

**ISTANBUL BILGI UNIVERSITY**  
**INSTITUTE OF GRADUATE PROGRAMS**  
**PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAM**

**CONSEQUENCES OF CONCEPTUALIZING THE POLITICAL AS A FRIEND -  
ENEMY DISTINCTION  
AND THE POSSIBILITY OF ANOTHER DEFINITION OF THE POLITICAL**

**Melis SOLAKOĐLU**

**119679024**

**Assoc. Prof. Ferda KESKİN**

**ISTANBUL**

**2022**

**Consequences of Conceptualizing the Political as a Friend - Enemy distinction  
And the Possibility of Another Definition of the Political**

**Siyaseti Dost- Düşman Ayrımı Olarak Kavramsallaştırmanın Sonuçları Ve  
Politikanın Başka Bir Tanımının Olasılığı**

Melis SOLAKOĞLU

119679024

**Tez Danışmanı:** Doç. Dr. Ferda Keskin

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

(İmza) .....

(İmza) .....

**Jüri Üyesi:** Doç. Dr. Zeynep Talay Turner

İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi

**Jüri Üyesi:** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Ömer Albayrak

29 Mayıs Üniversitesi

(İmza) .....

Tezin Onaylandığı Tarih: 08.07.2022

Toplam Sayfa Sayısı: 77

Anahtar Kelimeler (Türkçe)

1) Dost- düşman ayrımı

2) Siyaset

3) Politik mit

4) İnsan hakları

5) Carl Schmitt

Anahtar Kelimeler (İngilizce)

1) Friend – enemy distinction

2) Political

3) Political myth

4) Human Rights

5) Carl Schmitt

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I would like to thank to Arsen Yarman for his outrigh support when I decided to get my master's degree,

to Kaan Atalay, who inspired me drawing the starting lines of my thesis with his critical approach to Hobbes' contractarian theory and

to my advisor Ferda Keskin, who supported and facilitated me during my thesis process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ÖZET.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: HOBBS' THEORY OF STATE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.1. HUMAN NATURE AND THE STATE OF NATURE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2. CHOICE OF CONTRACT .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.3. ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.4. TWO PROBLEMS IN HOBBS' THEORY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.4.1. Description of Man.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.4.2. Description of the Sovereign .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO: THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTRACTARIAN THEORY .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE: CARL SCHMITT AND HIS VIEW OF THE POLITICAL... ..</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.1. SCHMITT'S PERSPECTIVE ON HOBBS AND THE SIMILARITY     BETWEEN THEM.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.2. CONSEQUENCES OF THE FRIEND-ENEMY DISTINCTION IN THE     REAL WORLD .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.2.1. Examples from different countries .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.2.2. Examples from Turkey .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.2.2.1. Military coup .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3.2.2.2. Hrant Dink.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: THE POSSIBILITY OF ANOTHER DEFINITION OF THE POLITICAL .....</b>	<b>56</b>

<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>65</b>

## ABSTRACT

It is an inevitable fact that world history has witnessed various wars and struggles. This thesis, however, can be considered as the product of the last 15 years, specifically of what I have witnessed and observed ever since the assassination of Hrant Dink in 2007. Regarding my personal observations and experiences throughout the time, I have come to the conclusion that any group that is defined as minorities by the dominant population, has faced similar hardships, oppression and violation of human rights. In this respect, my thesis aimed to present the theoretical outcomes and the practical examples of my observations in the context of Thomas Hobbes, Carl Schmitt and Johan Galtung. It is my observation that from the broad everyday practices to an exceptional situation of war, in all the stages, states can be seen in parallel with how Hobbes constructs the sovereign and the improvement of human nature in the *Leviathan*. In this context, I can say that the closest and most developed version of Hobbes's understanding of the state, can be found in Schmitt's definition of politics. While according to Hobbes, the state's duty is to protect the physical existence of the society, Carl Schmitt argues a similar idea in terms of politics. According to Schmitt, politics and political practice only stand for the ability to make a separation between the friend and the enemy. The duty of the state and the sovereign, besides, is to maintain the physical protection of the group that can make such separation. However, as usually seen, such one-way practices to provide the so-called physical security, cause violations of human rights widely. So, in this study, I tried to examine the political practices and their effects on human rights with examples from the world and Turkey in terms of Schmitt's definition. Regarding Galtung's arguments, in the fourth chapter, I tried to present that another definition of politics is also possible, by claiming that politics does not merely mean separation between the friend and the enemy, so it should also be possible that an individual is protected in terms of the individual rights.

**Keywords:** Friend – enemy distinction, political, political myth, human rights, Carl Schmitt

## ÖZET

Elbette dünya tarihinde çok sayıda çatışmalar, savaşlar yaşanmıştır ve yaşanmaya devam ediyor. Ancak benim gözlemleyebildiğim, tanıklık edebildiğim ve bu tezi yazmamda beni etkileyenin son on beş yıllık süreç olduğunu varsayabilirim. Hrant Dink'in vurulmasıyla başlayan kişisel gözlem ve deneyimlerimin temelinde, çoğunluk tarafından azınlık olarak tanımlanan tüm kesimlerin birbirine benzer zorluklar, baskılar, insan hakları ihlalleri yaşadığı sonucuna vardım. Bu tez çalışmasında ise gözlemlerimin teorik dayanak ve pratik örneklerini, Thomas Hobbes, Carl Schmitt ve Johan Galtung'un görüşleri çerçevesinde göstermeyi hedefledim. Günümüzde devletlerinin, günlük en yaygın pratiklerden en istisnai durum savaş haline kadar tüm alanda Hobbes'un *Leviathan*'da sınırlarını çizdiği egemen ve insan doğası tanımlarının geliştirilmesi, dönüştürülmesi ile paralel gittiğini düşünmekteyim. Bu bağlamda Hobbes'un devlet anlayışının, günümüz modellerine en yakın ve benzer, geliştirilmiş-dönüştürülmüş halini Carl Schmitt'in politika tanımında bulunduğunu söyleyebilirim. Hobbes'ta devletin görevi yurttaşların fiziksel varlığı korumakken, Carl Schmitt'te benzer bir hedef politika kavramında bulunmaktadır. Schmitt'e göre politika ve politik eylem yalnızca dost düşman ayrımı yapabilmektir, devletin ve egemenin görevi bu ayrımı yapıp, ayrımı yapabilme kuvveti olan grubu fiziksel anlamda korumaktır. Ancak çok sık görüldüğü üzere, tek taraflı fiziksel güvenliği korumayı hedefleyen çalışmalar, geniş çapta insan haklarında ihlallere sebep olmaktadır. Schmitt'in tanımı bağlamında politik eylemlerin, insan haklarına etkilerini dünyadan ve Türkiye'den örneklerle açıklamaya çalıştım. Dördüncü bölümünde ise Galtung'un görüşleri çerçevesinde başka türlü bir politika tanımının mümkün olabileceğini, politikanın sadece dost düşman ayrımı yapmak olmadığını, insanın kendini gerçekleştirebilmesi için gerekli olan haklar bakımından da güvencede olması anlamını taşımasının mümkün olduğunu gösterdim.

**Anahtar Kelime:** Dost -düşman ayrımı, siyaset, politik mit, insan hakları, Carl Schmitt

## INTRODUCTION

What is a state? Who is the sovereign? What are the duties of the state and the sovereign? What should be the state-sovereign-human relationship? Does the state or the sovereign have a decisive influence on man, both conceptually and in the sense of communities? What is the state system that knows the people best? Can we talk about a state system, a sovereign action, that can know the needs of all people? We can find the answers to these questions in Thomas Hobbes and Carl Schmitt by connecting with the periods/events they witnessed. Although Schmitt's views seem to be more influential in terms of being closer to the present day, I started my work with Hobbes, assuming that ideas can influence each other and move forward by changing from each other. Schmitt's ideas about Hobbes made it easier for me to maintain this assumption. In this context, I first began to examine Hobbes's concepts of state-sovereign-citizen, and then I dealt with Schmitt's views, which I assumed were Hobbes' altered form.

Hobbes deals with the concept of the state in two separate processes: Firstly, it is the state of nature in which humans clash with each other only in order to obtain the same pleasures; and the second is the state of society in which he/she can give up his/her pleasures and the possibilities of accessing these pleasures and preserve his/her bodily integrity. The second case that Hobbes describes can be linked to the above questions. According to Hobbes, humans are beings who pursue pleasures and benefits and clash with other individuals in various ways to obtain them. These, which he regards as human actions, refer to a nature that includes all human beings. This being, which has a nature that is supposed to be common and immutable to all members of its species, must be controlled in a state order under the supervision of the sovereign. People who conflict with each other transfer to the sovereign all the opportunities they use in a state of conflict in order to ensure peace and get out of the state of chaos and their right to use these opportunities: But once this is done, they will no longer be able to control the sovereign. In this case, the state and the sovereign from a power that aims to preserve the integrity of the human body and should not be questioned in order to achieve this goal.

When Schmitt's views are examined, the mandate to preserve the physical presence in Hobbes can again be seen in different concepts and definitions. In Hobbes, it is



explained that in order to gain the pleasures, an individual has the right to kill another individual with the same pleasure, or in other words, his opponent, in real physical interventions. When it comes to Schmitt, instead of individual physical conflicts, we begin to talk about a de facto conflict between groups. The state, on the other hand, is the organized form of a group that will play a role in physical conflict, it is the highest status in individual and social terms. And according to Schmitt, the forms of practice of the state are shaped by the prevailing political view.

So, what should be the political outlook that the state will follow in its practices? According to Schmitt, in order for the concept of politics to be defined, its criteria must first be determined, and the criterion of the concept of politics is the distinction between friend and enemy. The content of the distinction between friend and enemy mentioned here is not determined. In this distinction, the only expression is that friendship/enmity is between groups. However, these groups must be neither morally, economically or aesthetically opposed nor similar. Therefore, the ground on which to base this distinction is not clearly stated. But the distinction between friend and enemy is necessary to keep alive the possibility of a de facto conflict. Individuals who are hostile to each other because of their pleasures and who are the cause of conflict in Hobbes become enemies of each other in groups for reasons of uncertainty in Schmitt. Therefore, an enemy is created from the possibility that an attack can happen without being subjected to an actual individual or collective attack. The reason for this approach is to keep alive the possibility of a real war because, in Schmitt's opinion, the possibility of war would serve to control human behavior.

Controlling human behavior on the basis of a distinction between friend and enemy in the sense that Schmitt spoke of is very simple. By exaggerating the events of one group's history, or by creating purely mythical heroic stories and repeating these narratives over and over again, it is easy to make people believe that they are superior to another group. At the same time, the group shown to be in opposition can be portrayed as an enemy with mythical discourses, if not in reality. In order to ensure and maintain this belief, official historical documents, schoolbooks, newspaper articles, posters are used. The state, as the highest status, provides the organization of the means to realize this distinction. So, what is the role of the sovereign? For Schmitt, the sovereign is the one who decides on the state of exception. However, it is still not defined what the exception is. According to Schmitt, only the sovereign can foresee

the exception and only the sovereign can design it. Since the state of exception will be to the detriment of all, the sovereign, who is the only authority to eliminate it, should not be opposed.

In both Hobbes and Schmitt, human beings can be controlled in their behavior and should be controlled to sustain good perpetuity, and the authority that can do this is the sovereign. The sovereign concentrates in himself all authority to protect the physical existence of his own subjects in Hobbes and his own group in Schmitt. Especially in Schmitt, human rights violations occur when the authority to identify enemies, whose content is uncertain, and the authority to understand the exception is indefinitely transferred to the sovereign. Since there is no clearly defined basis for identifying enemies, groups can be portrayed as enemies for different interests. Since it is assumed that it cannot be controlled and that only one sovereign can foresee the exception, there are violations of the exercise of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the groups deemed to be enemies.

Also both Hobbes and Schmitt come together in terms of decisionism. It will be seen that sovereign is the only decider to exceptional situation which is can not be defined even by Schmitt. And in exceptional situation, sovereign can get rid of constitutional law, can declare legislative decree and decide the continuity of decrees. According to Schmitt Hobbes is the typical representative of decisionism. Schmitt gives example for his assumption about decisionism and Hobbes from Hobbes' "autoritas, non veritas facit legem."<sup>1</sup> Decision-making as a political theory is based on the concept of a justifiable deviation from the law through personal decision-making in concrete circumstances. In Hobbes and Schmitt sovereign is come to light as an only person who has capability of controlling exceptional situation and to giving decision to eliminate exceptional situation. This decisionist attitude in state, in political action, turns citizens in to subject who are forced to obey sovereign for perpetuity. If citizens turns into subject and sovereign turns into person who can not be criticized for perpetuity, man turns kind of commodity and lose fundamental rights.

The purpose of this thesis is to show the violations of human fundamental rights and freedoms that may occur for the aforementioned reasons and that a different kind definition of the political is possible. I considered the possibility of a different

---

<sup>1</sup> (Hobbes, 1996), (Schmitt, Political Theology, 2005)

definition of the political within the framework of Johan Galtung's views. Galtung argues that the sources of conflict are defined as nature, culture, and structure, but that man has the potential to go beyond these boundaries and build a new order. In this respect, there is no mention in Galtung's views, as mentioned in Hobbes and Schmitt, the determination of human actions as a necessity of nature. Therefore, the concepts of politics, the state and the sovereign that the Galtung defines do not have a content aimed at controlling the person and the group in a negative sense. Galtung defines politics as the work to be done in law, education, press, etc. in human resources that permeate all areas of life in order to ensure the continuity of peace. Peace is not the absence of conflict, but the ability of individuals to access and exercise their fundamental rights and freedoms. Therefore, instead of the political actions that prepare environments of conflict we see in many countries today, it shows the possibility of a permanent, human rights-taking political action.

In this regard i will explain in first chapter Hobbes' *Leviathan* in accordance with absolute power of sovereign. In second chapter I will discuss the similarity between Hobbes and Schmitt's political view. In this discussion it will be seen that Schmitt's political definition in effect of Hobbesian view of sovereign. In third chapter, I will give examples from world and Turkey in accordance with the consequence of Schmittian political definition. While these consequences are exemplified, I will explain what political myth means, which I argue that these myths help Schmittian political attitude.

In the fourth chapter, in parallel with the title of my thesis, I will include the view of Johan Galtung to show the possibility of another political definition. There are two reason to include Galtung in my thesis. One of the reason is, all three thinker's life and witness. Hobbes was testimony of English civil war and Schmitt was witness of many political attitude, but most known one is Nazi applications. And both of them produce their political view in accordance with their testimony and bring out an idea that contains fear, distinction and enmity. But in Galtung, although he was also a witness of Nazi persecution in his young age, he produces an idea about political which is based on human rights and equally accessible resources without any kind of distinction. Their similar life testimonies and especially in Galtung different approaches to political, make me think about possibility of different definition and action. Second reason of my decision on Galtung is about he is an activist. He just not

describes or define political in theoretical way, he accesses the area where is conflict and tries to help establishing peace.

Now chapters will start with Hobbes' arguments and goes on as it mentioned.

## CHAPTER ONE: HOBBS' THEORY OF STATE

Thomas Hobbes is one of the political philosophers whose ideas and concepts are remembered even today in critical times for politics. He was born in Malmesbury, England on 5 April 1588 and he died on 4 December 1679. Hobbes left his birthplace to study at the University of Oxford between 1602 -1603. He graduated from Oxford in 1608 and after his graduation, he started to work as a tutor for the Cavendish Family. He was teaching William Cavendish who would be the Earl of Devonshire. There is no accurate evidence about the duration of the service to the Cavendish Family. Since the Cavendish family contained many members named William, it is difficult to distinguish Williams from each other in unclear texts. However, it is claimed that Hobbes had spent many years in the service of the Cavendish family and such acquaintance had highly influenced his work. (Ducan, 2021). Thanks to the Cavendish family Hobbes had the opportunity to reach books and the other philosophers' thoughts. It seems to be clear that there is another influence on his work: the English Civil War. Hobbes lived through very challenging times for the British Empire. The country was completely disarmed. There was an inner strike and civil war between the King and the Parliament. In this civil war the legitimacy and even the existence of the kingdom were at risk. So, in a sense what he had in mind was to rationalize human existence on such grounds that this explanation would provide the king himself a new justification and legitimation for his existence and status.

Such details about Hobbes's life are significant because the ideas of philosophers can be influenced by the social and political environment in which they grew up and live. Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651) was written under the influence of his experiences and observations of England's political sphere. In this respect, *Leviathan* can be considered an early attempt to explain how the notion of human collectivity became possible, where this collectivity came from, and how it evolved, by the social contract theory.

