

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, RELIGION AND RELIGIOUS CONCEPTS*

Mustafa YILDIZ**

Abstract

The field of International Relations gained popularity after the First World War as the need for security policies and means to ensure peace emerged and different issues around international relations started to be discussed. In addition to the debates on the legitimacy of the Vietnam war, various issues such as post-80's emigration, global poverty and separation began to be addressed, even though differences in the level of welfare among various regions of the world and issues such as separatism have been subjects scholars in this field regularly avoid. Religion, which had been tried to be abstracted from the lives of people in the process of secularism and its role in shaping global politics was practically ignored in the analyses these scholars made. In this work, we will examine the reasons behind this and focus on religion and religious concepts in International Relations since the last quarter of the 20th century.

Keywords: *International Politics, Theopolitics, Religion, Secularism Theory, Religious Concepts.*

ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER, DİN OLGUSU VE DİNİ KAVRAMLAR

Öz

Birinci Dünya Harbi sonrası ihtiyaç duyulan güvenlik politikaları ve barışın temini çalışmaları ile de popülerite kazandığı ifade edilebilecek olan Uluslararası ilişkilerin farklı yönleri ile alakalı tartışmalar yirminci asrın ikinci yarısından itibaren ortaya çıkmışlardır. Vietnam savaşının meşruiyeti üzerine başlayan tartışmaların yanında 80 sonrası göç, küresel fakirlik ve ayrılma gibi farklı konular da ele alınmaya başlanmıştır. Dünyanın çeşitli bölgeleri arasındaki refah seviyesinin farklılıkları ve bölücülük faaliyetleri gibi konular ise klasik yazarların işlemekten kaçındıkları konular olmuştur. Sekülerizm kavramı altında kamusal alan olarak tarif edilebilecek bütün sahalardan uzaklaştırılmaya çalışılan din olgusu ve uluslararası politika üzerindeki etkisi Uluslararası İlişkiler çalışmalarında genel anlamda göz ardı tutulmuştur. Bu çalışmada bunun sebeplerine yer vererek yirminci

* This article is the expanded version of the paper presented at the USBIK 2018, International Social Sciences Congress held at Kayseri Erciyes University between 31 January and 3 February 2018, under the title of "International Relations, Religion, Religious Concepts".

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Yozgat Bozok Üniversitesi İİBF Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü, mustafa.yildiz@bozok.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3990-6275>.

asrın son çeyreğinden beri Uluslararası İlişkilerde din ve din olgusu gibi kavramlar ele alınacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Uluslararası Politika, Teopolitika, Din, Sekülerizm teorisi, Dini Kavramlar*

Introduction

The Peace of Westphalia caused religion and the Church in the West to leave their place of influence to ideology and the nation state, requiring individuals to shift their loyalty to the side of their nation states rather than to a deity. Religion was tried to be isolated from the political and social life of people and in some places to be removed from the public sphere altogether. Even without an active secularization process, it was assumed that technological developments and modernization would naturally reduce the influence of religion in societies. International Relations research has been one of the fields where this 'secularization bias' was held and as a result scholars failed to consider the role of religion in global politics. As this belief did not materialize as expected, it became evident that analyses of various events and developments in the world were incomplete at best and blatantly wrong at worst.

In this study, we will focus on religion and religious concepts in International Relations without which we believe a correct analysis of the events that took place after the Cold War and after 9/11 is not possible. While investigating the subject, we will first examine the period before the Cold War in which religion was practically ignored in international relations. We will briefly mention the role of religion in international relations during the Cold War period and its effect on the understanding of the new world order that was shaped by the dissolution of the Soviet Union. We will then focus on religious concepts that entered the scene of international relations with the clash of civilizations debate and the events after 9/11.

It cannot be said that there are enough studies in this field, which we begin to encounter in the literature under the name of Theopolitics. Even though Mehmet Şahin's "Relation of Religion and Foreign Policy: USA Case" draws attention as a study that concentrates on the place of religion in international politics and its effect on foreign policy with the USA as example, we have no doubt that this study will contribute to the field as well.

