

# THOMAS MORE'S UTOPIA: A MANUAL FOR EXPANSIONIST FOREIGN POLICY?

*Thomas More'un Ütopyası: Genişlemeci Bir Dış Politika İçin Kullanım Kılavuzu?*

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gökhan GÜNEYSU\***

## ABSTRACT

Thomas More's Utopia, among others, touches upon the international relations of the ideal state called Utopia. The utopian foreign politics depend upon a hierarchical understanding of international relations, where Utopia occupies the uppermost position. This self-righteous and self-serving position enables Utopia to wage aggressive wars and to implement an imperialistic policy. Geographical expansion is an important component of this policy, which is justified by an unquestionable moral superiority of this state. Utopians feel free to declare wars, appoint rulers from their ranks for their allies and usurp other nations' resources at will. All this stems from the fact that Utopia has an unfalsifiable claim of always being the rightful party. This paper deals with this apparently imperialistic and inherently supremacist design of Utopian foreign affairs. Thomas More foresees an ordered state within domestic realm, whereas regarding foreign affairs he offers a cruel yet rational policymaking geared towards aggressive wars.

**Key Words:** Thomas More, Utopia, International Law, International Relations, War.

## ÖZET

Thomas More'un eseri Ütopya diğer konuların yanı sıra Ütopya Devleti'nin uluslararası siyasetine ilişkin konuları da ihtiva etmektedir. Ütopya'nın dış siyaseti devletlerarasında mevcut olan ve zirvesinde Ütopya'nın var olduğu bir hiyerarşiye dayanmaktadır. Bu, kerameti kendinden menkul ve öz menfaat sağlamaya yönelik anlayış Ütopya Devleti'nin saldırı savaşları yürütmesinin ve emperyalist bir dış politika gütmesinin önünü açmaktadır. Bu politikanın en önemli unsurlarından biri de coğrafi genişlemedir. Coğrafi genişleme politikasının dayanağını da bu Devlet'in sahip olduğu düşünülen ahlaki bir üstünlük pozisyonudur. Ütopyalılar kendi keyiflerine göre savaş ilan edebilmekte, müttefiklerine bile yönetici atayabilmekte ve başka milletlerin topraklarını kullanabilmektedir. Tüm bunlar sürekli olarak haklı olduğunu düşünen Ütopyalıların bu iddiası ile meşrulaştırılmaktadır. Bu çalışma aşikâr bir şekilde emperyalist olan ve içkin olarak üstünlük iddiasına sahip olan Ütopya dış politikasına ilişkindir. Devlet-içi bir düzen öngören More dış politikada saldırı savaşlarına neden olacak acımasız bir politika-yapım modalitesi tasarlamaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Thomas More, Ütopya, Uluslararası Hukuk, Uluslararası İlişkiler, Savaş

## Introduction

Thomas More's approach to or analysis of international relations has been a matter that has been only rarely elaborated. This may be a willful abstention on behalf of the academia, since a probe into the way More prescribes state behavior in the field of international politics, may be seen to be in complete contrast with the way the author has been accepted by the academia, namely a humanist.

\* Anadolu University, Faculty of Law, Department of Public Law. gguneysu@anadolu.edu.tr.

More is usually seen as the ultimate anti-machiavelli and anti-realism.<sup>1</sup> However, the *foreign* relations of Utopia carry some inherently dystopic tendencies; whereas the main aim of More in writing Utopia is actually to craft a way to *order* human activities in the best way possible *within* a political community.<sup>2</sup> Thus, the effort on behalf of More to devise a system that will yield *ordered* human behaviors will also result in the creation of a political space. As he foresees an order within a realm, he draws up a mapping up of politically relevant and irrelevant territories. That means, the inclusive, i.e. constitutive definitions and delineations that cause a certain state of Utopia to emerge, also serve to exclude others and different identities.<sup>3</sup> Those individuals and societies that these boundaries happen to exclude will be on the receiving end of the Utopian international politics. As will be mentioned later in this paper, Utopians have an unshakeable claim of superiority and see other peoples as their natural preys and political tools. The Zapoletes are the best example of this self-righteous assumption. Utopians believe this people are completely devoid of any humane qualities and see their extermination *en masse* as something to cherish.

