

HISTORY, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE: A REVIEW ARTICLE

Argun BAŞKAN*

Abstract

This review article explores the connection between history and International Relations (IR) through the case of the Ottoman Empire. By examining Social Sciences Citations Index (SSCI) articles and some other complementary works, it aims to investigate how past events and processes have formed IR's theoretical foundations. Examining the empire's internal variations, diverse ethno-religious groups, and evolving diplomacy would provide a better understanding into current debates on diversity, minority rights, and how international order takes shape. However, directly linking the Ottoman era to modern issues risks oversimplifying and historical determinism, while generalizations from a single example can ignore regional and historical nuances. The legacy of the empire continues to impact contemporary debates on issues such as nationalism, sovereignty, and state-building. Therefore, productive interaction between IR and history demands open discussion and shared research methods. Only through collaboration, we can approach to better comprehend the complex ways the past continues to mold global politics in our ever-changing world.

Keywords: *History, International Relations, Ottoman Empire, Historiography, Interdisciplinarity.*

Öz

Tarih, Uluslararası İlişkiler ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu: Bir Derleme Makalesi

Bu derleme makalesi tarih ile Uluslararası İlişkiler (Ui) arasındaki bağlantıyı Osmanlı İmparatorluğu örneği üzerinden incelemektedir. Sosyal Bilimler Atıflar İndeksi (SBAİ/SSCI) makalelerine ve diğer bazı tamamlayıcı çalışmaları inceleyerek, geçmişteki olay ve süreçlerin Uluslararası İlişkilerin teorik temellerini nasıl oluşturduğunu araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. İmparatorluğun iç farklılıklarını, çeşitli etnik-dinsel grupları ve gelişen diplomasiyi incelemek çeşitlilik, azınlık hakları ve uluslararası düzenin nasıl şekillendiğine ilişkin güncel tartışmaların

* Asst. Prof., Ege University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of International Relations, İzmir. E-mail: argunbaskan@gmail.com; argun.baskan@ege.edu.tr ORCID: 0000-0002-0419-9489

(Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 02.08.2023 - Makale Kabul Tarihi: 26.12.2023)

daha iyi anlaşılmasını sağlayabilir. Ancak Osmanlı dönemini doğrudan modern meselelere bağlamak, aşırı basitleştirme ve tarihsel determinizm riskini taşıırken, tek bir örnektenden yola çıkararak yapılan genellemeler bölgesel ve tarihsel nüansları göz ardi edebilir. İmparatorluğun mirası milliyetçilik, egemenlik ve devlet inşası gibi konulardaki çağdaş tartışmaları etkilemeye devam etmektedir. Bu nedenle Uİ ile tarih arasındaki verimli etkileşim, açık tartışmayı ve ortak araştırma yöntemlerini gerektirmektedir. Sürekli değişen dünyamızda geçmişin küresel siyaseti şekillendirmeye devam ettiği karmaşık yolları ancak işbirliği yoluyla daha iyi kavramaya yaklaşabiliyoruz.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Tarih, Uluslararası İlişkiler, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, Tarih Yazımı, Disiplinlerarasılık.*

Introduction

This literature review article aims to explore the intricate relationship between history and the discipline of International Relations (IR), with a primary focus on the Ottoman Empire. Here, the literature is mainly based on the coverage of the most cited articles published in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) journals and some additional complementary works. The interactions between history and IR have been a subject of scholarly inquiry and debate. The discipline of IR has been molded by a range of historical events and processes, which have impacted its underlying theoretical and conceptual foundations. Over time, IR has undergone substantial transformations, with one of the most noteworthy being the increased recognition of the role of history in shaping the discipline. In recent years, an increasing multitude of scholars have turned their intellectual gaze towards the examination of how the vicissitudes of history have left their indelible mark on the spheres of IR theory and praxis. This article endeavors to delve into the intricate interplay between history and IR, with a particular focus on the Ottoman Empire, in a concerted effort to elucidate the historical underpinnings that have shaped and molded this disciplinary field. The Ottoman Empire is a valuable case for exploring the relationship between history and IR. The Ottoman Empire, recognized as one of the most notable empires in global history, held a pivotal position in shaping the political landscape of its era. Its impact persists in current discussions surrounding topics such as nationhood, governmental authority, and the establishment of states. Overall, this review article aims to contribute to a better understanding of the complex relationship between history and the IR. By using the Ottoman Empire as a primary case, it tries to shed light on the ways how history and IR can have an extended dialogue.

The relationship between past events and global interactions has prompted scholarly discussion for decades, with the Ottoman Empire making an intriguing case study. Supporters say examining history deepens understanding of theories through context and background, though critics warn against inaccurate interpretations and irrelevant general conclusions. This review explores the dynamic interplay between the fields, using the Ottomans to illuminate benefits and challenges. The empire, a gigantic force impacting the world stage for centuries, offers much for scholars. Its varied web of governance, acceptance of religions, and changing diplomacy provides a unique way to consider timeless questions of authority, nation-building, and how international order

evolves. By investigating its complex network of allies, inner power struggles, and contacts with other ruling bodies, valuable insights emerge into intricacies of influence and shifting international politics.

Diversities within the Ottoman Empire makes the empire a valuable case study. Its complex internal dynamics, seen in shifting friendships, different religions living in peace, and innovative diplomacy, offer fertile ground for scholars of how groups gain and keep power to explore ideas like empire-building, a balance of strengths, and how countries form and change. For example, the Ottoman system of governing different ethno-religious communities within one state in a fair way was pioneering. Looking at the Ottoman Empire's flexible administrative skills (e.g. see Barkey¹ for the empire's multi-layered institutions and flexibility in general; Clayer² for the complex friend-enemy dichotomy in the Albanian-Ottoman relations in the case of the Bektashi institutions; Low³ about the Ottoman efforts to provide potable water in the Hijaz region during the 19th century; Balcı⁴ about Algeria's extended loyalty to the Ottoman rule despite the deterioration of the Ottoman capabilities) and challenges (e.g. see Baltacıoğlu-Brammer⁵ for an analysis of intra-Islamic, Sunni-Shiite oriented sectarian tensions in the case of the "Kızılbaş" category; Ambartsumyan⁶ for institutional local reform attempts to regulate the Armenian vilayets just before the First World War; Akkaya⁷ about when and how the world and the Ottomans begin to see slavery as a tragedy and problem in the case of the Ottoman slavery trade in Circassia and nuances of Western and Ottoman types of slavery; Kasaba⁸ for the Ottoman policies towards the Turkish and Kurdish nomads) sheds light on today's debates about all groups living together, minority rights, gender issues, and the challenges of creating countries with many ethnicities. In the same way, taking apart the Ottomans' intricate network of alliances, from practical partnerships with European powers to strained relations with rival empires, offers invaluable lessons in realpolitik, strategic balance of strengths, and how international alliances form and change over time. Likewise, dissecting their multifaceted web of alliances with some Christian states (see for example, Isom-Verhaaren for the Ottoman-French alliance)⁹ and rivalries with some other Islamic entities (e.g. see Venzke for the Sunni versus Sunni Ottoman-Mameluke rivalry¹⁰; Üstün¹¹ for the Ottoman-Iran competition in Iraq; Togral¹² for the Ottoman subordination of the Crimean Khanate and former Crimean khans in exile) unveils the

¹ Barkey 2008, s.7.

² Clayer 2012, s.183-186.

³ Low 2015, s.442-443.

⁴ Balcı 2022, s.375-377.

⁵ Baltacıoğlu-Brammer 2019, s.47-49.

⁶ Ambartsumyan 2021, s.51.

⁷ Akkaya 2020, s.467.

⁸ Kasaba 2011, s.227-228.

⁹ Isom-Verhaaren 2011, s.4-5.

¹⁰ Venzke 2000, s.399-400.

¹¹ Üstün 2011, s.87-88.

¹² Togral 2018, s.355.

nuanced calculus of diplomacy and realpolitik.

However, using an Ottoman lens also presents difficulties. Connecting past events too directly to modern issues risks relying too much on history to clarify complex current situations. Additionally, concluding too much from just one example, even one as important as the Ottomans, can lead to oversimplifying nuanced realities and ignoring other possible explanations. For instance, applying our modern ideas of concepts like "sovereignty" directly to the Ottomans may result in incorrect interpretations that fail to account for how such ideas changed over time. Furthermore, deriving broad generalizations solely from a single case, even one as impactful as the Ottomans, can be problematic as it risks neglecting key regional and historical differences in international politics.

The Ottomans' multicultural makeup and perceptions of international politics complicate directly applying their lessons elsewhere. Plus, IR theories sometimes overshadow specifics from history. General theories might gloss over what uniquely happened. These risks perpetuating a focus on Western Europe. To best use history for understanding global affairs, historians and IR experts must have real discussions. They need share thoughts and research methods openly. Only then can they gain the most from learning history together. The discussion about how history interacts with IR is an intricate one. Carefully considering the Ottomans provides deep insights but also challenges. Their unique time and place cannot be ignored. Studying Ottoman history can broaden theories in new ways while questioning old ideas, but only with self-awareness of what history can and cannot do. The connection between the past and international politics, as shown through the Ottomans, is complex. While history offers context and details to explain theories, using it requires thinking carefully about what works and what does not. Moving ahead means having an open discussion between the fields, recognizing what they can offer each other while knowing their strengths and weaknesses too. Only through real give-and-take can we truly understand how the past continues shaping our world today through the ever-changing world of global politics (e.g. concerning some recent discussions on the benefits of history-IR interdisciplinary perspectives, see Neoclassical Realist perspective of Ediz¹³ to explain the Balfour Declaration of Britain).

Comparative Approaches, World History and Empires

Karpat¹⁴ illustrates that the history of the Ottoman Empire can be divided into stages based on land systems and elites. This approach offers a then new perspective for conducting Turco-Ottoman studies by promoting quantitative data analysis and innovative research methods. The author emphasizes the significance of understanding socioeconomic aspects along with cultural factors in exploring the history and social transformation of the Middle East and Balkans. Additionally, the study encourages further comparative studies in this domain. Ottoman history presents numerous research

¹³ Ediz 2019, s.99-100.

