers ethical foreign policy as rhetorical device used for some external and domestic purposes. More

specifically, according to the critics in this group, main external purposes for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy include to cover national interest, to defend legally questionable interventions by international law, or to increase soft power. Similarly, among the main domestic purposes for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy are to fashion an image for themselves; to cohere a sense of purpose and mission; to disavow political responsibility; and to secure a degree of political legitimacy.

### ***2.2.1. About the Use of Ethical Foreign Policy for External Purposes***

In the related literature, there are those who see invocation of universal values in the foreign policy sphere as the new paradigm rationale for imperial intervention after some national interests. Being among them, Gourevitch (2007) points out that beneath the ideology of new liberal cosmopolitanism shared by the Clinton and Bush administrations, diplomacy is wholly dedicated to the calculations of power politics and national interests. To prove this argument, the author mentions the decisions to deploy American forces for humanitarian purposes in places where the US possesses interests, e.g. Iraqi oil, Balkan military bases, while abstaining from such deployments in places of marginal strategic significance like Rwanda. He also mentions the exemptions from moral requirements accepted by both administrations for some strategic allies, including Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Pakistan (36-37).

Another external purpose for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy is the possibility to get a higher moral legitimacy for some foreign policy actions whose rightfulness is doubtful in accordance with international law. It is obvious that labelling such actions or interventions as requirements of ethical foreign policy provides a stronger ground for administrations to defend them (Gourevitch, 2007: 38).

For many scholars, it is also possible to use ethical foreign policy to keep or increase the soft-power of the acting country. For example, depending on a quantitative study, Heins (2007: 52) argues that French foreign aid programs are not primarily designed as an instrument to alleviate poverty or foster democracy. In fact, there is a statistically significant correlation between aid allocation by this country and the lack of democracy in recipient countries. It seems that these countries are considered eligible only because they are French-speaking former colonies on which the formerly established French influence should be maintained. Similarly, Chandler (2007b: 705) points out that power is today projected as an ethical or value-based act, which is especially true for the European Union.

### ***2.2.2. About the Use of Ethical Foreign Policy for Domestic Purposes***

An analysis of the related literature shows that the ethical foreign policy is also used as an instrument for some domestic political purposes: to fashion an image for themselves; to cohere a sense of purpose and mission; to deny political responsibility; and to secure a degree of political legitimacy.

Regarding the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy by statesmen to fashion an image for themselves domestically, Gourevitch (2007: 43) gives the examples of Clinton and Bush, who were anxious about their status at home and without a real political vision to offer sought to fashion an image for themselves in Kosovo and Iraq respectively. Similarly, Chandler (2003: 300-301) points out that then American and British political leaders used Iraq as an international cause to raise their status at home. Stressing their commitment to a moral mission abroad through ethical foreign policy activism, they gained an important resource of authority, credibility, and leadership attribute. This is in compliance with the functionalistic argument that a government can increase the support for its foreign policy via adding an ethical dimension, by which making it more attractive to the citizens (Werthes and Bosold, 2006: 27, 32).

The second domestic ground for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy by governments is to cohere a sense of purpose and mission for themselves. According to Chandler (2003: 295, 297-299), ethical foreign policy activism allowed governments to find a new sense of purpose and mission when they found it increasingly difficult to create at home through traditional ways with the end of the ideological framework of the cold war. In parallel to the increasing difficulty in justifying and legitimizing policies based on the traditional party politics of the left and the right, Western governments faced with the need to redefine their aims. It is in this context that they started to use ethical foreign policy as a powerful mechanism for generating a sense of political purpose and mission.

It is also possible for governments to use ethics to deny their political responsibility for the chosen foreign policy. Since ethics privilege certain ways of thinking about policy and exclude others, it can be used to suppress democratic discussion on a certain policy behavior (Gaskarth, 2006: 325). This provides the ground for ethical foreign policy to be used to build support for actions that might otherwise be questioned (Werthes and Besold, 2006: 27). Consequently, ethical foreign policy alters the terms of political accountability, providing political leaders with the opportunity to elevate themselves above democratic controls through the moral legitimacy it produces (Gourevitch, 2007: 43-44).

The final domestic purpose for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy is to secure a degree of political legitimacy. As Chandler (2003: 295) points out that ethical foreign policy has become an important mechanism of enhancing political legitimacy for governments which are often under question in the domestic context. In the words of Gourevitch (2007: 42), “the international sphere seems to be the domain in which floundering presidents, like Clinton and Bush, appear to be able to secure a degree of political legitimacy through the ethical foreign policy discourse.”

