

CONSTITUTION OF TURKISH *SELF*:
A POST-STRUCTURALIST FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS OF JDP'S
FOREIGN POLICY DISCOURSE ON DISTANT NATURAL DISASTERS

A Master's Thesis

By

ERDEM CEYDİLEK

Department of

International Relations

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

September 2012

To Duru

CONSTITUTION OF TURKISH *SELF*:
A POST-STRUCTURALIST FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS OF JDP'S
FOREIGN POLICY DISCOURSE ON DISTANT NATURAL DISASTERS

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

of

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

ERDEM CEYDİLEK

In partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

ANKARA

September 2012

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations, Economics.

Assoc. Prof. Pınar BİLGİN

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Nur Bilge CRISS

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

Assist. Prof. Esra Çuhadar GÜRKAYNAK

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel

Director

ABSTRACT

CONSTITUTION OF TURKISH *SELF*:
A POST- STRUCTURALIST FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS OF JDP'S
FOREIGN POLICY DISCOURSE ON DISTANT NATURAL DISASTERS

Ceydilek, Erdem

MA, Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Pınar BİLGİN

September 2012

Identity is mostly portrayed as given in foreign policy analysis. However, the power of foreign policy discourse on identity constitution has been raised by post-structuralism for the last 30 years. As the overall objective, this study aims at showing the performative link between foreign policy and identity. Specifically, this study also aims at understanding the performative link between foreign policy discourse of Justice and Development Party (JDP) policy-makers and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) officials on distant natural disasters and the constitution of the Turkish *self*, through utilizing a critical discourse analysis methodology. There are three main findings of this study, namely (i) the foreign policy discourse of JDP on the distant natural disasters has constituted the Indonesia and Pakistan disasters as important events, (ii) this discourse has constituted the Turkish *self* as a homogenous community, (iii) this homogenous Turkish *self* is linked with several signifiers and differentiated from negated external *others*.

Keywords: Foreign policy analysis, post-structuralism, Justice and Development Part, Identity

ÖZET

TÜRK KİMLİĞİNİN İNŞASI: AKP’NİN UZAK DOĞAL AFETLERLE İLGİLİ DIŞ POLİTİKA SÖYLEMİNİN POST-YAPISALCI ANALİZİ

Ceydilek, Erdem

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Pınar Bilgin

Eylül 2012

Kimlik, dış politika analizinde çoğu zaman "önceden belirlenmiş" bir kavram olarak gösterilmektedir. Fakat, son 30 yıldır, dış politikanın kimlik üretmedeki gücü post-yapısalcılık kuramı tarafından dile getirilmektedir. Bu çalışmanın genel amacı, dış politika ve kimlik arasındaki bu edimsel bağlantıyı göstermektir. Bu çalışmanın spesifik amacı ise, Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi (AKP) ve Türk Dışişleri Bakanlığı görevlilerinin uzak doğal afetlerle ilgili geliştirdikleri söylem ve Türk kimliğinin oluşturulması arasındaki edimsel bağlantıyı, eleştirel söylem analizi yöntemini kullanarak anlamaktır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, AKP ve Dışişleri Bakanlığı'nın geliştirdiği dış politika söyleminin, (i) Endonezya ve Pakistan afetlerini önemli olaylar olarak yeniden ürettiğini (ii) Türk kimliğini homojen bir topluluk olarak oluşturduğunu ve (iii) içerideki kimliği ise çeşitli gösterenler vasıtasıyla belirli özellik ve gruplarla pozitif olarak bağlantılandığını ve belirli "öteki"lerden farklılaştırıldığını gösteriyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dış politika analizi, post-yapısalcılık, Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, Kimlik

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The development and finalization of this thesis would not have been possible without the support, assistance, advice and encouragement of a number of people. I am deeply indebted to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Pınar Bilgin for her invaluable support, advice and especially patience, to Assist. Prof. Nil Seda Şatana for giving me hope and determination and to faculty staff Mrs. Fatma Toga Yılmaz for her helps.

I also want to thank to Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for funding me through my graduate study.

I am also grateful to my family for always making me feel their support, to my adorable little niece Duru for giving me breath of life with each smile and hug she gave me and to my dearest friends Arzu Okur, Kutay Yeşilöz, Ozan Bayar, Mehmet Çiçek, Okan Çağrı Bozkurt, Tuğberk Söğüt and Zeynep Can Sungur for their friendship and support in this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS	7
2.1 Foreign Policy.....	8
2.1.1 Foreign policy as a neglected concept	9
2.1.2 Realist Approaches to Foreign Policy.....	11
2.1.3 Liberal Approaches to Foreign Policy	14
2.1.4 Post-structuralist Approaches to Foreign Policy.....	16
2.1.5 Summary	21
2.2 Analysis	22
2.2.1 Explanatory Way of Analysis	23
2.2.2 Constitutive Way of Analysis	27
2.2.3 Summary	31
2.3 Foreign Policy Analysis: Post-structuralist Case Studies	32
2.3.1 Realist Foreign Policy Analysis.....	33
2.3.2 Liberal Foreign Policy Analysis	34
2.3.3 Post-structuralism	35
2.3.4 Summary	38
2.4 Conclusion	39
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN	40
3.1 Mainstream Understanding of Science and Criticisms against Post-Structuralism ...	41
3.1.1 Discourse study/Post-structuralism as bad science	43
3.1.2 Neglecting ‘Real Life’ Problems	44
3.2 Post-Structuralist Responses to Methodological Criticisms	46
3.3 Research Design.....	53

3.3.1 Research Question	53
3.3.2 Developing Research Design	53
3.3.3 Data Collection	57
3.3.4 Discourse Analysis.....	58
3.4 Conclusion	63
CHAPTER IV: IMAGINING A TURKISH <i>SELF</i> THROUGH DISTANT NATURAL DISASTERS	64
4.1 Constitution of Disasters as “Events”	65
4.2 Constitution of a Homogenous Turkish <i>Self</i>	73
4.3 Signifying the Turkish <i>Self</i>	76
4.3.1 Linking the Turkish <i>Self</i>	77
4.3.2 Differentiating the Turkish <i>Self</i>	82
4.4 Conclusion	84
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Lene Hansen's Research Design.....	51
Table 2: Application of Hansen's Research Design to This Study.....	54
Table 3: The Distribution of the Texts for Each Disaster	68
Table 4: The Numbers of Deaths, Injured and Displaced People in each Disaster.....	68
Table 5: The Distribution of the Texts in the Identified Sources.....	71
Table 6: The Distribution of the Texts among the Speakers.....	72
Table 7: References Made by We/Us Phrases in the Texts	75

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study will analyze the identity-productive role of the recent Turkish foreign policy between 2002 and 2010. In this study, the political group under analysis is the JDP in Turkey, which has been the ruling party in Turkey since 2002. Turkish foreign policy has been portrayed by Justice and Development Party (JDP) officials as experiencing a significant turn in comparison with the previous periods. The direction of this turn has been towards a more engaged foreign policy in relations with the Western world, as well as broadening the sphere of influence in especially the former Ottoman lands. The ultimate aim of these efforts is to become a stronger member of the international community with power to shape the international politics. This significant turn put forward by JDP officials in the foreign policy of Turkey has also resulted in a discourse, which has the capacity to constitute a Turkish *self* in accordance with the objectives and practices of JDP.

The overall aim of this study is to show the co-constitutive link between identity and foreign policy through analyzing the foreign policy discourse from a

post-structuralist perspective. The specific aim of this study, then, is to understand the way in which a Turkish *self* has been constructed in the discourses of JDP and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) on the three identified distant natural disasters, which took place in distant geographies to Turkey without causing a direct problem or threat to Turkey. The identified distant natural disasters are the tsunami in Indonesia in 2004, earthquake in Pakistan in 2005 and earthquake in Haiti in 2010. In line with these overall and specific aims, the research question of this study is formulated as follows: In what ways do the Turkish foreign policy discourse of JDP on distant humanitarian crisis and the constitution of a Turkish *self* linked with each other?

There are three preliminary answers given to this research question. The first one is that although these disasters took place in geographically distant areas, they have been still important in the foreign policy discourse of JDP with identity-constitutive power. Secondly, the *self*, which is constituted through the foreign policy discourse on distant natural disasters, is primarily a homogenous *self*. This homogenous *self* both establishes a unifying link among the members of that community internally and differentiates it from the rest of the world. Finally, this homogenous *self* has been in a continuous process of constitution, which is mostly signified with signifiers related with Islam and the Muslim world.

Post-structuralist foreign policy analysis is an important approach in terms of understanding this identity-constitutive role of foreign policy discourse and actions. Starting from the 1980s, international relations scholars began to use the framework provided by post-structuralism in order to challenge the mainstream foreign policy theories and practices. At first, post-structuralist scholars aimed at

challenging mainstream theories of international relations and foreign policy. (Ashley, 1984; Ashley, 1988; Der Derian, 1989; Shapiro, 1989).

This focus on the deconstruction led to several criticisms against post-structuralism. The main argument in these criticisms was that post-structuralism was not dealing with real life problems. However, according to post-structuralist scholars, deconstruction of the grand narratives of mainstream theories should be considered as a necessary first step in foreign policy analysis.

The second step poststructuralist scholars took was to focus on case studies, which analyze the identity-productive capacity of foreign policy discourses and actions. The shared characteristic of these studies has been their conceptualization of identity as a constitution by foreign policy discourse and practices rather than considering identity as a determinant of decision-making process.

David Campbell's (1992) study on the US foreign policy during the Cold War is an example to this second stage of research arguing that the identity of the state is linked with the external threats. According to Campbell, states are always in a process of being and it is the sense of insecurity rather than a sense of security, which constitutes the states. Specifically, Campbell argued that US identity during the Cold War period was constituted through the insecurities and threats originating from the Soviet Union.

In addition to the inspiring study of Campbell, there are other applications of post-structuralist approach to different security cases including but not limited with: Simon Dalby's (1990) book on the use of geopolitics as an ideological tool during the Reagan period; Bradley Klein's (1990) article about the representational characteristics of NATO policies; Doty's (1998) article on the Haitian immigrants in

the United States; Bleiker's (2005) book about Korea and how the South and North constitute their identities in relation to each other; Lene Hansen's (2006) book on security/identity link for the West during the Bosnian war; Burke's (2008) work on the formation of Australian identity through threat representations.

Although the number of foreign policy analysis studies from the post-structuralist perspective has increased recently, these studies mostly aimed at deconstruction of the foreign policy discourses on either existential threats such as David Campbell's (1992) study on the construction of American identity during the Cold War era against the Soviet Union or close threats such as Bleiker's (2006) study on the mutual identity construction process through the discourses by South Korea and North Korea.

What will be unique for this study within the larger literature of the post-structuralist foreign policy analysis is its power to understand the identity constitutive role of even the strategically unimportant and distant crisis in the world. In other words, not only closer problems which are challenging national security, but also geographically distant problems not necessarily threatening national security have identity-constitutive power. Accordingly, the aim of this study is to understand the way in which foreign policy ascribes meaning to distant humanitarian problems abroad which do not threaten the national security and how this process articulates and re-articulates identity of *self*.

This study is organized around three main chapters. In Chapter 2, post-structuralist foreign policy analysis is introduced by focusing on its ontological and epistemological assumptions. In the first section of Chapter 2, post-structuralism's conceptualization of foreign policy is presented in contrast to liberal and realist

approaches to foreign policy. This section basically looks at the ontological stance of post-structuralism in comparison with liberalism and realism, i.e. their different understandings of ‘foreign policy’. The second section presents post-structuralism's understanding of ‘analysis’ in contrast to realist and liberal scholars in international relations. Specifically, this section introduces the epistemological discussions between constitutive and post-positivist approach by post-structuralism and positivist way of analysis by the mainstream approaches. The final section of Chapter 2 offers examples of post-structuralist foreign policy analysis in comparison with the liberal and realist approaches to foreign policy analysis. These examples are helpful in making ontological (‘foreign policy’) and epistemological (‘analysis’) assumptions of post-structuralism easier to understand.

Chapter 3 has two sub-sections. In the first section, methodological debates about post-structuralism are presented. This section includes both methodological criticisms against post-structuralism and responses by the post-structuralist scholars to these criticisms. In the second section, the research design and methodology applied in this study is explained. Hansen's (2006) research design, which she explains in detail in her book *Security as Practice*, will be applied in this study. As the methodology applied, the second section also includes the critical discourse analysis with special reference to Dirk Nabers' (2009) application of critical discourse analysis on the constitution of US *self* in the post-9/11 period.

Chapter 4 is devoted to case study. Here, collected speeches and texts by JDP politicians and MFA officials on identified distant natural disasters will be analyzed. These distant natural disasters are 2004 Tsunami in Indonesia, 2005 Earthquake in Pakistan and 2010 Earthquake in Haiti. In the first section of Chapter

4, a quantitative analysis of the discourse by JDP politicians and MFA officials is presented in order to understand the way in which the identified three distant natural disasters have been constituted as “major events” or not. The second section presents the constitution of a homogenous Turkish *self* through the foreign policy discourses on these disasters. Finally, the third section of Chapter 4 presents the various signifiers identified within the texts used to signify the Turkish *self*. These signifiers attribute meaning to the Turkish *self*, either through linking the Turkish *self* to a positive characteristic and another group or through differentiating it from another group.

The conclusion summarizes the findings of the case study. It also suggests a number of ways for future research agenda of post-structuralist foreign policy analysis in order to develop this study.

CHAPTER II

FOREIGN POLICY ANALYSIS

This chapter aims at presenting post-structuralist theory of foreign policy analysis through comparing and contrasting it with the mainstream approaches of foreign policy analysis. It will be argued that post-structuralist theory of foreign policy analysis differs from the mainstream theories both in terms of how it conceptualizes foreign policy and analyzes it. On the one hand, on foreign policy, post-structuralism argues that foreign policy should be understood as the sum of discourses and practices in all levels of social interaction which has the capability of constituting and re-constituting identities, instead of considering foreign policy as the behaviors of states whose interests and identities are fixed. On the other hand, for post-structuralism, analysis serves the purpose of showing the constructive relationship between foreign policy and identity rather than the purpose of explaining the behaviors of states in order to reach generalizations.

Since post-structuralist theory is a response to dominant narratives of international relations, it is also necessary to analyze mainstream foreign policy

approaches and compare them with the post-structuralist perspective. Therefore, this chapter firstly gives an analysis of how post-structuralism understands the concept of *foreign policy* differently from realist and liberal approaches to foreign policy analysis. In the second section of the chapter, the methodological and epistemological stance of post-structuralism are presented, that is what *analysis* means for post-structuralist scholars in response to explanatory approaches of realist and liberal theories. The final section of the chapter presents a brief literature review of post-structuralist studies of foreign policy for the purpose of illustration.

2.1 Foreign Policy

The purpose of this section is to highlight post-structuralism's different understanding of foreign policy from the mainstream approaches to foreign policy as offered by realism and liberalism. As opposed to realism's "identity-blind" (Sayer, 2000) approach to foreign policy and liberalism's one-way understanding of identity as the only determinant of foreign policy, post-structuralist theory of foreign policy establishes a two-way link between foreign policy and identity as both of them have constitutive power on each other.

Starting with the argument that foreign policy has been relatively a neglected concept in the field of international relations and the reasons of this neglect; realist and liberal understandings of foreign policy are presented in this section. Following this review of the mainstream approaches, post-structuralist conceptualization of foreign policy is explained in detail mostly based on David Campbell's distinction between *Foreign Policy* and *foreign policy*.

2.1.1 Foreign policy as a neglected concept

Despite the emergence of alternative approaches to study international relations in the last decades, the field is still dominated by realist and liberal theories. The dominance of these mainstream approaches produces concepts used without much theorization behind them. The answers to the questions about the very nature of widely used concepts such as sovereignty and state are accepted as pre-given and pre-defined hence not deserving any further debate. What the alternative approaches in general and the post-structuralism in particular introduced to the field of international relations are mainly based on challenging these pre-given and pre-defined concepts. For instance, Ashley and Walker (1990) raised a dissident attitude on sovereignty as they framed sovereignty not as a straightforward reality but as a question (Ashley and Walker, 1990). In another study, Ashley asked the question why the state is taken as an unproblematic concept for structural realism (Ashley, 1984).

Foreign policy is another example of such neglect. Charles Hermann regarded foreign policy as a “neglected concept” (Hermann, 1978: 25) in international relations. This is because, he argued, most scholars in the field study foreign policy as if they knew what it was. In other words, they assume that the concept of foreign policy has a meaning, so clear that there is consensus on it.

