

## REAL POLITICS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE EXAMPLE OF FRENCH INVASION OF EGYPT

*Halil ERDEMİR\**

### ABSTRACT

The Osmanlı (Ottoman) State struggled for its very existence against the imperialist powers' partition plans, particularly, in the nineteenth century. The imperialist competition of the European powers on Egypt influenced on the Osmanlı rulers' international policies. Egypt was an important place in the region and international relations from the ancient to the modern periods. The opening of the Suez Canal increased this geo-political significance further, which fuelled the confrontation among the European powers. The Osmanlı rulers' policies regarding on Egypt were adapted to the internal and external developments.

Egypt's proximity to the French colonies in the north and central African countries were important for France as well as for Great Britain. Egypt shortened the way to India and South East Asian colonies, which made Egypt a focal point for France, Russia and Britain. European power struggles in Europe and other parts of the world were reflected in their Egyptian policies and its immediate region. The Osmanlı authorities were well aware of the fact that the Armed forces could not be able to deal with all these imperialist powers at a time. Therefore, policies were finely tuned 'balanced policies' one to another between the imperialist powers' expectations and confrontations. Egypt with its all specialities was perfectly used for the policies of the Osmanlı State and others.

This study discusses the confrontation and power struggles of the imperialist powers for Egypt, and how the Osmanlı State responded to such policies. What kinds of roles Egypt played in the creation of the Osmanlı policies towards the *European* powers? What would be beneficial outcome of such policies for the Osmanlı State and Egypt? The study highlighted that how an internal matter can be an international issue to determine the influential

---

\* Yrd Doç. Dr., Ahmet Yesevi Uluslar Arası Kazak Üniversitesi Uluslar Arası İlişkiler Öğretim Üyesi. Türkistan – Kazakistan. E – mail: uygula@yahoo.com

powers' policies. How international interests creates international conflicts and alliances as in the examples at the beginning of the nineteenth century in Egypt.

**Key Words:** Egypt, the Osmanlı State, France, Great Britain, Russia, International Relations, Realism.

### **MISIR'IN FRANSIZLAR TARAFINDAN İŞGALİ ÖRNEĞİNDE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLERDE REALİZM**

#### **ÖZET**

Osmanlı Devleti özellikle 19ncu yüzyılda emperyalist güçlerin bölme planlarına karşı hayatta kalma mücadelesi vermiştir. Avrupalı Emperyalist güçlerin Mısır üzerindeki yarışları Osmanlı yönetiminin uluslararası politikalarını etkilemiştir. Mısır, Eskiçağ'dan günümüze bölgede ve uluslararası ilişkilerde önemli bir yere sahiptir. Süveyş kanalının açılması Mısır'ın jeopolitik önemini artırırken Avrupalı güçlerin aralarındaki mücadeleleri de ateşlemiştir. Osmanlı'nın Mısır ile ilgili politikaları da içte ve dışarıda meydana gelen yeni gelişmelere göre sürekli uyarlanmıştır.

Mısır'ın Kuzey ve Orta Afrika'daki Fransız kolonilerine olan yakınlığı Fransa için önemli olduğu kadar Büyük Britanya için de hayattır. Mısır'ın Hindistan ve Güney Doğu Asya ülkelerindeki sömürgelere giden yolu kısaltması Fransa, Rusya ve İngiltere için önemli bir ilgi odağı haline gelmesine sebep olmuştur. Avrupalı güçlerin Avrupa ve dünyanın diğer bölgelerindeki mücadeleleri Mısır politikalarında yansımaktadır. Osmanlı eskisi gibi silahlı kuvvetlerinin emperyalist güçlere karşı aynı anda mukabele edemeyeceği gerçeğinin farkındadır. Bu yüzden oldukça hassas ayarlar gerektiren "denge politikaları" Emperyalist güçlerin beklentileri ve çatışmaları dikkate alınarak ayarlanmıştır. Böylece Mısır kendine has bütün özellikleriyle Osmanlı Devleti'nin özel ve genel çıkarları için değerlendirilmiştir.

