UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

FROM ISTANBUL TO ANKARA: TURKEY'S ENTRY INTO INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

MÉMOIRE PRÉSENTÉ COMME EXIGENCE PARTIELLE
DE LA MAÎTRISE EN SCIENCE POLITIQUE

by

SIAMAC MAHBOUBIAN

APRIL 2011

UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL

D'ISTANBUL À ANKARA : L'INITIATION TURQUE À LA SOCIÉTÉ INTERNATIONALE

MÉMOIRE PRÉSENTÉ COMME EXIGENCE PARTIELLE

DE LA MAÎTRISE EN SCIENCE POLITIQUE

par

SIAMAC MAHBOUBIAN

Mai 2011

Acknowledgements

There are a great number of people without which I never would have been able to get through the past five years. My mother is at the head of that line. Some of my first memories are of my mom and I watching the news. near the end of the Cold War. She would patiently explain what the major issues were in terms a five year old child could understand. She gave me the desire to learn as much as I can about the world. She also made these past few years possible with every type of support one can imagine. Thanks *babajan*, this thesis is dedicated to you.

Very special thanks go out to my dearest friends and in many ways, my real family. To the whole gang from CMF, specially 'les boys', I owe you lot a great debt for not letting me give up on myself. Thank you Mathieu Lecomte, Maurice 'Moach' Rosellini, Kimio Tessier, Christophe Bourhis, Stéphane Cerny, François-Xavier Morin, Marie-Audile Morin, Nathalie Niche, Sarah Boucher, Don Siravo, Maggie Currie (thanks for the wheels, I owe you a bike), the newlywed Cestaro-Sahwney family, Mat Desmarais, my new uncle Andy and of course, Panda. If any of you ever need *anything,* you know where to find me.

My sincere gratitude also goes out to Professor Alex Macleod, whose patience and attention to detail have made me a better student and a better writer. Without his direction, this paper would have scarcely amounted to more than incoherent rambling in an unacceptably familiar style.

I would also like to thank Madame Laurence Viens, Graduate Secretary at UQAM's Department of Political Science, who more than once made bureaucratic contortions to keep me in the program.

Résumé

Depuis le quinzième siècle, l'Empire ottoman représente pour l'Europe une source constante d'incompétence politique, de retard culturel et de mal. Elle a sans cesse causé friction et concurrence au sein de la communauté internationale européenne tout le long de son existence, particulièrement au dix-neuvième siècle, pourtant une période comparativement solidariste dans l'histoire du continent. Étant donné tout cela, la Turquie est seule à avoir un gouvernement totalement séculaire parmi les états islamiques nés de la chute de la dynastie d'Osman, et elle demeure aujourd'hui le pays le plus proche de l'Europe malgré le fait qu'elle fût rejetée à nombreuses reprises par l'Union européenne. Comment la Turquie a-t-elle trouvé cette place précaire dans le système international, prise entre deux mondes? C'est la question à laquelle que mémoire tente de répondre ce à travers une analyse socio-historique selon les principes de l'École anglaise des relations internationales. Après avoir présenté les principes fondateurs de l'École anglaise tels que 'la société internationale' et le rôle joué par les principales institutions internationales comme la diplomatie, l'équilibre des puissances et le droit international, le mémoire propose un historique des relations entre Ottomans et Européens axé sur les enjeux émergents en vue de faire ressortir les motifs, en attachant une attention particulière au dix-neuvième siècle, où 'la question de l'Orient' représentait un enjeu crucial pour la diplomatie occidentale. Ensuite, il examine l'émergence de nouvelles normes de la société internationale aussi bien que de la société Turque Enfin, il explore la chute final de la Sublime Porte, la transformation de son noyau anatolien en république séculaire et l'acceptante a contre- cœur de cette république dans la société internationale européenne.

Mots clés

BOP: balance du pouvoir

CUP: Comité union et progrès

ES: l'École anglaise

EU: l'Union européenne

GNA: Grande assemblée nationale d'Ankara

IGO: agence gouvernementale internationale

INGO: agence internationale non-gouvernementale

IR: relations internationales

LON: Ligue des nations

NATO: Organisation du traité de l'Atlantique nord

UN: Organzation Nations Unis

Summary

Ever since the Ottoman Empire captured Constantinople in the fifteenth century, the House of Ösman has represented political incompetence, cultural backwardness and evil. From then on, it fostered seemingly endless friction and competition within European international society, particularly during the nineteenth century, which was by all other respects a period of relative continental solidarity. That being said, Turkey is the only secular state to have emerged from the ashes of the Ottoman Empire, and of all the states that share an Ottoman heritage, it is by far the most European in its style of governance. The European Union has nevertheless repeatedly rejected Turkey's membership applications. How exactly did Turkey come to find itself caught between two worlds in this precarious international position? That is the question this dissertation will attempt to answer through a socio-historical analysis based in the principles of the English School of international relations. Chapter one will set the theoretical backdrop by defining the English School's central concepts such as 'International Society' as well as by exploring the role of order-maintaining institutions such as diplomacy, the Balance of Power and international law. Chapter two will provide historical context in Ottoman-European relations with the emphasis being placed on re-emerging patterns of conflict, particularly during the nineteenth century, when the 'Eastern Question' was most prominent in European foreign relations. The third chapter shall describe the emergence of new ordering principles in the international and Turkish societies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The fourth chapter explores the Ottoman Empire's last days, the transformation of its Anatolian heartland into a secular state and the unwilling acceptance of this new republic by the European international society. Findings shall be summarized in the text's conclusion.

Acronyms

BOP: Balance of Power

CUP: Committee for Union and Progress

ES: English School

EU: European Union

GNA: Grand National Assembly (of Ankara)

IGO: International Governmental Agency

INGO: International Non-Governmental Agency

IR: International Relations

LON: League of Nations

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

UN: United Nations

Table of Contents

Introduction

On September 23, 2009 a man named Ösman Ertugul Ösmanoglu, age 97, died at an Istanbul hospital. His passing made the news around the world. Born in 1912, he was a direct descendant Ösman I, the first Ottoman Sultan, and the grandson of Abdul Hamid II, perhaps the most infamous of the Anatolian patriarchs. He was twelve years old when the first President of the Republic and father of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, exiled the royal family, a necessary step in the creation of the Republic of Turkey. Mr. Ösmanoglu was a man who might have ruled an empire spanning three continents even at its weakest point. He ended up running a mining company from New York City, his brief obituary reduced to an item of historical curiosity in a testament to how much things have changed over the past century. From the capture of Constantinople in the fifteenth century right up to the end of World War I, the Turkish-led Ottoman Empire embodied political incompetence, cultural backwardness and pure evil to Europeans. Today, Turkey is a member of the United Nations and NATO. Moreover, of all the Islamic states to emerge from the fall of the Sultanate and abolition of the Caliphate, it is the only fully secular nation and the most European in its style of governance. Despite being the best- integrated into Europe's international society, it has faced repeated rejections from membership to the EU. How is it that Turkey came to occupy this particular place in international society?

Given its emphasis on the historical and sociological dimensions in international relations, the English School (ES) is well suited to answering that question. The general thrust of the school's theory holds that in any given historical period, outlying states in the international system will tend to adopt the norms and practices of the dominant states, or of the dominant international society in ES parlance. Generally, this explanation applies to the Turkish case, but the devil is in the details. The Bosporus separated more than mere continents. Culturally, its opposing shores might as well have been different planets as both Christian and Islamic principles governing international relations prevented any convergence or rapprochement. Military and economic weakness forced the Sublime Porte to import European savoir-faire from the eighteenth century onwards. For the next two hundred years, the 'sick man of Europe' would try fight fire with fire by resisting European political and economic penetration by adopting European social and physical technologies. In the end, the House of Ösman burned down from

the inside. These reforms, carried out at a snail's pace, had after two centuries created a reformist governing class with Westernized political ideals, the most radical and secularist elements of which, represented and led by Atatürk, seized power in the chaos which followed WWI. The year 1924 marks an obvious 'point of no return' in Turkey's convergence with Europe and in its transformation from the political head of an Islamic theocracy divinely tasked with the destruction or conversion of Christianity to a parliamentary nation-state. Turkey was the only losing party of the Great War to dictate its terms of peace and to receive reparations. This dissertation hopes to determine whether or not Turkey became a member of international society immediately following the First World War. It seeks to describe and understand how the process of international convergence took place in the Turkish context and to delineate the patterns of international relations between the Ottoman Empire/Turkey and the European international society which led to convergence.

The first chapter will cover the major points of ES theory, focusing particularly on the contributions of Hedley Bull and Martin Wight, its two most important authors. Their differing conceptions of international society and the roles of what they considered to be the most important institutions of that society, namely the balance of power, international power ranking, international law and diplomacy, shall be dealt with in depth. Chapter two establishes the Ottoman Empire as the quintessential outsider with respect to European international society and traces the evolution of the major trends and patterns in the relations across the Hellespont right up to the twentieth century. Particular attention is paid to the nineteenth century as the Porte and the 'Eastern Question' represented major issues in European foreign policy. Chapter three discusses the major changes in the ordering principles of international society as well as within the internal political arena of the Ottoman Empire from the emergence of the Young Turks and the attempted installation of a constitutional government to the preliminary peace negotiations held in Paris in 1919. The fourth chapter tackles the Kemalist resistance to a European-imposed peace, the emergence of modern Turkey through war, and the very reluctant acceptance of Turkey into the 'family of civilized nations' by European international society. A summary of the main points and findings shall be provided in conclusion.

Chapter I

Theoretical Considerations: The English School's Approach

This chapter will introduce the key points of the English School of International Relations, focusing particularly on the definition of 'international society' in the work of the school's two main contributors, Hedley Bull and Martin Wight. Detailed attention will also be paid to the means by which institutions maintain order in the international system.

The ABC's of the English School

By most accounts, the academic discipline of international relations is an American social science, and this is perhaps owing to the dominance of the neo-realist and neo-liberal paradigms starting in the early 1960s and lasting throughout the Cold War. Yet, to concede this point means to overlook the contributions of many other scholars, in particular those working out of Great Britain. As early as the 1920s, the writings of Arnold J. Toynbee dealt with matters of interstate relations and tended to see the world in terms of systems of states. He was well aware that during the nineteenth century, these systems were still being united by European economic activities, and ultimately resulted in a single global system dominated by that continent (Toynbee, 1964). As a historian, Toynbee entertained the notion that what 'made' these systems were collections of shared norms and principles that were developed over time. E.H. Carr's *The Twenty Year's Crisis 1919-1939* (Carr, 1946) is considered by many to be the first publication to deal exclusively and deliberately with international relations. Having been let down by the near-total failure of the Versailles peace process, a process in which he had participated on behalf of His Majesty's Diplomatic Service, Carr expressed a view of international politics which opposed the idealism of statesmen's beliefs against the realism of their needs. Needless to say, Carr was weary of utopian goals, preferring more sober motivations with regards to foreign policy. Both these men would have a direct and profound influence, as would the advent of neo-realism, on what would later become the English School of International Relations (ES).

In 1954, the Rockefeller Foundation began funding the United States Committee on International Relations, which included Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz among its members. Some four years later, the same foundation agreed to fund a sister committee across the pond. The British Committee on International Relations held its first meeting at Cambridge

University in 1958 and right from the start, awareness of the American theorists' methods was accompanied by a scholarly disapproval that would become increasingly pronounced as the years went by (Dunne, 1998: p. 90). The American use of mathematical proof and strict empirical procedures, the methodological over-indulgence in scientific approaches, the formation of models and the 'fetish for measurement' have basically the same constraining effect on academic pursuits according to Hedley Bull: they drastically limit the number of questions one can ask about the practice of international relations because these standards of proof are inappropriate and unrealistic (Bull, 1966b; Dunne, 1998: p. 118). Five of the eight original attendees of the British meetings were historians. It is perhaps no wonder that the behaviouralist-positivist proposition that international relations have always been and will always be conducted according to the same principles of self-help under anarchy was hard to accept. Founding member Martin Wight had even once commented during a lecture that international theory is not at all like scientific analysis, but perhaps "more akin to literary criticism" (Epp, 1998: p. 53). On the other hand, and the ES by no means rejects the idea of international anarchy, but rather suggests that its negative and destabilizing effects are often mitigated by customs and practices developed between states over time. 'Realism', in the narrower sense which refers to the dog-eat-dog nature of the international system, is actually one of three ideological traditions in the history of European IR identified by Wight. But order exists even in an international system governed by such anarchical tenets. Rationalism, the 'middle-way tradition', holds that through repeated and iterated interactions, the practices that come to be shared between states evolve into institutions, solidifying the bonds between separate political units and making them into an international society. The rationalist tradition presents quite a broad spectrum of possibilities. Revolutionism, the final and most troublesome tradition, does not refer to a single ideological perspective as do the other two, but instead describes revisionist movements within the extra-national, purely inter-human community of mankind through which ideological currents flow.

This complex and diverse ontological backdrop means that the ES brings together an extremely heterogeneous group of scholars both in terms of interests and outlooks. But if there are three elements that are common to all, they would be those alluded to above: the rejection of positivism in favour of a more classical liberal arts methodology guided by philosophical rigor, the acceptance of socially constructed super-national and extra-national units, and the bridging of ideological (Constructivist) and materialist (Realist) theories. Since the late 1990s, the often

overlooked ES has been making a resurgence with a new generation of scholars interested in the study of socially constructed order in interstate politics, perhaps partially motivated by the advent of Constructivist trends in the study of international relations (Dufault, 2007: pp. 159-160). It is no coincidence that members of the third and contemporary generation of English School theorists such as Barry Buzan have begun to reconsider these propositions after a growing dissatisfaction with the a-historicism of the Realist paradigm (See Buzan, 2004: p. 11; Dunne, 1998: pp. 5-8; Linklater and Suganami, 2006: p. 82). In this chapter, the fundamental principles of the ES will be discussed in greater depth, beginning with its creation by Martin Wight and its later development by Hedley Bull, whose more streamlined version ES theory will serve as the analytical framework for this dissertation.

Carr and the 3 'R's: Fundaments of the English School

Though founders Martin Wight and Herbert Butterfield had discussed the possibility of inviting E.H. Carr to the initial committee meetings, they finally decided not to. Embittered by what he saw as the two-faced nature of international relations and the needless demonization of the communist experiment, he had secluded himself from academe to work on a monumental sixteen volume history of the Soviet Union. Wight feared that Carr would divert too much attention towards his own agenda (Dunne, 1998: ch. 2 and p. 93). Carr had given up his teaching positions and hadn't been involved in IR since 1946, yet his partial inclusion amongst the ranks of English-Schoolers is attributed to his particular insight into international politics and the immense influence it had on the ES. Carr belonged to a generation understandably disenchanted by the failures of laissez-faire liberalism, which were numerous. Black Friday ushered in global economic collapse of course, and at the national political level, Carr feared a tyranny of the masses over the parliamentary system which also led him to believe that the application of democratic principles to interstate relations was a mistake.

In *The Twenty Years Crisis 1919-1939* (Carr, 1946), the spectrum of international relations is dichotomized into utopian and realist categories. The former is represented by intellectuals and their theories of free will and the harmony of interests, and the latter by bureaucrats and their practices predetermined by the need for power. Somewhat paradoxically, the crux of his argument, and of his realist critique of utopian theories and policies in IR, was that utopian politics were based on morality and that

> [t]heories of social morality are always the product of a dominant group which identifies itself with the community as a whole, and which possesses the facilities denied to subordinate groups [...]. Theories of international morality are, for the same reason and in virtue of the same process, the product of dominant nations or groups of nations. For the past hundred years, and more specifically since 1918, the English-speaking people have formed the dominant group in the world; and the current theories of international morality have been designed to perpetuate their supremacy and expressed in the idiom particular to them (Carr, 1946: p. 74).

Though genuine morality existed to Carr, it had become completely bankrupt. *The Twenty Years Crisis* is specific to one particularly troubled time in international history and though it serves the very important purpose of uncovering the power-based motivations behind overly moralized issues, it is good for little else. The work itself is inherently judgmental and pessimistic, which further detracts from its analytical usefulness. Still, what Carr had done was point out the huge rift between theory and practice, and it is in the attempt to fill this gap that Wight found his niche in the field of IR. Interpreting European history from diplomats' and scholars' perspectives, Wight sought to delineate clear traditions in Western political thought, in a word 'paradigms', pertaining to international relations. He found three: Realism, Revolutionism and Rationalism. Despite his personal beliefs, Wight's categorization is intended to be "free of the impulses of personal commitment" (Wight, 1966b: p. 89; see also Dunne, 1998: p. 14). He thus absolved the political scientist from having to deal directly with issues of right and wrong. His version of Realism was not a critique of utopianism, and Revolutionism itself was not necessarily concerned with the achievement of utopia either, but more with the attempt to transform or overcome the international political status quo.

To begin with what is most familiar, Wight's brand of Realism is really no different from the classical, non-positivist version of the paradigm as represented by Hans Morgenthau.

> "Anarchy is the characteristic that distinguishes international politics from ordinary politics. The study of international politics presupposes the absence of a system of government as the study of domestic politics presupposes the existence of one. Qualifications are necessary: there is a system of international law and there are international institutions to complicate or modify the workings of power politics. But it is roughly the case that [...] in international politics, law and institutions are governed and circumscribed by the struggle for power" (Wight, 1978: p. 102).

According to Bull, Realism is the tradition associated with the Hobbesian state of nature in which morality is no consideration at all in the extreme case, but where at the very least, it is

subordinate to raison d'état. "Either it is held (as by Machiavelli) that the state conducts its foreign policy in a kind of moral and legal vacuum, or it is held (as by Hegel and his successors) that moral behaviour for the state in foreign policy lies in its own self-assertion" (Bull, 1977: p. 25). As Bull would point out however, despite its crudeness, the assertion that 'might makes right' is a socially accepted norm (Bull, 1966a: p. 44).

The tradition Wight dubbed 'Revolutionism' has an extra-national quality to it and is defined as "recurrent waves of international revolution, that is to say organized attempts to transform international society [...]. Instead of a loose company of sovereign states, it seems more of an organic unity; individuals feel international loyalties which override national allegiances" (Wight, 1978: pp 86-87). Though the state often takes primacy at the level of international society, individuals can be considered the fundamental unit of analysis in the ES given the importance attributed to the thoughts of notable and powerful persons in the construction of international political understanding, institutions and communities. In Revolutionist streams of thought, the individual is not only the primary, but also the dominant unit of analysis; the ultimate goal is emancipation from the states-system resulting in the achievement of a world-state based on an ideal-type pan-global, pacific and homogeneous ideology of the sort most often associated with Immanuel Kant, though an imposed imperial doctrine such as Stalinism can play the same role (Dufault, 2007: pp. 161-162). Despite the centrality of the individual in Revolutionism, the state still plays a major role. Wight reminds that international revolutions such as the French Revolution and the Bolshevik uprising are born of specific national conditions and furthermore, that "the international repercussions of these national revolutions has not been accidental. They illustrate first that there is a degree of unity in international society making the internal events of one power of concern to other powers" (Wight; 1978: p. 80).

This is the starting-point of rationalist thought. It is based in an assumption directly opposed to that of Hobbes: that in the state of nature, man is a social animal (Dufault, 2007: p.162). From there, one may draw the conclusion that international politics can be less of an arena and more of a forum. Wight identified this middle road between realist and revolutionist streams with seventeenth century Dutch diplomat, jurist and author of *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* (1625), Hugo van der Groot, better known as Grotius. The 'via media', which seeks to achieve balance between national interests and the demands of the international system, is considered a

defining aspect of the European international system within ES history, and the basis of modern international society itself (Dunne, 1998: p. 59; Bull, 1966c: p. 51). Grotius had extended the principle of natural rights of individuals to cover relations between states as well, proposing that states, as collectives of individuals, hold the same responsibilities to one another as people do. Despite both Wight and Bull's adamant denial of the usefulness of domestic analogies in international politics, Grotius nevertheless became the flag-bearer for international society.

International Society: The English School's Keystone

In their study of ES theory, Suganami and Linklater quote Alexander Wendt, noting that when students of IR use the word 'structure', they are almost always referring to the Realist-Materialist definition, which is based on the distribution of military capabilities. "This is not so in the British study of international relations where rationalism, in Wight's sense, has been a dominant interpretation of world politics. In spite of the formally anarchical structure of the world of states, international relations are governed by rules, and therefore, substantively, the interactions of states exhibit a degree of order that could not, under anarchy, normally be expected" (Linklater and Suganami, 2006: p. 44). Unlike the Realists, the ES contends that anarchy and self-help are mitigated by other factors. Through their repetitive and iterated interactions, states develop, maintain and evolve norms, customs and rules which eventually become entrenched institutions. Despite this point being common to all members of the ES, there are some very important nuances between them. The basic premise, as expressed by Wight, is that "if anarchy means complete disorder, it is not a true description of international relations. There is cooperation in international affairs as well as conflict; there are a diplomatic system and international law and international institutions which complicate or modify the workings of power politics" (Wight, 1978: p. 105).

These are the bases of international societies, which are by their very nature different from states because their members themselves are, as states, more robust than individuals, much fewer in number and yet more heterogeneous (ibid 106-107; Bull, 1966a: pp. 45-48). The prerequisites for the existence of states-societies are, obviously, a number of sovereign states, mutual recognition of sovereignty, means of grading powers for hierarchical purposes, means of regular communications, a system of international law and finally, common goals and the ability to defend them. In the European case, the third and fourth roles are fulfilled mainly by the balance of power and ambassadorial diplomacy (Wight, 1977: ch. 5). Wight used the terms

'society of states', 'states-system', 'community of states' and even 'family of states' interchangeably. His historical knowledge was beyond reproach and he was well aware of the existence of non-European states and systems, but his preoccupation was Europe. It would be hard to successfully accuse the English School of eurocentrism (though it has been tried), given Wight's understanding that from the rest of the world's perspective, the West has been the foremost aggressor since the days of the Crusades (Epp, 1998: p. 56). Wight preferred to use the three traditions rather than Christianity as evidence of ideological and cultural homogeneity between Europeans.

Wight's star pupil, Hedley Bull, had a theoretical orientation that was a little more specific while his outlook was somewhat broader than purely inter-European relations. Bull explored the question of how order is maintained in international societies, and it is precisely his wider scope that confronted him with the issue of different states-societies such as the Islamic, the Chinese and the Indian systems making contact with Europe at various epochs in history. Thus, one very important point of departure between Wight and Bull is the latter's distinction between international systems and international societies. Whereas as Wight used the terms interchangeably, for Bull, "a system of states is formed when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another's decisions, to cause them to behave -at least in some measure- as parts of a whole" (Bull, 1977: pp. 9-10). In contrast, an international society "exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the workings of common institutions" (ibid: p. 13).

Bull also adds a third ontological category, the Cosmopolitan or World Society, to represent the international community of mankind proposed by the Revolutionist tradition. These additions have several effects. First, they facilitate the problem of dealing with several international societies at once by creating the all-encompassing system level which can encompass a multitude of societies, each with particular rules and institutions whether, they have direct contact with each other such as the case of Europe and the Ottomans, and even if they don't as in the case of Hellas and China in antiquity (Buzan and Little, 2000: ch. 8). Second, it grants the international analyst the possibility of focusing on systemic, societal or cosmopolitan issues on ontologically separate levels. The Realist stream thus finds its home in

the international system which is characterized by little else than calculated self-interest where interstate relations are concerned, and likewise, Revolutionist thoughts and actions are largely relegated to the realm of Cosmopolitan society, allowing Bull and like-minded scholars to focus on how order is maintained in the Rationalist domain of international society.

Wight had distinguished between societies with "thin morality" and the more "thick morality" of the Grotian doctrine which called for concerted action against violators of international law (Wight, 1966a). Bull made this issue the heart of his theory. Interstate society occupies a centrist position between raison d'état and revolution; it can be 'tugged on' at either end by the more leftist influences of Cosmopolitanism or Realist conservatism on the right, resulting in differing degrees of cohesion within international societies. The more an international society acts on systemic self-help or Realist concerns, the more it is said to be pluralist and inversely, the more Revolutionist or humanist its motivations and behaviour, the more it said to be a solidarist society. Order and justice are central concerns in the pluralist-solidarist divide. A pluralist society will be more concerned with mere coexistence and so norms, customs and institutions may be minimal in number or in responsibility and will be almost exclusively geared towards recognition and protection of sovereignty; justice takes a back-seat to order. Solidarist norms and institutional frameworks will be more elaborate, including means for pursuit and defence of common goals and cooperation on international projects of a wide variety. Another fundamental difference between the two lies in the understanding of what justifies the resort to war. "Les solidaristes considèrent que l'usage de la force doit être subordonné à la volonté collective de la société internationale en formant un régime de sécurité collective au sein duquel les états qui en violeraient les règles seraient punis" (Dufault, 2007: pp. 163-164). Pluralists, lacking common values or universal standards, may be able to create procedural and contractual understandings and even laws concerning the practice of war, though they will be unable regulate the use of force as an instrument of policy. Solidarist societies will likely have more numerous and complicated criteria for membership (Buzan, 2004: p. 193), while pluralist systems are more suited to culturally heterogeneous states' societies.

The question of common culture has always been central to the ES, and it is generally accepted that the more states have in common culturally, the more there is potential for a solidarist society, though there are always exceptions. Japanese entrance into European interstate society makes one wonder, at the very least, which elements of culture are more important

towards socio-political convergence. Wight also expressed the thought that international society can be 'patchy' since "political pressures do not operate uniformly throughout the states-system, and in certain regions which are culturally united but politically divided, a subordinate international society comes into being, with a states-system reproducing in miniature the feature of the general states-system"[1] (Wight, 1978: p. 63). One of the criticisms brought by the latest generation of ES theorists, namely Barry Buzan, is that the line between international systems and international societies, as well as between pluralist and solidarist societies, is very blurry. His solution was to first collapse the system and society levels, and then to create a spectrum ranging from the purely asocial system to the highest possible degree of interstate solidarism, the world-state. In Bull's work, the international system and international society are ontologically separate and as such, combining them can create complications down the road in historical periods where the system has several component societies. That being said, the idea of a spectrum covering the array of possibilities between pluralism and solidarism makes a lot of sense and is in no way contradictory to Bull's ontology. Competition, coexistence, cooperation and convergence all refer to different degrees of solidarity and plurality, making a more accurate investigation possible (Buzan, 2004: ch. 5; pp. 158-160).

The Roles and Characteristics of Institutions

For Buzan, institutions have a triple function in ES theory. They give international society its substantive content, they support the concept of international order, and they help set the English School apart from neoliberal institutionalists (ibid: pp. 161-162). Traditionally, the five most-studied institutions in the ES are the balance of power, international hierarchy (power ranking), diplomacy, international law, and war. Though there are others, discussion will be focused on these five first because, international trade notwithstanding, they are the most commonplace; they are the 'bare bones' of international society.

The Balance of Power (BOP) is a rather loaded term. Wight distinguishes between no less than nine usages of it (Wight, 1966c). For the purposes of this dissertation, the phrase will only be used to denote the repartition of capabilities within the international system or international society, and more commonly, to refer to the multilateral institutional practice of avoiding hegemony. As Wight once called it, "that elaborate artifice," is not necessarily a natural

[1] Please note that Wight uses 'society' and 'system' interchangeably

outcome of the combination of man's innate belligerence, systemic uncertainty and international anarchy. Historically speaking, the BOP as an institution, a most European social technology, signifies both the ideology and practice of not allowing any one state or bloc to become powerful enough to rule over the others, be it on a system-wide or regional level. As per Vattel's definition, it is a stalemate. In general, the ES distinguishes simple balances between two states from complex balances held between three or more powers. There is also a distinction drawn between single and multiple balances. Multiplicity entails a plurality of issues within an ever-shifting international society, balancing and re-balancing around them to maintain order. Single balances describe a dyadic configuration of international society on either side of a single set of issues. The latter are often the result of irresolvable conflicts of interests arising from within a complex balance. In Wight's playful words, in such cases of single-issue balancing, the BOP "is no longer a merry-go-round but a see-saw" (Wight, 1978: p. 170).

