

**International Comparative Workshop on  
'International Relations Theory: Deconstructing and Redefining International  
Relations'  
18-19 May 2001, Marmara University.**

THE TEACHING OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN TURKEY:  
REFLECTING INTERNATIONAL LEGAL HUMAN RIGHTS DEVELOPMENTS  
IN A FOREIGN POLICY

Presented by

**Dr. Fatih Karaosmanođlu**

**LLB (Ankara) LLM (Nottingham) PhD (Surrey)**

2001  
Marmara University  
İstanbul

## Introduction

The study is generally about international relations and human rights. The principle of respect for human rights is, today, one of the fundamental principles of international relations. It is typical of a new stage of development in the international society, which can largely be traced back to the Second World War. The general principle, prohibiting gross and large scale violations of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, has gradually emerged. During the cold war era, human rights was competing with the traditional principles such as the respect for the sovereign, the equality of states and the non-interference in the domestic affairs. Especially, after the adoption of the global and regional legal systems and instruments, no state currently challenges the idea that human rights must be respected everywhere in the world. The imposition of this principle on states is clear: the duty to refrain from gross violations of the rights rather than to abide by specific regulations on human rights. Such rights cover the right not to be subjected to torture, the right to a fair trial, the right to be freed from arbitrary arrest etc.

This article is concerned with the importance of legal human rights developments (Sub-section 1) for a foreign policy with a human rights objective in teaching of international relations in Turkey . It is known that there exist inescapable tension between human rights and foreign policy (Sub-section 2). It is however generally accepted that the issue of human rights is integrated with a foreign policy (Sub-section 1) despite foreign policy constraints on human rights (Sub-section 3 and 4). Nonetheless, foreign policy with a human rights objective have various aims, to say, it has the variety of the degrees of human rights integration (Sub-section 5). In this article, before making the theoretical explanations concerning the related concepts mentioned above (see Karaosmanoğlu, 2000), the recent legal human rights developments and the results of the internet survey<sup>1</sup> will be mentioned as well. The key question for the survey is: what is the percentage of having an independent course of human rights under the undergraduate curriculums in the departments of international relations of Turkish universities?

### **1. The Recent International Developments on Human Rights Law and the internet survey**

#### *Recent Legal Developments*

It is clear that the issue of international legal developments is very important for the principle of protection of human rights in international relations. Such developments should be should be reflected. For instance, there exist the recent decisions (10 October 2000) of the European Court of Human Rights concerning Akkoç and Satık cases<sup>2</sup>.

In *Akkoç case*, the Court held that Turkey was to pay 89 000 sterling (UK) for the violation of Article 2 (right to life) of the European Convention Of Human Rights (ECHR) on account of the failure of authorities to take preventive operational measures to protect individuals whose life are at risk from the criminal acts of another individual.

In *Satık case*, it was held that Turkey was to pay 55 000 sterling (UK) for the violation of Article 3 (prohibition of torture) of the ECHR in the absence of a plausible

---

<sup>1</sup> This internet survey was carried out on 14-15 May 2001. The names of the web sites of the Turkish universities have been taken from this source: (the others' do not appear).

[http://dir.yahoo.com/education/higher\\_education/colleges\\_and\\_universities/by\\_region/countries/turkey/complete\\_list/](http://dir.yahoo.com/education/higher_education/colleges_and_universities/by_region/countries/turkey/complete_list/)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.echr.coe.int/>

explanation where individuals are injured during the police custody and the detainment in a prison. Also, it is considered as a reason that there should exist some form of independent monitoring of the action of the security forces to ensure accountability for the force used. Such consideration suggests legally the importance of NGOs and the independent monitoring systems.

In my view, in international relations, these legal approaches should be articulated more by those who are decision-makers, diplomats, the others in the decision making process of a foreign policy, and the other actors of international relations, despite their reluctance about human rights.

### *The internet survey*

I wonder if to what extent are international legal human rights developments as such followed by undergraduate students in the departments of international relations of Turkish universities?

The results of the internet survey show us that of 40 the Turkish universities having the faculties of Economics & Administrative or Political Sciences, 26 have the departments of international relations. Of 26 departments of international relations, 12 have an independent course of human rights under their undergraduate programmes. These figures mean that in the teaching of international relations in Turkey, the degree of having an opportunity by the undergraduate students of international relations to follow international developments on human rights law is not satisfactory. I do not think that the result would have not changed if all Turkish universities had been accessible.

## **2. The Relationship Between Foreign Policy and Human Rights**

There is inescapable tension between human rights and foreign policy. Whereas the reference to human rights includes an implication of a global society, foreign policy is concerned with the world of states. In other words, governments act for their states, not for humanity. Can a solution to such tension be found simply by dropping the issue of human rights on the basis of the irrelevance to foreign policy? The explanations made above show that this option is no longer available. Today, agents of governments and foreign ministers are also forced by international law to pay attention to what is happening on human rights in the international community. Further, respect for human rights was also adopted by the OSCE, including conformity with the UN Covenants, as well as the UDHR.