¹⁴ Karpat 1974a, s.1-14; 1974b, s.79-80.

opportunities across various fields, including the sociology of history, historical demography, economics, and comparative social history. The author also delves into social, cultural, and political transformations and modernization. Additionally, it provides valuable models for comparative studies in social organization. By comparing the Ottoman state to Europe, insights can be gained regarding the forces that shape the rise and fall of empires. Likewise, McNeill¹⁵ demonstrates that Ottoman history provides rich terrain for historians to explore. Its vast scope encompasses editing manuscripts and delving into the realms of economic, social, and intellectual history. All these facets would be examined within the broader context of comparative and world history. This dynamic field welcomes researchers from diverse backgrounds.

Thies¹⁶ explores the difficulties encountered by political scientists when engaging in archival research or depending on secondary sources furnished by historians. Additionally, it proposes guidelines for researchers to mitigate investigator bias and unwarranted selectivity when utilizing historical source materials. Khoury and Kennedy¹⁷ compare the Ottoman and British Empires during the long nineteenth century. Despite their recognized differences in historical literature, this analysis acknowledges their shared characteristics. By examining these two empires within the same context, valuable insights emerge regarding how they governed vast territories with diverse populations. Moreover, it helps establish a connection between the history of the Ottoman Empire and the British Raj by uncovering continuities and linkages. As pointed out by Mikhail and Philliou¹⁸, the Ottoman Empire has garnered increased scholarly attention in the field of comparative imperial histories. They critically evaluate the existing scholarship, providing fresh insights into longstanding inquiries and suggesting promising avenues for future research. Wigen¹⁹ highlights that the Ottoman rulers, although lacking the concept of empire, adopted three imperial titles tailored for different audiences. In the 19th century, they introduced the idea of empire into their discourse to reinforce existing claims and establish legitimacy within the realm of international society.

International System, Order, and Hierarchies

As argued by Walker²⁰, the analysis of world politics involves broader social and political inquiry than is typical in IR. Exploring questions of interdependence, dependence, regimes, and institutions may challenge historically-derived concepts and disciplinary divisions, demanding attention to the difficulty of analyzing political life rather than presumptions of modernist social science. Neumann and Welsh²¹ assert that the Realist paradigm dominates IR. The Realist paradigm neglects cultural variables,

¹⁵ McNeill 1974, s.34.

¹⁶ Thies 2002, s.351-353.

¹⁷ Khoury and Kennedy 2007, s.233-234.

¹⁸ Mikhail and Philliou 2012, s.721.

¹⁹ Wigen 2013, s.44.

²⁰ Walker 1989, s.163-164.

²¹ Neumann and Welsh 1991, s.327-328.

focusing instead on the division of the world into sovereign states and power politics as the primary dynamic. Regarding the Westphalian Treaty, Osiander²² explores how the 350th anniversary of the Peace of Westphalia was ignored by IR, which traditionally deals with the international system that began with that event. There is currently debate over whether the Westphalian system is ending. The ideology of sovereignty has hindered the development of IR theory. A better understanding of contemporary international politics can be gained by analyzing historical phenomena such as the Thirty Years War, the 1648 peace treaties, the post-1648 Holy Roman Empire. The European system in which it was embedded is also worth examining. Barkawi and Laffey²³ examine the book titled *Empire* by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri as a means to reconsider the concept of empire in international politics. They argue that the Westphalian model obscures the role of imperial relations in world politics and that retrieving the imperial can offer new insights into phenomena overlooked by traditional international politics categories. De Carvalho et al²⁴ explore how the well-established myths surrounding the peace of Westphalia and the emergence of IR in 1919 have been refuted by historical scholarship. However, these debunked ideas continue to persist in current textbooks used to educate aspiring IR scholars. Unfortunately, this unwavering reliance on outdated notions has consequences and hinders the incorporation of valuable revisionist insights. Therefore, it is crucial to explore possibilities that can enhance dialogue and foster a more nuanced understanding.

Balance of power is discussed by Wohlforth et al²⁵. They study how the balance of power is a prominent theoretical idea in international politics, yet it has only been systematically tested in modern Europe and its global successor, prompting a collective and interdisciplinary research effort to address this gap. Findings from eight new case studies, spanning over 2000 years of international politics, indicate that factors outside of balance-of-power theory best account for variation between balance and hegemony in different international systems, suggesting a need to reframe research on both European and contemporary international systems. Tansel²⁶ argues that social forces are central to conceptualizing geopolitics. The author uses an analysis of the Eastern Question corpus written by Marx and Engels in 1853-6 to demonstrate the interwoven relationship between domestic class interests, the state, and the international system. This challenges the balance of power argument and bolsters materialist frameworks while also strengthening scholarship in international historical sociology.

Emrence²⁷ challenges the current center-periphery model and state-centered narratives in late Ottoman history. Emrence proposes a historical trajectory framework as a spatial, path-dependent, and comparative approach to understanding the distinct imperial paths of the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century. This framework also has

²² Osiander 2001, s.251-252.

²³ Barkawi and Laffey 2002, s.109-111.

²⁴ De Carvalho et al 2011, s.735-737.

²⁵ Wohlforth et al 2007, s.155-156.

²⁶ Tansel 2016, s.492-493.

²⁷ Emrence 2008, s.289-300.

the potential to provide new insights for comparative analysis of land-based empires in Eurasia, particularly in relation to state-society and local-global relations. Savage²⁸ states that the theories of Empire and international hierarchy have posited power disparities between the core and periphery as a sufficient condition for stable imperial arrangements. However, peripheral actors can resist despite power disparities, making the preferences and beliefs that motivate them to seek accommodation or resist important for explaining Empire and hierarchy. These preferences and beliefs can be analyzed by comparing European informal empires in China, the Ottoman Empire, and Egypt. Srourgo²⁹ investigates the reasons for the rapid economic growth and later decline of Thessaloniki, a port city. The study focused on two political periods, namely the final decades of the Ottoman regime in Macedonia (1870–1922) and the first quarter of a century in which Thessaloniki integrated with Greece (1912–1936). The author used core-periphery relations as a central paradigm for explaining such phenomena and explored why the development of a certain region creates under-development in another region within a national or global sphere.

Hoffmann³⁰ shows how the term Balkanization is often used as a metaphor for diversity, instability, and war. The emergence of national states and the Ottoman Empire's disintegration are frequently portrayed as processes of modernizing and naturalizing the international system of the Balkans and Middle East. The author argues that national independence is not a functional derivative of an expanding European modernity mediated through global capitalism or geopolitical competition but rather the result of conservative reactions to the modernization efforts of the Ottoman central administration. National state formation and Ottoman disintegration have distinct origins and are not two sides of the same coin in a totalizing form of European international modernity. Ejodus³¹ argues that Hedley Bull and Adam Watson's *The Expansion of International Society* has been the primary focus of discussions concerning the emergence of today's state system. However, Iver Neumann criticized the book for its Euro-centric perspective. This critique sparked a debate on how Central and South-Eastern European states, including Romania, Slovakia, Serbia, and Turkey, with diverse experiences and memories from different suzerain systems, began aspiring for membership in international society and the lingering tensions that persist to this day.

The transfer of riches and influence from the Western world to developing nations, as underscored by Kupchan's³² analysis, constitutes a pivotal element in the emergence of a fresh global arrangement. This novel system will be founded on diverse geopolitical, socioeconomic, cultural, and commercial principles, as rising powers endeavor to devise alternative arrangements in accordance with their own cultural, ideological, and socioeconomic trajectories. The ramifications of this transformation are

²⁸ Savage 2011, s.161-162.

²⁹ Srourgo 2013, s.422-423.

³⁰ Hoffmann 2008, s.373-375.

³¹ Ejodus 2015, s.445-447.

³² Kupchan 2014, s.219-220.

likely to be far-reaching and complex, leading to a perplexing and unpredictable landscape in the field of international politics. That will require a new normative consensus that tolerates diversity. Butcher and Griffiths³³ propose a framework for analyzing states and international orders that is culturally neutral and can be applied to diverse state systems. They show how the content of international order relates to system structure and the local density of a region, and argue that their framework balances the traditional focus on the Western experience with the current trend toward regional studies. Düzgün³⁴ argues that International Historical Sociology (IHS) has not successfully remedied the problem of unilinearism in historical narratives. This unilinearism tends to transhistoricize capitalism and obscure the heterogeneity of diverging paths to modernity. To address this, Düzgün uses theories of Uneven and Combined Development, Political Marxism, and Robbie Shilliams' discussion of Jacobinism to reinterpret the multilinearity of modernity and provide a new reading of the Ottoman path to modernity. Düzgün³⁵ explores how the theory of Uneven and Combined Development (UCD) has been used to establish a social ontology of the International in historical sociological terms. However, it underspecifies the role of social agency in the constitution of social and international orders, which weakens our ability to understand how and why social and international dynamics transform over time and space.

As argued by Balci³⁶, the discipline of IR has historically neglected the Ottoman Empire. However, recent interest has shifted towards non-Western and historical cases with a disproportionate focus on the Chinese tributary system. Balci and Kardaş³⁷ discuss three foundations that supported the Ottoman international system: projecting power, interconnectedness, and autonomous frontier territories. While the empire's military might diminish over time, Ottoman cultural and organizational abilities extended its impact beyond areas it could defend through force of arms alone. Situated at the center of trade, pilgrimage, and diplomacy, the empire still benefited from connections across the broader Afro-Eurasian area. Granting flexible, nearly self-governing status to peripheral regions not only boosted the empire's chances of enduring but also served as a core part of how the Ottoman international presence functioned.

Bartelson³⁸ asserts that the turn to history in the study of IR emerged as a response to the limitations of Neorealism and its failure to account for historical transformation in the international system. However, its focus on war as both disruptive and constitutive of international orders has detracted attention from other forms of violence and created a naturalization of war as a productive force. This, in turn, leaves scholars with challenges including a need to re-engage with diplomatic and International History, overcome tensions between different epistemological starting

³³ Butcher and Griffiths 2017, s.328-329.

³⁴ Düzgün 2018a, s.252-253.

³⁵ Düzgün 2022, s.297-298.

³⁶ Balci 2021, s.2090-2091.

³⁷ Balci and Kardaş 2023, s.866-867.

³⁸ Bartelson 2021, s.127-128.

points, and overcome Eurocentric biases in social theory.