1. SECULARITY BIAS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS (PRE-COLD WAR PERIOD)

Living beings can live alone or in groups. In terms of groups one should not automatically think about large crowds. Human beings live in groups, but they do not lose their individuality. Even though their production is collective, they are entitled to consumption in proportion to their contribution to the common production, and they do so as individuals. Thus, they preserve their individuality. Neither does the individual exist only for society, nor does society exist only for the individual. Although they have

different characteristics, they need and protect each other. The vitality of one depends on the existence of the other. Establishing the balance between the two has been one of the most occupying subjects in the history of humanity (Arslantürk and Amman, 2001: 160). Religion plays an important role in maintaining this balance. Before, religion covered the entirety of the social system, all other institutions that made up society existed within religion and progressed side by side with it. The development of humanity caused changes in religion and the social structure and society became stronger (Başgil, 1991: 27). Over time, religion and the system separated and the dominance passed from religion to the system. Revolutions and rebellions took place on behalf of both, and the individual was oppressed in between.

The field of International Relations, which is accepted as an important field of political science, is still a young discipline, but as historic as the concepts of war, peace, and conflict. Even though on the surface it may seem to be the same as International Politics or Foreign Policy, the differences should not be overlooked. While Foreign Policy covers the policies of a state with its external environment, International Politics covers the mutually developed and variable policy of many states and actors in relation to each other and also their reactions to movements abroad (Ari, 2011: 61).

International Relations, on the other hand, focuses on states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, security, welfare and dominance in general rather than political actors and content. In this context, religious leaders, companies, parties, underground organizations and terrorist groups are also subjects of the field. As such, it can be said that International Relations essentially refers to political relations protected by the states in the international system, because everything that originates from a state and happens outside or in the international system is attributed to it. It would not be wrong to evaluate issues such as foreign country research, the formation of underground resources and scarcity, international environmental problems and international tourism as within the scope of International Relations (Ari, 2011: 62).

Conventional understandings of International Relations assume that religion was privatized during modernization and is therefore absent in the sphere of power, excluding from the start the possibility that religion could be a fundamental force in the international system. This assumption is also referred to as the ‘secularization thesis’ or “secularization bias” and has been debated in the social sciences for decades, but have only just begun to enter the field of International Relations (Hurd, 2007). The secularist reading assumed that “in the long run, religious views will inevitably melt under the sun of scientific criticism and that religious communities will not be able to withstand the pressures of some unstoppable cultural and social modernization” (Habermas, 2006:15).

The process of secularization in the West can be traced back to the Reformation and Enlightenment period, manifesting different forms of secularism after the Peace of Westphalia. This process led to mainly two

forms of secularism represented in the West: laicism and the Judeo-Christian secularism. Laicism rejects religion in public life as dangerous, but in order to ensure the exclusion of religion from public life it has to constantly define what religion is and where the line between public and private has to be drawn (Hurd, 2008). The discussions around the issue of the French ban on the veil could be seen as an example for this. Hurd argues that laicism is therefore “not the opposite of theological discourse. It enacts a particular kind of theological discourse in its own right” and has to be analyzed in International Relations as a form of political authority itself (Hurd, 2008:35).

Judeo-Christian secularism, or passive secularism on the other hand, informs and sustains secular order whilst trying to regulate and limit its intrusion in public discourse (Hurd, 2008).

The common narrative, which holds that the Westphalian peace treaty ended decades of religious wars was challenged by Cavanaugh stating that violence and bloodshed had increased since. He saw as the issue behind the sectarian wars the wish to privatize the Church by “creating religion as a private set of beliefs that could exist separately from one’s loyalty to the State” (Cavanaugh, 1995: 403). He thought that it is important to see that “the principal promoters of the wars in France and Germany were in fact not pastors and peasants, but kings and nobles with a stake in the outcome of the movement toward the centralized, hegemonic State” (Cavanaugh, 1995:403).

Wilson argues that another shortcoming of International Relations with regard to its view on religion has been the kind of limited definition of religion it operates with. This definition focuses on the institutional, individual, and irrational dimensions of religion and ignores the ideational, communal, and rational dimensions (Wilson, 2012). It is commonplace to describe the West as secular, but this claim is usually based on one of three observations that result from this kind of limited definition: first, that institutional Christianity is in decline; second, that public discussions and debates are rarely religion related and religion is generally treated as a matter of private opinion rather than public truth; third, that its social and cultural state is often the target of critical comments from religious bodies, Western and Eastern alike (Smith, 2008).