In Hoffmann's view (1983:35), it is also a moral imperative to make the promotion of human rights a major goal of their foreign policies. Those who accept national interests as the only major goal of foreign policies, might be convinced in the way that moral consideration can only be eliminated as *extra muros* when international relations are "*a hell of inexpiable hatreds*" and life-and-death situations. Additionally, it is a political imperative to make the promotion of human rights a major goal of foreign policies. As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, we live in a world in which many issues such as trade, communications, and nuclear proliferation concern transnational flow that no single government can control. In the realm of human rights, although they seem to consist mainly of national struggles between individuals (or groups) and their governments, the massive violations that occur today are likely to provoke flows of refugees seeking asylum abroad. National attempts to regulate the flow of migrant workers are likely to result in violation of human rights.

One point is that as Henkin (1978:94) says, early human rights laws served state's own political or economic purposes. This was parallel with other international law issues

because generally, international law is made to serve common or reciprocal national interest. However, today's international law of human rights serves no patent, particular interest. It is not reciprocal between states; there is no other state that is the victim or is otherwise offended when a state violates its human rights undertakings.

This also raises the universality of human rights. As Hill (1989:3) points out, although there is the assertion that universal rights exist, what these are is unclear. Universalism is an elusive and contested concept. Although there is a lack of agreement over the essential meaning of human rights, today, they play a vital part in international relations. The discussion about the definition of human rights reminds us of the primacy of human rights. Some claim that civil and political rights are basic and indisputable; they require some kind of abstinence or forbearance on the part of government. However, they are not self-generating; they need legislation, promotion, and protection. Some claim that economic and social rights are basic: they, by contrast, call for governments to provide resources of various kinds.

The idea of universal human rights meets the need for human beings to establish a moral basis for politics. In the world of relations between states, the concern must be regional, particular and immediate. Although international regime, operating under the UN, agrees on an international rights regime, it does not relate very readily with what is happening at the grass roots in the regions and, among non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The third world also challenges the claim to Universalism as the last step of a cultural imperialism, that tries to impose inappropriate western forms of thinking on the rest of human kind.

It can be argued that human rights is basically a moral. The difficulty is to go on from this position to a general notion of universal human rights. This is proved by the fact that, while there is a lack of a universal definition of human rights, violations can be recognised when these occur because of its popular imagination. As Hill (1989:7) points out, there is a common belief that "the claim that there is no universal consensus on the definition of human rights should not of itself deter us from alleviating suffering and injustice".

This moral attitude is the basis of a successful implementation. As Wright (1989:45) puts it, critics of international human rights code indeed often point to its origins in the various bill of rights and constitutions of the liberal democracies. As the moral basis of human rights, however, the fact that we are all human is the basis of entitlement. Rights themselves exist in the moral basis of our common humanity. Their implementation is made by the way of the question of politics: the moral humanitarian obligation is the fundamental one, but every state chooses independently how to respect these obligations. Whether everyone agrees that a particular phenomenon is a human right or not is one test of universality, but this is a sociological one. In fact, whether or not all cultures agree is discernible.

However, in the eyes of realists, morality and foreign policy coexist uneasily. Wright (1989) argues that if we are to take human rights seriously as moral rights then we must accept that the relevant moral community is the human community. There still remains some problems: for instance, who can claim the moral authority to judge the failings of states about human rights? foreign policy exists in an international system based on the sovereign equality, with no higher authority to hand down judgement.

Regarding the relevance of human rights to the foreign policy, the other significant point is that the growth of international human rights law suggests that human rights play a part in the decision about the legitimacy of a state, as well as other actors and

institutions in international society. The recognition of a state, or, being a sovereign is, now, not enough. The state should also, domestically, be the guarantor of basic human rights. Whilst the question of what these basic rights are may not be resolved in international law, it should not be understood that there are none (Brownlie: 1979). Here, how the real world of diplomacy is penetrated is the key question. There are two levels: standard setting and standard keeping. The latter is more problematical than the former.

Rustow (1980:19) expresses this problematic character of standard keeping by saying that, once diplomats sought the codification of human rights for some decades, two major controversies arose from that effort: firstly, the definition of human rights, and secondly, the method of their global application. As members of the international society, all states engage in the process of standard setting. As Falk (1980:65) puts it, for various reasons, governments are quite ready to endorse these standards despite the absence of a will to comply with these standards. However, unless these standards are met by these states, what are the consequences? To be able to arrive at its answer, the extent of the regard of human rights in foreign policy has been examined in the following sub-sections.

### **3. Foreign Policy Constraints on Human Rights**

If it is accepted that human rights is now part of the calculation of what is legitimate internationally, it might be expected that diplomats regard them in their policy making. The first function of diplomacy, as James (1980) puts it, is communication among states. That is, all governments have to deal with almost every other government in the world on many diverse questions. Then, it may be argued that if human rights is dealt with, it becomes an obstacle to the fulfilment of such a function. Communication between the two states suffers if a state having an unsatisfactory human rights record is socially excluded. Not just relations, but also maintaining good relations with each other becomes the prime objective of diplomacy. There is therefore the inducement to play down the bad human rights records of certain states, especially, if there are some special reasons why it is believed inadvisable to antagonise the other government concerned. In this regard, as Luard (1981:4) puts it, in some cases, other government may be considered important for strategic, commercial, reasons; it may be an important supplier of raw materials as South Africa is to all Western countries.