There are several varieties of balance in Bull's work as well. First, he distinguishes between fortuitous and contrived balances. The former are spontaneous while the latter denote a BOP arising out of conscious efforts. Contrived balances tend to be more complex and that complexity increases with the number of member parties. The more the balance extends over the system as a whole, the more it requires active measures and calculation for its preservation, which actually entails a 'thickening' of international society (Bull, 1977: pp. 104-106). This is rather interesting because BOP policies are usually a good indicator of pluralism. Since war, peace and alliances are completely subordinate to maintaining order through balance, justice is almost not a question of morality at all. The 'right thing to do' is to maintain the balance. It would seem however, that BOP can evolve into more solidarist forms of multilateralism. More complex balances cannot exist without a network of embassies which generate information and allow for a measure of order through regular communication. Basic international laws providing rules of sovereignty, diplomatic immunity, compensation and war are also a prerequisite towards the existence of complex balances. Reciprocally, the existence of a functioning balance of power is absolutely necessary to the operation of international law yet paradoxically, the smooth functioning of the BOP often necessitates the violation of international regulations to 'hold the balance', regardless of whether or not encroaching powers have legitimately broken the law or not. Similarly, the interests of weaker states also take a back seat to the maintenance of order (ibid: p. 108-109).

In broad strokes, balancing against hegemony did occur in antiquity and thereafter, but actively pursuing balance as a policy originated in fifteenth-century Italy (Wight, 1977: p. 137). It was only during the seventeenth century that the concept was more clearly expressed and became wide-spread, the War of Spanish Succession being a perfect example of BOP policies (Butterfield, 1966a: pp. 132-139). By the late eighteenth century, the BOP became associated with Newtonian principles and taken as their high-political equivalent. Achieving balance, that is avoiding hegemony, was the utmost diplomatic imperative. Though self-interest was still perfectly legitimate grounds for action, states were expected to contribute towards the maintenance of order in interstate society. "The eighteenth century did not set its heart on either a Catholic order in Europe or a Protestant order, but on an international system which was to be defended for its own sake; a new kind of order because it was comprised of both Catholics and Protestants, just as it comprised both monarchies and republics" (ibid: pp. 141-142). During the nineteenth century, the complexity and the scope of the balance of power increased, and it came to be understood as "the equal aggrandizement of the great powers at the expense of the weak", and certainly at the expense of the Asian and the African (Wight, 1966c: p. 156).

The Concert of Europe was the most elaborate, complex and geographically vast balance that ever was, and joint European interventions in Africa and Asia demonstrate that the Concert registered on the solidarist end of the spectrum. Despite that, its generality increased and the limits of its institutions were pushed until European international society flew apart at the seams. BOP had clearly failed in the ever increasingly globalized and interdependent international system leading up to the world wars, and if the Versailles negotiations were its funeral procession, then the treaty of Locarno (1925) was the final nail in its coffin since it failed to create even a simple equilibrium between Germany and France. The inherent and obvious problem with the BOP is its "demonic vitality and changeableness", rendering it a system of "scales perpetually oscillating without ever coming to rest" (Wight, 1978: p. 175 and p. 179). There are three easily distinguishable types of alliances: BOP-maintaining, BOP-changing and doctrinal/ideological (which are almost always BOP-changing, but with motives being revolutionary and not material/strategic; Wight, 1978: ch. 12).

The institution associated with power ranking can be understood as an integral aspect of the BOP. Mutually-accepted hierarchy is yet another clue to the existence of international society (Wight, 1977: p. 129 and pp. 136-141) Grading powers is perhaps the initial step in the process

of achieving a balance, whilst in later phases, "great powers have the tendency to club together as a kind of directorate and impose their will on the rest of the system. They usually justify their action as enforcing peace and security" but really "they wish to monopolize the right to create international conflict" (Wight, 1978: pp. 42-43). Bull has three criteria in identifying the institution of 'great-powerhood' within a states-society: first, there has to be at least two powers of comparable strength and forming between them "a club with a rule of membership." Second, the members of this club must be at the military forefront of the international system. Third, these great powers must accept their functions as leaders and have that leadership recognized by other states within the interstate society. The concept of an accepted hierarchy signals another ordering principle. "The idea of a great power, in other words, presupposes and implies the idea of an international society as opposed to an international system, a body of independent political communities linked by common rules and institutions as well as by contact and interaction" (Bull, 1977: pp. 200-202). The duties that come with great-powerhood are focused around preservation of the balance, including crisis control and the limitation of war (especially between great powers themselves), and encouraging or enforcing stability within their spheres of influence, be it unilaterally or in concert (ibid: pp. 208-227).

Diplomacy is the master-institution of international relations, and to Bull, it entails both the formulation and execution of foreign policy by official state representatives. Formulation requires information-gathering while conversely, execution often demands expression. Means of regular communications between governments are thus the *sine qua non* of international society and mutual privileges granted emissaries are amongst its oldest customs and rules. Besides communication, diplomacy achieves several other goals. In and of itself, diplomacy presupposes a certain level constancy of interactions amongst states and the importance of this institution can also be attributed to its regularity. Day-in day-out interactions of an almost banal nature allow states to find common ground and develop and elaborate shared norms and customs. The diplomat him or herself is an avatar of international society, whose very existence symbolizes states' respect for international norms and rules (Bull, 1977: pp. 170, 172 and 179-180, Wight, 1978: p. 113). Negotiation is an integral part of international relations, and whether it is carried out through diplomats or directly by ministers and heads of states, information-gathering is, once more, central. European diplomatic methods were forcibly imposed upon the governments of Asian states in certain cases, as the former's state-society gained dominion over the rest of the

system. Of such situations, Bull writes that "[d]iplomacy can play no role where foreign policy is conceived as the enforcement of a claim to universal authority, the promotion of the true faith against heretics, or as the pursuit of self-regarding interests that take no account of the interests of others" (Bull, 1977: p. 170-171).

Even when not imposed, diplomacy can actively help enforce or entrench power-relations between center and periphery, as the dominant side can keep tabs on or give orders to the subservient state through the network. Identification of common goals and the application of reason to finding 'give and take' solutions are therefore defining aspects of the master-institution. Avoidance and management of crises are domains under diplomacy's purview as well, and can accurately be described as specialized areas of negotiation. The ES distinguishes between several different forms of modern diplomatic activity. The first category, the diplomatic network of resident ambassadors, mostly fulfills, though is not limited to, the communicative and informational functions. A second category, summit meetings, is more common when standard diplomatic channels are too slow or too far removed from the seat or power. Finally, congresses are more official and regular versions of summit meetings. Diplomatic endeavours can be ad hoc just as they can be institutionalized. International organizations such as the International Labour Organization or the World Health Organization can be classified as permanent conferences (Wight, 1977: 141-143; Bull 1977: p. 165-166).

Diplomatic endeavours can be bilateral or multilateral. There is also a distinction drawn between diplomatic and consular relations, the latter denoting relations between private citizens and a foreign government via their own government's diplomatic network. The lines between the two can be blurred when consular issues take on a large scale or are highly publicized. Far from being a uniquely peaceful institution, there are some precisions that must be made about diplomacy's darker side. As we all know, knowledge is power, and so the most obvious blemish is the institution's penchant for a different kind of information-gathering: espionage. Ironically, espionage only increases in times of war or instability, when honesty is most important. Revolutionary powers often initially withdraw from diplomacy as the Bolsheviks had, and later use it as a propaganda tool and weapon as Stalinists did (Wight, 1978; pp. 113-120). Historically, the master-institution has been known, under one form or another, to all states-societies. But ambassadorial diplomacy, as opposed to emissarial diplomacy, is an invention peculiar to Europe whose origins can also be found in Renaissance Italy, though some aspects of it can be traced

further back to medieval ecclesiastical congregations. European diplomatic practices started being adopted by Asian and Islamic states in the eighteenth century. The Sublime Porte opened its first permanent embassies in the1790s in Paris, London, Vienna, Saint Petersburg and Berlin, but it wasn't until the Treaty of Paris in 1856 that it was allowed to participate in multilateral negotiations in a manner befitting an empire of its status.

International laws are not always respected by virtue of the system's anarchical aspects, not the least of which being a lack of monopoly on the legitimate use of force or a corresponding enforcement agency as per Hegel. Nevertheless, Bull avers that these shortcomings should not be mistaken for a lack of efficacy. The important question is whether or not the rules of international law are observed to a *sufficient degree* to justify treating them as a substantial factor in the maintenance of international order. The institution of international law is responsible for codifying the generally accepted norms and habitually practiced customs of the international society, and so whether or not they are fully respected or enforced, they add an element of predictability to states' behaviour (Dufault, 2007: p. 165). International law has three main functions. Its first and primary role is to identify the universal principles of political organization within an international society. The second and third functions lie in the expression and transmission of international society's norms (Bull, 1977: p. 141).

> What is a clearer sign of the inefficacy of a set of rules is the case where there is not merely a lack of conformity as between actual and prescribed behaviour, but a failure to accept the validity or binding quality of the obligations themselves as indicated by a reasoned appeal to a different and conflicting set of rules, or by an unreasoning disregard for the rules (ibid: p. 138).

Violations of international law can often be made without prejudice or from a legally justifiable position, just as obedience can be coerced (ibid: p. 136-140). International law will vary with the degree of international solidarity. Adherence to notions of morality and justice being central to the difference between the two archetypes, international law in pluralism is derived from states' already-established practices whereas substantive natural law, involving elements of what states 'ought to do', are much more commonly accepted sources of jurisprudence under solidarism. Pluralist laws are based on consent, solidarist ones in consensus (ibid: pp. 148-156). Grotius, a solidarist himself, was called 'le père des droits des gens' precisely because he believed that European citizens should receive equal treatment under the

law in all Christian kingdoms regardless of their political allegiances. The more a society leans towards solidarism, the more war as an instrument of policy takes a back seat to non-violent means, and so the more international law becomes substantive. It follows that international societies displaying pluralist characteristics will establish much more basic sets of rules, more concerned with simple coexistence than any real cooperation. When it comes to war, the ES revives von Clausewitz' famous statement; war is nothing but the continuation of politics by more violent and compelling means, and does not necessarily represent the breakdown of order, but in fact, can reflect its functioning on another level. In pluralism, war is seen as business as usual (Howard, 1966; Bull, 1977: ch. 8). The reduced prominence of war only means that there are more rules and increased stringency surrounding its use. Solidarist societies still resort to war in necessary cases of enforcement or punishment, but action is subordinate to the consent of the states-society as a whole, which though occurring more rarely, leads to much more wide-spread engagements (Bull, 1977: p.155). International society has nevertheless sought to reduce the onset of wars through restrictions, but 'legitimate' reasons to fight have not yet ceased to present themselves.

Comparative History of the English School

Since the English School's study of international relations revolves around system-wide concepts of order throughout European history, it is a given that a comparative approach is the best way to understand the origins and evolution of the ideas that govern international political thought. Comparative history is in fact in-built into the ES method, but early proponents, particularly Wight and Butterfield, wove somewhat seamlessly between theory and history. Later works by Hedley Bull and Adam Watson as well as by Barry Buzan and Richard Little, sought to apply the logic supporting ES arguments to comparative historical analyses. Between *The Expansion of International Society* (Bull and Watson, 1982), *The Evolution of International Society* (Watson, 1994) and *International Systems in World History* (Buzan and Little, 2000), the ES has managed to flesh-out the grand narrative of European international relations and their spread to the rest of the globe. The details of this expansion and the Ottoman Empire's special role vis-à-vis European international society are the subjects of the following chapter, but at this point, the theoretical concepts yielded by their historical observations must be introduced.

First of all, conception of an international society unavoidably means that there are outsiders. This feature is not unique to European international society, but is a recurring theme in

history. China, Rome and Persia all distinguished between civilized cultures and those 'barbarous' hordes that surrounded them. The schism between East and West with the Bosporus as the median dates all the way back to the Hellas-Persia system. The standard of civilization, or in other words 'what makes an outsider' evolves with changes in international society or in its dominant members. The idea of the 'West and the rest', that there is a nugget or core group of states in Europe and that the rest form a periphery, is intrinsic to rationalist thought going all the way back to Grotius himself, who "had a dual conception of international society: an outer circle of all humankind bound by natural law; and an inner circle of Christians, bound by the law of Christ. Drawing on culture, he went as far as to call for a general league of Christian states and a crusade on 'the Turk'" (Neumann and Welsh, 1991: p. 339; see also Wight, 1977: pp. 125-128).

For Herbert Butterfield, Europe was unified by Christianity, which was and remains among its defining characteristics. After the fall of Rome, it was the frictions between church and state for dominion over the souls of men which led to unique and extremely dynamic conceptions of European society (Butterfield, 1952: p 28). Furthermore, for him, concepts of natural rights in international law are descended from the medieval church so directly that

> modern internationalism is the system of medieval Christendom with the religion evaporated out of it. The eighteenth century developed the conception of a Europe, a states-system bound together by a common culture and common standards and separated from the outer world of Turks and Chinamen (ibid: p. 39).

In the 1880s, Scottish natural lawyer James Lorimer devised a triple categorization scheme by which peoples could be classified as 'civilized', 'barbarous', or 'savage' (Bull, 1977: p. 38). Rooted in anthropology, this categorization was in fact quite popular from the late nineteenth century on. Even Friedrich Engels used it (Engels, 1884) and three and a half decades later at Versailles, it was applied in justification of international mandates. Civilization, nevertheless, does not equate directly with membership in international society. The most important observation made by Bull and Watson is that within international systems, states tend to converge around the norms and practices of the most powerful society of states, adopting their institutions and learning their culture. (Bull & Watson, 1984) The theory of convergence is very general as every case is different owing to domestic peculiarities. Though it is an often ill-defined concept in the foreign relations between core and peripheral states, the standard of civilization is not as intangible as one would initially suspect. Nevertheless, it is never uniformly

applied and each candidate nation must meet it in the fashion demanded by the dominant international society.

If international society can be likened to a club, the standard of civilization merely refers to the criteria for membership required by the directorate. From the beginning of the nineteenth century at the very latest, Europe has been the undisputed leader whose practices have since been mimicked by others. While the gap between Western and other states widened from the sixteenth century onward, Europe itself inversely shifted from a highly pluralist society in the seventeenth century to the solidarist Concert of Europe of the nineteenth. As European society solidified, the standard of civilization changed and the bar was set much higher, though it underwent some metamorphoses after the Balkan crises, and certainly after the troubled year that was 1919.

According to the ES, there have been several international systems in the past. From roughly the sixteenth century on, European trade began to unite them loosely. As the Vatican's hold over European politics began to wane in the 1600s, and as the principles of natural law began to emerge and gain momentum, relations with advanced non-European governments came to be guided to a large extent by the principals of mutually respected sovereignty during the 1700s. Several important things happened during the nineteenth century. First, the technological (also read military) cleavage between Europe and the rest of the world increased dramatically to the former's advantage. This in turn led to a shift in European policy with respect to foreign relations. It seems that the very real technical upper hand led to a perceived moral and cultural sense of superiority, which in turn drove European society's attempted absorption of the rest of the world forward. In many if not most cases, convergence was imposed rather than implemented. First the European economic model was internationalized, and political convergence soon followed, starting with Russia in the early seventeenth century and reaching a climax with the spate of post WWII decolonizations.

It is worth discussing the drastic break from past practices which took place at the end of WWI because that period marked a major evolution of international society because of the great shift in the ordering principles and practices in international relations that it espoused. Obviously, all primary institutions are interrelated, both with each other and with the principles upon which they are founded, and so it can be tricky to unravel the ties that hold interstate society together when they are so tangled. During the nineteenth century, the BOP was not only an institution, but the be-all end-all of international relations. Other institutions were geared

toward its maintenance and operation. In a system with five world powers and a number of other major powers, this feat necessitated constant diplomatic adjustments, and its continued success was contingent first on less powerful states' acceptance of the Big Five as the legitimate leaders of international society, and in second place, on a very low level of competition on the continent itself thanks to rampant and unimpeded colonial expansion. Both those factors would dissipate at the turn of the 20th century for a variety of reasons. Even before the Versailles talks, nationalism would increase the number of states on the continent. On its own, that is enough to make balancing more difficult, but nationalism had built into it the notion of self-determination, which struck a further blow to the doctrine of great-power management. This was exacerbated by another increase in the number of states immediately after the Great War. Despite their total lack of experience in international relations, these newcomers often resisted even altruistic outside influences. What is more, great powers were disappearing.

Germany was totally ostracized from international society and Austro-Hungary ceased to exist. The onset of Bolshevism also created more instability as it erected an ideological barrier between the former Russian Empire and a very large portion of international society. England and France were broke and the traditionally isolationist United States did not really want to assume the burden of international directorship. Internal changes had affected international relations as well. The combination of democracy, improvements in communications technology and an international press had somewhat unpredictable, and often detrimental effects on diplomatic relations, and the professional diplomat's importance was reduced (Butterfield; 1966b). Ironically, international law saw a revival of Grotian principles with the advent of the League of Nations despite the fact that international society had become highly pluralist at that time. This latter development was in part due to the number of new states both from the expansion international society and the breakup of old empires. Despite a renewed interest in subordinating war to international law, the almost exclusively self-interested way in which most European states conducted their foreign relations during the early interwar period made this impossible, causing the type of two-faced international relations that Carr found so distressing.

Research Orientation and Methodology

The question asked by this dissertation is a very simple one. Did Turkey become a member of the international society after World War One? To spoil the suspense, the short answer is yes. All facetiousness aside, both the question and the answer are much more complex.

To address to the query properly, three steps must be taken: first, it must be clearly established that the Ottoman Empire was in fact exterior to the European international society prior to the twentieth century and to list the main differences responsible for the sociological divide. How did internal differences apply to the external relations between the two states'-societies? What were the patterns of interaction between the two separate states'-societies. Knowing already that the Concert of Europe became the undisputed dominant international society in the nineteenth century, the second goal is thus reduced to an examination of the mechanics of convergence. The process of international politico-ideological convergence as described by the ES is not an overnight phenomenon, so how did the patterns of interaction evolve to include, absorb or force the Ottomans into the more complex European international institutions over time? The bulk of the work lies here. The third step is to explain which straw broke the camel's back. Precisely what changes, whether domestic, diplomatic or both, finally allowed Turkey make to meet the European standard of civilization? The chosen turning point, or the date at which time Turkey 'joined the club' is July 24, 1923, the day the Treaty of Lausanne was signed.

Methodologically speaking, the ES' guidelines can be resumed simply as the 'liberal arts method': reason and judgment, clearly elaborated and applied with philosophical rigour to the practices of international societies within a chronological narrative. The principles and ideas governing international relations are created and kept in the minds statesmen, scholars, diplomats and other professionals and intellectuals whose work pertains to international relations. The sources of empirical data in this study are balanced between texts from the disciplines of general history, diplomatic history and of course, Turkish/Ottoman history with special focus on speeches, statements and writings of the diplomats and heads of state involved, including memoirs.

Chapter II

Historical Context: Four Centuries of Antagonism

The goal of this chapter is to analyze patterns of relations between the Ottoman Empire and Europe in order to establish precedence and a basis for comparison to the early twentieth century. Toward that end, international interaction between the European Continent and the Ottoman Empire can be separated into three periods. The criteria for evolution into a new phase of relations are twofold since they must consider international as well as internal Ottoman factors. The earliest period (1535-1718) is one defined by the mutual antagonism of clashing civilizations. A relaxation of the standards of civilization on both shores of the Sea of Marmora marks the transition into a second period, which allowed the very first convergent changes on the part of the Ottomans (1719-1815). The third period (1818-1908) starts as European international society closes its ranks after the fall of Napoleon, and is characterized by its increasingly specific, demanding and invasive standard of civilization which accelerated and influenced the already confused reform efforts of the Sublime Porte.

The Cross and the Crescent: Early relations between Europe and the Ottomans (1535-1717)

Communities almost always define themselves against the backdrop of what lies beyond their borders, and this is no different in the practice of the nineteenth-century European states-society. According to Bull, Wight had noted that states-systems throughout history "have had a sense of cultural differentiation from what lay outside" (Bull, 1977b: p. 18). The savage and the barbarian have always been an essential and inescapable aspect of self-definition to European states-society. Since the capture of Jerusalem in 1076, the 'unspeakable Turk' has represented the outsider par excellence to Europe, and its territories marked the limits of European international society (Neumann and Welsh: p. 330). As early as 1095, Pope Urban II united Europe against the sultanate in the first crusade. "Let the holy Sepulchre of our Lord and Saviour, which is possessed by the unclean nations, arouse you. [...] Wrest that land from the wicked race and subject it yourselves" (Ikin, 1928: pp. 119-120). For an international society united and governed by the tenets of its faith and the leaders of its church, "[t]he principal external society with which

Christendom had to do, in the centuries when it was transformed into the states-system, was regarded by it as a historical, even an eschatological, embodiment of evil" (Wight, 1977: p. 120). This sentiment became more entrenched after failed military actions against 'the unclean nations', and would perhaps even increase over time, outlasting the unity of the Western church. Martin Luther was born in 1483, thirty years after Constantinople was taken, yet three decades were scarcely enough to dilute the venom in the European's psyche. He had expressed that "[a] beast full of life must have a body and a soul; the spirit or soul of antichrist is the pope, his flesh or body the Turk" (Martin Luther quoted in Wight, 1977: p 121). The feeling was mutual; Ottomans had likewise defined themselves against the Western 'other' during the same era and afterwards (Bozdağlioğlu, 2003: p. 36). Sultan Bayezid II, reigning from 1481-1512, had gone so far as threatening to feed his horse on the altar of Saint Peter's Basilica.

The nomadic Turkmeni, pushed West by advancing Mongols in the thirteenth century, replaced the Seldjoukid Turks of Anatolia thanks to military practices that would remain superior to those of Europe until the seventeenth century. During the fifteenth century, as the Reconquista ousted Islam from Iberia, the House of Ösman replaced Saracens at the helm of the *Umma*-the world-wide community of all people faithful to Allah. The empire that Ösman's dynasty had created can be described as a sort of international system given the great variety of peoples and territories annexed. Adopting a style of governance learned from Persians, the Sultan delegated much power to regional leaders in exchange for troops and tribute[1] (Watson, 1992: p. 113). In the Hanaf'i branch of Islam practiced by Ottoman Turks, the world is divided into *Dar-al Islam* (the abode of Islam) and *Dar-al harb* (the abode of wickedness). The former refers to all territory under Islamic law while the latter, its dyadic counterpart, refers to those parts of the world under non-Islamic rule. The patriarchal head of the empire fulfills a dual function as Sultan- temporal leader of dar-al Islam, and Caliph, spiritual leader of the *Umma*.

Foreign policy is very succinctly expressed in Hanafism: there is no differentiation between races, cultures or languages amongst members of the abode of Islam; Muslims comprise a single unit whose Allah-given duty is to wage eternal jyhad on Dar-al harb. There can be no peace under any circumstances. The best non-believers can ever hope for is trade relations and temporary periods of truce as permitted by the Hanaf'i interpretation of the Koran and Hadith

[1] Wight had long averred that suzerain empires were early forms of international society.

(Piscatori, 1984; Watson, 1992: p 113). Ironically, it is the similarities between Christianity and Islam that kept the Porte and Europe apart: two faiths, each claiming moral superiority over the other and monopoly of the ultimate spiritual truth, and both striving for the conversion of all infidels, cannot be expected to easily get along. And so during this period where the standard of civilization was purely based on faith, "[r]eligion was the creator of an iron curtain which neither the necessities of common diplomatic interest nor the lures of commercial profit could remove" (Berkes, 1998: p. 29).

Given the degree of enmity, relations between Ottomans and Europeans have always been paradoxically close. Due to geographical proximity, the Sublime Porte was drawn into the European system (not society) by the French in 1535 with the first great balancing act implicating non-Europeans. François I, who sought to give France the upper hand against the Habsburg Empire, justified the alliance with the reasoning that Turks lay within the community of humankind. François may have had the gift of foresight, for this would be the common understanding in the centuries to come. The move was very unpopular at the time (Wight, 1977: p. 122). As far as Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-1566) was concerned, this alliance was a unilateral act on the part of his empire to weaken the infidel Habsburgs on his western flank (Watson, 1992: 177). On a very basic level, one can reasonably argue that the Porte joined the institution of the Balance of Power as it was being elaborated in the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, that argument must be qualified. The Ottoman Empire often fostered anti-hegemonial states in Europe not to avoid hegemony per se, perhaps because the Sultan knew that he was the hegemon at the time, but to weaken the Christian continent as a whole (Naff, 1984: p. 147). In that light, one could easily argue that given the lack of common understanding about the purpose of the BOP and its disdain for European society as a whole, the Porte did not meet Bull's criterion of shared goals (Bull, 1984: pp. 117-119). It engaged in the BOP purely from a unilateral position and with nothing but power calculation as a motive, without being a participant in even the most minimally-defined collective institution.

This lack of common understanding and shared goals becomes more evident when contemplating the nature of capitulations. The first of them were granted to France (1536 informally, 1569 officially), England (1583) and the Netherlands (1613). *Capitula* were consular, juridical and commercial privileges granted to foreign sovereigns for their subjects in Ottoman lands. European traders were thus under the aegis of a consul, particularly when in need of legal

recourse, and had the added assurance that they would receive a trial "more or less in conformity with their own legal code" (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: p. 137). These concessions can neither be seen as diplomatic overtures nor as attempts to develop mutually binding international laws. In the case of diplomacy, though it is a given that consuls would gather information for their sovereigns, the establishment of Ottoman embassies in western capitals was still a century away. There was no regular communication across the straits of the Bosporus, so there was no real diplomacy to speak of. As for international law, while the Europeans considered *capitula* as binding and reciprocal contracts between sovereign states (as they reciprocated rights for Ottoman subjects in the European states concerned), Ottoman subjects were still considered outside the scope of European international law given some of their practices. Particularly offensive to European morality was the bondage of war prisoners. The infamous Janissary Corps, ranked by the fittest and ablest young boys plucked from conquered Christian families at the age of nine on average, converted to Islam, and trained in war and administration, was at the top of the list of offences. Again, the Porte saw these *capitula* as unilateral actions which were beneficial to the empire and sanctioned by the Koran; allowing foreigners to enforce justice by their own custom was merely an extension of the rules used to govern Jews and Christians already living in the empire. Furthermore, they were non-permanent: *capitula* were valid only during the lifetime of the Sultan who had proclaimed them unless renewed by his successor (Watson, 1992: p. 217).