However, it cannot be said that the religion-state relationship has completely disappeared in Western societies. Moreover, it is not possible to talk about a uniform relationship between the state and the church, because of the existence of different systems for different states: a single system that could be expressed as the state church in countries where Protestantism is dominant; an agreement system, also called Concordat, in countries with a predominantly Catholic population; and separatist systems in secular states (Ferrari, 2003).

A growing number of data suggests that religious beliefs and practices on an individual level are from diminishing as well. According to the Atlas of European Values from 2017, 18 percent of UK’s population equate being European with being Christian, 48 percent believe in God, 23 percent believe

in a personal God and 20 percent do not believe in any god. When it comes to membership in religious or church organizations France scores 4 percent, UK 14 percent and Germany 33 percent¹. In the USA, Christianity is considered a major social and political force, made evident in the so called culture wars (Smith: 2008).

If religion still plays a role in the lives of Western and Eastern societies alike, it is clear that politics will also be affected albeit to various degrees in different countries. Since International Relations is a discipline of political science, its relation with religion cannot be perceived differently. As belief systems direct the actions of individuals and societies, religion has the power of influencing, limiting, or justifying politics and the influence of religious groups and institutions on actors in global politics is undeniable (Sandler and Fox, 2004).

Religion continues to have a direct impact on Western politics through political discourses, narratives, and constructions of national identity (Wilson, 2012:9) and as such has to be included in analyses of International Relations. The establishment of Israel after the Second World War, the revolution by Khomeini in 1979, the Green Belt policy developed by the USA, and the religion-oriented approaches of governance that developed in the Arab world strengthen the argument that religion had an active role in the political sphere during the Cold War period, even though the concepts that occupied the public were mostly concepts such as capitalism, communism and nationalism.

2. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND RELIGION (POST-COLD WAR PERIOD)

The collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, which is also accepted as the end of the Cold War period, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact in 1991, and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 are voiced by many thinkers as the catalyzing events of the New World Order. It was assumed that the ideological war ended with the end of the East-West conflict and that Liberalism began to come to the fore not only for the security and determination of Europe, but for the whole world.

Religious concepts which did not occupy the public's opinion until this period, came to the forefront during NATO's search for a new enemy after the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact and were spoken about openly and openly. The ideological separation between the East and the West, which manifested itself in the form of Communism and Liberalism, started to give the signals of a transition into a new era.

American philosopher Francis Fukuyama (1992) states in his book titled "The End of History and the Last Man" that the ideological evolution of humanity has come to an end with the end of Communism. From now on,

¹ Atlas of European Values, <https://www.atlasofeuropeanvalues.eu/maptool.html>, last accessed 17.08.2021

the war will focus on the solution of economic and technical problems and this will cover not only Europe but the whole world. According to him, the ideological war is over. Although this understanding of universality was accepted as a good idea by many people at first, it was not found that grand later on when events took place that seemed to contradict it, such as the Serbian attacks of 1991 that took place in Slovenia and then in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although the attacks on Slovenia and Croatia were ended in a short time due to the pressure from the EU, Bosnia and Herzegovina was forced to endure the Serbian attacks until 1995. The massacre of 8,000 Muslims in Srebrenica, under the auspices of UN soldiers, revealed an atrocity not seen in Europe since 1945. Tens of thousands of Muslims were brutally murdered both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo without hesitation.

Samuel Huntington disagreed with Fukuyama's very optimistic predictions about universality and the future. He hypothesized that the leading source of conflicts in the future will not be primarily ideological or economic but cultural and that the clash of civilizations will dominate global politics (Huntington, 1998). Huntington, who categorizes civilizations under eight main groups, states that after the Cold War, people would search for identity; they would match their identity with the culture that expresses them and this would make the conflict between civilizations inevitable. Civilizations that are not compatible with Western values will become religion-oriented and this will form the backbone of conflicts. According to him, the most obvious conflict will be seen between Western and Islamic civilizations (Huntington, 1998: 515). He formulated this as a risk rather than a certainty and suggested that the West had to take this risk into consideration to minimize it (Rose, 2013:2). He saw "the failure of the West to provide meaningful support to the Bosnian Muslims or to denounce Croat atrocities in the same way as Serb atrocities were denounced" and other events around that time as examples in line with his theory (Huntington, 1993:188).