There is another idea that free trade should have priority over human rights considerations. Because of this idea, states have a mutual interest in trade. The mutuality of the interest would not be advanced by any opinion that an unsuccessful human rights performance ought to exclude other government from trade, or diminish its participation in it. According to the old fashioned liberal idea, trade, also, leads to peace as well as the transference of civilised values. As Vincent (1986:129) points out, in the "constructive engagement" between South Africa and the West, the long term view is admitted: "trade in the end will be good for human rights". However, in the meantime, it is unlikely that the interruption of trade will bear any human rights fruit for the usual reasons that make sanctions prone to failure. The same is true for aid.

Another connection of interest with human rights, apart from free trade, is security. This kind of national interest is most frequently played against human rights. Even where human rights has been put as an objective of foreign policy, the attention to human rights can be cancelled by extraordinary circumstances. To illustrate, as Cohen (1982:270) says, the US Foreign Assistance Act, Section 502B, gave an exception to the rule that governments that engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of

international human rights should be deprived of military aid. This is the intervention of the national interest. During the Carter administration, it gave military aid to Indonesia, Philippines, South Korea and Zaire. These states benefited either from their strategic position in the contest with the Former USSR, or their natural resources, or both. This security argument applies also to relations with adversaries as well as friends.

Attempts to undertake an active human rights policy is also argued to be contrary to the rules of diplomatic intercourse. Traditionally, each state has a full sovereignty over its own territory. The prohibition of interference in such matters is said to reduce the danger of conflict among states. This rule precludes any criticism of the actions of other governments within their own countries. It is also said that the UN Charter, article 2(7) states this principle. It is thus argued that interference is not allowed in such matters.

To sum up, foreign policy makers or diplomats are not excited about human rights. The human rights might be favoured in principle, and as Owen (1978:44) says, are preferred as standard setting. However, practical cases of their violation have shrunk. As Watson (1983:80) expresses, they prefer bilateral diplomacy and public debate tending towards issues of principle. On the other hand, private negotiation inclines towards compromise and understanding of the other persons' idea. When considering a particular case, they prefer quiet diplomacy. Even if human rights is taken up reluctantly, they are not received as a solution but a problem. Human rights is in the way of ordinary diplomacy. As Vincent (1986) points out, the issue of human rights is expected to surface in two kinds of situations: when the interest of the state is plainly served, and when the attention of human rights does not damage the other interest of the state. This raises the problem of inconsistency or double standards. The arguments made under this subsection, as Luard (1981:6) points out, should not be underestimated by those who are interested in human rights. Although all of them may be challenged, they are none of them altogether irrational. The important point is that, whether or not they are true, they deter, at least, attempts by governments to pursue an active human rights in foreign policy. Now, to what extent the foreign policy constraints are important will be examined below.

#### **4. Degree of the Importance of Foreign Policy Constraints**

Vincent (1986:129) suggests that human rights might get in the way of communication among states. Although it is of course the case that governments are always obliged to deal with each other all the time on a wide variety of issues, most of these relations will continue whatever posture one government may adopt on human rights issues. In this regard, NGOs have a big role. In some societies, human rights has been taken up by them as questions. Many human rights publications, facilitated by the advanced communication system and questions asked about what foreign ministers are going to do about them, have rewarded their efforts. This is one way in which human rights has become a subject about which states have to communicate with each other.

As Luard (1981:6) points out, there is little evidence for the assumption that expressions of concern by one government on human rights questions will totally prejudice the conduct of normal business with the government criticised. It will depend partly on other factors governing the relationship between the two states, and even more on the manner in which the issue is raised. Thus, a relationship may be seriously damaged when:

- complaints are aired in a polemical and highly political style, or, pursued obsessively. They should be made in reasonable terms and in the proper forum,
- the charges made are vague and generalised rather than specific, factual, and backed by firm evidence. In other words, the charges made should not cause the thought that they are inspired by malice or political prejudice.

Moreover, the danger that any expression of concern on such matters can be used by other governments as justification for breaking off or damaging relations has been reduced by the fact that human rights issues have already become so much the normal stuff of international politics. Not only Western countries, but also developing states, have become increasingly active over such issues and play a growing role in the international bodies responsible. Also, the growth of regional organisations has emphasised this trend. Any government cannot be insulated from this change in the international level.

The attempt of the claim of domestic sovereignty over such issues is rightly rejected by states. It is almost universally recognised that serious violations of human rights are a matter of concern to the international community. As Luard (1981:12) says, the diplomatic intercourse has been changing quite dramatically for forty years: in this regard, under the UN Charter, the discussion of human rights is possible in the Organisation and in other organs such as the Commission on Human Rights. Regional Organisations such as the European Court of Human Rights, Inter American Commission of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act (HFA) of the OSCE also reinforce this change of diplomatic intercourse. Salzberg (1986:24) argues that the HFA incorporates the substance of all the main instruments of human rights diplomacy. Moreover, international law has never been a static and inflexible body of rules; the definition of what is "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of state as well as sovereign rights of states is continually evolving. It is therefore less and less likely that inter state relations will be fatally damaged".