The theory of contract, in which Hobbes tried to explain the legitimacy and the justification of the sovereign, with the effect of the civil war in the British political arena, has another feature that follows the former explanations. The greatest feature of the contract theories, which serve to explain the human collectivity, is manifested in Hobbes's explanations of governance. According to the social contract theory, he has

a definition of governance, however, he does not suggest or title any name of regime. One of the most important things about social contract theories, is that they appear as regime agnostic. Contract theory demonstrates that the human collectivity, which came together by contract, does not have to commit itself to a specific regime. Hobbes also does not use any name of the regime, he just tries to present his understanding of government, citizenship and sovereignty. While Hobbes tries to explain these concepts, he starts-with a hypothetical argument, called as state of nature. The state of nature can be defined as a lack of certain social relations and institutions. The lack of certain social relations and institutions means the absence of the state, society itself, legality, property and any sort of collectivity to form a collective decision. In sum here in Hobbes' definition of state of nature, there is no government, sovereignty, or citizenship. The man who lives in a state which lacks certain society and societies functional requirements means, a man living in a state of nature.

### **1.1. HUMAN NATURE AND THE STATE OF NATURE**

In order to define or to explain system of governing, state, sovereignty, and the role of these concepts, one should start from the definition of the human being. Beginning with the definition of the human being is essential because the system will be based on the definition of the human being and his features. In this respect, the state will order or serve that human who has been defined, called citizen. Therefore, Hobbes also has an explanation of the characteristics of the human nature to start his theory of the state.

In Hobbes' theory, human nature is generally defined as a being that pursues pleasures -the most basic pleasure is the desire to survive and take care of its property - and struggles with other people who pursue pleasures like itself in order to achieve these pleasures. Hobbes lists the characteristics that he claims to be present in all human beings, these characteristic features cause struggle with other people. According to Hobbes, human nature has three fundamental qualifications: competition, diffidence and glory.

“The first, maketh men invade for Gain; the second, for Safety; and the third, for Reputation. The first use Violence, to make themselves Masters of other mens persons, wives, children, and cattell; the second, to defend them; the third, for trifles.” (Hobbes, 1996, p.88).

These conditions equally belong to man, hence, because of the equality of these conditions man never feels secure; “if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies;” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 87). All people are considered equal not only in fundamental qualifications, but also in the process of struggle. A physically disadvantaged person’s use of mind to defeat his opponent or enemy may be an accurate example of the process of struggle. “For as to the strength of body, the weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest, either by secret machination, or by confederacy with others, that are in the same danger with himself.” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 87). In this respect, it can be inferred that men are equal in killing each other. So while man is trying to protect his own life because of others’ fear, he becomes a threat to the others, and this fear circle goes on. So “an incessant struggle of every man with every man, struggle of each for power over others” will arise. (Macpherson, 1962, p. 19) Due to the equality in fundamental qualifications and the war process of struggle, a life fear emerges and a state of war begins. Nevertheless, Hobbes adds, “that every man, ought to endeavour Peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek, and use, all helps, and advantages Warre.” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 92) Here, the source of all these fear can be shown in right of nature and in law of nature. Hobbes defines right of nature as a liberty (“absence of external impediment”) of using own power to preserve his/her nature. Preserving his/her nature means his/her own life. And right of nature includes capability of acting by own judgement and reason, for preserve his/her nature. In page 87, it was mentioned that weaker one can beat the stronger one, they are equal. This equality comes from right of nature, man all have a liberty to use own power in accordance with their own judgement and reason. Physically weaker one can struggle with physically stronger in non-physical way. (Hobbes, 1996, s. 91) The way of struggle works by law of nature. Law of nature is a rule that forbid something to do which are destructive for his/her nature. So while the right of nature gives liberty to use own power, law of nature forbids to do something endangering for his/her life. Hence law of nature mentions to use own reason to preserve own life. Man have to liberty to use power, but law of nature rule an act which should be reasonable for sustain life. Hence law of nature must offer to ensure the peace, this is the reasonable act to preserve life. So at first, man has to ensure peace, but if it is impossible in any way, then he must fight. If everyone equally shares the same characteristic and the

same pleasure, there would be a competition that eventually turns into a war. In sum it is obvious that the first necessity (to ensure peace) can never be ensured because of the features of the human being. If everyone equally shares the same characteristics, and these features makes man fear from each other. In other words, according to the Hobbes, fear determines or shape human lives, it can be mentioned determining power of fear. Determination of fear has two meaning, one of them is escaping from a bad situation (which is state of nature/war), the second one is a source of ensuring peace by help of sovereign (BLITS, 1989).

As it mentioned above, because of human nature, men fear their lives, and this fear leads to state of war which occurs in state of nature.

State of nature can only be described in terms of what things lack of. So what sort of institutions, relations or activities are lacking? What sort of things are missing in the state of nature? First of all, certainly, society is missing; in the state of nature there are individuals on their own, completely atomized and disassociated. Under such circumstances in which there is no society, surely, man is lacking in family, legal structure and property. Possession is imaginable; however, man cannot define it as property because there is no law that man can rely on. In sum, what the state of nature “would lack is precisely all the goods of civilized living: property, industry, commerce, the sciences, arts and letters, as well as security for his life. To be without these goods is contrary to man's nature. It is because of the lack of these goods that Hobbes' natural man is driven to seek a way out of the state of nature.” (Macpherson, 1962, p. 29) When these institutions and activities do not exist in this natural state, the question becomes how people have such an individualized, atomized, disassociated existence? In this case Hobbes claims that this state of nature should be taken as something hypothetical like a thought experiment. It does not have to be an empirical fact. To complete this thought experiment, he goes on to explain how men come together.

## **1.2. CHOICE OF CONTRACT**

Then what should man do when surviving gets more challenging, and perhaps completely impossible? And that is when people start to realize that they have to get out of this state of nature because it makes it impossible for them to survive. According to Hobbes, the desire to get out of state of nature is a rational choice.



According to the definition of the human being and the effort of man to get out of the state of nature, Hobbes advocates a contract between men to stop the state of war and ensure peace. A state of nature where there is always competition and fights because of human nature turns into a state of war because of the absence of governance, which will end by this contract. Getting out of state of nature or in a sense state of war is possible by the result of rational contract. Contract means to stop this warfare, leaving their natural rights and power, which was in state of nature belonged to them, to a man or assembly of men.

“A *Common-wealth* is said to be *Instituted*, when a *Multitude* of men do Agree, and *Covenant, every one, with every one*, that to whatsoever *Man* or *Assembly Men*, shall be given by the major part, the *Right to Present* the Person of them all,” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 121)

The description of contract mentioned above, actually begins with a covenant which is an ongoing process. As ongoing process the covenant would have to be repeatedly formed. Hence, to avoid this repeating reformation, a contract is made, and this contract is transitive: if A makes contract with B, and B do with C, contract will be valid between A and C. Hence, as soon as these people give up their natural rights by contract, they become what Hobbes defines as body politic.

Contract means surrender of natural right. Nevertheless, it does not mean that the nature of man, defined by Hobbes, disappeared. Man, still carries his nature. Yet, he also makes contract not to use his natural features. They are still competitive, they still seek glory. With the contract they declare that they will not use their natural features anymore. However, since they have the same nature, since they have the same build up, same constitution they will compete, and they will again end up fighting with each other. Therefore, it can be inferred that even if there is contract, man is not constant because of his nature. He may break a contract to seek his own benefit, so there should be a sovereign to control them.

Contract is the only way for Hobbes to ensure peace. As a guarantee of peace, contract means that man who lives in the state of nature transfers his/her natural rights to a sovereign for being in peace. The sovereign, formed by the transfer of natural rights, ensures peace by keeping those who transfer their rights under his control. The controlling process is prominent because, as already mentioned above, people actually

do not change their nature through the contract, they just promise not to use it. If there would be a sovereign or governor and his/her laws, man cannot fight with each other. By leaving their power to a man or assembly man, “which is a Common Power, to keep them in awe, and to direct their actions to the Common Benefit.” is the only way to live in without war. (Hobbes, 1996, s. 120) In order for the society to sustain its existence an absolute power is required and that power should take care or defend and maintain the contract and anything that becomes possible through the contract, hence the society. However, the priority is that the sovereign has to defend the contract first because once the contract is demolished people will be back to the state of nature.

Although Hobbes argues that only the sovereign, who emerges by contract, can stop man’s natural desires, he does not discuss how the sovereign will be chosen. He just characterizes how a sovereign should be and what kind of rights he/she has to stop subjects.

### **1.3. ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN**

The explanation of the sovereign voter corresponds to the rational decision of people who want to get rid of the state of nature to make a contract. In that process of establishing a contract, man also give assent to the formation of a sovereign(ty). They have to transfer their natural rights to keep themselves safe and in peace. It is not clear how they choose a man to transfer their rights. However, according to Hobbes they make a rational choice by making a contract and choosing a man to leave rights and make him/her sovereign. As soon as these men, who live in state of nature, give up their natural rights they become what Hobbes calls a body politic. They become a political body and a society. This society includes those people who decided rationally to leave the state of nature behind, but they still have the same nature. According to their inseparable nature, they are still competitive, they still seek glory. By contract, they declare that they will not use their natural rights anymore so they will not seek glory or they will not compete with each other. Nevertheless, because they have the same structure—and the same nature, they may lose control over themselves, succumb to their desires, and start to compete and fight with each other again (you have already said all this in the previous section). In order for that body politic and society to sustain its existence, enforcing an absolute power is required to control human nature to prevent any competition. So, that power should take care of or defend and maintain

the contract and anything that becomes possible through the contract, hence the society. However, the priority is that the owner of power, the sovereign has to defend the contract first because once the contract is demolished, they will be back to the state of nature.

To defend the contract, in a sense, peace, Hobbes argues that there is a need for a power that will prevent competition and the desire for glory in human nature. This power exists to tame passions, make people feel secure, and prevent them from competing. This power appears as the sovereign and has an unlimited right to maintain peace. Hobbes gives a nearly unlimited right to the sovereign as; “Sovereign Power cannot be forfeited.”, “The Sovereigns Actions cannot be justly accused by the Subject.”, “Whatsoever the Sovereign doth, is unpunishable by the Subject.”, “And of making War, and Peace, as he shall think best:” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 122-124) Attribute such absolute power and right to sovereign carries purpose of prevent the continuity of the contract from being put at risk. This risk contains fear of returning to state of nature where man are not physically in safe.

These unlimited rights and not being a part of the contract attributes nearly absolute power to the sovereign. To protect the contract, he, by the absolute power, may fight subjects or other sovereigns, or can establish new laws. The subjects have to live with the laws that the sovereign commands. Political and legal norms are to be defended by the sovereign itself and only by him. There can be no participation in that process. There is not even a possibility of negotiation of the sovereign. According to *Leviathan*, the sovereign is not a part of the contract and that his only function is to preserve and defend the contract for the society. The persons who make up the society, or even the contract, have no fundamental importance or function for the sovereign.

“Because the right of bearing the Person of them all, is given to him they make Sovereign, by Covenant only of one to another, and not of him to any of them; there can happen no breach of Covenant on the part of the Sovereign;” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 122)

However, it may have a derivative value in terms of the preservation of the contract “as in the presences of the Master the Servants are equal and without any honour at all; So are the subjects in the presence of the Sovereign.” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 128) The absolute sovereign in Hobbes and the features he attributes to people have affected

today's political understanding by undergoing some changes. However, two of the most emphasized notes for these influences were the problems observed in the definitions of sovereign and human.

#### **1.4. TWO PROBLEMS IN HOBBS' THEORY**

In Hobbes' theory two main problems can be found. One of them is about the man who seeks his own benefit and because of fear of war invents a sovereign. The other one is about the definition of the sovereign itself.

##### **1.4.1. Description of Man**

Hobbes defines the features such as competition, diffidence and glory that he attributes to the human nature as a universal feature; all people have the same quality and they compete for their desires, try to protect bodily existence and as a consequence want to get glory. Man always competes for his desires and the most desirable is being alive. They achieve glory if they manage to survive and to avoid the exact opposite situation they are always in diffidence. Hobbes argues that these characteristics will be valid for every human being, and in this respect, the definition of the human becomes a uniform, a mechanical movement. The human nature which Hobbes defines is mechanistic, the human being consists of matter, this matter is in motion and this motion is provided by its own faculties. This can be exemplified by the provision of the movement by his own faculties, trying to survive through physical or rational form of struggle. Thus, the human being is self-moving and it can also be self-directed, his only aim is to keep on moving.

Since in the state of nature, man is in fact a system matter in motion, and since its only desire or only concern is to survive, man always competes or fights to grasp resources which will affect his/her survival rate. Then the survival rate would depend on grasping or controlling the life source. Man wants to keep on surviving as much as he can, and so to control these life sources, that the others also need, can compete or attack. So, man chooses a way of life that competes or fights. It can be argued that there are a few choices: the first one is to survive or to die. Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, man's first and the strongest desire is being alive. So, there is no choice about surviving. The second choice is fighting or competing to gain sources. Yet, indeed fighting or competing has no other result, both will eliminate the other person by

killing or injuring. This result causes fear to all man in the state of nature and given this fear they fight not only for desires, but now to get rid of that fear. If one eliminates the other, there would not be a man to cause him fear. Hence because of this circle of fear and fight, they make a contract not to kill each other. In these circumstances the third choice arises; contract. However, if man's first desire is to survive, and if man desires common resources with others in order to survive, and if all humans start a war because of a common feature such as competition, it seems impossible to reach resources without fighting. In other words, in order to live, which is the first goal, the first desire, man needs an order that will not create the possibility of war, and for this he makes a contract with his rational decision. Here again, the contract appears as a necessity. Even if Hobbes proposes another method or concept instead of a contract, the result will still be the result of an obligation.

All act of men is about surviving, all desires derive from this purpose. Men are atomized and disassociated individuals, self-moving, self-driven system of matter in motion. Hence, Hobbes describes the human being as a mechanical system that just seeks resources to survive and does everything to protect bodily existence. "The machine seeks to continue its own motion. It does this by moving towards things which it calculates are conducive to its continued motion and away from things conducive." (Macpherson, 1962, p. 32) They have only one aim, continue moving and this completely physical explanation leads to a set of values and tendencies that Hobbes finally describes as this fundamental universal human nature. According to his definition of man, there are no moral rules to tie men with each other, "The value man set on one another (...) is measured by the degree to which each is honoured and dishonoured by others." (Macpherson, 1962, p. 37)

In trying to understand what Hobbes wants to do, the final picture that one gets on is the following: The human being is in continuous competition, tries to get privileged access to resources, wants to achieve survival and is also aware that someone else might try to grab that thing, so he/she knows that everyone is a potential competitor. In this atmosphere, it is natural that people might compete to kill another person to eliminate the other resource consumer. According to these explanations, human existence turns in to some sort of commodity. Man's life can become the object of competition between an infinite number of individuals under the power used to attain

desires. So, one gets value from others like a commodity.

It is seen above that Hobbes' definition of human nature turns man into a commodity and this commodity is made by individuals whose are just enemies. The discourse of "homo homini lupus" - that is being enemies with each other because of scarce resources – according to which one can crush another for one's own benefit, is still used even four centuries after Hobbes. In other words, it cannot be said Hobbes' past definition of human being is no longer used. Sometimes in economics and sometimes in totalitarianism, the mechanical human picture that Hobbes defined can be found again. What is the equivalent of human nature, which has been commodified as mentioned above in a mechanical sense, today in the modern age? Evaluation of the human being as a commodity facilitates a group or person to be seen as valuable or unworthy through political or moral discourses in the modern age. While Hobbes attributed the adjective valuable/worthless in terms of ensuring the continuity of physical existence, today this value is defined in terms of power-economic relations and political views. In such an evaluation, it can be observed that production-consumption relations and politics including all kinds of life practices play a role.

The most striking problem of the definition of human, which even today is used and leads to the determination of all these valuable/worthless adjectives and still sees the human as a commodity, is that it tells the "things, which are" as "they ought to be" In Hobbes, the transformation of man into a commodity is encountered in two situations; first, that in the state of nature people can kill another for the sake of their own ends while pursuing their desires; second, in the state of society, while obeying the sovereign's command to avoid the feared return to the state of nature. In both cases, the worth of a person is determined by someone else on a case-by-case basis. It should be accepted that even if Hobbes expresses opinions about human beings based on the social situation he observes (the characteristics he assumes to be common among humans, the value of human being determined by someone else, etc.), his observations will be limited. It is impossible for him to examine all the people living in the state of society on earth and to find common features in the state of nature for all people on earth as a result of this examination. So it can be said that Hobbes examines the existing and refers to what ought to be. Considering that he lived during the civil war period, the sovereign must be bowed to in order to get out of the internal turmoil, and the

theoretical equivalent of this situation is turmoil in the state of nature, and the sovereign must be obeyed in the state of society. In the hypothetical argument that he created by isolating the existing relationships Hobbes observed from all social ties, he presents the “currently existing” as universal, and introduces it as “what ought to be”. Logically “ought to be” cannot derive from “what is”. But still nowadays this logical error is used for different purposes as previously mentioned. For example, in modern states, a state of emergency can be declared in order to get rid of internal turmoil, the existing legal practices can be abolished and the practice of obedience to a sovereign can be seen. This attitude is an existing practice, but it cannot be considered as something "ought to be".

