



Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

Faishal Agil Al Munawar

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding Email: faishalagilalmunawar@uin-malang.ac.id

Received: 25-12-2024 Reviewed: 10-01-2025 Accepted: 27-01-2025

Abstract

The Ottoman Empire, which lasted for over six centuries, experienced significant political and administrative transformations, particularly in its final years. This research analyzes the transition from an Islamic Caliphate to a secular republic, using Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity as a framework. Foucault's concept of power, as embedded in social structures, helps explain the gradual collapse of the Ottoman political system, influenced by socio-political factors such as nationalism, secularism, and the decline of imperial authority. The study explores the role of power mechanisms like military control, cultural hegemony, and administrative reforms in this transformation. Adopting a normative, descriptive-qualitative approach, the research follows four stages: data collection, reduction, presentation, and conclusion. The findings suggest that the Ottoman Empire's decline was shaped by both external pressures and internal shifts in how power was exercised. The study underscores the importance of Foucault's concepts in understanding the empire's modernization and eventual collapse, offering a deeper perspective on the shift from an Islamic Caliphate to a secular republic.

Keywords: Change in Government System; Ottoman Empire; Michel Foucault; Theory of Power and Modernity

Introduction

The discussion of power is an intriguing topic that has never ceased to be debated. This began in ancient Greece and continues to the present day (Inal, 2021). Classical philosophers generally associated power with goodness, virtue, justice, and freedom (Haris, 2020). Religious thinkers linked power to God. Political power was seen merely as a tool to serve the purpose of the state, which was considered noble and great, namely goodness, virtue, justice, and freedom, all based on the will of God and for the glory of God. (White, 2023)

Turkey is a nation that once ruled and reached the peak of its glory with the Islamic caliphate system during the medieval period, manifested in the form of the Ottoman Empire

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

(Shafir, 2019). History records that during its rule, which lasted for more than five centuries, Turkey experienced fluctuations where the bureaucratic system, directly led by the Ottoman Sultan, required the Sultan to have the ability to control governance effectively. (Fatarib et al., 2023)

Several sultans who became the caliphs of the Ottoman Empire were able to lead the empire to great strength and territorial expansion (Cherem & Zahreddine, 2021). The Ottoman Empire was able to resist and conquer the territories of the Byzantine Empire, one of the great empires that dominated from the early to the middle centuries. This made the Ottoman Empire emerge as a new Islamic power that was respected and caused concern among the Christian and Catholic kingdoms of the time (Yussa Azmi Naufal, 2016, p. 2).

The Ottoman Empire was the longest-lasting and largest empire in terms of territorial extent throughout the second millennium. It is said to be so because the Ottoman Empire endured for over six hundred years (1281-1924 AD) (Grosjean, 2011), experiencing both weaknesses and periods of grandeur (Yanatma, 2022). The Ottoman Empire, which was ruled by approximately 36 sultans, became a "giant empire" (Imperium, Empire) that played a significant role in enriching the pages of Islamic history. Over more than six centuries of its rule, the Ottoman Empire succeeded in expanding its power across three continents (Grigoriadis, 2023): Asia, Europe, and Africa. In Asia, Ottoman territory included Armenia, Iraq, Syria, Hijaz, and Yemen. In Europe, the Ottomans controlled Bulgaria, Greece, Albania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Romania. In Africa, the Ottoman Empire expanded its influence to Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, and Algeria.

Michel Foucault's theory of power and modernity focuses more on the mechanisms and strategies for organizing collective life. There are five methodological aspects of power that Foucault pays particular attention to: First, the role of laws and regulations; Second, the goals of power; Third, power is not localized but is everywhere; Fourth, power directed upwards; Fifth, the combination of power and ideology.

Foucault argued that every social relationship is essentially a relationship of power (hegemony of power). Power exists in every social interaction. In Foucault's view, power, as the foundation of social reality, is productive and invisible because it is everywhere, spreading and infiltrating every aspect of life, as well as being absorbed into knowledge and social practices that ultimately create a regime of truth. With this nature, the continuity of power seems to become unconscious. Individuals are willing to comply with what is demanded by power without even realizing they are being controlled (Michael Foucault, 2002, p. 120).