Margaret Thatcher pressed the need for the West to stand together and indicated a shift of focus in terms of military threats in her speech at the North Atlantic Council at Turnberry in June 1990 saying

"Stability in Europe depends upon the Western countries standing together. ... Ought NATO to give more thought to possible threats to our security from other directions? There is no guarantee that threats to our security will stop at some imaginary line across the mid-Atlantic. ... With the spread of sophisticated weapons and military technology to areas like the Middle East, potential threats to NATO territory may originate more from outside Europe" (Thatcher, 1990).

This is the period when Turkey's membership in NATO as the only Muslim country began to be questioned. While Jaques Delors, the president of the EU Commission described the EU as a "Christian club", the Belgian

prime minister Jean Claude Juncker, who would later become the head of the EU commission said "Turkey's culture is not suitable, it cannot become a full member". The German chancellor Helmut Kohl stated that Turkey, as an Asian country, could not be in the EU. And finally, the following statement of Wilfried Martens, the former Prime Minister of Belgium "the European Union is a civilization project and it is not possible for Turkey to become a full member of this community" were all in line with Huntington's thesis of the clash of civilizations (Akan, 2018: 170).

Former NATO secretary general Willy Claes told the German *Süddeutsche Zeitung* on February 12, 1995:

“Fundamentalism is just as dangerous as Communism. Please do not underestimate this danger. After the collapse of Communism, the biggest threat is Islam. The new mission is the fight against fundamentalism in Islamic countries and even military intervention can be considered if necessary”.

Emphasizing that NATO is more than just a military alliance, Claes adopted the principle of preserving the values that connect North America and Europe. NATO's classic color associations of blue-friendly, red-enemy were transformed into blue-friendly, green-enemy formulas after the collapse of the Soviet Union, thus manifesting the attitude towards the Islamic world (Akan, 2018: 169).

Nixon, a former US president stated:

"Some think the USSR poses a threat in the Middle East, while others say the real danger comes from the Palestinians. I say that the real danger are the Muslims who want to establish a state that unites the whole Islamic world from North Africa to Indonesia and take their people back to ancient times” (Gengerlioglu, 2017).

After the collapse of Soviet Communism, the world became unipolar and the collapse of the "religion is an opium"-thesis was confirmed by the fact that people filled the churches after the decline of Russia, while politicians competed with each other to be with the clergy in order to appear appealing to the public. The day Ceausescu was executed was declared as the day when Christianity was reborn in Romania. All these were clear indications that religion still played a role in societies and thus was affecting politics. Also the attitude of the West when it comes to Islamic countries and Islam confirms Huntington's thesis that it is again the turn of openly religion-oriented assessments and confrontations.

3. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND RELIGION (SEPTEMBER 11)

The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 are perceived as a breaking point as they added a new

dimension to the international arena and required International Relations to reconsider the position of religion in global politics.

Georg W. Bush, the USA President of the time, openly acknowledged that religion played an important role in his leadership vision and policy decisions. As such he is not a laicist but a Judeo-Christian secularist who does not support the exclusion of religion from the spheres of power and sees the US “as a secular republic that is realizing (a Christian) God’s will” (Hurd, 2008:37-38). This is made evident in his 2003 speech to the National Endowment for Democracy where he said “liberty is both the plan of Heaven for humanity and the best hope for progress here on earth” (Hurd, 2008:37-38).

After 9/11, Bush indicated that the new crusades had started and made the bold statement of "you are either on our side or on the side of terrorism", forcing the world to take his side. Arguing that the attacks targeted not only the USA, but the modern world as a whole, he tried to get the support of not only the public opinion in the USA, but also the North Atlantic nations and he was successful in this (Kissinger, 2003: 355).