#### **1.4.2. Description of the Sovereign**

In Hobbes's theory, the sovereign derives from the need for peace. In the state of nature, where there is no peace because of human nature, all men are equal in terms of their fundamental features. Being equal in fundamental features means equality in the sense of getting some way to access resources. This equality develops fear, and this fear causes fight or war to gain resources and to survive thanks to them. However, in this case there is always a conflict, and this action never comes to an end because of the equality of men. Fundamental equalities give man the same purposes and right to kill others for the same purposes. So, in a state if everyone is against everyone there cannot be life and peace. Yet it should not be forgotten that man's first desire is to survive, he/she should ensure peace to survive. If they all have the same desires, same fundamental features and same natural rights to reach desires, and if these qualities and rights can cause a war in the end, they should drop their natural rights. So to construct a peaceful life, men have to transfer their own will and the right to kill a man or assembly man. This man is called the sovereign and the rights are transferred by a contract. Sovereign should have more power than the subjects because he must stop or control their natural features and natural rights. So there occurs a sovereign which is the most powerful-among the subjects without equality with both sides. The sovereign is not even a part of the contract.

In this case, it cannot be said that a completely peaceful life has been established, because there is still a power, a power to kill others. When the sovereign collects all rights to kill, he now is the only person who has limitless right to kill. The sovereign

is not the most powerful simply because he has gathered power: If it were then one of the subjects might try to get his/her power back. Hobbes proposes that all possible ways against the sovereign be blocked so that he can remain stronger than his subjects. Particularly in the case of resistance, which Hobbes denies the right to resist, sovereignty has the right to maintain its own power. The subjects cannot stop or punish the sovereign even when they think that there is a problem because of the contract which transfers all will to the sovereign.

“Hurt inflicted on the Representative of the Commonwealth, is not Punishment, but an act of Hostility: Because it is of the nature of Punishment, to be inflicted by publique Authority, which is the Authority only of the Representative itself.” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 216)

The second problem derives after the transfer of right and power, which is about the sovereign. According to the definition of the new state, namely the state of the society, sovereign is the main protector of bodily existence and safety. “The End of Commonwealth, particular Security:” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 117) Yet, this security or institution of common wealth “are derived all the Rights, and Facultyes of him, or them, on whom the Sovereign Power is conferred by the consent of the People assembled.” (Hobbes, 1996, s. 121) . As it is mentioned before, it seems that there is a choice or pure will to transfer rights or create a sovereign, but in order to survive man must do these actions.



## **CHAPTER TWO: THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTRACTARIAN THEORY**

Although Hobbes' theory dates back to the seventeenth century, four century before the present, why he or his theory is still crucial?

It is evident that the twenty-first century states are not suddenly established and neither are they just based on Hobbes' theory. They have been formed as a result of a very long intellectual history and they evolve with new ideas. The first nuclei of the modern state begin to sprout in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries. Especially the changes of the definition of legality and legitimacy in centuries have prepared the features of the modern state. In the Middle Ages, the legitimacy of political power and the state was based on divine power, and with the institutionalization of religious actions, sovereignty was bestowed by God. However, from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, legitimacy began to be sought in society itself. Discussions on this new source of legitimacy that that was sought in society-started with Machiavelli, Bodin, and Hobbes and have continued until today. Especially in the nineteenth century, the sovereign's legitimacy was sought for in society, and it was tried to be established with new theories or proposals. These discussions, which continue in mutual interaction with the changing social, political and economic dynamics of each period, also show their effects on the twentieth and twenty-first century state order.

Why can Hobbes still be important today although ideas and theories change by time? Hobbes' suggestion is important because he gives a formula to legitimize an all-powerful sovereignty and a state order. This formula involves three distinct phases: first, the state of nature; second, the social contract and finally the state of society arises. In the first step is, state of nature which contains conflicts between man. This first step conflict brings with fearful times about protecting life. In second step, according to law of nature man use own reason and decide to make contract to ensure peace by transferring their right of nature to a sovereign. And the last step man starts to live in state of society where they protect physical existence and obey to a sovereign. Hobbes' suggestion is like a formula that is useful by changing data. The best example to constate political area by using Hobbes' useful formula is the epics of the creation, heroic saga, and war stories resembling a fairytale hero. Such historical or mythical

narrations are used for constructing identity and establishing a connection to people. This kind of narrations contains a human nature according to identity, the bad position in progress and rescue from that bad situation of this identity's people and maintaining the desired order for the owners of this identity. These narrations aim to move those who share the same identity as a whole against possible danger.

Perpetuity is the most useful concept for Hobbes' materialized formulation: avoiding the state of war and maintaining the perpetuity of the state of peace. It does not matter whether that avoidable war is a real threat or not. This real or hypothetical war ensures perpetuity which is defined as peace. This formula can also be used for economic benefit, although this is not the real problem for Hobbes. In a political order, when politics is used for a group's economic benefit, this economic benefit can be hidden under Hobbes' formula's third, state of society step. which can correlate with perpetuity. People can be dragged into a battle for economic achievements under the name of racial, religious, or state perpetuity.

So while social contract theory requires an understanding of human nature to theoretical movements, it is in a sense regime agnostic. The state itself does not have to adhere to a particular regime. Thus, social contract theory has been used for all sorts of purposes. Hobbes used social contract theory to provide a justification for the monarch's perpetuity.

this kind of understanding of perpetuity can be used for various purposes in Carl Schmitt's definition of the political concept. Even though he states that man cannot be used for any economic, moral, etc. purposes in war, his definition of political concept allows it.

### **CHAPTER THREE: CARL SCHMITT AND HIS VIEW OF THE POLITICAL**

Carl Schmitt (1888-1985) is one of the political theorists and jurists in Germany. The country where he worked and lived is often referred to because his country is the basis of his adaptation to the political and legal frameworks of his period and the views he defended in his works. “As witness to some of the most decisive events in German history, Schmitt experienced the collapse of the monarchy in 1918, the turmoil of the Weimar Republic, the Nazi dictatorship, and the creation of the Federal Republic.” (Bendersky, 1983, p. ix). It may be said that his witnessing starts with his family history, long before Schmitt's birth, but affects the world of thought. Schmitt's Catholic family members migrated from Moselle valley. The reason for their emigration from the Moselle was the constant rivalry and conflict between France and Germany. Moselle, which was included within the borders of Germany with the 1871 Frankfurt Peace Treaty, joined the French territory again as a result of the defeat of Germany in the First World War. Schmitt's family migrated to Plettenberg on complicated grounds. Schmitt's struggle with his family cannot merely be considered an immigration. This migration story has other challenges in close relation to faith. Schmitt's family members were devout Catholics. The family's religious affiliations were so strong that Carl Schmitt's three great uncles were all pastors. Being firmly attached to Catholicism, the Schmitt family wanted Carl Schmitt to grow up with this commitment, and they chose the institution where he would receive education in the province as a school that also provided Catholic education. In addition, all members of the family, who advocated Catholicism not as a pure belief but as a political attitude, were permanent members of the Catholic Center Party. After 1920, Schmitt tried to distinguish between religion and politics, but this did not rule out the personal and traditional testimonies that formed his political view. “Schmitt was ambitious; he would try to compensate for his humble origins by winning public recognition of his achievements.” (Bendersky, 1983, p. 7)

In 1920's he became one of the most effective theorists of Weimar Republic. He usually argued about democracy in Germany and feasibility of democracy. The most memorable position he held was being an adviser to the Hindenburg government

between 1930-33, to obtain the theoretical and legal justifications for the presidential government that ruled Germany through emergency decrees. (Bendersky, 1983) He worked on the illegal executions of political opponents of Hitler. In all these periods he studied political, constitutional issues, he wrote several essays about it.

Such political actions led Schmitt to be portrayed in different ways. For some, he is a thinker who draws attention to the bad tendency of German politics, for others he is a defender of fascist thought, for some others he is an opportunist and for others he is a nihilist. In this thesis, however, Schmitt's political attitude will not be challenged. Instead, the purpose is to show what that his descriptions of the politics, political action and political attitude can lead to.

Schmitt's political view mostly reminds Hobbes' theory. In Hobbes' theory, whether it is state of nature or state of society, there is always a physical fight, a real or a possible murder case. In state of nature subjects were the agent of possible killing, in state of society sovereign himself is an agent because of having all rights to kill. Schmitt also constructs his political definition on conflict, and he mentions a real killing case or its possibility.

When politics is mentioned, many relations of administration, especially the state comes to mind. Politics is used as a concept that summarizes the relations of administration and duties such as economy, security, order, etc. in the functioning of the system called the state. Being aware of this situation Schmitt states that “the state thus appears as something political, the political as something pertaining to the state-obviously an unsatisfactory circle.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 20) Nevertheless, according to Schmitt, the state and the political have different definitions and the state can be that definition's symbol by organized people. Schmitt claims that, the state is a status of an organized people in a land and this definition has become applicable in recent years. However, he explains the state in its historical and literal concept and notes that, state is a “specific entity of people” and “It is the decisive case the ultimate authority.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, pp. 19-20) So, it is the highest status compared to all individuals and collective statuses.

According to Schmitt, “The concept of the state presupposes the concept of the political.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 19) First, there should be a political view and then the state will be shaped through that view. According to

Schmitt, using the terms state and politics interchangeably would cause a mistake in practical/governmental sphere. However, there is a handicap that Schmitt's discourses highlight in the separation between the political and the state from each other, his definition of the political corresponds to the state takes precedence over society.

According to Schmitt, the definition of the political can only be found by defining certain political categories. Just as morality, aesthetics and economy have criteria, politics has its own criteria. Criteria in morality is good and evil; in aesthetics it is beautiful and ugly and in economy profitable and unprofitable. Criteria in political, besides, is distinction between friend and enemy. The distinction of friend and enemy is just a nominal distinction, it does not provide any information about the content. The friend-enemy distinction only expresses the degree of intensity of unity and separation at the extreme points. Just as a certain criterion was needed when defining concepts such as ethics, aesthetics, and economy, it was stated that a certain criterion was also needed when defining the concept of politics. However, the criteria of the political are not predetermined, or there is no obligation to be similar or united with another criterion which means "the political enemy need not be morally evil or aesthetically ugly; he need not appear as an economic competitor," or having just the opposite feature, does not necessarily make a political friend. (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 27) The concepts of friend and enemy just mean the unity or separation in certain cases. In Schmitt's political view, the concept of enemy becomes more important than friend. According to Schmitt's explanations about governing and politics, it can be observed that the actions are taken against the enemy. So, who is the enemy, how can be declared as an enemy, how can it be understood that someone is an enemy? Enemy is a group of man who have the possibility of fighting with another group of man. Hence, enemy is not a person but a group of man. There is no mention about personal qualities, maybe she/he would never be someone's economically personal competitor, a morally despicable person, or aesthetically ugly. However, a person can be declared as an enemy just because of being a member of another group. The enemy is not merely any competitor or just any partner of a conflict in general. He is also not the private adversary whom one hates. An enemy exists only when, at least potentially, one fighting collectivity of people confronts a similar collectivity. The enemy is solely the public enemy, because everything that has a relationship to such a

collectivity of men, particularly to a whole nation, becomes public by virtue of such a relationship. (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 28)

After defining the political as a friend enemy distinction with its critical points, Schmitt stated that “the political can derive its energy from the most varied human endeavors, from the religious, economic, moral, and other antitheses.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 38) It can be understood that the political, in other words the friend-enemy distinction, can be derived from different groups with religious, moral members and of economically different standards. Nevertheless, in the same book he writes “on the other hand, it would be senseless to wage war for purely religious, purely moral, purely juristic, or purely economic motives. The friend-and-enemy grouping and therefore also war cannot be derived from these specific antitheses of human endeavor.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 36) While on the one side, he says that human endeavors -as religion, moral, ethnic, economic – cannot be only reason to wage war, he says, on the other side, that these endeavor’s energy can cause political conflict. Schmitt does not give any clear information for the content of making or being political group. There are no answers to such questions as “what is the main cause of the conflict, how the endeavors affect this situation?”. Again in the same book he goes on to argue that “very religious, moral, economic, ethnic, or other antithesis transforms into a political one if it is sufficiently strong to group human beings effectively according to friend and enemy.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 37) Therefore, while earlier in his book Schmitt states that any of the humanitarian efforts alone cannot be a sufficient reason to distinguish between friend and enemy, later in the same book he states that if these efforts are strong enough, they can determine a political action. For example “a religious community which wages wars against members of other religious communities or engages in other wars is already more than a religious community; it is a political entity.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 37) The concept of power also is not clearly explained, but power can be understood as being a more crowded or a more unionized than the other group. However, if power is the only obstacle for religious, moral, economic, ethnic or as Schmitt mentions in page 37 other antithesis to become a political group, once they reach this power, there will be possibility of real existence of fight because of the friend enemy distinction. This real possibility, the existence of war in the sense of real existence, is the main point of Schmitt's political definition.

Schmitt always defends the existence of a real possibility of a real war between friend and enemy. Being a member of a group is not enough for Schmitt, there should be a real, physical possibility of combat. So combat, war or fight is not just a thought experience as Hobbes' state of nature, there should be real actors: "The friend, enemy, and combat concepts receive their real meaning precisely because they refer to the real possibility of physical killing. (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 33) The friend-enemy distinction is stated as a nominalist distinction, there is still no clear definition of these concepts. In such a case, any group can be named an enemy for any reason, and with that name alone, the possibility of a real war can be created.

What is the real possibility of war? In Schmitt's argument war is understood as a real act of killing. Nevertheless, besides his former explanations, he also states that every political action is not supposed to be a military fight. Therefore, it can be inferred that if it is not necessarily a military struggle, a war or a fight does not have to be a physical struggle. If political action involves intergroup conflict rather than individual enmity, and hostility between these groups does not always take place as a military struggle, then real possibility of war can turn into a repression between different groups by different tools. This may involve the domination of powerful groups, non-physical, cultural and similar, over weaker groups. In this situation, where there are no physical threats and protection which turns into a war, it can be said that the discursive or conceptual references can declare enemy as a group. Just intellectually, people can be named friends or enemies for various different reasons. In another paragraph, Schmitt bases his points on the words of a British diplomat claiming that the friend-enemy distinction is a political issue, not a military one: "A British diplomat correctly stated in this context that the politician is better schooled for the battle than the soldier, because the politician fights his whole life whereas the soldier does so in exceptional circumstances only." (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 34) Schmitt always emphasizes that the basis of taking a political action or being a political union is the ability to distinguish between friend and enemy and argues that this distinction should correspond to real existence and real possibility. In the previous quotations, he states that politicians are well trained in battling and that politicians fight throughout their lives. It is clear that politicians determine the conditions, situations and results with their rhetoric, not with a physical struggle. A politician can create conditions that can turn into a physical war with his discursive practices. In other words, politicians

can interpret the similarities and differences of two different groups positively or negatively, decide whether they can be enemies or friends, and can use the real existence of the members of these groups as a material for the actual war with their verbal/written expressions. Thus, even if there is no physical danger, people can be turned into enemies or friends through views and expression of thought. So the real possibility of war, does no longer mean a present danger. The other important issue in his definition is implicit in this statement: “But as an ever present possibility it is the leading presupposition which determines in a characteristic way human action and thinking and thereby creates a specifically political behavior.” (Schmitt, *The Concept Of The Political*, 2007, p. 34) Concepts such as friend - enemy and war, which get their meaning within reality according to Schmitt’s first definition, now turn into a consequence of a presupposition. So, why is the difference between “presupposition” and “real possibility” important? If there is a real possibility of an attack, then the subject of attack can be assumed to be an enemy and all actions aimed at protection may be accepted as a defense. However, if there is just a presupposition of an attack and because of this presupposition a group of man is assumed to be an enemy, there would be many acts of murder under the name of defense. Thus, a de facto war can break out between groups that are thoughtfully conceived and are declared as enemies or friends, based only on presupposition. The reason for this war is that people are convinced because of enough repetition of the presupposition. From the quotations addressed so far, it can be deduced that Schmitt's emphasis on the real possibility of war corresponds to “presupposition”. Why is there a need for a precondition that determines people's behavior and thoughts? Such a presumption is often used to easily manipulate the masses and maintain the existing system. The existing system tacitly or clearly can bring difference between groups into sharp relief, in religion, moral, linguistic or cultural side for economic reasons or the governor’s personal benefits. Also, manipulating masses for such differences is persuading that the other group is dangerous and to run away from danger they need someone who shows the way to escape. Sometimes the willingness of getting rid of danger can lead to obeying that person called “sovereign” who shows the way. So, the existing system means a life without a danger that is desired and expected to continue. The desire to “continue” a life without danger can be called perpetuity.



Perpetuity is mostly used for a meaning of good situation which exists right now and wanted to continue. The problem is that if Schmitt's political definition is taken into consideration and used in administration, war can easily be started between two groups of people because of some of the characteristics and distinctive definitions attributed to the person that are not the result of his own choice. Moreover, the cause of this war may serve to another purpose, such as economic benefit or personal interest, under the name of perpetuity of which even the combatants are unaware of.