One may also be sceptical about the argument for free trade when it is deployed against attention to human rights. As Vincent (1986:138) says, "the cobdenite connection between trade, peace, and global solidarity is now confronted by the idea that trade can easily buttress uncivilised values as carry civilised ones". Furthermore, in the world in which the multiplication of contacts among societies has been allowed by technology, trade no longer bears the principal burden of communication among them. Thus, there is less reason to regard the free trade as untouchable. According to Schoultz (1981:66), if the general argument that no attention to human rights in foreign policy should be paid in the interest of maintaining free trade was successful, it might be called "selling-out to the business lobby". This does not mean that trade should be manipulated at the drop of a political hat, but we should be doubtful about its universal claim to sovereignty.

Aid, on the other hand, is easier to manipulate because it is more firmly in the hands of governments. An example of this is that during the Carter Administration, there was an attempt in Congress to use the reduction of economic and military aid to discomfort repressive regimes. Despite the small impact of this, it offered encouragement to domestic dissent.

Regarding the issue of security, it is no doubt right that *raison d'état* should prevail in great emergencies. However, the tendency of the argument of security against human rights is to stretch implausibly the idea of emergency. Every tin pot dictator requires his security to be defended. This devalues genuine security arguments. Even if there are

genuine security arguments for attachment to a questionable regime, they should not be used merely to shore up the regime.

Regarding the issue of double standards, it is true that it is likely that the domestic push to include human rights in foreign policy will result in the human rights of some individuals and groups abroad being taken up with more enthusiasms than others. This reintroduces the issue of 'double-standards' or 'inconsistency'. In the past, the Reagan Administration was criticised for finding fault on human rights grounds, principally with communist 'enemies'. The point about human rights is their equal application to friends and enemies. States should pay attention to consistency, but not in such a way as to allow nothing to be done. Here, it must be said that as Hill (1989:19) points out, the problem of Aristotelian consistency i.e. that since the world is imperfect, then foreign policy is justified in treating unequal cases unequally, is itself not a persuasive argument against implanting human rights into foreign policy.

Regarding the issue of the inclusion of human rights in foreign policy, human rights is one more thing for diplomats to be unenthusiastic about. The reason is practical as well as doctrinal. Human rights in foreign policy are not merely about standard setting, public pronouncements or quiet words with the minister about particular cases; they are also matters that affect the great purposes of the state in securing and nourishing its citizens.

The argument that the inclusion of human rights by governments in their foreign policies is ineffective is, as Luard (1981:13) points out, also contrary to the facts. There have been many cases where international pressures, including public expressions of concern by other governments, have resulted in significant improvements in the human rights policies of particular states. On the other hand, it would be a misconception to hope that the government being criticised is suddenly going to reverse all its policies and become all at once a model of virtue. In the short term, little may happen. However, there might be a number of indirect effects: firstly, the government criticised may be gradually brought to realise that the type of policy being pursued has a significant external cost. At least, its foreign office, which is usually most aware of foreign criticisms, may become an influence within the government for a reform of policy, secondly, new hope and encouragement may be given to human rights campaigners within the country concerned. The international climate will be changed by expressions of concern on such matters. New forms of behaviour to be expected from civilised governments are established. Regional organisations may become more active.

##### **5. Main Aims of Foreign Policy with a Human Rights Objective (FPHRO)**

It is significant to have the main aims for the achievement of FPHRO. It will be concerned, partly, with the general recognition of the importance of human rights all over the world, as well as the definition of what the rights that all governments should protect are, and, partly, with the prevention or deterrence of particular violations of rights in individual countries. Luard (1981:15) suggests four main aims of FPHRO.

*The first aim* is to ensure that human rights concerns remain constantly at the top, or near the top, of the international agenda. The achievement of this aim is the easiest one, because every government in the world declares, in general terms, its concern on this question. In this regard, what President Carter did in this field was just to publicly demonstrate the importance that his government, as well as himself, attaches to the question of human rights, and that it had been an integral part of foreign policy. It is essential for every government to show their support for that general aim. According to Luard, two types of rights, civil and political, and economic and social, are complementary. One does not have preference over the other. He shows examples on

the basis of countries. The standards will be those that are generally applied in the international community as whole. He adds to say that the assertion of the entitlement of the "*Universal*" Declaration of human rights was that the standards would be attained in any country regardless of the size or poverty of a country.