There are numerous examples of such neglect in the literature of foreign policy analysis from the classics of foreign policy analysis to country studies. For example, the twelve page bibliography prepared by Hermann and Lambert in 1984 has only one entry for a conceptual discussion of foreign policy by E.J. Meehan (1971). Another example is the well-known book, *Essence of Decision* by Allison

and Zelikow (1999). In their book, Allison and Zelikow explain the Cuban missile crisis and the behaviors of two great powers. They use the rational actor model without any discussion on the nature of foreign policy and assume the unquestionable consensus on what foreign policy is. Besides, one of the most quoted books of the literature, *Ideas and Foreign Policy* written by Goldstein and Keohane (1993), is a good illustration of the attitude defined by Hermann as the book does not contain any discussion on what foreign policy is. Another classical work that does not provide a discussion on foreign policy is *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy* by George Alexander (1993). In his book, Alexander works on establishing a bridge between theory and practice of foreign policy so that the practitioners can benefit from what the scholars produce. However, no place is reserved for a discussion on the nature of foreign policy as he assumes that practitioners and scholars have reached a consensus on the definition of foreign policy.

In addition to aforementioned classical works of foreign policy, country studies also highlight the neglected position of the concept 'foreign policy'. In line with the case selection of this study, a brief review of the works on Turkish foreign policy will provide examples of this neglect. The first example is the work by William Hale (2000) in which he analyzes the development of Turkish foreign policy from the late Ottoman period to the post-Cold War period. In the introduction chapter of the book, Hale does not provide any explanation for what he understands by foreign policy and immediately starts to give the historical analysis of Turkish foreign policy. Selim Deringil (2007) studies Turkish foreign policy during the Second World War without any conceptual discussion on what foreign policy is. Besides these two examples, books on the Turkish foreign policy written

by Mustafa Aydın (2004) and Yasemin Çelik (1999) also exemplify this neglective attitude against the concept of foreign policy in the field of foreign policy analysis.

In the following section, mainstream approaches to conceptualize ‘foreign policy’ are presented. Instead of neglecting a conceptual discussion on what ‘foreign policy’ is, these mainstream approaches define foreign policy in terms of its causes and conduct. Realist and liberal theories of foreign policy will be analyzed in detail to illustrate these mainstream approaches to foreign policy.

2.1.2 Realist Approaches to Foreign Policy

Before providing an analysis of realist theory of foreign policy, it should be noted that the works of realist foreign policy analysis mostly belong to the classical realist theory rather than the neo-realist theory. The reason of this point lays in Kenneth Waltz's argument that neo-realism is a theory of international politics and not a theory seeking to explain the foreign policies of states (Waltz, 1996). As states are, according to Waltz, only bound to the impositions of the anarchical international structure, then there is no need to study the foreign policies of states. In other words, the dependent variable in international politics, from a neo-realist perspective, is not the behaviors of the individual states “but the properties of various international systems” (Rainer *et al.*, 2001: 37).

In contrast to above-mentioned characteristic of neo-realism, which does not attribute agency to states, when Morgenthau explains components of political realism, he also points to the agency of states: “political realism does not assume that contemporary conditions under which foreign policy operates, with their extreme instability and the ever-present threat of large-scale violence, cannot be

changed” (Morgenthau, 1948: 9). The rejection of the unchanging nature of international structure does not only originate from a material approach (technological potentials) but also a moral approach. In other words, states are both capable of changing the international structure and they should change it in terms of the moral core of realism, which are national security and state survival (Jackson and Sorensen, 2003: 69).

In addition to the agency given to the states and the statesmen, the way in which realism conceptualizes foreign policy is also linked to the basic assumptions of realism. This is because of the fact that states seek to survive within the rules of international relations. Hans Morgenthau formulates international politics as a struggle for power, like all other politics (Morgenthau, 1948: 13). Echoing the ideas of Hobbes on the state of nature, Morgenthau argues that the only way to survive in the international arena and to be free from the control of other nations is to mobilize the resources of the country to defend its interests in the international arena. Accordingly, states cannot seek any help from another state or an organization as the international sphere is based on the self-help of each actor.

In accordance with these rules of international relations, state-centrism is an integral part of the realist understanding of foreign policy. This is, the realist school argues, because of the fact that states are the only actors, which are sovereign and capable of defending the interests of the nation. Nation-state is the highest level in the historical development of political structures. What places nation-state at the highest level is that nation-state has full sovereignty in the domestic arena and it has the material tools to cope with threats against national interests in the international

arena. Therefore, it is no one else but the state which can protect the national interest, which makes it the sole actor of the foreign policy.

However, the agency attributed to the state and exclusive role given to the state in the realm of international relations do not lead realist scholars to theorize the state in terms of its nature “because it speaks for itself – just as facts do in positivism. Thus, the state is taken for granted, no theoretical question is raised about its precise nature, as well as about the basic characteristics of the social formation in which it is embedded” (Keyman, 1997: 57). It is noteworthy that while states have been at the core of realist school of international relations as the main unit of analysis, the literature has neglected the nature of the state. Walker argues, “although the state has long been the central category of international political theory, its precise nature remained rather enigmatic” (Walker, 1986: 531).

It is this lack of theorizing which makes the state, and therefore foreign policy, a pre-given concept. States, according to the realist school, can be qualified in terms of their nuclear weapons, their economic powers or their positions in the international system, but they cannot be qualified in terms of their identity and the way in which this identity has been constituted. Identity is not relevant to the study of foreign policy as states behave in accordance with their national interests and material capabilities. Therefore, from a realist perspective, there is no need to focus on the identity of a state when dealing with its foreign policy.

In light of above-mentioned basic arguments of classical realism, foreign policy from a realist perspective is defined as the external behaviors of nation-states towards the other nation-states in a self-help system to defend their interests. In other words, the international arena is a state of nature and foreign policy of states

consist of actions taken to maintain the survival and to protect the national interest in this playground as the sole representative of its geography hence being the sole actor of international relations. And there is no place for the question of identity in this arena.

2.1.3 Liberal Approaches to Foreign Policy

In contrast to realism's state-centrism in understanding foreign policy, liberals regard foreign policy not only as an interaction between nation-states but also as affairs among a network which includes other actors such as international organizations and non-governmental organizations. As an example of the pluralist way of understanding, John Burton (1972) presents the "cobweb model" to explain transnational relations instead of the billiard ball model of the realist approach. Burton argues that the analysis of transnational relations can no longer be limited to the interactions among states, and states are no longer able to form and apply their foreign policy on their own. Therefore, at the transnational level, it is not only states which have foreign policies but also other actors. Moreover, at the domestic level, state elites are not alone in the making of foreign policy and they are under the influence of various domestic groups.

In light of these additional actors at transnational and domestic levels, the liberal understanding of foreign policy is a pluralist one in terms of the study of both international and domestic relations. Accordingly, Deborah Gerner (1995) has an inclusive definition of foreign policy as she defines it as "the intentions, statements and actions of an actor -often, but not always, a state- directed towards the external world and the response of other actors to these intentions, statements

and actions” (18). Laura Neack also presents a comprehensive definition of foreign policy as she not only focuses on the behaviors but also includes the processes and the statements and does not limit herself with the states (Neack, 2008: 9-10). Liberals' focus on the processes shows that the liberal approach attributes an important role to domestic politics including public opinion, institutions and societal structures. Robert Putnam's “two-level game” is an effort to explain the two-sided nature of foreign policy, in which the states are challenged by the interdependency among differing actors in domestic and international politics (Putnam, 1988).

However, the pluralist understanding of foreign policy does not offer an alternative to the dominance of pre-given concepts in the practice and study of foreign policy. Instead, it replaces realist arguments with the liberal ones asserting that the best way to explain the foreign policies of states and the best way to manage foreign policy lays in the liberal approach. In this model, there are more actors taking place in foreign affairs and the decision making process is analyzed in a more comprehensive way. Nevertheless, identities and interests of these actors are also pre-given and do not seem to deserve any further analysis. For liberal approaches to international relations, the relationship between identity and foreign policy is a one-way relationship, in which identity has a role in determining the foreign policy behaviors of actors. In other words, the identity of state is pre-given and it has a determining power in the foreign policy of that state. That is to say, states have finished their process of being and now all have their own completed identities. These identities, then, have a role in the decision making and conduct of foreign policy, according to liberal approaches to foreign policy.

To sum up, foreign policy from a liberal perspective is a pluralist process including different actors not limited with states. These actors are in interaction with each other both at domestic and transnational levels. Identities of these actors are one of the determinants of the foreign policy behavior. However, these identities are taken as fixed and pre-given and these actors are considered as finished entities. This one-sided relationship between identity and foreign policy makes identity only a determinant of foreign policy but not a product of foreign policy.

2.1.4 Post-structuralist Approaches to Foreign Policy

So far, it has been argued that the realist school does not consider the identity of the state relevant to the study of foreign policy, while the liberal approaches integrate identity to their framework as one of the determinants of foreign policy. Post-structuralist foreign policy analysis moves one step further as it establishes a two-way relationship between identity and foreign policy. That is to say, unlike the liberal school, post-structuralist approach considers foreign policy not as an end, but as a means with a significant role on identity articulation. In this two-way relationship, identity does not only shape foreign policy but also is shaped by foreign policy.

Post-structuralism starts with theorizing state since it is the most powerful actor among other actors of foreign policy in terms of identity constitution. In this respect, it is possible to say that the post-structuralist approach deals with the state more than the realist school does. However, contrary to the mainstream approaches to the field of international relations suggesting that independent states have emerged naturally as a result of some important developments in history, Campbell

argues that “any particular state is achieved not through a founding act, but rather a regulated process of repetition” (Campbell, 1992: 10). Therefore, unlike what realist and liberal theories of foreign policy argue, states are never finished entities and are always in a process of being (Campbell, 1992: 12). In this continuous process, foreign policy is one of the practices able to articulate state and its identity.

In order to illustrate his argument on foreign policy, David Campbell utilizes the distinction between *foreign policy* and *Foreign Policy* (Campbell, 1992: 69). Providing the etymology of the word “foreign”, Campbell questions the understanding that being foreign is a situation inherently related to the state from the very beginning of history. Contrary to this general acceptance, the word “foreign” was first used in the English language in the 13th century in the phrase “chamber foreign”, meaning a private room in a house. Until the 18th century, when Bentham for the first time associated the term with “international”, the word “foreign” had been used to mean “distance, unfamiliarity, and alien character of those people and matters outside of one's immediate household, family, or region, but still inside the political community that would later comprise a state” (Campbell, 1992: 37). In other words, foreign policy is not only the behaviors of the states in relation with the other states, but also, and more importantly, is a political practice which articulates identity within the borders of each state. In the following paragraphs, the distinction Campbell makes between *foreign policy* and *Foreign Policy* will be summarized.

In accordance with the inclusive definition of “foreign”, Campbell argues that *foreign policy* consists of all kinds of practices of differentiations and exclusions in all levels of social interaction from the global to the individual. As

Laclau and Mouffe define politics as “a practice of creation, reproduction and transformation of social relations” (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 153), similarly, Campbell defines foreign policy as a “specific boundary producing political performance” constructing dangers and fears of people and framing the man with the demarcation lines between inside/outside and *self/other* (Campbell, 1992: 62). Campbell uses Richard Ashley's paradigm of sovereignty to explain how this articulation of identity works. Campbell re-phrases Ashley's paradigm and defines it as “a problematization in the Foucauldian sense that serves to discipline the ambiguity and contingency of history by differentiating, hierarchical, and normalizing the site in which it operates” (Campbell, 1992: 65). Ashley uses the dichotomy between sovereignty and anarchy as representative of larger dichotomies such as subject/object, rational/irrational, order/disorder. The first components of these dichotomies are placed on higher levels of the hierarchy and they are normalized, whereas the second components find place on lower levels of the hierarchy and labeled as abnormal.

It should also be stated that this process of identity formation is not finite but is superseded by another imagination. In other words, this formation of identity does not happen once and then become fixed. As Žižek (2007) argues, any effort to fill the void in identity always fails, which makes identity always partial and never full or complete (Nabers, 2009: 195). Therefore, identity reaches its (partial) meaning through the relationship of difference and opposition, i.e. through the exclusion of the *other*. Laclau also argues that the hegemonic struggle among different particular identity claims for being the hegemonic and universal identity is the core of identity formation and re-formation in a society. According to Laclau, “universal” and “particular” are empty signifiers and there is an open-ended

hegemonic struggle among the particulars in order to fill the void of meaning and become the hegemon. It is an open-ended struggle because it happens every day again and again, in a continuous manner because as Laclau points at, fulfilling this ideal of filling the void is impossible (Laclau, 2002: 5). Therefore, there is not any point in time that identity becomes full and fixed, and then the relationship between identity and foreign policy again becomes a one-way relationship as liberals argue. Rather, it is a continuous process in which both identity and foreign policy feed upon each other.

On the other hand, while this open-ended struggle that takes place every day is called *foreign policy* by Campbell, it also prepares the ground for the functioning of *Foreign Policy*. Although the scope of *foreign policy* is larger than *Foreign Policy*, the role of the latter should not be underestimated in the articulation of identity. As a state-based understanding in the practice and study of foreign policy, *Foreign Policy* “serves to reproduce the constitution of identity made possible by *foreign policy* and to contain challenges to the identity that results” (Campbell, 1992: 69).

However, this state-based characteristic of *Foreign Policy* does not lead to the conclusion that Campbell approaches the topic from a mainstream perspective. In its stead, Campbell argues that *Foreign Policy* is “an integral part of the discourses of danger that serve to discipline the state” rather than “the external view and rationalist orientation of a pre-established state, the identity of which is secure before it enters into relations with others” (Campbell, 1992: 51). In the mainstream literature, the disciplining role of the state is commonly ignored as it is believed that modern state is a disengagement from the church, which used to be imposing limits

on the people hence shaping their identity. It is also believed that modern state has emancipated man from all kinds of oppression thanks to secularism and the Enlightenment. However, Campbell argues that the modern state resembles the church in terms of how both gain legitimacy and articulate identity. On the one hand, modern state uses the project of security in order to justify its existence, in which the external world is presented as anarchical and dangerous. The modern state legitimizes itself through the repetition of the discourse as protector of the citizens from threats coming from the anarchical world. Likewise, the church used to benefit from the project of salvation offering escape from hell in exchange for living in accordance with the rules of the church (Campbell, 1992, pp. 50-51).

Despite its powerful role in identity articulation, *Foreign Policy* is not unique with its capacity to reproduce identity and it is one of many discourses, which function on the basis of *foreign policy*. However, within the context of modern nation-state, *Foreign Policy* has a privileged position among other political practices and discourse, which are also able to articulate identity. Thanks to the sacred and untouchable position of nation-state, dangers, problems, events, crisis emphasized by *Foreign Policy* gain priority in the eyes of the public over other things such as diseases, poverty or justice. While the world is full of problems threatening people and withholding them from having a pleasant life, “locating them [vitally important issues] in the external realm has to be understood as serving a particular interpretative and political function” (Campbell, 1992: 63). This function is basically to maintain the existence of the state. As the states are never finished organisms, “the constant articulation of danger through *Foreign Policy* is not a threat to a state's identity or existence; rather it is its condition of possibility” (Campbell, 1992: 13). Therefore, *Foreign Policy* serves the purpose of state's

survival, similar to the realist understanding. However, post-structuralist formulation of the relationship between foreign policy and state survival relationship differs from the realist formulation. In the post-structuralist formulation, what makes this survival possible is not *Foreign Policy's* power to eliminate the threats to national interests, but rather *Foreign Policy's* discursive power in utilizing, and sometimes creating, threats in identity formation.

To summarize, post-structuralist understanding of foreign policy is different from realist and liberal approaches. Post-structuralist scholars establish a two-way relationship between identity and foreign policy. They do not limit foreign policy to the relations between nation-states but also including all level of social interaction. Besides, post-structuralist theory conceptualizes foreign policy as a disciplining practice which helps the states to continuously re-articulate their identity.

2.1.5 Summary

In this section, post-structuralist conceptualization of foreign policy was presented in relation to the mainstream understandings of the concept so that the post-structuralist theory of foreign policy can be justified. The realist school considers the nature and identity of states as irrelevant hence not deserving a space in foreign policy analysis. On the contrary, liberal analysis of foreign policy takes the identity into consideration in its understanding of foreign policy, but only in terms of one determinant of foreign policy. Both of these mainstream approaches consider the identity of the state as pre-given and fixed, i.e. as finished entities. Post-structuralist approach to foreign policy is innovative, since it analyzes the relationship between foreign policy and identity as a two-way relationship. That is

to say, identity and foreign policy are in co-constitution process. The way in which Campbell differentiates *foreign policy* and *Foreign Policy* is important as he argues the identity producing discourses and practices in all levels of social interaction, which includes all kinds of *self/other* dynamics. The next section of this chapter will elaborate the way in which post-structuralist theory analyzes foreign policy.