### **3.1. SCHMITT'S PERSPECTIVE ON HOBBS AND THE SIMILARITY BETWEEN THEM**

This thesis started with Hobbes' *Leviathan* and continued with Schmitt's definition of the political because some similarities can be observed between them. These similarities between Schmitt and Hobbes can start from the friend-enemy distinction, although there are some differences in their explanations. Hobbes does not use the words of "distinction" and "friend", he usually mentions that men are against each other. In Hobbes' theory, everyone is against everyone because of human nature, so there can not be friendship at the same time with interpersonal conflict. Although people become enemies because of their nature, their first task is to ensure peace. To ensure peace or to get rid of war, all individuals make contract to not kill each other. However, the contract does not change their nature, they still have the same desires, so they need a ruler to keep their nature under control and in peace. The ruler or the sovereign keeps the subjects in peace by removing their natural right to kill. Subjects transfer their wills or natural rights to a sovereign; they accept being under the control to protect their physical existence. Now, subjects do not have the right of killing because they transfer their natural rights to sovereign but all rights of killing is collected at sovereign. It means choosing a sovereign or just transferring rights to someone and making that man the sovereign is not enough to protect or ensure peace. The sovereign must be the most powerful to stop subject's acts which would cause a war. Up to now, it is seen that being enemy in Hobbes' theory comes from the human nature and should be kept in control. While Hobbes defines being enemy or turning into enemy as a natural phenomenon, Schmitt defines being enemy or friend as a necessity while he defines the concept of the political, but he does not give any certain cause for being enemy or friend. From Schmitt's perspective, there should always be friend-enemy distinction, but this distinction can be made for many reasons. According

to Schmitt, all human endeavors like moral, economic, religious or ethnic can cause the friend-enemy distinction given that these endeavors belong a powerful group. In Schmitt's theory, there is no individuals, men are taken as members of groups and groups fight against each other. These groups can be religious, moral, ethnic or in a wider sense a state needs a sovereign who decides the time of war or friend enemy distinction.

Schmitt's clearest definition of sovereignty, apart from the above-mentioned explanations related to its historical context, comes from one of his famous books, *Political Theology*. In *Political Theology* he writes that "Sovereign is he who decides on the exception." (Schmitt, *Political Theology*, 2005, p. 5) However, deciding for the exception is not enough, the sovereign also decides the way of disposal of that exception. So, the sovereign ultimately means a person who decides for the state of exception and for the methods or ways to end that state. It is not clear in Schmitt's argument what makes a man able to decide for the exception and thus the sovereign. Schmitt only claims that the sovereign is the real person who can make a decision of exception. Not everyone, but only the sovereign can decide for the state of exception. But if the sovereign alone has this capacity, what gives this special capacity to him? Schmitt does not say anything about how the sovereign acquires this capacity, he only says that the sovereign is sovereign precisely because of his decision-making capacity. In this respect, Schmitt's approach to sovereignty is paradoxical. Although the first question about sovereignty remains unanswered, if his argument is further examined, two more questions come to mind: First, what is the exception that the sovereign should be aware of? Secondly, what are the ways of eliminating this exception, which was noticed by the sovereign and wanted to be eliminated? While Schmitt expresses the exception as a threat to the state, he does not make clear what is threat and when it occurs. In fact, Schmitt emphasizes that the state of exception is already uncertain. According to Schmitt, the details of the state of exception are not previously predicted and there is no idea about it and when it will occur is unknown. Therefore, when the state of exception is not clearly distinguished from other states, it is very difficult to foresee the exception, and if the person who may be challenged by this uncertainty is the sovereign, the sovereign has to be stronger than the others. What does being stronger mean? If exception is something that is wanted to be disposed of, it can easily be understood that exception is something which is not desired among state or

powerful groups because it will harm them. In Schmitt's view, exception is an authority which is unlimited. Being limitless in power or in authority means suspension of existing order, such as the deactivation of certain rights protected by constitutional articles. Consequently, if the exception is something that the sovereign can decide and end, then the sovereign is the most powerful person in terms of proclaiming this state of exception whose content is ambiguous according to Schmitt's definition and suspending the entire existing order to end the state of exception.

What are the similarities between Hobbes and Schmitt in terms of the sovereign? "For Hobbes, it is the state of war of individuals; for Schmitt, it is the state of war of groups (especially of nations)." (Strauss, 2007, p. 109) According to Hobbes, the sovereign is needed to not return to the state of nature which is the state of war, where everyone is against everyone because of man's nature. The state of nature is scary, no one can feel in confidence. Men's physical existences are under threat. To get rid of this threat a new protector, the protector of peace should be set. In Hobbes' theory this protector of peace, the sovereign is called *Leviathan*. According to Schmitt, Leviathan is the production of human reason, man produce Leviathan to keep on their physical existence. Schmitt describes Leviathan as "nothing but a product of human art and human intelligence. The Leviathan thus becomes none other than a huge machine, a gigantic mechanism in the service of ensuring the physical protection of those governed." (Schmitt, *The Leviathan In The State Theory Of Thomas Hobbes Meaning And Failure Of A Political Symbol*, 1996, pp. 34-35)

In the state, Leviathan should make the subjects obey his decisions to prevent civil war or to not go back to the state of nature and he should set an army and fight as a machine which does its works perfectly to prevent the state from foreign enemies. In Schmitt's definition, the sovereign is someone who rules the state of exception whose content and the friend-enemy distinction are not exactly clear. According to Schmitt, deciding for the state of exception is a capacity of the sovereign, and the sovereign also decides for the ways of ending this state. Ending the state of exception or, in another words, removing the risk contains suspension of the law or constitutional law by sovereign. The suspension of all existing order coincides with the fact that it is almost impossible for the sovereign himself, his actions, his decisions to be controlled by existing legal norms. Giving the sovereign the right to suspend the existing order in order to eliminate the exception and preventing it from being opposed, gives the sovereign

absolute power. Hobbes and Schmitt come together in terms of the absolute sovereign. Both in Hobbes' and Schmitt's terms, the sovereign should be the most powerful. For Hobbes it means to stop man fighting while for Schmitt it is the capacity to foresee the exception.

Political definitions of every state come from a kind of understanding of the human being. It can be inferred that Hobbes and Schmitt's understanding of the human nature are similar to each other. According to Schmitt, all real political theories define human nature as evil and show that there is a need for a strong state that can distinguish between friend and enemy in order to rein in the evil that is the result of human nature. In Hobbes hypothetical argument, "everyone knows that everyone can slay everyone else. Everyone is therefore the foe and the competitor of everyone else." For this reason, man needs a sovereign to protect their existence. (Schmitt, *The Leviathan In The State Theory Of Thomas Hobbes Meaning And Failure Of A Political Symbol*, 1996, p. 31)

Schmitt considers thinkers who describe human nature as evil to be true political theorists. This kind of definition of human nature is followed by the situation of conflict. Schmitt's definition of politics, which also determines human action, has a conflict in it. This conflict also exists in the functioning of state systems that adhere to a certain political view.

In Schmitt and Hobbes' understanding of the state, there is always a state of conflict, individually or as an organization. The reason for this fight is the preservation of the physical existence of the individual in Hobbes, but not clear in Schmitt. The fact that the criteria for determining friend-enemy and especially the state of exception are not clearly defined, and the acceptance of war as a pre-supposition to regulate human actions, allow the use of myths in Hobbes' contract formulation, as well as in Schmitt's. If any group that gains enough power - ethnic, economic, moral - turns into a political group and can distinguish between friend and enemy, they can produce mythical discourses to protect a situation they find "good" for themselves. For example, they may present "glorious" historical narratives that can demonstrate the current or former prosperity of an ethnic group in every sense. They may start a war by claiming that they have detected or predicted a situation that could discredit this glorious history and distort the narrative. Or vice versa, a powerful group can often impose on the masses

the fear of relapse, somewhat exaggerating the evil of the previous situation rather than the good of the current situation, as in Hobbes. They may declare another group as an enemy, which they think may cause this fear.

The historical narrations which can be used in Hobbes' contractarian theory and Schmittian political definition, called political myth. Political myths are useful for imposing fear and emerging a belief to a rescuer sovereign. It was seen in Hobbes that fear determines or shapes human lives. So it can be derived that myths are narrations of fear to determine life. In this context "In Cassirer's view, myth is not just a simple way of thinking or speaking: myth, in his view, is a whole form of life." (Bottici, 2007, p. 182) Usage of the concept of myth is common for ancient or religious beliefs but in the modern state, political myths can be called as a new technique of power. By this new technique, individuals come together as a member of a group and their feelings are affected. "By melting the individual into the collective responsibility, the very sense of freedom is destroyed but, at the same time, human beings are relieved from a heavy burden, that of personal responsibility." (Bottici, 2007, p. 155) According to Sorel, in relation to political myths, people who take part in social events, attribute their own "action as part of a sequence of events that assures the triumph of their cause". (Bottici, 2007, p. 177) The reason why they see their actions as a cause to be victorious is because political myths describe the group that has barely survived the hard times of the past, and they fear the past and aim to preserve the current good system. Thus, the person whose action is determined by political myth has a case from the past and an effort to prevent this case from ending badly. According to Cassirer, this attitude of political myths aims to link current and past events and tries to remind an old testament. (Bottici, 2007, p. 178)

So myths contain exaggeration and repetition of fear to influence nations by trying to link current and past events. "Myth is 'a belief held in common by a large group of people that gives events and actions a particular meaning.'" This belief works on "typically by defining enemies and heroes and tying ideas of right and wrong to people's identity." (Kaufman, 2001, pp. 16,29) As with other beliefs, in myth the discourse does not have to be true or its truth is not even important. Even if the discourse refers to real events, the way of telling and describing the event may contain mythical elements. These different types of narration also mobilize the masses who

believe in those types. To illustrate the point, Edelman uses the example of American attitudes toward the Vietnam War. To those who believed in the myth of “America the righteous,” the meaning of American military action was a stand against communist aggression, and facts that did not fit that image -American misdeeds of various kinds- were ignored or rejected. To others, the war was symbolized by the napalming of children. They therefore accepted the myth of “Vietnam the victim,” the ultimate expression of which was Jane Fonda's visit to North Vietnam and rejected or downplayed any evidence of North Vietnamese misdeeds. (Kaufman, 2001, p. 28)

Myths can be used as a symbol of an ethnic group and hostility to other groups can be fueled by the expressive power of this symbol. For example, “In ethno-nationalist mythology, the ethnic group has existed for millennia, and has always yearned for a country of its own:” (Kaufman, 2001, p. 4) In the myth of a certain ethnic group, let it be emphasized that a certain region is the homeland. If this group currently resides in that country, it takes the risk of protecting the region from the “enemy”. If it is not currently in that homeland, it prepares to fight to take it back from the “enemy” who has taken their place. What will guide these preparations and actions is the way of describing all situations, as in the example of the homeland. Continuing with the example of the homeland, there is an emotionally stimulating difference between saying that a territory has simply been lost and that it has been brutally seized. Again, explaining the victory of a region with a glorious victory or against very difficult conditions is an important factor in mobilizing the masses emotionally. “Edelman argues that symbolic appeals create around conflicts of interest a myth of struggle against “hostile, alien, or subhuman forces” as a way to mobilize support.” (Kaufman, 2001, p. 29) According to this view, political choice is mostly emotional expression, politics is mostly about manipulating people's emotions.

Considering the concepts of friend-enemy, sovereign and exception, whose content is not clearly explained, and the possibility of war, which emphasizes the possibility of being de facto, Schmitt's “political” can lead to a myth-supported political system that can work by appealing to the emotions of the masses.

### **3.2. CONSEQUENCES OF THE FRIEND-ENEMY DISTINCTION IN THE REAL WORLD**

In this part of the thesis, the reflections of a policy based on Carl Schmitt's friend-

enemy distinction will be discussed in terms of examples from different countries with a particular focus on Turkey. In the previous part, it was argued that the mythical history narration makes it easier to separate the friend-enemy which are not defined clearly in Schmitt. It is stated that mythical or legendary narratives can activate the emotions of the masses, and that an event that has been or has not been experienced can have an emotional impact on the masses when exaggerated. A few different events from several different periods in Turkey and other countries can be considered as the real plan, where we can see that this emotional influence goes in parallel with Carl Schmitt's definition of the political.

### **3.2.1. Examples from different countries**

While trying to establish a systematic general theory for ethnic war, Kaufman first gives examples of how mythical, economic and ancient hate speeches are and can justify war. Examples can be started from "Confederacy Flag" which Kaufman mentions as an American racial myth. This example is important because the political myth's origin goes back to 1860s but the Confederate Flag reminded itself in the US presidential elections in 2020. The action taken by the supporters of Trump, who lost the presidency in the election, in order to object the general election results in Washington DC, made an impact all over the world. After the counting confirmed that Trump lost the election, pro-Trump supporters stormed the congress building. The image they wore and the materials they used attracted attention rather than the pressure of the mass protesting the election results. One of these materials was the Confederate flag. What does this flag mean? The history of the flag dates back to the civil war in the 1860s'. The reason for the civil war is in sum the fact that in the South there was a mode of production based on the slavery of black people brought from Africa. The northern industrial-commercial bourgeoisie was working to abolish slavery, and these two different attitudes brought about conflicts between interests. For the Northern ruling class, the abolition of slavery meant that its capital at least had the right to life, which of course did not suit the Southern ruling class. Southerners united under the Confederate States and fought against the North American industrial bourgeoisie. With the north winning this war, the enslaved blacks in the south gained many rights (although they could not use them), and the confederation was dissolved. (Bayır, 2021) However, this dissolution did not stop the confederate supporters and the flag gained

a meaning as state rights which was actually the denial of African American's human rights. (Coski, 2018) Instead of accepting that the confederation was using a method against human rights, those who defended it as a state right continued for a long time. There were official statements of denial that allowed this defense to continue. Some of these discourses appeared as monuments, and some of them were included in textbooks as historical narratives. While Loewen mentions this narration as a myth he gives an example from a textbook on middle school students:

The South Secedes Lincoln and the Republicans had promised not to disturb slavery where it already existed. Nevertheless, many people in the South mistrusted the party, fearing that the Republican government would not protect Southern rights and liberties. On December 20, 1860, the South's long-standing threat to leave the Union became a reality when South Carolina held a special convention and voted to secede. (Loewen, 2015)

This event, which Loewen and Kaufman consider as a mythical discourse, shows itself in the elections, as the most obvious form of the political field, even after one hundred and sixty years. The reason why this discourse has lasted for so many years is due to a myth presented in official language. The official language of Southern ruling class refers to the priority of state and its main purpose is protecting the state's right. But because of African Americans these rights and precedence are seen to be in danger. Yet, when looked closely, the economic benefit will come to light. What is tried to be portrayed as a state right is in fact to show African Americans as enemies so as to protect the economic gain of the white native landowner, that is, to protect the perpetuity of the landlord. Besides, this economic purpose is shown throughout centuries as a state right, by producing mythical discourses, which affect emotions. So, again it can be said that mythical and as well official discourses can direct the emotions or benefits of the masses even after a century and these masses can come up in an election or protection and even war because of an ancient belief and hatred.

The other example in Kaufman is the slogan of "Only unity saves the Serbs". Serbs can be given as an example because, in a period when it is thought that nationalist discourses are gradually decreasing, it is seen that nationalist feelings are mobilized and caused a conflict with the effective use of political myths by the sovereigns. There is the myth of Serbian martyrdom which is traced back to the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The Battle



of Kosovo in 1389 is one of the most important events and because this war mythical narrations and slogans developed. In 1389, a war broke between the Ottoman Empire and Serbian-led coalition of forces. The leaders of both sides were dead in the war, and in a sense the war ended in a draw. Yet, showing a war as a draw ruled out a heroic saga or heroic national consciousness. For this reason, Serbs constructed a myth which portrays even defeat in a heroic way. According to this mythical discourse,

Serbs/Serbian leader Lazar, had two choices; to obey to the Ottoman or to die honorably. So, since the first one is unacceptable, Lazar chose to die. (Bills, *The Serbian Cross: The History of Serbia's National Symbol*, 2018) Serbs explain losing that war with the other myth, which accuses Vuk Branković, the son-in-law of Lazar, as being a betrayer since he sided with the Ottomans. They claim that, if he had stayed with his people, Serbs could have won the war. These expressions about history became beneficial in the 19<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The slogan of “Only unity saves the Serbs,” or in their language ‘Samo Sloga Srbina Spasava’, was used by the Serbs in the 20<sup>th</sup> century to justify hostility against Bosnian Muslims and Kosovo Albanian.