However, as Shue (1980) says, the nature of basic rights is not self evident. The arguments for civil and political rights, for economic and social rights, and for the right to development might be construed as an argument about the content of basic rights. He also offers that, for identification of basic rights, they are those rights that are essential to the enjoyment of all other rights: in this sense, both the right to life and the right to liberty are basic. On the other hand, Vincent (1986:142) argues that an international programme for the achievement of human rights might be laid down on the formulation of these basic rights. His central thesis is that, as a project for international society, he offers the acknowledgement of a universal right to subsistence as priority over other human rights. These rights are interrelated to the three generations of human rights. They form part of the right to life, which is the assertion of the first generation. They are the central of social and economic rights, which is the second generation of human rights. They are also essential to the emergent solidarity right to development, which is the third generation right. However, the place of basic rights in foreign policy is not, at the same time, located by the decision on priorities among rights. Although a series of choices is involved in this, it is not easy.

*The second aim* must be to ensure that the minimum standards of human rights which civilised states expect to see observed are satisfactorily defined. International bodies have made progress over that issue for about forty years: the UDHR first included the essential standards and amplification by the two UN Covenants. There are also specialised and regional instruments. One of the continuing objectives of governments through such a policy is to clarify and amplify this code, particularly, by extending it in certain specialised areas.

The means regarding the second aim are well established and no revolutionary changes are needed. Concerning the human rights, any convention reflects the views of the international community, generally. Thus it can only emerge from a process of international negotiation as at present. However, there may be room for improving the procedures used for this purpose. Luard (1981), however, argues that such international human rights bodies are not well equipped for this difficult and very important task. It really requires a legal forum rather than a political one. He suggests the involvement of the International Law Commission (ILC) in the future process. Interestingly, ILC has not taken part in drafting conventions in the field of human rights. It is vital that satisfactory texts should be achieved which can significantly influence the behaviour of governments in these areas.

*The third aim* of FPHRO is to improve the international machinery which at present exists for promoting and protecting such rights. It is generally believed that the UN bodies responsible should go on from legislation to the process specified as implementation. However, because of the principle of sovereignty and non interference in the domestic issues, it is really difficult to improve this machinery.

Globally, the main body is the UN Commission on Human Rights. Luard (1981) has the view that there has been a significant improvement in this area, though there exists criticism over the UN Commission. Regarding the third aim, the regional bodies can be more influential. For instance, already in America, the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights probably plays a more effective part in judging and deterring human

rights violations than any UN body. Similarly, the European Court of Human Rights have been given much greater power.

*The fourth aim* is to bring direct influence on governments all over the world so that the grave violations of human rights are less likely to occur. In other words, action must be taken by individual governments to cause improvements in the human rights situation elsewhere. This aim is the most difficult, as well as the most important, because it is also concerned with the security issue of countries. To ensure their survival the governments may feel that subversive forces in their countries should be prevented or suppressed. They also may feel that their repressive policies are the inevitable cost of maintaining power or bringing a disturbed situation under control. The governments may also ignore the opinions of other countries. They may, hence, appear impervious to any appeals of other countries on that issue. Nonetheless, whatever the attitudes of such governments, it is a main aim of the FPHRO to bring effective influence on governments.

To be able to pursue this aim, what means are available to an individual government to influence a situation of other countries concerned? According to Luard (1981), although the list is not exhaustive, the following, in ascending order of urgency, are the main types of response in dealing with such questions: a) Confidential representations to the government concerned, b) Joint representations made with other governments, c) Public statements of concern in parliament or elsewhere, d) Support for calls in international bodies for investigation of the situation, e) Direct initiation of such action in international bodies, f) Cancellation or postponement of ministerial visits, g) Restraints on cultural and sporting contacts, h) Embargoes on arms sales, i) Reduction in aid programmes, j) Withdrawal of an Ambassador, k) A cessation of all aid, l) The breaking of diplomatic relations, m) Trading sanctions,

There are many states which rarely, if ever, undertake any of these steps. Even governments in the West, having FPHRO, do not often proceed beyond the first two or three steps. An exception is the foreign policy of the previous Labour Government in the UK: it proceeded to the last but one in relation to Uganda and the last but three in relation to Chile.

For effective action along the above mentioned lines, the following conditions must be fulfilled:

- the pursuance of such a policy must be consistent, regardless of political prejudice or diplomatic convenience. Sometimes, difficult and unwelcome choices, both for governments and diplomats, will be involved in this. Diplomats abroad tend to become gradually committed to the existing regime and are reluctant to take any steps which may be unwelcome to them.
- contacts should be made with a broad section of the population, including political opponents of the government. However, there is a corollary for this condition: the disadvantage in a total severing of relations. This, in practice, provides for the worst thing in the world: not only that the hope that the regime is influenced is lost, but also an isolated regime often becomes more brutal than before. Newsom (1986:9) calls this situation *the high stakes*, which is one of the problems and limitations of human rights diplomacy. He shows the fear of a threat to its own power as a reason for brutality. It has been generally agreed that the promotion of contacts provides at least a chance to influence the climate of opinion within other countries.