---

Bu çalışma, Emperyalist güçlerin Mısır üzerinde güç mücadeleleri ve çatışmalarını ele alırken Osmanlı Devleti'nin bu politikalara nasıl cevap verdiğini incelemektedir. Avrupalı güçlere karşı Osmanlı politikalarında Mısır nasıl bir rol oynamıştır? Bu politikaların Osmanlı Devleti ve Mısır için olumlu sonuçları neler olmuştur? Çalışmada, bir iç meselenin etkili güçlerin müdahaleleriyle nasıl bir uluslararası konu haline getirildiği ve politikaları etkilediği gösterilmektedir. Uluslararası çıkarların nasıl uluslararası çatışmalar ve birliktelikler oluşturulmasına etki ettiği 19ncü yüzyılın Mısır örneğiyle incelenmiştir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Mısır, Osmanlı Devleti, Fransa, Büyük Britanya, Rusya, Uluslararası İlişkiler, Realizm.

#### **EGYPT IN THE IMPERIALIST POWERS' MEDITERRANEAN POLICIES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY**

**Egypt on the edge of the agenda of the European Imperialist Powers:** Egypt was a relatively peaceful province since it was conquered by the Osmanlıs at the beginning of the Sixteenth century up to the nineteenth century. Kavalalı Mehmet Ali Paşa and his descendants, who pulled Egypt further out of the Osmanlı control, which paved the way to the political rivalries and conflicts, and eventual invasion of Egypt by the Westerners.

After the Osmanlı conquest of Egypt in 1517, Sultan Selim I (1512-1520), left his viceroy with a guard of 5,000 Yeniçeris (Janissaries), with relatively few changes in its administration. Egypt was regarded as a vassal state, not a province, of the Osmanlı State. Osmanlı Egypt witnessed a competition for power struggles between the Mamluks and the representatives of the Osmanlı administration at the early stages (Lane-poole 1914:158-64). Egypt was dependent to the Osmanlı administration under the governorship of Abu'l Dhahab as 'Sheikh al Balad with the title "Paşa"'. With the permission of İstanbul, Abu'l Dhahab invaded Syria where he died (Shaw&Heywood 1972:44). His deputies and influential commanders in Cairo; İsmail Bey, İbrahim Bey and Murad Bey were soon involved in a dispute of leadership sharing among them. Nevertheless, they were able to maintain their joint administration in 1786 which was interrupted by the Porte in order to restore Osmanlı supremacy in Egypt. On 1 August 1786, İsmail Bey was reinstated as governor, in title of "Sheikh al-Balad and Paşa".

---

When İsmail Bey and his family were fell victims of plague in 1791, İbrahim and Murad Beys were sent to resume their dual government-ship due to the need for competent rulers in Cairo. These two Beys were in office when Bonaparte entered Egypt in July 1798.

**The French interests and occupation of Egypt:** Napoleon Bonaparte and French Foreign Secretary Charles Maurice de Talleyrand persuaded Directoire (Directory, Prime Minister) on the decision of interest of Egypt's invasion. Accordance to the French statesman, France would be able to gain the upper-hand in Europe 'if the Great Britain would be stopped in their colonies or diminish their easy access to them' (Armaoğlu 1988:44-45,87; Fulton 1984:141-143). Accordingly French generals decided to invade Egypt, in order to the French dominance in the Eastern Mediterranean which was used Great Britain's easy access to India. France had lost its Indian colony to Britain in the war of 1756-1763. This lost was never forgotten by the French rulers (Kent 1984:172; Shaw 1976:268; Sousa 1933:46-47). France tried to alternate it's lost by gaining the seven Greek islands and Albania which made France, a neighbour to the Osmanlı State. The French intention was partly known to the Osmanlı authorities as 'Bonaparte's spreading nationalistic ideas among the Greeks, and French invaded Create and Mora' (on 12 June 1898) which was also known to the Russians (Karal 1983:27,102; Lewis 1961:53-64; Miller 1927:4,37-45). Ostensibly, the French and the Osmanlıs had to been in peace at the time. The Turks were supportive to the French existence as their ally in Europe (İnalçık 1974:51-57).