The intention behind producing such a slogan or using it for six centuries is to gather all the Serbs against a possible war and to be cautious against a foreign domination. It was Schmitt's intention to take war as a presupposition and shape human actions. Again, for Schmitt, there was a distinction between friend and enemy whose content was not clear, and there was a state of exception. It is possible to read the official discourses of the Serbs addressing this mythical and ethnic heroism from the point of view of Schmitt's theory. Slobodan Milošević, one of the Serbian rulers, who used legendary discourses to identify an enemy and keep the potential war spirit alive, can be regarded as adding mythical stories to Schmitt's notions of enemy and exception whose content is not clear. Slobodan Milošević, who will be nicknamed “the butcher” with his actions and decisions, showed a special interest in Kosovo as a result of the state tradition that tried to move forward with a nationalist discourse, with the election of the Serbian president in 1987. Mete Çubukçu, in his 1999 article in *Birikim Magazine*, states that even if Milošević is not the sole cause of all the events, he is responsible for the Serbian people's potential for raising and still using and even mobilizing their already existing nationalist feelings. (Çubukçu, *Savaşla Beslenen Bir Lider: Miloseviç*, 1999) Milošević pursued a brutal policy of violence and oppression

against Albanians in 1987. He eliminated the Albanians who were active in the political arena and replaced them with Serbs. This exclusionary and ongoing political attitude eventually got what Milošević wanted, with the Albanians retaliating. The radical elements of the Albanians took action, and the attacks began. The Kosovo Liberation Army started to make its name known by raiding the police stations. In fact, it was exactly what Milošević wanted, a valid reason for the violence he created. (Çubukçu, Balkanlar Kan Kokuyor: Kosova'da Şiddet, 1998) The possibility of war, which he put forward to determine human behavior, became a reality with the discourses he produced and spread. The enemy, which did not exist physically in the real sense, existed intellectually, discursively and through the implementation of these discourses. Milošević defined the enemies of his people as a real sovereign does according to Schmitt, then he decided for the state of exception and made war.

Another example of the friend-enemy distinction according to Schmitt's definition and correlation of mythical discursive with Schmitt's theory emerged in the Georgian situation. Georgians were an ethnic group living with the two other ethnic groups, Abkhaz and Ossetians in the same area. During the time of the Soviet Russian period in Georgia, there was Abkhazians and South Ossetia regional autonomy. This regional authority emerged in order to provide political authority more easily. People who did not have cultural and historical unity among themselves were made live together in the same republic during the years of the USSR. Sooner or later these different people tried to separate from each other and in 1931 Abkhazia got autonomy according to Georgia and the Soviet Union. Although they had autonomy, Abkhazian population was not enough to the right of govern themselves. They could not even raise voice in the local government. While the Soviet Union was dissolving, Abkhazia and South Ossetia also cut loose from Georgia. In 23 July 1992, Abkhazians declared independence, but this departure was not to be accepted from Georgia and Georgian Prime Minister Mihail Saakaşvili tried to capture South Ossetia. Eventually the war started with the aim of gaining the bigger part of land and having the higher voice. (Berktaş, 2021) Georgian sovereigns used Georgian historical or cultural mythical narratives to encourage them in dominating other masses. The Georgian mythical expressions have a few versions about founding a state, belonging to a religion, relationship with other ethnicities people etc. They refer back to Kartli, where the first

Georgian state was declared in the third century B.C., to confirm their state's perpetuity. This attribution means that Georgians had a state here and now or in the future they should have the state again. According to Kaufmann, one another important narrative in Georgian national mythology is the conversion to Christianity and protecting their religion proudly against pagans and Muslims. This mythical discourse was used, after the seventieth century, when Arabs conquered the Georgian-country, as a “ “struggle of the Georgian people for liberation,” a goal finally achieved three centuries later.” (Kaufman, 2001, p. 91) Another Georgian myth tells about eleventh century, referring to Georgian unity and power. Myth tells that Georgian sovereign David, made all Georgia unified and took the Ossetians into vassalage. Another myth of Abkhazia, which can be used in modern age, is that Abkhazians are not an ethnic group on they own, that they are just a part of Georgians. The subordination of Abkhazians in the second century A.D. to the Kingdom of Egrisi made the Georgian claim strong (again according to Georgians). In developing countries or in countries that demonstrate territorial sovereignty in its most aggressive form, ignoring another ethnic origin completely is the most common reason that will lead to the most destructive actions. This reason causes those who are ignored to organize and attack within the framework of their valid ground (or again courage of mythical discourses) over the years. For example, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the leader of a nationalist stance, came to power in 1990, and his coming to power quickly sparked a guerrilla war in the autonomous region of South Ossetia. This war is the result of nationalist rhetoric over the years triggering the emotions of the masses for action. These discourses prepared a civil war that caused the loss of many people in both groups.

The reason for including these three examples is that, firstly, they organize a political action based on political myths and conflicts occur as a result of this action. The second is to show how important political myths are in a Schmittian understanding of politics or in a policy based on the friend-enemy distinction. When it is looked at the confederation flag and the Serbian examples, it can be understood that the political myths that legitimize the conflicts can come from centuries ago and still maintain their effectiveness. These activities (which will be seen in the following sections) gain visibility in the area that Galtung defines as cultural violence. Political myths impose that the life of the enemy, created by their constant repetition, is not worth living. This makes it easier to attack someone, to clash with someone, or even to go to war. It is no

longer a question of a human life but of the elimination of a commodity in order to avoid the feared situation depicted by the political myth.

### **3.2.2. Examples from Turkey**

It can be observed that, the examples above indicating different countries from different geographical locations, have the same qualification in terms of having mythical narratives to courage masses emotions while deciding the enemies. Regarding those examples, Schmitt's definition of political can be used with the mythical discourse, so it makes easy to define the friend and the enemy. As previously stated, Carl Schmitt argues that the political is something about the friend-enemy distinction. This distinction does not have to be a personal decision. So, the enemy is not necessarily someone personally evil neither is the friend someone necessarily good. It is a political group's decision, and the sovereign is someone who gives this decision in the name of the group. What is a political group called? A group that is sufficiently strong in political terms is called a political group. Who is the sovereign? The sovereign is the one who decides the distinction between the friend and the enemy. Who determines the sovereign? The sovereign is determined by himself as the person who knows what to do in the state of exception. What is the exception? It is an unpredictable situation for which only the sovereign will decide. Since there is no clear definition in Schmitt's explanations, the content of concepts such as exception, sovereignty, friend and enemy can be filled in any way to serve the needs of the day. According to the conditions of the time, mythical discourses can be shown as the best form of content filling. These discourses, which can be formed by exaggerating the events that have happened in history, are especially useful in the distinction between friend and enemy by retelling the events or by pretending that they never happened. The role of the mythical discourse in determining the enemy was shown in the Serbian and Georgian examples. Now, the connection between Schmitt's political definition and mythical discourse will be examined with a few examples from the Republic of Turkey.

Today, Turkey struggles with problems which had risen through the period that coincides with the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Republic of Turkey. The Republic of Turkey cannot be thought without the Ottoman Empire. In a sense, both have the same qualifications in terms of their principles of

foundation. The experiments in the Ottoman Empire and the process of establishment of the Republic, are used as mythical or heroic narratives in the Republic of Turkey.

Since the mythical or heroic stories used in the Republic of Turkey, cannot be considered separately from the Ottoman period, the determination of friend or enemy in the Republic of Turkey was also influenced by the Ottoman Empire. In this part of the thesis, the mythical and heroic narratives compiled from the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Republic and how these narratives are used to define the friend-enemy distinction in the Republic of Turkey will be discussed.

In this context, there are a few discourses referred to the Ottoman Empire. These are the events that occurred during the transition from the Ottoman Empire, which are shown as a justification or reference to many problems and states of exception situations during the Republican period. One of them is to accuse someone, a country or a nation in accordance with the solution of an internal problem. This accusation starts from the Ottoman Period: Great Powers wanted to divide the Empire and rule it through some ethnic groups which can be controlled. Fear of the division of the country is used in the Republic of Turkey in a different way to evoke masses emotionally. Sovereigns use the terms of “unity” against “separationist West” to survive in problematic cases. For example, although nearly a century has passed since the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, other countries are accused of being “external separatist countries” when two vital issues such as economic security and safety of life become a problem. Surely, in its historical background, the narrative of “great powers who want to divide the country” and a glorious nation that does not yield affects public opinion. In this respect, all the complex problems that arise largely from the failures of political power are simplified and it is made easier to make satisfactory explanations to the public. (Ayata, 2018) In this case, an external enemy has been created although its content and the exact country, nation or ethnic origin is not clear. This image of external enemy is actually constructed to cover up the disruption in the inner mechanism of the politics. Another discourse is used mostly to justify the decisions and actions of both the Ottoman and the process of establishment of the Republic. Justifications come mostly from massacres, persecutions and assimilation on minorities. This justification is related with the accusations mentioned above. The

West was accused of being separationist, and minorities were also accused of being traitors. Minorities were shown as allies against the Turkish or the Ottoman government in collaboration with West. When an economic or administrative problem occurs, the West, who wants to divide the country, and one of the minority groups, depending on the situation, are used as the internal enemy that supports the West. (Akçam, 2004)

Many ethnicities lived in the Ottoman Empire. Armenians, Greeks, Kurds, Jews were a few of them, but these ethnicities are still active in determining pre- and post-republic political attitudes. In terms of being an empire, the Ottomans spread to the geography where different ethnic origins lived. But when the Empire was replaced by the Republic of Turkey, the geography was narrowed down and the above-mentioned ethnic groups remained. And these ethnic groups, which are decreasing in population, are labelled as groups that cooperate with foreign powers in the problems experienced in the internal functioning of the society ever since the decline of the Ottoman Empire to the present day. So “the Republic of Turkey was formed as a result of a life-and-death struggle waged ‘against seven states.’ (Akçam, 2004, s. 22) The Republic established by the struggle against these seven states must be protected. How can the republic be protected when there is an external enemy against the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Republic, and when there are internal traitors ready to unite with this external enemy?

For decades, since the foundation of the Republic, the way to be protected from external and internal enemies has passed through an army-based approach of government. The Republic of Turkey was found in 1920s’ by a group of Ottoman military-bureaucratic elites who foresaw that the Ottoman Empire would not find its place in the changing world’s political system. Those who took part in the establishment of the Republic were essentially the officers of the Ottoman army. This Republic, which was founded on the basis of the army, will also have army-based problems for a long time and bureaucratic decisions will be made within the framework of the military. (Akçam, 2004) The establishment of republic by the military has values which are in relation with heroic, military narrations which can be exaggerated easily in mythical terms. For example, the Battle of Gallipoli, which was emphasized as the most important fight in the establishment of the republic, has also

been one of the sources used for exaggerated heroic stories. In order to further emphasize the self-sacrifice of the soldiers, who fought under the Turkish army during the Battle of Gallipoli, the emphasis is on the “master menu”, the accuracy of which is often debated. According to this menu, soldiers can only eat grape compote, bread and wheat soup during the day, and they cannot even do so on a daily basis. As stated, the accuracy of this information is still controversial and is the subject of research.<sup>2</sup> However, what is wanted to emphasize here, whether it is true or not, is the uninterrupted transmission of this information as a heroic epic for over a hundred years and creating a unity of feeling on the masses. It was seen that the same menu was distributed by some municipalities on the anniversaries of the Battle of Gallipoli. So, what is the aim of all these reminders? This discourse always contains an emotional preparation for “internal and external enemies” by keeping the idea of a heroic past, a hard-won land alive. Therefore, as in Schmitt, the existence of a real possibility of war is kept in mind so that human action can be controlled.<sup>3</sup>

The other controlling system of this army-based republic is to eliminate or assimilate many ethnicities as being internal enemy, by accusing them to divide the state with the help of West. With the foundation of the Republic, the new state started “to create taboos in designated areas of social life” to protect the state from the internal enemy and from its coworkers, the external states. (Akçam, 2004, s. 24) These taboos contain ethnicities, which are assumed to be potential internal enemies, and they advise to be cautious towards them. How does this recommendation take place?

Suggestions about being cautious against internal or external enemies, show itself in “principles”. The principles related on this political ground are:

- There are no different ethnicities in the Republic of Turkey, all citizens are (assumed) Turks.

---

<sup>2</sup> (Karakaya, 2016)

<sup>3</sup> What kind of human action can be controlled? This controlling system does not only create antagonisms stemming from ethnic difference, but also covers some undesirable situations such as economic crises. In 2019, the news spread that a poster of the mentioned menu was distributed to employees, who complained about the meals served in a factory in Turkey, on the anniversary of the Battle of Gallipoli. Although it was later said by the factory that the purpose of the menu poster was to commemorate the war, in the subtext it was asked the employee to tolerate this situation by remembering the conditions of war, and could be declared enemy, those who do not tolerate it.

- Citizens have a secular life, and a religious lifestyle is the opposite of secular life.
- There are no classes in Turkish society, citizens form a united society.

These principles will be used with exaggerated and mythical discourses for many years to gain importance in terms of protecting the republic against internal and external enemies. This ground is used in many years by the name of Atatürk's principles. These principles form the ground of the Republic of Turkey and if there is any opposition or someone to suggest the opposite, they can be accused of being enemy. To protect these principles, a constitutional law was set. For example, Article 125 of the Constitution forbids Kurdish propaganda according to the principle that all citizens are Turks. To forbid religious propaganda, Article 163 was established. Article 141-142 was made to forbid propaganda for class struggle. (Akçam, 2004) To avoid other nationalities and their rights, in relation to the principle that all citizens are Turks, article 301 was made. Now according to these principles and using historical background in terms of mythical narration, how are the enemies defined in Turkey?

### **3.2.2.1. Military coup**

The Republic of Turkey was established by Ottoman officers, that is, by the decision of a military group, taking advantage of the physical forces of the civilian masses. Although, there was physical support of civilians in the establishment of the Republic of Turkey, the methods of establishment, principles and objectives of the regime went parallel to the military administration. Instead of a policy that adopts the common good of differences in all respects living in the same geography, it has been worked out to produce a uniform and easily controlled public as in the military order. In addition, the concept of a charismatic leader, which is usually accepted in a military-administrative state, has also been accepted in the Republic of Turkey. In this regard, in addition to a sometimes exaggerated rhetoric such as “glorious history” or the glorious struggle against the seven states, a charismatic leader was needed, and, for this purpose, the image of Atatürk, which is still not open to criticism, was drawn by a certain circle. The principles mentioned above are manifested as the principles of Atatürk and play a role in the separation of Turkey's friends and enemies. Mustafa Kemal (and, after the republic, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk) became the charismatic founder of the Republic of Turkey when he was one of the officers of the Ottoman army. Exaggerated narratives of the founder of the country from all sides such as personality, character and power



were used in all political fields starting with textbooks, from the civilian to the military field. The mentioned principles were also recalled several times by military coups again as representatives of the founder.

The Republic of Turkey has been interrupted in administration by military coups for three times, in 1960, 1971 and 1980. Although the reason for these coups is the fear of communism spreading in the world, every military coup was realized by arguing that Atatürk's principles and reforms were in danger, and that the country was deviating from them. For example, for the coup of May 27, 1960, Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu, a member of the Executive Committee of Dev-Genç, stated that the main character of the left at that time touched on a labor-oriented anti-imperialism and an understanding of national independence. Hence, he shares the main idea of the right but in the opposite direction, referring to anticommunism as a reaction to the development of the left. According to Müftüoğlu, what united all these right-wing trends was 'anticommunism', and according to him, the counter-guerrilla links of the 'Anti-Communist Associations', the 'commando camps' of the United States have been the facts that have been written down and drawn upon much since then. (Müftüoğlu, 2021) Another name referring to the economic origin of the coups is Feroz Ahmad. According to Ahmad, the generals in Turkey ideologically supported the center-right parties that adopted the program of developing capitalism. These generals were opposed to groups or views that argued that a socialist order rather than capitalism would respond to the needs of Turkey. (Ahmad, 1993, s. 12) Again, these generals used the deterioration of the economy and the failure of civilian governments to prevent political violence and terrorism as the justification for their coup. However, there has been no civil support for the coup. In order to receive this support and to make the coup legitimate, the military administration has carried out quite intensive propaganda activities. At the heart of this systematically conducted propaganda more symbols related to Atatürk and Atatürkism have been implemented. (Kılıç, 2020) After the coup, a Constitutional Commission consisting of academics and military officials was established both to prove the legitimacy of the coup and to make a formulate constitution. According to the statement of the Commission's report, the Democratic Party has become an enemy to the principles of Atatürk, which are expected to be at the heart of the state and are important for its continued existence among the world's states. (Kılıç, 2020) But is it really just a violation of the principles of Atatürk that

brought this coup? According to Feroz Ahmad, unrest among junior officers had begun in the middle of 1950's. This situation coincided with the beginning of the inflation trend, which weakened the position of the salaried classes in the economy. Officers saw their prestige diminish along with their standard of living in the multi-party period. The financial situation of the Turkish army had become ever more aggravated in comparison with its allies in NATO. When the Turkish soldiers made this comparison, they realized not only their own but also the country's backwardness. In the 1950's, Turkey's military spending was causing economic difficulties by igniting inflation and disrupting balances.