To paraphrase historians in the language of the English School, the situation can be described as two international societies within what was increasingly becoming a single system, divided by a single issue; relations revolved around a simple balance and could be likened to a holy cold war. As would be the case four and a half centuries later, the stronger of the two societies would eventually 'absorb' the other. But while the Porte was powerful enough, it could survive in self-imposed isolation from Europe. A series of territorial losses to Persia and to Europe during the mid to late seventeenth century weakened the previously undefeated empire, and after a second failure at the gates of Vienna in 1683, the absorption of the Ottoman Empire by the West was only a matter of time. The Peace of Carlowitz, accompanied by a treaty of the same name (1699), was the first in which the Porte ever ceded territory. Parts of the Balkans and the Peloponnesus were handed over to Austria, Poland and Venice. Peter the Great would negotiate a separate peace to buy himself enough time to close his northern front. In 1718, even

more land was signed away after the Tsar provoked the Porte into declaring war. Peter would not hold the land he invaded, but Vienna would keep everything north of the line running from Sarajevo to Bucharest according to the treaty of Passowaritz (1718). From then on, the Porte would be on the defensive. "Il n'est pas adapté à une interruption de son expansion territoriale. L'armée vit du butin autant que de la solde. Il n'y a plus de nouveaux territoires, donc moins de butin, donc moins de revenu" (Ternon, 2005: pp. 61-62). Unversed in the economic principles of their neighbours, the sultanate had under-estimated the importance of the capitulations. As goods flowed out of the Levant and Anatolia and gold and other wealth flowed in from the New World at unregulated rates, the empire's currency was debased markedly and persistently from the start of the eighteenth century. Corruption, nepotism and incompetence further reduced tax revenue. Together, these ever-increasing weaknesses finally provided the Porte with the impetus to reconsider its cultural isolationism (Toynbee, 1962: pp. 24-27; Aktar, 1985: p. 34).

The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same (1719-1815)

Across the straits, the Vatican's sway in matters of state had been weakening before the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), the most commonly accepted point of departure for a European international society based on secular, 'logical' foreign policies, but it still retained a powerful influence. The gradual rift between faith and politics initially led to a new conception of international society. The days of the crusades were over and gone with them was the horizontal organization between sovereigns. This move away from a solidarism rooted in Catholicism generated a pluralist international society ordered by natural law, whose universalist principles extended the fundament of mutual recognition of sovereignty across the board, at least in theory. Voltaire's famous quote about "la grande république" reveals that despite this pluralist shift and the theoretical inclusion of non-European powers into a broader, though looser, society of states, shared history made manifest in similar cultures and shared norms and institutions still supported what Grotius had expressed one century prior: that Europe was like the inner ring of an ever-growing spider web. The House of Ösman would soon become more entwined.

In 1717, the Europhile Sultan Ahmed III (1703-1730), with the support of his Grand Vizir, made the decision to open the empire to the West. The importance of this decision should be put in perspective. Hanafite Islam is an indivisible whole; there are no clear lines between the individual, the family, and the state. Laws of appropriate conduct have been handed down by

God and misbehaviour in any realm is a sin. For that reason, the decision to pursue further contact with infidels is very important. But one must remember that the Porte did not at first envision any serious reforms to come from these openings. It had experienced first-hand what modernization could accomplish at the tips of Peter the Great's bayonets, and planned on making technical and technological ameliorations to its military, and nothing more. (Ternon, 2005: p. 76). The Ottoman elite had no doubts pertaining to the moral -and by connection, political superiority of Islam and the empire. Throughout the eighteenth century, the problem was purely understood as a technological deficiency. In other words, the first Ottoman reformers were not really reformers at all, but statesmen who were slightly more open-minded than their predecessors. Necessity had forced them to contort Hanafite jurisprudence in order to dilute the concept of jyhad, allowing for a more stable and durable alliances with European powers (Naff, 1984: p. 150-153). Almost immediately, an Islamic conservative movement surfaced, allying the Ulema with the Janissaries. These elite and once meritocratic soldiers and bureaucrats had become increasingly corrupt and nepotistic however, selling their stations, accepting bribes for favours, and making or breaking Sultans at their pleasure.

The Tulip Era (1717-1730) would mark the end of the long and almost purely antagonistic initial phase of Ottoman-European relations. In 1720, Louis XV received the first ever Ottoman delegation. Thus commenced a period of data absorption, and by the end of that decade, the Porte had amassed an impressive collection of Western military manuals. In 1727, the Sheik ul-Islam (the empire's spiritual second-in-command) had produced a fatwa allowing the translation and publication of secular books, and on January 31, 1729, the first book ever printed in the Islamic world rolled of the press in Istanbul (nearly all publications consisted of military and medical manuals; Berkes, 1998: pp. 48-49). When Ahmed attempted to open an engineering school in 1730, the Janissaries forced his abdication with the support of the Islamic jurists. The school was shut down. They blamed the Empire's weakness on the Sultan's impiety and could not accept this latest breach of Koranic law. In reality, any change in the status quo, especially in terms of military organization, was a threat to the Janissaries' power. Likewise, it was the madrassa school system that produced the Ulema's jurists, and foreign influences in scholarship were a threat to the conservative social elements, and to the empire's traditional culture in general. Even guilds, of paramount economic importance and serving as the link between the productive classes and government, preferred the artisan to the machine and thus

acted as a conservative agent. Scribes and calligraphers protested the opening of Istanbul's first press in 1729, for example. The press had been known to Turks since the early seventeenth century. Chelebi Mehmed, Ahmed III's emissary to the Bourbon Court, displayed great familiarity with the machines he was shown in France. Chelebi's son Said Mehmed, who accompanied his father to France, would eventually become the first Turk to speak French as far as history recalls. He would return to Paris in 1741 to find friends from his first visit, frequent operas and flirt with courtesans. Voltaire even postponed performances of his play *Mahomet* out of courtesy during Said's visit. (ibid: pp. 34-36). This swing of the Ottoman pendulum between progressive and conservative periods persists to this day, though to a much less dramatic scale.

Russian ascension would mark the eighteenth century for the whole of Europe as it would for the Ottomans. Istanbul and Saint Petersburg's fates were bound together. It was Ottoman strength that had prompted Peter the Great's reforms with European consent, hoping for a strong Christian, albeit Orthodox power on the Ösmanli's northern frontier. Once its westernization complete with modern professional armies, universities and a Polish Tsarina who corresponded regularly with the likes of Voltaire and Diderot, it would be Russia's turn to push the Turks further into the European institutions in search of allies. The momentary reprieve granted by Peter's northern campaigns gave the Ottomans an opportunity to 'learn the ropes' of European diplomacy. After 1683, and even more so after Passowaritz, concessions were no longer unilaterally handed down by an omnipotent Sultan, but were in fact negotiated and would later be imposed from the other end. During the eighteenth century, the Porte had but one unallied victory against a European power in the 1738-39 campaign against Austria, which was waged as part of a conservative backlash after Ahmed's deposal.

Even amongst conservatives however, an awareness of the necessity of defensive treaties with Europeans became painfully obvious. The need for outside help would of course draw the sultanate further into the European balance of power. Envoys to European capitals increased, especially to Versailles, the Porte's oldest ally and the cultural centre of Europe at the time. France would gain further preferential trade concessions as well as dominion over Latin Christians in the Empire in 1740, in exchange for an agreement of mutual defence in the case an of Austrian attack. Foreign missions in the Pera, on Istanbul's western shore commonly reserved for non-Ottomans, increased both in size and in number. With Russia looking north, and with the Austrian Wars of Succession (1740-1763) and American and Central Asian expansion occupying

the continental powers at home and abroad, the Porte was mostly left alone until Catherine the Great turned her sights on the Crimea. The 1770's brought one military disaster after another for Istanbul, who was forced to sign the treaty of Kuchuk Kainarja in July, 1774, granting Russia dominion over Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire, unlimited access to the Black Sea, the Sea of Azov and to the Straits, and sovereignty over all land between the Dniepr and the Boug. The Ottomans resisted, declaring war on Catherine in 1787 with the encouragement of the British. But by 1790, the Foreign Office had thrown its lot in with the Tsarina to counter-balance against France, who was of course, in no position to help its oldest Eastern ally at the time. In 1792, Russia imposed the treaty of Jassy, re-establishing the terms of 1774. Jassy would bring to light three tendencies that will become irrefutably clear by their numerous and successive examples: first, Ottoman reforms would, save for a few isolated instances, never be progressive, but always reactionary to a loss of power; second, as already noted, reformative actions themselves would always be accompanied by a conservative reaction; and third, convergence of the outward-looking institutions of the Ottoman Empire with European norms and practices cannot be disassociated with *internal* institutional changes and convergence with European norms and practices.

Nevertheless, the union of the Ottoman and European systems was nearing completion. The Ottomans were, by the end of the eighteenth century, an integral part of balancing calculations amongst the French, the Romanoffs, the Habsburgs and more recently, of the English, and vice versa. Selim III (1789-1807), one of the more enlightened Sultans to have ruled, established the Porte's first permanent embassies in 1792, in the four of the most important capitals of the day (Paris, London, Vienna and Berlin). This was a small and very tardy step forward considering that during the three quarters of a century that had elapsed since Ahmed's envoys, numerous treaties had been negotiated, a high number of foreign officers came to serve in Ottoman ranks, and extensive commercial relations had developed between East and West. In another swing of the pendulum towards the reformist end, Selim managed to send a contingent of 150 students to European schools. He expanded the engineering school, which had been reopened in 1768, and staffed it with French professors. He even opened a Turkish-run engineering school eight years later which he attended himself, and sent further special envoys to European capitals to study the internal organization of European governments. The Sultan had also learned much about the infidels' law of nations. After the Wars of Succession, he had gone

so far as to offer his mediation, causing some raised eyebrows in European diplomatic circles. The offer was declined, but politely. More revealing in terms of Ottoman understanding was a comment by Selim III's Grand Vizir upon the Russian Black Sea squadron's unannounced entry into the Straits in 1799.

> The Reis Effendi (meaning Selim) should take this opportunity to remind the Russian interpreter in an amicable way of the international rules of conduct and of the clauses of the treaty (of Jassy) governing the matter. It is contrary to the canons of international law that a war fleet should enter a foreign port without specifying the number of vessels. This act of the Russians causes agitation among ill-intentioned persons. They look on such acts as insults to our state (taken from Naff, 1984: pp. 159-160; parentheses added).

The Ottomans were too big and still too powerful to be quartered and divvied as Poland had been, yet militarily and economically, they were weak enough to be treated as a minor power. This was definitively so from 1774 on, even when it was the only non-European power in the anti-hegemonial coalition against Bonaparte, and perhaps even the holder of that balance. The proof is in the pudding. Selim's downfall would be his commitment to alliances with Sweden (1790) and Prussia (1791), both against Russia, and both to be neglected by Stockholm and Berlin in 1792 in favour of *status quo ante bellum* with St. Petersburg (ibid: p.160-161).

Europe found itself in a state of perpetual war from that year on until the end of 1814. Battles were not merely fought between states, but between political systems. It is tempting to attribute such double-crossing behaviour on the part of Europeans towards the Ösmanli as part of the tradition of unequal treaties that would last well into the 1900's, but in reality, this was not drastically different from the way European states treated each other at the time. "La partie consiste à contracter des alliances: les reines entres elles, avec ou contre le roi noir, avec ou sans les pions. Elle se joue par coups successifs et s'étend sur un siècle. Aucune alliance n'est donc définitive. Chaque partenaire est donc menacé par les autres. D'européene, la partie devient vite mondiale" (Ternon, 2005: p. 120). As Selim was sucked into the Napoleonic Wars, he was judged a puppet of the Franks by his subjects, and a traitor by the Janissaries. Having lost Egypt to Bonaparte, his end would come in the shape of a military reform policy called Nizam-e Jadid, a Farsi phrase meaning 'new military', and once again, with the support of the Ulema, he and his heir apparent were assassinated, leaving Mahmud II (1807-1839) the only living male descendant of Ösman on the Ottoman throne.

Two Steps Forward (1818-1856)

The Porte was neither summoned to Vienna nor to Aachen, but big changes were to European international society were around the corner. Mahmud II is most renowned for two achievements: he built the Sublime Porte in 1834, but before that, he destroyed the last of the Janissaries with cannon fire in June, 1826. It took him some 17 years to do so because as soon as he had come to power, an attempt to continue Selim's military innovations resulted in yet another rebellion in 1809, perpetrated by the usual suspects. Istanbul was losing Mediterranean territories to France, then to England. Russia had pushed southwards along the Black Sea coast and continued to gain influence in the Balkans. Mahmud was wise enough to wait until his Prussian-trained armies won victories against Mehmet Ali's forces to demonstrate the efficacy of European militarism to the Ulema and other conservative institutions (Ternon, 2005: pp. 140-141). He was the first Sultan to see his empire as an Ottoman state containing a variety of ethnicities and faiths rather than as the home of the Umma. At the very least, he did not see the empire exclusively as the latter. He embodied many other innovations. Mahmud II was the first Sultan to base his understanding of sovereignty on the citizenry, first Sultan to learn French, and most importantly, first to realize that the traditional institutions of the Ottoman Empire had to change before any worthwhile degree of modernity could be achieved (Berkes, 1964: p 90-92).

In 1824, he had initiated compulsory primary education, though it was not secular. The ability of the state to maintain this policy to an effective degree is debatable however, for as late as the 1870's, the illiteracy rate was as high as 90% in what was then left of the Ottoman Empire, with statistics varying greatly between urban and rural areas in favour of the former (Garnier, 1973: p. 45). Primary education in the madrassa system did not concern itself with literacy; arts and trades are the product of science, serving man in this world, while Islam is concerned with salvation in the world to come. Furthermore, madrassas utilized Arabic script, which was ill-suited to Turkish phonetics. After having gained the support of the religious castes, Istanbul's naval and military academies, staffed by foreigners, opened in 1827 and in 1834 respectively, followed by a teaching hospital for war surgery attached to the naval arsenal at Galata Saray in 1838. Necessities being what they were, the hospital's main function soon turned out to be obstetric. "That Muslim women should have been willing as early as 1839 to have their accouchements superintended by infidel Frankish physicians shows how rapidly the anti-Western prejudice was already breaking down" (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: p. 47).

By the 1840's, the reformist momentum was picking up with the *Tanzimat* -literally 'reorderings' era (roughly 1839-1875), during which few of the changes to government made by Mahmud were consolidated by his spendthrift son, Abdul Medjid. To describe the Tanzimat as an epoch of institutional evolution is partially inaccurate. Certain institutions did change, but in most cases, education and the justice system being the most obvious, new Western style administrations were created and emplaced without the abolition of their Ottoman forerunners. Mahmud had decommissioned certain palatial offices and replaced them with an administration of ministers each in charge of the quasi-autonomous departments of internal, external, financial, commercial, educational, agricultural and industrial affairs, led by a *bashvekil* or chief minister. The office of the Seyul Islam, whose political powers Mahmud also sought to reduce through the removal of temporal responsibilities, was actually reinforced by the administrative transformation since it inherited jurisdiction over the entire court system. Mahmud is often and mistakenly credited with the establishment of the first Turkish penal code, when in reality, the codes he did create addressed the responsibilities of officials and included penalties for incompetence and corruption, hence the erroneous categorization. Nevertheless, these were the first codified rules outside the Sheriat. So alien was the concept of government accountability and of public service that the code was unpopular with the very public it was meant to protect (Berkes, 1998: pp. 98-99).

Legal reforms would become central during the Tanzimat and the catalyst would be economic this time. In 1838, the Foreign Office would enforce free trade, and though economic liberalism increased trade flows by connecting Ottoman farms directly to the European agricultural market, there would nevertheless be very little sustained growth in the Porte's economy. Turkey represents one of the first instances of non-colonial foreign economic development in modern history, and the problems faced then are no different than those of the twentieth-first century. Trade liberalization demanded a new commercial code of laws which facilitated and guaranteed foreign investment, and increased foreign control as a consequence. There was no capitalist class to speak of among the Turkish Ottomans, and the Greek, Armenian and Balkan bourgeoisies which traditionally formed the empire's merchant classes were little inclined to partake in burgeoning sentiments of economic nationalism. Foreign commercial companies, banks and insurance firms set up shop in the major Ottoman ports. Though military improvements had greatly improved tax collection and security throughout the empire by the

1840s, the cost of maintaining a professional conscripted army was overwhelming. Reform is an expensive endeavour and the Porte's economy was still caught in a feudal configuration. Faced with western industrial capitalism, it was helpless to prevent penetration as Europeans gained monopolies in several important areas of trade. Infrastructure, starting with roads, ports and lighthouses, but later including rail and telegraph lines were also developed by European contractors with foreign capital (Toynbee and Kirkwood: p. 46; Aktar: p. 46).

The Ottoman Empire furnished raw materials and outlet markets for a Europe booming demographically as well as economically and industrialization provided the latter with more and more buying power as well as access to cheaper foodstuffs from abroad, including the Near East (Keynes, 1920: pp. 5-17). As Ottoman agriculture was increasingly 'plugged into' European markets, sectoral specialization arose on ethno-geographic lines that would later accelerate the spread of various nationalisms, and ultimately, the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire (Berkes, 1998: pp.140-142). Matters only got worse as time elapsed. The extractive nature of western economic penetration coupled with the increased cost burden of reforms would mean that from the Tanzimat on, the vicious cycle of capital flight leading to foreign loans, resulting in loss of sovereignty and autonomy, thus creating the need for more reforms, costing more money, requiring more concessions to secure loans ad infinitum, would become endemic. It would also become a favoured means of manipulation by foreign offices across Europe (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: pp. 244-245). As of 1865, virtually all new loans were paying old debts and so was 60% of Ottoman revenue. The empire's heavy military expenditures and inelastic revenue sources meant that large groups of rentiers in the UK and France held a direct stake in Ottoman stability (Anderson, 1966: p.174). Furthermore, by impoverishing the Ottoman peasantry indirectly for a number of reasons, free trade would further accentuate urban-rural cleavages and the unfavourably viewed reforms would drive the children of classes left behind towards the conservative camp and into the madrassa system. The small urban middle classes were much more likely to have their sons schooled in the institutions of secondary education run by foreigners, of which there were over 250 by 1870 (Ternon, 2005: pp. 152-154).

If there was a silver lining to this dark cloud looming over the Porte, it was that the inadequacies of its legal system were made undeniably obvious, and beginning with the commercial code of 1838, legal reforms took on a new vigour. The Tanzimat were actually ushered in by the Rose Chamber charter which bound the patriarch to the laws of the empire,

though legislation was not carried out by elected officials and was subject to final approval by the Sultan himself. The charter also called for the creation of codified laws in areas not covered by the Sheriat, thus widening the breach between the secular and the religious. A mixed tribunal for commercial suits which used France's 1807 commercial code became the first court outside the jurisdiction of the Seyul Islam starting in 1840. A criminal code mixing Sheriat and secular concepts was published that same year, but incompatibility led to another in 1851, and yet another based mostly on the Napoleonic Code, in 1858. During the Tanzimat, more and more areas of Ottoman life came to fall under secular elements of governance, but bifurcation would remain the defining element of Ösmali rule, and continued well into the first quarter of the twentieth century, though it was most pronounced during the mid-nineteenth. The court system had at times a theatrical element about it, as differently costumed lawyers and judges would trade places between secular/criminal and civil/religious proceedings (Berkes, 1964: 162-164). If irreconcilability of the two legal systems was not yet perceived by Ottoman reformers, it was nevertheless a source of concern to European statesmen. There is an often-cited quote by the Tyrolean Metternich, Austrian Chancellor at the time, which reflects this well:

> We recommend the Porte the following policy- Build your government upon the basis of adherence to the religious institutions which are the essentials of your very existence [...] because western institutions are based on principles that are different from those forming the bases of your empire. Restez turcs mais alors consultez la loi musulmane (from Berkes, *op cit* : pp. 148-149).

European political norms and ideals had begun to trickle into intellectual circles in the Ottoman Empire as early as the 1730's. Some had contact with Europeans and had learned on their own, such as Said Chelebi, and of course, there were Selim's academic envoys. Others such as Ibrahim Müteferrika were more typical of what was to come. Müteferrika's foremost interests were scientific. He had written the first Turkish treaties on Cartesian geometry and Galilean astronomy but had had to learn several European languages including Latin to do so. He was an ethnic Hungarian and a convert from Unitarianism, but his linguistic skills had opened up a new universe for him. In 1731, he printed a book entitled Rational Bases for the Politics of Nations in which he discusses different Western political concepts such as monarchy, aristocracy and even democracy, and the roles of the military in each of the three configurations. Müteferrika viewed Europe as a Christian empire, and said of his own that since "neither the statesmen nor the public cared to learn the causes of [European success] and did not consider them important, it has now

become an evident and urgent need to collect information about the details of European affairs in order to repel their harm and to prevent their malice" (from Berkes, *op cit*: pp. 43-44).

A very small group of intellectual elites thus became acquainted with European culture, and by the late 1790s, European vestments and alcohol had made their way onto Istanbul's Eastern shore. So had the understanding amongst a select few that there was no band-aid solution to reform. When the Porte introduced Western style institutions of higher learning during Mahmud II's reign, the focus and the foreseen applications were still exclusively military. Even the engineering and medical faculties were erected with combative aims in mind. These schools found it more practical to teach in French than to translate manuals. Foreign languages thus became an integral part of curricula from day one. By allowing for Western-style academies and opening their doors to all who demonstrated capability (and who could afford tuition), Mahmud stimulated the creation of an elite class of intellectuals. By placing the graduates of western schools in the bureaucratic functions left vacant by the abolished slave-classes to which the Janissaries and palace staff belonged, Mahmud also ensured that the primary Ottoman and later Turkish agent of reform would be the state, and more specifically, the upper ranks of the military (Bozdağlioğlu, 1993: pp. 38-39). Atatürk himself would be a product of this phenomenon. He would start his education in a Western-style normal school and continue at a high school intended for the training of Salonika's bureaucrats.

By the late Tanzimat, this intellectual class was beginning to take on a life of its own. During the 1860's, the growing westernized intellectual class began to elucidate the particularities of Ottoman identity. Though nationalism had been sweeping through the western provinces of the empire quite naturally since the early eighteenth century given the combination of religious and ethno-linguistic homogeneities and later, economic specializations, the idea was slow to take hold in the central areas of the empire due Islam's religious definitions of identity and citizenship. Ibrahim Sinasi (1824-1871) was the first Turkish writer to tackle such issues as nationalism and liberalism, and did so openly in his opinion-based newspaper, the first to be Turkish-owned (1861). He was also a literary pioneer given that he wrote in a simple, almost conversational Turkish rather than in literary Arabic or Farsi. Sinasi was adept at translation from French, but he was only one of the best among many. "Translations were made of almost all of the French literature which provided the intellectual background for the French Revolution. The works of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, Fénélon, Fontenelle, and Volney enjoyed

particular attention" and if the numbers of copies published are any indicator, these authors found an audience among Tanzimat intellectuals, as did Molière and Racine (Berkes, 1998: p. 199).

One of the most important Ottoman thinkers also emerged during the Tanzimat. Namik Kemal (1840-1888) was the main inspiration behind the birth of the Ottoman constitutional movement and of the Young Ottomans [2] in 1858, and perhaps the first Ösmanli intellectual to suggest that an application of the principles of natural rights to the legal and philosophical tenets of Islam may be possible. He also clarified the idea of popular sovereignty raised by Mahmud, but he was more conscious of the West's invasiveness, and thus painfully aware of the dangers of fighting fire with fire, of becoming more European in order to keep Europeans at bay. Namik Kemal was the bridge between what was and what was to come. Mustafa Kemal (no relation) would write of his second year at the Istanbul military academy in 1900, that

> c'est à ce moment-là que la pensée politique commence à nous occuper. Nous ne parvenons pas à nous rendre un compte exact de la situation. C'est à l'époque du Sultan Abdülhamid. Nous lisons les livres de Namik Kemal. Une nuit, j'appelle Ali Fuat et je lui donne un examplaire du Panégyrique de la mère patrie de Namik Kemal; je lui demande de l'apprendre par coeur. Je lui en lis un passage à voix basse: "Que tout les désordres et les fardeaux du mondes se rassemblent sur mes épaules, je ne tournerai pas le dos au service que je dois à mes compatriots (Atatürk, 2005: p. 9).

Whether or not he was aware of Metternich's warning, Namik Kemal's brand of nationalism was based in Islamic faith and included all Ottoman subjects regardless of ethnicity. In his thinking, rights should be subject to the will of the majority, but based in the conception of 'good' as determined by Islamic law within a constitutional system framed by an institutional model closely resembling Napoleonic France (ibid: pp. 210-213).

So far, we have discussed the major changes within Turkish society that represent a fair degree of modernization and of convergence with European political practices of the nineteenth century- the 'two steps forward'. Before discussing the 'step back', the international context must be brought back into the foreground. International societies vacillate too. Watson and Bull (1984), and Watson (1992) in particular, have observed that states'-societies 'swing' between pluralism and solidarism. Napoleon Bonaparte may have failed to unite Europe under his own

---

[2] It was Namik Kemal who drafted the Young Ottoman manifesto from Paris, demanding a constitution and a parliamant from the Sultan

banner, but in the end, he caused the major powers to create a union based on cooperation rather than dominion. The Treaty of Vienna (1815) is a reaffirmation of the balance of power. The agreement reached at Aachen three years later, to which France was also party, takes that affirmation one step further. Traditionally, the BOP was a negative affair; it was supposed to be the natural result of states pursuing self-interest. For the first time since the remnants of the Holy Roman Empire had disintegrated, a positive and horizontal organization between states' leaders re-emerged, but this time rooted more deeply in reason than in faith. The five major powers of the day (France, England, Germany, Austria and Russia) agreed to cooperate, even to collude, not only to deter hegemonic aspirations, but to manage the economic and political affairs of a rapidly growing international system. So began the Concert of Europe. If a shore-bound ship sails forth too slowly during a rising tide, it may find itself further from its destination as time goes by. In the nineteenth century, the Porte was at the helm of such a ship. Reforms came too slowly and too ineffectually during a time when European international society was rapidly gaining solidarity, which resulted in a much more rigorous standard of civilization.

Among ES authors, Gerritt W. Gong has paid the most attention to the European states-society's standard, dedicating an entire book to the exploration of this concept. He has noted that prior to the end of the nineteenth century, it was implicit and vague but that "[b]y 1905 at the very latest, a standard of civilization had emerged as an explicit legal principle and an integral part of the doctrines of international law prevailing at the time" (Gong, 1984b: p. 14). He goes on to say that these laws emerged as crystallized and elaborated versions of the early customs and norms governing the treatment of foreign nationals in non-European countries. The Ottoman capitulations being among the earliest of such treaties, served as the basis, or at least the inspiration for the first arrangements with Eastern empires such as China, Japan and the Indian states'-society. To Gong, the standard of civilisation has five main requirements. First, certain basic rights such as security of the person and of property and freedom of worship, travel and commerce had to be guaranteed. Second, states considered 'civilized' had to have a political organization capable of delivering and protecting freedoms, order and domestic institutions so as to maintain internal security and sovereignty. In addition, domestic institutions created or reformed along western models were favoured by Europe, and as Toynbee points out, none more so than parliament (Tonybee, 1925). Third, states had to observe the principles of international law. Fourth, states had to maintain permanent diplomatic channels. Gong goes on to state that

despite general acceptance of the concept by mid to late nineteenth century international lawyers, the standard of civilization was little more than a "blunt legal instrument". This is reflected by his fifth and intentionally vague and tautological criterion, that 'civilized states' adopt 'civilized norms' and customs, and avoid or outlaw practices considered barbaric such as slavery (Gong, 1984b: ch. 1). Clearly, the increasingly juridical 'standard' of the nineteenth century was a European one. Even seemingly unambiguous political concepts such as 'freedom' and 'security' cannot entirely be separated from the cultural context in which they are developed and applied.