The Russians were eager to eliminate the French dominance over the Eastern Mediterranean which was a challenge to the Russian influence on the territories and Christian orthodox. The French invasion and influence in some of the Balkan countries were not serving to the political, cultural and economic interests of Russia (Kent 1984:1; Kinross 1977:424; Miller 1923:5,14,32). 'The Russian ultimate political goals were the control over the Straits, national statehood for the Balkan Christian peoples, and ascendant political influence throughout the region. Russia pursued these ends in three ways; by the use of force, by diplomatic combination with the Powers, or by alliance with the Porte itself'(Bodger 1984:76). Russia tried many ways to achieve its ultimate aims. 'Early in the nineteenth century, it had already become an axiom of Russian policy that the preservation of a weak Turkey under predominantly Russian influence would be preferable to its dissolution and partition. The real focal point of Russian economic, political, and strategic interests in the Osmanlı State lay at the Straits' (Bodger 1984:76-77; Shaw 1976:270; Sönmezoğlu 2006:537,690-98).

---

Nevertheless, France declared that the aim of the French invasion was 'to reinstate the authority of the Sublime Porte, and suppress the Mamluks'. The proclamation printed with the Arabic types brought from the Propaganda press, and issued shortly after the taking of Alexandria on 2 July 1798 and Cairo on 25 July 1798 (Kartal 1983:27,37,101; Miller 1927:31). Bonaparte's declaration referred 'the prophet Muhammed, Allah, and the Qur'an' far more than the Mamluks revered. It was argued that 'all men were equal except so far as they were distinguished by their intellectual and moral excellences, of neither of which the Mamluks had any great share. In future, all posts in Egypt were to be open to all classes of the inhabitants; the conduct of affairs was to be committed to the men of talent, virtue, and learning' (Ahmad 1984:11). The French authority tried to spread an idea and encouraged locals' rebellion against their rulers, the Osmanlı State, by saying "Egypt belongs to Egyptians". Similar kinds of approaches and perceptions were exercised in the other parts of the Osmanlı State for the realisation of French interests (Kartal 1983:101-110; Karpas 2001:162-63).

A municipal council was established in Cairo, consisting of persons taken from the ranks of the sheiks, the Mamluks and the French. Delegates from Alexandria and other important towns were added to the council. This council did little more than register the decrees of the French commander, who continued to exercise a kind of dictatorial power. Initial reaction to the French invasion was vague by the locals 'friendly feeling' in various means. Villages and towns which capitulated to the invaders were required to hoist the flags of both, the Sublime Porte and the French republic. The French authority tried to spread its influences and interests by every means in the region and the Eastern Mediterranean (Shaw 1976:268-69).

Nevertheless, the Osmanlı authorities tried to respond the French invasion initially by organised local Beys' resistance and to find possible international alliances against France and the French interests in the region. In this issue, particularly Britain was favoured, as the Porte ordered that 'the British navy will be welcomed and treated by friendly approaches' in the Osmanlı ports. Russia, on the other hand, was eager to eliminate French influence in the region which made Russia a natural ally of the Osmanlı State (Bailey 1942:30-62; Bodger 1984:77; Graves 1999:1-9). Russia warned the Osmanlı authority about the intention of France in the Eastern Mediterranean which was cautiously treated by the Sublime Porte. Moreover, Russia determined not to leave the Russian interests to France in the Mediterranean, and prepared its navy to sail towards Bosphorus. British Admiral Lord Nelson attacked the French Navy by destroying