### **Conclusions**

Introducing ethical foreign policy with all related aspects together with its impact on the new Turkish foreign policy, the study reaches to the following conclusions:

The first conclusion is that ethical foreign policy has become an alternative perspective in the post-Cold War period to the traditional realistic one based solely on power and national interest. Reflecting this development, some new terms, such as morality, values, ethics, and universal principles, have started to be used increasingly in world politics during the last two decades. Beside this rhetorical change, there emerged certain foreign policy practices, including the attempts to promote democracy, rule of law, human rights, freedom, and social welfare of other populations; to deter or catch war criminals; to exclude authoritarian governments from arms transfers and foreign aid; to commit troops to peacekeeping missions; to accept debt relief; and to perform humanitarian intervention, even via military means.

The second conclusion is that the recent tendency towards ethical foreign policy can be explained as part of the evolutionary trend of universal human rights concerns since 1945 or as a result of many other factors emerged at end of the Cold War period, including the drastic changes in international society; the increasing needs of populations in the failed states; the role of the shifting sensibilities among Western publics about the global problems; the role of the political leaders who search for a sense of global mission and a meaning in history; the need to strengthen moral authority of the state in the domestic field; and the regret from the failure of Western states in dealing with the humanitarian crises in ex-Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

The third conclusion should be mentioned as such that NATO’s Kosovo intervention in 1999 and the United Nations’ peacekeeping operations after the Cold War are generally found as the initial good examples for the application of ethical foreign policy. Similarly, under the effect of ethical foreign policy perspective, the UN peacekeeping operations not only expanded greatly in number but also undertook some new tasks, including

conducting elections, forming civil administration, ensuring the repatriation of refugees, and protecting humanitarian convoys.

The fourth conclusion is that the decision to follow an ethical foreign policy is closely connected to values and norms, either through their effect on the personality of decision makers or being part of social context in which they operate. It can also be argued that pursuing of an ethical foreign policy depends on such more concrete factors as political regime type and size of the state's power. In this connection, it may require existence of stable constitutional liberal democracy or a formative shift from authoritarianism to democracy as well as having a middle power size.

The fifth conclusion is that there are also many critics that question the sincerity of ethical foreign policy. Such critics can be divided into two main groups: those questioning the possibility of ethical foreign policy and those arguing instrumental use of ethical foreign policy for some domestic and external purposes. The literature in the former group stresses impossibility of a genuinely ethical foreign policy, describing it as 'self-declared' or 'organized hypocrisy'. The critics in the latter group consider ethical foreign policy as rhetorical device used for some external and domestic purposes. More specifically, the critics in this group list the main external purposes for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy as follows: to cover national interest, to defend legally questionable interventions by international law, or to increase soft power. Similarly, the main domestic purposes for the instrumental use of ethical foreign policy are given as follows: to fashion an image for themselves; to cohere a sense of purpose and mission; to deny political responsibility; and to secure a degree of political legitimacy.

Finally, the study makes it obvious that the new Turkish foreign policy has got an ethical dimension under the influence the ethical foreign policy perspective since 2002. There are only three cases in which the followed foreign policy is seen as inconsistent with ethical foreign policy perspective. They are given as Turkey's initial silence regarding the Libyan uprising in the context of so-called Arab Spring and its initial opposition to any sort of international intervention; Turkey's maintained good economic and political relations with Sudan during the Darfur crisis; and Turkey's unreserved foreign policy towards Iran without taking into account the authoritarian nature of the Iranian regime.

The need for greater understanding of ethical foreign policy still continues, so does the need for further studies in the same direction.

#### **References**

Akbaş, Z. 2012. *Journal of Academic Approaches*. Spring. Vol. 3. Issue. 1. 51-73.

Akbaş, Z. and Arslan D.Z. 2012. Libya'daki Arap Baharı'na Yönelik Türk Dış Politikasına Konstrüktivist Bir Yaklaşım. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. Güz. Cilt. 8. Yıl. 8. Sayı. 2. 57-81.

Alden, A. and Aran, A. 2012. *Foreign Policy Analysis - New Approaches*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bozkurt, A. 2011. İdealist Söylem-Realist Eylem İkileminde Türkiye'nin Son Dönem Olayları Karşısında İzlediği/İzlemek Zorunda Kaldığı Paradoksal Siyaset. *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika Dergisi*. 7 (28). 147-151.

Bulley, D. 2009. *Ethics as Foreign Policy - Britain, the EU, and the Other*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bulley, D. 2014. Foreign Policy as Ethics: Toward a Re-evaluation of Values. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10. 165-180.