A theory of conceptual entanglement is proposed by Wigen³⁹ to explore the connections between different languages in IR. The author uses the example of how the French concept of civilization was translated into the Ottoman Empire and later Türkiye to illustrate this theory. Mattern and Zarakol⁴⁰ argue that hierarchy-centered approaches to IR offer a framework for theorizing and analyzing world politics as a global system. This framework involves three key features structures of differentiation are deeply implicated with power, hierarchies organize relations among different actors, and there are different logics of hierarchy influencing outcomes. The authors review and analyze IR scholarship on hierarchy, identifies three logics of hierarchy, and argues that hierarchy promises a more integrated theoretical framework for IR and more cohesive insights into contemporary world politics. Phillips⁴¹ critically engages with the global Transformation thesis through the lens of multiple early modernities. The author acknowledges that the 19th century saw a profound shift in the global mode of power but also recognizes that this impacted regions that had already been reconfigured by an early modern Eurasian Transformation. Acknowledging the diversity of these early modern orders enhances our understanding of variance in patterns of order reconfiguration that attended the global Transformation, cautioning against thinking of great transformations in world politics as constituting radically discontinuous breaks with the past.

Illing⁴² evaluates the standard view of European diplomacy in the 1780s as divided into two spheres, East and West. The evaluation shows that this view is not entirely accurate since the Eastern Question, involving the fate of the Ottoman Empire and Poland, is linked to the Western Question stemming from European unrest in the late 1780s, through the example of the United Belgian States of 1790. This example highlights overlooked diplomatic aspects of the eighteenth-century Low Countries and demonstrates how European diplomacy concerning Belgian independence was influenced by the connections between these two spheres, especially in regards to Prussia's role as a regional hegemon in the Low Countries during this period. Yurdusev⁴³ aims to explore how Ottoman diplomacy was formulated and conducted. This has been a neglected area in research as studies on Ottoman external relations have focused mostly on narrative diplomatic history and individual statesmen rather than on the formulation and carrying out of policies, means and instruments of diplomacy, and agents involved. The Ottoman Empire had unbroken and intensive interactions with Europe from the beginning to its collapse, ranging from warlike encounters to peaceful cooperation in economics, politics, culture, trade, and diplomacy, but a comprehensive history of its relations with the European state system is yet to be written. Diplomacy is defined as the reciprocal exchange of resident ambassadors, multilateral conferences,

³⁹ Wigen 2015, s.44-45.

⁴⁰ Mattern and Zarakol 2016, s.623-624.

⁴¹ Phillips 2016, s.481-482.

⁴² Illing 2009, s.64-65.

⁴³ Yurdusev 2016, s.1-4.

rules of procedure and protocol, immunities and privileges for diplomats, a diplomatic corps, rules of ranking and precedence, professional training and recruitment, some common diplomatic language, and tactful manners. It constitutes an institution of the international system, closely interwoven with foreign policy and international politics.

Burbank and Cooper⁴⁴ evaluate the aftermath of World War I in 1919. They argue that it did not spell the end of Empires but rather opened new imperial possibilities. The authors discuss various outcomes, such as losers' Empires being destroyed, victors adding new territories and mandates to their repertoires, Japan recognized as a major imperial actor, the Soviet Union constituted as a new form of Empire, Germany creating the Third Reich, and the United States developing its own way of exercising power at a distance. They describe the varied trajectories of Empires in the decades after World War I, noting changes in discourse and international institutions but arguing against fitting 1919 into a linear narrative of Empire to nation-state as self-determination proved problematic, leading to conflicts such as the forced breakup of the Ottoman Empire that have yet to be resolved, and anticolonial movements fought oppression but often sought alternatives to both old-style Empires and the territorial state, while colonial Empires were able to contain challenges, refine their methods of rule, and claim international legitimacy until another catastrophe threatened their fundamental existence, with the Japanese takeover of southeast Asia beginning the unraveling of European Empires after 1945, and political possibilities that reach beyond the national continuing to shape the world. They describe the varied trajectories of Empires in the decades after World War I, noting changes in discourse and international institutions. However, they argue against fitting 1919 into a linear narrative of Empire to nation-state as self-determination proved problematic, leading to conflicts such as the forced breakup of the Ottoman Empire that have yet to be resolved. Anticolonial movements fought oppression but often sought alternatives to both old-style Empires and the territorial state. Colonial Empires were able to contain challenges, refine their methods of rule, and claim international legitimacy until another catastrophe threatened their fundamental existence, with the Japanese takeover of southeast Asia beginning the unraveling of European Empires after 1945. Political possibilities that reach beyond the national continue to shape the world.

The objectives, tools, and practices of Ottoman diplomacy during the period from the 1290s to the seventeenth century's conclusion of territorial expansion were analyzed in a study by Işıkşel⁴⁵. The study proposes an exegetic framework to interpret the Ottoman understanding of diplomatic practices and how they evolved over three centuries due to changes in inter-Empire power relations and internal factors as Ottoman sultans redefined the political identity of their realm. De Lange⁴⁶ discusses how the Congress system in Europe after the Napoleonic Wars facilitated imperial expansionism, particularly in North Africa, due to shared discourses of security and

⁴⁴ Burbank and Cooper 2019, s.81-82.

⁴⁵ Işıkşel 2019, s.278-279.

⁴⁶ De Lange 2021, s.940-941.

threat perceptions and common practices of concerted diplomacy, as seen in the French invasion of Algiers in 1830. Özavcı⁴⁷ demonstrates that the Eastern Question in the 1810s has received limited attention in scholarship. The question concerned the involvement of the Ottoman Empire in the new European state system. The author examines the rational and emotional factors that informed Ottoman decisions using archival sources and explores the conflicts in the Ottoman cabinet, rivalries among great powers, and European efforts to secure commercial interests. Ohanyan⁴⁸ investigates how scholars have studied why some regions are peaceful while others are not. State-centric tools that view regional formations as extensions of the state system have precluded uncovering regional forms of engagement under hierarchical relations of empires and have privileged great power politics over non-state actors. The article develops a methodology for concept development for regional fracture and applies it to the Eastern Anatolian region of the late Ottoman Empire.

State Formation and Sovereignty

Leira⁴⁹ explores the influential thinker Justus Lipsius and his ideals of discipline in an IR context. Lipsius' ideals were meant to order both the ruler and those that he ruled, subordinating the individual to the purposes of the state and teaching self-control to master emotions. Buzan and Lawson⁵⁰ address how IR fails to understand the impact of the 19th century on its subject matter. The authors examine how industrialization, state-building, and ideologies of progress destabilized existing forms of order and promoted novel institutional formations, using changes in organized violence to illustrate these changes. The authors conclude by examining how IR could be rearticulated around a more pronounced engagement with the global transformation. The phenomenon of varying levels of willingness among states to adopt military innovations is exemplified by Kadercan's⁵¹ illustration of the puzzle of why this occurs. This illustration is best explained by civil-military relations and historical timing. The case of the Ottoman Empire versus the great powers of Europe during the military revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries highlights the ability of the former to block reform efforts due to an institutionally strong and internally cohesive army, while the latter initiated reforms and motivated officers and military entrepreneurs to participate.

Armitage⁵² asserts that historians used to focus on the development and interaction of self-identifying nations organized politically into states, with even cross-border history following similar lines and concerning stability and not mobility. Neumann and Wigen⁵³ argue that the Eurasian steppe has been neglected as an object of

⁴⁷ Özavcı 2021, s.1450-1451.

⁴⁸ Ohanyan 2022, s.589-590.

⁴⁹ Leira 2008, s.669-670.

⁵⁰ Buzan and Lawson 2013, s.620-621.

⁵¹ Kadercan 2013, s.117-118.

⁵² Armitage 2014, s.232-233.

⁵³ Neumann and Wigen 2013, s.311-312.

study within IR. They attribute this neglect to 19th-century prejudice against non-sedentary polities as being barbarian. The authors suggest that the steppe has a tradition of ordering politics that has hybridized with various polity-building projects, which has the potential to alter accounts of the emergence of European IR at large, spanning almost three thousand years. The evolution of Ottoman military and defensive strategies in the Balkans from 1600 to 1800 are discussed by Aksan⁵⁴. The author argues that sustained warfare forced a transition from a standing army to state-commissioned militias and comparing Ottoman options and limitations with those of the Habsburgs and the Romanovs in multiethnic eastern European empires, emphasizing the interplay between sovereignty, religious affiliation, and assimilation. Zarakol⁵⁵ investigates how the idea that the concept of sovereignty emerged exclusively in Europe is so ingrained that most scholarship on the issue does not even consider other regions, leading to assumptions that the non-West is lagging behind the West on this issue. The author will discuss how thinking beyond the West can change our understanding of modern sovereignty. Zarakol⁵⁶ challenges the Eurocentric view that modern sovereignty only emerged in Western Europe. The author uses the Ottoman Empire as a comparative site to highlight the need to acknowledge local roots and parallel institutions. Zarakol emphasizes the significance of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the Ottoman Empire's state-building trajectory, with implications for re-explaining the divergent fates of the Ottomans and Europe in the nineteenth century.

War, Peace, and Alliances

The dominance of domestic and cultural explanations for Ottoman military reform are challenged by Tuck⁵⁷, arguing that Neo-Realist perspectives on military competition and efficiency are also valuable and complementary. Crawford⁵⁸ explores the challenges allies face in coordinating diplomatic efforts to accommodate and peel off their enemy's potential allies and proposes that the efficacy of such efforts depends on whether allies agree on the target state's ability to tip the War toward victory or defeat. The argument is illustrated through a paired comparison analysis of two First World War cases The Entente's efforts to induce Ottoman neutrality and Italian intervention. According to Patrick⁵⁹, during the month of December in 1917, the United States Congress engaged in deliberations concerning the possibility of declaring war against Austria-Hungary and Turkey. President Wilson, a proponent of military intervention, endorsed the idea of entering into armed conflict, while specific representatives of Congress exhibited a firm inclination towards initiating hostilities, particularly targeting the Ottoman Empire. Ultimately, the United States made the decision to formally declare war exclusively against Austria-Hungary, while

⁵⁴ Aksan 1999, s.103-104.

⁵⁵ Zarakol 2018, s.506-509.

⁵⁶ Zarakol 2021, s.464-465.

⁵⁷ Tuck 2008, s.467-468.

⁵⁸ Crawford 2014, s.113-114.

