

Neighbourhood; Past, Present and Future - Komşuluk; Geçmiş, Bugün ve Gelecek

Middle East Technical University (Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi)

June 30-July 2, 2005 (30 Haziran-2 Temmuz 2005)

Session 2-A: International Relations Studies and Education in Turkey

(Türkiye’de Uluslararası İlişkiler Çalışmaları ve Eğitimi)

Roundtable Organised by International Relations Council (Uluslararası İlişkiler Konseyi tarafından hazırlanan Yuvarlak Masa Toplantısı)

Chair: Mustafa Aydın (Ankara University)

Speakers: Şule Kut (Bilgi University)

Ali Karaosmanoğlu (Bilkent University)

Atila Eralp (Middle East Technical University)

Mustafa AYDIN*: Dear colleagues, friends, students, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the panel organized by International Relations Council (IRC) of Turkey on International Relations studies and education in Turkey. This is actually a follow-up panel to the two-day workshop, organized by the Faculty of Political Science of Ankara University, together with the IRC, in Ilgaz in April 2005 on the same topic. Two of our current speakers (Prof. Kut and Prof. Eralp) were also present there. But, Professor Karaosmanoğlu is joining us for the first time. We would like to continue today the discussion started in Ilgaz and hope to share our observations with you on the International Relations thought and studies in Turkey.

Our panellists will speak about 15 minutes each and then we will have an open discussion around the table. We expect your contributions and questions. We will start with Prof. Dr. Şule Kut from Bilgi University. I am sure you are all familiar with her work. She had

* Prof. Dr., Ankara University Faculty of Political Science, Department of International Relations.

graduated from Robert College and Boğaziçi University. She has her PhD from the State University of New York at Binghamton. Then, she worked at the Department of International Relations, Marmara University, and later as visiting lecturer at Koç University. She was founding Head of the Department of International Relations at Bilgi University, where she is also Vice-Rector since 2000. Her main research areas include the Balkans, Turkish-Greek relations and Turkish foreign policy in general. She has been especially active recently in projects about the rapprochement between the Greeks and the Turks. As I found out luckily before our Ilgaz meeting, she is also very knowledgeable about Turkish International Relations academia and the development of IR in Turkey.

Şule KUT*: Thank you. I am honoured to be on this panel for many reasons. Although there are so many people working on different aspects of International Relations and also on the discipline in Turkey, I was invited to take part on this panel, thus I am very grateful to be here, next to my professor Ali Karaosmanoğlu from my Boğaziçi University days.

I would like to be very brief. I have already stated my points in Ilgaz meeting. I am not one of those in Turkey who work on the development of our discipline; there are others working on the development of the discipline of International Relations and Political Science in Turkey. But, before coming here and before going to Ilgaz, I made a small research about our discipline, our studies, our departments, and our students. The findings were at least surprising for me. I would especially like to share those basic facts about the teaching of International Relations and our faculty and student body.

In Turkey, we have 81 undergraduate programs altogether for International Relations, Political Science, and Public Administration. When we exclude Public Administration programs from the list, as the rest are more directly related with the IR, the number of IR-relevant programs in Turkey is 43. These ones that are more or less strictly on IR, are launched under eight different names. The names range from Political Science and International Relations to International Relations, and recently to International Relations and EU Studies. When you look at their curricula, you see that all of these have a number of common courses, so each of these eight different programs can be considered as full or partial International Relations programs. All in all, we have 43 undergraduate programs in IR under 8 different names.

* Prof. Dr., İstanbul Bilgi University, Department of International Relations.

It is striking to see that we have about 200 International Relations PhD students at the moment registered in IR graduate programs in Turkey. This means that 200 young PhDs will be looking for job most probably at universities. The master and PhD programs are run in 38 universities in Turkey. In terms of undergraduate students, only looking at the number of students newly registered in 2004 as a result of University Entrance Examination, we see that 3166 new students has joined our student body for International Relations programs. In other words, last year 3166 new students decided that they want to study International Relations.