The second time the military was involved in civilian administration was on March 12, 1971, through a memorandum. By the 1970's, problems related to economic growth again came to light. Although the migration of workers to Europe was decreasing, there still was no desired level of work rate. The number of unemployed people under the age of thirty had reached a remarkable level. A large number of unemployed young people with and without diplomas attracted attention. In addition, legal regulations were made for the number of seats that could be won in parliament. However, these regulations were also strongly criticized especially by the left-wing masses. The government decided to use military force to restore order. High-ranking military personnel were aware of the situation. On March 12, 1971, the generals issued a memorandum on behalf of the Turkish Armed Forces. They demanded the formation of a strong and reputable government capable of carrying out the reforms envisaged by the Constitution. (Ahmad, 1993)

Considering the justification of the 1971 coup and the content of the memorandum, it could be seen that the theme of public order and the theme of reform were used together. The memorandum was issued on the grounds that the socio-economic reforms envisaged by the 1961 Constitution could not be implemented. According to Zürcher, this memorandum was prepared by high-ranking commanders against the imaginary threat of communism as a coup. (Zürcher, 2015) Yet, the apparent purpose of the memorandum was to call for the formation of a new government that would consider the reforms envisaged by the Constitution with an Atatürkian view. (Subaşı, 2019) Nihat Erim, who was assigned to form the government after the Memorandum of March 12, 1971, states that the government he founded came to work with the

determination to continue the reforms that Atatürk started. He emphasized at every opportunity that they came to this job to implement the revolutionary laws that Atatürk had made and put in place as needed. Erim, who describes the government he heads as a nationalism following Atatürk' principles, points out that they work for the peace of Turkey. (Erim, 2007)

While it is not even a matter of debate whether Atatürk's principles are fair, feasible, consistent, democratic and desirable within the borders of the Republic of Turkey, they have been designed, decorated with glorious liberation myths and used for the separation of friends and enemies. Like any discourse that is sanctified and mythologized, the discourse of Atatürk's principles can easily create enemies and cause actions such as war, coup, massacre and murder. Or again, the same rhetoric has the power to declare an exception when it sees trends that are contrary to the interests of the segment that holds or wants to hold the administration. For example, as mentioned above, the reason for the complexity of the 1960's and 70's was mostly economic crises. Against the growing demands for economic prosperity, numerous side factors can also be listed such as the fear of communism of the rulers and the fact that the military's expenditures do not coincide with domestic and foreign economic systems. However, it is noteworthy that all these factors are dissolved under the principles of Atatürk as if there is just a single problem.

Why is everything reduced to a single problem and, in particular, to the problem of the violation of the principles of Atatürk? As already mentioned, in order to create an enemy, one can exaggerate the reference to the past. The figure of Atatürk also allows for the depiction of a hero with a military background and republican rhetoric and can maintain a political group in the sense shown by Schmitt. People are forced to comply with these principles, and those who do not comply are declared enemies. Although the real reason is different, events such as a coup or a memorandum can be legitimized by referring to the principles of Atatürk as the most unifying point. The state of exception observed in Schmitt, can justify military intervention in the form of a coup or a memorandum. It is the sovereign himself who decides on the exceptional case and the method that should be applied to remedy the situation. In the Turkey of the period between 1960 and 1980, there are processes of military intervention in which the governing staff is the military personnel who make the decision for the state of

exception situation and the decision to apply it to eliminate this so called “chaos”. However, in this process, sight is lost on whether a state of exception is really necessary or whether it is directly related to the principles of Atatürk.

Akçam explains through Deniz Gezmiş that a state of exception and an enemy have been created using the excuse of violation of Atatürk's principles in order to cover up other reasons and ensure control. According to Akçam's account, Gezmiş was accused of acting contrary to the principles of Atatürk by the generals who visited him. However, in this account, the following letter written by Gezmiş to his father is included; “I’m grateful to you because you raised me with Kemalist principles...I’ve been hearing stories about the war for [Turkish] Independence since I was little...We’re Turkey’s second-generation independence warriors.”. (Akçam, 2004, s. x) It is clear from Gezmiş's letter that the principles he touched upon politically contradict those who accuse him.

Erik-Jan Zürcher's book contains information on how the state of exception of the 1970’s was extended and used. According to Zürcher's account, on April 27<sup>th</sup>, the National Security Council declared martial law in 11 provinces and reiterated its martial law decisions every two months for two years. For these two years, under the name of martial law, anyone regarded as a terrorist criminal was detained. Martial law was mostly used as a justification for capturing, detaining leftist and progressive liberals. Prominent figures of trade unions and members of left-wing parties were arrested. (Zürcher, 2015, p. 259)

By the end of the 1970s’, the most difficult situation for governments was economic crises rather than ongoing clashes on the street. Although industry developed in certain regions in Turkey, it was still a country that was obliged to import durable goods. Turkey, which has been using oil as an energy source since the 1950’s, was economically affected by the 1973-74 oil depression. Again, due to the employment opportunities that did not go parallel to the increasing population, there were migrations of workers from the country to abroad. Those who stayed were informed about workers' rights and tried to obtain those rights.

In the face of the fact that the oil price increased again in 1980, it became clear that Turkey could not cover any of its export revenues and oil expenses. These factors led to a weakening of Turkey's bargaining power, while the IMF, DB and OECD have

increased their own. (Kazgan, 2005) Some decisions had to be made to overcome the structural crisis experienced by Turkey in the 1970s, which was affected by the economic fluctuation of the world system. The most important of these decisions is the “Decisions of January 24”, which were raised in order for Turkey to adapt /articulate the capitalist system. The January 24 is a program launched under the leadership of the United States (Reaganomics) and the United Kingdom (Thatcherism) to solve the global ‘world debt crisis’. In this program, a harmony is sought with the ‘new world order’, which is characterized by the liberalization movement. According to the program mentioned, the price (interest) of goods, labor and money should be determined on the free market. There were two theoretical approaches underlying this structural transformation. These were export-oriented growth and financial liberalization. (Özçelik) Preparing the conditions for the transition to the program, carrying out the necessary legal and political arrangements fell upon the military administration, which seized political power with the coup of September 12, 1980. Fikret Başkaya considers the coup of September 12 from an economic point of view. According to Başkaya, in order to understand the process of the coup, it is necessary to evaluate the period of economic restructuring launched on January 24, 1980. September 12, according to Başkaya, adopted the model of an “outward-looking”, “export-led growth”. According to him, a study of the September 12 coup without taking into consideration the economic background is doomed to remain incomplete. (Başkaya, Paradigmanın İflası Resmi İdeolojinin Eleştirisine Giriş, 2006)

The years 1980-1983, when the military held political power, are the period when Turkey was integrating to neoliberal policies with structural adjustment programs. The agreements made by the military regime as a way to integrate with world capitalism during the time they held the administration pave the way for this articulation. The Standby agreement signed with the IMF under the military administration and the agreements on Structural Adjustment Loans with the World Bank are a few examples of this way. (Özçelik) In order for all these arrangements and agreements to be made, it is necessary to prepare the society for these agreements or to keep the society under control so that they do not break the agreements.

Of course, the proletariat is the most difficult part of the society to convince in the neoliberal market order. And there was a working class that had been politicized along

with unionization and their demands to protect their rights. It should be noted that there was a concentration of workers' strikes after the mid-1970s. Thus, the military administration, the perpetrator of the September 12 coup, assumed the task of putting the politicized working class under pressure in the interests of the bourgeoisie and making the necessary arrangements in this direction.

So, there was economic crises in Turkey parallel to the world economic system, and there was a need to solution to get rid of crises. According to Başkaya, economic regulations cannot be enough to solve economic crises. There should be an ideological background to prepare masses or make masses support the new system. For this purpose, a new interpretation of Atatürkism was prepared. (Başkaya, Paradigmanın İflası Resmi İdeolojinin Eleştirisine Giriş, 2006) To produce a new interpretation of Atatürkism would be useful for interests of the domestic bourgeoisie and the imperial system as required by the new conditions. For example, there are no strict borders about the left in the traditional interpretation of Atatürkism. While how to approach the left in Atatürk's traditional interpretation in clear lines is ambiguous, where the liberal economy was to be introduced the definition of the left was to be precise. How was this new interpretation to be actualized? This actualization came to light in Kenan Evren's words. He states that, in the name of Atatürkism, one of the cornerstones of the republic, the institutions of the republic that have been distorted will be reorganized and even closed if necessary and reopened in accordance with "Atatürkism". (Taşkın, 2009)

So, for what purpose the new interpretation of Atatürkism will be used is a matter of question. Why is it important that institutions are included in this new interpretation? It has been stated that Atatürkism and the principles of Atatürk are a common discourse used for different purposes to bring the masses together. Now, Atatürk and its new interpretation, would be used to describe the enemies, inside or outside of the country. Hence, the new interpretation of Atatürkism tried to describe the outlines of the left clearly, and this means a description of the new enemy in accordance with new economic regulations.

As it was mentioned in Schmitt's introduction, the state of exception is a state which only the sovereign can decide upon. Besides, the sovereign's capacity to make that decision goes beyond making a decision. In Turkey, the coup of 1980 can be seen to

be similar to Schmitt's state of exception. The Army decided that the country was dragged into chaos and set orders, prohibitions and liberties, in sum a state of exception, to end this chaos. Anyone who did not obey these new orders, prohibitions and liberties could be defined as an enemy ignorant to country's perpetuity. The Army, which decided to declare a state of exception in 1980, set a certain order. What was that order? It was the prohibition of criticizing political decisions or Kenan Evren's discourse concerning the new constitution. Furthermore, for 10 years, being a member of a political party was forbidden to politicians who were active before 1980 and new political parties could not be founded without the agreement of The National Security Council.

According to this order, who are the enemies? Many students, teachers, academics, lawyers and journalists were arrested under the name of "terror suspect". However, when one looks at the background of most of these arrests, it can be observed that these people had expressed leftist or Islamist ideas before 1980. (Zürcher, 2015) The restoration of law, the way of establishing the desired order was identified with the suppression of groups that were considered leftist. "Thus offices of such groups as the Ideas Clubs in the universities, branches of the Union of Teachers, and DISK were searched by the police." (Ahmad, 1993, s. 148) The friendly enemy determined by the state also encouraged relatively individual actions. Among the people who remained apolitical, the "leftists" looked dangerous and were excluded from everyday discourse, while the youth organizations of the Nationalist Movement Party, encouraged by this attitude of the state, began violent actions against those they considered leftists. The attitude against the leftists was not only seen in big cities, but it was also present in rural areas. In rural areas, the teachers who were seen as the member of Worker's Party became the main target when an enemy was needed. In general, considering who is to blame, in addition to supporters of the Labor Party, most often, people who are considered intellectuals, students and young academics were also included. In order to teach a lesson to what they describe as the "left", the army arrested some professors of law personally known to Prime Minister Erim, as well as well-known writers such as Yaşar Kemal and Fakir Baykurt. (Ahmad, 1993) It was found that the detainees were subjected to widespread torture. The purpose of the tortures was to break the will of the political prisoners or even to stop those who wanted to involve in politics. In this

case, it can be observed that the violence against the right to criticize politics, which is prohibited by law, is also supported by torture.

Therefore, it can be argued that the 1982 Constitution was an expression of the class struggle in the 1970's in favor of the bourgeoisie. Thus, the legal-political superstructure was reorganized in such a way that was against the working class in favor of the bourgeoisie. This regulation took shape in the new interpretation of Atatürkism through the strengthening of the state. With the new interpretation of Atatürkism taking shape, the masses were divided into friends and enemies in society, and those who were exposed as enemies were tried to be suppressed in order to achieve the desired order. The coup of September 12 carried out the purpose of regulation for a new capital accumulation model in Turkey. For this purpose, the coup needed a new official ideology, so a new interpretation of Atatürkism was produced.

Looking at the statement no. 1 of the National Security Council, it is possible to see the new and mythic discourse produced. According to this discourse, The State of the Republic of Turkey, had been in intellectual and physical treacherous attacks on its existence, regime and independence in recent years, at the instigation of external and internal enemies. The emphasis on internal and external enemies includes an ambiguous and large public, but it reveals the appropriate grounds for creating a state of exception. Atatürk's image is constantly repeated as the most basic point in the distinction between friend and enemy. In another part of the declaration, it is claimed that "reactionary" and "deviant" ideologies are pursued instead of the "correct" form of government determined by Atatürk. These deviant ideologies, from primary schools to universities, judiciary institutions, labor organizations and political parties spread among the citizens and played the role of bringing the country to the brink of a civil war. Hence, the justifications for the military intervention can be listed as protecting the integrity of the country, ensuring national unity, preventing a possible civil war and brotherly quarrel, restoring state authority and existence, and eliminating the reasons that prevent the functioning of the democratic order, as stated in the declaration. Surely, such a ranking cannot be opposed, the person who comes out is branded as an internal - external enemy.

Çalışkan found some examples from archives and literature about the discourse of propaganda of the period and the reflections of discourses on the newspapers. If the



newspapers of period are studied, it can be seen that the media used a discourse on accepting an enemy who threatens the Turkish state and its citizens. Newspapers used a militant discourse-against an enemy whose existence was already accepted. It is seen that they supported the military intervention directly. It has been suggested in the newspapers that the army carried out the military intervention to protect the life and property of the Turkish people, the unity and integrity of the country, the principles and revolutions of Atatürk. (Çalışkan, 2020)

It is seen that coups can have many causes. The official cause of the coup of 1960 was the repressive methods of Adnan Menderes in government. It was true that the government started to use repressive methods, but this cannot legitimize a coup. Another method could have been for the public to express themselves in their own way of protest. However, it is known by the coup plotters that when the people get involved, those in power become impotent and deprived of the opportunities for exploitation and looting. (Başkaya, Reel Atatürkçülük, 2007) Until recently, the military was still in a strong situation of both representation and position. The army did not want to lose this position neither by its material achievements mentioned above nor by its moral force over the mass.

September 12, 1980 was legitimized on the grounds that the country was on the verge of disintegration. However, the main movement was to suppress the left and the Kurdish movement, which could not be sufficiently crushed on March 12, to pave the way for democratic and social expansions. (Başkaya, Reel Atatürkçülük, 2007) Realizing the state of exception, identifying friend and enemy, is considered only to be a power possessed by the sovereign, and if it is unclear how the sovereign is elected, it gives rise to the unlimited sovereign as in the coup of 1960. “The day after the coup it was announced that Cemal Gürsel had been appointed head of state, prime minister and minister of defence, in theory giving him more absolute powers than even Atatürk had ever had.” (Ahmad, 1993, s. 242)

The economic reasons behind all three periods of military intervention in Turkey were shown above. However, the justifications offered by those who made the interventions are different. The reason for this difference is to legitimize the interventions by getting the support of the masses. The mass support to legitimize the intervention is obtained through political myths. The Republic of Turkey has been trying to influence the

emotions of its citizens and determine their actions with its political myths since its establishment. Turkey shapes its political myth work through Atatürk during the periods of military intervention. It was mentioned that political myths instill fear in people and shape their actions by linking past events with the present. When the coups in Turkey are examined from a Schmittian policy view, it can be seen that the fear of a political myth shaped in Atatürk's discourse (the fear of a return to pre-Atatürk in Turkey) makes a distinction between friend and enemy. It can be said that this distinction between friend and enemy is determined by the sovereign, who can only decide on the exception, as with Schmitt. It becomes clear with the example of Deniz Gezmiş that the sovereign is the most competent and unquestionable. Gezmiş, who was sentenced to death for acting against Atatürk's principles by the sovereign, wrote in a letter to his father that he acted in accordance with Atatürk's principles. However, since the decision of the political myth-supported sovereign, which arouses fear from the past, cannot be questioned, the value of the decisions made, the lost human life, is ignored. It will be tried to be explained with the murder process of Hrant Dink that the policy, which is prepared with political myths and which is content as the distinction between friend and enemy, is effective not only in mass but also in individual actions.

### **3.2.2.2. Hrant Dink**

In Turkey, a military rhetoric made a friend-enemy distinction with reference to a glorious history, and along with mass reactions caused by this distinction, events that were considered to be individual also took place. They are considered as individual because the perpetrator seems to be a single person, but the perpetrator's background is shaped by the official discourse. It can be said that, in accordance with years, if an official discourse is repeated enough many times, a conception of enemy can be installed in public opinion. This enemy is sometimes symbolized only in a single member of the mass who is considered to be an enemy, and the intension is to intimidate all members of the mass. For this purpose, there are many crimes committed in Turkey and one of the most remarkable one is the assassination of Hrant Dink. Hrant Dink was the chief-editor of the *Agos Weekly Newspaper* published bilingually in Turkish and Armenian. He was killed on January 19, 2007, by a nationalist. Yet, it was evident that Dink was the victim of the official discourse. Dink was accused of "insulting Turkishness" because his articles did not compromise with the official discourse. One of the reasons of accusation was the article of "*Sabiha Hatun'un Sırrı*".