Somewhat paradoxically, the 'standard' was devised as a means of including non-Europeans in the society of states. The 'new' Europe had first begun to spread across the globe in the late fifteenth century through trade. As the full potential of that economic system was unleashed by the industrial and scientific revolutions' advancements in transportation, communication and weaponry, the occident colonized and subjugated Asia, Africa and the New World. One of the many consequences of European sprawl was that by early in the nineteenth century, a great deal of economic interdependence existed; indeed, the world was but a hop and a skip away from becoming the global international system we live in today. Increased interdependence meant that relatively weak states traditionally outside European powers' calculations or influence could now tie up railways or shipping lines, hindering trade and creating disruptions, and of sewing disorder in the whole system in the worst cases. By bringing other 'civilized' states into European international society, the West would gain colleagues in the maintenance of order throughout the world. At least that was the idea. As such, the increased level of solidarism in European international society does not by itself explain the increased stringency of the rules of membership. The vital necessity for assistance in creating world order, which also increased the demands of the standard, would only increase with European penetration of the East and the South.

The scientific revolution is also intimately linked to the 'raising of the bar'. As Christian doctrine gave way to international relations guided by natural law in the eighteenth century, positivism and positive international law would redefine relations with Asia and Africa in the mid to late nineteenth century. August Comte's six volume *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (1830-1842) is obviously linked to James Lorimer's famous legal classification of states into savage, barbarous and civilized (Gong, 1984b: pp.42-49; Pyenson & Sheets-Pyenson, 1999: pp. 419-423). Comte had divided the evolution of thought, and consequently of human society, into three

consecutive stages: the theological, the metaphysical and the scientific. The pinnacle of intellectual evolution being the scientific mind, Christian moral superiority was thus transposed into a sense of superiority that, though perhaps not purely the result of military and economic preponderance, was greatly enhanced by it. Greater means were taken as a sign of greatness *tout court*. Lorimer put into positive law in 1883 what Comte had contemplated four decades earlier, and as Gong correctly points out, what had already been in the practice of European colonial powers for nearly two centuries. The mandate system of 1919 would be, as the South African General Jan Smuts commented, nothing but colonialism by another name. Sadly, positive international law aided in the justification of unequal treatment of those areas of the world deemed barbarous or savage, and a clear line can be drawn from straight from Grotius to Lorimer, and later to others such as Oppenheim. Though he never openly advocated war on the Turks, Lorimer, like Grotius, believed that they did not belong to the 'civilized races' (Howard, 1984: p. 35-37; Gong, 1984b: pp. 26-49).

Increased solidarity after Aachen does not equate with contemporary European unity by any means, but the bellicose competition of the eighteenth century gave way to contests of an extraterritorial and often economic nature that diffused continental militarism to a great extent (Watson, 1984a). Even so, the Ottoman Empire represented a constant source of friction between the UK, France and Russia. The most intense rivalry after the Napoleonic Wars was between London and Saint Petersburg. Both their empires were expanding east, placing the Ottomans in the middle of the scuffle for several reasons. Of paramount importance to the British, who would somewhat replace France in the pecking order of Ottoman foreign affairs during the nineteenth century, were shipping and rail lines to the British Raj. The need to control the Black Sea straits and rail lines through Anatolia and Persia, and the Suez Canal from 1869 onwards, would place them in direct conflict with Russian influence in the Near-East, with the added complication of possibly alienating Muslims of which there were several million under British rule or influence. France, who had shifted alliances from the London to Saint Petersburg, was caught in the middle. Somewhat withdrawn from political ambitions in Turkey and the Levant given its ebbing status, coupled towards the end of the nineteenth century with the ineptness of Napoleon III, the Quay d'Orsay was playing both sides in order to protect the considerable sums of public and private funds invested in the region.

The Ottomans also learned to play sides against each other to get what they wanted, and

none had more talent for this game than Sultan Abdul-Hamid II. It was perhaps a clever way to survive, but it had the dual effect of increasing tension amongst the world powers in general. A revival of Christian missionary movements in the mid 1800's also strained relations between the Porte and Europe (Gillard, 1984: p. 96). Russia and France would use the plight of Christian Ottomans as a pretext to gain influence and the right to intervene on behalf of Orthodox and Catholics respectively should these groups need protection. Stratford Canning (later Stratford de Redcliffe), twice British ambassador to the Porte, even succeeded in placing his personal agenda for Britain to gain such rights over Ottoman Protestants at the forefront of the Foreign Office's policies.

The 1840's were marked by mistrust between France and England mainly over Middle-Eastern shipping, and between France and Russia over capitulatory rights and influence in the 'Holy Land'. Great Britain and Russia were a distant cry from any steady collaboration given competitive expansionism in Asia. Mutual distrust was always in the background of international agreements and this particular triangle of antagonistic Russian, French and British goals created a kaleidoscopic pattern of alliance-shifting which left the Porte spinning at the centre. It would cause the Crimean War and dictate the clauses of the resulting Treaty of Paris (1856), whose terms would actually precipitate the Eastern crises of 1875-78 and the subsequent 'balkanization' of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1852, the Porte succumbed to both Paris and Saint Petersburg, granting them dominion over Catholics and Orthodox respectively in the Holy Land. This act increased tensions, but not to an overwhelming degree, since the two collaborated in quelling national uprisings in Wallachia, Poland and Hungary later that same year (Anderson, 1966: pp. 116-117). By this period, an anti Russian sentiment was brewing in England, and in 1853, the Foreign Office and the Quay d'Orsay had agreed to check Russian advances into the Caucasus. The Tsar's intransigence in the matter led to a confrontation over capitulations that left hard-liners in the Duma pushing for dominion over all Orthodox Christian in the Ottoman Empire, an astonishing two-fifths of its overall population at the time.

Russian sabre-rattling got out of control. In mid-September, riots broke out in Istanbul and cries for blood overwhelmed the Divan, the Sultan's grand council, into declaring war on the 25th of that month. The British and French tried to limit the hostilities by sending fleets into the Black Sea and by inviting both parties to peace talks. The offer was declined by both sides in January 1854. In March, the Foreign Office and Quay d'Orsay signed defence treaties with the

Porte that ended up dragging them into combat at the end of the month. The Crimean War and Treaty of Paris foreshadowed the First World War in many ways. For one thing, it was the first conflict fought with modern weaponry and in which front-line journalists would affect policy through their influence over public opinion (Ternon, 2005: p. 169). More importantly, it demonstrated the fallibility and escalatory potential of the balance of power in the Turkish context. The Crimean was an accidental war in many ways. Economic imperatives aside, given the Ottoman Empire's geographically central location, misgovernment by the Porte seemed to justify European involvement beyond what was within the 'regulatory bounds' of the balance of power. In other words, the stakes were just too high for the BOP to be applied unselfishly; *raison d'état* outweighed *raison de système*.

Though no state may have wanted war, they were all responsible for its outbreak. England would reinforce the Porte; it was part of the buffer running from the Bosporus to Afghanistan, and its stability was detrimental to Russian power and an obstacle to her southern goals. Prussia and Austro-Hungary, being stuck in the middle, played the roles of mediators and moderators, though often negotiating outcomes that were in their favour. They held the balance as much as possible because all out war between Russia and the UK would have left them caught in the crossfire, and rapprochement between France and Russia would likely threaten their security as well. Balkan instability was a particular danger to the Habsburgs, though the rampant spread of nationalism was a source of concern to all. Needless to say Russia's Pan-Slavic foreign policies in the Balkan, Baltic and Black Sea regions were also a cause of consternation to Vienna. The old saying that politics makes for strange bedfellows applies to nineteenth century Europe with the addendum that it also makes for lots of them. Everyone was with and against everyone else when it came to the Ösmanli, and this Gordian knot of international relations made partition of Ottoman lands impossible. The only option left was stabilization of the Porte, though this too would be greatly complicated by Europe's competing interests.

The Treaty of Paris was the first to include a non-European power, though most historians and international relations theorists agree that this was more of a ploy to keep the Ottoman Empire together by pulling it in under the full aegis of international law than an actual admittance into European international society (Gong, 1984b: pp. 110-113; Naff, 1984: p. 169; Anderson, 1966: pp. 142-143). Even then, efforts were sceptical and half-hearted. A separate, uneasy multi-lateral agreement was signed between France, Austria and Great Britain (without

the Porte) towards mutual defence of Ottoman territorial integrity. Austria and Russia also agreed bilaterally not to intervene in the western Ottoman territories until after any eventual cessation from the Porte. There were four major points to the treaty of Paris. First, the Sublime Porte's sovereignty was to be fully guaranteed under international law, including access to third party mediation in future crises. Second, the Porte agreed to stop tax-farming the Christian minorities and to grant religious equality throughout the empire. Third, the Danubian principalities would remain under Ottoman suzerainty, and thus out of the Tsar's hands. Finally, the Black Sea would be closed to all military ships but equally open to all merchant vessels. In the end, the treaty did little to weaken Russia while tying the Turks' hands in the Black Sea. As of 1866, Russia completely ignored the naval limitations and had its full maritime freedoms officially reinstated in 1871.

A secondary concern of the treaty was the millet system, used by Ottoman Sultans to govern their non-Islamic subjects. Islamic tradition held that Mohammad had decreed that Jews and Christians be allowed to carry out justice according to their own customs within their communities. This was the basis of the millet, a political institution purposed with self-regulation in civil and religious realms of public life, traceable as far back as 1453 in Ottoman history. Each religious community had its millet and was led by a patriarch; an archbishop each for the Orthodox, two Catholic and later Protestant millets, and a grand rabbi for the Jewish millet. The patriarchs oversaw communal affairs with a fair degree of autonomy though they liaised with the Sultan on a regular basis. Though an avant-guard institution in the early days of the empire, the millet system proved to be little more than a source of headache throughout the nineteenth century. This practice, which included extra taxation for non-Muslims, did not jibe with the European standard of civilization at the time, and as discussed, tended to invite unwelcome European interventions. In Jerusalem, feuding between millets was commonplace and the Ottoman Empire had no shortage of confessional fault lines. The more conflicted, such as between Greek Orthodox and Bulgarian Pomaks in Macedon, or between Druzes and Maronites in Lebanon to name but two, were incessant sources of instability. In both cases, schisms were accentuated by British-French rivalries (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: pp. 143-144; Ternon, 2005: pp.177-182).

Education was part of the millets' mandate, which meant that non-Islamic and non-Ottoman modes of thought were preserved and even entrenched, and though the idea of the

nation-state may have been slow to spread in some of the Islamic parts of the empire, it was adopted quite naturally in the millets. They also accelerated the break-up of the Ottoman Empire by resisting the creation of a new Ottoman identity. The Porte's lands west of the Straits were already ethnically distinct from their Ösmali overlords, and were further distinguished by economic specialization and language. Sandwiched between three empires they did not want to ever join, the region was a veritable powder keg. The millet system shortened the fuse a little. It is worth noting that there were cleavages between Istanbul and many Islamic provinces as well. Particularly in what is now Saudi Arabia, Muslims felt that the Caliphate had been perverted by western influences and that returning to a stricter, purer version of Islam was what the ailing empire needed. These were the Wahabists.

They were not entirely wrong in their claims. International aid had not come without a price. Free trade had impoverished the Turks and led to a very precarious, and now fully Eurasian, balance of power. Abuse of the capitulatory system would intensify after the Crimean War. Administrative reforms since Selim III had been steadily centralizing power, which had two effects. Though won through academic merit in earlier instances, the new bureaucratic positions had at some point become hereditary, which by the 1860's at the very latest, once again led to an ineffectual and corrupt state apparatus (Anderson, 1966: p. 168). Second, Istanbul ended up isolating itself politically from more distant provinces, which in the end, shared the same fate as satellites that have strayed too far from their orbit. Anti-European sentiments, particularly against the British who bore most of the blame for the Crimean war, carried on into the 1860's in great part because the reforms they demanded didn't seem to make sense.

If the 'Eastern Question' were put into words, it would likely be phrased as 'how do we Europeans keep the Ottoman Empire's decline from pushing our international society into an all-out war?' Yet the track record of the nineteenth century shows that most reforms had the exact opposite effect. Educative and military progress caused rifts between governing elites. Legal and fiscal transformations likewise alienated the majority of middle and lower class subjects. Administrative changes helped disjoint the suzerainties. Ironically, the politically savvy Turkish intellectuals of the nineteenth century were tackling the Eastern Question from their own perspective, and to them, the primary duty lay in defining a new Ottoman identity that everyone could live with, thus reversing nationalist fractures. This would remain an impossible task so long as the major European states continued to interfere with internal Ottoman affairs. The

Ottoman Council of State (1868), a precursor to parliament, in which third of members were non-Islamic, and the Ottoman Nationality Law of 1869, which officially based citizenship purely on territoriality (and not faith), evoke the old adage 'too little, too late'. The satellites were already breaking free.

The Ottoman case is curious given that the Sublime Porte was unable to meet Europe's standard of civilization, in large part because the demands of the European international society made it impossible. Generally speaking, both sides share in the blame for the uneasy unification of the two international systems. The Treaty of Paris was the final step towards full amalgamation at the system level and in light of Bull's theory, this argument holds water despite the lack of socio-political international convergence. Regular Ottoman-European diplomacy had been in operation for over six decades and the empire had been part of the European balance of power for much longer. Yet the Treaty in no way granted the Ottomans a role in the concerted creation of international or even regional political order, but only the most basic recognition of territorial sovereignty (and even that's a bit of a stretch considering the Black Sea clauses). The Treaty of Paris did more to regulate European relations where Near-Eastern policies were concerned than it did for relations between Europe and the Ottomans.

One Step Back - The Hamidian Era (1876-1908)

The events leading up to Abdul Hamid's enthronement resemble the ones which would lead to his deposal in 1908: territorial loss. A Christian rebellion against Muslim landlords in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1875 spread through the Balkans. The Bulgarians were next, then the Serbs and Montenegrins in 1876. On the 30th of May, Sultan Abdul Aziz (Mahmud II's second son) took his life after being dethroned. The reign of Abdul Hamid II, who managed to have the legitimate Ösmanli successor declared insane, was much more reminiscent of the old-style Ottoman patriarchy European statesmen found so unpalatable. He is most often described as an autocratic, paranoid tyrant who was childishly obsessed with naval ships. Since Ahmed III, Sultans had had to juggle internal and external influences, whereas "le principe du sultanat hamidien, basé sur le pouvoir absolu du monarque, qu'il importait de sauvegarder, consistait à se défendre quotidiennement contre les deux monstres, qui de droite et de gauche, pouvait l'assaillir, l'Islam et l'Europe" (Garnier, 1973: p. 42). Perhaps having earned the nickname 'génie du déspotisme', Hamid made a Trojan horse out of the constitutional movement. Around the time

of the Treaty of Paris, faith in the Ottomans' ability to reform was waning. On the other side of the veil, crisis upon crisis beginning with the Cretan rebellion of 1860 likewise meant that Ottoman subjects were losing faith in the Sultanate. When Hamid came to power, he outright rejected a proposed armistice, bolstering his reputation back home, but he simultaneously pushed through the composition of a constitution he would hide behind when facing Europe. The inauguration of a constitution guaranteeing freedoms was a welcome event in many European foreign offices because it would provide a check to Russian intervention over Orthodox Ottomans (Berkes, 1964: p. 225). But again, European international society would be hoist on its own petard. The new constitution provided for a parliament composed of a Senate whose members were appointed for life by the Sultan, and a Chamber of Deputies elected by provincial administrations in which the Sultan would always had the final say. The document itself provided very weak protection of the people, but ultimately safeguarded the patriarch's power. Not surprisingly, it was inspired by the French (1814) and imperial German (1871) constitutions, both of which were created by heavily autocratic regimes (ibid: pp.232-242). Parliament opened on March 19, 1877, seating members of all faiths and ethnicities. It lasted eleven months less a week before Abdul Hamid prorogued it, doing so in perfect concordance with the constitution itself on the grounds that financial and diplomatic crises threatened the empire's very existence. It would remain closed for the next thirty one years.

Hamid did manage to bring palpable material improvements to the Ottoman Empire. Railways. reach increased greatly even before the Paris-Vienna-Istanbul line's completion in 1888. The Sultan also posted 30 000 km of telegraphic line. It was said of the Ottoman Empire that it was the only place in he world where the telegraph could be found in places where tracks had not yet been laid. Hamid had indulged his paranoia by creating a very large network of spies to keep tabs on his own government, and the telegraph was merely a means to that end. Otherwise, he was deeply superstitious and did not trust telephones or electricity. The Porte had defaulted on its debts in October, 1875 and Hamid was basically keeping the lion's share of state revenue in his personal accounts, tithing a smaller amount to Islamic institutions, and using whatever was left to make arms purchases from the West and for the empire's payroll -which included salaries for the Sultan's 900 cooks as well as a bribery fund to 'influence' journalists (Garnier, 1973: p. 39-43). In 1881, the despot's hand was forced away from the Porte's purse-strings. The Council of the Ottoman Debt, composed of seven European members representing

various bondholders, took control of revenues accruing from salt, tobacco, stamps and alcohol as well as tributes from Rumelia and Bulgaria, and was to manage these funds to service the public debt. Lord Derby, Disraeli's Foreign Minister and an ardent critic of foreign-imposed reforms, complained two years before the debt council's establishment that even then, "the daily surveillance of which Turkey is the object in her own domestic affairs has reduced her sovereign authority to practically zero" (from Anderson, 1966: p. 226). The deal was not at all unfair in that it did not overburden Turkish finances, but it was nevertheless degradingly intrusive and flagrantly disrespectful of Ottoman sovereignty as guaranteed by the Paris terms.

At the cusp of the Hamidian era, we also begin to see loss of reformative confidence manifest itself in the first inter-European agreements for partitioning in the eventuality of an Ottoman collapse, as well as yet another major shift in alliances over the Eastern Question. Austria and Russia had tried to jointly stabilize the Bosnian crisis of 1875, but their failure resulted in the Berlin Memorandum of 1876 in which they agreed that Austria would get Bosnia-Herzegovina and that Bessarabia would go to the Russians should the Porte lose control over them. That particular contingency never panned out, however. The borders were set multilaterally in 1878 by the Congress of Berlin, with but a symbolic representation from the Porte. "Bismarck, as chairman of the congress, bullied mercilessly Caratheodory Pasha, the chief Turkish delegate, a sign that the Ottoman Empire itself was only a minor factor in the solution of the problems facing the congress" (Anderson, *op cit*: p. 210). Vienna got control of Bosnia but the rest of the area became, for lack of better term, more balkanized. Many detailed volumes have been written about the various national movements, but here, it suffices to note that they added even more complexity to the international relations of Europe. The simple explanation is that international political order, the customs and shared norms between governments which create varying degrees of predictability, was diluted by sheer numbers. Second, should it exist at all, the degree of shared norms is much lower with new states, which are truly terra incognita in terms of their internal political landscapes, not to mention that their domestic disorder can spill-over into the international system. (Lyon) On top of that, and more specifically, they complicated the balance by making Austria and later Germany, previously neutral players, much more active competitors in the east. Oddly, this left the British in a buffering role between Vienna and Saint Petersburg.

Anglophobia had been mounting in Turkey with every added imposition, and events such

as the Suez Canal purchase and especially the Debt Council only upped tensions. Anti-Turkish sentiments were also growing stronger in London since the end of the Crimean, which Abdul Hamid exacerbated to a great degree. Prime Ministers like Palmerstone and Disraeli had no great fondness for the Turks, but they remained both cautious and poised. In 1876, Gladstone had published *The Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*, condemning Ottoman war atrocities in matting the rebellion. When elected Prime-Minister four years later, he withdrew from many commitments to the Porte made by his predecessors:

> Between him and the Sultan lay a gulf of mutual incomprehension and suspicion which proved quite unbridgeable and which rapidly widened. Layard (British minister at Istanbul 1877-1880) had to confess that the Sultan felt "a kind of horror of Mr. Gladstone' and the English statesman repaid the compliment by saying that 'the mind of the Sultan, who is the Turkish government, is a bottomless pit of fraud and falsehood, and he will fulfill nothing except under force or the proximate threat of force (Anderson, 1966: p. 224 - parentheses added).

Abdul Hamid would ally himself with Russia, reversing the traditional relationship between the two empires and leaving the UK farther out in the cold. By the 1880's, Germany began filling the void with its policy of *drang nach Östen*. Berlin had come to fear a renewed Franco-Russian alliance and would address the problem by extending its influence in the Caucasus through economic policy and by constructing the Bagdad railway to funnel in well-priced high-quality manufactured goods. Berlin's ingresses into the Porte's politics were channelled through military reform, of course. German holdings in Turkey would grow fourfold between 1880 and 1914, intensifying competition, rivalry and tensions between Europeans in Turkey (Garnier, 1973: pp. 68-73).

Social changes affected the empire as well. There were many more Turkish intellectuals during the Hamidian era owing to the ever-increasing number of graduates. But where "the Tanzimat intellectual was both valued by others and satisfied with his life, the Hamidian intellectual was frightened, oppressed, feared and suspected" (Berkes, 1998: p. 274). The sultan had surrounded himself with "professional obscurantists" and religious aristocracy, and had granted the police the right to enforce Sheriat laws on the spot in cases of malfeasance. Abdul Hamid was proceeding to rewrite Turkish history and his use of Islam was but a front to legitimize his rule and to resist European influences. Like his constitutionalism, his theocracy was a sham. It was the schools that resisted obscurantism. Secondary education and higher

learning had reached a sort of critical mass; more schools meant better teachers and more of them, which in turn led to better education, and so on. Hamid could not reverse educative reforms because graduates of western learning were ever-increasingly needed to accomplish bureaucratic functions. Furthermore, by the 1890's, and more so at the turn of the century, Turkish youth were generally much more aware of the world beyond the Ottoman Empire. Reading for leisure began to appear and now, the most popular works were not only secular, but fictional. Fortunes were made from translations of Jules Verne's and Alexandre Dumas' works, and Western-style magazines complete with photos appeared, catering to the newer urbanized and industrial classes generated by the railways. Though the Sultan's religious censors were officially in control of what was legally legible, the influx of publications on railways through foreign post offices, over which the Seyul-Islam had no jurisdiction thanks to past capitulations, was beyond their grasp. So were the growing number of Turks capable of translating from French, English and German. Hamid's fiscal and foreign policies were his undoing in the diplomatic community, but back home, it was the schools that stalemated the dissemination of his ideology (ibid: pp. 276-294).

It was only a matter of time before he ran the Porte into the ground, but the series of revolts that would spell his undoing would ultimately bring down European international society and cause a revolution in the principles of order in international relations globally. The new Balkan states caused friction between Russia and Austria. Fearing an alliance between France and Russia, the Germans were already preparing for war in the late 1890's. In the midst of all this, the Porte was still shedding its possessions, near and far. The 1880's saw the arrival of the British in Egypt through financial controls- again because of foreign debt. Europe backed the Greeks in the Greco-Turkish war of 1897, forcing the Porte to cede land in exchange for money. In 1902, France took most of what was left of the Ottoman's North African lands and when Macedon rebelled in 1903, Britain once again imposed an international financial commission to oversee their debt payments through a bit of gunboat diplomacy. There would be many more national uprisings to come, of course, but Macedon was the breaking point for young officers who could no longer stand by as their empire fell to shambles. The Young Turks would reinstate the constitution of 1876 as part of yet another reaction to loss.

Chapter III

Global Metamorphoses: The End of Empires and the Birth of Nations

This chapter will describe and analyze the major internal changes resulting from two hundred years of reforms in the Ottoman Empire, as well as the drastic and rapid evolution of the traditionally accepted principles that perpetuated order in the international system.

Tail End of the Whip: Turkish Nationalism

State-driven modernization had created a curious situation in the Ottoman Empire in general, but nowhere more so than in Turkey proper. As with the Japanese who started their process much later than the Turks, or as with the Russians before them, the Turks had imported foreign institutions in a state-driven effort to modernize. The central difference was they had been neither able to impose these social technologies as Russia had, nor willing to adapt them to the Ottoman way of life as the Japanese had done with respect to their own culture. The Porte's new institutions thrived anyway. To use a biological simile, the novel Western educative, administrative and judicial configurations were like foreign species that, once having crossed the Hellespont, proceeded to decimate the local fauna because they were simply better adapted to survival in comparison with traditional Ottoman institutions which were clearly ill-suited to the European-dominated international political climate of the nineteenth century. As noted, men educated in the European traditions were increasingly placed in high bureaucratic functions within the Sublime Porte, amongst the upper (but not top) echelons of its military, and in other socially important positions, without being given any real executive or legislative power. Ottomans remained exterior to European international society and 'europeanized' Turks were on the outside of their own society looking in. The Young Ottomans and their successors, the Young Turks, were no exception at first. The movement had started out as a sort of secret society modeled on the Freemasons, understandably so given the Hamidian era's politically oppressive atmosphere.

The first chapter of Young Ottomans emerged from Istanbul in 1889, its members recruited from the capital's military academies and medical schools. The date may have been

coincidental, but the symbolism of the French revolution's centennial anniversary was not lost on the group. The establishment of the original chapter was followed by many more in the major Rumelian cities.[1] Outside Istanbul, Paris and Salonika would host the most important branches of the movement which spread to most major European cities via expatriated Ottomans. The various Young Ottoman clubs remained geographically and ideologically scattered until the Paris and Istanbul chapters united in 1907 to form the Committee for Union and Progress (CUP), which at least solved the first problem. It is from this point on that CUP members came to be called the Young Turks (Ternon, 2005: pp. 231-234; Garnier, 1973; p. 91).

Young Turks, who would have been considered radicals by the majority before and likely even after the emergence of the CUP, would not ordinarily have anything to offer that would rival the social bonds provided by the family, the community and guilds. But again, the opening of Anatolia and the Caucasus by rail, urbanization and the appearance and popularization of print media introduced Turks to Western modes of thought, and as a result, the traditional social ties were loosened. As fitting historical patterns, the Macedonian nationalist revolt of 1908 would create a backlash against orthodoxy which would allow the Young Turks to gain a measure of popular legitimacy. Macedon, an often rebellious province, had many Ottoman troops stationed there in order to deter its natives' penchant for defiance. During the crisis, the Sultan's general and his second-in-command were assassinated and people from Monastir to Kosovo spilled riotously into the streets. Mutinous Young Turk officers took control of the armed forces across Rum and bombarded the Sultan with pleas if not demands to restore the Constitution.

> Sur le désir exprimé par le peuple et par ordre de Sa Majesté impériale le Sultan, la constitution promulguée le 23 décembre 1876 et qui avait été rapportée, est de nouveau rétablie. L'assemblé générale (Sénat et Chambre des Députés) pourra se réunir dans les termes préscrit par la loi (Imperial edict taken from Ternon, 2005: p. 235).

The CUP, the political arm of the Young Turks, ushered in an era of true convergence rather than of mere imitation, not only because they were the first Western-educated men to pull off a coup or even because they restored the constitution, but because they were the first to try and seek a working integration of the two different political cultures in question. Needless to say, the Young Turks were unified in and by their rebellion, and in that none of them, not even the most ardent Westernist, envisioned the abolition of the sultanate or the caliphate. Their plans

[1]Rum is Turkish for Rome, but was also used to denote the parts of the Ottoman empire in Europe

were all more reformative rather than outright revolutionary. They all wanted to create a new order while keeping the best of the old customs. Nevertheless, they were divided on what was baby and what was bath water. This had not gone unnoticed in European foreign ministries as the Quai d'Orsay archives reveal:

> Dans cet empire musulman, les Jeunes Turcs proclament les droits égaux de tout les individus, sans distinctions de Croyants et d'Infidels. Un Turc est à la fois membre de la nation turque, de la famille des peuples musulmans, et de la civilisation européene (Les mouvements Jeunes-Turcs, d'après les Archives du Quai d'Orsay from Garnier, 1973; p. 80).