In the last academic year we have just finished, a total of over 12.000 undergraduate students were registered in all International Relations departments while the number of graduates from our undergraduate programs, was 1852 in the year 2004. I am not sure if you are also surprised by those numbers, but I was sincerely surprised. I am heading one of the most popular and crowded International Relations undergraduate programs, however, until I saw the overall numbers, I was not aware that in Turkey we were all training so many students each year.

The number of full-time IR faculty is not that high. Altogether there is about 400 full-time IR-teaching staff. Half of those are professors, associate professors and assistant professors; the other half is the lecturers, research and teaching assistants. The other numerical information I would like to mention here concerns the male-female ratio. This is not important by itself, but it may be of interest to note if there will be any impact on our teaching or study of IR in Turkey by the feminization of our discipline. When you look at the male-female ratio at graduate programs, it is definitely obvious that there is feminization in this discipline. In terms of total student body, female students are over 6000 and male students are over 5000. Our students and our faculty are getting more and more feminine! I think that is good and that is quite an interesting piece of information if one wants to think if there is any impact of this on the development of our discipline in Turkey. I have some detailed figures and I can share them with you later, but let me mention one more thing. In 1989, there was one woman professor and today -do not worry we are still a very small group- there are 12 female professors. This is still a small number, but it also means that in the last 15 years we managed to multiply our number by 10! Let me move to another issue by giving another figure about the IR faculty. Today, 55 full professors in Turkey are basically working, that is, teaching and researching, in this field.

These are the numbers. Now we can come to the substance. Please keep the numbers in your mind, so we can discuss later what we can do with these numbers. When you look at these numbers, you will see something about our discipline, that is, the traditional International Relations in capital letters. We can draw the conclusion that everybody wants to study International Relations. But, if everybody wants to study International Relations in order to practice international relations is a question mark. If they are studying IR to join the Foreign Service, the most classical target, this is very doubtful. Because, those from Ankara know better than those coming from İstanbul, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs take only 30 or 40 of our graduates each year. I gave you the numbers. If you calculate, you see that only two percent of these students actually join the Ministry. Other public offices are of course open to our students, but we know that most of our students rather work in the private sector. Furthermore, they work in much unrelated jobs. But, in an age of globalization, because of internationalization, whatever they do will have something to do with international relations. If they work in a family company, most probably they will still be doing something in relation to international relations. In Ilgaz, a good example was given from agricultural sector. Even in agriculture, most probably a graduate of International Relations program may find it useful when he or she does business with foreigners. So, it is good to study IR. To put it differently, there is at least nothing wrong to study International Relations, even if one works in a seemingly unrelated job later. But the fact remains that International Relations graduates do not necessarily work in an area directly what you call international relations. This brings us to the question of who an International Relations person is. Is it somebody who works for an International Relations department? Or, are they in trade or Foreign Ministry or other ministries and public offices or in private sector? That is, what do International Relations graduates do? Or, what do we train the International Relations graduates to do? I think we train them to be as liberal as possible in their intellectual environment. IR is part of the liberal arts program. In the United States and continental Europe, International Relations studies are basically part of liberal arts. Therefore, it is important not to attach to or to expect too much technicality from International Relations. International Relations is not like architecture, it is not like engineering or medicine. So, what is our discipline?

When you look at our discipline, you see that this discipline is the child of the combination of other disciplines: History, Law, Political Science. These are the classical sources of International Relations. In

Turkish, I sometimes say “*Boynuz kulağı geçti*”, in reference to Political Science. Political Science is the mother of our discipline, but when you look at the scores at the University Entrance Examination, it is always ranked higher than Political Science in the preference lists of the prospective students. So, these three classical sources of the discipline had nurtured International Relations over the years. This is for everywhere, not necessarily just in Turkey. I think it is important to remember that International Relations was born in Ankara and born in a very particular place, *Mülkiye*. From there it has spread to other places and was shaped differently at different institutions.