It should be noted that the coalition here went beyond the Cold War partnerships. India due to its large Muslim population, Russia because of its neighbors with dense Muslim populations and China considering its western regions revealed their intention to work together against Islamic Terrorism (Kissinger, 2003: 356).

On October 2, Bush signed the plan for ‘Operation Enduring Freedom’ in Afghanistan using the 9/11 attacks and the fact that al-Qaeda’s leader Osama bin Laden’s presence as pretext. Acting on the legitimacy it received from the UN, the USA caused the death of thousands of Muslims in Afghanistan leaving nothing but turmoil and tears behind instead of the freedom that was declared to be brought to the country (Sommer, 2012: 44).

Using its alleged relations to al-Qaeda as an excuse, Bush declared the War on Iraq in March 2003, which “defense intellectuals” Paul Wolfowitz and Richard Perle were dreaming about for years. The invasion resulted in the murder of hundreds of thousands of Muslims. The ‘War of Choice’, which should have been completed in a few months, continued until December 18, 2011², leaving behind an Iraq completely destroyed, fragmented and more easily exploitable. Saddam Hussein was gone and this was expressed as a source of pride for the USA (Sommer, 2012: 42).

The statements of the former CIA Director James Woolsey in the article he published at The Guardian during that time are important in terms of understanding USA's approach towards the war:

“America and the western world are at war with 'fascist' Middle East governments and totalitarian Islamists. The freedoms we stand for are

² It should be noted that the newspaper Le Monde compared the American army that had to leave Iraq after 3196 days, to "night thieves" (Sommer, 2012: 42).

loathed and our vulnerable systems under attack. Liberty and security will be in conflict as we line up behind the new march of democracy. The war is, essentially, similar to the Cold War. ... Those parallels are: that it will last a very long time - decades; that it will sporadically involve the use of military force, as did the Cold War in Korea for example; but that an important component would be ideological.

To exactly the same degree, we will surely be successful in this long war if we convince the hundreds of millions of reasonable and decent Muslims around the world who do not want to be terrorists (The Guardian, 20 July 2003).

The language used by William Kristol, editor of the Weekly Standard, addressing President Bush, seems to confirm Huntington's thesis:

“It would be easier to act sooner rather than later. Yes, there would be repercussions - and they would be healthy ones, showing a strong America that has rejected further appeasement. But such a military strike would take a while to organize. In the meantime, perhaps President Bush can fly from the silly G8 summit in St. Petersburg - a summit that will most likely convey a message of moral confusion and political indecision - to Jerusalem, the capital of a nation that stands with us, and is willing to fight with us, against our common enemies. This is our war, too” (Kristol, 2006).

The chaotic situation in Libya, which was exposed to NATO's newest intervention after the events of the Arab Spring that broke out in 2011, also clearly shows that what is targeted in this region is not democracy but Islam.

All these are indications that the period of interregnum, which expresses the state of peace experienced by the countries that sided with the superpowers due to the bipolarity during the Cold War, had come to an end (or perhaps made come to an end). A world without the balance resulting from the bipolarity like in the Cold War period, should be evaluated differently in terms of the form and techniques of war. Considering that it is not clear who is being fought and geographically identifying the enemy is getting harder by the day, the problem becomes both larger and more complex.

4. RELIGIOUS CONCEPTS IN THE CLASH OF CIVILIZATIONS AND THOUGHTS THEY INSPIRE

Despite the efforts to be isolated from social life, religious concepts gained an unmissable role in international relations and it becomes necessary to mention the dimension that these concepts add to it. From the perspective of the Western world, the concepts of ‘jihad’, ‘fundamentalism’, ‘Islamic terrorism’, ‘political Islam’, and ‘moderate Islam’ have been widely used since the beginning of the new century and have influenced the world’s public opinion. From the Eastern front, we see that the main concept that can be considered religion-oriented and that has been used throughout history is

the concept of ‘crusades’. Concepts such as ‘evangelicalism’ and ‘Christian Zionists’ are also being spoken about.