This passage hints at the internal division of the CUP into its three main branches: the Westernists, the Islamists and the Turkists, each of which had a different, though equally murky plan to renew their government and empire through different combinations of Islam, science, nationalism and personal freedoms. To begin with the familiar, the Islamists for the most part proposed more of the same (a good number of them were in fact remnants from the Hamidian era). In their minds, what the empire needed was a reinvigoration of the caliphate through a return to Orthodox Islam and a continued appropriation of western technology. In other words, modernization wasn't working because Islam had been perverted. Their chief proponent, a poet named Mehmed Akif, lauded the Japanese for becoming technologically proficient without succumbing to the superficial trappings of western culture. He also believed that the Japanese had adopted all the best aspects from Islam into Buddhism (Berkes, 1964: pp. 340-342)!

The Westernists, for their part, wanted to radically transform Ottoman society starting at square one, the Ottoman-Islamic system of values. To them, modernization was first and foremost an internal and psychic transformation rather than a purely material one. The Westernists were not against Islam, just the Islamic state, and as long as the masses remained uneducated, ignorant and superstitious, the empire would lag behind the 'civilized world'. Obviously, these two factions bitterly opposed each other. The Islamists, whom had lost much of their sway at the end of the Hamidian era given the deplorable and noticeable losses of sovereignty, still had one very valid point when confronting their rivals: the Westernists simply did not reflect the common Ottoman's point of view. They completely ignored the issue of modernizing within the confines of the Sheriat. No matter how dissatisfied or disappointed average Ottoman Muslims may have been, and they were now even more of an overwhelming demographic majority given territorial losses on the Western frontier, they would not easily

accept a life outside of the Sheriat (Garnier, 1973: pp. 105-107). On the other hand, the Islamists could hardly refute that their way had been tried and had failed several times over. This bitter and irresolvable argument was a major boon towards the flowering of a Turkist position which had budded during the Tanzimat. If we consider Revolutionism as Martin Wight described it, as the dissemination of anti-status quo ideologies across the international system, then the Turkists of the post Hamidian era represent the tail end of a change in the ordering principles of the European, and later global international system which began with the French Revolution. Nationalism was finally taking root in the Ottoman heartland.

The three splinters of the Young Turks had an uneasy, albeit productive chemistry. On their side, the Turkish nationalists came to realize that the Westernists' assessment was on the mark. The Turkists' most relevant thinker, Ziya Gökalp, had understood that the idea of the Umma, of a unitary Muslim nation, was neither practicable nor would it allow the emergence of Turkish national identity. The prevalent branch of nationalist thought up to and during WWI was called pan-Turkism. Likely inspired by the Russian pan-Slavic movement, it was based predominantly on a racial definition of identity, though language was also a determinant. Inspired by Durkheim, Gökalp perceived national identity as a constructed reality. Shared understanding and shared experience were the keys. For there to be a Turkish nation, there had to be a revival of pre-Islamic traditions that would unite Turks (Ternon, 2005: p. 274). As noted, a Turkish identity had been forming since the Tanzimat. Linguistically, Arabic and Farsi had replaced Turkish very early on in the empire's history as the languages of the intellectual elite. They were the Latin and Greek of the Islamic states-system if you will; Turkish was for lay people and when it was transcribed, it was done so in the Arabic script. Since the late 1800s, the common Turkish language was making a comeback with authors such as Namik Kemal, and purging it of its Persian and Arabic influences became a central policy pursuit amongst nationalists later on.

Young Turk and Turkist Mehmed Emin (1869-1944) would carry the torch lit by Kemal's generation. Trained as a civil servant, he also wrote poems largely influenced by folk tales which idolized the Anatolian peasant:

> I am a Turk; my faith and my race are mighty,
> My chest, my essence is filled with fire,
> A man is the slave of his fatherland, I shall go.

I shall not let the book of Mohammed be removed,
I shall not let the banner of Ösman be taken,
I shall not let the enemy attack my homeland,
The house of God will not be destroyed, I shall go.

(exerpt from "Going to Battle" by Mehmed Emin)

Active measures to purge the Turkish language of Persian and Arabic, and to adopt the simpler Latin script, came to the forefront during the early Kemalist period of the 1920s, but they began in the new constitutional era and even included a debate about whether to call the language Turkish or Ottoman[2]. The national sentiment is palpable in these lines, but so are the complications of shedding the old identity, which was not only Islamic, but Ottoman and multi-ethnic. Something, or rather someone would have to go.

Akif was not the only one of his contemporaries to draw comparisons with the Japanese, though his was the most erroneous. Japan was on the minds of many at the turn of the twentieth century. Their victory over Russia in the Manchurian conflict of 1904-05, which was conducted under the strict letter of international law, had shown the world that the Nipponese were both ready and willing to assume a position of regional governance. Their continued presence at the European table during the 1907 Hague conference merely confirmed this. Obviously, since the Ottomans themselves were making the comparison, one can infer that they were well aware of Japan's progress, however misguided they sometimes were in drawing parallels. With a hundred years' worth of hindsight, we can clearly see that prior to the irreversible demise of Edo's isolationism in 1868, the Land of the Rising Sun had known four centuries of near-total stability under the Tokugawa emperors. It had perfected and consolidated a very efficient bureaucratic system, a feat facilitated by several other factors including a great measure of geographical seclusion from outside influences, the relatively small size of the domain, and military superiority over its immediate proximity.

The near total ethnic and religious homogeneity only aided in creating a unity which simply did not exist in the Ottoman Empire. In fact, the Nipponese represented the total antithesis of the Ösmanli. Identity, taxation, and constant effective government had all existed before Commodore Perry showed up at Edo in 1853. So stable was the Japanese feudal system

[2] The word 'Turk' was considered derogatory until well into the nineteenth century when nationalist aspirations made their entrance into Turkey

that European institutional practices were, in many cases, merely superimposed on pre-existing social structures which persist to this day. Japan tripled its GDP between the start of the Meiji period and the outbreak of WWI. At the latter date, its industrial economy already rivalled that of France. Curiously, Japanese technical proficiency and military prowess did not spill over into the cosmopolitan cultural arena. In other words, by 1907, Japan had more or less entered the European international society as a co-opted regional power, but even as late as the treaty negotiations in Paris in 1919, there are several examples of the Nipponese not quite 'fitting in'. Language presented a barrier at Versailles. The Mikado's envoys, including his ambassador to Britain, had a hard time expressing themselves in English, prompting some very derogatory comments from Georges Clemenceau[3] (MacMillan, 2002: pp. 307-310).

Cosmopolitan Society and Turkish Elites: The Missing Link?

The argument Islamists used against Westernists was not entirely without merit against the more evolved though less inclusive position of the Turkists: no matter how contemporary or logical the idea of the nation-state may have seemed to them, it was nevertheless an idea being developed by a Turkish intelligentsia that had little in common with the Ottoman in the street. Whereas nationalist movements in Europe had generally been 'bottom up' affairs, modernization was an undeniably 'top-down', state driven phenomenon amongst those Asian nations wishing to meet the European standard of civilization in the nineteenth century. To claim that nationalism in the post 1908 empire was state-driven only captures half the story. At that this time, it was more the product of friction between opposing sides within a bifurcated state apparatus than the result of coherent policies issued by a strong, united government with specific aims in mind. Turkish intellectuals were working towards the development of a coherent ideology within a movement that was itself splintered, however.

The emergence of Turkish nationalism brings Cosmopolitan society into the foreground in the convergence of European international society and non-European states. The Sublime Porte lay outside the bounds of the former, but it still managed to produce a certain class of men which understood Western thought, and who could adopt western ideas and customs with relative ease.

---

[3] Clemenceau and Prince Saonji, head of the Japanese delegation, had actually been classmates in law school at the Sorbonne.

> Avec leurs camées d'Auguste Compte à la cravate, les Jeunes-Turcs, adeptes aussi de Heackel, Voltaire, Rousseau, affichaient leur résolution de conduire l'Islam à leur gré. Ils buvaient du cognac, mangeaient du jambon, se proclamaient partisans du laïcisme, de la séparation de l'Église et de l'État (Garnier, 1973: p. 100).

These were 'cosmopolitan Turks', which begs the question 'what is the exact relation between Cosmopolitan Society and International Society in the process of convergence?' The two most obvious ways this complicity would operate are first, a power is socialized and inducted at the state level, then at the individual level, meaning that it joins international society and then its inhabitants become members of Cosmopolitan society by the changes that come with state-led modernization. The second option is the reverse; people change first, become 'Cosmopolitan' and then change their state. At least superficially, most cases appear to be somewhere in the middle. The Japanese represent the archetype for the first possibility. The Turks fall much closer to the second.

The emergence of a global Cosmopolitan class coincides roughly with the development of much more intrepid means of communications and transport in the late nineteenth century, or in Buzan and Little's words, with an increase in "interaction capacity" throughout the system (Buzan & Little, 2000 : ch. 13). Simple logic dictates that the existence of a truly global extra-national society of the sort described by the ES, defined in Kantian thought as a global inter-human community which transcends borders, is impossible without a rather explicit understanding of what values exist outside any given international society within the system. This is not possible without a certain degree of social and cultural exchange, be it through translation of the great literary and philosophical works, or even through more mundane means such as travel. The mid-to-late nineteenth century allowed for a much greater degree of exchange and mobility through the telegraph, international postal delivery, steam power and later magnetism, rail and so on. The ES places no fixed date on the birth of Cosmopolitan society, but it is difficult to imagine the possibility of such phenomena before the mid-to-late nineteenth century because of low interaction capacity and because European expansion had not yet unified and globalized the international system. Ideals and customs such as nationalism and laws of war were largely confined to European society including the Americas, though other international societies had their own versions of many such principles.

Dates may vary from region to region as well. In the Ottoman case, they had been

exposed to European Cosmopolitanism ahead of the curve, but to no avail. The effects of increased interaction capacity on Cosmopolitanism can be observed in the marked spike in the number of IGOs and INGOs towards the end of the nineteenth century, from the revolutionary Communist movement which held its first international rally hosted by Marx himself in 1864 to the benevolent Red Cross, which became international in 1896. These are but the two most obvious examples. "The main event of the development in social interaction capacity during this era was the development of a much richer, deeper, better organized, more formal and more extensive international society that had ever existed before" (Buzan & Little, 2000: p. 289). There is an obvious ingestion of at least some Asian thought within Europe through its elites, but for the most part, Cosmopolitan ideas were European. Industrialization would also create an international capitalist class and commonalities between bourgeoisie and working class internationally, which also led to culturally lopsided center-periphery relations (Wallerstein, 1974). With an increase in the interaction capacity of the various parts of the new global system came a new global awareness of the plight of 'the other', what Ronald Dore has called the "fellow-feeling", an understanding that 'we're all in the same boat' for lack of a better term. Sympathy for 'the other' is an indispensible pre-condition towards the existence of a Cosmopolitan society (Dore, 1984: pp. 412-415). These issues are part of a much broader study than is possible to undertake here, yet it would have been remiss to neglect them altogether as the track that Turkey followed to statehood clearly passes through Cosmopolitan society.

Prelude to Paris

Abdul Hamid abdicated and left Istanbul for Salonika April 25, 1908 aboard his lavish and previously unused personal train, with nothing but a pitiful group of four eunuchs, four concubines and fourteen servants. The new constitutional government became an oligarchy shared by the CUP and the new Sultan Mehmet V. The first controlled the parliament, the other the senate. As with the internal divisions of the CUP, the friction was productive in the sense that it forced the Young Turks and old-guard Ottomans alike to face the tough questions avoided in the past, which, if answered, would allow them to redefine themselves and create a new polity. In its last decade of its existence, the Ottoman government was openly debating modernization policy as well as the role of the European international society in that process. The Porte was becoming confronted with problems that reflected its bipolarity. Unfortunately for the Turks, progress was stifled because the six years between the advent of the new constitutional

government and the outbreak of the Great War were consumed by turmoil and an almost forgotten violence, obscured by the magnitude of what came next. In 1908, Austria annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina and Bulgaria seceded from the Ottomans. The Albanians revolted in 1910-11. Italy took Tripoli (Libya) by force in 1911. In 1912, the Balkan states created a series of bilateral agreements, and so when tiny Montenegro declared war on the Porte on October 8 of that year, it was joined by Serbia and Bulgaria despite Saint Petersburg's threats to cut off aid. By 1913, Macedonia and part of Thrace were gone. Serbian expansionism endangered the Habsburgs' Balkan suzerains, and anything that gave Austria reason to move aggressively into the Balkans alarmed Russia, one third of whose annual exports sailed through the Straits at this point.

The major powers all needed the Bosporus to remain Ottoman because none could afford to let another hold it, and the Porte was easily pliable anyways. Albania won its sovereignty in 1913 and became but one more unpredictable element in the system. The institution known as Balance of Power was being strained to its limits. The planet was colonized. The safety valve provided by overseas expansion had been exhausted, creating the foremost rivalry of the early twentieth century that pitted Germany against Britain. The former, as Keynes notes, was propped up on large and diverse foreign direct investment and overseas trade which it needed to protect, prompting it to increase its navy's tonnage. This policy triggered an arms race between the Reich and the British that the BOP could not stop (Keynes, 1920: pp. 1-4). Anti-hegemonialism's second massive failure was at hand.

In the years leading up to the war, the Ottomans had see-sawed between British and German alliances. With the Young Turks, the Ottoman Empire had shifted back to the British, but the Balkan outbreak of 1912 returned them into the German camp anew. The naval arms race had once more made a gambit of the Bosporus, and as no one had jostled it too hard yet, the Ottoman Empire held its precarious position like the pin in a very large grenade. In truth, it was just a matter of time before some event would pull the pin on one the many grenades of the era which could have started the war, but we all know what happened next. There is no need to discuss the whole war, but there are a few details that cannot be omitted. Chief among these are the secret Constantinople Agreement, the Treaty of London which further involved Italy in the breakup of the Porte, and the secret Sykes-Picot agreement, one of the last treaties involving the Tsar. They were all signed during the war and each would shape the outcome of the Turkish

peace talks more so because of the impossibility of their application than anything else.

The first secret pact to address the Ottoman question was the Constantinople Agreement (March 18, 1915) in which the Russians, with Britain and France's consent, secured for themselves both shores of the Bosporus, the European shore of the Sea of Marmora as well as Istanbul, which they would guarantee as a free port. The Italians had played out the start of the war in a more Machiavellian style. The terms of their engagement to the Central Powers stipulated that they were only obliged to intervene if Germany or Austria were attacked first. They remained neutral until the first sign that the Allies were going to win, then they turned coat. The territory that Italy wanted was under Austrian control, and Britain and France needed help. They were obligingly happy to promise away chickens that had not yet hatched to get it. Under the secret Treaty of London (April 26, 1915), Rome was guaranteed its demands for Southern Tyrol and the port of Trieste. The Entente even sweetened the pot with a number of Adriatic Islands, the Albanian port of Vlore, a protectorate over the rest of Albania, the Dalmatian coast, and yes, a share of the Ottoman Empire should it fall, though the wording of the contract was extremely vague on this last point.

The Porte's fate was still up in the air in 1915. Like Italy, it had remained cautious at first, but provoked an Allied declaration of war on November 5, 1914 when it closed the Straits to all but German shipping. It was fighting the Entente on six fronts in total. A British expeditionary force was in Mesopotamia gunning for Bagdad, another toward Suez from the west, and Russia was breathing down its neck in the north. Mehmet's call to the Umma for jyhad had the exact opposite effect in the Hejaz, prompting local Arabs to revolt against the Porte's rule. The call had fallen on deaf ears everywhere else, including in the British Raj, much to the War Cabinet's relief. The Umma, the Islamic international society, was no more, or at the very least, the Ottoman Caliph at its head was no longer seen as the rightful leader of the faithful, and its constituent parts had either been absorbed into the European system, or were about to be (Toynbee, 1925: pp. 75-76). Alone and surrounded, the Turks were still redoubtable on their home soil as Mustafa Kemal would demonstrate at Gallipoli. He would make his name there at the expense of the Commonwealth troops who tried to bridge the Hellespont. On its own, the Treaty of London might not have caused tremendous problems. Of course, Italy would be gaining sovereignty over a large number of Germanic and Slavic peoples, yet such is the nature of imperialism. But there were other, irreconcilable secret deal as well.

The most infamous of them, the one whose repercussions we are still dealing with today, bears the name of its creators, Mark Sykes, a British aristocrat who had travelled from Cairo to Baghdad and has been described as "one of those wealthy dilettantes who fluttered around the fringes of British diplomacy", and Georges Picot, a French career diplomat who had been Consul General in Beirut before the war, and who had very close ties to French colonial lobby groups concerned with the Middle East (MacMillan, 2002: p. 383). They drew up the plans for an idea that would shape the future, an idea that the Concert had flirted with for a century and which they had already partially enacted in the Balkans: they retraced the map of the Ottoman Empire. Sykes-Picot (16 May, 1916) was just an elaborate pie-sharing arrangement, intended to divvy the Ottoman spoils at the end of the war. No more trying to reform the empire with external pressure. Under the agreement, the French would annex the coastal regions of what is today southern Syria, Lebanon and northern Israel and would set up local governments over which it would have a sphere of influence in the area extending over northern Syria, southern Iraq (including Mosul) and Jordan. The British would get the Mesopotamian provinces surrounding Basra and Baghdad, and their sphere of influence would extend south of the French zone from about 200km east of Suez all the way to the south-western edge of the Persian Gulf, excluding the Hejaz (no one then knew that the world's largest oil field was under all that apparently worthless sand). To avoid conflict, Palestine would be placed under international administration. In an addendum to the agreement later that May, Russia would claim the northern Ottoman provinces abutting its southern borders: Armenia, Kurdistan and Azerbaijan.

When Italy somehow found out about the Constantinople Agreement, it claimed the Ottoman city of Smyrna (now Izmir), an important port-town on the Aegean coast. Lloyd-George, who himself called the plan "fatuous", notes that Sykes also disapproved of it, but that he was under pressure from the Foreign Office to conclude the deal (Lloyd-George, 1936: p. 1826). Of course, these deals were struck at the worst of times, when outlooks were grim and promises were, in many cases, almost meaningless considering the duress under which they were made. Russia's uncontested claim to Istanbul reflects this desperation. Still, Sykes-Picot was archetypal of Concert of Europe-era relations. First, it was passive and diplomatic in its competitiveness; it was yet another clever balancing act placing the French between the British and the Russians while effectively surrounding the Central Powers. Second, it was imperialistic; the greatest international powers of the day were going to manage or supervise the affairs of

those problematic peoples that didn't live up to the standard of the times and that had caused so much trouble for 'the civilized world'. Toward that aim, the great powers of the international society were also enlisting the help of lesser European states such as Italy, and later Greece, to manage the Ottomans. Third, the three-tiered classification was directly related colonialism and to the nineteenth century's positivist standard of civilization. 'A' mandates referred to states that were nearly able to govern themselves and that would, in a short but undefined period, reach total independence. The Middle-Eastern areas of the former Ottoman Empire fit into this category. The 'B' mandates would be administered by a 'civilized' state until they were deemed self-reliant, and 'C' mandates were to be ruled as part of a civilized state's own territory for 999 years with virtually no other regulatory stipulations.

When the Cat's Away...

Some very major changes were on their way. But by the time the post-war celebrations relented and that people and governments began to ascertain the level of destruction, the situation in most of Europe and much of Asia in January 1919 could only be described as near total chaos maintained in and by an international power vacuum. International Society and its most powerful members were in shambles. Sick and wounded troops lay scattered across the globe and starvation and the Spanish flu may have killed as many as the war did[4]. Empires were crumbling, entire cities were ablaze and anarchy was commonplace. After having survived Red October, Russia had pulled out of the war with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in order to fight another war internally between its 'Reds' and its 'Whites'. Arguments about how to deal with the Bolshevists consumed the peacemakers, who in many cases, Winston Churchill and Marshall Ferdinand Foch most notably, thought of Communism as a sort of second great plague. They wanted to invade to restore a Tsar or a democratic government. Even Clemenceau, no lover of Russia nor of monarchy, was shocked at the assassination of the Russian royal family and wanted to isolate the Bolsheviks, "surrounding them, as it were, by a barb wire entanglement" (MacMillan, 2002: p. 63-72).

Capitalist states feared the Bolsheviks to an often exaggerated extent, who, as far as they saw, were solely concerned with the violent overthrow of the entire capitalist world order. It did not help that there were workers' uprisings worldwide, even in such relatively uneventful places

[4] Atatürk himself nearly fell victim to the Spanish Flu and was bed-ridden for several weeks.

as Winnipeg. Nevertheless, a military incursion into Russia was impossible at the time for lack of fresh troops, money and reliable intelligence. Initially at least, the grudging consensus boiled down to letting the Russians work it out on their own. They would recluse themselves from European diplomacy for almost five years, which would neither lend stability to the Eastern front nor alleviate international alarm over the spread of Marxism. The impacts of the French Revolution were still being felt in the Balkans and the Near-East, and even an absent Russia would have much influence over the future of the Turks. The Austrian Empire had also disintegrated in October of 1918. One after the next, Poles, Czechs, Rumanians, Slovaks and Hungarians proclaimed new capitals. Austrian Prime Minister Karl Renner stated at the conference, "We stand before you as one of the parts of the vanquished and fallen Empire. In the same way as the other national states, our Republic too has sprung to life, consequently, she can no more than the former be considered the successor to the late monarchy" (MacMillan, *op cit*: p. 246). The British tended to agree, to the Italians' chagrin.

Ideologically, the end of the First World War represents an international historical milestone. The principles that governed and maintained order in the International Society were 'put through the ringer', resulting in another great identity crisis as had occurred at the end of the Renaissance. Around the world, the political catch phrases of the day were "Wilsonian self-determination" and "autonomous development". Of course, these were not new ideas. The novelty lay in that these ideas were now being championed by Europe's 'saviour', who fulfilled an almost messianic role. The most common criticism of Woodrow Wilson (aside from his vanity and stubbornness) was that despite his good intentions, his plans tended to be idealistic without any consideration towards practical application. National self-determination was perhaps a worthy goal, but Wilson's Secretary of State Robert Lansing questioned his Commander in Chief at the start of 1919.

> When the President talks of "self-determination", what unit has he in mind? Does he mean a race, a territorial area, or a community? [...] It will raise hopes which can never be realized. It will, I fear, cost thousands of lives. In the end, it is bound to be discredited, to be called the dream of an idealist who failed to realize the danger until it was too late to check those who attempt to put the principles into force (MacMillan, *op cit*: p. 11).

But it was already too late. Across Europe, in those parts of former empires which had been subjugated, and especially among the youth who generally felt by this time that the war had been fought for the interests of old men at the expense of the young, the President's rallying cry

had already struck a deep chord. Wilson felt that the war had not just been fought to defeat Germany, but also, as he told crowds in Paris, "to end the very causes of war, to substitute for the old system of alliance and balance of power politics a new order based upon justice and upon the rights of all people to determine for themselves their own governments" (Mee, 1980: p. 11). South African General Jan Smuts, writing in December of 1918, summed up the dilemma that Lansing had foreseen quite well.

> The peoples left behind by the decomposition of Russia, Austria and Turkey are mostly untrained politically; many of them are either incapable or deficient in power in self-government; they are mostly destitute and will require much nursing towards economic and political independence. If there is going to be a scramble among the victors for this loot, the future of Europe must indeed be despaired of. [...] The vital principles are: the principle of nationality involving the ideas of political freedom and equality; the principle of autonomy which is the principle of nationality extended to the peoples not yet capable of complete independent statehood; the principle of political decentralization, which will prevent the powerful nationality from swallowing the weak autonomy which has so often happened in the now defunct empires; and finally an institution like the League of Nations (LON) which will give stability to that decentralization and thereby guarantee the weak against the strong (from Toynbee, 1925: p. 51).

What Wilson wanted, and Smuts cautiously hoped for, would be impossible in ES theory and in reality. The ES holds that, in terms of international society, *qui dit justice dit solidarité.* Despite all criticisms aimed at Wilson, he clearly did have his finger on the pulse of Cosmopolitan society. The world was indeed calling for a new order founded in nationalism rather than imperialism, but the truth of the situation was that such underlying principles could only come to life in an international society where a common conception of not only order, but of justice existed. The League of Nations would have had, in Wilson's mind, an international policing role as well, unifying its members in common retaliation against treaty violators. Such international action corresponds exactly to Hedley Bull's description of 'just war' in Solidarist International Society, which is confirmed by the language of the League's Covenant. The most notable examples are the Covenant's preamble, which defines the League's goal to "promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security", and the more concrete Articles 10, 11 and 12, which stipulate that all members of the League are responsible for defending any of the others in cases of territorial aggression and that the League, or more precisely, the International Court of Justice would serve as an institution for arbitration of disputes. Also, Article 16 effectively renders non League-sanctioned military action a violation

of the Covenant (Nathan, 1925: pp.124-129).

The Covenant was clearly built on Solidarist principles, right down to its making neutrality in cases of war legally impracticable for its members. Yet the world was brimming with new states. There were the Balkans of course, but also Eastern Europe as a whole had been reshaped. Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary were born and Poland re-emerged. Bolshevism had created not only a new form of government, but independent states out of the Ukraine, Georgia, Estonia, Latvia, Finland, Armenia, Kurdistan and Azerbaijan, only one of which survived the year. The British were loosening their grip over the Commonwealth which no longer spoke with a single voice. Australian intransigence over the Japanese proposal to tack racial equality on to the religious equality clause of the Versailles terms at Paris created bad blood between Tokyo and London. In short, the sort of solidarist international society envisioned by Wilson and his followers was an impossibility given the number of new states and divergent, even mutually exclusive polities in the now-global International Society. It is almost formulaic: more states plus less in common equals pluralism. In other words, as the system became global in the nineteenth century, its most powerful states had, by the twentieth, pulled the rest of the world at least into the periphery of the dominant European International Society. Though the lesser and peripheral powers were intended to be managed by the global ones, the Great War in fact marks a sort of 'point of no return' for a pluralist shift that had already commenced by the late 1870's. National self-determination gained its legitimacy at the expense of great-power management.

The impossibility of Wilson's vision was further compounded by several factors, not least of which being that he wished to pursue both pluralist and solidarist courses at once by bringing even more new states into the system *and* creating an over-arching international body. Second, the British and the French would behave exactly in the fashion that Smuts had feared and that Wilson abhorred. The traumatized French demanded very heavy assurances against German militarism which the British conceded for a bigger share of the Middle East, a strategic boon in the preservation of their empire's land and sea routes. In English School terms once again, the various levels in the system were moving in different directions at the same time. Most of the European governments were acting like perfect Realists at the International Society level. Wilson and various members of European Cosmopolitan Society on the other hand, behaved more like 'Revolutionists'. The dichotomy actually made adhesion to a via media impossible during the

early interwar period. Despite forty-seven states' adhesion to the LON right from the start, criticisms made by the pessimistic Carr as well as the more even-keeled Toynbee, that the League was merely another means for the strong to impose their will on the weaker states, were never far behind.