Thomas More's starting point is the real political situation in Europe of his time.<sup>4</sup> He criticizes the politics of his country as well as Europe, for the politics were administered in an irrational way back then.<sup>5</sup> Against this backdrop, he comes up with a plan of a state and a society making use of a system of political and moral sanctions to escape the shortcomings of the-then England and Europe<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, the second book of Utopia is sliding away farther from the political reality, just as the teller of the Utopia Hythloday had to travel long distances away from Europe to have the opportunity to observe the Utopian society.<sup>7</sup>

The order of the Utopian society has its root in chaos and violence<sup>8</sup> dexterously used by Utopus, who went on to exclude his realm from neighboring localities by building a huge canal. Utopia bears the name of its founding father, a certain Utopus, who brilliantly jockeyed for political power and used to his advantage the political disputes among a very high number of

---

<sup>1</sup> Nyers, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> De Luca, p. 521; Nyers, p. 2; Osgood, p. 180. De Luca also highlights the very fact that More's piece is "a work of constitutional and political ideology, rather than simply imaginative literature", which conveys a written text an objective., De Luca, p. 522.

<sup>3</sup> Nyers, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Bal, s. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Spreen.

<sup>6</sup> Nyers, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup> Nyers, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Nyers, p. 8.

warring parties.<sup>9</sup> The original name of the Utopia was a certain Abraxa, which was not an island but a peninsula. Abraxan natives were a “rough and uncouth” people, who were not able make use of their land to its fullest potential leaving it waste and idle.<sup>10</sup> Utopus forcefully imposed an allegedly progressive modernist yoke over the natives, who were now allocated a lesser place in the rank of humanity, where Utopians represented a modernist progressive group directly claiming an ecological sovereignty on the originally Abraxan territory.<sup>11</sup> Simultaneously, the Natives were the pitiable embodiments of the primitive pre-moderns, who had no rightful claim over their own land solely due to the fact they failed to “rationally recognize the law of nature and proceed to instrumentalize the land on which they lived”.<sup>12</sup> The moment they failed to do so, the Abraxan Natives were stripped of their natural being, for now they are relegated to a de-naturalized entities, which have been marked for murder.<sup>13</sup> Here a “logic of elimination” is at work, a vicious and self-righteous logic justifying its existence by making use of a modernist language. The method employed by the conquering and assimilating Utopians possesses a twofold *modus operandi*, as Ruth Levitas diagnoses. First of all, they strip of the subject of their conquests of their natural characteristics, which she dubs “a cognitive estrangement”. This estrangement, in turn, enables the conquerers to go *critical* on their future prey.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the imaginary reconstitution of a foreign society comprises an inherently self-supremacist approach, a *carte blanche* for the future assimilation and re-humanization, the latter meaning, needless to say, nothing else but a complete extermination of the old way of life and imposing a completely-Utopian one.

Utopus thus made use of violence and geographical exclusion to create and impose his order in the Utopian society. Thomas More has no problem with the violent and suppressive policies, as far as they are geared to creating an ordered society. Even Hythloday, who was at first very critical of the violent monarchical expansionism rampant on the European continent, praises Utopians’ gentle-in-rhetoric expansionist foreign policy.<sup>15</sup> A strong vacillation between a “fanciful anti-materialism and keen-eyed-pragmatism” is observable here.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Yıldırım, p. 38.

<sup>10</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 5; Hardy, p. 126.

<sup>11</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 5; Hardy, p. 126.

<sup>12</sup> Hardy, p. 126.

<sup>13</sup> Hardy, p. 127. Hardy reminds us that Patrick Wolfe terms this attitude as the “logic of elimination”.

<sup>14</sup> Hardy, p. 128.

<sup>15</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 5.

<sup>16</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 6.

As Nyers succinctly points at, More does not aim to create or design a good or a just society.<sup>17</sup> He highlights the fact that Utopians do have a very well ordered society, of which they are very proud. This order is attained by a constant surveillance of the individuals. Utopia is a society where individuals are denied any personal space and life. Since every deed or omission of individuals are observable by others, shame proves to be the most important sanction of law and legal order.<sup>18</sup> Other penalties and sanctions are available yet the reel teeth of the system stem from the collective shame burdened by not only the evildoers themselves, but also their family.<sup>19</sup> Their parents are also added to this collective frenzy of shame, for they have been unsuccessful in the proper upbringing of their children. All in all, the legal system of Utopia depends heavily upon the notoriety one has to bear when one commits a crime. Even the slavery, which is deemed as a kind of penalty in Utopia, uses this notoriety principle, for the slaves will be seen by others' "universal gaze" doing their hard labor, which in turn means that these people are obviously wrongdoers and criminals.<sup>20</sup> More's Utopia is a place where an all-seeing eye is at work, making vicious use of every social and penal tool available, to instill fear and a sense of lawfulness in the citizenry.