- aid should be provided to the people directly, not to the government concerned. Luard (1981:30) also argues that, although small-scale assistance can be given, independently of the regime in power, to groups in the country concerned running projects in the field to help those most in need, it should go primarily to educational and agricultural projects or small scale co-operatives, which will make the biggest contribution in creating employment and meeting basic needs, rather than to large scale dams, roads or steel mills, which bring little direct benefit to most of the population. Where aid is providing direct benefit to the people, there should be no cessation because of human rights violations, thereby penalising the people, in order to punish the sins of the rulers in the country concerned, except possibly in the most exceptional circumstances. Otherwise, it would be wrong and illogical.
- military assistance, on the other hand, has a different position on the effective action on the above mentioned lines. Where human rights violations occur in the country concerned, arms supplies and other kinds of military assistance should be halted, as one of the first steps taken to prevent such assistance being directly used or possibly being used by the government concerned in its oppression of its population, and that it can therefore reasonably be claimed by the recipient government as a mark of friendship and approval. Therefore, the regular reappraisal of programmes regarding military assistance and arms supplies is needed to ensure that the human rights policy of the state concerned is satisfactory.
- among the above mentioned steps, the most serious one is the breaking off of trade relations. Thus, it will only be considered in the most extreme cases. Concerning this action, if a country has a bad human rights record, investment, in such a country could be prevented and discouraged at earlier stages. As Luard (1981:31) points out, many believe that this condition should have already been fulfilled by the UK in the case of British investment in South Africa. The same is true for the breaking off of diplomatic relations. Where there is always some value in maintaining contacts, almost the best thing is to retain diplomatic representation in some form.
- the argument that the most drastic step is always the most influential is unacceptable because, sometimes, direct representations to the government concerned is the most influential one. The minister of the country concerned can be approached by the visiting ministers, even if they have arrived for other purposes, to make clear the concern caused in their own country by reports of serious human rights violations. Then, the influence of the minister approached within the government may be used to cause changes in policies. If representations on such matters derive from more than one government they carry far greater weight, as well as reducing the political costs of taking action and lessen the problem of *locus standi*, that is the right of governments to intervene in matters in which their own nationals are not directly concerned. However, such representations are relatively rare because the basic philosophy of foreign offices is always business as usual.
- the importance of the NGOs is clear. One of the most useful ways in which governments can influence the government concerned, at least indirectly, is to provide assistance to NGOs because they are indeed in some ways more effective on this subject than governments. Their concern on the subject can be spoken and published more freely. They are less likely to be accused of political bias. How they can be assisted is the important question. Usually financial support is unwelcome because it might be thought that their independence has been prejudiced. However, the following suggestions can be made: regular exchanges of information and ideas and a pooling of

knowledge about the situation in particular states, joint seminars or other activities to educate the public, and co-operation in international human rights bodies.

- the availability of information about the situation that exists in different countries all over the world is necessary for both the public and the governments that will play a more effective role in preventing human rights violations elsewhere. On the one hand, although most people, at present, learn vaguely about what is happening in other countries, it cannot be said that impressions are generally very clear. One reason for this is that they are based on stray newspaper reports rather than reliable and systematically compiled evidence. Also, in practice, the degree of concern depends upon the agenda of the press and television. On the other hand, the information supplied by the governments should be *objective*. Governments usually only take action when their own public opinion is aroused. Thus, a better informed public opinion would function more in stimulating more effective action by governments. In this regard, the most useful action by NGOs is the publication of an annual survey of the human rights situation in individual countries, with some indication of the gravity of the situation in each place.

The above mentioned aims are not exclusive, especially for western governments. However, they are the main aims that governments will have in mind.

### **Conclusion**

Given that in today's world, the issue of human rights are included in foreign policies of states, and that foreign policy as the outside behaviour of a state is one of elements of international relations, the issue of legal human rights developments is so important for a foreign policy with a human rights objective. It seems to me that its reflection in such a foreign policy is a key for the protection of human rights in international relations. The reason is that it makes the foreign policy with a human rights objective more effective. Not only those who are in a foreign policy decision-making process but also international relations students are thus expected to take notice of such developments. The first step of this is of course the education in international relations.

The results of the internet survey indicate that the international relations students in Turkey need to have more opportunity to be able to follow the international developments in the area of international law of human rights.

The followings are offered:

All departments of international relations at the universities in Turkey should have an independent course of human rights.

If possible, students who are at the departments of international relations should be able to take course from the faculties of law,

If possible, students who are at the faculties of law, taking international law course, should also take various courses concerning international relations theory.

---

### **REFERENCES**

- BROWNLIE, Ian, *Principles of International Law*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), third edition.
- COHEN, S.B., *Conditioning US Assistance on Human Rights Practices*, *American Journal of International Law*, 76, (1982)