When we look at the curriculum, we see differences in the curricula of *Mülkiye*, METU, Bilkent, Boğaziçi, Bilgi, etc. But, one can simply divide this curriculum into two. In some of our departments and universities, we are under the influence of the teaching patterns of American International Relations and in some others, we are more under the influence of continental Europe and Britain. In both cases, however, history, political science and law are traditionally important.

I will say a few words now on the future of the teaching of International Relations. I think we are going to continue to have these three classical sources as the main groups of our courses, that is international law and political science and history. I think that all of these are in interaction with another. Let me give you an example. I gave the same example in Ilgaz. If you are thinking yourself to be an International Relations expert on the Aegean conflict, you must know UNCLOS and the history of the Aegean issues by heart. Otherwise, you can not comprehend the politics of the Aegean Question either. Similar is also true for any Law student working on the continental shelf. But, in case of history students, I think they can get away with this. You must know as an International Relations person everything about the history of Aegean issues, but if you work on the history of the Dodecanese Islands, history is enough. You do not necessarily have to know the legal implications of the Aegean problem nor the current political questions associated with it. Therefore, our discipline is in interaction at least with its traditional sources. At this point, I must add a few words on what we might arrive now in the discipline. I believe that in addition to the three traditional sources, IR is getting more interdisciplinary each day. Current teaching of IR is in need for more interaction with economics, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, etc.

I think this brings us to an essential question. How broad we should be in the teaching of International Relations, or in studying International Relations. How broad and how deep? These are the

essential questions. I think in Turkey, especially in Turkey, our discipline must enlarge and must deepen at the same time. These must be done at the same time. It is a challenge because it requires us to learn more about anthropology, for example. It requires us to learn more about sociology. I think today we must include courses from other disciplines in our curricula more than yesterday. And inclusion is not enough, as they were included even in the beginning. Other disciplines should be more and more integrated into International Relations to produce contemporary International Relations studies.

As an IR academic, I will finish by saying a few words on others who are working on international relations outside the universities. We must realize that we, the IR academics at the universities, do not have a monopoly over international relations. Media has become our rival and partner; they use us, we use them and it is a helpful relationship, whereas our traditional rivals and partners were diplomats. Now, the think-tanks are also on the line as the third rival and partner of the IR academics.

I am finishing with a wishful thinking. I started by saying that it was surprising for me to see that so many students are choosing to study International Relations. I think it is basically a good choice and it is also good to teach International Relations. Because, teaching and studying International Relations brings a broader perspective to the teachers and students. In this age of various conspiracy theories, this alone may contribute to a better understanding of the world around us by contributing to the production of more scientific knowledge and more sensible people.

Mustafa AYDIN: Let me put a couple of questions before giving floor to our next speaker. We have three professors here today from three different universities teaching in English. Thus, my first request from them is to touch upon problems, if any, of teaching International Relations in English to Turkish student. The second question is about the current obsession of Turkish academia of publishing in English. How does this affect the quality of works produced by Turkish academics? When the first symposium on International Relations was conveyed in 1961 at the Faculty of Political Science, Ankara University, Professor Suat Bilge, one of the founders of IR in Turkey, complained that he published his lecture notes and nobody read it. (In Turkish: *"Okuttuğumuz mevzuları küçük bir kitapçıkta neşrettik, ama galiba kimse okumadı, eskiciye düştü."*) It seems that not much has changed in Turkey, as today we continue to complain about our student's lack of interest in reading. Do you have any explanation for this anomaly? Another

problem Prof. Bilge complained back in 1961 was too much emphasis on current events while analysing international relations in general. Almost 45 years after, we are again on the same spot: We still continue to complain today about too much focus on current events and lack of conceptual analysis. One of the complaints raised in Ilgaz meeting was that Turkish International Relations academia in general lacks in method. We do not have schools, which may be called “epistemological communities”. As Prof. Karaosmanoğlu is one of the founders of the IR discipline in Turkey, he may wish to refer to this problem.