Wilson loathed secret deals. He thought the Treaty of London and Sykes-Picot were abominations and desired "open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view" (Wilson, Fourteen Points: Point I) . On their side, the Europeans generally found the American head-of-state naïve and unrealistic. One junior British diplomat commented that the President was "as a debutante is entranced by her first ball" (MacMillan, 2002: p. 3). The sentiment was shared all the way to the top. Lloyd-George noted of Wilson that "[h]e shunned the sight or study of unpleasant truths that diverted him from his foregone conclusions" and that he may also have "regarded himself as a missionary whose function it was to rescue the poor European heathen from their age-long worship of false and fiery gods" (Lloyd-George, 1972a: pp. 139-140). Clemenceau was perhaps Wilson's harshest critic, even poking fun at him for wanting to eventually hand Istanbul over to the League of Nations. "When you cease to be President, we will make you Grand Turk" said Le Tigre (Mee, 1980: p. 67).

If Cosmopolitan and International societies were moving in different directions, Lloyd-George and Clemenceau, like Lansing, represented the old International Society, and they were not going to change easily. Given the emerging international pluralism, a peace treaty that created additional ideological divide rather than increase unity between the world's leading powers, and between those powers and the lesser ones, was doomed from the start. Another factor that detracted from international order relates to American ascendance to the rank of world power and the US refusal to clutch the reigns of world-power management. Up to President Taft, the Monroe Doctrine had remained steadily in force. Wilson, a Democrat, had nevertheless gained the support of the Republican Party for entering the war. He then alienated them by refusing to appoint a single Republican to the Paris delegation, a mistake that would prove fatal for many. The Republicans would take the Senate majority during the peace talks. Writing from his deathbed, Theodore Roosevelt commented that "Mr. Wilson and his Fourteen Points and his four supplementary points and his five complementary points and all his utterances every which way have ceased to have any shadow of right to be accepted as expressive of the will of the

American people" (Mee, 1980: p.14).

Matters were made worse on January 25, 1919 when the President issued a press release stating that the establishment of the LON should be made an integral part of the forthcoming peace treaty, a proposition previously turned down by Clemenceau and Lloyd-George. "The League of Nations should be the gilded ball on the dome of a cathedral and not a foundation stone" (Lloyd-George, 1972a: p. 121). Obviously, the news did not go over well in Washington either, where it was argued that the League was a catch 22: if it worked as it was meant to, it would erode American sovereignty and draw the US into further European imbroglios. On the other hand, a weak League with little or no international power was just a shibboleth (Nathan, 1925: p. 132). The Republican-led Senate would refuse to ratify the Versailles Treaty, further diluting the legitimacy of both League and Treaty. Of the major empires of the Western Eurasian continent, two had fallen including the Ottoman. Two, the Belgian and the Dutch, were totally marginalized. The remaining two, the French and the British, were completely broke, starving, and exhausted in almost every other way. Germany and Russia were ostracized. The age of empires was over and with it, for the time being at least, was the direction of the world's politico-economic affairs by the system's strongest. Great power management was not likely to be possible, but that wouldn't stop some from trying.

The inability of the European international society to arrive at a Grotian mid-point solution to post-war dilemmas can further be explained by the failure of the other major institutions at the time of the peace talks. In the immediate aftermath of the war to end all wars, diplomacy had been reduced to a dangerous state. Like all international institutions, it relies on precedent, and nothing in the past even remotely resembled the situation in 1919-1920. Besides their large number, inexperience and the lack 'history' between them and the core of international society, the new governments installed parliamentary systems which were often congested by infighting, usually over class or ethnic issues. These internal instabilities spilled over into the international realm via incomprehensive foreign policies. Some, such as Russia and as shall be expounded in the next chapter, Turkey, briefly even had more than one centre of power, further complicating matters with the question of rightful legitimacy. European nationalism of the 1920's was inherently Janus-faced. Irredentist claims were greatly exaggerated, and more often than not, the Big Three's various committees at Paris were absolutely overwhelmed by the task of fixing borders fairly between national claims and actual ethno-linguistic lines. In many parts of former

empires, populations were just too jumbled to create single-ethnicity states without complicated, unpopular and simply inhumane population exchanges. And besides that, delegations at Paris often 'fudged the numbers'.

The end results were borders that didn't always make sense. Nearly forty percent of new Poles didn't speak Polish. Forty-five percent of new Czechs did not speak Czech. Throughout the 1920's, one border region or disputed city after another was at the centre of a crisis associated with nationalism; Teschen, Smyrna, Erzurum, Vilna, the Burgenland, the Sudetenland, Western Thrace, Klagenfurt, Upper Silesia, and certainly the Ulster Boundary all caused more than their share of woe. In the European parts of the former Ottoman Empire, states refused the peacemakers' insistences that they sign treaties guaranteeing the safety of minorities because they were reminiscent of the old capitulations for Christians demanded by the Christian powers of Europe (Lyon, 1973: p. 42). From the arbitrariness of the reparations to various settlements of conflicting claims, international law would further expose the new world order for the sham that it was. The most blatant sign to that end was the exclusion of Germany from the talks. Even France had been present at Vienna a century prior, again showing that there was simply no precedent for the plight of Europe in 1919. There were several more examples of the Big Three neglecting not only the infamous and as of yet untested Fourteen Points, but even keystone international laws surrounding sovereignty were often ignored. Even Wilson the idealist wavered, supporting Italian claims to the clearly Austrian Southern Tyrol, but that was nothing compared to the affronts to international law centered on Turkey, the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Treaty of Sèvres. When it came to Ottoman partition, all bets were off.

By all accounts, the Turks fought valiantly. Cut off from their allies and aggressed on all fronts, surrender was only a matter of time. Their main problem had been logistical. They had switched over to European weights and measures, unified their currency and adopted the Gregorian calendar, all to coordinate better with their European allies. Nevertheless, food was not getting to the front lines, sometimes for lack of transportation. By February 1918, Ottoman Foreign Minister Halil Bey was already giving President Wilson assurances of his support for new Arab independences where it would be necessary. After the rebellion led by 'Lawrence of Arabia', the Porte was starting to comprehend that trying to hold on to these provinces would only weaken it. Ziya Gökalp had endorsed the idea, which helped with its popularity. After the worst decade in Ottoman history, most Turks understood that the Arab and European provinces

were more of a burden than an asset, and when it comes to cutting losses, better late than never (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1928: pp. 61-62). After the roughly 1.1 million square kilometres lost in Europe right before the war, Arab dismantlement finally cost the CUP its political existence, and it fell on October 7, 1918. On the 30th of that month, with a whole new Ottoman government behind him[5], Admiral Rauf surrendered to his British counterpart at Mudros with assurances that President Wilson's Fourteen Points would be respected (Anderson, 1966: p. 348-350). Point XII reads:

> The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and absolutely unmolested opportunity of development and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

But the surrender had been unconditional, and its seventh stipulation broadly granted the Allied Supreme Council the right to occupy any strategic points in the event of a situation arising which threatened the security of the Allies. Italy and Greece would show up in Paris with their hands out asking for what had been promised them, and in the nearly two years between the Porte's surrender and the onset of negotiations over the Arab and Turkish provinces, the seventh clause would be invoked. It was a sheepskin draped over wolves nipping at an Ottoman carcass.

Greek participation in the war and at the peace conference was both unpredictable and troublesome. They had much in common with the Italians. Italy and Greece shared the status of minor powers in the European International Society, and as such, they were being both invited by the leading states to pick up slack in global management. The two stood to gain quite a lot from Ottoman dismemberment. Both also had more appetite than teeth. Despite their illustrious histories, Greece and Italy were relatively new European states. Italy had unified in 1870 and Greece won its hard fought independence from the Porte in 1832, but only regained the bulk of its territories in 1897. Both were nearly broke and the pair of them had shaky governments, torn between drastically opposed factions for lack of moderate centrists. In the Greek case, its government and its people were torn between a liberal parliament and a conservative king. The schismatic Greek government delayed Greece's entry into the war. In 1915, during the final days of the age of empires, the old-fashioned King Constantine had refused Entente offers of Turkish

[5] Mehmet V had died in July and had been replaced by his younger brother Mehmet VI by the time of the Porte's surrender

territory. The Allied proposal had included the much-coveted port of Smyrna, but the monarch refused on the grounds that he was married to the Kaiser's sister. Constantine would not even agree to a unilateral declaration of war on the Porte since that would implicate Bulgaria, the Kaiser's close ally, against Greece. It is comprehensible though ironic that the institution that failed to create a balance capable of preventing the war also created a balance that greatly delayed its end. French commandos deposed Constantine and replaced him with the Entente-sympathetic Prince Alexander. The Greeks supplied fresh troops who drove a wedge through the Balkans, cutting off Central supply lines and turning the flank on Austria.

The war had started in the east, it was perhaps fitting that the decisive blow come from there as well. Athens would demand a heavy price for landing it. At St. Jean de Maurienne (April 19-21, 1917), a final secret treaty conceded Smyrna, a Turkish economic hub populated mostly by Ottoman Greeks, to the Italians, by then full members of the Entente. That decision would come to haunt everyone involved. The agreement was never ratified by the Kremlin and right out of the gates at Paris, the British would argue that it was nugatory. Despite the twenty-one month lag between Mudros and Sèvres (August 10, 1920), the Ottoman dilemma came up in conversation from the start, and two facts are abundantly clear: the European members of the Supreme Council had not signed on for Wilson's Point XII, and the most vehement opposition to it came from British Prime Minister.

> From the moment the war was declared, there was not a British statesman of any party who did not have it mind that if we succeeded in defeating this inhuman Empire, one essential condition of the peace we should impose was the redemption of the Armenian valleys for ever from the bloody misrule with which they have been stained by the infamies of the Turk (Lloyd-George, 1972b: pp. 811-812).

Internationalization of the Straits, of Istanbul, annexation and mandates were all ideas regularly entertained by the Supreme Council, and the common understanding in Allied diplomatic circles was that the Ottoman Empire had effectively ceased to exist, and that very large sections what was left, even theTurkish parts, would fall under foreign administration. By all accounts, Lloyd-George's sentiments were part of a Liberal legacy handed down by Gladstone (Ternon, 2005: p. 315). Lord Curzon, his cabinet minister responsible for foreign policy in eastern affairs likened the Porte to "a canker that had poisoned Europe" and he likewise wished to use an imposed peace treaty as a remedy. "The presence of the Turks in Europe has been a

source of unmitigated evil to everybody concerned. I am not aware of a single interest, Turkish or otherwise, that during nearly 500 years, has benefited by that presence" (Macmillan, 2002: p. 373).

Even the US State Department had officially proposed to accept mandate-ship over the Straits, Armenia and possibly elsewhere, as well as the internationalization of Istanbul at the end of the war, contrary to Wilson's Point XII (ibid: p. 376). The Turks' position in international society was precarious before the war, and certain events between 1914 and 1918, with the Armenian massacres heading the list, worsened their international image. After all, they had also been on the losing side of a war, and the massacres had only reminded Europe of the ineffectiveness of the millet system. Moreover, the British would assume the lead over the more sympathetic French in the Levant. Strategic concerns aside, there was a real fear at the Foreign office that Bolshevism, Nationalism and Islam would combine in all those 'backwards peoples' from Turkey to China's western edge and not only set the British Empire aflame, but overthrow capitalism, democracy and western civilization itself. This may seem like a paper tiger now but at the time it certainly did not. As a result of all this, no real objections were raised amongst the Western states when the Italians landed at Adalia on April 29, 1919 and the Greeks at Smyrna on May 15. Rome was cashing in on the Treaty of London and Athens had been sent in under Allied naval cover and by invoking the seventh clause of the Turkish surrender[6]. With regards to the peace treaties,

> [t]he Devil's Advocate could show another side of the picture. He could present a list of entire nationalities still submerged and of substantial minorities unredeemed. He could cite instances to prove that the Peace Conference had meted out one measure to the victors and another to the vanquished, and he might argue with plausibility that the gains had been cancelled by the losses, and that the general effect of the settlement had been to reverse the positions of 'top-dog' and 'under-dog' without altering their relations or reforming their behaviour (Toynbee, 1925: pp. 60-61).

With the exception of the Treaty of Versailles, no other treaty fits this description as well as that of Sèvres. The 'dogs' that Toynbee alludes to are Germany and France respectively, of course, but the Turkish treaty engendered its own set of reversals. Britain had taken over for Russia as the Islamic world's number one enemy, and Turkey, for a time at least, would be the under-dog to Greece. But the Turks' relations with the major powers and the behaviour of those

[6] Reports that the Greek citizens of Smyrna were being massacred by Turks had been flowing into Paris, but they were of dubious reliability

powers with regards to the Turks had remained constant, though the Supreme council would really drop the hammer on Istanbul with the Treaty of Sèvres' terms. Territorially, save for the Anatolian interior, the Porte was forced to renounce suzerainty over everything else. The Levant, Middle-Eastern, Arab and North African provinces were to become British and French 'A' or 'B' mandates. The Straits and Istanbul would be administered internationally. The Dodecanese and other islands were given to Italy. Greece received a few islands as well. Smyrna and its hinterland would be administered by Athens for a period of five years, after which its fate was to be self-determined through referendum. Perhaps most humiliating was the preservation of the Capitulations, including the Ottoman Debt Council. Turkish finances would remain under European control and now being in the age of early flight, it was decided that Turkish air-space was to remain under Allied control as well. The Allied powers were to guarantee personal freedoms in Turkey. Yet the real story behind the Treaty of Sèvres, its subsequent repeal, and Turkey's tentative entrance into European International Society can only fully be understood after a political and historical analysis of what happened inside Turkey between 1919 and 1924.

Chapter IV

Its Name is Republic: Kemal's Turkey

This chapter will describe and analyze the final steps, both internal and international, in Turkey's adoption of a secular republican government as well as its admittance into international society.

Slicing the Pie

Allied forces officially took possession of Istanbul in January 1920, but according to historians, the difference was unnoticeable. The city's western banks had long hosted hordes of European businessmen and dignitaries, but immediately after the end of the war, it was choc-a-bloc with foreign troops and ships as well. British soldiers, of whom there were over a million in the former Empire, were primarily confined to the Mediterranean coastal regions in Turkey. Mehmed VI pondered how to save his throne and what was left of his empire, and to the Sultan, the two goals were one and the same. The only salvation he could foresee lay in cooperation with the Allies (Garnier, 1973: p. 188).

While the patriarch worried and schemed in his palace chambers, Italian forces had discretely moved into ports along the Adalian coast over the winter. The official date of April 29 for Italian occupation perhaps merely reflects the acknowledgement of a *fait accompli*. The Entente had promised so much it could neither reasonably justify nor grant under to Italy, and this became painfully obvious to Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando during the Big Four's Turkish negotiations. The deck was stacked against Italy. No one had envisioned such a thing as a Czechoslovak or Yugoslav state when Habsburg possessions on the Adriatic were auctioned-off. Rome's engagement to the war effort was often called into question and their Machiavellian tactics were ill-appreciated in diplomatic circles. Lord Balfour had even referred to them as 'swine' in public (Mee, 1980: pp. 58-59). In Paris, many envoys felt that the Italians were constantly asking for more than they deserved. They had switched sides, fought half-heartedly and more than once, they had delayed military engagement, leaving their allies to fend for themselves. Italy's tactics at the table evoked the same sentiments as in the field. It tended to think only of itself when bargaining, seemingly sharing no understanding of or effort in the maintenance of international order. Orlando himself was able to do little to change Allied

perceptions. He spoke neither English nor French and was prone to ridiculously emotive outbursts. He was also too rigid. The Italian Prime Minister simply would not compromise with Yugoslavia over Fiume. Wilson resented the Italian delegation because he had agreed to concede the undeniably German Southern Tyrol to Rome who later refused to budge reciprocally over the Adriatic port[1].

When the Italian delegation submitted its Turkish demands in early April, few among the Big Three's committee members paid any serious attention. The problems were not on the Italian side alone of course. The Treaty of London was incredibly vague. It stated only that Italy would receive "a just share" in the event of Ottoman collapse (MacMillan, 2002: p. 427; Mee, 1980: p. 56). The Allies were perhaps right to claim that the secret pact was nugatory since Russia had never ratified the more precise Saint Jean-de-Maurienne amendments delimiting the Italian territory and zone of influence in southern Asia Minor (which originally included Smyrna). In truth, they had also been caught stealing from Peter to pay Paul since the Big Three had by this time more or less decided to hand over Smyrna to the Greeks. Furthermore, the agreement at Saint Jean had never sat well with the French, who felt that Rome was getting much reward for little work, and it suited the Quay d'Orsay to see the London clauses undone altogether. Paris did not want a strong Italian presence hindering French trade and investment in the Mediterranean. Sensing he was about to lose promised possessions on the Dalmatian and Adalian coasts, Orlando walked out of the Paris talks on April 21, 1920.

The timing was calamitous. Japan and Belgium had been threatening to abscond as well. The perceived legitimacy of the all-encompassing treaties was becoming a major thorn in the peacemakers' side. Since they had been conceived by so few, they needed to have their legitimacy buttressed by the consent of a good number of important or respected powers in international society.[2] To make things worse, the German delegation was scheduled to arrive eight days later to receive its terms at Versailles. During Italy's absence, the Big Three sat down to discuss the fate of Turkey officially for the second time. Since the start of April, reports

---

[1] The fiasco at Fiume orchestrated by Gabriele d'Annunzio and his motley crew of armed bandits later in September 1919 only made things worse when the militant poet turned the city into a fifteen-month party (MacMillan, *op. cit*: p. 302).

[2] The full conference had only met eight times. Most of the 'real' dealings were carried out by the Big Three. The other parties concerned would later be 'invited' to receive their terms. Many negotiations actually took place privately between plenipotentiaries who developed working, and even personal relationships between 1919 and 1920.

informed that Italian soldiers were making incursions in Asia Minor and neither of the three other Allied leaders were about to allow unilateral moves, if not for the sake of the peace or the Turks, then in the name of international order. Someone had to stop the Italians, and Greece would be first in line. As much as Rome and Athens shared in terms of international status, the difference in the nature of their respective diplomacies, owing a lot to the characters of their leaders, would make all the difference in the world.

Former Greek Prime Minister Elutherios Venizelos was, by all accounts, a very charismatic man[3]. He had fought the Turks all his life. His father and four of his uncles had fought the Ottomans during the Cretan rebellion. He began his legal studies at the age of seventeen and had been one of the first graduates of the newly reconstituted University of Athens, whose mission it was to instil Greek culture in youth by reviving instruction of the Classics. Venizelos wanted to rebuild a Greek nation spanning from Albania to Anatolia, comprised of long-lost territories and including Constantinople as its capital (MacMillan, 2002: p. 348). He was tough, he was smart, he was charming and most importantly, he had the respect, if not the admiration of the peacemakers at Paris, most of all Lloyd-George, who had dubbed him "the greatest statesmen Greece had thrown up since the days of Pericles" (Lloyd George, 1972b: p. 775). Greece's claims were no less ambitious than Italy's, but the Greeks had not yet made any blunders at the conference, and had by all appearances, acted more as team players. Their demands, put forth in February 1919, were all in line with ethno-linguistic and nationalist principles. Though there was much debate over the accuracy (and honesty) of their statistics, Athens was claiming areas that had at least a small Greek presence. By all accounts, Smyrna, more than any other Turkish port on the Mediterranean, was a predominantly Greek town, though its hinterlands were almost totally Turkish. Venizelos successfully argued that it didn't make sense to hand it over to Italy. Greece presented a less offensive choice to the peacemakers. Despite doubts, France went along with the idea with a purely balance-of-power reasoning in mind: Greek presence would diminish Italian strength in the eastern end of the Mediterranean. Along the same lines, the British felt that Hellas would provide a check to France. Both France and Britain were certainly tired of propping-up a dangerously ineffective Ottoman government. (MacMaillan, 2002: pp.347-355)

On May 13, with the Italian delegation back in Paris, Lloyd-George, Orlando and his

[3] Elutherios means 'liberator' in Greek.

Foreign Minister Sydney Sonnino, met in Lloyd-George's Parisian apartments to discuss Anatolian partition. The Italians asked for land in the south and Smyrna. The second request was denied, but later that day, the Big Three met and the consensus was to grant Italy territory in Southern Anatolia. France would take the northern half, Greece would receive Thrace, Smyrna and its suburbs, as well as Cyprus and the Dodecanese. It was still assumed at this point that the US would accept a mandate over Istanbul and Armenia. The plan had many detractors however. Clemenceau and the Greek General Ioannis Metaxas both doubted Greece's ability to maintain order over such a large swath of territory when its government and infrastructure were so shaky. Others, such as Winston Churchill, feared that an ill-conceived dissection of Turkey would lead to interminable strife in the Middle East (MacMillan, 2002: p. 435). One thing was for certain, Turkey was once again at the heart of discord between the European superpowers (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: p. 122). In the end, these plans came to nothing. Clemenceau would offer Lloyd-George the choice of pistols or swords when he found out that the British Prime Minister had flip-flopped in favour an American mandate for the whole of. Mounting pressures were temporarily eased when the Orlando government fell on June 19, 1919. His successor, Prime Minister Francesco Nitti, perhaps wisely chose to turn his back on Italy's foreign debacles to concentrate on its monumental internal political and economic problems. Also, Republican opposition and a massive stroke would prevent Wilson from accepting mandates in the Straits, Armenia and Kurdistan by November, 1919, though it had become clear to most that this was the case by the end of July Anatolia (MacMillan, 2002: p. 436-441).

Before he had fallen ill, Wilson had shown reservations about wholesale partition. Some shared the President's hesitation to detract so much from Turkish sovereignty, but if there had been any remnant of hope for a strong and independent Anatolian State, it had evaporated with Damad Ferid Pasha's plea to the peacemakers. Ferid was the Empire's Grand Vizir[4]. When he appeared at the head of the Turkish delegation before the Big Four's representatives at the Quay d'Orsay on June 17, he would deliver a prepared note that would essentially blame everything from siding with Germany to genocidal war crimes on the Committee for Union and Progress (CUP).

[4] Ferid was widely regarded as incompetent. He had earned the Sultan's trust and approval by wedding the patriarch's sister.

> The great trial of the Unionists at Constantinople has proved the responsibility of the leaders of the Committee -who all of them occupy high positions in the State- for the war and the other tragic events; that is the rehabilitation of the Ottoman nation. Thus rehabilitated in the eyes of the civilised world, our mission will henceforward be an intensive economic and intellectual culture in order to become a useful factor in the League of Nations (Lloyd-George, 1972b: p. 653).

Ferid would go on to request *status quo ante bellum* and use Wilsonian rhetoric to ask for the whole of Thrace back and the removal of Greeks from Smyrna. Wilson, Lloyd-George and Clemenceau all agreed that the statement was ridiculous and that laying all responsibility on the CUP had been a cowardly ploy. Wilson, who had "never seen anything so stupid", thought that the Turkish delegation "had exhibited a complete misunderstanding of the West" (MacMillan, 2002: p. 437). Ferid was sent home humiliated.

When all the other treaties were squared away, negotiations over Turkey once again fell into the nineteenth century pattern, evoking duplicity and competition in an increasingly tenuous European alliance. Not much had changed besides Russia's absence. The Big Four were posturing to do what had not been possible throughout the nineteenth century: all-out subjugation of Turkey by an international coalition. By the end of the summer of 1919, circumstances had made it so that the troublesome Italians and the out-of-place Americans were no longer a factor in decision-making, leaving Greece, France and the UK as the sole deciders of Turkey's fate. There was also a little-known grey-eyed general stirring up nationalist rebellion in the Turkish interior...

Teeth and Nails

Long before the Allies discussed Turkish partition in Lloyd-George's study, a very different but equally important conversation took place in the Sultan's chambers back in Istanbul. Mustafa Kemal's position was clear right from December 1918. "Il faut que votre majesté [...] constitue un gouvernement fort, capable de traité d'égal avec l'ennemi. Il faut mettre fin, une fois pour toute, à la psychose de défaite qui règne dans les milieux gouvernementaux" (Garnier, 1973: p. 189). The man who would later name himself Atatürk has been compared to Julius Caesar, Luther, Henry VIII, Cromwell, Napoleon, Bismarck, Mussolini and De Gaulle.[5] Born in 1881, he had fought with his mother over his education at age nine. She wanted him to attend a

[5] In 1934, President Kemal would push through a law that required of Turks to have a last name as per Western practice. He chose Atatürk, literally 'fatherturk'.

madrassa, he wanted secular schooling. He never looked back. He excelled at mathematics, political studies and in the military disciplines. He spoke French fluently. He quite intuitively followed the same path that was creating the modern Turkish bureaucratic and reformist class: secular primary and secondary education, the military academy in his native Salonika, and officer school in Istanbul, a hub of dissent in the Hamidian era, during which the outspoken Kemal had some potentially dangerous extracurricular activities, including pamphleteering.

He often spent long nights with his close entourage drinking raki and arguing about politics and current events, habits that he would maintain throughout his life. He rose rather quickly, making captain by the age of 24, but his opinions often got in the way of his career. At the end of 1904, he was briefly imprisoned for treason for organizing *Vatan*, a secret association that had evolved from a student study group with under his direction. Vatan was not dissimilar to the early CUP. Kemal might have remained in his cell had it not been for a sympathetic superior officer coming to his aid. Too good an officer to be dismissed outright, Kemal was shipped off to Damascus. Defiant to the last, he would start over in Syria. When the CUP took over in 1908, Kemal managed to secure a series of important staff positions, but again, was sometimes passed over because of his arrogant tendency to demand promotion, but mostly because of the animosity he displayed towards Enver Pasha, perhaps the most powerful of the triumvir at the head of the CUP. Kemal's chief complaint was Enver's unflinching loyalty to Germany. As a divisional commander, Kemal became a hero to his people during the Great War, repelling Allied forces at Gallipoli and Anafarta. He had earned the symbolic title of Ghazi, 'the victorious'. The Ghazi had been stalled however, forced to sit on his hands since he had arrived in Istanbul at the end of the war. Mobility was made impossible to him under Allied martial law and he had been trying to find a way to the Turkish interior in order to assess the situation there. He got his wish when the Sultan agreed to make him the army's Inspector General, a post that came with imperial traveling papers. Two days later, the Greeks landed at Smyrna. The day after that, Kemal set out for Samsun, deep inside Anatolia. His arrival there on May 19 is a Turkish national holiday (Garnier, 1973: 192-196; MacMillan, 2002: 433; Ternon, 2005: 378-379).

Two weeks prior, Kemal had been summoned by the Sultan on the day the Big Four met in Lloyd-George's flat. Mehmed wanted assurances that his new Inspector would play along with the only discernable means of political survival to the beleaguered patriarch: compliance with the Allies. A wise officer, Kemal reassured his liege but very discretely ordered troops to Ankara.

He had long decided to resist any attempted occupation. He never admitted as much publicly, but he had probably already decided to depose Mehmed as well. The future general had youthfully hoped to overthrow Abdul Hamid with all the Ottoman soldiers in Syria when he was posted there, but had realized even then that it was wishful thinking. Much had changed since then however, and conditions would become even more conducive to a putsch in the days to come.

There had been expressed reservations amongst the Greek Orthodox communities of Western Turkey about Italian occupation. Though there was legitimate discord in Smyrna, it had been trumped up by Venizelos to support his claims and Greek action. Yet in sending Hellenic soldiers to Smyrna, the Allies set in motion events that would lead to their undoing in Anatolia. The hatred between Greeks and Turks was at a peak, and consequently, the Hellenic landing bestowed the utmost urgency and élan to Turkish nationalism, crystallizing soldiers, peasants, Islamists, Westernists in their hatred for the Greeks, which ran deeper than for any other group. This hatred would grant Kemal reprieve from the heterogeneity of the various reformist branches that had so plagued the CUP during its decade in power. It would also permit him to capitalize on popular frustrations with the Sultanate (Anderson, 1966: p. 364; Berkes, 1964: p. 436). Mehmed himself would oblige towards the latter end as well. Kemal, who had been organizing a guerrilla around Smyrna, waited until news of Ferid's initial failure at Paris hit on June 18 to convince the officers at his side of the need for a provisional government. Though the consensus was that the Allies had to be resisted, Kemal went the extra step, asserting that a military response alone would not achieve full success because the Sultan and the Istanbul parliament were as good as foreign agents.