2.2 Analysis

Post-structuralism does not only bring a new perspective to what foreign policy is, but also epistemologically and methodologically differs from mainstream approaches to analysis. In this section, post-structuralism's radically different understanding of analysis will be presented in contrast to the explanatory approaches. To do so, firstly the explanatory way of analysis will be discussed through its assumption of independent existence of the external world and the rationality principle. Then, the constitutive way of analysis, of which the post-structuralist approach is also a part, will be presented as it does not share the idea of external world's existence free from theory and focuses on the productivity between power and identity. In this section, the point of departure in differentiating these two ways of analysis will be their understanding of the relationship between the world and theory. It will be argued that explanatory approaches consider the world and theory to be separate from each other, while constitutive approaches reject the independent existence of world free from theory. The latter challenges dominant narratives of 'real world' and theory.

2.2.1 Explanatory Way of Analysis

Explanatory approaches to social sciences consider the world as external to the theories trying to make sense of it. In other words, scholars working through these approaches argue that it is possible to study the external world on its own similar to a chemist working in a laboratory. Concordantly, existence of the external world independent from theory and theoretician is the core assumption of explanatory approaches. This is the reason why these approaches mostly deal with “why-questions.” As Hollis and Smith put, the rationale behind the explanatory approaches is rooted in logical positivism, which is “to detect the regularities in nature, propose a generalization, deduce what it implies for the next case and observe whether this prediction succeeds” (Hollis and Smith, 1990: 50). In other words, an explanatory approach firstly tries to abstract observations made in the real world, then it raises generalizations so that a collective pattern among these abstractions can be obtained, and finally these patterns are utilized to establish connections with other – by time or by place-observations.

Rationality principle plays a crucial role in this process aiming at generalizations as the social sciences lack of super-laws which are necessary to animate the scientific research model. Resembling the role played by the law of gravity in physics, according to Popper, rationality principle is one of the rare super-laws in social sciences and he defines it as “individuals always act in a fashion appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves” (Koertge, 1972: 201). Although Popper accepts that rationality is an “almost empty” principle (Popper, 1994: 169), it helps to turn individuals into abstractions giving the research model a general explanatory power (Gorton, 2006: 9). In other words, rationality principle is a “good approximation to the truth” (Jacobs, 1990: 568). This definition

of rationality provided by Popper necessitates being able to observe the situation as an outsider so that the individual can decide on the appropriateness of the situation. Therefore, the world and the social scientists should be in independent sets since it is the only way for the researcher to decide on the rationality of the situation.

Looking at the explanatory approaches in the literature of foreign policy analysis, it can be argued that mainstream literature has a limited understanding of analysis. This understanding includes firstly comparative studies with the aim of explaining governmental behavior. Secondly, it includes policy recommendations aiming at guidance to the government in making its decisions “better” based on the knowledge acquired through these comparative studies. Both of these functions need the assumption of rationality. When Popper's aforementioned definition of rationality is applied to foreign policy, the international arena can be defined as a place where states always act in a fashion appropriate to the situation in which they find themselves. Similar to other social sciences, rationality is a necessary assumption in foreign policy analysis so that the researcher can animate research models, which are abstractions of the real world to reach the general patterns of foreign policy behaviors. Therefore, states should be considered as rational actors which resemble individuals with their fixed characteristics and their rationality assumption, i.e. seeking to maximize power and minimize threat. Otherwise, it would not be possible to have explanatory and predictive capacity in foreign policy as the actors involved in the model have the chance to think and behave differently under the same conditions.

In light of this basic assumption of rationality, the mainstream way of foreign policy analysis tries to find out similar patterns of state behavior across

time, space and issues, hence asking “why-questions.” As Doty argues, “foreign policy analysis is generally concerned with explaining why particular decisions resulting in specific courses of action were made” (Doty, 1993: 298). Depending on the theoretical background, the answers given to these why-questions differ such as “the relative position of a state in the international power hierarchy, infighting among various government agencies, or the perceptions of decision makers” (Doty, 1993: 298). Although the main point where these answers focus changes, what is common to all of them is their acceptance of pre-given existence of states and the decision makers. In other words, scholars of foreign policy analysis are supposed to be independent from what they study, as if they study biology in a laboratory.

Motivated by a desire to study foreign policy through scientific methods, Rosenau argues that there is a need for a pre-theory in foreign policy analysis as existing theories fail at specifying “causal links between independent and dependent variables” (Smith, 1985: 48). Since Rosenau needs simplifications in order to apply his pre-theory, he limits foreign policy analysis to the causes and the conduct of external behaviors of nation-states all of which have the same characteristics to think and behave under the same conditions, i.e. behave rationally (Rosenau, 1987: 2). Therefore, Rosenau's state-centric description of foreign policy (Rosenau, 1987: 1) originates not only from normative realist assumptions, but also from a methodological necessity, that is being able to establish causal and general links between dependent and independent variables of foreign policy. A closer look inside realist and liberal understanding of analysis will elaborate explanatory approaches to foreign policy analysis.

2.2.1.1 Realism

Through its black-boxing approach to the state (or the billiard ball model as it is also named), realism, and especially structural realism, might be the best example to explanatory approaches: States resemble each other in terms of being rational actors and acting in the same way under the same conditions just as the amoebas present the same behaviors under the same conditions.

In search for general patterns about state behavior, realist scholars agree on the dominance of power politics as the general determinant but disagree on the content (Rynning and Guzzini, 2001: 1). While Kenneth Waltz (1979) argues that states are defensive and therefore seek to balance threats, John Mearsheimer (1990) describes general state behavior as offensive and in need of expanding. Morgenthau is more comprehensive in describing state behavior as he points out three different sets of behavior: a “policy of the status quo” for maintaining its power; a “policy of imperialism” to increase its power; and a “policy of prestige” for the purpose of demonstrating power (Morgenthau, 1948: 30). Therefore, although their general explanation of state behavior varies, realist scholars work to find a general pattern within the margins of power politics. In search of these general patterns, rationality assumption of state behavior derived from the separation of theory and practice is the most important standpoint of all realist schools.

2.2.1.2 Liberalism

Realism is not alone in the universe of international relations studies in terms of sticking to explanatory approaches. Pluralist theories of international relations also have a similar understanding of what analysis is. Liberal approaches

to foreign policy analysis add other actors like individuals, corporations and organizations besides the states as the actors of international relations. These approaches focus on not only the distribution of material capabilities but also ideas and identities. However, liberal approaches to foreign policy analysis still consider these actors and identities as pre-given and fixed. In other words, liberalism opens the black-box of realism as it allows different actors and differing motivations in the conduct and analysis of foreign policy.

Nevertheless, opening the black-box does not mean that liberals are not in search of general patterns of state behavior. For instance, Michael Doyle argues that democratic states have a predictable behavior that they never go into war with another democratic state (Doyle, 1983). Therefore, liberal analysis of foreign policy also aims at finding general explanations to state behavior so that scholars and practitioners can have predictive capacity for future circumstances. In this formulation, actors of foreign policy are again rational actors with their fixed identities and only differ from the realist way of analysis as the liberal theory introduces more variables than realist theory in the calculation of pay-offs.

2.2.2 Constitutive Way of Analysis

Constitutive approaches to foreign policy have different assumptions from explanatory approaches, which lead them to argue the impossibility of obtaining general explanations in foreign policy. Most basically, constitutive approaches challenge the idea that the world is out there to be mapped. Once the existence of the world independent from discourse is challenged, it also means a challenge to the explanatory models as these rationalist models establish their explanations on the

pre-given and fixed characteristics of the subjects and objects. Doty argues that instead of explaining, “why a particular outcome is obtained,” constitutive approaches look for understanding “how the subjects, objects and interpretive dispositions were socially constructed such that certain practices were made possible” (Doty, 1993: 298).

As it is discussed above in detail, explanatory approaches utilized by mainstream approaches to foreign policy, whether from a realist or liberal theoretical background, ground their position in the argument that generalizations are possible in foreign policy and causal links can be established between variables of foreign policy. Once a scholar thinks that material and ideational worlds exist independent from each other, then it is possible for him/her to establish causal links between events and ideas. On the contrary, for constitutive approaches, “neither ideas nor materiality have a meaningful presence separate from each other” (Hansen, 2006: 21). Inseparability between the material and ideational worlds is a result of understanding language as a social and political practice. In this regard, language as a social practice means that it is not “a private property of the individual but a series of collective codes and conventions that each individual needs to employ to make oneself comprehensible” while language as a political practice means that it is “a side for the production and reproduction of particular subjectivities and identities while other simultaneously excluded” (Hansen, 2006: 16). In short, what prevents constitutive approaches from establishing causal links between variables in foreign policy and from searching for generalizations through these links is the way in which they understand language and theory, both of which have identity producing and re-producing power.

2.2.2.1 Post-structuralism

Post-structuralism is one of the most provocative voices among constitutive approaches. In the introduction to his book *Writing Security*, David Campbell points to the difference of constitutive approaches from mainstream explanatory approaches. Campbell describes mainstream explanatory approaches in three headings and replaces them with the post-structuralist ones. According to Campbell, the first characteristic of mainstream approaches is the commitment to an epistemic realism urging “the world comprises objects whose existence is independent of ideas or beliefs about them.” Secondly, a narrativizing historiography presents events in history with the ability to speak for them without any influence of the history-writer. Logic of explanation is the third feature of the mainstream approaches arguing the existence of material causes. As a response to these three characteristics of mainstream explanatory approaches, Campbell proposes three alternative ways of understanding analysis from a post-structural perspective. Contrary to epistemic realism, he presents the inescapable role of discourse outside of which nothing can exist. Contrary to a narrativizing historiography, he proposes historical representation. And contrary to the logic of explanation, logic of interpretation appears to be more appropriate bearing in mind that it is improbable to find out the “real causes” of events (Campbell, 1992: 4).

However, if the existence of the world independent from the discourse is challenged, then how can foreign policy be studied scientifically? If it is not for explaining the causal links in foreign policy and searching for general patterns of state behavior, then what does “analysis” mean for a post-structuralist scholar? Accepting the dominant understanding about anything in the world is arbitrary as it is one possibility among a range of others (Campbell, 2007: 204), a post-

structuralist analysis tries to draw a picture of “the history of the present.” This is actually Foucault's answer to why he wants to write the history of the prison in his book *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1979: 31). Foucault says that he is not writing the history of the past from the perspective of the present, but instead he is writing the history of the present. History of the present is a mode of analysis seeking “to trace how rituals of power arose, took shape, gained importance, and effected politics” (Campbell, 1992: 6) or as Michael S. Roth puts differently “writing a history of the present means writing a history in the present; self-consciously writing in a field of power relations and political struggle” (Roth, 1981: 43).

Therefore, the function of analysis in post-structuralist foreign policy analysis is to write the history of the present foreign policy practice and theory in order to understand these relations of power capable of producing and reproducing identity. This is the point which the explanatory approaches ignore with their why-questions: constitutive role of power relations (Doty, 1993: 299). Hansen describes these relations as a positive process of linking and as a negative process of differentiation. She argues that these two different kinds of linking are attached to each other as the example of the construction of the role for woman indicates. In this example of “constructing woman”, Hansen argues that, while woman is defined in a positive manner linking the emotional, motherly, reliant and simple, woman is also described in contrast to the attributes linked to man, namely rational, intellectual, independent and simple (Hansen, 2006: 17).

Post-structuralist analysis of foreign policy follows a similar path in studying the way in which established narratives in foreign policy practice and

theory link the subjects with negative or positive attributes, hence constructing the subject's identity. For example, defining foreign policy as “the continuous attempt by governments to assume the role a representative of the nation, thereby creating identity and social order”, Dirk Nabers (Nabers, 2009: 192), analyzed the discourse of “war on terror” by the Bush administration in order to illustrate the identity constructing role of foreign policy. His analysis shows that while concepts of peace, security, freedom, order, civilization, Western, good are positively linked with the American people, the words war, insecurity, fear, instability, barbarism, non-Western and evil are negatively linked with the rest of the world (Nabers, 2009: 206).

In short, post-structuralism differs from mainstream explanatory approaches in terms of how it conceptualizes the link between theory and practice. As post-structuralism rejects assumptions regarding independent existence of theory and practice from each other, it becomes impossible to explain foreign policy behavior. This is because of the fact that theory and practice are in a continuous process of being, none of which has a fixed characteristic. Therefore, unlike the mainstream approaches of realism and liberalism, post-structuralist theory of foreign policy considers analysis as a tool to deconstruct the dominant narratives of the foreign policy theory and practice hence showing the identity productive capacity of foreign policy.

2.2.3 Summary

This section presented the way in which post-structuralism understands ‘analysis’. In contrast to post-structuralist understanding, explanatory approaches in

the social sciences establish understanding of analysis on basic epistemological assumptions: rationality and existence of a world independent of theory. Similarly, explanatory approaches to foreign policy analysis share these basic assumptions and aim to provide general explanations about state behavior which will help the scholar and practitioner in predicting future circumstances. Realist and liberal theories of foreign policy can be placed under the heading of these explanatory approaches as they both share the aim of general explanations on how states behave, though they differ in terms of means and ends. As opposed to explanatory approaches, constitutive approaches, of which post-structuralist perspective is a part as well, have a different understanding of analysis. Since this perspective challenges assumptions regarding independence of the world from the discourse and argues that raw facts are meaningless unless a discourse attributes meaning to them, analysis from constitutive perspective aims at understanding the identity-productive power of established narrative of foreign policy, both in practice and study. Bearing this aim in mind, the next section is going to provide examples from the literature of foreign policy analysis from the post-structuralist perspective.

2.3 Foreign Policy Analysis: Post-structuralist Case Studies

As it is discussed in the first two sections of this chapter, mainstream works in the literature of foreign policy analysis focus on the decision-making processes of states and other actors on the basis of their theoretical stance. On the contrary, post-structuralist foreign policy analysis focuses on the co-constitutive link between foreign policy and identity. In this section, examples from the literature of foreign policy will be presented in order to make the radically different approach of post-

structuralism more clear. To do so, firstly, examples of the mainstream literature will be presented. Then, works of post-structuralist scholars will be analyzed.

2.3.1 Realist Foreign Policy Analysis

Thomas Schelling (1966), in his well-known book *Arms and Influence*, provides one of the most characteristic examples of the mainstream approach to foreign policy analysis. As a product of the behavioralist revolution in the field of international relations, Schelling considers foreign policy as a functional activity among the rational actors of states. As a theoretician who focuses on the decision-making process of states in bargaining with other states, Schelling utilizes the game theoretical model as it provides an insight into the strategy of states. In his book, Schelling argues that states need arms not to defeat the existing enemies, but to threaten potential enemies. Therefore, the volume of arms is a means of signaling and demonstrating power hence is a determinant in strategic decisions of both states.

In light of what has been discussed in the first two sections, it can be said that Schelling and his theory of bargaining have all the characteristics of realist foreign policy analysis: an international structure consisting of rational and identical states motivated to maximize their power and minimize the threats; and an epistemological stance arguing that the theoretician can study foreign policy objectively and conclude the general patterns about state behavior. In Schelling's formulation of state behavior, there is no place for identity in any way but only for the material capacities of states.

Considering the time Schelling wrote this book, identity was not a matter of international relations. Therefore, it would not be fair to criticize Schelling for not dealing with identity. However, as a classical book of realist school, it is illustrative to show the way in which realism considers identity.

2.3.2 Liberal Foreign Policy Analysis

Another example of the mainstream literature of foreign policy analysis is Holsti and Rosenau's (1990) article "The Structure of Foreign Policy Attitudes among American Leaders." In this article, Holsti and Rosenau assess a scheme which resulted from Wittkopf's analyses of the Chicago Council on Foreign Policy surveys about the match or mismatch between foreign policy behavior of the United States and public opinion. They test this scheme with the nationwide survey results conducted with the opinion leaders in 1976 and 1984. As a result of their testing, they conclude that correlations between foreign policy and public opinion "are strong for ideology and party; moderate for occupation; and weak for gender, age, education, travel, and military service" (Holsti and Rosenau 1990: 94). For the purpose of this section, it is important to understand the aim of this article. Although they focus on a more comprehensive set of actors in the domestic level than the realist theory, Holsti and Rosenau's article aims at reaching a general pattern and structure about foreign policy behavior. In other words, they analyze how much influence public opinion has in shaping foreign policy. As it is discussed in the section about pluralist understanding of foreign policy, they consider the relationship between foreign policy and identity as a one-way relationship and

concentrate on the effect of public opinion on foreign policy behavior. Accordingly, they leave identity constructing power of foreign policy outside of analysis.