- FALK, R., A., *Theoretical Foundations of Human Rights*, in Paula R. Newberg, (Ed.), *The Politics of Human Rights*, (New York and London: New York University Press, 1980)
- HENKIN, Louis, *How Nations Behave: Law and Foreign Policy*, (New York: Colombia University Press, 1979)
- HENKIN, Louis, *The Rights of Man Today*, (London: Stevens & Sons, 1978)
- HILL, Dillys, M., *Human Rights and Foreign Policy: Theoretical Foundations*, in Dillys M. Hill, (Ed. ), *Human Rights and Foreign Policy*, (London: The Mcmillan Press Ltd., 1989)
- HOFFMANN, S., *Reaching for the Most Difficult: Human Rights as a Foreign Policy Goal*, 112, *Daedalus*, (1983), 4, p.19-49.
- JAMES, A., *Diplomacy and International Society*, *International Relations*, 6, (1980), 6.
- KARAOSMAOĞLU, Fatih, *Human Rights Norms in CSCE and the Behaviour of A State: Perceptions of Elites in Turkey* (PhD Thesis, Surrey University: 1996)
- KARAOSMANOĞLU, Fatih, *Human Rights, the OSCE Process, Law and Foreign Policy: The Case of Turkey*, (Ankara: Nobel, 2000)
- LUARD, Evan, *Human Rights and Foreign Policy*, (Oxford-New York: Pergaman Press, 1981)
- NEWSOM, David D., *The Diplomacy of Human Rights*, (Lanham-New York-London: University Press of America, 1986)
- OWEN, D., *Human Rights*, (London: Cape, 1978)
- RUSTOW, Dankwart A., *Man or Citizen? Global Modernisation and Human Rights*, in Paula R. Newberg, (Ed. ), *The Politics of Human Rights*, (New York and London: New York University Press, 1980)
- SALZBERG, John P., *The Carter Administration and Human Rights*, in David D. Newsom, (Ed. ), *The Diplomacy of Human Rights*, (Lanham/ New York/London: University Press Of America, 1986)
- SCHOULTZ, L. *Human Rights and United States Policy Towards Latin America*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)
- SCOTT, A. M., *The Functioning of the International System*, (New York: Macmillan, 1967).
- SHUE, Henry, *Basic Rights*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980)
- VINCENT, R. J., *Human Rights and International Relations*, (Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1986)
- WATSON, A., *Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983)
- WRIGHT, M., *How Problematical are the Moral Foundations of Human Rights*, in Dillys M. Hill, (Ed. ), *Human Rights and Foreign Policy*, (London: The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1989)

**THE SURVEY BY USING THE INTERNET**  
**Carried out on 14-15-2001**

**Abant İzzet Baysal University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: <http://www.iibf.ibu.edu.tr/bolum/index.htm>

**Adnan Menderes University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Its web page is not accessible.

Source: <http://www.adu.edu.tr/hm/fakulte/iktidr/bilgi/uluslararasibölümü.htm>

**Anadolu University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: <http://www.anadolu.edu.tr/>

**Ankara University,**

The Faculty of Political Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Its web page on courses is not accessible.

Source: <http://www.ankara.edu.tr/faculties/political/uluslar/>

**Akdeniz University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: <http://www.iibf.akdeniz.edu.tr/>

**Atatürk University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: <http://www.atauni.edu.tr/fakulteler/ibf/dersler.htm?>

**Baskent University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of Political Science and International relations,

Courses: Introduction to Law, International Law, Human rights,

Source: <http://www.baskent.edu.tr/html/akademik/32/333/program.php>

**Bilkent University,** Faculty of Economics, Administrative and Social Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Courses: Selected Topics in Turkish Law, Private International Law, European Union

Law, selected Topics in International Law, International law, The Use of Force in

International Law, 1, 2; International Protection of Human Rights

Source: [http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~ir/Ug/course\\_desc.html](http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~ir/Ug/course_desc.html)

**Bogazici University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of Political Science & International Relations  
Course: Introduction to law, Turkish Constitutional Law,  
Source: <http://registration.boun.edu.tr/scheduleframe.htm>

**Cankaya University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source: <http://www.cankaya.edu.tr/akademik.html>

**Cukurova University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
(There exist no students enrolled in the department  
Source: <http://idari.cu.edu.tr/ul-lisans.htm>

**Cumhuriyet University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source: <http://www.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/birimler/index.html>

**Dogus University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Course: Introduction to Law, Constitutional and Administrative Law, International law  
1 and 2, International legal issues-Human rights and Humanitarian Intervention,  
Source: <http://www1.dogus.edu.tr/dogustru/indextim.htm>

**Dokuz Eylul University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source: <http://www.deu.edu.tr/akademi/index.html>

**Ege University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Course: Fundamental Principles of Law, Constitutional Law, Administrative Law,  
International Law-1, 2  
Source: <http://bornova.ege.edu.tr/~wwwiibf/english/int.html>

**Fatih University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Course(s): International Law-1, 2; Human Rights and Law,  
Source: <http://www.fatih.edu.tr/iibf/ui/lisans56.html>

**Gazi University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,  
Course(s): International Law-1, 2; European Union Law, Citizenship Foreigners law,  
Consular Law, International Protection of Human Rights,  
Source: <http://www.iibf.gazi.edu.tr/>

**Gaziosmanpasa University,**

Its web page does not appear.

Source: [http://srd.yahoo.com/drst/15863052/\\*http://gaziosmanpasa.edu.tr/](http://srd.yahoo.com/drst/15863052/*http://gaziosmanpasa.edu.tr/)

**Hacettepe University,**

Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Courses: Fundamental Concepts of law, Introduction to Constitutional Law,  
International Law, International Criminal law, Private International law, Public  
International Law, Human Rights Protection In International Relations, European  
Community Law.