### **Thomas More on the Essence of Mankind**

According to Thomas More, human beings do not possess a quality of goodness from birth. The basic characteristics of human beings are greed and a rapacious attitude, especially when they do not own vital goods.<sup>21</sup> Thus, Thomas More has an essentialist take on human character and these antisocial tendencies and potentialities should be squared away by education.<sup>22</sup> This in turn entails a constant surveillance built upon the citizenry. This bleak outlook has its ramifications in the way Thomas More sets forth the utopian foreign affairs and its modus operandi. The Utopian individuals who have a falling out with the Utopian legal system are to be sentenced to slavery with a high probability. As a result, More defended the establishment of a socially Darwinian system, which declares some individuals unfit to remain as citizens and downgrades them to *untermensch* category, i.e. slaves. As may be expected, the way Utopians handle their international affairs is not distinct from their justice administration.

---

<sup>17</sup> Nyers, p. 10.

<sup>18</sup> Nyers, p. 12.

<sup>19</sup> Nendza offers a thorough analysis of the way family matters are regulated in Utopia, Nendza, pp. 438-440.

<sup>20</sup> Nyers, p. 13.

<sup>21</sup> Spreen.

<sup>22</sup> Spreen.

### Thomas More on International Relations

While talking about the way Utopians handle their foreign affairs, Thomas More, looks, at the very first sight, like a premature idealist, whose design displays great proximity to today's United Nations system, especially as regards the legitimate use of force. However, war has its own unique place in Utopian foreign affairs.<sup>23</sup> Thomas More stresses unmistakably that Utopians fight defensive wars. Reminiscent of today's U.N. System, Utopians fight solely for legitimate self-defense of themselves and of other nations. However, a closer look reveals that Utopians do have some ulterior motives and their fancy and peaceful illustrations by More may only be too thin to hide one of the most cynical political designs of all times.

Utopians exploit the rhetoric of *prima facie* defensive wars, for the subsequent assumption of power in other countries as well as expansionist and irredentist policy objectives.<sup>24</sup> They have a racist approach to other nations and places themselves in a higher position than the others, which Nyers calls an "assumed superiority".<sup>25</sup> They make use of mercenary armies and do not shy away from using bribes for political assassinations. All in all, Utopians deem as legitimate almost every political maneuver that exists in the realm of the politically and practically do-able, provided that these tactics yield the required results. At the same time they never cease donning that hollier-than-thou attitude, a self-consciousness inherently and strikingly Utopian-supremacist. Yet they are wise enough to utter the politically correct words that create a peace-loving image. Utopians see themselves as a nation predestined to lead others, a humble but successful fulfiller of that notorious *la mission civilisatrice*. They are the supreme nation whose mission is to save and lead other nations. All these taken into consideration, it is fair to say that all of the Utopian international relations depend upon hierarchical relations with other nations, where Utopians have the most superior position.

The most important aspect of Utopians Foreign Affairs is the predominant character of trade relationships.<sup>26</sup> The Utopians are capable of producing everything they are in need of. Yet, they are perfectly capable of trading their surplus materials and produces.<sup>27</sup> In this trade, they especially target valuable goods like gold, which will, when needed of course, enable them to recruit mercenaries, who will fight and logically die in their stead.

---

<sup>23</sup> De Luca, p. 528.

<sup>24</sup> Avineri, p. 264.

<sup>25</sup> Nyers, p. 15.

<sup>26</sup> De Luca, p. 526; Spreen.

<sup>27</sup> De Luca, p. 526; Spreen.

### Thomas More on War and Conquest

The second pillar of the Utopian Foreign Affairs is the military stratagem used ruthlessly for the establishment of new colonies and for the placement of Utopian citizenry in the affluent positions of the so-called "allies" of Utopia. However shrewd and cynical that may sound, Utopians dislike the idea of waging war themselves. They do wage wars but they choose to employ mercenaries from other nations, most notably from the Zapoletes, but not limited to them.