This type of power is referred to as disciplinary power. It induces compliance in individuals to conform to the discourse of discipline. In other words, it is a way of enforcing power through normalization. It represents a technology of normalizing societal life. Thus, the concept of normalcy is nothing more than a social construct built through dominant discourse. This discourse then gives rise to practices such as defining, categorizing, and measuring normality. All of this becomes routine and is accepted as a necessary practice to follow (Siskandar, 2008, p. 100-101).

From the above explanation, the author intends to analyze the Pattern of Change in the Ottoman Empire's Government System and apply Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity in analyzing these changes.

Literature Review

Change in Government System

Change in Government System refers to the transformation or shift in how a country or region is governed and administered. It encompasses changes in the structure, policies, principles, and methods used to manage society and the state (Askim et al., 2024). Change in Government System refers to the transition or evolution in the way a government is organized and operated, often influenced by various political, social, and historical factors. (Zhou et al., 2024)

Ottoman Empire

The Ottoman Empire was a vast and influential state that spanned over 600 years, from around 1299 to 1923. It was one of the largest empires in history, at its height controlling large parts of Southeast Europe, Western Asia, and North Africa. The empire was founded by Osman I and expanded through conquest and alliances. Its capital was Constantinople (modern-day Istanbul), which became the cultural and political center of the empire after it was captured in 1453.

Michel Foucault's Power Theory and Modernity

Michel Foucault's theory of power is central to understanding modernity and the evolution of social control. In contrast to traditional views of power as something that is centralized or possessed by specific elites, Michel Foucault emphasizes that power is diffuse, relational, and intertwined with knowledge. Modern power operates through surveillance, discipline, and the regulation of life itself, shaping individuals and populations in subtle but profound ways. By analyzing the relationship between power and knowledge, Michel Foucault provides a critical lens through which we can understand the ways in which modern societies control and govern individuals, and how resistance operates within these power structures. (Castro-Gómez et al., 2023)

Research Method

This research discusses the Change in the Government System of the Ottoman Empire. It falls under the category of normative research as it examines documents and literature related to the Change in the Government System of the Ottoman Empire. The approach used is descriptive-qualitative, aimed at analyzing the Change in the Government System of the Ottoman Empire from the perspective of Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity. As a qualitative study, this research involves four interconnected stages: 1. Data collection, 2. Data reduction, 3. Data presentation, and 4. Drawing conclusions or verification. From this, the

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

research aims to provide insights into the Change in the Government System of the Ottoman Empire from the perspective of Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity.

Result and Discussion

The Government System of the Ottoman Empire

The Ottoman Empire was established in 1281. The founder of this empire was the Turkish people from the Oghuz tribe who settled in Mongol regions and the northern part of China, namely Osman bin Erthogril. The name Ottoman was derived from their first grandfather and the founder of this empire, Osman bin Erthogril bin Sulaiman Shah from the Qayigh tribe, a branch of the Oghuz Turkish descendants (Bandri Yatim, 2010, p. 129).

Before the establishment of the Ottoman Empire, the journey began with Sulaiman Shah's expedition to Anatolia. However, before reaching his destination, he passed away in Azerbaijan, and his position was replaced by his son, Erthogril. Eventually, they reached Anatolia and were accepted by the Seljuk ruler, Sultan Alauddin, who was at war with the Byzantines. Thanks to Erthogril's assistance, Sultan Alauddin's forces were victorious, and as a reward, Erthogril was granted a piece of land on the Byzantine border and given authority to expand. After Erthogril's death, with Sultan Alauddin's approval, he was succeeded by his son, Osman, who ruled the Ottoman Empire from 1281 to 1324 CE. (Zürcher, 2019)

The Mongol invasion of Baghdad, including the Seljuk territories, in 1300 CE, led to the death of Sultan Alauddin, causing the Seljuk dynasty to break into several small states (Ajib Thohir, 2004, p. 182). In the wake of Seljuk's collapse, Osman declared full independence over the territories he occupied and proclaimed the establishment of the Ottoman Empire, with Osman as the first ruler, often referred to as Osman I (Badri Yatim, p. 130).