13 out of 17 warships in Aboukir port on 1 August 1798 (Karal 1983:30; Kinross 1977:424-25). Two months after this event, the Osmanlı authority proclaimed war against France on 25 September 1798. The Osmanlı State and Russian Empire signed a treaty on 23 November 1798, and the Osmanlı State and Britain on 5 January 1799 (Karal 1983:31,38-9). According to the agreements, Russia obliged to defend the Osmanlı State's territorial integrity and vice versa, which was agreed that the agreement was assumed to be started before the French invasion of Egypt. So, this was the first ever international agreement of the Osmanlı State to use a foreign power against its European Christian enemy power in its war. These agreements were on the line of European understanding of alliances and cooperation which had to be adapted by the Osmanlı authorities. This, on the other hand, was also against the principles of getting a Christian power's assistance against to another, in its interpretation of Islam (Hourani 1974:73; Kinross 1977:425).

These agreements were difficult to be observed by the Osmanlı Muslim public opinion. Nevertheless, there were practical results for the contracting parties of the agreements. While the Osmanlı State getting the Christian powers' support against to another Christian state, in this case it was France, the Osmanlıs secured its eastern border against possible Russian attack. So, as an arch enemy of the State, Russia, became an ally, who gained free access to the Mediterranean ports increasing Russian trade relations. Russians were able to access its co-religious communities within the Osmanlı State, which was a challenge against the French interest in this particular issue (Kent 1984:1; Karal 1983:35). Starting from that time onwards, the British and the Russian influences were felt more than ever in the Osmanlıs' international relations, particularly, on the security and strategic issues of the Eastern Mediterranean. Britain was eager to maintain the security of its Indian trade road, and vital trade interests in the region. Moreover, the Osmanlı State signed an another agreement with the two Sicilian Kingdoms against France on 21 January 1799 which made the total agreed alliance states was four (Armaoğlu 1988:52-54; Boyce 1999:5-20).

Meanwhile, the Egyptians-French conflicts were started as a result of the destruction of the French fleet at the Battle of the Nile. The strained relations were increased between the conquerors and the conquered day by day. The French authority imposed a house tax which paved the way an insurrection in the University of El Azhar in Cairo on 22 October 1798. The Egyptian mob killed the French General Dominique Martin Dupuy (1767-1798), Governor of Cairo. The upheavals were suppressed by the arrival of General Jean Baptiste Kléber from

---

Alexandria. Napoleon Bonaparte wanted to extend the French suzerainty to Syria and the neighbouring areas. Bonaparte regarded Syrian invasion, was, an absolute necessary measure, for holding and governing of Egypt and the region (McGhee 1992:24-33). He said that 'in order better administration and absolute power in the region the conqueror must hold "Egypt and Syria" together' (Karal 1983:39; Kinross 1977:425). Napoleon wanted to eliminate British influence and interest in the region by conquering Syria in addition to the already invaded of Egypt. To achieve his idea, Napoleon marched with his 18,000 troops towards Syria on 31 December 1798. He continued his route by conquering Elarish, Gaza and Jaffa in February 1799. Nevertheless, he was not able to conquer Acra as a result of fierce resistance of Cezzar Ahmet Paşa and his new Nizam-ı Cedid Army. The Bonaparte's withdrawal from Acra was the first defeat of his Army career despite his declaration that 'his mission was accomplished' on 5 May 1799 (Karal 1983:40-41; Kinross 1977:425-26; McCarthy 1997:289-90).