"Zapoletes are a rude, wild and fierce nation who delight in their own rugged woods and mountains among which they were born and bred up. They are hardened both against heat and cold and labour, and know nothing of the delicacies of life. They do not apply themselves to agriculture nor do they care either for their houses or their clothes: cattle is all that they look after; and for the greatest part, they live either by hunting or upon rapine; and are made, as it were, only for war. They watch all opportunities of engaging in it, and very readily embrace such as are offered them... They serve those that hire them with much courage and fidelity... There are a few wars in which they make not a considerable part of the armies of both sides".<sup>28</sup>

According to Utopians, Zapoletes are savages devoid of any qualities that would qualify them as humans. They are deemed by Utopians as *unmensch*<sup>29</sup>, i.e. as beastly creatures and are just too suitable to draw to bloody military confrontations, since they are easily motivated by the promise of gold and similar valuable goods. That said, Utopians carry out an inhumane calculation here and the promise of gold and other riches are fulfilled properly, only after the safe return of those Zapoletes, who succeed in returning from bloody wars, which is rarely the case. Utopians are only too happy to see the high casualty rates of their Zapoletean mercenaries and indirectly believe to do humanity a great favor by causing massive casualties among the Zapoletes. Their happiness arises not only because the money to be paid will be less than planned in the light of the high casualty rates, but also for the fact that a big chunk of these beasts has been eliminated from the face of the earth.

"The Utopians do not care in the least how many Zapoleteans they lose, thinking that they would be the greatest benefactors to the human race if they could relieve the world of all the dregs of this abominable and impious people".

---

<sup>28</sup> More, p. 154-155.

<sup>29</sup> Not even as *untermensch* as is the case with those Utopians who have breached law, but just *unmensch*. I owe this differentiation to Shlomo Avineri.

Utopians allegedly believe in the “natural fellowship of man”<sup>30</sup> but are ruthless and at the same time very rational in their military planning, which is reminiscent of the rational functioning and planning of the Nazi war machine during World War II.

Zapoletes, as they are the beastly creatures from woods and mountains are just too loyal and worthless in the eyes of Utopians and they form just another column in the accountants’ labor dealing with the war expenditures. Since they are stripped of any human qualities in the eyes and minds of the Utopian decision-makers, their slaughter does not cause any sense of a cumulative guilt. They are nothing but a shell of human beings reduced to “instruments for good or the ill” in the political plans of other nations and states.<sup>31</sup>

The Utopian *modus operandi* in the face of a potentially violent dispute does not foresee the use of mercenaries in the first place. They are keen on the idea of making use of corrupt personalities from the other camp. They induce these persons to kill their leaders before the dispute could fruit an all-out military confrontation. In order to secure this prophylactic result, Utopians make vast use of gold and similar valuable stones and create havoc on the other party to the conflict from among their very own ranks. It is clear that Utopians deem it ethical and logical to interfere with the domestic affairs of the other societies for their own political agenda. More backs up authorization with “pity and compassion” for those other nations suffering under tyranny.<sup>32</sup> In this pro-intervention rhetoric, More does nothing original but follow an ancient way of thought from Aristotle through Catholic Fathers of international law to himself.<sup>33</sup> However, this prototypical argumentation in favor of the nations under tyranny may and most probably will serve the national interest of Utopia, for Utopians appoint new leaders from among its own Utopian cadres for those societies assisted and liberated by them. Therefore, the elimination of tyranny in other societies will also end up consolidating Utopian political power in those areas. This is a thinly veiled scheme for Utopian expansionist ambitions fueled by Utopian sense of superiority, for in case of a tyranny imposed upon other societies Utopians are ready to wage aggressive wars.<sup>34</sup> Even Fritz Caspari, who looks sympathetic to the More’s endorsement of an interventionist foreign policy on the ground that it is nothing outrageous given his contemporary political theory, displays the urge to remind the readers that his attitude is much more self-righteous

---

<sup>30</sup> Engeman, p. 139.

<sup>31</sup> Engeman, p. 139; Yıldırım, p. 43.

<sup>32</sup> Caspari, p. 305.

<sup>33</sup> Caspari, p. 306.