The article was published on February 6, 2004, and it was about a research on Sabiha Gökçen's ethnicity who is an adopted child of Atatürk. The article referred to Hripsime Sebilciyan, who called herself the nephew of Gökçen, and claimed that Gökçen was an Armenian orphan. Again, in the same article, Dink suggested to research the assertion with other references, and he gave examples of Simon Simonyan's story, named Լեռն եւ Ճակատագիր (Mountain and Fate). According to Dink's research, Simonyan's story also gave same proof about Sabiha Gökçen's ethnic origin.

After Hrant Dink wrote these allegations about Sabiha Gökçen, a statement about the article came from the Turkish General Staff of the period. Earlier it was mentioned that Atatürkism was used for different periods and sometimes with renewed rhetoric in order to build extraordinary situations and achieve unity. In this case, Turkish General Staff used a discourse based on national unity in accordance with Atatürkism again. In the statement of the General Staff, it was stated that Sabiha Gökçen is the first female war pilot of the Turkish Armed Forces. Besides, she is the representative of the Turkish women's position in the Modern Turkish society. Opening such a prominent symbol to debate, regardless of its purpose, is an approach that does not contribute to national integrity and social peace. When Dink's entire article is read, it can be seen that what is questioned is whether there is a Sabiha Gökçen character as has been described for many years. However, this questioning was treated as a threat because it did not match the official rhetoric. Again, in the entire article, if the part on Atatürk is read it will be seen that only the process of taking the child from the orphanage is briefly mentioned. However, in the statement of general staff's the article was accused as being unhealthy, dangerous and against Atatürk's nationalism. Hence the statement was formulated to eliminate dangerous thoughts. In the rest of the statement, it was argued that during a period when national unity matters the purpose of such publications raises concerns about this unity and the of for the large part of the Turkish society. This statement emphasizes that the enemy who threatens national unity is recognized by the citizens who are aware of this unity. In the other words, the internal enemy was found out and was followed. According to the statement, it is understood that the general staff assumes the role of spokesman for all the citizens. The statement on behalf of the citizens continues on such grounds. It is also expected that the Turkish media will be more sensitive to the spiritual existence of Atatürk, the system of thought, the basic principles and values of the Republic of Turkey, the unity

and unity of the Turkish nation, and review the principles of publication in the light of these thoughts. Another article by Dink, published a week after Sabiha Gökçen article, was used directly to prosecute him in accordance with the Article 301 of the constitution. Hrant

Dink wrote an article on February 13, 2004, with the purpose of criticizing Diaspora Armenians. The issue that Hrant Dink wanted to address in this article was the Armenians facing the problems about building a future and their focus on the past without reconciliation with the Turkish identity. He expressed these ideas with the following words: Türk'ten boşalacak o zehirli kanın yerini dolduracak temiz kan, Ermeni'nin Ermenistan ile kuracağı asil damarında mevcuttur.”<sup>4</sup> If the whole article is read, his main purpose is clearly understood. When the entire article of Dink is examined, the scope of his criticism becomes evident. However, this article is presented as a justification for targeting Dink with a nationalist rhetoric. Since 1915, Armenians are shown as internal enemies. This last article of Hrant Dink's was examined as an insult to Turkishness, and it became one of the accusations who would cause Hrant Dink's death. “Bir Ermeni'nin göğsüne “Türklüğe hakaret etmiştir” diye bir yafta asılması, ölüm cezasına çarptırılmak gibi bir şeydi. Nitekim öyle oldu. Yargılanması ve mahkûm edilmesi onu hedef hâline getirdi.” (Cengiz, n.d.)<sup>5</sup> Hrant Dink, who was targeted after his statement that Sabiha Gökçen might be Armenian, was sentenced to prison for “insulting Turkishness” after an article that even language experts said was not an “insult” and he was killed as a target of ultranationalist circles apparently developed in this process. (Tahincioğlu, 2022) Following the news about the article, the deputy governor of Istanbul at the time called Dink to his office to warn him. He later explained the reason for the warning as “preventing the creation of public indignation”. On February 26, 2004, a group led by Levent Temiz took action in front of the Agos Newspaper. The group was shouting slogans such as “love it or leave it”, “we can come suddenly one night” and they gave a statement by saying that “Hrant Dink is the target of all our anger and hatred from now on, he is our target.”

---

<sup>4</sup> “The clean blood to replace the poisoned blood that will come out of the Turk is present in the noble vein that the Armenians will create with Armenia.” (Dink, Why was I targeted?, 2007)

<sup>5</sup> “It was like being sentenced to death if an Armenian is accused in “insulted Turkishness”. And that's exactly what happened. His trial and conviction made him a target.”

These targets lasted a few years and brought Dink's death. On January 19, 2007, Hrant Dink was killed in front of his newspaper's office by the 17 years old Ogün Samast. On 20 January 2007, 36 hours later of the incident, Ogün Samast was arrested at the Samsun Bus Station while he was about to go to Trabzon and was detained. However, no one believed that the real agent was a 17 year old boy, a large group thought that the “state” which regards Armenians as an internal enemy for many years, has a role in this murder. At the top of the news that Cumhuriyet Newspaper announced the murder on January 20 2007, it was stated: “Ankara'nın Kerkük'le ilgili açıklamalarının sertleştiği, Ermeni iddialarının ABD Kongresi yolunda olduğu bir dönemde gazeteci Hrant Dink Silahlı saldırı sonucu yaşamını yitirdi.”<sup>6</sup> (Türkiye'ye Kurşun, 2007) Due to the statements made after the capture and the media images, no one is convinced that the state was not preinformed of this murder. On the day Samast was captured, he took a photo with two police officers next to him at the police station with a Turkish flag in his hand, and this was somehow shared with the press. In the background of Samast's photo, there was also a Turkish flag in the form of a poster framed again in the form of a poster and on it was a saying of Atatürk: Vatan toprağı kutsaldır, kaderine terk edilemez.<sup>7</sup> (Sendika.Org, 2007) The photograph of Samast in front of Turkish flag and on where Atatürk's sentences was written is important in Schmittian political action in accordance with political myth. Samast photograph was a symbol of “condensational power” of political myths, that is, their capacity to condense things into a few images or “icons”. (Bottici, 2007, p. 181)

The case of this murder has not been solved in 15 years and the agent was shown someone different. Firstly, the crime was shown as an isolated event brought about by a few sensitive and nationalistic young people. Later, allegations were made that this crime was committed by a group of people directed by the Ergenekon organization. In order to open the Ergenekon investigation, the theses dating back to the fact that the group organized by the Fethullah Gülen community carried out the murder turned into an indictment.

---

<sup>6</sup> “At a time when Ankara's statements about Kerkük were hardening, when Armenian claims were on the way to the US Congress, journalist Hrant Dink died as a result of an armed attack”.

<sup>7</sup> Homeland is sacred, it can not be abandoned to its fate.

Although 15 years passed since the murder, there have not been any satisfactory decision or process. During the process it was confirmed that there was a murder plan that was heard by some officials, although no necessary measures were taken. The following statement of the *Cumhuriyet Newspaper* is important: “when Armenian claims were on the way to the US Congress, journalist Hrant Dink died as a result of an armed attack”. For the integrity of the homeland and the survival of the country, the attack on the internal enemy has been ignored. This indifference, in the case of Hrant Dink, did not work out to cover all citizens of Turkey. The death of one of the Armenians, who was described as an internal enemy, as a result of unexpected and official hatred, brought people together. It can be said that this togetherness showed, despite the friendly-enemy distinction created by repeating the same official rhetoric for 84 years, another definition of politic is also possible thanks to unpredictable human actions and thinking.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: THE POSSIBILITY OF ANOTHER DEFINITION OF THE POLITICAL**

It is seen that, in the political action model of Carl Schmitt, human rights are ignored when this model is used in real life practices. Defining the political action only and necessarily as the friend-enemy distinction brings with a forfeiture. Much as Schmitt mentions that personal hostility is not necessary to defining enemy, in practice personal hatred can occur. Especially, when the political myth or heroic narrations are repeated frequently in every source (textbooks, newspapers, as a slogan in politicians), mankind can get used to it and internalize these thoughts. Thoughts which are internalized can activate feelings of superiority. It is noteworthy that although official associations such as the police, army, court processes are shown to be political acts of the state, in cases such as that of Hrant Dink, individuals show a willing to kill action. The willingness of killing in some of the perpetrators can appear in relation to the influence of heroic narrations on individuals. In daily life, in practical examples, it is seen that there is sometimes one-way and sometimes mutual interpersonal enmity between people belonging to different groups such as ethnic, religious, language and skin color. This enmity emerged by political myth's repetition in different and every source. Under the title of "Examples from different countries" it was seen that sovereigns used political myths to effect masses national emotions and draw citizens to war. Johan Galtung mentions that "There is a direct link from interpersonal violence to interstate wars." (Galtung, *Peace and Conflict Studies as Political Activity*, 2011, p. 5) Whether individual or massive, political action which based on friend enemy distinction, emerges human rights violation. While the political action, which Schmitt mentions, ignores the basic human rights, a question can still arise as to the possibility of redefining the political.

There are other views that differ from the policy described by Schmitt and aim to protect human rights. Johan Galtung, who is well known for his peace studies, offers a different political action plan for ensuring peaceful life and the resolution of existing conflicts. The founder of the Peace Research Institute Oslo, Prof. Dr. Johan Galtung, who is also a mediator in many conflicts, witnessed Nazi persecution in his childhood and his father, who was the Mayor of Oslo in World War II, was arrested by the Nazis.

It is especially important that the two thinkers who witnessed the Nazi period, Schmitt and Galtung, present two different approaches. While only the concepts of war and enemy are in the foreground in Schmitt, Galtung's witnessing of the same periods and emphasizing the concept of peace shows that a different policy is possible. As it mentioned Hobbes lived during the potentiality of English civil war and tried to legitimate sovereign. Schmitt lived during the Nazi governance and he also tried to legitimize sovereignty even which persecute notably Jewish and all opponent. But in contrary, Galtung, who also lived under the conflict governance in period of Nazi, does not try to legitimize conflicts or war or friend enemy distinction as a natural. He suggests and be in active to ensure peaceful life and the end of conflicts in a peaceful way.

Galtung argues that all forms of violence should disappear in the process that leads societies to peace. Referring to all forms of violence is important because he suggests that there are three kinds of violence: direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence. Direct violence generally means a kind of violence that a certain perpetrator enforce on a certain individual or a group. Direct violence contains a crime against humanity in terms of an attempt to eliminate the existence of a people or destroy an individual's life. The second type of violence is "structural violence". This type includes systematic violence that includes social inequalities. It covers situations such as the systematic pressure of different groups or individuals and the restriction of usage areas. Although there is no visible physical violence, it includes violence in terms of restricting living space and access to resources. The third violence is cultural violence which prepares background of structural and direct violence and their effects. Cultural violence and the other two types of violence are closely related. With this type of violence, other forms of violence are justified. The message that is intended to be given to the society with cultural violence is that the violence suffered by "some" or the disasters they have suffered are "deserved". The concept of cultural violence is also functional in the sovereign power's reflecting its own values as if they were the values of the whole society and at the same time maintaining its hegemony by reflecting the policies in its own interest as if it were in the interest of the whole society. Indeed, cultural violence suggests to those who are living that the lives of people who have been subjected to violence are not worth living that much. This type of violence is embedded in the political myth, heroic narrations that reinforces Schmitt's distinction



between the friend and the enemy. The link between political myth and cultural violence can be described by Cassirer's sentences: "The political myths acted in the same way as a serpent that tries to paralyze its victims before attacking them." (Cassirer, 1946, s. 286) From this point of view, Galtung's recommendations on the types of violence and the end of these types become important. Peace, according to Galtung, is not just the end of the conflict, it is a model of action that requires continuity, which includes many stages. For example a conflict can be quashed by military coup, a constitutional law, or behaving indifferent. But these implementations are not solution of conflict. These implementations just make conflicts invisible or restrain appearance of conflicts. But they can not treat conflict or can not figure out the reason. According to Galtung if the reason of conflicts are not figured out peace can not be established.

For the establishment of peace and for the continuity of this establishment, Galtung has a few suggestions. In these suggestions, the remarkable point is that he starts his method from an understanding of mankind. Hobbes and Schmitt also have an understanding of human being and in both of them man is something that can be controlled for particular purposes. In Galtung, on the contrary, the unpredictability and changeability of human beings is stressed. Galtung, knows that the reason behind conflicts can be explained in three topics: nature, culture and structure. However, Galtung notes "the human actor is always squeezed between the pressures from Culture and Structure and the urges of Nature, but we can use our spirit to carve out more space. We are capable of self-reflection, including on how we are programmed, and transcendence to create new realities." (Galtung, Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach, 2007, p. 19) Pointing out the possibility that humans can act in another way indicates that contrary to the general definition of the human being, which makes man limited and predictable. Such an understanding of human as Galtung mentioned, can make political action, something different purpose than identifying as friend or enemy (which makes man determinable). And this different purpose can be a program created to make peace.

According to Galtung, peace depends on the transformation of conflict. The conflicts which are not transformed sooner or later turn into a war. Conflict is a result of the contradictory purposes of incompatible groups. However, the transformation of

conflict means a reality that transcends the goals of the parties involved and aims to live and develop together. (Galtung, Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach, 2007, p. 14) The approach that offers a new depiction of life by going above the conflicting goals of groups is conceptually the TRANSCEND approach. As it mentioned previous, taigle or making conflicts invisible do not mean ensuring peace or treat of conflict. To ensure and last peace or peaceful life, groups should drop their own goals, benefit or unilateralist support out and should aim equal rights to reach sources for each and every person. This aim, the aim of reaching sources in equal rights, contains transcend approach. To show transcend approach, in other word drop out the one sided benefit / goal, and make common future in peace Galtung suggest a method like medical treatment.

Galtung recommends focusing on the past and the future like a medical case to achieve peace with the Transcend approach. The examples from the past should be researched for diagnosis, while for the future it is the prognosis that is necessary, and therapy is required for prescription. Galtung argues that a broad spectrum of thought, speech and action, knowledge and skills is needed for diagnosis, analysis and prognosis. This statement conflicts with those who argue that history should be viewed only in terms of state of exception, the official rhetoric and historical texts in order to resolve conflicts that still exist today. The “let's leave history to historians” rhetoric, which is often referred to, especially on the topic of the Armenian Genocide, leads the present and tomorrow into conflict instead of building the future in peace. This is because historians will do nothing but transfer the official state discourse to writing. If official discourses used for definition of the friend-enemy distinction, political myths already are the transformation of official discourses, every repetition of the official discourse will allow the murders such as Hrant Dink but not peace as Galtung's view.

However, in Galtung's method, the Transcend approach, which ensures the transformation of conflict, there is a new approach which involves common life with deep dialogue and a new reality instead of the official approach that will repeat the discourse of the states and make the friend-enemy distinction again. So, the Transcend approach means “deep culture work, calling on cultural anthropology, philosophy, history of ideas, etc. The major instrument is peace education.” (Galtung, Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach, 2007, p. 27)

Galtung advocates the circulation of discourses aimed at peace in all aspects of life. He states that instead of the news in the newspapers that make the victory a focal point and report that conflicts have been stopped in some way for security, statements containing solution-oriented peace discourses should be included. In an approach that adopts the distinction of friend and enemy, expressions of heroism are usually used in all fields from course materials to newspapers, and this affects individual emotion. Accordingly, this statement of Galtung will be equally effective in creating a peaceful environment. Because according to Galtung, there is a decomposition in the inner human world as Good and Evil, and in this model, good is the Self and Evil is the Other. The result of this mental decomposition is embodied in the external world according to the interactions of good and evil, or even not interacting at all, and people become polarized. As it has been mentioned before, some heroic or mythic narrations (which can be embodied in concept of political myth) can be used for defining friends and enemies and this narrations affect feelings. This narrations works for mental or inner decomposition. And in relation to this feeling, on the behavioral side, individuals can be enemy in person to a another who is different from one. Mental dissociation legitimizes behavioral dissociation, and as a result the “other is no longer seen as human but as an evil object ready to be killed,”. (Galtung, Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach, 2007, p. 29) Galtung gives an example with the slogan “there is no good German but a dead German”. Such slogans obviously show that human rights are ignored. In that case, peaceful discourses should be produced instead of discriminatory administrations that will hinder human rights. Then what does peace means? According to Galtung, peace does not just mean a word which contains the goal of groups, it should contain equity for every human being in accordance with human rights. Besides peace should always be in mind for the continuity of its function. As Galtung argues, the TRANSCEND approach goes beyond the parties’ goals to ensure the peace and it is a deep work of culture. This deep work of culture means that the TRANSCEND approach should be included in all legal, military, international studies with a nonviolent discourse. In other words, in order to demonstrate a peaceful approach, an equity practice should be observed in economic investments, the judicial system, and the use of resources in everyday life practices. “Obviously this is political work, mobilizing the knowledge and possible skills of jurisprudence, political and military science, international studies and economics.”