Source: <http://www.hacettepe.edu.tr/english/prospectus/faculties/economic/inter.html>

**Isik University,**

Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: [http://www.isikun.edu.tr/academics/academic\\_units.html](http://www.isikun.edu.tr/academics/academic_units.html)

**Istanbul Bilgi University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Course(s): General Principles of Law, Constitutional Law, International Law-1, 2.

Source: <http://www.ibun.edu.tr/faculties/economics/intercur.htm>

Istanbul Technical University,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,

Source: <http://www.itu.edu.tr/1-4-18tr.htm>

**Istanbul University,**

Faculty of Political Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Courses: Introduction to law, Constitutional Law, International Law, Civil Law,  
Administrative Law, Human Rights, International private Law, International Panel Law

Source: <http://www.istanbul.edu.tr/fakulteler/siyasal/dersler.htm>

**Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

It appears to be no web pages for the department

Source: <http://www.ksu.edu.tr/yeniweb/turkish/index.html>

**Karadeniz Technical University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of International Relations,

Courses: Fundamental Concepts of Law, Constitutional Law, European Union Law and Turkey, International Law-1-2, Minority Rights in China, International Private Law, Human Rights (optional)

Source: <http://www.iibf.ktu.edu.tr/der.htm>

**Koc University,**

College of Administrative Sciences and Economics,  
Department of International Relations,

Courses: The Turkish Constitutional System, Topics in Turkish Constitutional system, International Law,

Source: <http://www.ku.edu.tr/ir/>

**Kocaeli University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,

Courses: Fundamental Concepts of Law-1-2, European Union Law-1-2, International Law-1-2, International Private Law, International Human Rights-1-2,

Source: <http://www.kou.edu.tr/akademik/iktisat/uluslararasiiliskiler/index.htm>

**Marmara University,**

Department of political Science and International Relations,

Courses: Introduction to Law, Constitutional law, International Law 1-2, Administrative Law, Commercial Law, Law of Obligations,

Source: <http://www.feas.marun.edu.tr/int/courses/courses.htm>

**Middle East Technical University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,

Courses: Introduction to Law, Public International Law 1-2, International Protection of Human Rights, International Private Law 1-2, Human Rights in World Politics,

Source: <http://www.ir.metu.edu.tr/frame/program/anasayfa.html>

**Mugla University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site

Source: <http://www.mu.edu.tr/akademik/akademik.html>

**Nigde University**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site

Source: <http://www.nigde.edu.tr/>

**Osmangazi University,**

Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,

Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site

Source: <http://www.ogu.edu.tr/aiibf.html>

**Sabancı University,**

Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,

Social and Political Sciences Programme,

Course: Constitutional Law,  
Source: [http://www.sabanciuniv.edu/akademik\\_ssbf.html](http://www.sabanciuniv.edu/akademik_ssbf.html)

**Sakarya University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Courses: Introduction to Law, Introduction to Constitutional law, Civil Law, Turkish Constitutional law, Law of Human Rights, Law of Obligations, International Private Law 1-2, Commercial Law, Criminal Law, International Law of the Sea,  
Source: <http://www.iibf.sakarya.edu.tr/intrel/curriculum.html>

**Suleyman Demirel University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source: <http://www.sdu.edu.tr/old/akademik.htm>

**Trakya University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Its undergraduate education has not started yet.  
Source: [http://www.trakya.edu.tr/Uluslararası\\_iliskiler/lisans.htm](http://www.trakya.edu.tr/Uluslararası_iliskiler/lisans.htm)

**Uludag University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Courses: Introduction to Law, Civil Law, Constitutional law, Law of Obligations, Law of the Citizenship, International Law 1-2, Administrative Law, International Human Rights,  
Source: <http://www.uludag.edu.tr/html/akademik.html>

**Gaziantep University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source:  
[http://www.gantep.edu.tr/academic/faculties/iktisadi\\_ve\\_idari\\_bilimler\\_fakultesi/](http://www.gantep.edu.tr/academic/faculties/iktisadi_ve_idari_bilimler_fakultesi/)

**Yeditepe University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of International Relations,  
Its web page is under construction,  
Source: <http://www.yeditepe.edu.tr/7tepe/ulusiliskiler.html>

**Yidiz Technical University,**  
Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences,  
Department of Political Science and International Relations,  
Its web page is not available  
Source: <http://www.yildiz.edu.tr/html/akademikf.html>

**Zonguldak Karaelmas University,**

Faculty of Faculty of Economics & Administrative Sciences at Caycuma,  
Department of international relations does not seem to exist in the web site,  
Source: <http://caycuma.karaelmas.edu.tr/>

---

*The web sites of the Turkish Universities have been taken from this source:*  
[http://dir.yahoo.com/education/higher\\_education/colleges\\_and\\_universities/by\\_region/  
countries/turkey/complete\\_list/](http://dir.yahoo.com/education/higher_education/colleges_and_universities/by_region/countries/turkey/complete_list/)