The opposing elements of traditional Ottoman patriarchy and Turkish western-inspired modernization, which had been so often in conflict in the past, were engaged in their final confrontation. By the end of June, Kemal had once again been charged with treason by the Sublime Porte and summoned to Istanbul. He resigned his commission but his officers remained loyal to him. He refused the Sultan's summons. On his way to the Armenian city of Erzerum, he improvised a now-famous speech in the town of Tokat. "If we have no weapons, we shall fight with our teeth and our nails." He would lead by example, but he was not fighting for the same reasons as the great majority of his partisans, who were still attached to the concept of a sultanate, and who in fact wanted a constitutional monarchy modeled on the United Kingdom (Jevakhoff, 1989: p. 339). But the more the patriarch blundered, the more he drove Turks to

Kemal, the man most responsible for Turkey becoming a Republic.

A battle for legitimacy ensued between nationalists and the Sultan. On July 23, Kemal called for the formation of a new parliament on the grounds that the Istanbul government had betrayed the Turkish people. To the Minister of the Interior he wrote "Vous êtes des lâches et des criminels d'empêcher le peuple de soumettre ses demandes. Vous conspirez avec des pays étrangers contre la nation." An ultimatum went out to the Sultan shortly thereafter:

> La nation a complètement perdu confiance dans votre cabinet et vous-même. Elle ne garde confiance que dans son souverain à qui seule elle doit soumettre rapports et pétitions. Votre cabinet s'interpose entre la nation et le souverain. Si vous persistez dans votre obstination une heure de plus, la nation se considérera libre d'entreprendre toute action qu'elle jugera utile et rompra toutes relations entre votre cabinet illégal et la nation entière. Ceci est notre dernier avertissement (Garnier, 1973: p. 216).

Mehmed issued a call to general elections for the new parliament in Istanbul, but simultaneously communicated to the Foreign Office that this was merely a ruse to placate the nationalists. Churchill took advantage of the opportunity to corner the Sultan into a secret treaty behind France's back in September, in which Mehmed placed the whole of Turkey under British mandate and placed the spiritual authority of the caliphate at London's service.

The Sultan would also succumb to demands to fire Damad Ferid on October 2. Too little too late. The most unpopular Ferid had already signed as the Sultan's representative at Sèvres, after which time the Kemalist army had cut telegraph lines and interrupted postal service in and out of Istanbul, and seized control of tax collection and coffers. More and more, Kemal would undertake reforms with the same strategic cunning that made him a brilliant soldier, never advancing beyond his means, strangling his adversaries, and leaving but one way out: his way. The father of modern Turkey had never believed in the possibility of a harmonious marriage between Islamic/Ottoman and European political philosophies. Like, Gökalp, he acknowledged that culture and civilization were indivisible: ''[Modernization] would have to assume a radical character, to affect all the aspects of Turkish society and to sweep away most, if not all, of its traditional beliefs and institutions.[...] If we are going to be westernized, let us go to the fundamentals of the West" (Bozdağlioğlu, 2003: p. 46). Atatürk wished to liberate Turkish culture and government from the obscurantist and superstitious elements of Islam that were so deeply entrenched in the sultanate that they could never be removed through reform alone, as the experience of the late nineteenth century had demonstrated. The strategist was not about to

alienate the conservatives in his camp, however, until he knew he had them cornered.[6]

Better the Devil You Know

December 1919 was a pivotal month for the Kemalists. Their leader had set up a new capital in Ankara, far from the intrigues, influences and occupations which made Istanbul such a politically dangerous place, and beyond the reach of any foreign army. The Grand National Assembly (GNA), a legislative body meant to replace the Ottoman parliament, was established though less than forty of the over two hundred ministers invited to Ankara actually presented themselves. Nevertheless, every action by the Allies at this point reinforced Kemal's rebellion, thus far allowing him to make a nearly seamless transition from an occupational resistance movement to a provisional government. The gauntlet was thrown to the British led Allied forces by Kemal on January 28, 1920 with the 'National Pact', which stated the nationalist's goals. The gist of the document boiled down to exactly the same thing as Wilson's twelfth point: the Allied powers can do what they will with the Arab portions of the former empire, but Turkish regions, including Istanbul, must remain intact and sovereign. According to the Pact's sixth article:

> It is a fundamental condition of our life and continued existence that we, like every country, should enjoy complete independence and liberty in the matter of assuring the means of our development, in order that our national and economic development should be rendered possible and that it should be possible to conduct affairs in the form of a more up-to-date regular administration. For this reason we are opposed to restrictions, inimical to our development in political, judicial, financial and other matters.

This clause was invoked to demand the total abrogation of capitulations, and would be summoned by Kemal's supporters as a rebuttal to the terms set by the Big Four and Greece at Sèvres (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: p. 141). In March 1920, the British nailed shut the doors of the Ottoman parliament. It was an omen. No session would ever deliberate in Istanbul again. Ministers deemed nationalists were either deported or interned at Malta (Garnier, 1973: pp. 222-226). The Sultan's reputation as a British marionette grew, adding validity to Kemalist claims that Istanbul did not represent Turkish interests, to which the riposte was that the Ankaran government had no authority to negotiate at the international level. As a result, during the first half of 1920, the Ghazi's mission was still one of resistance rather than revolution. But that didn't

---

[6] One of Kemal's first acts as a rebel had been to arm most of the extreme-right religious organizations around Smyrna.

stop him from acting as though he were a head of state. On April 23, 1920, Kemal was elected president by the GNA. In a speech the following day, he appeased anxious clericals and moderates who had cold feet; he was still playing the transition card. "As soon as the Sultan-Caliph is delivered from all pressure and coercion he will take his place within the frame of the legislative principles which will be determined by the Assembly." Between the lines, one can still read his famous slogan: "sovereignty belongs to the people" (Berkes, 1964: p. 444). As of July, his soldiers, rather exhausted by Greek advances along the coast, had decided to withdraw to the interior. In August, the Sultan agreed to the terms laid out by the treaty of Sèvres. Turkish nationalism was in trouble. To the north, another new and explicitly revolutionary government was also vying for legitimacy within the international society, and it too needed friends.

Atatürk had made tentative openings to the Bolsheviks three days after becoming president and had proposed that the 'Reds' and the Republicans cooperate to settle borders in the Caucasus. Negotiations took on a strangely familiar hue. Bolshevik Foreign Minister Chicherin called for 'self-determination' in the Caucasian states of Georgia, Azerbaijan and Armenia. Kemal understood the implied message that these states were *only* free to choose Sovietization, so he agreed to settle borders bilaterally, absorbing a loss in exchange for stability (Ternon, 2005: p. 388). Lord Curzon, Balfour's successor, would officially ask for an American mandate over Armenia on behalf of the British government the following day at the San Remo conference. He was unaware of talks between Ankara and Moscow. Britain's worst nightmare was coming true. There were nineteen million Muslims in the former Russian Empire and the Allies, most of all the British, were mortified by a possible union between the forces of Near to Far Eastern nationalism, Islam and Bolshevism, which in the worst case scenario, would enrapt half the earth's population and spell the end of Christianity, capitalism and personal freedom worldwide. This was perhaps mere alarmism, however. The common enemy that was Great Britain may have a created a marriage of convenience between these various elements, but the more fundamental divergences of Communist and Islamic and/or nationalist political philosophies could not be so easily or permanently overcome (Toynbee, 1925: pp. 76-77). Furthermore, though the Russian revolution was seen in a positive light, not only because of the removal of the troublesome Romanoff dynasty, but also because of the Reds' condemnation of Western imperialism with regards to Ottoman partition, Bolshevism remained a poorly understood curiosity in Turkey (Berkes, 1964: pp. 436-437).

In the span of a lifetime, Turks would go from feudalism to a republic through their own versions of the renaissance, reformation, scientific revolution, separation of church and state and industrialization, but the stars never aligned in a way that would permit Communism to take root there. The spiritual aspect is perhaps the most obvious reason why. Though Turks might be convinced to abandon an Islamic state in favour of a secular one with Islam as the official national religion, the 'godlessness' of Bolshevism was a bridge too far to cross. Furthermore, at the time, Turkey was mostly agrarian. The brutal conditions that industrial capitalism had imposed upon the proletariat throughout Europe did exist in Turkey, but on much too small a scale to spread Marxist ideology.[7] Moreover the Anatolian peasant was not nearly as oppressed by his landlord in comparison to his Russian counterparts, and landowners in the Ottoman Empire had neither been nearly as powerful nor as loathed as in Russia. To boot, with Armenian and Greek 'displacements', even more land became available to native Turks whom had never lacked in that regard anyways. Finally, though Turkey was what we would now call a 'peripheral' economy, a label that comes with its own set of reasons to rebel against capitalist imperialism, Kemal saw Arab cultural domination, and not European economic subjugation, as the main problem plaguing his nation. In total opposition to their northern neighbours, Turkish nationalists across the spectrum actually wanted to stimulate the development of a capitalist class, the need for which had been compounded by the mass exodus of Greek and Jewish merchants (Georgeon, 1986: pp. 136-138; Berkes, 1964: pp. 425-426). Pan-Islamism and the various Pan-Turkist movements had alarmed both old and new Russian governments given the number of Muslims and ethnically or linguistically Turkic peoples within its frontiers. As a result, these movements also prevented Turkish reformists from aligning with Russia. But they had come to be regarded as lofty and superfluous ambitions from better days, to be dropped in favour of saving what was essential during the eleventh hour. With them out of the way, cooperation between Ankara and Moscow was possible. That would be very bad news for Yerevan.

Even after the death of the Armenian mandate in the US Senate in June, 1920 by a vote of fifty-two to twenty-four, the idea was revived by Article 89 of the treaty of Sèvres, which reallocated the task to the British. This clause amounted to little more than a face-saving gesture on the part of a Supreme Allied Council that had once again made promises it could not or would

[7] A Turkish Communist party did briefly exist in 1920, but its leader was drowned, cast off on a ship that was scuttled off the coast of Trebizond along with sixteen Soviet agents January 24, 1921. Moscow turned the other cheek (Ternon , 2005 : pp. 392-393)

not keep. No matter the intentions, the argument would be mooted the following year. For the time being, fronts around Smyrna and Cilicia were stabilized momentarily in August with a little clandestine help from the embittered and withdrawing Italian forces, who had been 'surrendering' their arms and equipment to whatever band of nationalist Turks they crossed in defiance to the British. A more conventional Russian aide arriving in August in the form of 400 kilos of gold also helped.

By this time, the Sultan had lost the few supporters he had left by accepting Sèvres, driving even more Turks to join ranks with Kemal. The Kemalists were reinvigorated. By September 23 1920, the GNA gave Kemal permission to invade Armenia. France had been soundly beaten in their Cilician campaign in early 1920 and had no more stomach for casualties. Minister of Finance Jules Cambon, a man of considerable experience in the Near-East and who had lived in Turkey for seven years, strongly doubted the Allies' ability to impose and administer peace there, and had long advocated on behalf of economic rather than military means of manipulating the Porte. He was now raising the alarm. Should the nationalists win, France's considerable holdings in the region might literally go up in smoke for no more reason than defending a treaty in which London had connived them out of their just deserves (Lloyd-George, 1972b: pp. 822-826). Sèvres was losing its last semblances of legitimacy.

Sensing that it stood to gain nothing, France refused to ratify the Treaty of Sèvres. The Italian government lined up behind the French, calling for a renegotiation of terms. The Istanbul government was anything but in control of the Turkish territory. Greece had advanced way beyond Smyrna and in doing so, beyond any justifiable excuse for occupying Turkish soil. Their signature would add little weight to the document. By the end of 1920, it had become clear that the treaty could only be enforced as it would never be accepted by Turks. The document had had the reverse effect, granting the Ankara government its ultimate legitimacy and momentum. Politically at least, the Sultan had signed his own death warrant and the British had spelled the end of any possible foreign mandate in Turkey. Still, it took a few months longer for this to become clear. If he had not ascertained it already from the Italian fiasco, Kemal had realized by November, 1920 that he was by no means dealing with a united Allied front.

Tabula Rasa

The year 1921 would prove a turning point for Kemal and Turkey. The Armenian campaign had paid off. Turkish Nationalists pushed north and Bolsheviks south, wiping out the

last remaining White Russian forces on the way. Though minor skirmishes did break out, Turkey's Transcaucasian borders, which remain geographically unchanged to this day, were settled in negotiations. Peace was sealed between the Soviets and Ankara with a friendship treaty on March 16, 1921. At Lausanne, the French and the British would be powerless when presented with this *fait accompli*. Kemal and Lenin exchanged ambassadors. Positive acknowledgements of the nationalist government accrued, but the British remained stubborn. Lloyd-George had campaigned hard to win Smyrna for his friend Venizelos. The Greek landing had been handled poorly, blood was needlessly spilt, and Hellenic governance had been clumsy. Still, in June of 1920, when the more organized forces of Kemal began their attack on Smyrna, it was the British PM who approved Greek movement inland, an act that was divisive even within the British government. By the time Sèvres was signed, Greek soldiers were 400 kilometres east of Smyrna (MacMillan, 2002: pp. 448-449).

Athens would pay dearly for its hubris. On October 25, 1920, King Alexander died of complications arising from a monkey bite. The following month, Venizelos lost dramatically in the elections. His party was in minority and he didn't even win in his own riding, and he narrowly survived an assassination attempt by two Greek marines. King Constantine returned in December and purged his armed forces of Venizelists, which resulted in the irreplaceable loss of many competent officers. By the time the Armenian frontier was closed, the Greek army was in disarray. Still they pressed forward and Lloyd-George continued his now more implicit encouragement despite the increasingly disapproving clamour of his own cabinet. The London Conference, held in February 1921, brought undeniable recognition by the European diplomatic community of the Ankara government, which had been allowed to send two delegates. This precursor to Lausanne accomplished little else.

The Turks demanded a total renegotiation of Sèvres and the Greeks refused to budge. The following Greek offensive in the spring of 1921 was a disaster. The Allies, now realizing the size of the hornet's nest they had rattled by allowing a Greek invasion, were looking for ways to back out. They argued that the return of Constantine nullified the allied offer to Smyrna[8] (Ternon, 2005: p. 395). The Greeks orchestrated two more offensives in 1921, but they were out of international support, out of momentum and about to be routed. By spring, 1922, London, Paris

[8] Though they had offered it to Constantine in 1914 and had later told Venizelos that the offer no longer stood with *Alexander* on the throne.

and Rome had declined to aid Athens with guns and money, but offered to broker a deal which Atatürk turned down because Greece refused to evacuate. The Turkish army would help them along. Atatürk reached Smyrna on September 10, 1922 and watched as the Greek parts of the city burned to the ground. He called it "[a] regrettable incident" (MacMillan, 2002: p. 451). Later, when overseeing the evacuation of Hellenic soldiers from the neighbouring town of Konak, he would prevent Turkish youths from trampling a Greek flag. It was after all, he said, the beloved symbol of a proud nation, regardless of the enmity one might feel for it. The nation was sacred (Garnier, 1973: pp. 270-271).

The secret wartime agreements had stunted peacetime negotiations before they even started, and the onus lay squarely on British and French shoulders since the Romanoffs were out of the picture. The outcome may have been better for all had the Big Four and Greece stuck to Point XII, or at least, not strayed so far from it. Giving the Dodecanese to Italy was not unreasonable, taking Thrace away and splitting it between Bulgaria and Greece may have worked at the limit, but the second Italians and particularly Greeks landed on Anatolian soil, a great many Turks began to believe that their homeland was about to be drawn and quartered. After all, what was there to assure them of the contrary? There was a good deal of timorous precedent in the Balkans, not to mention that the most important city in the country was in European hands and that the Sultan and his parliament were their hostages. Conversely, the nineteenth century experience also bound the peacemakers' imaginations with respect to Turkey.

The Young Turk's movement had not existed long enough to wash away the tarnished image left by Abdul Hamid, and had in fact added a few blemishes of its own. The majority of high-ranking diplomats involved could not initially envision a Turkish nation-state capable of thriving on its own, or simply did not want to for reasons of their own imperial ambitions. The British Prime Minister, the person who would ultimately yield the most influence in the matter, would be at the head of both groups. His unflinching loyalty to Venizelos also blinded him to the fact that he was repeatedly backing a losing horse, one that had deliberately misled him as to the extent of his ambitions, no less. Smyrna may have been inhabited by mostly Greeks, but like Salonika or Istanbul, which also had very large Hellenic communities, they were economic hubs of the utmost importance to the Ottoman economy, and their removal would prove a huge loss to Turkish revenue. Greeks there had also lived in the Ottoman Empire for centuries and were for all intents and purposes naturalized.

The same treaty a hundred years prior might not have ruffled so many feathers, but the age of empires was almost over. The political mores that went with it were on their way out, and nationalism, once a dirty word amongst statesmen, was now ending its transition from the realm of cosmopolitan ideals to the more politically legitimate and practiced principles of international society. The rules of the game had changed more than superficially, but the evolution had less effect on those that held the reins of power than on those that sought them. This lag created the most strain of all on the negotiations centered on Turkey because of its desire to join the increasingly global international society dominated by a European core that was doing almost everything in its power to prevent that outcome. While the Big Three spoke of 'open covenants arrived at openly', openness was only practiced when it was somehow beneficial for more underhanded reasons. There had been several instances of use of the press to inflame opinions and render decisions irreversible or inoperable. The real bargaining was, for better or for worse, almost always far removed from public scrutiny. France and the United Kingdom continued to act on the same impulses legitimated by the same set of values that were so rapidly becoming outmoded. The Big Four and Greece's treatment of the Turks was what created the necessity for resistance in the latter's minds.

The two year period between the signing of the 'porcelain treaty[9]' and the first sit-down at Lausanne had removed many befuddlements. By the time the invitation went out in October, 1922, the French had already withdrawn in exchange for economic concessions and arrived at their own peace with Ankara a year prior which had traced the southern border with Syria. There was only one Russian government left, and it had destroyed all possibilities of Caucasian mandates in tandem with the Kemalists, establishing the northern border. The Americans didn't even send a mission to Lausanne, only observers. Italy was there, represented by Benito Mussolini, but it had abandoned its promised rewards. Venizelos actually presided over the hearings, but both he and Greece had fallen victim to their own pride, to Turkish resolve and to the bite of a rabid monkey. Even worse, Lloyd-George had resigned, brought down in part by the failure of the last Turkish treaty. The only three major issues left on the table were foreign occupation, international administration and the capitulations, including the Debt Commission. Istanbul and Ankara were both summoned this time. The invitation extended to the Porte was a "diplomatic fiction" however (Ternon, 2005: p. 406). Kemal simply had the Sultanate abolished.

[9] At Sèvres, the treaty was signed in a porcelain factory

His instructions to Ismet Pasha, one of his best generals, closest confidants and now chief negotiator were simple: no compromises in Turkey. With the Greek army's collapse, the British forces at Istanbul and the Straits were totally exposed and nearly surrounded. The already-beleaguered European alliance was now even further strained by disagreements over French occupation of the Ruhr valley. The Allies'soldiers were tired and their resources exhausted. There was to be, therefore, no bargaining on the three cardinal points: Turkey's frontier in Thrace would be restored to the 1913 borders, the capitulations had to be abolished and all allied troops had to vacate Turkish soil, meaning no international administration of Istanbul or of the Straits. British intransigence remained intact. The UK would neither let go of Mosul province nor of the Straits. The Soviets protested the second claim.

Even more heated were the economic arguments. European states wanted guarantees for their considerable investments in Turkey, whose new government understood the mechanics of economic servitude better than any Sultan ever had. Curzon remained at the head of the Foreign Office after Lloyd-George's coalition government fell. He tried to use the capitulations to coerce the Turks, but Ismet wasn't hearing it (he suffered from 'selective deafness', often ignoring offers he did not like). Curzon was enraged by his pertinacity. "You remind me of nothing so much as a music box. You play the same old tune day after day until we are heartily sick of it- sovereignty, sovereignty, sovereignty" (Macmillan, 2002: p. 453). After two weeks worth of negotiations, the British walked out as part of a dramatic ultimatum designed to soften the Turks. It failed. In fact, the press in Ankara was crying that Ismet had been too soft and that he should have asked for Iraq and Syria as well.

The British delegation returned on April 23 of the following year, and it was they who had softened. The Ankara government's position had only grown stronger. The Turks had never intended on committing economic suicide and were ready to secure foreign holdings by legal means so long as it was done on their own terms. Once that was agreed upon, advances could be made. The capitulations as a whole were abolished. Since no one could enforce Sèvres, it was dropped outright. Turkey got Eastern Thrace back and the Straits would remain under its control, though there would be a limit on tonnage for warships, which was probably to their advantage anyway. The western limit was not settled and the Turks agreed to let the League of Nations decide its fate. The League awarded Mosul to Iraq in 1925. The Ottoman debt was relegated to the domain of private law and bond payments were established on a case-by-case basis, often at

favourable terms, much to the envy of the Weimar Republic. Of all the Great War's losing parties, the Turks were the only ones to impose their own terms of peace. Even weapons seized by the Allies at the end of the war were given back. They had reclaimed all that was Turkish before the war and even received reparations from both Greece and France.

The treaty was signed on July 24, 1923. *Le Figaro* commented that "[l]e traité de Lausanne marque une date capital dans l'histoire du monde, car, pour la première fois, la Turquie est traitée comme une puissance occidentale" (from Georgeon, 1986: p. 314). In London, *The Times* was much more sceptical.

> The treaty will seem a humiliating confession of surrender by the Western Powers. [...] Unless the Turks so completely alter their habits as to bring the administration of the law into some sort of harmony with that to which Western Europeans are accustomed, it will be impossible for foreign traders to pursue their calling in security (from Gong, 1984b: pp. 118-119).

Either way, one thing was for certain: the Turks were not given their place in international society, they took it by force.

Hats Off to the New Republic

Force would also be the determining factor internally in the final and irreversible step away from Ottoman governance. The more actual ground Kemal gained against Greece, the more he gained ground in the political realm and in the hearts and minds of Turks. The officer in him knew that timing was everything. As early as April, 1920, Kemal had asked the assembly to draft a new constitution. At the time, he had had to concede the temporary nature of his government. But he was laying the groundwork laid for something bigger. The first article of the draft constitution read "[s]overeignty belongs unconditionally to the nation. The government is based on the principle of the people's direct rule over their own destiny." Kemal's influence is clear. Most did not realize the article's implications. General Kiazim Karabekir, the man who had refused the Sultan's order to arrest Atatürk at the very beginning in Erzerum, would later oppose Kemal over his commander's republican aims on the grounds that

> [t]he majority of the persons making up the group supporting this Constitution are aspiring to lead the destiny of the country to a revolution. Only a small fraction of the people would support the idea of a new regime. Supporting the new Constitution can only be a matter of the private opinion of certain members of the Assembly (Berkes, 1964: pp. 445-447; see also Aktar, 1985: ch. 3).

Kemal delayed all engagement in the confrontation that was looming over this most polarizing issue until he was in a better position to deal with it, and the Greeks were his greatest ally towards that end. As long as they posed a threat, friction along the rag-tag Assembly's many ideological fault lines was minimal though ever-present. By 1922, a heated confrontation seemed imminent, but this time, the British inadvertently came to Kemal's rescue by inviting the Sultan's government to Lausanne, infuriating everyone in the GNA. A mere week after the call to Lausanne had come, the bill for the abolition if the Sultanate was ready. It was prepared within a few hours of Atatürk asking for it and passed later that day on November 1, 1922, riding in on the coattails of anti-European sentiment.

The reaction to the British faux-pas had been incredibly swift. The Sultan left aboard the *HMS Malaya* on the 17th and Lausanne again diverted attention from internal matters. With the treaty settled, the ideological rifts within the GNA began to reappear when it came time to settle who would rule, and even of what type government would be put in power, as the question had indeed been left open by the Constitution of 1921. When the Sultan was deposed, the uneasy agreement reached in the Assembly was to elect a new Caliph, Abdul-Medjid, installed on the day after Mehmed VI fled. Both conservative Sheriatists and Kemalist Republicans had hopes and anxieties regarding the new Caliphate. On the one hand, a weak spiritual leader removed of all temporal authority was a stepping stone to a secular Turkish republic. Inversely, to the Islamic conservatives, the new Caliph, who by the very definition of his post was imbued with political powers, embodied a last chance to create a totally Islamic state devoid of the impurities of Hanafite doctrine.

Years later, Kemal would write that "[f]ollowing the abolition of the Sultanate, I accepted the abolition of the Caliphate as it was nothing but the same personal sovereignty under another name" (Berkes, 1964: p. 454). Furthermore, in the aftermath Ottoman collapse, the Caliphate was in fact a source of unwanted foreign influence, and Republicans wished to sever links with the Islamic world precisely for that reason. Kemal would put the issue to the Khilafatists in September of 1923 before they had time to organize a proper opposition. After a ten day filibuster, Minister Sheref, the most venerable to sit in the Assembly and the last official historian of the House of Ösman would proclaim "One hundred years of the Turkish transformation is giving birth to a child. Are we afraid to spell his name? Let us face it: this is Republic!" (ibid: p. 456) Objections were either ignored or went unheard, drowned out by

shouting and rambunctiousness, depending on whose version you read, but the bill spelling the demise of the Caliph and establishing Turkey as the first and as of yet only secular Republic went through on October 19, 1923. It would take until March of the following year for the theocratic office to be legally abolished, but the blow to conservative Islamic leftovers from the Ottoman days was decisive and fatal. Under the new system, the President ran the executive branch and the Assembly ran the legislative. As it happened, Kemal was both president and head of the Assembly. He was also the supreme commander of the Turkish armed forces, as appointed by the Assembly in 1920. Though he did not control nearly as large an area, by 1924, Atatürk had far more control than any Sultan had since the glory days of the fifteenth century.

Though his motivations were far different, Kemal would use his power no less autocratically than a Sultan and over the next decade or so, he would continue to pick off the old Ottoman political and cultural bastions one by one as if they were stragglers in a retreating army. A good soldier cuts his enemy's lines of supply and communication. Governments and cultures, like soldiers and armies, can be isolated and starved into surrender. He depoliticized his own army, fearing a possible alliance between it and opposition parties. He banned religious parties, a sanction eventually extended to all opposition parties in 1930 and which would remain in effect until 1946, eight years after his death. The percentage of religious leaders in the Grand Assembly reflects the success of Kemal's policies. They held 17% of seats in 1920, 11% in 1923, 4% in 1927, 3% in 1931, 2% percent in 1939 and a mere 1% in 1943 (Bozdağlioğlu, 2003: p. 51).