2.3.3 Post-structuralism

In accordance with what has been discussed on the post-structuralist approach towards foreign policy and analysis, foreign policy analysis from a post-structuralist perspective can be defined as deconstruction of dominant discourses of foreign policy so that the identity-producing links can be understood. As David Campbell argues, foreign policy analysis is about “how the conventional understanding of foreign policy was made possible via a discursive economy that gave value to representational practices associated with a particular problematization” (Campbell, 1992: 37). Any effort to re-theorize foreign policy requires these conventional narratives to be challenged, both in theory and practice of foreign policy. However, this challenge does not refer to an effort to make the correct or true analysis of foreign policy, replacing the one with errors so that we can provide better recommendation to policy-makers. Rather, it is about “interpreting the effects of certain historical representations on our understanding of foreign policy” (Campbell, 1992: 40).

In this process of interpreting foreign policy, discourse analysis of practitioners and scholars of foreign policy is the main venue from which post-structuralist scholars benefited. According to post-structuralism, texts are not independent from each other, but are connected to each other intertextually. Post-structuralism also argues that the relationship is not between a subject and an object but an inter-subjective one. Accordingly, any practice or discourse of foreign policy

should be considered in relation to other discourses, policies, identities, and social structures. Therefore, the way in which foreign policy practices take place and how mainstream approaches analyze these practices are also texts for post-structuralist foreign policy scholars. Besides, these texts should be studied intertextually as materials for discourse analysis. It is important to remind that Waever suggests limiting the discourse only with the public texts since so much is hidden in foreign policy. Waever argues that discourse analysis “does not try to get to the thoughts or motives of the actors, their hidden intentions or secret plans” (Waever, 2002: 26). This is an important point to consider as post-structuralist analysis of foreign policy should not push its limits to turn into being a conspiracy theory.

Although postmodernism has its philosophical roots in the 1960s, post-structuralist perspectives have been influential in IR starting from the 1980s. As noted above, David Campbell's (1992) book on the construction of US identity during the Cold War through foreign policy discourse was one of the first comprehensive studies on this topic. In his book, Campbell argues that states are in need of a sense of insecurity and not a sense of security in order to maintain their existence. United States foreign policy during the Cold War is a good illustration of this argument, according to Campbell, as the discourses and practices of security during these years had productive influences on state identity. In other words, Campbell argues that the Soviet threat during the Cold War was not a destructive threat to the identity of United States but a constitutive tool.

R. Lynn Doty (1998) studies the construction of US identity through the analysis of anti-immigrant discourses. Doty focuses specifically on the Haitian immigrants in the United States and the way in which the anti-immigrant discourse

has been developed. Utilizing the concept of securitization, Doty illustrates how the case of Haitian immigrant was securitized in the United States and the political implications of these securitization processes.

Post-structuralist foreign policy analysis does not only focus on great powers' identity constitution through foreign policy discourse such as the United States, but also studies any state with its own security concerns and discourses on these concerns. Robert Bleiker's (2005) book on Korean politics is a good example of these studies. In *Divided Korea: Toward a Culture of Reconciliation*, Bleiker analyzes the way in which South Korea and North Korea have constituted their identities in relation to each other. As Bleiker deconstructs the discourses in both states, he works through different sources of discourse from newspapers to school textbooks and shows that the representations of South Korea and North Korea by the other side have been influential in the constitution of South Korean and North Korean identities.

Lene Hansen (2006), in her book *Security as Practice*, deconstructs Western discourse on the Bosnian War as she analyzes how security discourses and practices during the war constituted Western identity. She presents competing discourses in the public debates in Europe and the United States over Bosnia. These discourses are generally based on the responsibilities of the West, human rights, genocide, and "inherently violent" characteristic of the Balkans. Through analyzing these discourses, Hansen demonstrates the co-constitution between representations of identity and competing foreign policy stances.

Anthony Burke's (2008) book on Australia *Fear of Security: Australia's invasion anxiety*, is an interesting example since he reminds that the fear of others

and the threats are instrumentalized in order to constitute the domestic *self* not only in “geopolitically insecure” states like Israel but also in “geopolitically isolated” states like Australia. Burke starts his discussion by saying that raw facts are meaningless unless “we bring a critical historical perspective to understanding and acting upon them” (Burke 2008: 1). With examples from the history of Australia, Burke presents the exclusionary security practices that have shaped identity in Australia. These examples include the deportation of criminals from Britain and resettling them in Australia for the sake of Britain's security, genocidal policies against Aborigines and an increasing fear of immigrants in the post-September 11 period. As Campbell describes foreign policy as a political practice, Burke describes security as a “political technology” which “has had a profound impact on the political, cultural and economic forms of life that have been held to characterize the Australian nation and the modernization path of the Asia-Pacific region” (Burke, 2008: 10) and which “is able to construct and influence individual subjectivity, national life and geopolitics – often at once” (Burke, 2008: 11). In short, Burke argues that internal and external threats are capable of identity articulation in Australia starting from the early history of the country.

2.3.4 Summary

As this overview of post-structuralist foreign policy analysis literature demonstrates, the aim and the approach of these works are radically different from the mainstream literature. Considering identity not as a pre-given determinant of foreign policy, but as a product of foreign policy discourse, post-structuralist scholars make room for discussing the co-constitutive link between foreign policy

and identity. This room is of utmost importance in order to deconstruct dominant narratives of the literature and re-theorize the basic concepts of the literature, which are called the “prison-houses of language” by Fredric Jameson (1974) and the “conceptual jails” by Campbell (quoted in Vasquez, 1998: 215).

2.4 Conclusion

Post-structuralist approach to foreign policy analysis is a radical response to the mainstream way of studying foreign policy. Post-structural approaches differ from mainstream approaches not only in how they define *foreign policy* and draw the borders of the concept, but also how foreign policy should be *analyzed*. A growing number of studies in post-structuralist literature demonstrate the increasing importance of this perspective in the study of foreign policy. This study aims at contributing to this growing literature through utilizing the post-structuralist perspective in analyzing the foreign policy discourse of Turkey during the Justice and Development Party (JDP) period on distant humanitarian problems. In advance of the case analysis, the following chapter will explain research design.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter will discuss methodological debates about post-structuralism in the study of international relations. It will also introduce the method used in the case study. Any research in international relations needs a chapter on methodology utilized but a study from the perspective of post-structuralism needs more elaboration. This is because of the general belief that post-structuralism does not care about methodology and ‘scientific’ research. The first section of this chapter focuses on the mainstream understanding of ‘scientific’ research. Patrick Jackson's (2008) book *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations* will be the main resource in this section, where Jackson proposes different ways of “hooking up the world” between mind and the world. This section will also present methodological criticisms directed against post-structuralism. These criticisms are lack of causality and not dealing with real life problems. Post-structuralist scholars’ responses to these criticisms will be presented in the second section including those post-structuralists who completely reject methodology and those who seek to legitimize a post-structuralist methodology.

The third section will discuss different methodologies applied within post-structuralist international relations with specific reference to Lene Hansen, Jennifer Milliken and Patrick Jackson. The fourth and the final section of this chapter will present how the research of this study is designed, using Lene Hansen's (2006) model and Dirk Nabers' (2009) application of critical discourse analysis

3.1 Mainstream Understanding of Science and Criticisms against Post-Structuralism

The problem of demarcation is a long-lasting effort by scholars of the philosophy of science. The purpose of these efforts has been to find a set of objective criteria, which will solve the question of what should be considered as science and what should not. In international relations, there have been two negative traditions about the demarcation problem. Patrick Jackson (2008) argues these negative traditions in his book *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations*. Firstly, the demarcation problem in international relations has been made through its methods and theories, not through its goals. However, as Jackson points out, “science is defined by its goals, not by its methods or theories” (Jackson, 2008: xii). He argues that placing method and theories in the core results in neglecting the power and benefit of alternative ways of producing knowledge other than the mainstream path to knowledge. Accordingly, Jackson defines social science as “the systematic production of empirical, factual knowledge about political and social arrangements” (Jackson, 2008: xii) without any methodological restriction.

The second negative tradition is that, mainstream theories declare themselves as the sole authority to determine which method and theory in

international relations study is scientific and which is not. In the first debate of international relations, Morgenthau and Carr discussed that IR research should be scientific without any more discussion on what kind of a science should it be. On the contrary, the second debate in international relations brought the qualifications of the science in IR to the forefront, which was followed by linking science with quantification, formal models and general propositions. As a result of the second debate, positivists claimed a supreme position within the field of international relations compared to the other approaches in IR. Through their limited definition of science, this self-attributed manner of commenting on how scientific a theory is, positivists even labeled some theories not as a real science (Keohane, 1988; Osterud, 1996).

The rising popularity of critical/reflexivist theories in international relations has led to a more enthusiastic debate on the philosophy of science and demarcation problem. The first challenge for these new critical approaches was to “prove” them as a science in terms of the narrow definition made by the positivists. As Smith argues, “reflexivists or post-positivists, a category that encompasses a rich array of theoretical approaches, all of which offer a series of alternatives to rationalism, are presented by the mainstream as operating outside the acceptable realm of academic study and not part of the social-scientific enterprise” (Smith, 2002: 72).

Discourse studies, including post-structuralism, faced several criticisms. Identifying these criticisms briefly is important to present the post-structuralist methodologies in general and the methodology applied in this study, since these are very common criticisms by the mainstream international relations scholars. These criticisms can be summarized in the following two points:

3.1.1 Discourse study/Post-structuralism as bad science

In his 1988 article, Robert Keohane states the most important weakness of the reflexivist approaches as “the lack of a clear reflective research program that could be employed by students of world politics” and argues:

Until the reflective scholars or others sympathetic to their arguments have delineated such a research program and shown in particular studies that it can illuminate important issues in world politics, they will remain on the margins of the field (Keohane, 1988: 392).

On the one hand, Keohane sympathized with reflexivist approaches as he argued that this new approach has much to contribute to the international relations field. However, Keohane also argues that reflexivist approaches will be in the shadow of the rationalistic approaches and their methodological commitments, until they also develop a rigid research program.

In a similar manner, John Mearsheimer also raised criticism about critical theories, in which he also includes the study of discourse. He argues that critical theorists have little empirical evidence for their arguments. The conclusion by Mearsheimer is the same as Keohane: critical theory “will likely remain in realism's shadow” (Mearsheimer, 1994/95: 46) because of its methodological weaknesses.

Such arguments that push the discourse study and post-structuralism outside the borders of science originate from a narrow definition of science and positivists' self-attributed role of authority on what is science and what is not. These arguments on the demarcation problem ground their position on methods utilized instead of the objective of knowledge production.

Post-structuralism's rejection of causality is another point why the approach is criticized from a methodological perspective. As King et al. (1994) consider

systematic study of explaining the causal relationship between two variables is the very basic of any scientific effort. This understanding has become the “ideal of social science research and it stands as the model around which constructivist and post-structuralist scholarship have had to cast themselves” (Hansen, 2006: 10). While constructivist scholars aim to change this understanding through argument that “there is a causal relationship between ideas and material relations”, post-structuralists criticized this argument since they think “it is overly agentic, in so far as ideas are understood to be instrumentally employed by individual actors, with insufficient attention to how these actors are constrained by a social and historical context of interaction” (Fierke, 2001: 171). The rejection of causality, therefore, is a viable criticism by the positivist scholars, and the post-structuralist scholars do not reject it either:

What constitutes 'proper knowledge' is not a theory's ability to uncover causal truths as knowledge is historically and politically situated. Causal epistemology is, therefore, a particular discourse of knowledge, which cannot sustain its privilege outside of its own historical and political location (Hansen, 2006: 10).

In short, if science is defined in a limited way as the mainstream theories make, rejection of causality may seem a valid criticism against post-structuralism. However, a broader definition of science which tolerates alternative ways of producing knowledge other than finding the causal links will consider post-structuralism within the borders of ‘scientific’ research.

3.1.2 Neglecting ‘Real Life’ Problems

In *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, King *et al.* (1994) argue that a research topic “should pose a question that is

'important' in the real life world” (King *et al.*, 1994, quoted in Hansen, 2006: 6). Post-structuralism has also been criticized for lack of its connection with real life problems and only dealing with metatheoretical issues in a philosophical manner. For instance, Katzenstein *et al.* (1998: 678) argued that post-structuralism is detached from the real world: “Postmodernism falls clearly outside of the social science enterprise and in international relations research it risks becoming self-referential and disengaged from the world.” Post-structuralist scholars have also responsibility for the emergence of such a criticism since they mostly spend their time and effort to deconstruct the dominant discourses and concepts of international relations theory itself, with a limited number of case studies. On the other hand, this has been a necessity as studying the cases through the framework and concepts developed by the mainstream IR would contradict the very nature of post-structuralism. Starting from the 1990s, post-structuralist scholars have started to apply post-structuralist theory to real life cases.

In addition to King *et al.*(1994), Barbara Epstein (1995) has also criticized post-structuralism and discursive approaches, but for a different reason. For Epstein, a discursive theory without any emphasis on progressive politics must be "rejected as part of the project of developing something better" (Epstein, 1995: 116). For Epstein, basic commitments of post-structuralism such as "rejection of metanarratives, the insistence that everything must be understood as socially constructed, the rejection of any claims of truth or value" (Epstein, 1995: 84) create a dangerous environment for the fight against injustices. Just like Kenneth Walt's (1991) warning on seductive effects of post-structuralism in security studies, Epstein points to a more general “danger” that post-structuralism does not bring any support to fight against social injustices, which, according to Epstein, should be the

main purpose of a theory. Ken Booth (2007: 178) also puts emphasis on post-structuralism's lack of providing a robust political option and its “failure to engage persuasively with politics” where he argues that post-structuralism deconstructs the grand narratives and challenges them, which are at the same time the hope of millions of people to emancipate from their restrictions in terms of race, gender or poverty.

3.2 Post-Structuralist Responses to Methodological Criticisms

In response to methodological criticisms outlined above, post-structuralists offered two counter arguments. Firstly, some post-structuralist scholars reject the use of any methodology and argue that any kind of methodology is also a kind of structure and corresponds to a metanarrative:

Based on their postmodern critique of foundationalism, these scholars (leading figures of the community) have represented the foreignness of discourse analysis as partly lying in its rejection of methodological and research design criteria, which in their view constitutes attempts to silence alternative experiences and perspectives (Milliken, 1999: 227).

Second, some post-structuralist scholars sought to develop methodologies within discursive scholarship. Among those scholars, Milliken argued “to refuse to engage in mainstream modes of doing social science should not mean the near exclusion from the debate of issues of research and method” (Milliken, 1999: 226).

There is also an evolving research programme for discourse scholars

That programme may be different from others in its commitment to studying the politics of representations all that exotic or foreign a mode of collective intellectual labor. Like other research programmes, its adherents attempt to, cite and follow up on the work of knowledge producers socially acknowledged as important for the research programme (Milliken, 1999: 228).

Different strategies in the study of international relations “constitute, in effect, different ways of ‘hooking up’ with the world. They must be taken on faith, as none of them can be validated by reason or evidence. Each, in effect, generates different kinds of puzzles and challenges for scholars” (Lebow, 2011: 1224, quoted in Jackson). As no theory of international relations has the monopoly to define what is considered as science and what is not, Jackson argues to extend the definition of science used in international relations. Tickner (2011) also points to the necessity for a broader definition of science as the narrow definition is a barrier to constructive dialogue across paradigms (610).

Both Tickner and Jackson present the Weberian understanding of science as the way out from non-productive discussions on science, based on the methodologies used ignoring a goal-based definition. According to Max Weber, “the terms in which we describe the things we wish to explain are given for us in what Weber characterizes as the language of life, hence there is a "fundamental conflict between the task of understanding action and the task of causal explanation" (Weber 1904: 208, quoted in Turner 2005: p. 38). As Thomas Kuhn has shown, science is not a “single unified field of endeavor” since it has neither common standards/criteria nor a single measurement of progress. Instead, within a certain paradigm, there are different aspects and elements of science with different criteria and measurement with a single objective: systematic, communal and empirical production of knowledge (Jackson, 2008; Tickner, 2011).

Reflexive knowledge and discourse scholarship occupy significant positions for this end. Reflexive knowledge aims at permitting the “production of a more realistic and praxis-bearing understanding of how knowledge and reality are

mutually constitutive” (Hamati-Ataya, 2011: 260), while scholars study discourse “to illustrate how ... textual and social processes are intrinsically connected and to describe, in specific contexts, the implications of this connection for the way we think and act in the contemporary world” (George, 1994: 191). In other words, discourse scholars, including the post-structuralists, also serve the same end, which is production of knowledge, but with different methodologies and different commitments. In order to understand the production of knowledge through discourse scholarship, the following paragraphs will present its basic features.