Most of you are already familiar with Professor Karaosmanoğlu and his work. He is currently the Chair of International Relations Department at Bilkent University. He obtained his PhD from University of Lausanne in International Law. He has been Fellow at the Hague Academy of International Law; a Fulbright Fellow; a NATO Fellow, and was Visiting Scholar at Stanford University (1980-1981) and later at Princeton University. He was member of Turkish delegations to various international conferences, the most notable of which was the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. He has been researching and writing especially on security issues, foreign policy and lately on peacekeeping operations.

Ali KARAOSMANOĞLU*: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Şule touched upon the most important aspects and development of the discipline of International Relations in Turkey, especially focusing on the present state of discipline. I do not have much to say on the present situation of the discipline. I would like to share with you some of my observations from 1960s to the present and the prospects on the International Relations discipline in Turkey. I did not prepare an organized paper. However, I divide the development of International Relations in Turkey in four stages. The first stage was actually dominated by *Mekteb-i Mülkiye*. The contribution made by it is un-debatable. However, I differ a little bit from Şule. Because, *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* begins in the second half of the 19th century in Istanbul then after the Turkish Republican elite moved the school to Ankara. However, in İstanbul, the teaching was not an International Relations teaching per se. It was rather the teaching of diplomacy, diplomatic techniques, diplomatic protocol, etc. So, the *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* in İstanbul and in Ankara, as the capital, *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* was not a university. It was something like a vocational school. And the mission was to prepare the students for the state

* Prof. Dr., Bilkent University, Department of International Relations.

agencies. So, teaching was made with certain moves of indoctrination. I think this continued up to the end of the 1970s.

In the 1960s, Faculty of Political Science in Ankara had three programs. They were called as "sections". They were Administrative Studies Section, Financial Studies Section and Political Studies Section. They approached the Political Studies Section like other sections mainly state-centric. The curriculum took into consideration the Turkish state's needs and explanation of Turkey's foreign policy and Turkish diplomatic history. The needs of Turkey were given priority consideration in the preparation of the curriculum of the faculty of Political Science. However, in the 1960s, a change occurred in the teaching of International Relations. If I am not wrong, the first International Relations textbook was published in 1966 by Professor Suat Bilge. His book was a well-organized and beautifully written one and it was not boring to read for the students and it contributed to the development of our discipline. It offered the students the major classical concepts of power politics, like balance of power and factors influencing international affairs, such as geography, geopolitical factors, demography, and economy. There was another factor which was underlined and which occupied a section. It was nationalism. There was also a chapter on the role of International Law. If you compare this to today's textbooks, you can hardly come across such long sections on International Law, especially in the textbooks written in the United States or Great Britain or even Turkey. Professor Bilge referred in his book to a considerable number of American scholars of the period, such as Morgenthau, Quincy Wright and many others. There were quite a number of occasional references to these scholars. They are just occasional references without really reflecting their thought and their approaches to International Relations. English School was completely ignored. There was no reference to Carr. However, the book was mainly inspired from the French textbook approach in International Relations. The famous textbook of the period was Introduction to the History of International Relations. This book was history-oriented, but not a history book. Another interesting point is that Suat Bilge's book said hardly anything about two principle debates of the time, the debate between scientific approach and traditional approach and the debate between idealist approach and realism.

The second stage was mainly dominated by Political Science and Public Administration departments of the Middle East Technical University and to some extent by the Political Science Department of Boğaziçi University and even to less extent by that of İstanbul University. Curriculum of the Department of Political Science and

Public Administration at METU included International Relations courses in which International Relations theory was adequately studied. This is late 1960s and 1970s. However, as you know, METU was formed in 1956. Of course, important contributions to the development of International Relations were made in 1960s and 1970s by the METU library. It had the best International Relations and Strategic Studies collections of that period. Besides this trend of improvement, it is regretful that another trend affected the study of International Relations. This trend was marked by student political movements, clashes between left and right militant groups in the university campuses. This phenomenon encouraged in certain academic and student circles in Turkish universities the stereotypical ideological arguments. It discouraged scholarly thinking among the academics as well as students. Those were the years wasted not only for the discipline of International Relations but for Social Sciences in general. One example concerning International Relations which was at that time increasingly studied at the United States and Great Britain was strategic studies. During those years it was something almost shameful to study strategic matters actually. Once you attempt that, you were regarded as militant. Despite this, some scholars had enough courage to study security and strategic matters. One of them was Duygu Sezer. She went to International Institute of Strategic Studies in London and there she spent a year and wrote a paper on Turkey's security policy.