⁵⁹ Patrick 2018, s.486-487.

concurrently preserving a state of non-belligerence with the Ottomans throughout the entirety of the conflict. The issue of why states form unfavorable alliances is explored by Sazak⁶⁰, who suggests that the conventional explanation of imperfect information and systemic complexity may not fully capture the complexities of the situation. The author offers an alternative explanation based on recent scholarship on network theory and interpersonal trust. The author argues that alliances are products of interactions within transnational social networks of political, military, and business elites in prospective allies, who develop mutual trust and gain subjective certainty about each other's intentions and capabilities through brokerage. A case study of the Turco-German alliance demonstrates the brokerage role played by Colmar von der Goltz in the two countries' eventual alliance in World War I, offering insights on alliance behavior and geo-economic competition.

The participation of the Ottoman Empire in World War I, despite their initial hesitation for a period of three months, is examined in a study conducted by Balci et al⁶¹. The study employs an analysis of both systemic and unit-level factors that contributed to the decision-making process of the foreign policy executive during the period from August to November 1914. One of the significant factors identified is the division within the foreign policy executive, which played a crucial role in shaping the Ottoman Empire's stance towards the war. Balci et al⁶² also delve into the reasons behind the victory of the war party in decision-making processes and the potential loss of the peace party, even when war is deemed too perilous. The authors accomplish this by examining the case of the Ottoman Empire's Crimean War decision and subsequent declaration of war against Russia in 1853. The decision-making process was influenced by internal debates, foreign interference, and a dynamically evolving European strategic landscape. Through a systematic analysis of the Ottoman origins of the Crimean War, the article traces the decision-making process during the crucial months of 1853. This analysis demonstrates how the Portes War decision was gradually formed, inadvertently changing the decision structure in favor of the War Party within a span of one year.

Eurocentrism and World History

İnalcık⁶³ points that the significance of the Ottoman Empire in history has garnered renewed attention as there is a growing inclination towards a more comprehensive global perspective. New scholarly contributions of the circa early 1970s, have explored fresh ideas and orientations, although it should be noted that certain studies still demonstrate biased viewpoints. Barkawi and Laffey⁶⁴ discuss how the Eurocentric perspective of security studies after World War II inaccurately portrays the Global South's role in security relations, leading to a distorted understanding of Europe, the West, and world politics. This hindered comprehension of the legitimacy and nature

⁶⁰ Sazak 2020, s.64-65.

⁶¹ Balci et al 2020, s.643-644.

⁶² Balci et al 2022, s.375-377.

⁶³ İnalçık 1974, s.51-55.

⁶⁴ Barkawi and Laffey 2006, s.329-330.

of weak actors' armed resistance. In this article, Eurocentrism is critically examined, and a foundation is laid for non-Eurocentric security studies.

The challenges to the values of freedom, equality, and non-violence that result from the world's interconnectedness are examined in a study by Linklater⁶⁵. To understand how humanity has responded to this growing interconnectedness and explore principles for peaceful coexistence, we need closer integration between IR and world history. Moving forward, it is crucial to build upon recent endeavors in engaging with world history and develop a cosmopolitan perspective on the history of global political organization. Bhambra⁶⁶ examines three recent developments in historical sociology. However, these developments have not successfully resolved the issues identified in earlier forms of this field. The reason is that each of them remains confined within the original methodological framework of historical sociology. This limitation arises from their reliance on ideal types as the foundation for sociohistorical analysis. Moreover, this Eurocentric approach isolates specific relationships from their broader connections and proposes self-contained internal processes as inherent to these relationships. To provide a more comprehensive methodological and substantive basis for a global historical sociology, the article concludes by advocating for the adoption of connected histories.

The boundaries of postcolonial International relations and anti-Eurocentrism are examined by Matin⁶⁷. The author argues that a non-ethnocentric International social theory, integrating the universal, is essential for displacing Eurocentrism. However, this theory needs a fundamental reevaluation, moving away from being an inherent self-transcendence of the particular and recasting it as a radical embrace and formation of alterity. This idea is exemplified in Trotsky's concept of uneven and combined development. Capan⁶⁸ explores the limitations of current approaches to writing non-Eurocentric histories of the international. The author suggests an alternative framework in four sections. These sections include defining Eurocentrism, critiquing Eurocentric narratives through entangled narratives, introducing the concept of abyssal lines, and demonstrating the proposed framework using the example of the Haitian Revolution. Powel⁶⁹ addresses how Eurocentrism and tempocentrism in IR literature often overlook the significance of non-Western perspectives and restrict the development of theories. This suggests a necessity to reconstruct historical narratives in textbooks by emphasizing connections and relations and unveiling the multi-layered aspects of time.

Anieväs and Nişancioğlu⁷⁰ utilize the theory of UCD to offer an analysis of the transition to capitalism. The authors examine historical events such as the Mongol invasions, Ottoman imperial expansion, and the discovery of the New World. The argument emphasizes that these specific forms of UCD influenced the trajectory of

⁶⁵ Linklater 2007, s.355-357.

⁶⁶ Bhambra 2010, s.127-128.

⁶⁷ Matin 2013, s.353-354.

⁶⁸ Capan 2020, s.289-290.

⁶⁹ Powel 2020, s.957-958.

⁷⁰ Anieväs and Nişancioğlu 2013, s.78-79.

capitalism in northwestern Europe. Nişancioğlu⁷¹ explores how the Eurocentric history of capitalism's origins often overlooks the Ottoman Empire, a significant player in the Early Modern period. The author aims to address this non-European blind spot by utilizing the theory of Uneven and Combined Development. Through this lens, we can reincorporate the material importance of the Ottoman Empire in historical processes that played a role in transitioning to capitalism.

An examination by Bilgin⁷² delves into the frequent acknowledgment yet insufficient clarification of the boundaries of Eurocentrism within the realm of IR. Additionally, Buzan and Lawson's composite approach challenges existing myths about the international system and society. The author aims to deepen the understanding of Eurocentrism and highlight what is missing from IR theorizing by illustrating the point through a focus on a landmark text on Ottoman history by İlber Ortaylı's *The Longest Century of the Empire*. Düzgün⁷³ addresses a significant aspect of the Great Divergence debate by critically examining and recontextualizing the fundamental concept of capitalism. The author draws upon the theory of social-property relations to offer new comparative insights into the early modern Ottoman Empire, providing an alternative perspective that expands beyond Eurocentric interpretations in understanding world historical development.

The Ottoman/Turkish perspective in the field of IR and Western scholarship is subjected to a Eurocentric treatment, as argued by Ruacan⁷⁴. Often, the Ottomans are depicted as abnormal or contrasting with Europeaness, resulting in unintended implications for present-day EU-Turkey relations. However, by utilizing Martin Wight's concepts and Herbert Butterfield's academic history, it becomes possible to reimagine the Ottoman/Turkish narrative in a more positive and balanced manner. Davutyan⁷⁵ explores the development of modern banking in Ottoman lands. The author provides evidence of local financial sophistication even before European involvement. As European banks entered the scene, their financial ties not only bolstered security but also filled the void left by the absence of domestic institutions. This ultimately resulted in European banks, notably Banque Imperiale Ottomane, dominating Ottoman capital markets.

Constructivism and Identities

According to Isacoff⁷⁶, the assumptions that form the basis of historical knowledge in IR scholarship have never been subject to questioning. However, John Dewey's pragmatism provides a more valuable approach to conducting historical research explicitly aimed at benefiting the public good. Welch⁷⁷ states that Thucydides

⁷¹ Nişancioğlu 2014, s.325-326.

⁷² Bilgin 2016, s.492-493.

⁷³ Düzgün 2018b, s.24-25.

⁷⁴ Ruacan 2018, s.157-158.

⁷⁵ Davutyan 2023, s.322-323.

⁷⁶ Isacoff 2002, s.603-604.

⁷⁷ Welch 2003, s.301-302.

is widely recognized as the first theorist in IR. However, his history of the Peloponnesian War is largely seen as unhelpful since it offers no new insights into human nature or valuable generalizations. Nevertheless, his text does provide a wealth of evidence that can aid our understanding of international politics. The author reveals that choices play a central role, identities are shaped through interaction, and national interests are molded by historical circumstances. By treating Thucydides with respect, we may find the solution to remedy the unintended repercussions he has caused.

The traditional approach to practical knowledge relies on theory-building and field-independent epistemological criteria, which are analyzed in Kratochwil⁷⁸. However, this approach fails to understand the type of knowledge required for making practical choices and neglects the role of history in shaping individuals. In order to address these shortcomings, the author explores the importance of historical context and situatedness in practical knowledge. Furthermore, the author discusses how understanding past experiences helps inform present decision-making processes and proposes more appropriate criteria for generating practical knowledge. Reus-Smit⁷⁹ argues that IR scholars, particularly constructivists, have recently shown renewed interest in history. They utilize historical inquiry to shed light on the meaning and evolution of international practices, processes, and social structures. The author examines whether constructivist history is guided by a distinct philosophy of history. The author argues that it can be best described as skinnerian in nature through a constructivist interpretation of the constitutional crisis faced by the Spanish Empire following the Napoleonic invasion. Linklater⁸⁰ points out that the increase in social power has led to both remarkable achievements and destructive forms of harm over greater distances, with the development of moral frameworks being critical in protecting individuals from senseless harm throughout history. Societies that are entangled in global civilizing processes can discover new norms and agreements that are anchored in shared vulnerabilities. Studying universal history from a cosmopolitan point of view can help us understand the contribution of international societies to global civilizing processes.

Revisionist scholars have challenged the notion that the Peace of Westphalia played a central role in shaping international society, and Kayaolu⁸¹ interprets their arguments. However, proponents of the English School and constructivist International relations scholarship have increasingly embraced this argument. In this context, the author examines how the Westphalian narrative perpetuates a Eurocentric bias in International relations theory, distorts our understanding of the modern International system, and hinders effective analysis of global interdependencies and pluralism. Buzan and Lawson⁸² examine how the field of IR follows a traditional system of using benchmark dates for research and teaching. However, it is necessary for scholars to

⁷⁸ Kratochwil 2006, s.5-6.

⁷⁹ Reus-Smit 2008, s.395-396.

⁸⁰ Linklater 2010, s.155-157.

⁸¹ Kayaolu 2010, s.193-194.

⁸² Buzan and Lawson 2014, s.620-621.

critically evaluate the relevance and establishment of these dates. The authors challenge the orthodox set of benchmark dates and proposes a revised set based on mainstream IR theories. By doing so, it aims to expand the theoretical and historical scope of the discipline by reflecting macro-historical International dynamics.