According to Milliken (1999), basic commitments of discourse scholarship are considering discourses as systems of signification, discourse productivity and the play of practice. Firstly, considering discourse as systems of signification, Milliken answers the question of how “these systems operate to construct things and give people knowledge about social reality” (231). According to Milliken (1999), there is not only one method to find answers to these questions, and “predicate analysis” is one of the most common methods for this purpose being “suitable for the study of language practices in texts” (231).

For predicate analysis, Milliken gives the example of a text which presents Japan as a subject who experiences emotions while United States as making rational decisions, through the verbs, adverbs and adjectives used in the text (Milliken, 1999: 232). However, a predicate analysis should be based upon a different set of texts since the method is also for “elucidating both how discourses overlap, as well as the structures of meaning that they share” (Milliken, 1999: 234).

Lene Hansen in her book on the Bosnian War illustrates a predicate analysis as she presents the different- resembling or differentiating- discourses by the

Western politicians and media. The methodology applied in this study will be explained in more detail in the following section. As well as predicate analysis, other methods can be used in order to show significations of discourses, such as an analysis of metaphors used constantly “in the language practices of a group or society to make sense of the world” (Milliken, 1999: 235).

As the second commitment of discourse scholarship, discourse productivity is an important aspect of discourse analysis. For Milliken, two important productions of discourse are common sense and policy practices: production of what is normal and what is true. Post-structuralist thinkers argue that truths are not the products of accumulated scientific knowledge, but in its stead, “are historical choices” (Vasquez, 1998: 217). Derrida calls this process as “logocentrism” which involves constituting dualities such as us/them, inside/outside and then imposing a hierarchy between two sides. In the final step of logocentrism, the dominance of one side over the other is normalized as truth. Applying this process to world politics, Campbell argued “the dominant understanding of world politics is (...) arbitrary in the sense that they are but one possibility among a range of possibilities” (Campbell, 2007: 204). While the assumed-realities of international relations are examples of produced common senses, Foucault's work on how the disciplinary technologies such as surveillance and governmentality (1991), have been influential in the development of criminality is example of production of policy practices.

The third and the final commitment of discourse scholarship identified by Milliken as the “play of practice,” through which she addresses the open-endedness and instability of discourses: There are different speakers producing discourses;

there are conflicting and overlapping discourses; there are successful discourses and unsuccessful discourses. All of these discourses are in a continuous process of interaction with each other in a never-ending manner.

In short, Milliken's effort is to show that "the study of discourse in international relations is not just a project of metatheoretical critique; it has also become a vibrant research programme that deserves to be further advanced" (Milliken, 1999: 248). In other words, Milliken's article can be regarded as a direct response to the criticisms of "lack of research program" by Keohane in 1988.

In addition to Milliken, Hansen (2006) has developed a research design to study discourse from a post-structuralist point of view. In her book *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and Bosnian War*, Hansen analyzed different discourses developed by the Western media and politicians on the Bosnian War, and how these discourses developed different and sometimes conflicting identities for the Bosnians and the West. Hansen theorizes the relationship between foreign policy and identity in non-causal terms, arguing that, "the absence of causality does not imply a lack of structure" (18). Arguing the need to loosen the link between positivist epistemology and methodology, Hansen (2006) presented that "a post-structuralist methodology is not only possible, but also desirable" (2). Table 1 shows the main components and alternatives in each component in Hansen's research design (Hansen, 2006: 81).

In Hansen's research design, the "number of selves" row represents the subject whose identity is constituted. The "intertextual models" row lists the available departments in society in which hegemonic struggle takes place. Thirdly,

Table 1: Lene Hansen’s Research Design

Number of Selves	- Single - Comparison around events or issues - Discursive encounter
Intertextual models	- Official discourse - Wider political debate - Cultural representations - Marginal political discourses
Temporal Perspective	- One moment - Comparative moments - Historical development
Number of events	- One - Multiple- related by issue - Multiple- related by time

three options listed in the “temporal perspective” row are alternatives between whether the discourses will be analyzed for a limited time period or its historical evolution or comparing two moments from the history. Finally, “number of events” row shows us how discourse-related event/s can be selected: It can be only one event as well as being multiple events related by time or issue.

After discussing the post-structuralist efforts to respond to the criticism of not fulfilling the basic criteria of being science, the problem of not dealing with real life problems should be addressed. The most fundamental response by post-structuralism is that what is called reality today is not arbitrary but one of the possibilities among a variety. In other words, what is signified as the reality is not the product of a natural historical development, but it is one of the possible alternatives, which was constituted throughout time with the help of discourse and practices. That is to say, post-structuralism is related with the real life problems as these real life problems are meaningful as long as we attribute meaning to them. Accordingly, what post-structuralism does is to show the way in which the present

meanings have been constituted throughout time. In this sense, post-structuralism helps us to understand what is presented as “reality.” This is not to suggest that there is nothing outside discourse and we are making things up in our mind, but to suggest that there are different discourses in society, which are in continuous competition with each other in order to become the hegemonic discourse. Through this way, the hegemonic discourse gains the opportunity and power to attribute its own meaning to several social values, events and practices.

This process of identity articulation works best at times of crisis, which are “characterized by a void of meaning- that might be deliberately constructed—a structural gap that has to be filled, a situation of fragmentation and indeterminacy of articulations” (Hansen, 2006: 193). For example, the events of September 11 were constructed as a “global tragedy” instead of a national disaster or a crime attributing them with an “exceptional ahistoricity” (Der Derian, 2002: 178). Jenny Edkins also shows how the “traumatic events are described as 'the moment the world changed'” because of the fact that “the traumatic event points to the inadequacy of all forms of everyday reality” (Edkins, 2002: 253). In parallel with the increasing level of importance given to a crisis, the void of meaning in identity increases as well. A larger void of meaning provides a better opportunity to construct a collective identity. Therefore, there are bigger or smaller crisis with different levels of power to articulate identity.

In short, post-structuralist scholars have been able to develop responses to methodological criticisms of not fulfilling the “requirements” of being a science and dealing with abstract matters instead of real life problems. The following sections present the research design and methodology applied in this study to analyze the

foreign policy discourse of JDP in Turkey towards the distant natural crisis in the period after 2002, mostly based on the research design presented by Hansen, with support by the methods of Nabers.

3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Research Question

In this research, the basic research question is “In what ways do the Turkish foreign policy discourse under the rule of JDP on distant humanitarian crisis and the constitution of a Turkish *self* link with each other?” The question is formulated in line with the ontological and epistemological basics of post-structuralist international relations perspective. In other words, it establishes neither a one-sided nor a causal relationship between two variables: Turkish foreign policy discourse on distant humanitarian crisis and the Turkish *self*. Instead, there is a co-constitutive link between the two variables and both of them are in a continuous process of being by the influence of the other.

3.3.2 Developing Research Design

In order to understand the co-constitutive link between foreign policy and identity, Hansen's above-quoted research design is applied to this research question. Applying her design to this question, Table 2 summarizes the research design of this study.

Adapting this research model to this study, a single *self* (state identity of Turkey) is analyzed in terms of multiple events related by time and issue (2004:

Southeast Asia Tsunami, 2005: Pakistan Earthquake, 2010: Haiti Earthquake), throughout one period (JDP period), through analyzing the discourse of one party in the wider political debate (official discourse of JDP).

Table 2: Application of Hansen’s Research Design to This Study

Number of Selves	- Single: Turkey
Intertextual models	- Only official discourse: Official discourse by the JDP government
Temporal Perspective	- One moment: Period under JDP rule, since 2002
Number of events	- Multiple- related by time and issue: 2004: Southeast Asia Tsunami 2005: Pakistan Earthquake 2010: Haiti Earthquake

3.3.2.1 Number of Selves

As it is discussed in the previous section, when establishing her research design, Hansen presents different alternatives for the number of selves, temporal perspective and number of events to be studied and the intertextual model to be utilized. The first row of Hansen’s research design corresponds to whose identity we are analyzing as a constitution by foreign policy. Among other alternatives including multiple selves, this study analyzes only one *self* that is the Turkish *self*.

However, a single *self* still necessitates looking for discursive contrasts in terms of identity: Not only analyzing how the *self* is portrayed but also how the *other* is portrayed. For instance, when looking at the foreign policy discourse of the JDP government on the flood in Pakistan in 2010, we still need to focus on the Pakistani identity, but in terms of how JDP discourse linked it with or differentiated it from the Turkish *self*. In other words, when a single *self* is chosen from the

research design of Hansen, identities other than the chosen *self* are only tools for the construction of that *self* through discursive linking and differentiation. Choosing single *self* in the research design does not create a problem from a methodological perspective since the cases analyzed in this study are natural disasters, which do not generate hot political debates between two parties. However, if the cases are humanitarian crisis originating from armed conflicts, then this would likely generate a hot debate with counter-productive discourse by at least two political parties. Each new discourse by one side will feed the discourse by the other side, playing an important role in the identity construction process. For the scope of this study, a single *self* that is the Turkish *self* is studied only through the discourses by the official discourse of Turkey under JDP rule without focusing on the discourses of other parties.

3.3.2.2 Intertextual Model

For the second row, that is the intertextual model, only the official discourse is analyzed in order to understand the productive power of foreign policy discourse on identity. Hansen presents four different alternatives to cover in the intertextual analysis, which are official discourse, wider political debate, cultural representations and marginal political discourses. The scope of official discourse in this case study covers the discourse of the ruling party including the Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, other members of JDP in the parliament and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) officials.

3.3.2.3 Temporal Perspective

For the third row, which is the temporal perspective, only one period is analyzed that is the period starting from 2002 elections, when JDP has started to govern Turkey as a single-party government. Since 2002, JDP has won 3 general elections, 2 local elections and 2 constitutional reform referenda gaining the majority of votes. JDP governments in this period played crucial role in the transformation of Turkey, changing its republican patterns coming from the foundation of the country in 1923, and replacing them with more conservative democratic patterns. This transformation has taken place in each and every area of politics in Turkey from the armed forces to local governance and the legal system, from the relations with the European Union to relations with the Middle East countries. Therefore, it can be argued that JDP has established full control over the state mechanisms since 2002, which placed JDP to a position as the sole speaker of the official discourse of Turkey both in domestic and global politics.

3.3.2.4 Number of Events

The final row of the research design by Hansen indicates the number of events to be analyzed. In this study, multiple events are analyzed related by both time and issue. These events are the distant humanitarian crisis originated from the natural disasters: 2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami, 2005 Pakistan Earthquake and 2010 Haiti Earthquake. The reason for choosing these distant humanitarian crises is to show that not only the foreign policy discourse on strategically important issues but any foreign policy discourse has an identity-constitutive power. David Campbell has shown that discourses on “existential threats” to a country are capable of identity constitution. In this study, through choosing these particular events, the

aim is to show that distant humanitarian problems are also discursively utilized and plays a role in the formation of identity in Turkey.

Only the discourses of the two months following crises under consideration are included in this study. This is because two months constitute the period when the event attracts maximum level of interest in the international arena. As Nabers (2009) argues, “International crises are crucial in processes of change, as they are characterized by a void of meaning—that might be deliberately constructed—a structural gap that has to be filled, a situation of fragmentation and indeterminacy of articulations” (193). Therefore, in the following two months of these natural disasters, there was a void of meaning to be filled by different discourses. This is why; the time frame is limited with the following two months of the chosen natural disasters.

3.3.3 Data Collection

In order to identify the official Turkish foreign policy discourse under JDP rule, four sources were used. These are the official website of JDP (www.akp.org.tr), website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) (www.mfa.gov.tr), minutes of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey and Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's speeches at the JDP party group in the Grand National Assembly. In line with the above-mentioned focus on crisis by Nabers, the time frame of the search was limited to the two months period following the disasters.

Although each source has different search tools, the basic keywords used to identify the related texts were “deprem” (earthquake), “Asya” (Asia), and “tsunami” for the 2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami; “Pakistan” and “deprem” (earthquake) for the

2005 Pakistan Earthquake; “deprem” (earthquake) and “Haiti” for the 2010 Haiti Earthquake.

3.3.4 Discourse Analysis

As post-structuralist theory of international relations asks questions on how discourse shapes identity, it should also utilize some important insights from other disciplines. For example, a British linguist, Norman Fairclough studies political communication through conceptualizing it as a social practice (Fairclough, 1989; 1992; 2003). In addition to the works of Fairclough, critical discourse analysis methodology has been developed by a group of linguists such as Ruth Wodak, Siegfried Jäger and Teun van Dijk. As Van Dijk argues, critical discourse analysis “studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (van Dijk, 2001: 352).

In his article on the post-structuralist analysis of the “war on terror” discourse of the United States following 9/11, Nabers (2009) links critical discourse analysis with the theory of hegemony which has been developed by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985). The theory of hegemony aims to show “how hegemonic discourses serve as the nexus between crises and social structures and how they make identity construction possible” (194). According to Laclau and Mouffe, there is a constant hegemonic struggle within the society to become the hegemonic discourse. Therefore, identity is a discursive articulation (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 105) with the presumption that any identity is incomplete, always remains partial. The reason behind this is that identity is articulated through a

process of negation, where there is always an *other* to be negated and always a lack or gap to be filled. For Laclau and Mouffe, what dominates articulations of identity results from logics of equivalence and difference.

On the one hand, logic of equivalence corresponds to the process of articulating a community through positively linking that group of people with various desires and characteristics. As Žižek also discusses, "the two logics are not simply opposed, (...) a system of pure differentiability would lead to a pure equivalence of all its elements" (Žižek, 2008: 36). In other words, as opposed to the radically excluded *other*, all elements are equivalent who all share the common feature of negating the excluded *other* (Nabers, 2009: 195). Therefore, there is a continuous tension between what is equivalent and what is different and this tension is what produces the social.

In this process of filling the void of meaning, the relationship between the signifier and the signified is important. Initially used by Ferdinand de Saussure, the signifier is the word, sound or image, while a signified is the concept, meaning or the thing indicated by that signifier. Empty or floating signifiers are signifiers without any direct referent, hence giving "a particular demand a function of universal representation—that is to give it the value of a horizon giving coherence to the chain of equivalence and, at the same time, keeping it indefinitely open" (Laclau, 1996: 57–58). Examples of the empty signifiers from world politics can be given as "order," "democracy," "nation," "human rights" and "justice". These are commonly used signifiers in world politics, but there is no consensus over what should be the signified through these signifiers. On the other hand, these signifiers are important words used by the individuals and communities to declare their

identity. As these signifiers have different meanings to different people and groups, a discursive battle emerges in the society where each discourse tries to close the gap in the articulation of identity.

This process of identity-building is an open-ended struggle (Butler 2000; Laclau 2000). In fact, this hegemonic struggle is the very basis of the politics. As Laclau and Mouffe (1985) argue, “the social only exists, however, as an effort to construct that impossible object” (112). At a certain point, a particular discourse can become hegemonic and can prevail for some time. Despite the existence of alternative discourses challenging it, hegemonic discourse has the capacity to establish the way in which people in that society perceive reality, i.e. how they read signifier and perceive the signified. This capacity of shaping the dominant perception of reality also shapes the articulation of identity in that society. As Nabers (2009) argues, hegemony "reproduces our daily lives; it starts to be hegemonic when our everyday understanding of social relations and the world as a whole starts to alter according to the framework that is set by the hegemonic discourse" (197).

If hegemonic struggle is about the logic of equivalence and logic of differences among different empty or floating signifiers, then the first stage of a critical discourse analysis should be the identification of those signifiers within the texts to be analyzed. The purpose of such identification is to find out the frequency of the empty signifiers in the sum of all texts. It is only possible after this quantitative approach to qualitatively analyze the linguistic insights of the texts. If understanding discourse as "an element of social life which is closely interconnected with other elements" (Fairclough, 2003: 3), intertextuality is the key

method to "generate broader meanings" (Nabers, 2009: 199) by the texts. As texts and discourses are also social productions, the emergence of thoughts does not firstly take place in the minds of the people but instead they are part of a bigger picture articulated throughout a "complex sociolinguistic history" (Nabers, 2009: 199). Most of the time, the logic behind intertextual analysis is established through binary oppositions. As the construction of the identity of a *self* is only possible through the exclusion of an *other*, these binary oppositions articulate the identity of the *self* by linking and differentiating signifiers used to predicate the *self* and the *other*.

The analysis of the Turkish foreign policy discourse on the distant natural disasters in Chapter 4 is made through the above-mentioned assumptions of critical discourse analysis. First, identified texts will be analyzed quantitatively:

- How many texts mention the three natural disasters identified within the following two months after the date of the disaster?
- What is the distribution of those texts among four sources identified?
- Who made those speeches?