Bonaparte returned to Egypt, where he won a battle against the British fleet which was aided by the Turkish army. Köse Mustafa Paşa was the commander of the army who lost the battle at Aboukir on 25 July 1799. Napoleon returned to France, for his future carrier, in order to assist the losing French army against Austrians, by leaving his appointee General Kléber to govern Egypt on 23 August 1799. The new Turkish forces were sent to Egypt by sea from Damietta and by land from Damascus, which were welcomed by the locals. The reinstated Turkish authority was approved by the signing of the agreement on 24 January 1800 (Karal 1983:41; Shaw 1976:268-69). However, the implementation of the agreement was interrupted by the intervention of Great Britain. Perhaps, as it was a reflection of imperialist competition and conflicting interests in Europe, the British government ordered Sir Sidney Smith to take the French forces as prisoners of war before the carrying out of the signed convention. As a result of this British intention, Kléber decided to precede the country in a state of defence which led to attack the Turks at Mataria and vice versa. Kléber succeeded to hold Egypt until his assassination on 14 June 1800. Kléber was replaced by General Abdullah Jacques (F. Baron de) Menou (1750-1810) who took various measures in order to win locals' hearts and minds. General Menou declared that 'he embraced Islam, and he excluded Christians from the divan which was replaced by the Copts and Muslims'. Nevertheless, his declaration of Egypt as 'a French protectorate' was regarded by the locals as 'a French colony' (Karal 1983:101-2; Shaw 1976:269).

---

**Return to Osmanlı Control:** The English forces landed at Aboukir, and then proceeded to Alexandria under Sir Ralph Abercromby who was attacked by Menou on 2 March 1801. The Osmanlı Army arrived under Kapudan-ı Derya Hüseyin Paşa, high admiral of the Osmanlı Navy, to take Rosetta on 25 March 1801. The Turkish and the English troops forced the French troops to evacuate from Egypt in August and September 1801. This was the termination of the French occupation of Egypt. The Turks tried to eliminate the French influence as well as the power of the Mamluks in a plot with the assistance of British intelligence. Nevertheless, this led the beginning of the disastrous power struggles between the Mamluks and the Turks. Muhammed Hüsrev was the first Turkish governor of Egypt after the expulsion of the French, who continued to fight the resistance of the Mamluks (Kinross 1977:426).

The French invasion of Egypt and the European powers' reaction was marked the European states' early interests in the region and power politics in the area. For the first time, some of the European powers supported the Osmanlı State against their European rivals (Kent 1984:1-2). European religious bigotry did not play its role in the relations as much as it was expected. The Christian European states fought against another Christian state. The uniqueness in this issue, in fact, the support was made to a Muslim state against its co-religious Christian power. This incident indicated that the nature of economic and political interests were much powerful than the religious feelings. In international relations and international interests were required rationality rather than sentimental connections. The Osmanlı authorities realised that 'their state's crafts are no longer would be able to resist and overcome a powerful single enemy. Rationality in international relations of the state had to be applied. Religion could be left aside in the matter of life and death of the state. This was the first time experienced which will be used quite often in the coming decades of "power balance policies" of international relations. The rulers played one Great Power off against another to get the best advantage for the State (Arı 2006:214-231; Beloff 1967:1-23; Sönmezoğlu 2005:235-249).

European politics were played and Egypt became the central focal point of political and military discussion. Russia, Britain and the Osmanlı State agreed on the expulsion of France from the Eastern Mediterranean. International secret and open agreements were signed for their mutual interests bilaterally and multilaterally. For the first time, the Osmanlı State agreed and signed with non-Muslim states against another power/s. The political frictions and rivalries among



---

the Powers were used for the Osmanlı policies by the Turkish authorities for the first time (Kent 1984:2-3; Armaoğlu 1988:44-45; Karal 1983:42).

France had aims and occupied Egypt for the realisation of their dreams. Nevertheless, France could not achieved all their aims; Great Britain could not have been stopped to access its colonies, India and other vital colonies in the region. Britain was able to continue to hold Malta and Gibraltar in its possession and it was able to eliminate the Napoleon's threat posed on the British interest in the region and Europe. Russia continued to dominate its influence in the co-religious communities and was also able to trade freely in the Eastern Mediterranean (Karal 1983:43; Kinross 1977:426).