I call the third period as Özal period. It is a little bit out of context, but in fact it is not. This period is between 1980s and 1990s. This period affected the study of International Relations indirectly. Because, this period was marked by Turkish economy's opening up to the international economic system: the introduction of liberalization reforms on trade and finance. These changes promoted the idea that international economic relations and joint ventures would create interdependencies between nations and would contribute to the stability and peace. This in turn enhanced the interest in International Political Economy and liberal theories in a number of International Relations departments. The media also encouraged the interest in International Economic matters by extending their pages and columns on international economy. Parallel to these developments, a second contribution of the Özal period was the emphasis put on the growing significance and role of the non-state entities of international relations, especially in international economic relations.

The fourth stage begins after the end of Cold War. This last period is marked by a systemic change in international affairs. Turkey's

international relations moved from simplicity and inflexibility of the Cold War to cover much more diversity and complexity of international relations. Turkey's new challenges and new opportunities combined with the increasing number of problems, considerably enhanced the interest on International Relations in Turkey. This development has had a number of consequences. First of all, area studies were included in the curriculum and research programs. At the graduate level, International Relations departments inaugurated specific area programs or programs focusing on specific International Relations sub-disciplines, such as conflict resolution. And, also area studies, such as Russia, Central Asia, European Union and also security studies. We can also come across some other programs at METU, Bilkent and Koç Universities. We also observe a growing interest in International Relations and this growing interest led many universities to open separate International Relations departments and as Şule pointed out, in some departments, International Relations programs are included within Political Science programs. Actually, independent International Relations departments are rare. However, it is not peculiar to Turkey. Only in a few countries, universities have independent International Relations departments. Britain is the most prominent example. In most of the countries, they are integrated to the political science departments and this is the case in almost all the American universities. Only on the graduate level, they have separate International Relations programs.

The new circumstances had promoted policy-oriented research and foreign policy and strategic think tanks. The first think tank which was established in 1974 in Turkey is Foreign Policy Institute created by Seyfi Taşhan. Foreign Policy Institute contributed to the opening up of a number of academics to the United States and Europe, and especially to the think tanks in those countries.

Lastly, I want to focus on the quality of the research and publications. The quality of research and publications considerably increased in the last period. This is probably a partial response to one of the questions of Mr. Chair. International Relations research in Turkey today is opening up to international academia. Number of International Relations publications in the journals abroad greatly increased in the last 10 years. However, there is still a deficiency which should be discussed. It is on the possible Turkish contribution to the theory of International Relations. We have not contributed to the development of International Relations theory yet. I think it is a deficiency. What are the ways of achieving this? Would it be possible to develop a special Turkish approach to international relations? I think these are the questions which we should try to answer.

Mustafa AYDIN: At this point, let me state some facts. The first course I come across in *Mekteb-i Mülkiye* related to International Relations was given in 1926. It was called *Hukuk-i Düvel*. In 1960, *Dış Münasebetler Enstitüsü* was established at the Faculty. In 1967, there were four institutions in Turkey teaching International Relations: Ankara University, METU within the Political Science and Public Administration Department, İstanbul Economy Faculty and Robert College. Professor Karaosmanoğlu said there was one textbook in 1967 on International Relations written by Suat Bilge. There was also *Milletlerarası Siyasi Teşkilatlanma* (International Political Institutions), which was published in 1964, written by Mehmet Gönlübol. There were many books on International Law and Diplomatic History, but not on International Politics. In 1967, Ankara University also decided to establish an area studies centre with the money coming from Rockefeller Foundation. This did not survive.