The invasion and occupation intensifying in Muslim countries after 9/11, which we stated as a breaking point earlier, had a negative impact on both the people of the countries that were targeted and the whole group of people who shared the same belief, causing reactions. In this context, the Western public has been constantly warned using various concepts to be alert about. The first of these is the concept of ‘jihad’. Despite its non-aggressive and non-confrontational understanding in religion and history, this concept is generally used as negative in international relations by Western thinkers.³

After the Cold War and the Gulf War of 1990/91, the pressures intensifying in the Middle East and especially on Muslim countries caused diverse reactions. The occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviets, the Gulf War that started after the Iran-Iraq War that lasted for about ten years and the Bosnian War, were factors that triggered these reactions. Jihad was presented as a ‘holy war’ and the attacks against Muslims were thus justified in order to show Islam, which was placed in new enemy patterns by NATO, as bad in the eyes of the public and to be constantly vigilant against.

Al-Qaeda and organizations such as the Taliban, which were supported against the Soviets but were touted as fundamentalist organizations after 9/11, became the new face of religion in International Relations affecting the perceptions within the field. Just as the attack on the Twin Towers was used to legitimize the invasion of Iraq, the reason for entering Afghanistan was stated to be that of Osama bin Laden’s hiding there. Events and organizations were used to ensure the acceptance of many military operations by the international public opinion.

It is clear that the wars that continued from the First Crusade with Pope II. Urban in 1096-1099 on (though it was planned by Pope VII. Gregor after the defeat of Manzikert in 1071) up until the conquest of Istanbul in 1453, were religion-oriented. G. W. Bush’s mention of the crusades after 9/11, is an important indicator that he views international relations and the Islamic world through a religious lens.

The search for Muslims behind every negative event that takes place in the West and continuously making their lives more difficult has led to reactions in several places. Subjects and personalities considered holy by Muslims were ridiculed in a way that would offend them causing outrages. The 2004 Madrid bomb attack can be considered one of the first in terms of alerting the Western public. The murder of Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh for offending Islamic values changed the Western view of Islam a little

³ For more information on the word jihad, which in Arabic derives from the root word ‘jahl’ meaning ‘to exert strength and effort, to use all means in order to accomplish a task’ and is understood in Islamic literature as ‘learning religious orders and living according to them and to teach others, trying to enjoin good and forbid evil, convey Islam, struggling against your own ego and external enemies’ and in fiqh “to fight against non-Muslims” and in Sufism “to fight against the ego”, see <https://islamencyclopedia.org.tr/jihad>, last accessed on: 25.06.2021

more. With the cartoon crisis in Denmark in 2005, where insulting the Prophet was considered within the framework of freedom of the press, the events gained an international dimension, causing attacks on embassies and consulates of Denmark and other Western states in countries where Muslims are concentrated. Pope Benedict XVI.'s statements in 2006, in which he insulted Islam and the prophet Muhammad, show that the scale of this kind of events do not remain national but can affect the whole world. The attack on Charlie Hebdo in Paris in May 2015 gathered Western politicians in one photo and became the symbol of the fight against Islamic terrorism. These are just a few of the events that have caused controversy and outrage in the Islamic world as a response. The western world connects these responses to the extremism of fundamentalists and determines its reactions accordingly. This shows that religion-oriented thoughts affect international relations.

Conclusion and Final Thoughts

While social life was shaped by religion in the beginning of history, it was not only tried to be separated from it, but also to be completely erased from institutional structures. The bond of a person and his creator was to be kept strictly private, resulting in a situation where religion became merely a symbol that was tried to be kept alive in social life through rituals and ceremonies. Interfering with societies and especially individuals who tried to keep religion alive was not avoided.

Examining three reasons for this kind of involvement in religious affairs will clarify the issue. The first is that people do not want to live within a framework set by others. This is understandable and the provision of social peace can only be achieved by respecting this. The second arises when people deny others who do not believe like them, to live according to their beliefs. This constitutes a problem and conflicts begin to emerge. The third arises when a group feels entitled to determine the principles of faith of another group and to enforce them. This is unacceptable, because it means interfering with the essence of a religion. The project 'moderate Islam' and the steps planned to be executed in Muslim majority lands to facilitate it are exactly in this line of reasoning.