The rulers of the Osmanlı State had realised that 'the state was no longer strong enough to oppose or defence against a powerful state by its own'. For the first time, the Osmanlı State played its' newly invented "power balanced policy" between the European conflicting powers. To achieve such policy, the rulers signed several secret and open agreements between Russia, Britain and Sicilian island states (Kent 1984:3; Karal 1983:73).

As soon as the required peace was achieved by the usage of force, the rulers of the Osmanlı State started to question the Russian and the British interests and intentions, on the region in particular, on the Osmanlı State in general. The Osmanlı State tried a peaceful settlement with France, by bearing in mind that Osmanlıs might need France in the near future against its present allies (Karal 1983:43; Kinross 1977:427).

Bonaparte was ordered to dissolution of the ally against France and the French interests. At the initial stage, France would not be cooperative-working with Great Britain while their interests confronting on Egypt, the Eastern Mediterranean and Europe. The Osmanlı State would not be regarded differently with Great Britain, while, France wanted to obtain some of its territories. So, these two states, Great Britain and the Osmanlı State, according to the French rulers, 'could not be worked with for the immediate coming years'. Russia, on the other hand, was 'a possible candidate to be approached to' while the Russians were not happy on the replacement of French invaded areas by the British troops. The power balances in Europe were delicate and fragile, and possible political approaches had to be tuned and scrutinized carefully. Napoleon Bonaparte tried every way to find a compromise between Russia and Austria against the Osmanlı State and Great Britain. According to the envisaged plan, France was going to obtain the Eastern Mediterranean and Egypt, whereas Russia will be the dominant

---

power in the Eastern countries up to India. Austria had to be included to the plan by given the most of the Balkan countries (Bodger 1984:76-77; Karal 1983:44-45). Nevertheless, Tsar Paul was assassinated by an interest group who deal and encourage the relations between Russia and Great Britain. So, the French plan died before it was born and implemented.

On the other hand, negotiations were concluded with the Treaty Amiens between Great Britain and France in 1802, while the Paris Agreement was signed between the Osmanlı State and France. The Osmanlı State regained Egypt (Kinross 1977:426; Shaw 1976:270). The personal relations between Napoleon Bonaparte and Sultan Selim III were used to improve the bilateral relations of the two states. The political rivalries in Europe, particularly between Great Britain and France, led alliances. Soon, rivalries paved way the wars between France and Great Britain and its allies in Europe (Hale 2000:22; Karal 1983:46-49; Kinross 1977:429).

### CONCLUSION

The Osmanlı State experienced one of the most difficult periods at the first half of the nineteenth century. The European imperialist powers' competitions on Egypt were varied and affected the Osmanlı State's Egyptian policies directly or indirectly. Egypt was/is one of the important strategic places which was/is important for world powers in the region and international relations throughout history. The importance of geo-strategically and geo-economic significance of Egypt which fuelled the confrontation among the European imperialist powers was practiced through Mehmet Ali Paşa incidents. The confrontation of interests were forced the involving states to make alliances according to their political, economic and strategic requirements of the time. The Osmanlı rulers made their alliances for the first time with one or many Christian states against another Christian power or a Muslim vassal state. Accordingly, the Osmanlı rulers created multiple policies regarding the area and Egypt. Osmanlı Egypt policies were adapted to the internal as well as international developments of the time.

Egypt was very important strategic point for France and Great Britain due to its proximity to their colonies in Africa and Asia. Egypt was the way to the colonies and very important for the domination in the Eastern Mediterranean. Russia wanted to use Egyptian issues in order to reach to the Mediterranean Sea and eliminate the British influence in India and the East. The Russian influence and presence in the Eastern Mediterranean was not welcomed by the Turks and

---

the European powers. The Osmanlı State was not be able to deal with all the imperialist powers at a time. This paved the way carefully balanced policies between the imperialist powers' expectations and confrontations. Egypt was the focal point and used for the policies of the Osmanlı State and the European powers. The developments in Egypt were the primary factors in the changes of the policies of the involving parties' needs.