The rulers of the Ottoman Empire held the titles of Sultan and Caliph simultaneously. The Sultan held worldly power, while the Caliph had authority in religious matters or spiritual/afterlife concerns. The power was inherited, but it was not necessarily the firstborn who succeeded the previous Sultan; at times, power was passed to the Sultan's brothers instead of his sons (Ajib Thohir, 2004, p. 53).

In the governance structure, the Sultan as the highest ruler was assisted by the *Shadr al-A'zam* (Prime Minister), who oversaw the *Pasha* (governors), with the governors heading the first-level provinces. Below them were several *Al Zanaziq* or *Al Alawiyah* (regents). To manage the state's affairs, during Sultan Suleiman I's reign, laws (Qanun) were established, including *Multaqa al Abhur*, which served as the legal guide for the Ottoman Empire until the reforms of the 19th century. Sultan Suleiman I was given the title *Al Qanuni* for his contributions (Badri Yatim, 2010, p. 135).

On March 3, 1924, with the reformist figure Mustafa Kemal Atatürk and the Young Turks organization (Ahmad al-Usairy, 2003, p. 372), the Sultanate and Caliphate were officially abolished in Turkey, and the Republic of Turkey was proclaimed as a secular state

according to its constitution (Ajib Thohir, 2004, p. 161). Despite being a monarchy, it is interesting to note that during the Ottoman Empire's reign, the country was governed by three key officials: the Sultan, the Vizier, and the Mufti. From this, it can be said that although the state was a monarchy, there was already a division of powers, and thus, this empire cannot be classified as an absolutist monarchy (Hasbi Amiruddin, 2000, p. 76-77).

Politically, the change in the government system was caused by the intellectual movements and efforts to address the decline of the Ottoman Empire. Movements such as the Tanzimat period, the Young Ottoman thinkers, and the Young Turks believed that the decline of the empire was due to the government and military systems. The shift in the governmental system occurred between 1839-1871, known as the Tanzimat period, which included several reform efforts to reorganize and improve the administrative, social, economic, and cultural structures. The reforms carried out by Tanzimat reformers were not fully supported and even faced criticism from within and outside the Ottoman Empire because the Tanzimat movement's reforms were influenced by Western liberal ideas and departed from the religious law basis, one of the main reasons why the Tanzimat reforms failed.

Reforms were also carried out by the Young Ottomans, a group originally established in 1865 to transform the absolute monarchy of the Ottoman Empire into a constitutional government. The Young Ottoman figures gained many experiences while in Europe, and their ideas led to reform efforts. Their views included the need for a constitutional system rather than absolute power. The Young Ottoman leaders introduced new ideas about democracy and constitutional governance, which emphasized the sovereignty of the people over absolute power. (Merzić, 2022)

They believed that European countries advanced because they no longer had absolute monarchies but instead adopted constitutional systems. They argued that Turkey was in decline due to weak political and economic systems and that to advance politically and economically, Turkey needed a change in its governance system. To establish an ideal system, rulers should prioritize the people's interests. Since the interests of the people were the foundation of the state, the state must be democratic, based on support and the people's interests.

After the victory at the Lausanne Conference, Mustafa Kemal made it clear that he had new ideas for Turkey's reforms. The first step was to abolish the Sultanate while retaining the Caliphate as a religious position without political power. Kemal argued that while the Abbasid Caliphate had lost all its political power in its final years, it was still regarded as a symbol of Islamic unity and truth. (Rosli, 2022)

Moreover, the dualism in Turkish governance needed to end because the 1921 Constitution clearly stated that the Grand National Assembly was the sole legitimate representative of the people. Kemal could have kept the Caliphate as a tool for Turkey's influence among Muslim countries or used the Caliph's legitimacy to strengthen his mandate, but he believed that modern states could only be realized by severing all ties with the old political and social Islamic institutions. Kemal believed that a modern state could be supported by "the religion of the people," and the necessary task was to form new institutions to promote

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

the religion and the people's development and foster individual responsibility, where religion would grow (LESFI, 2002, p. 150-160).