It is not possible for an individual to keep away from religion, which we refer to as one of the institutions that developed throughout history and changed according to circumstances in early times. Even people who do not believe, find reflections of religion in their immediate environment and society. Being a part of a social structure, traces of religion will definitely be found in every person's actions.

Even though religion was seemingly absent in the public discourse of the bipolar world during the Cold War period, keeping the involved nations in their own gravitational field, it could be observed that both poles started to act with reference to religion immediately after. Efforts to bring their allies together on this axis should be accepted as an indication that religion has been considered important also by statesmen who adopted a secular

understanding. The negative attitude of the Western world towards Islam also became evident after the Cold War. It is possible to see this in the language, as well as in various foreign policies. And thus, an atmosphere of a clash of civilizations continues to dominate.

Since International Relations is a political science discipline that covers almost every aspect of social life, it will be affected by religion and confronted by decisions of people who are under the influence of religion. Events that take place for completely different reasons, will have to be approached from a religious perspective, and religion will have to be one of the solution-oriented references when analyzing these events. As the modern world ostensibly tries to move away from religion, it finds itself devoting time to it and immersed in it. The establishment of a solution-oriented approach in International Relations will be possible with the acceptance of religion as an active force and by reaching an understanding that does not marginalize and does not see differences as a reason for conflict.

References

- Akan, M. (2018). *NATO'nun İslam'la Savaşı*. Ankara: Hayat Yayınları.
- Arı, T. (2011). *Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Dış Politika*. Bursa: Mkm Yayıncılık.
- Arslantürk, Z. and Amman, T. M. (2001). *Sosyoloji*. İstanbul: Çamlıca Yayınları.
- Başgil, A. F. (1991). *Din ve Laiklik*. İstanbul: Yağmur Yayınları.
- Cavanaugh, W. T. (1995) *A Fire Strong Enough to Consume the House: The Wars of Religion and the Rise of the State*. *Modern Theology*, 11:4.
- Ferrari, S. (2003). *The Legal Dimension*. Muslims in the Enlarged Europe: Religion and Society, Leiden: Brill.
- Fox, J., Sandler, S. (2004). *Bringing Religion into International Relations*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Gergerlioğlu, M. T. (2017). *Avrupa'da Hayatın Neşvüneması; İslam Dünyasına Tesiri*.
<https://www.tahagergerlioglu.com/kose-yazilari/avrupada-hayatin-nesvunemasi-islam-dunyasina-tesiri/> (Last accessed: 21.06.2021)
- Habermas, J. (2006) *Religion in the Public Sphere*. *European Journal of Philosophy*, 14:1.

- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *If Not Civilizations, What? Paradigms of the Post-Cold War World*. *Foreign Affairs*, 72:5.
- Huntington, S. P. (1998). *Kampf der Kulturen: Die Neugestaltung der Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert*. München: Siedler im Goldmann Verlag.
- Hurd, E. S. (2008). *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kissinger, H. (2003). *Die Herausforderung Amerikas Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert*. (Übers. Hans-Ulrich Seebohm). Berlin: Ullstein.
- Kristol, W. (2006). *Why Bush Should Go to Tel Aviv - and Confront Iran*. <https://www.ft.com/content/d1e9154e-14e0-11db-b391-0000779e2340> (Last accessed: 21.06.2021)
- Rose, G. (2013). *The Clash at 20*. Foreign Affairs Collection. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/system/files/c0007.pdf> (Last accessed: 17.08.2021)
- Smith, G. (2008). *A Short History of Secularism*. London: I.B.Tauris.
- Sommer, T. (2012). *Diese NATO hat ausgedient Das Bündnis muss europäischer werden*. Hamburg: Edition Körber-Stiftung.
- Şahin, M. (2009). *Din-Dış Politika İlişkisi ABD Örneği*. Ankara: Barış Platin Kitabevi.
- Thatcher, M. (1990) *Transcript of Margaret Thatcher's speech to the North Atlantic Council at Turnberry, June 7 1990*. <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/108106> (Last accessed 18.08.2021)
- Wilson, E. K. (2012). *After Secularism: Rethinking Religion in Global Politics*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Woolsey, J. (2003). *At War for Freedom*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/jul/20/usa.terrorism> (Last accessed: 21.06.2021)