Some of the Powers had had interests in the Osmanlı State for much longer than the others while some of the Powers' concerns were basic. Some Powers had special interests on geographical areas, France, for instance, was particularly concerned with Egypt and Syria. Great Britain's particular interests with Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean which was vital for the protection and continuation of the colonies. Russia's particular concern lay within the Straits and northern Anatolia (Erkin 1968:23-29).

Egypt was vital for the Great Powers' pursuit of interests for various reasons such as consideration of strategy, economic gain and political prestige. The European Imperialist interventions in Osmanlı affairs were the special circumstances in the Osmanlı State. The nineteenth century was the European century par excellence, and many part of the globe effected by the European Powers' attention. The strategic location and its proximity to Europe and vital colonies, Egypt, namely, the Osmanlı State, could hardly have escaped European encroachments.

As Feroz Ahmad suggested "the Ottoman-Turkish experience with Europe was a bitter one and it has left deep scars on the Turkish psyche. Its memory continues to haunt the Turkish people to this day" (Ahmad 1984:26). Perhaps this was true to say that such understanding and suspicion started with the Egypt invasion of France in 1798.

When Egypt was invaded by France in 1798, Great Britain and France reacted immediately not because of the protection of the integrity of the Osmanlı State received lavish support by the two states in order to force France to evacuate out of the area. Economic, political and strategic rivalries and confrontations were apparent between the Powers. The Osmanlı rulers used 'the balance policy' for the first time despite the understanding and the practices of the State. This was the beginning of the changes in the foreign policy pillars of the Osmanlı State. Rationality and real politics were replaced the religious dominated approaches and perception on the foreign policies. Egypt was the central issue in the changes of the policies and the realisation of the interests of foreign powers on the Osmanlı

domain. Bilateral and multilateral agreements were signed for the first time for or against the Osmanlı State. In spite of internal and external turbulences, and the fact that its military power was almost at rock bottom, the Osmanlı State had managed to come through the internationalised conflicts of its own. The State achieved relatively little loss of territory, by forming flexible alliances and exploiting the mutual rivalries of the European powers. During the period of this study covered, the main threats were posed by the European powers and indirectly from European supported Christian communities' rebellions.

France, Russia and Great Britain had fought to achieve their aims on the Osmanlı State. Their interests either forced them to fight each other or one to another within a short period of time. The realisation of the weakness of the Osmanlı State led new rivalries and/or alliances for the involving parties. The situation and the balance of the Osmanlı State was changed permanently, and never be the same as it was before, from that time onwards. The new situation will constantly arose accordance with new international developments, and the Osmanlı rulers will adapt themselves for better than the Powers' expectations. One way or another, the shadow of the first balance policy experience of Egypt will follow the Turkish rulers up to the present time.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHMAD, Feroz, "The Late Ottoman Empire," edited by Marian Kent, **the Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire**, George Allen & Unwin, London, Boston, Sydney 1984, p.5-30.
- ARI, Tayyar, **Uluslararası İlişkiler Teorileri**, 4. Baskı, Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul 2006.
- ARMAOĞLU, Fahir, **20. Yüzyıl Siyasî Tarihi 1914-1980**, Tisa Matbaası, Ankara 1988.
- BAILEY, Frank Edgar, **British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement, A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations 1826-1853**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge and London 1942.
- BELOFF, Max, **the Balance of Power**, McGill University Press, Montreal 1967.
- BODGER, Alan, "Russia and the End of the Ottoman Empire", edited by Marian Kent, **the Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire**, George Allen & Unwin, London, Boston, Sydney 1984, p.76-110.