<sup>34</sup> Spreen.

than that of his like-minded predecessors and contemporaries.<sup>35</sup> In this issue, Caspari makes a striking comparison between Thomas More and Hugo Grotius. The latter too advocates military intervention for humanitarian causes.<sup>36</sup> That said, Grotius feels the pressing need to highlight that evil men may abuse this right to start a just war.<sup>37</sup> According to him, *prima facie* humanitarian concerns have been abused, misused and manipulated to promote selfish and aggressive objectives. It is remarkable that Thomas More's analysis of international politics has gone usually unnoticed and overlooked, which displays a totally different trait than his otherwise humane and rational policy recommendations. This forms the first way of Utopian expansionism, which one may dub as *expansion by military victory*. This aggressive character of Utopian foreign affairs is so dominant that More's book is deemed to be the very "first Tudor attempt to elaborate a theory of colonization" by Jeffrey Knapp and Antonis Balasopoulos, which runs the very plausible risk of being used as "colonial propaganda".<sup>38</sup> Under the light of all these, it should not surprise anybody that the brother-in-law of More, a certain John Rastell actually took part in the colonization of America.<sup>39</sup>

The second modus of Utopian expansionism is related to the population on the island and the transfer of excess Utopian population to other localities. More's Utopia follows the example of Plato's expansionist state<sup>40</sup>. Just as Plato does, More sets a numerical limit to the population in the cities of Utopia. In case this limit is exceeded, then the Utopians should strive to look for another locality, where they can settle this excess amount of individuals. However, this new settlement cannot be established on the island of Utopia, therefore Utopians have to go abroad and establish new colonies.

Richard Saage sees this as a normal consequence of the fact that Utopian economy is based on agriculture and it is not possible to stretch the limits of agricultural production beyond some natural limits.<sup>41</sup> When the inevitable population growth is observed, then inhabitants from each city shall be designated so that these persons can go and colonize other peoples' towns and states on the mainland close to island.<sup>42</sup> The criterium to select the land to colonize is basically the way the natives of the to-be-colonized area make use of their natural resources. If this people fail to make good use of their

---

<sup>35</sup> Caspari, p. 306.

<sup>36</sup> For a good introduction of Groatian conception of *Bellum Justum* see Mutlu, pp. 75-85.

<sup>37</sup> Caspari, p. 307.

<sup>38</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 6; Knapp, p. 21.

<sup>39</sup> Balasopoulos, p. 6.

<sup>40</sup> Saage, p. 41.

<sup>41</sup> Saage, p. 41.

<sup>42</sup> De Luca, p. 530.



land to the fullest, they will have waste and unoccupied territory in the eyes of Utopians.<sup>43</sup> In such localities, Utopians establish new cities and prosper.<sup>44</sup> According to More, the new settlers will introduce their way of government and administration to the colony. The natives are not given any right to resist this new mode of living. Either they will be driven out by this new superior force, or they will accept this yoke and live their lives peacefully in accordance with the imposed Utopians codes and culture.<sup>45</sup>

As can be seen, Utopians are imperialists *par excellence*, whose greedy politics are justified by a shallow morality stemming from a false sense of superiority. The question of the rights of the aggrieved indigenous peoples would fall on deaf Utopian ears, since they are utterly unconcerned about the possibly legitimate claims of other peoples, whom they forcefully colonize and assimilate.<sup>46</sup> What makes the text more dangerous is the fact that More wishes to convince the Christian Europe to adopt his plans which in return will yield good policy and order.<sup>47</sup> Thomas More is willing to offer his oeuvre as a serious contribution to politics, not as a fictional work of a learned mind.<sup>48</sup> Logically, as conceived in the light of this, the text emerges as a precursor of the European imperialistic and colonialist practices.

### **Thomas More on International Treaties**

Utopia enjoys diplomatic relations with other states. They receive envoys representing other states. In the world More creates, diplomacy is at work then.<sup>49</sup> According to Utopians the normal state of international affairs is peace.<sup>50</sup> This rampant peaceful situation makes the conclusion of international treaties *unnecessary*. This may be the fundamental reason for the Utopian dispensing with the international treaties. However, there is another reason for the total disregard for treaties on behalf of Utopia. According to them, treaties and alliances are not honored by the majority of the rulers of the world. This too makes the treaties redundant. That is the reason More suggests that international treaties are worthless and should not be written.<sup>51</sup> Theoretically speaking, Utopians seem to have no problems whatsoever with the idea of entering into treaty obligations. However, they are convinced that

---

<sup>43</sup> Saage, p. 41.