These questions in the quantitative analysis give the chance to see the overall picture of the official Turkish foreign policy discourse on these natural disasters. Intensity of the speeches for each disaster, the sources where these speeches were published and the speaker of these speeches all have importance to show the way in which these disasters were portrayed in Turkish foreign policy discourse. As a result, this quantitative analysis will provide us to observe whether official Turkish foreign policy overlooked that distant natural disaster or cared about it, including that disaster into the political debates in Turkey.

It should also be noted that a quantitative analysis does not contradict with the ontological and epistemological assumptions of post-structuralism as long as these numbers are not used to reach generalizations with a predictive capacity for the future cases. In other words, this study utilizes a mix methodology of quantitative content analysis and a qualitative discourse analysis. However, the content analysis of the speeches by JDP politicians and MFA officials do not aim at explaining the causes of these speeches, but to draw a general picture of the speeches on the three distant natural disasters identified.

Following the analysis of the identified texts through these three questions, the content of these texts will be analyzed next. In this second stage, signifier-signified relationship will be fundamental. Basic questions of analysis in this section are:

- Whom does “we/us” signify in the identified speeches?
- What are the signifiers used to signify the Turkish *self*?
- What are the signifiers used to signify disaster victims?

As a result of the analysis through these questions, different usages of “we/us” phrases, different words/phrases used to signify the Turkish *self* and different words/phrases used to signify the disaster victims will be identified. These will be categorized as the ones linking the Turkish *self* with a resembling group, civilization, historical period or a positive characteristic, and the ones differentiating the Turkish *self* from an *other*. These linking and differentiating predications will indicate the positive and negative ways of signifying a signified, which articulates positive and negative identities for the *self*.

3.4 Conclusion

In the history of international relations scholarship, science has been defined in a very narrow manner, challenging the scholarly legitimacy of alternative approaches to the study of international relations. Discourse analysis scholarship including post-structuralism has been at the core of these challenges coming from the mainstream international relations scholars as post-structuralism rejects the very basic commitments of positivist epistemology such as causality. This is why post-structuralism has been criticized in methodological terms mainly on two issues: Not fulfilling the required criteria for being considered as “real” science threatening the integrity of international relations as a field of science and not dealing with the real life problems but with abstract matters. Despite the early periods of post-structuralist study of international relations were lacking of a research programme and mostly dealing with deconstructing the concepts developed by mainstream international relations, later they succeeded in developing structured research programmes with basic commitments as Milliken listed in her article and started to deal with real life problems such as in Hansen, Nabers and Campbell’s works.

CHAPTER IV

IMAGINING A TURKISH *SELF* THROUGH DISTANT NATURAL DISASTERS

This chapter analyzes the discourse of Justice and Development Party (JDP) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in Turkey about three distant natural disasters, namely the Southeast Asia Tsunami in 2004, Pakistan Earthquake in 2005 and Haiti Earthquake in 2010. The analysis of these discourses is conducted in line with the research design and methodology as described in Chapter 3.

This chapter is organized in sections. In the first section, the identified distant natural disasters are analyzed quantitatively in terms of their constitution as a “major event” in the discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials. In this section, Derrida's arguments about the constitution of an “event” are the main reference point. In the second section, constitution of a homogenous Turkish *self* through the foreign policy discourses on these disasters is discussed. The final section shows the various signifiers identified within the texts used to signify the

Turkish *self*. These signifiers are categorized as the ones which link the Turkish *self* to a positive attribution or another group and the ones which differentiate the Turkish *self* from another group.

4.1 Constitution of Disasters as “Events”

In his discussion on September 11 attacks, Jacques Derrida argues that these attacks have been constituted as a “major event” which should be evaluated in a different manner than every other event (Derrida, 2003: 89). An event, according to Derrida (2003: 89), is “made up of 'the thing' itself (that which happens or comes) and the impression (itself at once 'spontaneous' and 'controlled') that is given, left, or made by the so-called 'the thing'.” In other words, “the thing” itself is not sufficient to become an event without the contribution of the impression. Derrida stresses the question of why is it that September 11 attacks have been constituted as a major event as some other examples where more people died than 9/11 attacks were not constituted as a major event such as wars and mass murders. For Derrida, what makes us believe that this is a major event is “the interpreted, interpretative and informed impression” given by the predominant system through language, communication, rhetoric, image, media (Derrida, 2003: 89).

Bearing in mind arguments of Derrida, during a humanitarian crisis that takes place in a distant place, there are two options for a political group, be it a ruling political party or a small non-governmental organization. This is a choice between the options of overlooking that humanitarian crisis or choosing to highlight the distant humanitarian crisis. In other words, this is a choice between giving that disaster an impression of an event or not. Unlike the ‘existential’ problems, which

directly influence that political group, speaking out about the distant crisis is not politically constituted as a requirement for that political group. On the one hand, a humanitarian crisis, whether it is an armed conflict or a natural disaster, which takes place in a neighboring country surely necessitates more political action and discourse within that country as this humanitarian crisis has results for their country as well, such as asylum seekers or instability in the region. Therefore, it is likely that the political groups in that country including the state officials constitute their own discourse on the humanitarian crisis. In other words, it is more likely that these close crisis will be constituted as an event by the political groups, whose impression is given mostly by “the thing” itself.

On the other hand, during a distant humanitarian crisis, these existential threats do not exist and it is up to that political group to speak up or remain silent. That is to say, “the thing” itself, in terms of Derrida's conceptualization, requires the impression and interpretation more so that it can be constituted as an event. This impression and interpretation can be given to “the thing” itself through published news in the media, through discourses of the political groups or through campaigns.

The first option for a political group, which is to overlook that distant humanitarian crisis and constituting “the thing” as an event, prevents that crisis to be a part of the political debate in that country. In other words, that humanitarian crisis does not become an issue over which the several political groups struggle to become the hegemonic discourse. This overlooking is also valuable in terms of understanding the way in which that political group constitutes a *self*. On the other hand, if that political group has chosen to raise its position regarding that distant humanitarian crisis, then this disaster (as constituted as an event) becomes an issue

over which different political groups are engaged in a struggle to assume the hegemonic discourse. The overall aim of this hegemonic struggle is to fill the void of meaning following the acceptance of such a distant humanitarian crisis as a subject of political discussion.

As the quantitative analysis in the following section shows, JDP policy-makers and MFA officials have constituted the Pakistan and Indonesia natural disasters as an event with the impression and interpretation they attached to “the thing” itself, while the Haiti earthquake was not constructed as an event in discourses of JDP politicians and MFA officials. Accordingly, JDP policy-makers and MFA officials have brought the Pakistan and Indonesia cases into political debate. Since then, several political groups including JDP engaged in a hegemonic struggle to become the hegemonic discourse over these natural disasters. However, this was not the case in the Haiti Earthquake, as it was almost overlooked in broader political debate.

Table 3 shows the number of texts and speeches by JDP politicians and MFA officials in the two months period following the date of disasters. In the 4 identified sources, the distribution of texts among the disasters is significant. While there were a total of identified 36 texts and speeches for the Southeast Asia Tsunami which occurred on 26th December 2004, this number has been 21 for the Pakistan Earthquake which happened on 8th October 2005, and only 5 for Haiti Earthquake which happened on 12th January 2010.

These numbers are not in a parallel line with the number of deaths and displaced people in each disaster. As seen in the Table 2, the Haiti Earthquake was the deadliest and most destructive one among the three with a total of 316,000

Table 3: The Distribution of the Texts for Each Disaster

	Number of Related Texts
2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami	36
2005 Pakistan Earthquake	21
2010 Haiti Earthquake	5

deaths, 300,000 injured people and 1 million displaced people.¹ In the Southeast Asia Tsunami, there were a total of 225,000-275,000 deaths, 500,000 injured people and 1,7 millions of displaced people.² These numbers were 73,000 deaths, 150,000 injured people and 2,5 millions of displaced people for the Pakistan Earthquake.³

Table 4: The Numbers of Deaths, Injured and Displaced People in each Disaster

	Deaths	Injured	Displaced
2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami	225000-275000	500000	1,7 millions
2005 Pakistan Earthquake	73000	150000	2,5 millions
2010 Haiti Earthquake	316000	300000	1 million

In addition to the comparison among these natural disasters in terms of the level of destruction, economic strength of related countries also suggests that Haiti was the one that needed the humanitarian aid most. According to *CIA Factbook*,

-
- 1 Although it is possible to find different numbers in different sources, these numbers are taken from the reports and speeches by Haitian government. For the total number of deaths calculated in 2011 please see <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/story/2011/01/12/haiti-anniversary-memorials.html> and for the number of injured and displaced people please see <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8511997.stm>
 - 2 For the death toll provided by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration please see http://docs.lib.noaa.gov/noaa_documents/NOAA_related_docs/death_toll_natural_disasters.pdf, for the number of injured people please see http://www.searo.who.int/LinkFiles/Water_Sanitation_and_Health_1_Tsunami_The_Initial_Impact.pdf and for the number of displaced people please see <http://www.gwu.edu/~sigur/assets/docs/scap/SCAP23-TsunamiFINAL.pdf>
 - 3 For the death toll, and numbers of injured and displaced people please see http://www.who.int/hac/crises/international/pakistan_earthquake/en/

Haiti has the worst economic conditions to recover from the destructive effects of the earthquake as the *GDP per capita* is 1,300 USD and is 205th in the world with a 80% of its people are living below the poverty line⁴. However, Pakistan and Indonesia have better economic conditions to recover from the destructive effects of the disasters, holding GDPs of 2,800 USD (174th in the world)⁵ and 4,700 USD (156th in the world)⁶ respectively. At the same time, 22,3 % of the population in Pakistan and 13,3 % of the population in Indonesia are living below the poverty line.

In short, the destructiveness of the disasters and the economic indicators for each country show that Haiti was the most affected country in comparison with the others, hence facing a more difficult situation to recover in the post-disaster period. However, a quantitative analysis of official Turkish foreign policy discourse regarding these three natural disasters shows earthquake in Pakistan and tsunami in Indonesia found more space in the speeches of the JDP politicians and MFA officials, rather than the earthquake in Haiti.

The fact that JDP policy-makers and MFA officials have produced more speeches and texts for the earthquake in Pakistan and tsunami in Indonesia than the earthquake in Haiti provides insights to how these officials' speeches constituted the Pakistan and Indonesian disasters as an event, which should be included in the political debates in Turkey.

In a similar manner with the distribution of the related texts by the JDP officials and MFA within the 2 months following each disaster, the distribution of

4 Please see <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ha.html>

5 Please see <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html>

6 Please see <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html>

those texts among the four sources identified and among the speakers who produced those texts are also in line with the above-mentioned argument. Table 5 shows the distribution of those texts among the four sources identified. As Table 5 shows, for the Southeast Asia Tsunami in 2004 and for Pakistan Earthquake in 2005, texts and speeches in each source can be found in all of the four sources, namely in the official website of JDP, JDP Group Meetings, General Assembly of Parliament and the official website of MFA. On the other hand, all of the five texts related to the Haiti earthquake in 2010 are from the official website of MFA.

Firstly, the official website of JDP is a source where especially the visits of JDP officials and Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's visits to Pakistan and Indonesia can be found. This source is followed by each and every media in Turkey, hence having a capacity to address millions of people in Turkey through published news in the website. Additionally, this website is the official voice of JDP which received the support of almost half of the voters in Turkey in the last elections.

Secondly, Prime Minister Erdoğan speaks in his party's group meetings each week and these speeches are broadcasted in national TV channels live and watched by millions of people in Turkey. As Yıldırım *et al.*(2007) argue, “due to his political, anthropological, and charismatic identity, Erdoğan has become an attractive political personality for at least a large part of Turkish society and therefore mobilized a great deal of political support” (13). Considering the influential and charismatic leadership of Erdoğan, these speeches have a strong effect on shaping the ideas and identities of millions in Turkey.

Thirdly, the general assembly of Turkish Grand National Assembly has a relatively narrower access to the people in Turkey than the first two sources.

However, the power of the speeches in the general assembly originates from the fact that the general assembly is a place where different groups with different discourses come together and each of these groups tries to become the hegemonic discourse in a given subject, hence constituting the Turkish *self*.

Finally, the official website of MFA has a unique character among other sources, as there is no counterpart of MFA in the domestic level. In Turkey, the foreign policy issues, hence the discourse and the activities of the MFA, started to be a matter of political debate since the 1950s (Bilgin, 2007: 746-47). In recent years, Turkey has been experiencing a “return of the political” (Aktay, 2010) in the conduct of foreign policy. The result of this uniqueness is an authority of conducting foreign policy of Turkey which is also contested by the hegemonic struggle in Turkey by other actors of politics.

Table 5: The Distribution of the Texts in the Identified Sources

	Akparti.org.tr	JDP Group Meetings	General Assembly	Mfa.gov.tr	Total
2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami	21	3	4	8	36
2005 Pakistan Earthquake	9	3	6	3	21
2010 Haiti Earthquake	0	0	0	5	5

Considering the above-mentioned characteristics of each source, Table 5 can be interpreted as follows: Southeast Asia Tsunami in 2004 and Pakistan Earthquake in 2005 have been constituted as a major event as the numbers and diversity of texts and speeches in each of four sources show. On the other hand, the Haiti Earthquake

in 2010 was only limited with 5 texts in the official website of the MFA. Therefore, discourses by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on Pakistan and Indonesia cases had a broader access to the public with a stronger influence of constituting a Pakistan and Indonesia cases as important events, in comparison with the Haiti Earthquake.

A closer look into the speakers of these speeches also supports this argument since it is possible to identify texts and speeches for Southeast Asia and Pakistan disasters by different speakers with different titles such as Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs, other ministers, members of Parliament, MFA spokesperson and MFA bulletin. However, as Table 4 shows, this diversity of speakers cannot be found in the Haiti case, as all of 5 texts for Haiti Earthquake are from the MFA bulletins published in the official website of MFA. This comparison also suggests that the Pakistan and Indonesia cases have become parts of public discussions and political debates while the Haiti case was limited with solely an MFA interest.

Table 6: The Distribution of the Texts among the Speakers

	Prime Minister	Minister of Foreign Affairs	Other Ministers	MPs	MFA Spokes-person	MFA Bulletin	Total
2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami	23	1	2	3	3	4	36
2005 Pakistan Earthquake	10	1	2	5	1	2	21
2010 Haiti Earthquake	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

To summarize this section, the disasters in Pakistan and Indonesia were not "constructed" as irrelevant disasters, which took place in a distant and unrelated geography in the world for Turkey, but they have been constructed as events in

terms of Derrida's conceptualization. These events were constructed as if they matter for Turkey and the people, unlike Haiti. In other words, JDP policy-makers and MFA officials have chosen to include the distant humanitarian crisis in Pakistan and Indonesia to the political discussions in Turkey through their continuous speeches and texts in several sources. However, they did not include the Haiti case to these political discussions.

4.2 Constitution of a Homogenous Turkish *Self*

Once the distant natural disaster is included in the political debates Turkey, Turkey is not constituted as a heterogeneous society in these discourses. Rather it is portrayed as a homogenous society, which is different from the rest of the world. As a fundamental characteristic of foreign policy discourse and action, foreign policy draws a border between what should be included in domestic politics and what should be included in foreign policy. As against to the issues of foreign policy, all the other elements are unified as a homogenous *self*. As Campbell (1992) argues, Foreign Policy is "an integral part of the discourses of danger that serve to discipline the state" (51). That is to say, state as never finished entities need the disciplining power of Foreign Policy so that it reproduces the constitution of identity of the *self*.

As Nabers (2009) argues "empty signifiers are characterized by an indistinct or non-existent signified, that is, terms that can have different meanings and can thereby serve to unite disparate social movements" (196). "We" is an example of empty signifier as it is used to signify an indistinct or non-existent group - that is the *self*- and which may have different meanings for different groups. As Benedict

Anderson (1983) points out, any community including nations, are products of particular cultural processes and he defines the nation as “an imagined political community that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (7). Nations are not “real” but imagined communities, because none of the members of the community can know each and every member of its community, with the exception of tiny rural communities. On the contrary, he/she can only know a small number of them and should imagine the rest of the community. Nations are also limited communities because in order to construct the *self* image inside, an *other* image should be constructed outside the borders. Foreign Policy discourse and action have a significant role in this imagining process as it asserts a homogenous inner group as against to the rest of the world.