Our third panelist today is Professor Dr Atila Eralp from METU. He had graduated from the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, METU, and then wisely decided to move to International Relations and took his MA and PhD in International Relations. He has been writing extensively on issues related to European studies; such as politics of European integration, enlargement process, theories of European integration, European security; in short anything associated with the European Union. He has been the Head of the Department of International Relations at METU. He has also been Jean Monnet Professor since 2002.

Atila ERALP*: I do not have any study on the teaching of International Relations in Turkey. So, I will share only my observations with you and I will try to be short because my colleagues will contribute as well. I have seven or eight points to start the discussion on the issue of teaching International Relations in Turkey.

My first point is that I think 1980 is a turning point in terms of teaching of International Relations. I depart from Professor Karaosmanoğlu because of my personal experience. When we look at the teaching of International Relations before 1980, there were only two traditions in my opinion. One was the *Mülkiye* tradition, which was very strong. The second one was İstanbul University tradition. The *Mülkiye* tradition focused on Turkish Foreign policy and looked at international relations, international law and international history. The İstanbul tradition basically looked at international relations in linkage

* Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Department of International Relations.

with comparative government. These were two strong traditions and the METU and Boğaziçi traditions were not so influential. In my opinion, this was the case before 1980. After 1980 and during 1980s, we started to see the positioning of the teaching of International Relations in Turkey. Unfortunately, I do not know how to characterize this, this coincided with the formation of Higher Education Council in Turkey. It was highly interesting that the teaching of International Relations flourished during the 1980s and after then. When I look at this period, especially when I focused on our experience at METU, in the beginning there was a strong suggestion from Higher Education Council that we should try to develop a uniform International Relations teaching. Taking the model of *Mülkiye*, we should create our International Politics section, International Law and Diplomatic History and look at these things somewhat autonomously from each other. In our department, we had a long debate on this matter. We tried to look at advantages and disadvantages of uniform kind of International Relations teaching. In our debate in the department, we decided to deviate from the uniform International Relations teaching, which was a major decision at that point.

But, the challenge was how we could deviate from this pattern because the uniform pattern was well-known. To deviate from the well-established traditions was not so easy. When we decided to deviate from this pattern, we tried to bring theory into the study of International Relations. As Professor Karaosmanoğlu pointed out, at METU there was some traditional teaching in theory in International Relations and we thought that we should take that tradition and we should bring in conceptual frameworks and theory in the study of International Relations and we should try to focus on area studies. So we arranged the department's area curriculum within studies of theory and also area studies. Two areas which we chose at that time were Middle Eastern Studies and European Studies. We tried to arrange our graduate program first and then in time we started to arrange our MA programme and more importantly our PhD programme, as the latter is more important in terms of both teaching and research. In terms of our PhD programme, again after long discussions, we decided that we should focus on theory and area studies starting with Middle East and Europe. And, in time we decided to create interdisciplinary programmes in our university. We contributed to different MA programmes on area studies. I told our strong sides.

When I look at the weak sides of our programme, yes, we tried to focus on theory, we have focused on area studies, and we have tried to create our own way of teaching and tradition. But, in terms of theory

for example, as Professor Karaosmanoğlu pointed out, we have not contributed to the search in this field much. So, we still have much to do in terms of theory. We did these, but could not create linkages. This is not peculiar to METU but other International Relations programmes as well. Another weakness of our programme, also the problem of Turkey, is the issue of methodology. When I looked at our programme and other programmes, we are trying to study different issues. But, we are all lacking in methodological issues. We should try to look at this issue and include it because especially in the teaching of International Relations and the research of International Relations, the issue of methodology is significant.