<sup>44</sup> Avineri, p. 264.

<sup>45</sup> Avineri, p. 264; De Luca, p. 531; Saage, p. 41.

<sup>46</sup> Engeman, p. 141; De Luca, p. 531.

<sup>47</sup> Surtz, p. 156.

<sup>48</sup> Surtz, p. 160.

<sup>49</sup> De Luca, p. 526.

<sup>50</sup> De Luca, p. 527.

<sup>51</sup> Osgood, p. 181.

theoretical legal obligations inked onto written texts usually have no effect upon the way states behave, especially when it matters the most.<sup>52</sup> This is the typical Utopians mind-set. Utopians have a ubiquitous skepticism about their far neighbors and their intentions. This is a learned reflex actually, taught by the double standards- laden Utopian foreign affairs. In addition, that they do not need to enter into treaties with their allies and friends is another symptom of the Utopian politics. Utopians do have a different understanding of these terms from the normal sense of the words. Since they establish hierarchical relations with their allies and friends, international treaties are unnecessary for they are in a position to impose at will their own political designs and culture. This is only a natural prolongation of the Utopian self-image. This city is “intended to rival, perhaps to surpass” any other philosophical cities or its contemporary rivals.<sup>53</sup>

Richard Saage reminds his readers of his agreement with Gerhard Ritter about that the Utopians are no fascists preying upon a hierarchical juxtaposition of different races with themselves at the top. Allegedly, what they employ to differentiate among peoples are the degree of education and moral maturity.<sup>54</sup> They do not believe in an essentialist superiority or inferiority of societies and / or states. They just value an ordered society with high morals and sound societal structures.

This is an interpretation, which is not fully in accord with the written text. As mentioned above, Utopians have an unmistakable claim of superiority. This is especially remarkable in their attitude towards the natives living in the newly colonized areas. These indigenous peoples do not enjoy a right reminiscent of a self-determination. They only face a dichotomy of Utopian hegemony or Utopian sword. Here these groups are between rock and a hard place. This is not a real freedom of choice but rather an imposed conquest solidified, if and when necessary by brute force. More's Utopia, it is in my opinion justified to claim, is an important contributor to the naturalization of an aggressive settler expansionism.<sup>55</sup> This Utopians do, by using of unfalsifiable and extremely essentialist methods, which dehumanize the conquered party. This method gives the whole process a false flavor of a *prima facie* progressive modernist benefactor of humanity, which is in Chaudhury's word “simultaneously absolutist and radically progressive, inclusive in format yet elitist in dissemination”.<sup>56</sup> Likewise, the way Utopians handle their relations vis-à-vis their so-called allies is suggestive of an imperialistic power that

---

<sup>52</sup> De Luca, p. 527.

<sup>53</sup> Surtz, p. 156.

<sup>54</sup> Saage, p. 43.

<sup>55</sup> Hardy, p. 133.

<sup>56</sup> Chaudhury, p. 43.

makes use of a friendly rhetoric to create the consent for the establishment of new Utopian-friendly administrations in those localities. That consent allows the Utopians to appoint the nobles and governors of their allies from its own Utopian cadres, after these allies are *freed* from the threats created by a third party.

*In toto*, even if one were to accept those rather benign interpretations about Utopian political system, this Utopian outlook is easily exploitable by an evil-minded ruler, as Grotius rightfully warns us. What is obvious for me is that Utopians are cold-blooded realists in the mold of those power-mongering Athenians in that notorious Melian dialogue. As the holders of the might, Athenians are of the opinion that whatever they may impose to further their cause is just and legitimate. Accordingly, the weak have to suffer everything thrown their way by the superior adversaries.

In this vein, Thomas More quits being the highly touted anti-Machiavelli and still remains a-Machiavellian. Machiavelli, surrounded by political strife, had to deal with intricacies, wars and other perilous plots. He had to recognize the major tenets of the political game, whether he liked it or not. He was in a way subjected to these evil ways. In order to cope with the vicious character of conflict he has to detach ethics and politics from each other. What Utopians do is far more cynical than Machiavelli's observations, since Utopians, making use of an unfalsifiable ethics, believe that every war they declare is a just war. Being the justified ruler and the self-serving *conquistadors* is their manifest destiny.