In line with the role of Foreign Policy in the imagining process of a *self*, the Southeast Asia Tsunami Case in 2004, Pakistan Earthquake Case in 2005 and Haiti Earthquake Case in 2010 indicate the continuous use of we/us phrases in the discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials. For the 2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami case, a total of 49 uses of we/us phrases have been identified within 35 texts and speeches produced by the JDP policy-makers and MFA officials. These numbers are 34 uses of we/us phrases in 21 texts and speeches for the Pakistan case, and 6 uses for Haiti case in a total of 5 texts and speeches. Occurrences of we/us phrases in each and every speech and text created for these three distant natural disasters are of particular importance in the analysis. As it is argued in linguistic studies, any noun both creates a difference and asserts a universe of indifference. In other words, while a noun distinguishes what it claims to define from every other noun, it also asserts a homogenous existence among the signified object, situations or people denying the differences among them. Therefore, uses of words and

phrases such as “people,” “nation,” “we,” “us” in Foreign Policy discourse "allow diverse groups in a society to affiliate and identify with each other" (Nabers, 2009: 202) while drawing a boundary with the external world.

It is possible to identify different imaginations of *self* in the discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on these three distant natural disasters. In order to find out these different imaginations of *self*, difference references made by the use of we/us phrases should be analyzed. For the 2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami case, identified usages of we/us phrases are as following: “we” as Turkey (12 times), “we” as Turkish people (14 times), “we” as Turkish nation (8 times), “we” as Turkish citizens (3 times), “we” as government (6 times), “we” as party (4 times), “we” as the Muslim world (1 time), “we” as Turkey and Indonesia (1 time). For 2005 Pakistan Earthquake case, the references of we/us phrases are as following: “we” as Turkey (8 times), “we” as Turkish people (5 times), “we” as Turkish nation (20 times), and “we” as Muslim world. Finally, for the 2010 Haiti Earthquake Case, these references are as follows: “we” as Turkish people (3 times), “we” as Turkey (2 times) and “we” as our government (1 time).

Table 7: References Made by We/Us Phrases in the Texts

	Turkey	Turkish people	Turkish nation	Turkish citizens	Govern-ment	Party	Muslim world
2004 Indonesia	12	14	8	3	6	4	1
2005 Pakistan	8	5	20	1	0	0	1
2010 Haiti	2	3	0	0	1	0	0
Total	22	22	28	4	7	4	2

These phrases signify the *self* through a positive way as they positively link the *self* with a group which has its own political constitution in the minds of people and which has been constituted throughout history. Each different usage of “we” in

the discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on the Pakistan earthquake as stated above, shows a different way of imagining the inner group and the community, that is the *self*. While the first 4 references, namely Turkey, Turkish people, Turkish nation and Turkish citizens form the majority with a total number of 76 out of 90, there are also references such as government and party which assert a *self* within Turkey different from the other political groups who have been included in the hegemonic struggle in these three cases. On the other hand, unlike the initial hypothesis of this study suggests, references made to the Muslim world are only limited with 2 speeches. In these references made to the Muslim world, a *self*, which covers the Muslim populated countries, is constituted while the Turkish *self* is also constructed as a part of this broader Muslim world.

In short, among all the references made by we/us phrases, the dominance of references made to Turkey, Turkish people, Turkish nation and Turkish citizens indicate the production and reproduction of Turkish *self* through the discourses by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on these three cases. That is to say, the major imagined community in these speeches and texts is the Turkish *self*, while there are other secondary imagined communities such as the government, party and the Muslim world.

4.3 Signifying the Turkish *Self*

In addition to this imagination of Turkey and Turkish people as a homogenous group, which differs from the rest of the world, it is also important to understand the way in which this homogenous group is imagined. In order to understand this imagination, signifiers used by JDP policy-makers and MFA

officials to signify the Turkish *self* should be also identified. These signifiers can be categorized as the ones, which positively link the Turkish *self* with an attribution, and the ones which negatively differentiate it from an “other” group.

4.3.1 Linking the Turkish Self

In this section, four signifiers, which signify the Turkish *self* in the discourse by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on distant natural disasters, are presented. These signifiers are the ones that signify the Turkish *self* through remembering the past disasters, the ones signifying through remembering the Ottoman legacy, the ones that imagine a Turkish *self* via “our brothers and friends” and the ones which imagine a mighty and powerful Turkish *self*. These linking signifiers show how the homogenous Turkish *self* has been constructed inside through various speeches and texts.

4.3.1.1 Remembering Past Disasters

In the 2004 Southeast Asia Tsunami Case, among the signifiers, which signify the Turkish *self*, references made to history and traditions are significant. On the one hand, the dominant signifier in the speeches and texts produced by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials was the emphasis on Turkey's past experiences about natural disasters. The majority of the references are made to the 1999 earthquake in Turkey, which killed more than 17.000 people. As this earthquake showed its destructiveness in the most crowded and most developed city of Turkey, İstanbul, this disaster has influenced the Turkish people deeply. For example, in his address to the nation on 26th of January 2005, Prime Minister Recep Tayyip

Erdoğan also referred to the disaster in the Southeast Asia and called the Turkish citizens to participate in the humanitarian aid campaign reminding that the Turkish nation is a “nation who experienced similar pains in the past and who knows best how these disasters can hurt societies. We shall show the richness in our hearts and help to this region suffering from great difficulties” (Erdoğan, 2005d). In the Indonesian case, it is possible to identify similar references to the past natural disasters experienced by the Turkish people for a total of 10 times. The continuous repetition of references to the past disasters signifies a Turkish *self* which should help the disaster victims.

4.3.1.2 Remembering the Ottoman Legacy

There are other signifiers that signify the Turkish *self* with a reference from history such as being members of civilization of charity (Erdoğan, 2005b) and the strong historical ties with Indonesia since the 16th century (Erdoğan, 2005f). In his visit to Indonesia, Prime Minister Erdoğan said “Our responsibility is as big as our sorrow. We are here to share your pain and find a solution. This is an expression of our friendship lasting back to the 16th century” (Erdoğan, 2005f). These are direct references to the pre-Republican period of Anatolia when the Seljuks and the Ottomans were ruling the same geography. Charity organizations used to be important actors of the social life in Seljuks and Ottomans with responsibility to fight against poverty and social injustices (Barnes, 1986).

In order to understand the significance of these references, the foreign policy of Turkey during the JDP governments which receives its power from the Ottoman past and traditions should be discussed in brief. The popular book by Ahmet

Davutoğlu (2001), *Strategic Depth* is a result of the will to remember and utilize this Ottoman legacy in foreign policy, which stresses the link among Turkish foreign policy, Turkish society and Muslim/Ottoman identity.

In line with the foreign policy of Turkey during the JDP governments introduced by Davutoğlu, these references signifying the Turkish *self* reproduce the Ottoman-Islam identity of Turkey. Prime Minister Erdoğan's words in JDP group meeting on the 23rd of February 2005 exemplify this reproduction: “We feel this feeling in any geography from Southeast Asia to Balkans. Wherever we go, each nation and each country proves that we are inheritors of such a great civilization” (Erdoğan, 2005g). In short, these references to the Seljuk and Ottoman civilization signify the Turkish *self* linking it with Ottoman identity.

There are also Islamic references used to signify the Turkish *self*, other than the ones originating from the Turkish-Islam civilizations. For example, Prime Minister Erdoğan used the words “as a nation who loves human because of its creator Allah” (Erdoğan, 2005a) to signify the Turkish *self* in order to mobilize the Turkish people to participate in aid campaigns. These words are written in a verse of Koran with a direct reference to Islam. Additionally, in his speech on the 21st of January 2005, Erdoğan emphasized that the aid campaign for Indonesia is not only a humanitarian responsibility but it is also a responsibility of Islam (Erdoğan, 2005c). Erdoğan also declared that the head of the Department of Religions Affairs would accompany him during his visit to Indonesia since the spiritual aspects of this disaster were also important (Erdoğan, 2005e). In short, the Islamic references made by Prime Minister Erdoğan to signify the Turkish *self* and to justify why to care for

the Southeast Asia Tsunami disaster contribute to the imagining process of an Ottoman-Islam oriented *Self*.

4.3.1.3 Imagining a Turkish *Self* via “Our Friends and Brothers”

Looking at the Pakistan case in 2005, there is a smaller number of signifiers used to signify the Turkish *self*. In comparison with a total of 18 signifiers used to signify in the Indonesian case in a total of 35 texts, the number of signifiers in Pakistan case is only 9 in a total of 21 identified texts. These signifiers are the same ones with the Pakistan case such as “a country/nation/people who experienced the same pain in the past,” “as the first to send aid to the region” and “as a country who had helped to Tsunami victims in Indonesia”

What is striking in Pakistan case is the signifiers used to signify the Pakistani *other*. While there is a total of 15 signifiers to signify the Indonesian *other* in 2004 tsunami case in a total of 35 texts, there are 46 signifiers used to signify the Pakistani *other* in a total of 21 texts. More importantly, among these 46 signifiers, 39 of them signify the Pakistan as a “friend and brother” country. On the other hand, it is only possible to identify 4 signifiers, which signify the Indonesian *other* as “friend and brother.” Therefore, it can be argued that, JDP policy-makers and MFA officials' discourse in the Indonesian case has constituted a Turkish *self* through a more direct manner and through directly signifying Turkish *self* with several attributes and characteristics; while in the Pakistani case, their discourse has constituted a Turkish *self* via linking to “friend and brother” Pakistan people/nation/country. A quick look into the history of Turkish and Pakistani relations shows the continuous use of the “friend and brother country” discourse for

decades. It is also possible to observe this use in JDP's discourse. In his speech on 21st October 2005, Prime Minister Erdoğan was stressing this friendship and brotherhood between Turkey and Pakistan as "a mutual friendship and brotherhood relation with each other whose foundations originate from shared historical, cultural and spiritual values" (Erdoğan, 2005i). Although it is possible to identify the uses of "friend" and "brother" in Indonesian and Haitian cases, these uses have less weight in the overall discourses both quantitatively and qualitatively. Unlike the Pakistan case, these uses of the term "brother" are not reciprocal between Turkey and Indonesia/Haiti. Rather, it is a one-sided brotherhood, which does not signal the mutual relations and support between countries. In other words, while the relationship with Pakistan is portrayed as a mutual brotherhood, the relations with Indonesia and Haiti include a hierarchy, which was portrayed as an older brother-younger brother relationship.

4.3.1.4 Imagining a Mighty and Powerful Turkish *Self*

As well as the uses of friendship and brotherhood discourses in the Indonesian and Haitian cases, constitution of a powerful Turkish *self* is also present in the "Turkey as among the first to send aid to the disaster region" signifier used to signify the Turkish *self*. For instance, as Erdoğan said, first aid convoys that reached the Muzafferabad city of the Pakistan region was by Turkish people and Turkish Red Crescent (Erdoğan, 2005h). As well as the repetition of this signifier, declaration of the amount of the aid sent to the regions by mostly the Prime Minister Erdoğan and MFA bulletins is also influential in the imagining process of a mighty and strong Turkish *self*.

4.3.2 Differentiating the Turkish *Self*

Although the majority of the signifiers used to signify the Turkish *self* in JDP policy-makers and MFA officials' discourse link the Turkish *self* with a positive characteristic, historical fact or another group, there are also signifiers which differentiate the Turkish *self* from an *other*. These differentiating signifiers show how the borderline between the homogenous Turkish *self* and the *other* has been drawn. In this section, the Turkish *self* vs. the Christian *other* and the Turkish *self* vs. the Argentinian/ Brazilian/Mexican *other* during 2001 crisis are analyzed.

4.3.2.1 The Turkish *Self* vs. Christian Aid Teams

Christian aid teams in Indonesia are the first group portrayed as the *other* as against the Turkish *self*. In his speech on 21st of January 2005, Prime Minister Erdoğan emphasized this point, which made him worry:

We really found it incorrect to approach the disaster region with an aim of converting the Muslims into Christianity. It is not proper to work for this end in such a hard time. We will not have an aim of converting a Christian into a Muslim when we go there. Our primary goal is to find ways to save those people from this difficult situation. In an oxygen tent, this should be the only thing you should do. We will do this (Erdoğan, 2005c).

Erdoğan's words are reproductions of the long-lasting image of Western imperialism and missionary activities. As Jenny White (2010: 217) argues, the missionary image in Turkey is an important factor in the formation of national identity. As well as reproducing this threat, Erdoğan's words also links the Christians with the attributes of utilitarianism, being inhumane and not being

charitable while differentiating the Turkish *self* all of these negative connotations and it is constituted as a humane and charitable *self*.

4.3.2.2 The Turkish *Self* vs. the Argentinian/ Brazilian/Mexican *Other*

The second group which is portrayed as the *other* in the formation of a Turkish *self* was the group consisting of Argentinians, Brazilians and Mexicans. During his visit to Pakistan, Erdoğan told the story of a poor child from Turkey who was willing to participate in the aid campaign and continued his words:

Aren't these the values which make us strong? If we did not have these values, we would have experienced the same scenes with the ones took place in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico during the 2001 financial crisis. The values of solidarity and helping each other have brought us to this level. Now, it is our turn. We have to do what has to be done, we have to take the steps that have to be taken (Erdoğan, 2005i).

Directly giving reference to the pillage images from Latin America during the 2001 economic crisis, Erdoğan's words establish a productive duality between the Latin American *other* and Turkish *self*. So-called immoral traditions and activities of the Western and Christian world have been repeatedly portrayed as a way of promoting the Turkish and Muslim culture in the last decade by JDP. JDP has always established this co-existence of conservatism and liberalism through linking conservatism with rejecting the moral values of the West and linking the liberalism with the Western accumulation of science and economy. As Yıldız Atasoy (2009: 106) also argues, JDP has increased its power through combining the Islamic morality with the Western modernity. In other words, representation of the Western and Christian culture in terms of its moral values and ethics has become

one of the most influential ways of reproducing the identity of JDP itself and the Turkish *self*.

In this case of Latin American *other* vs. Turkish *self*, it is also possible to observe the constitution of an *other* who lacks the moral values to prevent from plundering the markets, who do not have the values of solidarity and helping each other which would help them to survive in hard times. Erdoğan's words therefore differentiate the Turkish *self* from this 'immoral' *other*, attributing the antonyms of the negative attributions to the Turkish *self*.

4.4 Conclusion

To sum up this section, discourse on the Southeast Asia Tsunami in 2004 and Pakistan Earthquake in 2005 can be characterized as a continuous process of re-imagining "Turkey" and its new active foreign policy under the rule of JDP. In short, this chapter showed that a post-structuralist analysis of the foreign policy discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on the distant natural disasters shows a number of conclusions about the way in which the Turkish *self* has been constituted through these discourses. The initial conclusion is that while the Pakistan and Indonesia cases were constituted as events, which should be included in the political debate, the Haiti earthquake could not find such an interest and constitution in the discourses of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials. The second conclusion is that the foreign policy discourse of JDP and MFA on these natural disasters have constituted a homogenous Turkish *self* which is supposed to share the same characteristics internally and which is different than the rest of the world. Thirdly, this homogenous Turkish *self* has been signified with several signifiers in

JDP ad MFA officials' discourse as it is linked with the past disasters, Ottoman legacy, "friend and brother" communities and being strong. On the other hand, the Turkish *self* is differentiated from different *others* such as the Christian aid teams who are supposed to conduct missionary activities in Indonesia and the Latin Americans who do not have the necessary moral values for solidarity and helping each other.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The central objective of this study is to understand the performative link between foreign policy discourse and identity. Challenging the mainstream ways of conducting foreign policy analysis, this study has utilized the post-structuralist approach to foreign policy analysis in order to understand this performative link. As discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, post-structuralism presents a radical way of conducting the foreign policy analysis. In order to understand this performative link, this study has used the case of foreign policy discourse of the Justice and Development Party (JDP) on three distant natural disasters that took place since 2002.

The reason behind choosing this case study was to show the identity-constitutive power of foreign policy discourse even in distant humanitarian crisis. Although these humanitarian crises took place in geographically distant areas, this

case study has shown that foreign policy discourse on these types of ‘non-existential’ crisis has also a constitutive role in the re-imagining process of a *self*.

As it is explained in Chapter 3, research in this study has been designed under four components. Firstly, this study aims to analyze the constitution of only one *self*, which is the Turkish *self*. Secondly, in order to understand the constitution of the Turkish *self*, this study analyzed the official foreign policy discourse of Turkey, not including the discourses of other political groups. Thirdly, this study has analyzed the official foreign policy discourse only in the period when JDP has been the ruling party since 2002. Finally, this study has limited events to be analyzed with three distant natural disasters which are related by time and issue. These events are the tsunami in Indonesia in 2004, earthquake in Pakistan in 2005 and earthquake in Haiti in 2010.