MacKay's⁸³ assesses the validity of recent International Relations theories, particularly those put forth by David Lake and Jack Donnelly. The author conducts a comprehensive analysis of the historical interactions among city-states and various international entities in Central Asia spanning the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This region serves as a valuable case study for assessing structural theories. The article assesses the relationships among city-states, neighboring empires, and non-state actors, ultimately providing insights into the merits of these new structural perspectives and their relevance to constructivist IR theories on global change. Leira and De Carvalho⁸⁴ explore how constructivists have used history to create narratives of change within the field of IR. They argue that this usage has evolved over three generations. In the first generation, history was employed to criticize mainstream arguments. In the second generation, history was used to replace those arguments with more progressive ones. Finally, in the third generation, history is valued for its own sake and utilized to challenge mainstream ideas at a local level. Delatolla and Yao⁸⁵ show the utilization of race and religion as tools of scientific imperial administration during the 19th century. They specifically examine how this framework influenced European interactions with populations within the Syrian Provinces of the Ottoman Empire. These historical dynamics continue to shape discussions on religion in international politics.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives

The application of historical lessons to contemporary circumstances, according to Gilbert's⁸⁶ argument, presents a difficult predicament. On the one hand, the recollection of recent events may lead to erroneous comparisons and catastrophic outcomes. Conversely, a lack of historical awareness can yield benefits. While international affairs students can greatly benefit from studying history, they should approach it cautiously due to the complexities involved in applying past lessons. Thorne⁸⁷ describes how history holds immense importance, as those who lack an understanding of the past are equally deprived as those who remain oblivious to literature. Relying on professional historians for insights into bygone events involves navigating varying perspectives and conclusions. Additionally, the subjective nature of historians studying international politics poses a potential challenge. There exist fundamental differences in basic assumptions within this field. While many historians acknowledge the subjectivity of their viewpoints, politicians and social scientists still seek concrete lessons, truths, or laws from history. Consequently, it is the outcome

⁸³ MacKay 2013, s.210-211.

⁸⁴ Leira and De Carvalho 2016, s.99-100.

⁸⁵ Delatolla and Yao 2019, s.640-641.

⁸⁶ Gilbert 1968, s.352-353.

⁸⁷ Thorne 1983, s.123-124.

rather than the journey that truly matters. Elman and Elman⁸⁸ investigate how diplomatic historians and theorists in IR have faced difficulties when it comes to exchanging ideas across different disciplines due to the narrow focus of their institutions. This results in limited conversations and scholars remaining unaware of advancements beyond their own field. Although respected members from both professions have made efforts to address this issue, it would be more beneficial if training programs incorporated a greater sense of sensitivity and appreciation for each other's work. Additionally, the development of methods to teach graduate students how to appropriately engage with one another's research would greatly enhance interdisciplinary collaboration.

Walker⁸⁹ argues that Political Realism has come under scrutiny, prompting the need for alternative theoretical frameworks in IR research. However, the emergence of these alternatives has been hindered by the historical neglect of political theory. In this context, the author presents an overlooked alternative rooted in Paine's international thought, whose works have unfortunately been disregarded by scholars in IR. Surprisingly, despite being a classic second-image theorist who initially proposed that democratic governance could foster global peace, Paine's profound contributions have been largely ignored. The author argues that Paine offers a more faithful representation of Enlightenment ideals for students studying IR compared to Kant. Paine's writings encompass all aspects of cosmopolitan thinking within this field.

The convergence of historical sociology and IR since the late 1970s and early 1980s is demonstrated by Hobson⁹⁰. In this convergence, historical sociology has gained traction within international politics as theorists seek to augment their discipline. However, outside of international politics, there has been a slower adoption of these developments by historical sociologists. Consequently, there remains a lack of comprehensive understanding regarding the nature and contributions of historical sociology to the field of international politics. Smith⁹¹ examines scholarship in international politics, spanning classical Realism to postmodern work. Its contribution lies in the analysis of philosophy and method in history as well as international politics.

The analysis conducted by Vaughan-Williams⁹² focuses on the discourse surrounding the historical turn in IR and suggests the need for a greater emphasis on historical context. However, mainstream IR has neglected to address the issue of history, as highlighted by ongoing debates between traditional historians and critical historiographers. The author draws on Derrida's work to advocate for a different approach to analyzing the past. The author emphasizes embracing the radical indeterminacy of historical meaning to incorporate historicity into analyses of world politics. Hobson and Lawson⁹³ describe that the question of history in IR holds great

⁸⁸ Elman and Elman 1997, s.5-8.

⁸⁹ Walker 2000, s.51-53.

⁹⁰ Hobson 2002, s.3-4.

⁹¹ Smith 2003 [1999], s.2-6.

⁹² Vaughan-Williams 2005, s.422-423.

⁹³ Hobson and Lawson 2008, s.415-417.

importance for the entire discipline. They uncover four distinct approaches to studying history within the field, offering a complex web of connections and interactions that shape our understanding of IR. These modes enable us to envision the discipline beyond its current confounding constructs, pushing the boundaries of the international imagination and paving the way for new perspectives.

The influence of the history of human sciences on global politics during the 20th century and its ongoing impact on the contemporary world are explored by Bell⁹⁴. The modern research university plays a crucial role in generating and spreading ideas related to the self, society, the economy, and world order. IR also hold significant importance in this context. Recent research has brought attention to flaws in foundational myths within this discipline while identifying future directions for further investigation. Yetiv⁹⁵ explores the role of history in IR. The author highlights how history aids in studying change by connecting events over time, building theories, and complementing quantitative approaches. Additionally, it discusses the importance of acknowledging differences among historians and IR scholars, as well as recognizing the limits and potential misuse of historical analysis. Finally, it proposes an integrated approach for interdisciplinary analysis in International Studies. The relationship between history and IR is examined by Lawson⁹⁶ through the exposition of two divergent viewpoints. On the one hand, there are mainstream positions that view history as a tool to supplement theoretical frameworks. On the other hand, post-positivists reduce history to a collection of random events without much significance. To reimagine this relationship in social science, the article employs four frameworks. McCourt⁹⁷ presents the argument that there is a historical turn in the field of IR. This shift goes beyond merely defining history within the discipline. The author signifies a larger movement away from neopositivism and towards recognizing historical knowledge as central to political praxis. The implications of this shift extend far beyond the realm of IR.

The challenges of achieving pluralism in IR research are explored by Leira⁹⁸ by engaging with history. The author argues that embracing a spirit of enthusiastic exploration and amateurism when dealing with history presents an important opportunity to uncover shared characteristics and promote diversity within and across disciplinary boundaries. Glencross⁹⁹ examines the historical consciousness of two main paradigms in IR theories Realism and Liberalism. The author delves into whether these disciplines share a common historical awareness beyond perceiving history solely as instructive. The analysis compares three genres of historical consciousness employed in Realism and Liberalism, showcasing their purposeful utilization of historical knowledge.

⁹⁴ Bell 2009, s.3-9.

⁹⁵ Yetiv 2011, s.94-95.

⁹⁶ Lawson 2012, 203-204.

⁹⁷ McCourt 2012, s.23-24.

⁹⁸ Leira 2015, s.23-27.

⁹⁹ Glencross 2015, s.413-415.

Vergerio¹⁰⁰ describes how the discipline of IR has failed to consider how great thinkers become recognized as such. This is primarily due to a reluctance to reflect on methodology and a tendency to inaccurately depict their ideas. In response, the author suggests an integrated approach that combines contextualism and reception theory. By adopting this more rigorous methodology, the study of great thinkers can analyze both the influence and distortion of their ideas in a comprehensive manner. Mulligan and Levy¹⁰¹ investigate how the interdependence among European great powers from 1871 to 1914 had a dual effect. On the one hand, it maintained peace by fostering international financial and commercial networks and transnational social and cultural exchanges that reshaped power dynamics. However, this interconnectedness also heightened the likelihood of a European War. This was due to the utilization of military force, trade agreements, financial loans, expert missions, and cultural diplomacy as tools for competition in smaller nations.

Özkan¹⁰² highlights the significance of an interdisciplinary approach in the social sciences, specifically the connection between IR and history. The author explores how history contributes to discussions within IR, delves into the historical context of positivist theories, and examines the methodological value of historical theories in IR. Ultimately, it asserts that spatial constructs like historical sociology possess the potential to challenge Eurocentric perspectives in IR. Özcan¹⁰³ shows how the precursors of IR education in Turkey emerged in the late 19th century. Courses on diplomacy, political history, and international law were introduced during this time. The first courses specifically focused on IR were delivered in the early 20th century. However, it wasn't until after World War II that the discipline became institutionalized. The author explores the evolution of key concepts and their interactions with Turkey's socio-political realities. Ghorbani et al¹⁰⁴ examine the use of the historical method in IR research. This qualitative approach explores past events to uncover historical facts and understand current occurrences. Its aim is to provide insights and guidelines on applying the historical method within IR. Kadercan¹⁰⁵ examines how the Ottoman Empire maintained peace and stability within regions that eventually experienced ethnic, religious, and sectarian conflicts. The author proposes an explanation centered around territorial design—a strategic approach that facilitated cost-effective expansion. This perspective holds potential for addressing significant historical phenomena from an interdisciplinary standpoint.

Global IR

The phenomenon of neglecting non-Western societies within the field of IR is

¹⁰⁰ Vergerio 2018, s.110-111.

¹⁰¹ Mulligan and Levy 2019, s.611-612.

¹⁰² Özkan 2019, s.5-7.

¹⁰³ Özcan 2020, s.3-4.

¹⁰⁴ Ghorbani et al 2022, s.7-8.

¹⁰⁵ Kadercan 2017, s.158-159.

discussed by Acharya¹⁰⁶ in his interpretation. However, the concept of Global IR offers a more inclusive approach. This approach emphasizes pluralistic universalism, considers world history, redefines existing theories, integrates regional studies, avoids ethnocentrism, and recognizes a broader conception of agency. To support the idea of Global IR, research should focus on comparative studies of international systems and conceptualizing a post-Western world order. Furthermore, expanding regionalism studies and fostering synergy between disciplinary and area studies are essential. Research should also investigate the two-way diffusion of ideas and norms while exploring the diversity found in civilizations coming into contact with one another. It is important to note that building Global IR does not advocate for a one-size-fits-all approach but rather emphasizes acknowledging and celebrating diversity while seeking common ground to address conflicts. Hurrell¹⁰⁷ explores how the mainstream discourse on IR has primarily centered around Western perspectives. However, non-Western scholars have shed light on inherent biases and put forth significant arguments regarding a more inclusive understanding of IR. These contributions focus on examining the experiences of marginalized groups, redefining concepts like security, and acknowledging the varying perceptions of the International category in fragile states and deeply interconnected systems.