Socially, the change in the government system was influenced by shifts in social conditions due to interactions with European nations. To address the Ottoman Empire's decline, talented youth and ambassadors were sent to Europe, and European experts were brought to Turkey to train the Turkish military in modern warfare. Additionally, schools were established during the reign of Mahmud, where students were introduced to modern Western ideas and philosophies of individual freedom. This interaction later influenced Turkish society's thinking about the need for a change in the governance system (LESFI, 2002, p. 140).

From a technological perspective, the change in the governance system was also driven by one of the key causes of the Ottoman Empire's decline: stagnation in science and technology. While the Ottoman military had not progressed in technology, Europe developed advanced weaponry. As a result, during military conflicts, the Ottomans suffered repeated defeats. Recognizing the need for military improvement, reforms were made by sending representatives to Europe and establishing military schools (K. Ali, 2000, p. 374).

For 600 years, the Ottoman Empire strived to uphold the Islamic Caliphate across Asia, Europe, and parts of Africa, continually resisting the Crusader kingdoms. However, the international constellation that led to Europe's rise due to the Renaissance and the French Industrial Revolution eventually caused a clash of interests. Europe's resurgence in education, technology, industry, and economics was not matched by the Ottoman Empire, which was preoccupied with internal problems. As a result, the Ottomans faced repeated defeats in wars against Europe, leading to the loss of its territories one by one. The idea of Pan-Islamism, aimed at uniting the fragmented Islamic powers, was not successful in countering the dominance of European nationalism. The nationalist reform movements within the Ottoman Empire effectively weakened the Sultan's power, which was already struggling with various internal issues.

Revolution became inevitable as the Caliphate lost legitimacy among the Turkish people, and nationalist reformers intensified their efforts to dismantle the system, which they saw as the root cause of Turkey's decline. The trend of secularization in the 19th century, which had helped Europe become a superpower, inspired Turkish reform movements to adopt similar practices. They believed that the only way to save Turkey from its decline was by fully adopting European methods and concepts. Thus, the Republic of Turkey emerged, replacing the Islamic Caliphate, as the product of the belief that Turkey could be freed from its period of decline (Yussa Azmi Naufal, 2016, p. 2-3).

The Theory of Power and Modernity by Michel Foucault

Michel Foucault was born in Poitiers, France, on October 15, 1926, and passed away in Paris on June 25, 1984. Foucault graduated from the École Normale Supérieure and studied under Althusser, a social philosopher. Initially, he worked as a philosopher, but later abandoned philosophy because he found it too abstract and naïve in its claims to truth (Walden, 2023). He then delved into psychology and pathological psychology, working at a mental hospital.

Foucault taught French language courses in Sweden, Germany, and Poland between 1950 and 1960. After the student demonstrations in May 1968, he became the head of the philosophy department at Vincennes University. In 1970, he was appointed as a professor of the History of Systems of Thought at the Collège de France, where he worked until his death (Steven Best and Douglas Kellner, 2003, p. 40).

Foucault was once a member of the French Communist Party but left it in 1951, criticizing the party for being too doctrinaire and suppressing freedom. Despite this, Foucault maintained an ambiguous stance towards Marxism. Throughout his life, Foucault produced a vast number of influential works. Some of his most notable works include *Psychology and Madness* (1954), *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1961), *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (1963), *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (1966), *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), *Discourse on Language* (1971), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1975), and *The History of Sexuality, Vol. I: An Introduction* (1976), with Volumes II and III published posthumously (K. Bertens, 2001, p. 279).

Michel Foucault was skeptical of all kinds of truths. For him, any claim to truth is an interpretation of a world that does not actually exist as something historical. Therefore, he investigated ways of thinking and the history of civilizations. For instance, in *Madness and Civilization*, he depicted how madness was defined by various dominant groups at certain times. Here, Foucault explains that a doctor's views and treatment methods were heavily influenced by various conditions such as knowledge, institutional, pedagogical, and security factors (K. Bertens, 2001, p. 307-310).