Chandler, D. 2003. Rhetoric without Responsibility: The Attraction of 'Ethical' Foreign Policy. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5. (3). 295-316.

Chandler, D. 2007a. The Other-regarding Ethics of the 'Empire in Denial', David Chandler and Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. London and New York: Routledge. 161-183.

Chandler, D. 2007b. Hollow Hegemony: Theorising the Shift from Interest-Based to Value-Based International Policy-Making. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35. (3). 703-723.

Colonomos, A. 2007. Precision in Uncertain Times - Targeting as a Mode of Justification for the Use of Force. David Chandler ve Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. London and New York: Routledge. 206-223.

Cunliffe, P. 2007. Poor Man's Ethics? Peacekeeping and Contradictions of Ethical Ideology. David Chandler ve Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. London and New York: Routledge. 3-21.

Davutoğlu, A. 2013. Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy: Objectives, Challenges and Prospects. *Nationalities Papers*. N. 41(6). 866.

Fidan, H. 2013. A Work in Progress: The New Turkish Foreign Policy. *Middle East Policy*. Vol. XX, No. 1. Spring.

Gaskarth, J. 2006. Discourses and Ethics: The Social Construction of British Foreign Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2. 325-341.

Giles, B. 2013. Turkish Diplomacy since 2003: Transition from Realpolitik to a Liberal Foreign Policy? *Perspectives*. Vol. 21. No. 2. 63.

Gourevitch, A. 2007. Neo-Wilsonianism - Limits of American Ethical Policy, David Chandler ve Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. Londrave New York: Routledge. 25-49.

Grigoriadis, I.N. 2014 Turkey's Foreign Policy Activism: Vision Continuity and Reality Checks. *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*. Vol. 14. No. 2. 159-173.

Gropas, R. 2006. What Role for Human Rights in the European Security Strategy? Tobias Debiel and Sascha Werthes (Eds.) *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas: Introduction to Changes, Concepts, and Cases INEF Report 80*. 53-65.

Heins, V. 2007. Crusaders and Snobs - Moralising Foreign Policy in Britain and Germany, 1999-2005. David Chandler ve Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. London and New York: Routledge. 50-69.

Heins, V. and Chandler, D. 2007. Ethics and Foreign Policy: New Perspectives on an Old Problem. David Chandler ve Volker Heins (Eds.) *Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy - Pitfalls, Possibilities, and Paradoxes*. London and New York: Routledge. 3-21.

İpek, P. 2015. Ideas and Change in Foreign Policy Instruments: Soft Power and the Case of the Turkish International Cooperation and Development Agency. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 11. 173-193.

Kalin, İ. 2011. Turkish Foreign Policy: Framework, Values, and Mechanisms. *International Journal*. Winter. 12

Öniş, Z. 2011. Multiple Faces of the "New" Turkish Foreign Policy: Underlying Dynamics and a Critique. *Insight Turkey*. Vol. 13. No. 1. 47-65.

Panayırıcı, U.C. and İşeri, E. (2014). A Content Analysis of the AKP's "Honorable" Foreign Policy Discourse: The Nexus of Domestic-International Politics. *Turkish Studies*. Vol. 15. No. 1. 62-80.

Perkins, R. and Neumayer, E. 2010. The Organized Hypocrisy of Ethical Foreign Policy: Human Rights, Democracy and Western Arms Sales. *Geoforum*. 41. 247-256.

Sözen, A. 2010. Paradigm Shift in Turkish Foreign Policy: Transition and Challenges. *Turkish Studies*. Vol. 11. No. 1. 103-123. March.

Warning, M. and Kardaş, T. The Impact of Changing Islamic Identity on Turkey's New Foreign Policy. *Alternatives - Turkish Journal of International Relations* www.alternativesjournal.net. 145-162.

Werthes, S. and Bosold, D. 2006. Caught between Pretension and Substantiveness - Ambiguities of Human Security as a Political Leitmotif. Tobias Debiel and Sascha Werthes (Eds.) *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas: Introduction to Changes, Concepts, and Cases INEF Report 80*. 21-31.

Werthes, S. and Debiel, T. 2006. Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas: Introduction to Changes, Concepts, and Cases. Tobias Debiel and Sascha Werthes (Eds.) *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas: Introduction to Changes, Concepts, and Cases INEF Report 80*. 7-17.

Zarakol, A. 2012. Analysis of Current Events, Problem Areas for the New Turkish Foreign Policy. *Nationalities Papers*. Vol. 40. No. 5. September. 739-745.