(Galtung, Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach, 2007, p. 28)

In that case, politics can be defined not only as being able to distinguish between the friend and the enemy, but also as an effort to ensure the use of human rights.

## CONCLUSION

Throughout this study, the concepts of politics, state, and the sovereign are examined in terms of the approaches of three different philosophers and real-life examples are touched upon with regard to their views. Philosophers and political science theorists, offer a system of government on the basis of a specific understanding of the “human being”. In parallel with the understanding of the human being, the style of government that the human group needs, determines the understanding of the sovereignty. So, they offer different kinds of sovereignty with regard to the determined understanding of a “good” state or administration. While a part of these philosophers and theorists regards an order that separates the human beings from other creatures and uses the opportunities as “good”, some of them give priority to the economic power, territorial integrity, and even to the sovereign’s power. Even though such priorities are not always set consciously, they can be traced in practical life.

As being the first theory that can be applied in practical life, Hobbes’s views on his political philosophy are examined. The reason to start with Hobbes’s views is that his well-known contract theory is still used in different practices in today’s world. As mentioned in previous chapters, Hobbes, begins with setting a contract theory on the basis of a specific definition of the human being. According to Hobbes’s definition, due to their nature, all human beings are competitive and they are capable of committing any crime to get rid of any other human being who seeks same ends. So, they can only end it by making a contract to give away their power to end all the possibilities of conflict and clash. In Hobbes’s political philosophy, which starts as a thought experiment, the contract is used as the concept that would set state order free from conflict. As a consequence of the contract, the whole power is dedicated to the sovereign who will set the order in the state to avoid any chaos, and the duties and the decisions of the sovereign cannot be questioned.

The understanding of the conflict in people evolves and comes to our times due to the contract and pleasure. Hobbes’s contract is no longer used to refer to thought experience naturally, however, it is used to refer to the perpetuity of the “good” time of the present, maintained through exaggerated narratives of the historical events by referring to hard times. For instance, the discourse in Turkey, “a war held against the

great powers and this nation survived” refers to the hard times of the past and carries the meaning that “if this nation, founded against many hardships, cannot be protected in terms of the sovereign’s rules, it can turn back to the hard and even worst times”. If we continue with the example of Turkey, the contract can be seen in parallels with by-laws. For example, in order to protect the views such as “Citizens of the Turkish Republic are Turks”, “No social class differences between the Turkish citizens” and “Turkey has a secular model of life”, laws are set. In order to avoid a new war with the great powers, those laws should be followed. Objecting and questioning those laws mean returning to the old hard days and causing chaos. So Hobbes’s reference for today’s world can be seen through the contract theory.

A similar view of Hobbes can be found in Schmitt’s views. While in Hobbes’s view, individuals become enemies for their pleasures, in Schmitt’s perspective, there are only groups that are enemies. But Schmitt does not maintain a clear reason for this conflict. Even though Schmitt does not clearly define his understanding of the human being, he believes that all political theories regard human beings as bad and in need of control. In this respect, it can be said that Hobbes and Schmitt’s views are similar in terms of their definition of human nature. Another similarity they share is the commodification of human beings. For Hobbes, people can be destroyed by one another in order to attain competing pleasures, and the same situation can be found in Schmitt’s view without concrete reasons for the destruction. Schmitt claims that the political is the separation between friend and enemy. He does not offer a piece of clear evidence of the separation between the friend and the enemy, but, regarding the contract, we can easily separate between the friend and the enemy in today’s world. Turning back to the Turkish model, those who obey the laws mentioned above can be regarded as friends while those objecting are regarded as enemies. Considering that Schmitt’s understanding is more collective than individual and the context is ambiguous, mythical narratives of heroism can be used to emotionally touch on the masses and the hard times of the past can be presented in the light of such discourses.

So, the friend-enemy distinction in Schmitt’s view can easily be brought together with contract theory. The discourse of heroism can be maintained in an easy way. If such mythical and heroic discourses are rapidly highlighted in different sources such as schoolbooks and magazines, not only mass conflicts but also individual enemy

practices can be faced. In a state order that is set on the basis of Schmitt's views, people's rights and freedom can be in danger. The danger is not specifically caused by the sovereign, but also by those practitioners who stand on the same political, heroic discourses for years. Nevertheless, for Schmitt the political is to separate between friend and enemy, and to determine the human practices by always keeping in mind the possibility of a war. The results of such a view can be seen in today's world.

However, political definitions that support the basic human rights and freedom and mean to discover their potential can also be observed. The founder of Oslo International Peace Institute, Johan Galtung, whom we know as a peacemaker, defines politics differently than the modern state forms of practice. According to Galtung, politics or political practice is the equal presentation of the use of human rights from law to media, to economy, and to schoolbooks. Only through this way, we can get rid of the destruction that the friend/enemy distinction causes in many aspects and the abuse of human rights can be avoided and peace can be maintained. Unlike Hobbes and Schmitt, who support the sovereign's orders to protect the peace, for Galtung, what is precious is the peace set through the equality that human beings share in terms of human rights and practice.

## REFERENCES

- (2007, 01 25). Retrieved from Sendika.Org: <https://sendika.org/2007/01/hukumet-derhal-aciklamali-tetikci-posteri-kimin-hediyesi-11256/>
- Ahmad, F. (1993). *The Making Of Modern Turkey*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Akçam, T. (2004). *From Empire to Republic Turkish Nationalism and the Armenian Genocide*. London & New York: Zed Books.
- Akyol, M. (2021, 03 26). *14. yılında 14 soruda Hrant Dink cinayeti davası*. Retrieved from evrensel: <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/428920/14-yilinda-14-soruda-hrant-dink-cinayeti-davasi>
- Ayata, S. (2018, 12 01). “*Dış güçler, kuşatma ve büyük oyun*” söylemi; ne ölçüde gerçek ne ölçüde propaganda? Retrieved 02 21, 2022, from T24 : <https://t24.com.tr/yazarlar/sencer-ayata/dis-gucler-kusatma-ve-buyuk-oyun-soylemi-ne-olcude-gercek-ne-olcude-propaganda,20949>
- Başkaya, F. (2006). *Paradigmanın İflası Resmi İdeolojinin Eleştirisine Giriş*. Maki Basın Yayın.
- Başkaya, F. (2007). *Reel Atatürkçülük*. Ankara : Maki Basın Yayın.
- Bayır, C. Y. (2021, 01 20). *Federasyondan faşizme simgeleşen bayrak*. Retrieved from Evrensel: <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/423917/federasyondan-fasizme-simgelesen-bayrak>
- Bendersky, J. W. (1983). *Carl Schmitt Theorist For The Reich*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Benoist, A. d. (2013). *CARL SCHMITT TODAY Terrorism, 'Just' War, and the*. Arktos Media.
- Berktaş, D. (2021, 12 28). *Sovyet sonrası çatışma sahası*. İstanbul, Şişli, Türkiye. Retrieved 2 2, 2022, from <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/olaylar-ve-gorusler/sovyet-sonrasi-catisma-sahasi-deniz-berktay-1895883>
- Bills, J. W. (2018, 04 28). *Breaking Down The Complex Case of Serbia and Kosovo*. Retrieved 01 29, 2022, from culturetrip:



<https://theculturetrip.com/europe/serbia/articles/breaking-down-the-complex-case-of-serbia-and-kosovo/>

Bills, J. W. (2018, 05 29). *The Serbian Cross: The History of Serbia's National Symbol*. Retrieved 01 29, 2022, from culturetrip: <https://theculturetrip.com/europe/serbia/articles/the-serbian-cross-the-history-of-serbias-national-symbol/>

BLITS, J. H. (1989). HOBBSIAN FEAR. *Political Theory*, 417-431. Retrieved 07 7, 2022, from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/191224?origin=JSTOR-pdf>

Bottici, C. (2007). *A Philosophy of Political Myth*. Cambridge University Press.

Cassirer, E. (1946). *The MYTH of the STATE*. YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Cengiz, O. K. (n.d.). *Hrant Dink'ten Sezgin Tanrıkulu'na 301*. Retrieved from BAĞIMSIZ GAZETECİLİK PLATFORMU: <http://platform24.org/yazarlar/4039/hrant-dink-ten-sezgin-tanrikulu-na-301>

Cohen, J. (2013). Getting Past Hobbes . In S. A. LLOYD, *Hobbes Today Insights for the 21st Century*. Cambridge University Press.

Coskı, J. (2018, 01 09). *Myths & Misunderstandings | The Confederate Flag*. Retrieved from American Civil War Museum: <https://acwm.org/blog/myths-misunderstandings-confederate-flag/>

Çalışkan, S. (2020). 12 Eylül Darbesi'nde Televizyon Yayınlarında Propaganda Faaliyetleri Üzerine İnceleme. *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi İletişim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 85-116.

Çubukçu, M. (1998). Balkanlar Kan Kokuyor: Kosova'da Şiddet. *Birikim*, 15-18. Retrieved 2022, from Birikim: <https://birikimdergisi.com/dergiler/birikim/1/sayi-108-nisan-1998/2303/balkanlar-kan-kokuyor-kosova-da-siddet/2845>

Çubukçu, M. (1999). Savaşla Beslenen Bir Lider: Miloseviç. *Birikim*, 63-66.

*Dink cinayeti davasında skandal ifade: Samast'ı rahatlatmak amacıyla çekmişler!* (2017, 07 31). Retrieved from cnnturk.com: <https://www.cnnturk.com/turkiye/dink-cinayeti-davasinda-skandal-ifade-samasti-rahlatmak-amaciyla-cekmisler?page=1>

- Dink, H. (2004, 02 6). *Sabiha - Hatun'un Sirri*. Retrieved from Agos: <https://www.agos.com.tr/tr/yazi/17528/sabiha-hatunun-sirri>
- Dink, H. (2007, 01 12). *Why was I targeted?* Retrieved from Hrant Dink Foundation: <https://hrantdink.org/en/hrant-dink/hrant-dink-articles/728-why-was-i-targeted>
- Ducan, S. (2021, 09 26). *Thomas Hobbes*. Retrieved from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/hobbes/>
- Dündar, C. (2009, 04 16). “Kart kurt”, alt üst oldu. *Milliyet*. Retrieved 04 04, 2022, from <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/yazarlar/can-dundar/kart-kurt-alt-ust-oldu-1083712>
- Erim, N. (2007). *12 Mart Anıları*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Galtung, J. (2007). Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation – the TRANSCEND approach. In C. Webel, & J. Galtung, *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. Routledge.
- Galtung, J. (2011). Peace and Conflict Studies as Political Activity. In T. Matyók, J. Senehi, & S. Byrne, *Critical Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies*. Lexington Books.
- Galtung, J. (n.d.). Peace and Conflict Studies as Political Activity. In T. Matyók, J. Senehi, & S. Byrne, *Critical Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies*.
- Hobbes, T. (1996). *Leviathan*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hür, A. (2013). ŞEYH SAİD İSYANI VE TAKRİR-İ SÜKUN KANUNU. In A. Hür, *Öteki Tarih-2*. İstanbul: Profil Yayıncılık.
- işçi, K. b. (2019, 03 22). *Patrondan Çanakkale istismarı*. Retrieved 2 20, 2022, from Evrensel: <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/376069/patrondan-canakkale-istismari>
- Jason Dockstader, R. M. (2021, 12 04). *The Domination of the Kurds*. Retrieved from Journals: <https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/theoria/68/169/th6816903.xml?rskey=3wGBiD&result=61&ArticleBodyColorStyles=full-text>

- Jones, E. (2018, 02 26). *Long way to Afrin: Turkey's strategic refugee policy aimed at electoral hegemony and regional political ambitions*. Retrieved from openDemocracy: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/north-africa-west-asia/long-way-to-afrin-turkey-s-strategic-refugee-policy-aimed-at-ele/>
- Karakaya, M. M. (2016). Çanakkale Savaşı'nda Askerin Yemeği Hakkında Bazı Tespitler Ve Yeni Belgeler. *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*(29), 65-83. Retrieved 02 20, 2022, from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1033447>
- Kaufman, S. J. (2001). *Modern Hatreds The Symbolic Politics Of Ethnic War*. Cornell University Press.
- Kazgan, G. (2005). *Türkiye Ekonomisinde Krizler:1929-2001* . İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kılıç, A. (2020). 27 Mayıs 1960 Darbesine Meşruiyet Kazandırma Çabaları. *ODÜ Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 954-967. Retrieved 2 27, 2022, from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/1339678>
- Loewen, J. W. (2015, 07 1). *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from Why do people believe myths about the Confederacy? Because our textbooks and monuments are wrong.: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/07/01/why-do-people-believe-myths-about-the-confederacy-because-our-textbooks-and-monuments-are-wrong/>
- Macpherson, C. (1962). *The Political Theory Of Possessive Individualism*. Oxford University Press.
- Müftüoğlu, O. (2021, 03 13). Kibleşi 6. Filo olanlarla mücadele devam ediyor. (Y. Aydın, Interviewer) Retrieved 02 26, 2022, from <https://www.birgun.net/haber/kibleşi-6-filo-olanlarla-mucadele-devam-ediyor-337363>
- Need for transparency, investigations, in light of “alarming” reports of major violations in south-east Turkey – Zeid*. (2016, 05 10). Retrieved from United Nations: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2016/05/need-transparency-investigations-light-alarming-reports-major-violations>

- Nicholls, A. (2015). *Myth and the Human Sciences Hans Blumenberg's Theory of Myth*. Routledge.
- Onaran, N. (2014, 06 12). Cumhuriyet'in Ermeni fişlemesi ilk kez gün ışığında. *Agos Gazetesi*. Retrieved from <https://www.agos.com.tr/tr/yazi/7331/cumhuriyetin-ermeni-fisleme-i-lk-kez-gun-isiginda>
- Öcal, B. (2009). 12 EYLÜL'DEN 28 ŞUBAT'A DARBE SÖYLEMLERİNDEKİ DEĞİŞİMİN ANALİZİ. *ETHOS: Felsefe ve Toplumsal Bilimlerde Diyaloglar*. Retrieved from <http://www.ethosfelsefe.com/sites/default/files/2021-09/ethos3-beyhan.pdf>
- Özçelik, P. K. (n.d.). 12 EYLÜL'Ü ANLAMAK. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 73-93.
- Poggi, G. (1978). *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Schmitt, C. (1996). *The Leviathan In The State Theory Of Thomas Hobbes Meaning And Failure Of A Political Symbol*. Greenwood Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2004). *Legality And Legitimacy*. Duke University Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2005). *Political Theology*. United States of America: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2007). *The Concept Of The Political*. The University Of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, C. (2014). *Dictatorship*. Polity Press,.
- Strauss, L. (2007). NOTES ON CARL SCHMITT, THE CONCEPT OF THE POLITICAL. In C. Schmitt, *THE CONCEPT OF THE POLITICAL* (p. 109). THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS.
- Subaşı, E. (2019, 02 28). Bir Yeniden Hegemonikleştirme Hamlesi Olarak. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 27-61. Retrieved from DergiPark: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/941110>
- Şafak, C. (2007). *MESS Grevleri (1977-1980)*. Retrieved 2022, from Çalışma ve Toplum Ekonomi ve Hukuk Dergisi: <https://www.calismatoplum.org/makale/mess-grevleri-1977-1980>

- Tahinciođlu, G. (2022, 01 19). *60 soruda Hrant Dink cinayeti dosyası: 15 yıllık adalet mücadelesi hâlâ sonuç vermedi*. Retrieved from T24 Bađımsız İnternet Gazetesi: <https://t24.com.tr/haber/60-soruda-hrant-dink-cinayeti-dosyasi-15-yillik-adalet-mucadelesi-hala-sonuc-vermedi,1008960>
- Taşkın, Y. (2009). 12 Eylül Atatürkçülüđü ya da Bir Kemalist Restorasyon Teşebbüsü Olarak 12 Eylül. In *Modern Türkiyede Siyasal Düşünce Kemalizm* (pp. 570-583). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Türkiye'ye Kurşun. (2007, 01 20). *Cumhuriyet Gazetesi*(29690), p. 1. Retrieved from <https://egazete.cumhuriyet.com.tr/oku/192/2007-01-20/0>
- Ward, G., & Hoelzl, M. (2014). Translators' Introduction. In C. Schmitt, *Dictatorship* (p. xix). Polity Press.
- Yardımcı, A. (2008, 9 29). Abhazya'nın tanınma savaşı. İstanbul, Şişli, Türkiye. Retrieved 02 02, 2022, from <https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/haber/abhazyanın-taninma-savasi-12964>
- Zürcher, E. J. (2015). *Turkey a Modern History*. I.B. Tauris.
- Zürcher, E. J. (2005). *SAVAŞ, DEVRİM VE ULUSLAŞMA TÜRKİYE TARİHİNDE Geçiş Dönemi: 1908-1928*. İSTANBUL BİLGİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ YAYINLARI 84.