I would like to make the point that I think in terms of International Relations teaching and research, we should collaborate more. We have departments all over Turkey, but there is no collaboration. Especially, when it comes to the post-doctoral programmes, we should collaborate and exchange our young PhD students and young assistant professors. There must be a certain exchange. But, in Turkey, it is restricted and limited. We should work on that. There are some possibilities now. There are many scholarships and we should take advantage of them. In our university, we also have a post-doctoral programme. We should also organize the conferences on this issue and the aim here is to create a community to study International Relations. We should create a sense of community. I do not think that it is late. We should work on this. An association in International Relations in Turkey must also be created and this association should work on a publication. We should have a journal as most associations do. Here, I congratulate Mustafa in creating *Uluslararası İlişkiler Konseyi*, International Relations Council. I think it is a right step.

Mustafa AYDIN: Thank you very much. I am going to open the floor for discussions.

A Graduate Student from METU (Name not heard): METU is Europe-oriented. There were no courses on other areas like China or Japan. I took these courses during my education in the US. I think we should also take more courses on political science and economy. Concerning education in English I would like to say that we can take some courses in Turkish like Constitutional Turkish Law.

Fuat KEYMAN (Prof. Dr., Koç University): I would like to add two points to presentations. I disagree with Prof. Karaosmanoğlu's

periodization. Last stage was O.K., but previous stages were exaggeration. My main observation is that there is no thinking about IR in Turkey until the 1990s. There is confusion about what IR and what foreign policy is. IR is sometimes considered as foreign policy. This is a very clear demarcation in American School and British School of IR. When we look at media and when we complain that there is no foreign policy vision of Turkey, it comes from this confusion.

There must be a distinction between foreign policy and IR. This distinction is recent in Turkey. Only in the 1990s and after 2000 we have such a distinction.

There is no tradition in Turkey. There is no thinking of epistemology in Turkey. We have to approach the question in a more methodological way.

Okan AKTAN (Prof. Dr., Hacettepe University): I am the Head of the International Relations Department at Hacettepe University. International political economy is also very important. It was introduced by Adam Smith and Ricardo. I did not see any reference to teaching of economics in IR. What about economics?

Wolfgang PICCOLI (The University of Wales, Aberystwyth): I would like to ask a question about IR community in Turkey. 80-90% of Turkish scholars work on Turkey. Why is that the case?

Cengiz SÜRÜCÜ (METU): In US in major universities there are also abstract IR studies. Why is there so much emphasis on area studies in Turkey?

Ali KARAOSMANOĞLU: We are talking about IR programs and curricula. At the same time there are foreign policy courses. Foreign policy can be commented on two ways: Foreign policy of a given state and foreign policy analysis. He is right in saying that in our teaching and research we have some weaknesses. In methodological questions we are weak. We may discuss different paradigms.

Şule KUT: I do not agree with Fuat Keyman. I do not think that there is such a broad equation of foreign policy and IR in Turkey.

Meanwhile, I would like to mention growing significance of economics as one of the sources of IR discipline. Not only economics, but we also need to include philosophy as such in our curricula.

I also think student input is very important, because it is the real feedback. Without feedback from our graduates or students, I think development of a better curriculum is not possible. I did not go into my own experience in my own university, but after hearing Atila's METU explanation, I will mention one thing. What we do at Bilgi is that we include the opinions of our students at the end of each academic year for the development of next-year's curriculum.

This year, we are organizing a major conference, the WISC conference, at Bilgi in İstanbul in August. The topic of my paper there is "The Mushrooming of Area Studies" in Turkey. They have mushroomed. The copyright goes to Duygu Sezer, because she put the title for me there. Area studies are important. But, when I was a student, area studies was not the part of my studies at the universities I studied. When I got my PhD at SUNY, I immediately came back to Turkey. The day before I left, I received a call from a professor offering me a job at a college nearby New York.. It was quite unbelievable, because people were going from campus to campus, from conference to conference to find teaching jobs. He said "we want you to teach Russian politics", I said I have no idea about it. His reply was: "how come? Aren't you from Turkey?" Yes, I was, and that was precisely the reason. He was thinking that coming from Turkey, I would naturally be more knowledgeable about Russia than others around him. Unfortunately, it was the other way around because it was the 1980s. I remember very well that the people who wanted to learn Russian language were seen as possible communists or agents. 1990s were important in that respect too. The end of Cold War had actually opened our minds and our interests. I always say that I am lucky because I started my career as a teacher in International Relations right before the 1989. I had the liberty to choose whatever region and whatever topic I wanted to study without any such limitations.