Historical IR

Mulich¹⁰⁸ explores how the field of IR has recently seen an increased interest in history. Scholars are critically engaging with history as a process; however, there hasn't been much discussion on how to approach historical sources and methodology. The author aims to spark that conversation by exploring how Historical IR scholarship approaches source material and suggesting valuable insights from methodological debates in disciplinary history. The author provides an overview of recent approaches to history and the use of historical sources in IR scholarship. The study delves into two main types of historical sources secondary sources and primary sources, specifically archival ones. Finally, it concludes by addressing potential trends and challenges faced when conducting historical research in IR, recognizing the difficulty of making generalizations about the field's scholarship. The central advice given is to view historiography as an evolving body of work and the archive as a partially explored terrain that demands open-mindedness and curiosity for uncharted areas. Conducting immersive archival research poses significant practical challenges, such as linguistic barriers and logistical obstacles; however, these can be addressed through transnational collaboration among researchers. Additionally, initiatives like Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) offer partial solutions to journal word count limitations. Engaging with historiographical literature requires sustained commitment but holds immense value for interdisciplinary engagement between history and IR scholars who can learn from one another at the methodological level. Cooperation and mutual

¹⁰⁶ Acharya 2014, s.647-649.

¹⁰⁷ Hurrell 2016, s.149-150.

¹⁰⁸ Mulich 2021, s.488-489.

learning between these disciplines are vital for continued growth in their shared interests.

De Carvalho et al¹⁰⁹ highlight that history has been an important partner in IR scholarship, with the last two decades seeing an increase in Historical IR scholarship and interest in the history of international thought and the discipline itself. This major work provides an overview of approaches to history in IR, the history of international thought/historiography, and the emergence of the state and the state system. Aydin-Düzgit et al¹¹⁰ examine the critical use of Historical IR to analyze the populist manipulation of history. The authors specifically focus on debunking historical myths related to Self and others, using the case of Europe-Ottoman relations and present-day anti-Western populism in Turkey. They shed light on the overlooked Tanzimat period and illustrates how developments during this time can contribute to more harmonious self-and-other relations in contemporary Turkey-Europe relations. Lemke et al¹¹¹ focus on the study of Historical IR and the ongoing debates surrounding its analysis methods and relationship with History and IR disciplines. Contributors address three key issues methods, ontology, and disciplinary boundaries in Historical IR. Additionally, they provide a definition to clarify its position within IR.

International History

Puchala¹¹² highlights a renewed interest in the history of relations among states and peoples among IR scholars. The author examines the positivist dispute that agitated German scholars during the last half of the 19th century and the first decades of the 20th. Additionally, Puchala discusses the contemporary assault on the correspondence theory of truth and the need for intellectual conversation among discourses as the pathways to knowledge in history lead to representations of reality mediated through subjective interpretations. Finney¹¹³ covers the negative reception of postmodernism in mainstream International History due to the discipline's culture and links to politics and argues that maintaining skepticism towards theory has unrecognized costs for International History, proposing post-structuralist-inspired approaches to revitalizing the field. Suganami¹¹⁴ argues that narrative is an essential component of explanation in IR and international history. The author also argues that treating the disciplines differently based on their treatment of narrative is nonsensical, challenging standard philosophical distinctions. Additionally, he advocates for a historical mode of knowledge production that takes seriously the critique of history and narrative representation and identifies meta-historical questions to deepen understanding.

Ties with International Law

¹⁰⁹ De Carvalho et al 2021, s.1-14.

¹¹⁰ Aydin-Düzgit et al 2022, s.513-514.

¹¹¹ Lemke et al 2023, s.3-7.

¹¹² Puchala 1995, s.1-18.

¹¹³ Finney 2001, s.291-292.

¹¹⁴ Suganami 2008, s.327-328.

The emergence of international law as a global influence during the 19th century is analyzed with respect to the expansion of European political power in a study conducted by Horowitz¹¹⁵. Asian states were subjected to unequal treaties through which this legal framework was imposed upon them. This resulted in significant changes for entities such as the Ottoman Empire, Qing China, and Siam as they navigated the territorial aspects of sovereignty prescribed by international law. These transformations corresponded with their adaptation to the prevailing notions of national identity. Lorca¹¹⁶ challenges the notion that international law achieved universality solely through European expansion. Instead, the author argues that the widespread adoption of European international legal principles was facilitated by jurists from semi-peripheral polities appropriating these ideas. The historical development and progress of the IR discipline in Turkey from 1859 to 1945 is examined by Erozan¹¹⁷. The author examines textbooks and courses on International law and offers insights into the institutional history and growth of this field. Palabıyık¹¹⁸ describes how the Treaty of Paris holds significant importance for the recognition of Ottoman participation in the European concert and the benefits of European international law. However, this article puts forth the argument that the Ottomans were already interested in and subject to international law before the treaty, aiming to secure their empire's survival.

Genell¹¹⁹ examines the issue of semi-sovereignty within the Ottoman Empire and its position in the Eurocentric international legal order. The author explores this topic by analyzing textbooks on international law that highlight how Ottoman lawyers argued for granting autonomy to autonomous provinces, as it aligned with European treaty law and gained international recognition. However, a shift towards centralization was later pursued. Todd¹²⁰ explores the emergence of extraterritoriality in 19th-century Egypt. This phenomenon resulted from a compromise between various European Empires and the Egyptian government, affecting Egyptian sovereignty. The historical transition from the Ottoman Empire to nation-states in the Balkans between 1878 and 1949 is interpreted by Tzouvala¹²¹. This transformation was influenced by the internationalization of decision-making processes related to state-building and experimentation with international legal techniques. These developments challenged the conventional understanding of international law as a purely benevolent entity. Hock¹²² discusses the discourse found in newspapers published in the Ottoman language during the Ottoman-Italian War of 1911–1912. These newspapers brought attention to various issues, including international law, Ottoman sovereignty, and imperial ambitions. Similar discussions arose after the Balkan Wars.

¹¹⁵ Horowitz 2004, s.445-448.

¹¹⁶ Lorca 2010, s.475-479.

¹¹⁷ Erozan 2014, s.53-54.

¹¹⁸ Palabıyık 2014, s.233-234.

¹¹⁹ Genell 2016, s.533-534.

¹²⁰ Todd 2018, s.105-108.

¹²¹ Tzouvala 2018, s.1149-1150.

¹²² Hock 2019, s.204-205.

Conclusion

This exploration into the complex bond between history and IR, guided by the Ottoman Empire, has tried to uncover a pattern woven from past and present threads. Examining this empire, a global political titan for centuries, would shed light on how historical events and processes deeply impacted IR theory and practice's foundations from a larger perspective. The Ottoman experience exemplifies how historical analysis would enhance comprehending international phenomena. Uncovering the intricacies of the Ottoman Empire helps to illuminate timeless questions of authority, nation-building, and evolving international order. Through its intricate governance system, diverse ethno-religious coexistence, and shifting diplomatic scenery, the empire provides fertile ground for considering modern debates on minority rights, identity issues, and challenges in multi-ethnic societies. Similarly, dissecting its complex alliance and rivalry network supplies invaluable lessons in realpolitik, strategic balance of power dynamics, and international coalition formation. However, as with any historical lens, using the Ottomans comes with challenges. Over-simplifying nuanced realities or directly applying past concepts to current situations can lead to misinterpretations and overlook the unique historical context tapestry. Deriving broad generalizations from a single case study, even one as significant as the Ottomans, risks neglecting regional and historical variations within international politics. Ultimately, the true fruit lies in history and IR's interplay, facilitated by an open and critical dialogue between historians and IR scholars. Sharing research methods, perspectives, and healthy skepticism is crucial to navigate interdisciplinary engagement complexities. Only by acknowledging each field's strengths and limitations we can better harness the combined power of the historical context and rigorous theoretical frameworks to achieve deeper understanding of global polities in a complex world. The Ottoman Empire, with its lessons and challenges, serves as a potent reminder that past and present are intricately intertwined. Studying the empire's intricacies can not only broaden our theoretical frameworks but also compel questioning existing assumptions. While history offers invaluable context and details, we must remain mindful of its limitations and engage in critical dialogue with its lessons. Only through such genuine intellectual exchange can we weave a deeper and more nuanced comprehension of how past continues shaping today's international landscape.

History, International Relations and the Ottoman Empire: A Review Article

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Books and Articles

- Acharya 2014 A. Acharya, “Global International Relations and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda For International Studies”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(4), 647-659.
- Akkaya 2020 M. Akkaya, “The Backyard of Slavery: Child and Adolescent Slaves”. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9, 467-479.
- Aksan 1999 V. H. Aksan, “Locating the Ottomans Among Early Modern Empires”, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 3(3), 103-134.
- Ambartsumyan 2021 Ambartsumyan K. R. “Проблема реформирования армянских вилайетов Турции в политике великих держав в 1908-1914 гг. [The Problem of Reforming the Armenian Vilayets of Turkey in the Politics of the Leading Powers in 1908-1914; in Russian]”. *История: факты и символы [History: facts and symbols]*, (4 (29)), 51-60.
- Anievás and Nişancioğlu 2013 A., Anievás, and K. Nişancioğlu, “What’s At Stake in the Transition Debate? Rethinking the Origins of Capitalism and the ‘Rise of the West’”, *Millennium*, 42(1), 78-102.
- Armitage 2014 David Armitage, “The International Turn in Intellectual History”, in Darrin M. McMahon and Samuel Moyn (Eds.) *Rethinking Modern European Intellectual History* (Pp. 232-252). Oxford University Press.
- Aydın-Düzgit, et al 2022 S. Aydin-Düzgit, B. Rumelili, and A. E. Topal, “Challenging Anti-Western Historical Myths in Populist Discourse: Re-Visiting Ottoman Empire–Europe Interaction During the 19th Century”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 28(3), 513-537.
- Balcı 2021 A. Balcı, “Bringing the Ottoman Order Back into International Relations: A Distinct International Order or Part of an Islamic International Society?”, *International Studies Review*, 23(4), 2090-2107.
- Balcı 2022 A. Balcı, “Algeria in Declining Ottoman Hierarchy: Why Algiers Remained Loyal to the Falling Patron”. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 35(3), 375-393.
- Balcı and Kardaş 2023 A. Balcı, and T. Kardaş, “The Ottoman International System: Power Projection, Interconnectedness, and the Autonomy of Frontier Polities”. *Millennium*, 51(3), 866-891.
- Balcı, et al 2020 A. Balcı, T. Kardaş, İ. Ediz, and Y. Turan, “War Decision and Neoclassical Realism: The Entry of the Ottoman Empire into the First World War”, *War in History*, 27(4), 643-669.
- Balcı, et al 2022 A. Balcı, T. Kardaş, Y. Turan, and I. Ediz, “When Doves Feed Hawks: Ottoman War Decision and European Powers Towards the Crimean War”, *Alternatives*, 47(2), 67-83.