Regarding the idea that both present and past history must always be reevaluated, Foucault introduced the concept of "genealogy." Genealogy is history written for contemporary purposes, particularly in relation to issues of the present. History must engage with contemporary events. In this way, genealogy is "effective history," written as contemporary involvement. Inspired by Bachelard, Canguilhem, and Cavailles, Foucault stated that history is always genealogy and an intervention, thus the framework of knowledge and models of understanding always change. Epistemology is the study of these changes as "the grammar of knowledge production" revealed through science, philosophy, art, and literature. Epistemology is also a way of connecting material events with thoughts or ideas.

The key to Foucault's thinking about history lies in the term "episteme" (discourse system). Foucault critically examined how sciences developed historically in a systemic way (an entire system of thought) within a period, and then underwent a total change in subsequent periods, sometimes very quickly. Knowledge, it turns out, does not develop and become established based on thinkers whose ideas are followed by many. Every piece of knowledge we develop is a vast and intricate web between various interests and their sensitivities to rational order. No idea or concept introduced by an individual or a group of scientists becomes established in society without being interconnected with other aspects of a social system. This entire system of human thought is what Foucault calls "episteme" (Karlina Leksono, 2002, p. 22-31).

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

There are three characteristics of Foucault's "episteme": First, Episteme determines how we see and experience reality. Our way of experiencing reality determines how we view it. Reality is subjective and often unconscious. Therefore, reality is neither simple nor as certain as we think. This means that episteme is not something experienced consciously by those who live it. When episteme becomes conscious, that is, when we are aware of seeing reality from a certain perspective, it opens up the possibility of seeing reality from another viewpoint. If this happens, then reality becomes fabricated; we see reality as constructed, not by an inherent consciousness, but rather through an artificial perspective

Second, another characteristic of episteme is the presence of prohibitions, denials, neglects, and rejections. Episteme controls and regulates human knowledge through three types of exclusions: taboos, madness, and falsehood. The identity of episteme lies in these unconscious elements, such as prohibitions. From here, episteme reveals its true identity. This is why Foucault was interested in the phenomena of madness, crime, and deviant sexual behavior. Each era has its own episteme, but it cannot be traced because it is unconscious. However, although it cannot be traced (untraceable), it can be reconstructed by acting "from the outside in": from prohibition to truth, from taboo to permission, from madness to normality.

Third, within episteme, there is a relationship between language and reality. Generally, language is seen as a transparent medium, as a reflection of reality. For Foucault, this is not the case. Language is always determined by episteme, in other words, the forms of language used to articulate truth. "Just as episteme organizes and filters our knowledge of reality, so too does language. Language is not a transparent medium, nor is it a reflection of reality. Language is a tool used by episteme to organize and construct reality, according to the nature of that episteme itself." Thus, Foucault clearly shows that both discourse and episteme are not passive but active. Both seek to change reality and even dominate reality.

In almost all of his discussions on power, Foucault uses the ideas of others as materials but always processes them and integrates them innovatively into his own conceptual framework. This is why we can find Nietzsche's concepts in his work. Foucault uses Nietzsche's discussion of power as a basis for his cultural and philosophical reflection. Traditional political philosophy has always been oriented toward the issue of legitimacy. Power is something metaphysically legitimized to the state, which allows the state to obligate everyone to obey it. However, according to Foucault, power is not something merely controlled by the state, nor something measurable. Power exists everywhere, as power is a dimension of relationships. Wherever there is a relationship, there is power (K. Bertens, 2001, p. 319).

Power is everywhere and emerges from the relations between various forces; it happens absolutely and is not dependent on human consciousness. Power is simply a strategy. This strategy operates everywhere, and in it, there are systems, rules, structures, and regulations. Power does not come from the outside but determines the structure, rules, and relationships from within, enabling everything to happen (Michel Foucault, 2000, p. 144).