Another comment I want to respond to is about Turkish contribution to IR. It is said that people from Turkey did not contribute to International Relations theory. That may be the case. But International Relations theory is not the total of the International Relations discipline. As I tried to express myself at the beginning, I think there is a flourishing of different subjects and areas in International Relations, which used to be not regarded as part of International Relations. So, International Relations theory is not the only area that Turkish contribution is expected. There are contributions to various areas and to Turkish studies. There are many Turkish scholars whose works are now in the reading list of many universities abroad. They are writing on many issues from nationalism to area studies.

I should stop here. But, I want to say something on teaching in English and publishing in English as well. If one discipline is going to be taught in English, it must be International Relations. It really benefits both parties; the students and the teachers. On publishing, my views on citation index are known by some of my peers in this room. I think citation index in this field is a joke. Social sciences are different than applied sciences in this respect. Of course, the quality is very important. But most of us, especially once we are more established scholars in this field, do not really care if we publish in those journals which may not be in the citation index as long as they are good journals. This citation index is a big question, and I do not want to prolong, because, here in Ankara as elsewhere it has become an overwhelming issue for everyone.

Atila ERALP: Economics must be an essential part of teaching in IR. In IR economics is taught differently. In IR there are rather political economy kinds of courses. IR scholars have to develop their own courses on economics. In terms of area studies I do not believe in autonomous area studies. They must be related to IR.

There was a question on why 80-90% of Turkish scholars research and write on Turkey. I think it is changing. I have not done any research on this. This may be based on *Mülkiye* tradition.

Mustafa AYDIN: Let me say a few words on this subject. What Prof. Eralp said was true about Turkish scholars mostly working on Turkey, but it also is related to how the Department of International Relations in *Mülkiye* was created. It was established with the strong support of the Turkish Foreign Ministry. Moreover, in those days International Relations was too much ideology-ridden in Turkey. Its subjects were difficult to study, especially the subject of the Soviet Union or Russian studies. It was difficult at times to study political economy because you might be viewed as Marxist. Studying Turkish Foreign Policy was easy way out. It was also encouraged. But this has been changing since the early 1980s; and now many students, especially those graduated from universities abroad, are studying more and more subjects not related to Turkey. Finally, academic careers are sometimes built on demand. How much you try to avoid writing about Turkey, after your name starts to be known around the world, inevitably you start to get requests and book offers to write on Turkish foreign policy. And this is hard to resist.

Ali KARAOSMANOĞLU: Probably the field of International Relations is the most interdisciplinary one. There are military affairs, strategic studies etc. There are two problems: How to balance these different disciplines in a program? Which courses should be must and which courses should be elective? This is one problem. The other problem is about area studies people and IR and foreign policy people. They have difficulties to cooperate. Area studies people are mostly history-oriented. They do not like theory. Not linking theoretical approach to what is happening in a particular area is one weakness.

Area studies programs popped up in the 1990s. In most of the research centers scholars are not really people who speak the language of the area and know about its culture.

The number of think tanks increased in Turkey after the end of the Cold War. Some of them are doing good job. Some have a strong inclination about conspiracy theories. One of the reasons is lack of vision.

(Name not heard): There are structural problems. There are problems stemming from the primary school education. There is also the problem of paradigm to study.

Pınar BİLGİN (Bilkent University): Turkey is a developing country. IR developed in Turkey how it developed in other developing countries. The fact that Turkey did not contribute to IR theory is also the fault of IR theory itself.

(Name not heard): Are we teaching enough about Turkish foreign policy? Turkish foreign policy courses are important, but they are usually in the 4th year curriculum. It is too late. Meanwhile, how do you see future of IR in general and in Turkey in particular?

Şule KUT: There are two groups of departments and two or three types of curricula. We should compare different curricula in order to develop better ones.