History, International Relations and the Ottoman Empire: A Review Article

- Baltacıoğlu-Brammer
2019 A. Baltacıoğlu-Brammer, “One Word, Many Implications: The Term “Kızılbaş” in the Early Modern Ottoman Context”. In Vefa Erginbaş (Ed.) . *Ottoman Sunnism* (Pp. 47-70) . Edinburgh University Press.
- Barkawi, and Laffey
2002 T. Barkawi, and M. Laffey, “Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations”, *Millennium*, 31(1), 109-127.
- Barkawi, and Laffey
2006 T. Barkawi, and M. Laffey, “The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies”, *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.
- Barkey 2008 K. Barkey, *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bartelson 2021 J. Bartelson, “War and the Turn to History in International Relations”, In De Carvalho, B., Lopez, J. C., and Leira, H. (Eds.) . *Routledge Handbook of Historical International Relations* (Pp. 127-137) . Routledge.
- Bell 2009 D. Bell, “Writing the World: Disciplinary History and Beyond”, *International Affairs*, 85 (1), 3-22.
- Bhambra 2010 G. K. Bhambra, “Historical Sociology, International Relations and Connected Histories”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(1), 127-143.
- Bilgin 2016 P. Bilgin, “How to Remedy Eurocentrism in IR? A Complement and a Challenge For the Global Transformation”, *International Theory*, 8(3), 492-501.
- Burbank and Cooper
2019 J. Burbank, and F. Cooper, “Empires After 1919: Old, New, Transformed”, *International Affairs*, 95(1), 81-100.
- Butcher and Griffiths
2017 C. R. Butcher, and R. D. Griffiths, “Between Eurocentrism and Babel: A Framework For the Analysis of States, State Systems, and International Orders”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(2), 328-336.
- Buzan and Lawson 2013 B. Buzan, and G. Lawson, “The Global Transformation: The Nineteenth Century and the Making of Modern International Relations”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(3), 620-634.
- Buzan and Lawson 2014 B. Buzan, and G. Lawson, “Rethinking Benchmark Dates in International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 20(2), 437-462.
- Capan 2020 Z. G. Capan, “Beyond Visible Entanglements: Connected Histories of the International”, *International Studies Review*, 22(2), 289-306.
- Clayer 2012 N. Clayer, “The Bektashi Institutions in Southeastern Europe: Alternative Muslim Official Structures and their Limits”. *Die Welt des Islams*, 52, 183-203.
- Crawford 2014 T. W. Crawford, “The Alliance Politics of Concurred Accommodation: Entente Bargaining and Italian and Ottoman Interventions in the First World War”, *Security Studies*, 23(1),

- 113-147.
- Davutyan 2023 N. Davutyan, “The Penetration of European Banking into Ottoman Lands During the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century”, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 25(3), 322-339.
- De Carvalho, et al 2011 B. De Carvalho, H. Leira, and J. M. Hobson, “The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You About 1648 and 1919”, *Millennium*, 39(3), 735-758.
- De Carvalho, et al 2021 B. De Carvalho, J. C. López, and H. Leira, “Introduction: Historical International Relations”, In De Carvalho, B., Lopez, J. C., and Leira, H. (Eds.) . *Routledge Handbook of Historical International Relations* (Pp. 1-14) . Routledge.
- De Lange 2021 E. De Lange, “The Congress System and the French Invasion of Algiers, 1827–1830”, *The Historical Journal*, 64(4), 940-962.
- Delatolla and Yao 2019 A. Delatolla, and J. Yao, “Racializing Religion: Constructing Colonial Identities in the Syrian Provinces in the Nineteenth Century”, *International Studies Review*, 21(4), 640-661.
- Düzungün 2018a E. Düzungün, “Capitalism, Jacobinism and International Relations: Re-Interpreting the Ottoman Path to Modernity”, *Review of International Studies*, 44 (2): 252–278.
- Düzungün 2018b E. Düzungün, Property, “Geopolitics, and Eurocentrism: The ‘Great Divergence’ and the Ottoman Empire”, *Review of Radical Political Economy*, 50 (1), 24–43.
- Düzungün 2022 E. Düzungün, “Debating ‘Uneven and Combined Development’: Beyond Ottoman Patrimonialism”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 25(2), 297-323.
- Ediz 2019 İ. Ediz, “A Neoclassical Realist Explanation of the Balfour Declaration and the Origins of the British Foreign Policy in Palestine”. *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 34(1), 99-122.
- Ejodus 2015 F. Ejodus, “The Expansion of International Society After 30 Years: Views from the European Periphery”, *International Relations*, 28(4), 445-478.
- Elman and Elman 1997 C. Elman, and M. F. Elman, “Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory: Respecting Difference and Crossing Boundaries”, *International Security*, 22(1), 5-21.
- Emrence 2008 C. Emrence, “Imperial Paths, Big Comparisons: The Late Ottoman Empire”, *Journal of Global History*, 3(3), 289-311.
- Erozan 2014 B. Erozan, “A Distant History of the International Relations Discipline in Turkey: International Law (1859-1945) /Türkiye'de Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Uzak Tarihi: Hukuk-I Düvel (1859-1945)”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler/International Relations*, 11(43), 53-81.
- Finney 2001 P. Finney, “Still ‘Marking Time’? Text, Discourse and Truth in

History, International Relations and the Ottoman Empire: A Review Article

- International History”, *Review of International Studies*, 27(3), 291-308.
- Genell 2016 A. M. Genell, “Autonomous Provinces and the Problem of ‘Semi-Sovereignty’ in European International Law”, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 18(6), 533-549.
- Ghorbani, et al 2022 M. Ghorbani, Mousavi Shafaei, M. Shariatinia, and, M. Eslami, “Applying the Historical Method in International Relations Research”, *International Relations Researches*, 12(3), 7-38.
- Gilbert 1968 A. N. Gilbert, “International Relations and the Relevance of History”, *International Studies Quarterly*, 12(4), 351-359.
- Glencross 2015 A. Glencross, “From ‘Doing History’ to Thinking Historically: Historical Consciousness Across History and International Relations”, *International Relations*, 29(4), 413-433.
- Hobson 2002 John M. Hobson, “What’s at Stake in “Bringing Historical Sociology Back into International Relations?” Transcending “Chronofetishism” and “Tempocentrism. In *International Relations*”, in Stephen Hobden and John M. Hobson (Eds.). *Historical Sociology of International Relations* (pp. 3-41). Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson and Lawson 2008 J. M. Hobson, and G. Lawson, “What Is History in International Relations?”, *Millennium*, 37(2), 415-435.
- Hock 2019 S. Hock, “Waking Us from This Endless Slumber”: The Ottoman–Italian War and North Africa in the Ottoman Twentieth Century”, *War in History*, 26(2), 204-226.
- Hoffmann 2008 C. Hoffmann, “The Balkanization of Ottoman Rule: Premodern Origins of the Modern International System in Southeastern Europe”, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 43(4), 373-396.
- Horowitz 2004 R. S. Horowitz, “International Law and State Transformation in China, Siam, and the Ottoman Empire During the Nineteenth Century”, *Journal of World History*, 445-486.
- Hurrell 2016 A. Hurrell, “Beyond Critique: How to Study Global IR?”, *International Studies Review*, 18(1), 149-151.
- Illing 2009 P. Illing, “The Brabant Revolution and the Western Question (1787–1790)”, *Dutch Crossing*, 33(1), 64-79.
- İnalcık 1974 H. İnalcık, “The Turkish Impact On the Development of Modern Europe”, In Karpat, K. H. (Ed.). *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History* (Pp. 51-60). Brill.
- Isacoff 2002 J. B. Isacoff, “On the Historical Imagination of International Relations: The Case for Adeweyan Reconstruction”, *Millennium*, 31(3), 603-626.
- İşiksəl 2019 G. İşiksəl, “Hierarchy and Friendship: Ottoman Practices of Diplomatic Culture and Communication (1290s–1600)”, *The Medieval History Journal*, 22(2), 278-297.