Religious education was not rendered illegal right away, but secular primary education was placed entirely under the Ministry of Education and made free for both boys and girls until the age of 12, which drastically reduced enrolment in madrassas. Opening new religious schools was forbidden outright. By the time of Kemal's death in 1938, the literacy rate had gone up by nearly twenty percentage points (Jevakhoff, 1989: 363). When Latin script was made the official script of the Turkish Republic in 1928, Arabic could no longer be taught in any institution without state permission, and it became illegal to speak or write it in government buildings. Legal bifurcations were eliminated in public law. The Swiss civil code, the most modern at the time, was adopted in 1926 and the Sheriat was completely done away with. Marriage was totally secularized, meaning that inter-faith marriages were possible at any courthouse, absolutely unheard of at the time and still almost guaranteed to raise eyebrows in many parts of the Islamic world. Equal rights of divorce and of succession came with the new code and so did tax reform.

The tithe, a pillar of Islam, was abolished and the last feudal land holdings were redistributed among landless peasants. Universal suffrage came in 1931 and women could run for office by 1934, effectively putting Turkey ahead of the European curve in that respect. Article 2 of the 1924 Constitution, which declared Islam as the state religion, was abrogated in 1928. As in Japan, even clothing became a target of reform. The turban and the fez were banned outright, as were veils in all government institutions including schools as of the end of 1925. This was most alarming to certain hard-line conservatives who found that western head garbs were blasphemous, since one could not show humility before God because the rims make it impossible to prostrate oneself fully when praying.

In a way, Kemal had waged his own war on the Ottoman Empire, and it had been a blitzkrieg. He had capitalized on every advantage, securing his hold on the reins of power in order to bring his vision of a modern, secular Turkey to life. So where did this leave Turkey with regards to the international society of the late 1920s? *Le Figaro* was justified in reporting that the Turks had for the first time in their long history, been accepted as members of the diplomatic community. But one must remember that that community itself had gone through some very dramatic changes, most relevant to this case being the 'pluralisation' of international society, which by definition comes with a relaxation in the standard of civilization and a reduction in both the depth of and adherence to the ordering principles. In the particular case of the 1920's, nationalism also came to be a core tenet of international political ideology. It cannot be stressed enough, however, that Turkey quite literally had to fight for every inch of its sovereignty. No Entente power had ever truly envisioned a Turkish state, republic or otherwise, and the diplomatic history of the nineteenth century was in many ways repeated in Paris and afterwards right up to the treaty of Lausanne.

Beyond any doubt, Turkey's admittance had been incredibly begrudged, most of all by the British. European statesmen and scholars alike seemed to have two major gripes even with respect to the new republic. The first, of course, was the Ottomans' very memorable past disposition for bloody misrule that was not easily forgotten. The Ghazi's autocracy was not at all reassuring. Raymond Poincaré would say of the Turkish Republicans that "[l]a révolution accompli par des Ottomans enthousiastes avait eu pour cause la funeste incurie du système hamidien; mais sous des apparences d'abord libérales, le nouveau gouvernement avait persisté dans les mêmes habitudes d'arbitrairité et de violence" (Garnier, 1973: p. 115). The Weberian

charismatic leader had become the new patriarch and thus the leader of a new bureaucracy, one that he was fashioning after his own beliefs. While the Sultan ruled over his 'human cattle' as per his god-given duty, Kemal was, in his own mind at least, a servant of the people of Turkey. That didn't make Karabekir Pasha's criticism any less true, however. When a journalist asked Atatürk what would happen if parliament voted for a constitutional monarchy, he replied that should that be the case, "we shall chase them away with a big stick" (Jevakhoff, 1989: p. 332). The main criticism of Kemal, and certainly the most widespread, was that despite his benevolence, the old state-subject relations had not changed (Aktar, 1985: ch. 5).

The second major European discomfort was directly related to the first. Turkey had been a deeply religious country, and despite the comparative lack of bloodshed in the Turkish revolution, there was a sort of cultural, even spiritual brutality to the forced secularization of the Kemalists. Throughout his campaign across the country to bolster support for the resistance against Greece, Atatürk never gave any sign that any religious aspect of society would change. He often referred to God in his speeches, he went to prayer on Fridays, and he even had the Ankaran parliamentary sessions opened with prayer in the early years (Ternon, 2005: p. 383). He led a sneak attack on theocratic institutions. When the Caliphate was abolished, he managed to make Islam subservient to republican needs. A Bureau of Religious Affairs was opened to fill the void, but also to subdue and control religiosity. Secularization was thus unnatural. Even Arnold Toynbee, who by his own admission admired the Ghazi, was alarmed by "the general holocaust of ancient social possessions" (Toynbee and Kirkwood, 1927: p. 243). Writing in 1926, the historian added that:

> the transformation had been induced by the force of a strong personality; it could not reproduce itself when that personal stimulus was removed.[...] This is the main danger of the present situation in Turkey. The reforms run the risk of dying out with the reformers by sheer inertia, unless the leaders can pass on the momentum to others as effective and as enthusiastic, while more numerous than themselves (ibid: pp. 257-258).

In other words, the big danger was that the changes just wouldn't stick. There were ample signs from within that this might be the case. The magnitude of change was as great as its speed was blistering, and a mood that can be described as nihilistic angst settled in. Mehmet Emin, a professor of philosophy, wrote in 1928:

> We are facing a spiritual chaos. As a result of the destruction of the institutions of religion which came down from the past and which were found incompatible with

national life as well as modern civilization, unrest had developed in men's souls. Up to now, we have associated Islam with [...] the legal actions of the state.[...] The sociological consequences of the struggle for national liberation and the power created by it have finally demolished all fetters. But, now we are faced with the question of religion minus those institutions and with the question of religion as a religious consciousness and as a religious experience. [...] Can Islam, reshaped to fit the requirements of secular life, fit this need? (*Hayat*, March 1, 1928, taken from Berkes, 1964: p. 492).

Conclusion

It is clear that the emergence of the Republic of Turkey, which implies both secularization and acceptance into the diplomatic community, was the result of historically specific circumstances after a very slow and long progression of Western-inspired reforms. It was both inevitable, the result of many past actions finally coalescing, and a total fluke, impossible without a great number of variables all lining up favourably for Kemalists against overwhelming odds.

Turkish-European convergence more or less happened in nine steps: trade; systemic political interaction brought on by geographical proximity; minimal convergence defined by an initial adoption of the most basic principles of European international institutions by the Ottoman Empire; European technological domination leading to an imposition of Western customs entrenched by juridical measures within the Porte; initial voluntary internalization of Western culture in the hopes of modernizing the Empire coupled with a moderate increase in interaction between Ottomans and Europeans; a cosmopolitan convergence, meaning the creation of a European-minded intellectual-administrative class in the empire; bifurcation of the Ottoman state characterized by the emergence of a dual set of institutions, one based in traditional Islamic culture, the other in western secularism; a period of international chaos which overthrew the traditional understanding of great power management, created an international power vacuum and delegitimized the Sultan, allowing the Westernized element of Ottoman society to take over Turkey and claim its place as a nation-state within the new pluralist international society; finally, consolidation of the new Turkish Republic both internally through the state's creation and imposition of a new, self-perpetuating secular culture, and internationally, first through military victory, then through compliance with accepted international practice.

The first politically ordered interplay between Europeans and the Ottoman Empire, a states-society in its own right, revolved around trade. Regardless of whom they favoured, capitula were little more than business arrangements designed to facilitate commerce, supporting the ES view that trade acts as the 'ice-breaker' of international relations. Necessity and curiosity spontaneously create trade routes, which once established, become lucrative and thus attract interstate governmental involvement to secure roads, raise levees, and so on. In the this case, the cultural exchanges that may have otherwise flourished from East-West trade, as they had in so

many past occasions, were kept to a minimum by the exclusive nature of the religious principles which governed external relations on both sides. Trade did lead to formal contact between the Sultan and European governments through their envoys however, and given the proximity and power of the Islamic empire, it was only a matter of time before political necessities of a more engaging nature would arise. As they did, the Ottomans were drawn into a distinctly European balancing act. When the Sultans first participated in the balance of power, they did so purely intuitively.

Fostering Protestants to weaken the Pope amounted to no more than 'the enemy of my enemy is my friend', which is not quite as subtle nor intricate as balancing in the institutional sense of the term. But the die had been cast and time would do the rest. The eighteenth century would usher in a very moderate increase in the number and depth of interactions, but the foundations for permanent diplomatic relations were established. While European technology and administration improved thanks to the increased competition that accompanied a weaker Vatican, the theocratic monolith that reigned in Istanbul made significant innovations nearly impossible within the Umma. European domination increasingly led to an economically extractive relationship that would be institutionalized by capitula. Another recurring pattern of relations that emerges from that century, brought on by the increased competition of a more pluralist Europe and aggravated by the ascension of Russia to the rank of world power, is the kaleidoscopic deal-making and breaking between competing European states and the Porte. Geography put the Turks at the center of everyone's ambitions, and the fact that the 'sick man' was coming undone made him that much more of a tantalizing target. Even in the more solidarist epoch of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire represented the primary and irremediable source of strife amongst occidental governments. It didn't help that the Ösmanli patriarchs would play on rivalries to get their way. These three patterns of international relations would define the nineteenth century and perdure into the twentieth.

External weakness, whether economic or military in nature, was the one and only impetus for reformative and revolutionary change. Even the more ideologically-motivated Kemalists had to capitalize on the outrage provoked by a Greek invasion to seize power and transform the state. As a result of being reactive rather than goal oriented, earlier reforms were not well planned and lacked foresight regarding their effects. Efforts were further hindered by two main factors. First, because of the way power was spread in the Ottoman government, even an avant-garde Sultan

willing to make changes had to face the entire theocratic and conservative institutions built-in to his administration. From the mightiest Sey-ul Islam to the lowliest mullah, any given reform axed in Western thought would have had half the Ottoman government working against it from square one. The second obstacle was external. Ottoman instability was a source of consternation for all five of the most powerful European empires throughout the nineteenth century. The central powers would have been caught in the middle of any confrontation between Russia and Britain, whose main concern was control of the Straits (and France balanced between Russia and the UK to protect its own interests). They would either seek to stabilize the Porte through legal reforms or use diplomatic or economic pressure to secure their goals in the Empire.

Though European motivations were not always entirely self-serving, Ottoman reforms that were the result of external coercion were problematic more often than not. The Concert of Europe may have been more organized and/or less competitive elsewhere as in China, but there was neither much coordination nor cooperation on their part with regards to the Ottoman Empire. Russia, France, the UK and others would all pursue their own agendas. The reforms that resulted from their compelling thus went in too many different directions at once, effectively making it impossible to achieve lasting or meaningful advances, another similarity to present-day international aid and development. The gravitational pull of the most powerful European empires and the internal Islamic orthodoxy's resistance would have each made politico-economic advancement an arduous endeavour on their own, but combined, they made it nearly impossible. Reforms were not creating enough change in the short term, and big changes never came because the haphazard little reforms were not adding up in the medium to long terms.

One thing the Ottomans did not realize for a long time was that it was not possible to itemize western military superiority or industrial capacity from the rest of Europe's social technologies: culture is a package deal. Weaponry, banking, industrialization and the Renaissance were all linked by a unique historical evolution that resulted in the singular socio-economic construct known as Europe. But at the end of the nineteenth century, the Porte still maintained so many feudal elements in its social organization that it could scarcely compete with the efficiency of the West. It is ironic that the military academies that were erected to strengthen the empire are what brought it down in the end. The introduction of Western culture spread through Ottoman institutions like tumours. Though the foreign elements may have been benign enough at first, the effect on traditional culture became irreversible when the state's vital organs

were infected. The higher education facilities created the new leaders of the bureaucracy and of the armed forces, putting these partisans of modernity exactly where they were most able to create change. In 1908, the Young Turks' parliament became the first governmental body to openly discuss the possible effects of reform and to consider their various options. It is perhaps a little sad that they ended up as casualties of war. Their government was by no means perfect, but it was headed in an interesting if not unique direction, and given enough time, it may have produced a truly authentic form of government, blending eastern and western political philosophies. They may have created something a little more Turkish or they may have reverted to Orthodoxy like their neighbours to the East. If things were different, they just wouldn't be the same, as the saying goes.

At the end of the war, the Ottoman government was at its lowest point ever with respect to the European standard of civilization despite the fact that they had made some progress in a decade of parliamentary government. European antipathies for the Sublime Porte ran so deep that, as soon as he was subdued after the Great War, the Sultan was doomed to remain a western puppet despite changes in the ordering principles of the international society that favoured nationalist causes. Turkey became a member of the international society first because of the latter's shift towards the pluralist end of the spectrum and second, because it resisted attempts by Europeans to subjugate it. It took two hundred years of snail-paced reforms which nevertheless led to the creation of an 'enlightened' administrative-intellectual class, the disappearance of the Habsburg Empire, the transformation of Russia into the Soviet Union, the bankruptcy and military exhaustion of England, France and Germany, the power vacuum that resulted from all this, an Allied-sponsored Greek invasion, a killer monkey, a 180 degree shift in international political principles and a very determined and charismatic Turkish general taking command of the army and the enlightened administrative-intellectual class within it to oust the Sultan to make Turkey a member of the international society.[1]

But to be clear, Turkey became a member of a pluralist international society which was (and still is) European in origin, but not part of the European international society itself. Europe still represented 'the inner ring' or 'the core', and many 'uncivilized' areas of the world remained

[1] Turkey's is not the only case in which military force against the international society was a decisive factor in membership to it. Despite Peter the Great's creation of modern institutions at the beginning of the seventeenth century, it was his military expansion into Scandinavia and the Baltic which brought him into Europe's diplomatic community. Japan's naval victory over Russia in 1905 marked the former's entry as well.

in the outer ring. But the Treaty of Paris had created a semi-periphery of international society which had been growing since 1856. Its numbers were initially increased by American ex-colonial, Balkan and Asian states. After World War I, cultural factors came to play less of a part than economic and material ones, and as a result, the new states emerging from imperial carcasses were also relegated to the semi periphery for lack of means. Turkey joined this enlarged semi-periphery of international society.

Turkish Lessons for the English School

A common observation about the ES is that it is unwieldy. It may well be inaccessible for the novice political scientist. Its ontological complexity makes it hard to apply thoroughly, not to mention the vague and often lacking amount of theory addressing the linkages between the different 'layers' of international relations. Nevertheless, given an adequate amount of contextual research which can be multidisciplinary, drawing from the full spectrum of economic, sociological and cultural studies, the ES allows for an incredible amount of subtlety, depth and breadth. For one thing, the line drawn between domestic and international politics is still there, though it is much more porous. The scholar is thus liberated from the shackles of purely systemic-level analyses. In fact, the ES demands consideration of all three 'images', that is of the individual, of the state and of the system, which again brings us back to the lacking degree of clarity with regards to interactions between the three.

As the creator, preserver, transmitter and evolver of political thought, the individual is the fundamental unit of analysis in the ES. The individual operates within the state, and the state within the system. The international system has two international horizontal levels. There is the international society (or societies), complete with practices, customs and norms based in its own set of values. Its principle components are states. Cosmopolitan society, on the other hand, is a purely inter-human horizontal international phenomenon. You and I are its basic units. The first main complication with this model is that Cosmopolitan Society is simultaneously associated with Kantian-type aspirations towards a single world-state and with anti status quo revolutionism. Logically, this does not follow. It presupposes that revolutionist ideas will increase interstate solidarity in the system as a whole when that has never been the case. Of the three international revolutions identified by Wight, those being the Reformation, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution, not one brought the world closer together. The first two never aimed to and the third would have had to overtake the rest of the planet through violent

uprising to achieve total global convergence. During the age of empires, the idea that nationalism was a legitimate principle by which to organize the international system spread through Cosmopolitan circles before it was accepted in diplomatic ones. But nationalism is an inherently divisive idea and practice. Even human rights, the cosmopolitan ideal of our times, cannot escape the criticism that imposing one's values on others is a violent act. Cosmopolitan society is a very useful concept that may be better off if it was simply detached from any allusions to a Kantian world-state.

The second major problem rests in the ill-established connections between Cosmopolitan society, state leaders and the values of the dominant international society. International societies' values are created and maintained by state-leaders, academics and various diplomatic professionals. Yet as individuals, these people belong to Cosmopolitan Society as well. So how does that work exactly? Are ideas unidirectional, only 'trickling up' from cosmopolitan to international society? Do cosmopolitan ideas only flow outward from the center to the periphery and beyond in international society? In this scenario, the answer is a qualified yes on both counts, though this observation is certainly case-specific. General patterns would only emerge after a lengthy, thorough and narrowly focused comparative study. Until then, we may only speculate. The westernized Ottoman class created and perpetuated by western education can only be described as Cosmopolitan. If there were such a thing as a standard of civilization for individuals, these men (and after Atatürk, women) would have met it. As this study may have unintentionally pointed out, the ES has much in common with Immanuel Wallerstein's take on World Systems Theory. To Wallerstein, the economic centre of the international system stays dominant in part because it creates a directing class fashioned in its own image throughout peripheral states, then co-opts that elite to run the peripheral state in a way that is subservient or at least complementary to the central states' interest. These are very broad strokes, and the Turkish case does not fit exactly into this model, but the parallels are clear.

"Change Is Eternal. Nothing Ever Changes."

"Both clichés are 'true'" (Wallerstein, 1974: p. 1). The observation applies exceedingly well to the Turks. Kemalist reforms didn't die out from lack of inertia. The changes did stick and so did the Treaty of Lausanne, the most long-lived of the post-war agreements. On the day it became a republic, the 'father' of modern Turkey proclaimed:

Our object now is to strengthen the ties that bind us to other nations. There may be a

> great many countries in the world, but there is only one civilization, and if a nation is to achieve progress, she must be a part of this one civilization. [...] The Ottoman Empire began to decline the day when, proud of her successes against the West, she cut ties that bound her to the European nations. We will not repeat this mistake (Bozdağlioğlu, 2003: p. 51).

Turkey won its place in the new, bigger but less cohesive international society, among the 'civilized' states. To keep it, Kemal knew that he had to eliminate the possibility of an Orthodox conservative backlas. In the 1930's, the Kemalists set out to create a new Turkish identity. The state would create the nation. History was rewritten, the Turkish language was purged of Persian and Arabic words.[2] The Six Arrows was the name given to the statist manifesto created by the Ghazi in 1931. The 'arrows' are metaphors for the directions in which he wanted his nation to progress and they are republicanism, secularism, populism, nationalism, statism and the revolutionary spirit. These principles were incorporated into the constitution in 1937 and they would outlive their progenitor, but as with the secular states of Europe, so would religious paradoxes within the government. The Bureau of Religious Affairs still organizes and sponsors the Hadj for eligible citizens. Turkey is still caught between two worlds. It sided with the West during the Cold War. The American missiles there were pivotal bargaining chips during the Cuban Missile Crisis. It sided with the West again during the Gulf Wars and in Afghanistan, but still, its membership applications to the European Union have been denied. Kemalist autocracy has long been dead and the democratic republic remains secular. Marginalization of the more religiously inclined segments of the population has gone a long way towards re-establishing Islamic rhetoric at the heart of opposition parties' platforms. But so does every European rejection.

A popular slogan throughout the 1990's was "Turkey will never be Iran." The Islamic Welfare Party nevertheless resurrected the dyad juxtaposing Islam versus the West and attempted to restore ties with Libya and Iran during its very short tenure as part of a coalition government in 1996, after the EU turned Turkey down, a decision based on cultural determinants and the treatment of Turkey's Kurdish minority. The latter obstacle had been overcome by 2005, but at that time, the EU would raise economic objections. How curious that Greece somehow met these economic requirements when Turkey did not. Change is constant. Nothing ever changes.

---

[2] If there was no synonym of Turkish origin, a European, usually French term would be used.

Bibliography

Aktar, O.C., 1985, *L'Occidentalisation de la Turquie*, Paris: L'Harmattan

Allan, Thomas B., 1994 "Turkey: Struggles for Balance", *National Geographic*, 185, 5, pp. 3-35

Anderson, M.S., 1966, *The Eastern Question 1774-1923: A Study in International Relations*, New York: St. Martin's Press

Ataturk, Mustafa Kémal, (edited by J.P. Jackson), 2005, *Mémoires*, Paris: Coda

Ataturk, Mustafa Kémal, 2008, "Grand discours du 15 au 20 Octobre 1927" de Broquet, H., Lanneau, C. and Peterman, S., *Les 100 discours qui ont marqué le XXe siècle*, Bruxelles: André Versaille éditeur, pp. 111-121

Bazin, Marcel, 1986, "Les disparités régionales en Turquie" de *La Turquie en transition. Disparités, identités, pouvoirs*, Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose

Berkes, Niyazi, 1964, *The Development of Secularization in Turkey*, Montreal: McGill University Press

Bozdağlioğlu, Yücel, 2003, *Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity: A Constructivist Approach*, New York: Routledge

Bozdémir, Michel, 2007, *Turquie: Entre Islam et Europe*, Paris: Éditions Ellipses

Bozeman, Adda, 1984, "The International Order in a Multicultural World", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 387-406

Brownlie, Ian, 1984, "The Expansion of International Society: The Consequences for the Law of Nations" from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 357-369

Bull, Hedley, 1966a, "Society and Anarchy in International Relations", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations,* London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 35-50

Bull, Hedley, 1966b, "International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach", *World Politics*, 18, 3, pp. 361-377

Bull, Hedley, 1966c, "The Grotian Conception of International Society", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 51-73

Bull, Hedley, 1973, "War and International Order", from James, Alan (ed.), 1973, *The Bases of International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 116-132

Bull, Hedley, 1977, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press

Bull, 1977b, "Introduction" from Wight, Martin (edited by Hedley Bull), *Systems of States*, Leceister: Leceister University Press, pp. 1-20

Bull, Hedley; 1984, "The Emergence of a Universal International Society", from Adam Watson

and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 117-126

Butterfield, Herbert, 1952, *Christianity in European History: The Riddell Memorial lectures 1951*, London: Collins

Butterfield, Herbert, 1966a, "The Balance of Power", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 132-148

Butterfield, Herbert, 1966b, "The New Diplomacy and Historical Diplomacy", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 181-192

Butterfield, Herbert and Wight, Martin, (eds.), 1966, *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin

Buzan, Barry, 2004, *From International to World Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Buzan, Barry, and Little, Richard, 2000, *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations*, London: Oxford University Press

Carr, E.H., 1946, *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, second edition, New York: Palgrave

Dore, Ronald, 1984, "Unity and Diversity in World Culture", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 407-424

Dufault, Evelyne, 2007, "L'École Anglaise. Via media entre ordre et anarchie dans les relations internationales?", from Alex Macleod and Dan O'meara (eds.), *Théories des Relations Internationales*, Montreal: Athéna Éditions, pp. 159-176

Dunne, Tim, 1998, *Inventing International Society: A history of the English School*, Oxford: Palgrave

Dunne, Tim, Cox, Michael and Booth, Ken (eds.), (1998), *The Eighty Years' Crisis: International Relations 1919-1999*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Engels, Friedrich, 1884, *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*, New York: Penguin Classics, reprinted in 1986

Epp, Roger, 1998, "The English School on the Frontiers of International Relations" from Dunne, T., Cox, M. and Booth, K. (eds.), (1998), *The Eighty Years' Crisis: International Relations 1919-1999*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 47-64

Fakhry, Majid, 1989, *Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, Paris: Les Éditions de la CERF

Garnier, Jean-Paul, 1973, *La fin de l'Empire ottoman. Du sultan rouge à Mustafa Kémal*, Paris: Plon

Georgeon, François, 1986, "À la recherche d'une identité. Le nationalisme turc" from Altan Gökalp (ed.), *La Turquie en transition*, Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose, pp. 125-153

Gillard, David, 1984, "British and Russian Relations with Asian Governments in the Nineteenth Century", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 87-97

Gong, Gerrit, 1984, "China's Entry into International Society", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.171-183

Gong, Gerritt, 1984b, *The Standard of Civilization in International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Hattstein, M. and Delius, P., 2000, *Islam: Art and Architecture*, Cologne: Konnemann

Howard, Michael, 1966, "War as an Instrument of Policy", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp.

Howard, Michael, (1984), "The Military Factor in European Expansion", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 33-42

Hyman, A. and Walsh, J.J.,(1967), *Philosophy in the Middle Ages: the Christian, Islamic and Jewish Traditions*, New York: Harper and Row

Ikin, R.G., 1928, *A Pageant of History: An Outline of the History of the World*, London: Nelson and Sons

James, Alan (ed.), 1973, *The Bases of International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Jevakhoff, Alexandre, 1989, *Kémal Atatürk. Les chemins de l'occident*, Paris: Tallandier,

Kedourie, Elie 1984, "A New International Disorder", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 347-355

Keynes, John M., 1920, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, New York: Harper and Row

Kushner, David, 1977, *The Rise of Turkish Nationalism: 1876-1908*, London: Frank Cass

Linklater, Andres and Suganami, Hidemi., 2006, *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lloyd-George, David, 1936, *War Memoirs volume IV*, London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson

Lloyd-George, David, 1972a, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, New York, Howard Fertig

Lloyd-George, David, 1972b, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference volume II,* New York: Howard Fertig

Lyon, Peter, 1973, "New States in the International System", from James, Alan (ed.), 1973, *The Bases of International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25-59

MacMillan, Margaret, 2002, *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World*, New York: Random House

Mee, Charles L. Jr., 1980, *The End of Order: Versailles 1919*, New York: Dutton

Naff, Thomas, 1984, "The Ottoman Empire and the European States System", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.143-169

Nathan, Manfred, (1925), *The Renaissance of International Law*, London: Sweet and Maxwell Limited

Neumann, Iver B. and Welsh, Jennifer, 1991, "The Other in European Self-Definition: An

Addendum to the Literature on International Society, *Review of International Studies*, 17, 4, pp. 327-348, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20097270

O'Brien, Patrick, (1984), "Europe in the World Economy", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 43-58

Piscatori, James, 1984, "Islam in the International Order", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 309-321

Pyenson, Lewis and Sheets-Pyenson, Susan, 1999, *Servants of Nature: A History of Scientific Institutions, Enterprises and Sensibilities*, New York: Norton & Company

Suganami, Hidemi, 1984, "Japan's Entry Into International Society", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 185-199

Temon, Yves, 2005, *Empire ottoman. Le déclin, la chute, l'effacement*, Quetigny: Éditions Du Félin

Toynbee, Arnold J., 1925, *The World After the Peace Conference*, London: Oxford University Press

Toynbee, Arnold J., 1964, *Le monde et l'occident*, Paris: Éditions Gonthier

Toynbee, A.J. and Kirkwood, K.P., 1927, *Turkey*, New York: Charles Scribners and Sons

Vincent, R.J., 1986, *Human Rights and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1974, *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Watson, Adam and Bull, Hedley (eds.), 1984, *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Watson, Adam, 1984a, "European International Society and its Expansion", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 1-32

Watson, Adam, 1984b, "Russia and the European System", from Adam Watson and Hedley Bull (eds.), *The Expansion of International Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 59-74

Watson, Adam, 1992, *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Analysis*, London: Routledge

Wight, Martin, 1966a, "Why There Is No International Theory", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 17-34

Wight, Martin, 1966b, "Western Values in International Relations", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations,* London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 89-131

Wight, Martin, 1966c, "The Balance of Power", from Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds.), *Diplomatic Investigations*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 149-175

Wight, Martin, 1973, "The Balance of Power and International Order", from James, Alan (ed.), 1973, *The Bases of International Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 85-115

Wight, Martin (edited by Hedley Bull), 1977, *Systems of States*, Leicester: Leicester University Press

Wight, Martin (edited by Hedley Bull and Carlsten Holbraad), 1978, *Power Politics*, New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, Inc.

Yerasimos, Stéphane, 1993, *Questions d'orient. Frontières et minorités des Balkans au Caucase*, Paris: Éditions La Découverte