Through using this research design, a critical discourse analysis of the texts and speeches by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on the three identified distant natural disasters is provided in Chapter 4. There are three main findings as a result of this critical discourse analysis. The first main finding is that the 2004 Indonesian Tsunami and 2005 Pakistan Earthquake have been constituted as important events by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials, while the 2010 Haiti Earthquake was overlooked by these officials. Their constitution as important events has included Pakistan and Indonesia disasters to the political debates in Turkey, on which different political groups including JDP’s struggle to become the hegemonic discourse. Therefore, this finding supports the first preliminary answer of this study which proposed that distant natural disasters are also important in the foreign policy discourse of JDP with their identity-constitutive power.

The second finding of this study is that the discourse by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on these three distant natural disasters has helped to constitute a homogenous Turkish *self*. This homogenous Turkish *self* has been imagined as a community in terms of Benedict Anderson's conceptualization of nation as an “imagined community.” In accordance with the second preliminary answer of this study, continuous usage of the phrases “we/us” in reference to Turkey/Turkish nation/Turkish people/Turkish citizens shows the re-imagining of a homogenous Turkish *self* that is unified internally and differs from the rest of the world.

The third finding of this study challenges the third preliminary answer stated in Chapter 1, which argues that the Turkish homogenous *self* has been constituted mostly through Islamic signifiers in the discourses of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials on the distant natural disasters. It is still possible to identify Islamic elements which signify the Turkish *self* in discourse of JDP policy-makers and MFA officials. However, the majority of the signifiers signifying the Turkish *self* is about the past disasters experienced by Turkey. There is also a variety of other signifiers such as the ones imagining an Ottoman-Muslim *self*, the ones which refer to the brotherhood and friendship with Indonesia, Pakistan and Haiti at different levels and the ones which imagine a mighty and powerful Turkey in the international arena. As well as these positive identities which link the Turkish *self* with a characteristic, attribute or another group, negative identities which differentiate the Turkish *self* from another group are also identified. These *others* were the Christian aid teams in Indonesia who were portrayed as missionaries and Latin Americans who were portrayed as not having the moral values owned by the Turkish *self*.

These three findings are important in order to show the way in which identity is constituted through the foreign policy discourse about distant natural disasters. However, it should be noted that these are not the features of an objective Turkish *self* waiting out there to be discovered. Rather, these findings show the way in which JDP policy-makers and MFA officials' discourse on distant natural disasters has helped to constitute a Turkish *self*. That is to say, identity is never full or complete and it is always in a process of being. Within this process, each political group in a society has its way of imagining the *self* and they are in a continuous process of struggle to become the hegemonic discourse on a certain issue. Therefore, this study should be evaluated as only one side of this hegemonic struggle on the distant natural disasters, which is the official discourse of Turkey.

In accordance with this broader hegemonic struggle, there are several possible areas for further research on the issue of identity constitution through foreign policy discourse on distant natural disasters. Considering the research design of this study, a further research on this issue may choose to develop this study in three directions. Firstly, instead of analyzing only one *self*, multiple selves can be analyzed in a mutually discursive manner. Secondly, as well as the official discourse, discourses by other political groups can be included in the analysis such as wider political debate, cultural representations and marginal political discourses. Thirdly, instead of focusing on one moment in history, several moments in history can be compared or historical development of discourse can be traced back. These three ways of broadening this study will provide a better representation of the hegemonic struggle in society which is among different political groups and which has been constituted throughout history.

Although the scope of this study does not allow a more comprehensive analysis of this hegemonic struggle around the issue of distant natural disasters, the analysis of the official discourse of Turkey is still important to understand the way in which government officials re-imagine the Turkish *self*. This study provides an insight to both foreign policy of Turkey and how discourses by JDP policy-makers and MFA officials helped to constitute the Turkish *self*. This insight is significant for further research on these areas, showing the co-constitutive link between foreign policy and identity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aktay, Yasin. 2010. "Politics at Home, Politics in the World: The Return of the Political in Turkish Foreign Policy," *Mediterranean Quarterly*. 21(1): 61-75.
- Alexander, L. George. 1993. *Bridging the gap: theory and practice in foreign policy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Allison, Graham, and Phillip Zelikow. 1999. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (2nd ed.). London: Pearson.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Ashley, R.K., and R.B.J. Walker. 1990. "Reading Dissidence/Writing the discipline: Crisis and the question of sovereignty in international studies," *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 367-416.
- Ashley, Richard. 1984. "The Poverty of Neorealism," *International Organization*, 38 (2): 225-286.
- Ashley, Richard. 1988. "Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique," *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 17 (2): 227-262.
- Atasoy, Yıldız. 2009. *Islam's Marriage with Neo-Liberalism: State Transformation in Turkey*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aydın, Mustafa. 2004. *Turkish Foreign Policy: Framework and Analysis*. Ankara: Center for Strategic Research.
- Barnes, John Robert. 1987. *An Introduction to Religious Foundations in the Ottoman Empire*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Bilgin, Pınar. 2007. "'Only Strong States Can Survive in Turkey's Geography': The Uses of 'Geopolitical Truths' in Turkey," *Political Geography*. 26(7): 740-747.

- Bleiker, Roland. 2005. *Divided Korea: Toward a Culture of Reconciliation*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Booth, Ken. 2007. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, Anthony. 2008. *Fear of Security: Australia's invasion anxiety*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, John Wear. 1972. *World Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler, Judith. 2000. "Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism." In Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek, eds., *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality. Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*. London: Verso, 11-43.
- Campbell, David. 1992. *Writing Security*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Campbell, David. 2007. "Poststructuralism." In Dunne, T., Kurki, M. and Smith, S, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 203-228.
- Çelik, Yasemin. 1999. *Contemporary Turkish Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger.
- Criss, Nur Bilge. 2010. "Parameters of Turkish Foreign Policy under the AKP Governments," *UNISCI Discussion Papers*, 23: 9-22.
- Dalby, Simon. 1990. *Creating the Second Cold War: The Discourse of Politics*. London: Pinter.
- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. 2001. *Strategic Depth*. İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.
- Der Derian, James. 1989. "The Boundaries of Knowledge and Power in International Relations." In James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, Eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*. Toronto: Lexington Books, 3-10.
- Der Derian, James. 2002. "9/11: Before, After and in Between." In Craig J. Calhoun, Paul Price and Ashley Timmer, Eds. *Understanding September 11*, New York: New Press, 177-190.
- Deringil, Selim. 2007. *Denge Oyunu: İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nda Türkiye'nin Dış Politikası* (The Game of Balance: Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War). İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2003. "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicides—A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida," In Giovanna Borradori, Ed., *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 85–136.

- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 1993. "Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines," *International Studies Quarterly*. 37(3): 297-320.
- Doty, Roxanne Lynn. 1998. "Immigration and the politics of security," *Security Studies*. 8(2&3): 71-93.
- Doyle, Michael W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 12(3): 205–235.
- Edkins, Jenny. 2002. "Forget Trauma? Responses to September 11," *International Relations*. 16(2): 243-256.
- Epstein, B. 1995. "Why poststructuralism is a dead end for progressive thought," *Socialist Review*. 5(2): 83-119.
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005a. "AK Parti Genel Başkanı ve Başbakan Erdoğan'ın TBMM Grup Toplantısı'nda Yaptığı Konuşmanın Tam Metni (The Full Text of the Speech Given by Head of JDP and Prime Minister Erdoğan in the JDP Group Meeting)," *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from <<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/ak-parti-genel-baskani-ve-basbakan-erdoganin-tbmm-grup-toplantisinda-yaptigi/2809>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005b. "Başbakan Erdoğan: Bazı Dersler Alınmamış (There are Lessons not Learned)," *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from <<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/sakaryadaki-deprem-konutlarinin-anahtar-teslim-toreni-basbakan-erdogan-bazi/3270>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005c. "Başbakan Erdoğan: Türkiye'nin Güneydoğu Asya'daki Felakete Ne Derece Duyarlı Olabildiği Tartışma Konusudur (The Level of the Humanitarian Aid of Turkey to the Disaster in Southeast Asia is Debatable)," *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from <<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/ak-parti-genel-baskani-ve-basbakan-erdogan-turkiyenin-guney-asyadaki-felake/2654>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005d. "Başbakan Erdoğan'ın Ulus Sesleniş Konuşması (Prime Minister Erdoğan's Address to the Nation)," *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from <<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/basbakan-erdoganin-ulusa-seslenis-konusmasinin-tam-metni/2631>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005e. "Başbakan Erdoğan, Tsunami Felaketinin Yaşandığı Güney Asya'ya Gitti (Prime Minister Erdoğan has Gone to Southeast Asia, Cictim of Tsunami Disaster)," *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from <<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/basbakan-erdogan-tsunami-felaketinin-yasandigi-guney-asyaya-gitti-biz-turki/2929>>

- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005f. “Başbakan Erdoğan, Endonezya Cumhurbaşkanı Yudohoyono ile görüştü (Prime Minister Erdoğan, had a Meeting with Indonesian President Yudohoyono),” *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from
<<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/basbakan-erdogan-endonezya-cumhurbaskani-yudhoyono-ile-gorustu-derdinizi-ac/2615>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005g. “Başbakan Erdoğan'ın Grup Toplantısı'nda Yaptığı Konuşma (Prime Minister Erdoğan's Speech in the Group Meeting),” *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from
<<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/basbakan-erdogan-endonezya-cumhurbaskani-yudhoyono-ile-gorustu-derdinizi-ac/2615>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005h. “Başbakan Erdoğan'ın Grup Toplantısı'nda Yaptığı Konuşma (Prime Minister Erdoğan's Speech in the Group Meeting),” *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from
<<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/ak-parti-genel-baskani-ve-basbakan-erdoganin-tbmm-grup-toplantisinda-yaptigi/5716>>
- Erdoğan, Recep Tayyip. 2005i. “Pakistan için Yapılması Gerekenleri Yapmamız Atılması Gereken Adımları Atmamız Gerekıyor (We have to Take the Necessary Steps for Pakistan),” *Official website of JDP*. Accessed on 31st August, 2012 from
<<http://www.akparti.org.tr/site/haberler/basbakan-erdogan-pakistan-icin-yapilmasi-gerekenleri-yapmamiz-atilmasi-gere/5698>>
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fierke, K. M. 2001. "Critical Methodology and Constructivism." In Karin M. Fierke and Knud Erik Jørgensen, Eds., *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*. New York: M. E. Sharpe Publishing, 115-135.
- Foucault, M. 1991. “Governmentality.” In Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, Eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 87–104.
- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin Books.
- George, Jim. 1994. *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re) Introduction to International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Gerner, Deborah J. 1995. “The Evolution of the Study of Foreign Policy,” In Laura Neack, Jeanne A. K. Hey, and Patrick J. Haney, and Englewood Cliffs, Eds., *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*. N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 17-32.

- Goldstein, Judith, and Robert Keohane. 1993. *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Gorton, W. A. 2006. *Karl Popper and the Social Sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hale, William. 2000. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Hamati-Ataya, Inanna. 2012. "Beyond (Post)Positivism: The Missed Promises of Systemic Pragmatism," *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(2): 1-15.
- Hansen, Lene. 2006. *Security as practice: discourse analysis and the Bosnian war*. New York: Routledge.
- Hermann, Charles F. 1978. "Foreign Policy Behavior: That Which Is to Be Explained." In Maurice A. East, Stephen A. Salmore, and Charles F. Hermann, Eds., *Why Nations Act*, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hermann, Charles F., and Paul F. Lambert. 1984. "Foreign Policy Bibliography," *Policy Studies Review*, 3(2): 352-363.
- Hollis, Martin, and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holsti, Ole R., and James N. Rosenau. 1990. "The Structure of Foreign Policy Attitudes Among American Leaders," *Journal of Politics*, 52(1990): 94-125.
- Jackson, Patrick. 2008. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jackson, Robert, and Georg Sorensen. 2003. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, Struan. 1990. "Popper, Weber and the Rationalist Approach to Social Explanation," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 41(4): 559-570.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1974. *The Prison-House Of Language*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter J., Robert O. Keohane, and Steven Krasner. 1998. "International Organization and the Study of World Politics," *International Organization*, 52 (4): 645-85.
- Keohane, Robert O. 1988. "International Institutions: Two Approaches," *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4): 379-396.
- Keyman, Fuat E. 1997. *Globalization, State, Identity/ Difference Toward A Critical Social Theory of International Relations*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.

- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Klein, Bradley S. 1990. "How the West was One: Representational Politics of NATO," *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(4): 311-25.
- Koertge, N. 1972. "On Popper's Philosophy of Social Science," *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*. 1972(1): 195-207.
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 1996. *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 2000. "Identity and Hegemony: The Role of Universality in the Constitution of Political Logics." In Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek, Eds., *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, London: Verso, 44-88.
- Laclau, Ernesto. 2002. "Democracy and the Question of Power," *Constellations* 8(1): 3-14.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. 2011. "Review Article: Philosophy and International Relations," *International Affairs*. 87(5): 1219-1228.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1990. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War," *International Security*. 15(1): 5-56.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1994/95. "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*. 19(3): 5-49.
- Meehan, E.J. 1971. "The Concept Foreign Policy," In W. F. Hanrieder, Ed., *Comparative Foreign Policy*, New York: McKay, 265-294.
- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods," *European Journal of International Relations* 5(2): 225-254.
- Morgenthau, Hans. 1948. *Politics among Nations*. New York: Knopf.
- Nabers, Dirk. 2009. "Filling the Void of Meaning: Identity Construction in U.S. Foreign Policy after September 11, 2001," *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 5(2): 191-214.
- Neack Laura. 2008. *The New Foreign Policy: Power Seeking In A Globalized Era*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Osterud, Oyvind. 1996. "Antinomies of Postmodernism in International Studies," *Journal of Peace Research*. 33(4): 385-390.

- Özcan, Mesut, and Ali Resul Usul. 2010. "Understanding the 'New' Turkish Foreign Policy: Changes within Continuity" *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politiki*. 6(21): 109-133.
- Popper, Karl. 1994. *The Myth of Framework*. London: Routledge.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization*. 42(3): 427-460.
- Rainer, Baumann, Volker Rittberger, and Wolfgang Wagner. 2001. "Neorealist Foreign Policy Theory." In Volker Rittberger, ed., *German Foreign Policy Since Unification: Theories and Case Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rosenau, James. 1987. "Introduction: New Directions and Recurrent Questions in the Comparative Study of Foreign Policy," In Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley Jr., and James N. Rosenau, Eds., *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*. Boston: Routledge, 5-6.
- Roth, Michael S. 1981. "Foucault's 'History of the Present'," *History and Theory*. 20(1): 32-46.
- Rynning, S. and Guzzini, S. 2001. "Realism and Foreign Policy Analysis," *Working Papers 42*, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute.
- Sayer, Andrew. 2000. "System, Lifeworld and Gender: Associational Versus Counterfactual Thinking," *Sociology*, 34(4): 707-725.
- Schelling, Thomas. 1966. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shapiro, Michale J. 1989. "Textualizing Global Politics," In James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, Eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*, Toronto: Lexington Books, 11-22.
- Smith, Steve. 1985. *International Relations: British and American Perspectives*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Smith, Steve. 2002. "The United States and the Discipline of International Relations," *International Studies Review*. 4(2): 67-85.
- Tickner, J. Ann. .2011. "Dealing with Difference: Problems and Possibilities for Dialogue in International Relations," *Millennium*. 39(3): 607-618.
- Turner, Stephen. 2005. "The Continued Relevance of Weber's Philosophy of Social Science," *Max Weber Studies*. 7(1): 37-62.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. "Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity," In Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, Eds., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, 95-120.

- Vasquez, John A. 1998. *The Power of Power Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waever, Ole. 2002. "Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy," In Lene Hansen and Ole Waever, Eds., *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of the Nordic States*, London: Routledge.
- Walker, R.J.B. 1986. "The Territorial State and The Theme of Gulliver," *International Journal*. 39(3): 529-552.
- Walt, Stephen. 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly*. 35(2): 211-239.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1996. "International Politics is not Foreign Policy," *Security Studies*. 6(1): 54-57.
- White, Jenny. 2010. "Fear and Loathing in the Turkish National Imagination," *New Perspectives on Turkey*. 42(2010): 215-236.
- Yıldırım, Ergün, Hüsamettin İnaç, and Hayrettin Özler. 2007. "A Sociological Representation of the Justice and Development Party: Is It a Political Design or a Political Becoming?," *Turkish Studies*. 8(1): 5-24
- Zizek, Slavoj. 2007. *How to Read Lacan*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Zizek, Slavoj. 2008. *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences*. New York: Routledge.