- 
- BOYCE, D. George, **Decolonisation and the British Empire, 1775-1997**, Macmillan Press, Hong Kong.
- CREASY, Edward S., **History of the Ottoman Turks**, Khayats, Beirut 1961.
- DAVIS, William Stearns, **A Short History of the Near East**, The Macmillan Company, New York.
- DAVISON, Roderic H., *Turkey*, Prentice-Hall, Washington 1968.
- ERKIN, Feridun Cemal, **Türk-Sovyet İlişkileri ve Boğazlar Meselesi**, Başnur Matbaası, Ankara 1968.
- FULTON, L. Bruce, "France and the End of the Ottoman Empire," edited by Marian Kent, **the Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire**, George Allen & Unwin, London, Boston, Sydney 1984, p.141-171.
- GRAVES, Philip P., **İngilizler ve Türkler, Osmanlıdan Günümüze Türk-İngiliz İlişkileri (1700-1939)**, translated by Yılmaz Tezkan, Birinci Baskı 21 Yüzyıl Yayınları, Ankara 1999.
- HALE, William, **Turkish Foreign Policy 1774-2000**, Frank Cass Publishers, London 2000.
- HOURANI Albert, "the Ottoman Background of the Modern Middle East", in edited by Kemal Karpat, **the Ottoman State and Its Place in World History**, E.J. Brill, Leiden 1974, p.61-78.
- İNALCIK, Halil, "The Turkish Impact on the Development of Modern Europe", in edited by Kemal Karpat, **the Ottoman State and Its Place in World History**, E.J. Brill, Leiden 1974, p.51-58.
- JUNG, Dietrich & PICCOLI, Wolfgango, **Turkey at the Crossroads Ottoman Legacies and a Greater Middle East**, Zed Books, London & New York 2001.
- KARAL, Enver Ziya, **Osmanlı Tarihi, V. Cilt**, 4. Baskı, TTK Basımevi, Ankara 1983.
- KARPAT, Kemal, **Ortadoğu'da Osmanlı Mirası ve Ulusçuluk**, translated by Recep Boztemur, İmge Kitabevi, İstanbul & Ankara 2001.
- KARPAT, Kemal, **Turkey's Politics**, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1966.

- 
- KENT, Marian, "Great Britain and the End of the Ottoman Empire," edited by Marian Kent, **the Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire**, George Allen & Unwin, London, Boston, Sydney 1984, p.172-205.
- KENT, Marian, "Introduction", edited by Marian Kent, **the Great Powers and the End of the Ottoman Empire**, George Allen & Unwin, London, Boston, Sydney 1984, p.1-4.
- KINROSS, Lord, **The Ottoman Centuries the Rise and Fall of the Turkish Empire**, William Morrow and Company, New York 1977.
- LANE-POOLE, Stanley, **Turkey**, T. Fisher Unwin, London 1914.
- LEWIS, Bernard, **The Emergence of Modern Turkey**, Oxford University Press, London, New York and Toronto 1961.
- LYBYER, Albert Howe, **The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent**, Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1913.
- McCARTHY, Justin, **The Ottoman Turks An Introductory History to 1923**, Longman London and New York 1997.
- McGHEE, George, **ABD-Türkiye-NATO-Ortadoğu**, translated by Belkıs Çorakçı, Birinci Basım Bilgi Yayınları, İstanbul 1992.
- MILLER, William, **The Ottoman Empire and Its Successors 1801-1927**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1927.
- PALMER, Alan, **the Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire**, John Murray, Cambridge 1995.
- SHAW, Ezel Kural & HEYWOOD C. J., **English and Continental Views of the Ottoman Empire, 1500-1800**, University of California, Los Angeles 1972.
- SHAW, Stanford J. & SHAW Ezel Kural, **History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume II: Reform, Revolution, and Republic: The Rise of Modern Turkey, 1808-1975**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1977.
- SHAW, Stanford, **History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey, Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1976.

---

SÖNMEZOĞLU, Faruk, **Türk Dış Politikası**, Der Yayınları, İstanbul 2006.

SÖNMEZOĞLU, Faruk, **Uluslararası Politika ve Dış Politika Analizi**, Filiz Kitabevi, İstanbul 2005.

SOUSA, Nasım, **The Capitulatory Regime of Turkey**, the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.