- Isom-Verhaaren 2011 C. Isom-Verhaaren, *Allies with the Infidel: The Ottoman and French Alliance in the Sixteenth Century*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Kadercan 2013 B. Kadercan, “Strong Armies, Slow Adaptation: Civil-Military Relations and the Diffusion of Military Power”, *International Security*, 38(3), 117-152.
- Kadercan 2017 B. Kadercan, “Territorial Design and Grand Strategy in the Ottoman Empire”, *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5(2), 158-176.
- Karpat 1974a K. H. Karpat, “Introduction”, In Karpat, K. H. (Ed.). *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History* (Pp.1-14) . Brill.
- Karpat 1974b K. H. Karpat, “The Stages of Ottoman History: A Structural Comparative Approach”, In Karpat, K. H. (Ed.). *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History* (Pp. 79-106). Brill.
- Kasaba 2011 R. Kasaba, “From Moveable Empire to Immovable State: Ottoman Policies Towards Nomads and Refugees in the Modern Era”. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 45, 227 - 236.
- Kayaoğlu 2010 T. Kayaoğlu, “Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory”, *International Studies Review* 12 (2), 193–217.
- Khoury and Kennedy 2007 D. R. Khoury, and D. K. Kennedy, “Comparing Empires: The Ottoman Domains and the British Raj in the Long Nineteenth Century”, *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 27(2), 233-244.
- Kratochwil 2006 F. Kratochwil, “History, Action and Identity: Revisiting the ‘Second’ Great Debate and Assessing its Importance for Social Theory”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(1), 5-29.
- Kupchan 2014 C. A. Kupchan, “The Normative Foundations of Hegemony and the Coming Challenge to Pax Americana”, *Security Studies*, 23(2), 219-257.
- Lawson 2012 G. Lawson, “The Eternal Divide? History and International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 18 (2), 203-226.
- Leira 2008 H. Leira, Justus Lipsius, “Political Humanism and the Disciplining of 17th Century Statecraft”, *Review of International Studies*, 34(4), 669-692.
- Leira 2015 H. Leira, “International Relations Pluralism and History—Embracing Amateurism to Strengthen the Profession”, *International Studies Perspectives*, 16(1), 23-31.
- Leira and De Carvalho 2016 H. Leira and B. De Carvalho, “Construction Time Again: History in Constructivist IR Scholarship”, *European Review of International Studies*, 3(3): 99–111.
- Lemke, et al. 2023 T. Lemke, A. A. Szarejko, J. Auchter, Barder, A. D., D. Green, S. Pampinella, and S. Srivastava, “Doing Historical International Relations”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 36(1), 3-

- 34.
- Linklater 2007 A. Linklater, “World History and International Relations”, *International Relations*, 21(3) : 355–359.
- Linklater 2010 A. Linklater, “Global Civilizing Processes and the Ambiguities of Human Interconnectedness”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(2): 155–178.
- Lorca 2010 A. B. Lorca, “Universal International Law: Nineteenth-Century Histories of Imposition and Appropriation”, *Harvard International Law Journal*, 51, 475-552.
- Low 2015 M. Low, “Ottoman Infrastructures of the Saudi Hydro-State: The Technopolitics of Pilgrimage and Potable Water in the Hijaz”. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 57, 942 - 974.
- Mackay 2013 J. Mackay, “International Politics in Eighteenth-and Nineteenth-Century Central Asia: Beyond Anarchy in International-Relations Theory”, *Central Asian Survey*, 32(2), 210-224.
- Matin 2013 K. Matin, “Redeeming the Universal: Postcolonialism and the Inner Life of Eurocentrism”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(2), 353-377.
- Mattern and Zarakol 2016 J. B. Mattern, and A. Zarakol, “Hierarchies in World Politics”, *International Organization*, 70(3), 623-654.
- McCourt 2012 D. M. McCourt, “What’s at Stake in the Historical Turn? Theory, Practice and Phronēsis in International Relations”, *Millennium*, 41(1), 23-42.
- Mcneill 1974 W. H. McNeill, “The Ottoman Empire in World History”, in Karpat, K. H. (Ed.). *The Ottoman State and Its Place in World History* (Pp. 34-50). Brill.
- Mikhail and Philliou 2012 A. Mikhail, and C. M. Philliou, “The Ottoman Empire and the Imperial Turn”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 54(4), 721-745.
- Mulich 2021 J. Mulich, “International Relations in the Archive: Uses of Sources and Historiography”, in De Carvalho, B., Lopez, J. C., and Leira, H. (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Historical International Relations* (Pp. 488-502). Routledge.
- Mulligan and Levy 2019 W. Mulligan, and J. S. Levy, “Rethinking Power Politics in an Interdependent World, 1871–1914”, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 49(4), 611-640.
- Neumann and Welsh 1991 I. B. Neumann, and J. M. Welsh, “The Other in European Self-Definition: An Addendum to the Literature On International Society”, *Review of International Studies*, 17 (4), 327–348.
- Neumann and Wigen 2013 I. B. Neumann, and E. Wigen, “The Importance of the Eurasian Steppe to the Study of International Relations”, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 16, 311-330.
- Nişancioğlu 2014 K. Nişancioğlu, “The Ottoman Origins of Capitalism: Uneven and

- Combined Development and Eurocentrism”, *Review of International Studies*, 40(2), 325-347.
- Ohanyan 2022 A. Ohanyan, “Regional Fracture and Its Intractability in World Politics: The Case of the Late Ottoman Empire”, *Nationalities Papers*, 50(3), 589-610.
- Osiander 2001 A. Osiander, “Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth”, *International Organization*, 55(2): 251–287.
- Özavcı 2021 O. Özavcı, “A Priceless Grace? the Congress of Vienna of 1815, the Ottoman Empire and Historicising the Eastern Question”, *The English Historical Review*, 136(583), 1450-1476.
- Özcan 2020 G. Özcan, “From Politics to International Relations: A Conceptual History of the International Relations Discipline in Turkey”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler-International Relations*, 17(66), 3-21.
- Özkan 2019 F. Özkan, “Uluslararası İlişkilere Disiplinlerarası Yaklaşım: Tarih ve Teori Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 16(61), 5-22.
- Palabıyık 2014 M. S. Palabıyık, “The Emergence of the Idea of ‘International Law’ in the Ottoman Empire Before the Treaty of Paris (1856) ”, *Middle Eastern Studies*, 50(2), 233-251.
- Patrick 2018 A. Patrick, “Woodrow Wilson, the Ottomans, and World War I”, *Diplomatic History*, 42(5), 886-910.
- Phillips 2016 A. Phillips, “The Global Transformation, Multiple Early Modernities, and International Systems Change”, *International Theory*, 8(3), 481-491.
- Powel 2020 B. Powel, “Blinkered Learning, Blinkered Theory: How Histories in Textbooks Parochialize IR”, *International Studies Review*, 22(4), 957-982.
- Puchala 1995 D. J. Puchala, “The Pragmatics of International History”, *Mershon International Studies Review*”, 39 (Supplement 1), 1-18.
- Reus-Smit 2008 C. Reus-Smit, “Reading History Through Constructivist Eyes”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 37 (2), 395-414.
- Ruacan 2018 I. Z. Ruacan, “Classical English School Theory and the Ottoman/Turk: Reimagining an Exclusionary Eurocentric Narrative”, *Alternatives*, 43(3), 157-172.
- Savage 2011 J. D. Savage, “The Stability and Breakdown of Empire: European Informal Empire in China, the Ottoman Empire and Egypt”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(2), 161-185.
- Sazak 2020 S. C. Sazak, “Bad Influence: Social Networks, Elite Brokerage, and the Construction of Alliances”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 26(1_Suppl), 64-90.
- Smith 2003 [1999] T. W. Smith, *History and International Relations*. Routledge.
- Srougo 2013 S. Srougo, “Core–Periphery Interactions in the Late and Post-

History, International Relations and the Ottoman Empire: A Review Article

- Suganami 2008 Ottoman Periods: Dependency and the Uneven Development of Thessaloniki: 1870–1936”, *European Review*, 21(3), 422-434.

Tansel 2016 H. Suganami, “Narrative Explanation and International Relations: Back to Basics”, *Millennium*, 37(2), 327-356.

Thies 2002 C. B. Tansel, “Geopolitics, Social Forces, and the International: Revisiting the ‘Eastern Question’”, *Review of International Studies*, 42 (3), 492–512.

Thorne 1983 C. G. Thies, “A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations”, *International Studies Perspectives*, 3 (4), 351-372.

Todd 2018 C. Thorne, “International Relations and the Promptings of History”, *Review of International Studies*, 9(2), 123-135.

Togral 2018 D. Todd, “Beneath Sovereignty: Extraterritoriality and Imperial Internationalism in Nineteenth-Century Egypt”, *Law and History Review*, 36(1), 105-137.

Tuck 2008 Ö. Togral, “Akdeniz Adalarına Sürgün Edilen Kırım Hanları”. *Mediterranean Journal of Humanities*, 8 (1), 355-366.

Tzouvala 2018 C. Tuck, “‘All Innovation Leads to Hellfire’: Military Reform and the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth Century”, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 31(3), 467-502.

Üstün 2011 N. Tzouvala, “‘These Ancient Arenas of Racial Struggles’: International Law and the Balkans, 1878–1949”, *European Journal of International Law*, 29(4), 1149-1171.

Vaughan-Williams 2005 İ. S. Üstün, “The Ottoman Dilemma in Handling the Shi‘i Challenge in Nineteenth-Century Iraq”, in Ofra Bengio and Meir Litvak (Eds.), *The Sunna and Shi'a in History: Division and Ecumenism in the Muslim Middle East* (pp. 87-103) New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.

Venzke 2000 N. Vaughan-Williams, “International Relations and ‘the Problem of History’”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 34(1): 115–136.

Vergerio 2018 M. Venzke, The Case of a Dulgadir-Mamluk Iqtā': A Re-Assessment of the Dulgadir Principality and its Position within the Ottoman-Mamluk Rivalry. *Journal of The Economic and Social History of The Orient*, 43, 399-474.

Walker 1989 C. Vergerio, “Context, Reception, and the Study of Great Thinkers in International Relations”, *International Theory*, 11 (1), 110-137.

Walker 2000 R. B. Walker, “History and Structure in the Theory of International Relations”, *Millennium*, 18(2), 163-183.

- Welch 2003 D. A. Welch, “Why International Relations Theorists Should Stop Reading Thucydides”, *Review of International Studies*, 29(3), 301-319.
- Wigen 2013 E. Wigen, “Ottoman Concepts of Empire”, *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 8 (1), 44–66.
- Wigen 2015 E. Wigen, “Two-Level Language Games: International Relations as Inter-Lingual Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 21(2), 427-450.
- Wohlforth Et Al 2007 W. C. Wohlforth, Et Al “Testing Balance-of-Power Theory in World History”, *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(2), 155-185.
- Yetiv 2011 S. Yetiv, “History, International Relations, and Integrated Approaches: Thinking About Greater Interdisciplinarity”, *International Studies Perspectives*, 12 (2), 94-118.
- Yurdusev 2016 A. N. Yurdusev, “Introduction”, in A. N. Yurdusev (Ed.). *Ottoman Diplomacy: Conventional or Unconventional?* (Pp. 1-4). Springer.
- Zarakol 2018 A. Zarakol, “A Non-Eurocentric Approach to Sovereignty. in: Forum: In the Beginning There Was No Word (For It): Terms, Concepts and Early Sovereignty”, *International Studies Review*, 20: 506–509.
- Zarakol 2021 A. Zarakol, “Linking Up the Ottoman Empire With IR's Timeline”, in De Carvalho, B., Lopez, J. C., and Leira, H. (Eds.). *Routledge Handbook of Historical International Relations* (Pp. 464-476) Routledge.