### Conclusion

Thomas More has clear intentions while writing his book, Utopia. Utopians impersonate a progressive nation. More wants this regime to be the exact opposite of the then-ruling Europeans. Utopia is a regime of reason, progress and justice, which result in an ordered domestic sociopolitical realm. However, these benign attributes are nowhere to be observed, when one probes into the way Utopians handle their international affairs. Utopians are still the same Utopians *in rhetoric*, good intended and progressive. They *say, inter alia*, that they are staunchly against aggressive wars and that they are ready to help other nations facing an outside threat. A scrutiny reveals the fact that Utopians do act very differently from their rhetoric and employ brutal strategies to reach their objectives in international politics. They seem to mean well by their *prima facie* progressive politics, which turn out to be nothing more than a thinly veiled jockeying for more power and land. With all these taken into consideration, Utopia, as far as her foreign policy is concerned, is the prototypical expansionist European power, which was to emerge in history, years after the publication of More's book.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avineri**, Shlomo. "War and Slavery in More's Utopia", *International Review of Social History*, VII, 1962, 260-290.
- Bal**, Metin. "Ütopyanın Siyaset Felsefesi Tarihinde Evrimi", *ETHOS: Felsefe ve Toplumsal Bilimlerde Diyaloglar*, Sayı 3 (1), Ocak 2010, 1-13.
- Balasopoulos**, Antonis. "Unworldly Worldliness: America and the Trajectories of Utopian Expansionism", *Utopian Studies*, Vol 15.2, 2004, 3-35.
- Caspari**, Fritz. "Sir Thomas More and Justum Bellum", *Ethics*, Vol. 56, No. 4, July 1946, 303-308.
- Chaudhury**, Sarbani. "Literature and Beyond: Contextualising More's Utopia", *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3. Dizi, 18. Sayı, 2009/1, 43-68.
- De Luca**, Kelly. "Utopian Relations: A Literary Perspective on International Law and Justice", *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence*, Vol. XXVII, No. 2, July 2014, 521-534.
- Engeman**, Thomas S. "Hytloday's Utopia and More's England: an Interpretation of Thomas More's Utopia", *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 44, No.1, Feb., 1982, 131-149.
- Knapp**, Jeffrey. *An Empire Nowhere: England, America and Literature from Utopia to the Tempest*, The New Historicism Series No. 16, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1992.
- Hardy**, Karl. "Unsettling Hope: Settler-Colonialism and Utopianism", *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series, No. 1, 2012, 123-136.
- More**, Thomas. *Utopia*, Pergamino Publishing, Istanbul.
- Mutlu**, Erdem İlker. *Savaşın ve Barışın Hukuku: Modern Dönemin Etik İkiyemleri*, Turhan Kitabevi, Ankara, 2016.
- Nendza**, James. "Political Idealism in More's Utopia", *The Review of Politics*, Volume 46, No. 3, July 1984, 428-451.
- Nyers**, Peter. "The Politics of Enclosure in Thomas More's Utopia", *Problématique*, Vol. 6, 2000, 1-21.
- Osgood**, Russell K. "Law in Sir Thomas More's Utopia as Compared to His Lord Chancellorship", *Thomas More Studies*, Volume 1, 2006, 177-187.
- Saage**, Richard. "Morus' "Utopia" und die Macht. Zu Hermann Onckens und Gerhard Ritters Utopia-Interpretationen", *UTOPIE kreativ*, Heft 183, Januar 2006, 37-47.

**Spreen**, Nils. Thomas Morus: Utopia. <[www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/philosophy/didaktik\\_kultur/pdf/TexteUtopie/Utopia.pdf](http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/philosophy/didaktik_kultur/pdf/TexteUtopie/Utopia.pdf)>, (15.02.2017).

**Surtz**, Edward L. "Interpretations of "Utopia"", *The Catholic Historical Review*, Volume 38, No. 2, July 1952, 156-174.

**Yıldırım**, Mehmet Akif. "Thomas More'un Yaşamı ve Utopia Üzerine", *Genç Hukukçular Hukuk Okumaları*, 33-43.