Foucault's concept of power is deeply influenced by Nietzsche. He sees a similarity between Nietzsche's genealogy and his own archaeology, but there is an element in Nietzsche's genealogy power that is not yet visible.

In his works *The Order of Things* and *Archaeology of Human Sciences*, Foucault shows that there are two major shifts in the general form of thought and theory. The first occurred in the mid-seventeenth century, and the second in the early nineteenth century (Michel Foucault, 2007, p. 394-395). After analyzing the scientific discourses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries concerning the history of nature, the theory of money and value, and grammar, Foucault concluded that the center of knowledge at that time was the table. People wanted to represent reality in tables. The table is a system of signs, a general and systematic taxonomy of things (Michel Foucault, 2007, p. 421-422). With this focus on tables, knowledge at the time became ahistorical.

At the end of the 18th century (after the French Revolution) and into the mid-20th century (World War II), the focus of scientific discourse was on history and humans as its subject. Humans were freed from all alienation and from being determined by anything. Humans became the object of knowledge and, in turn, became the subject of their own freedom and existence (Michel Foucault, 2007, p. 422-424). Humans became the center of thought, as seen in the development of social sciences and psychology.

Foucault's object of research in this work is the underlying conditions that give rise to a particular discourse. Here, Foucault illustrates the relationship between the discourse of science and power. Scientific discourse, which seeks to distinguish truth from falsehood, is fundamentally driven by the will to power. Science serves to establish what is true and eliminate what is considered false.

It becomes clear that the will to truth is an expression of the will to power. Knowledge cannot be neutral and pure. There is always a correlation where knowledge contains power, just as power contains knowledge (K. Bertens, 2001, p. 322). One scientific explanation seeks to dominate by dismissing other scientific explanations. Furthermore, knowledge manifested in technology is easily used to impose things upon society. Even in times of advanced technology, there remains coercion, which means we cannot speak of the progress of civilization. What actually occurs is merely a shift in the instruments used for coercion.

Foucault saw the practice of dividing people, such as separating the sick from the healthy and the normal from the abnormal, as a form of power exerted by one person or a group over another. He found that during the Renaissance, madness and reason were closely related, as both used the same language. Society did not seem to reject brilliant ideas and actions that came from people labeled as mad. Madness was seen as a freedom of imagination, still part of societal life during the Renaissance (Michel Foucault, 2007, p. xxii).

However, after this period (1650-1800), the dialogue between madness and reason was silenced. They were carried out in different languages, and ultimately, reason subdued madness. Slowly, madness became something alien and was excluded from life, which was now to be governed by logic. At the same time, madness had to be removed from normal society. Madness became a theme that divided and separated society. What happened to the

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

mad was parallel to what happened to criminals, the poor, and the homeless. They all began to be separated, through prisons, hospitals, mental institutions, and regulated by police and courts. All of these institutions served as forms used by rulers to apply power over society (Konrad Kebung, 1997, p. 68-69).

Unemployment became a social issue, as did all the reasons for unemployment, such as madness or illness. The mad were associated with the poor and the unemployed. With this, ethics became a matter for the state. The state was justified in applying punishment for moral violations. Public executions were evidence of this way of thinking. The execution was a spectacular display and the most effective way of acknowledging the power that controlled.

Thus, we can see that the essence of Foucault's theory here is that mental illness only emerges as mental illness in a culture that defines it as such. Because it involves definitions, mental illness is where power dominates. Madness is what is different from the ordinary, and because the ordinary is characterized by productivity, madness is the absence of productivity. Handling madness is a form of applying power from one person or group over another, not primarily a psychological knowledge issue (Konrad Kebung, 1997, p. 73).

The dominance of power can also be seen in Foucault's analysis of the theme of sexuality. Foucault viewed sexuality as a redirection of the understanding of power. How sexuality is discoursed is an expression of power. Public discussion about sex, according to Foucault, is for the purpose of regulating and recording birth rates. Population issues are social issues, and these are related to sexuality. Therefore, power seeks to study and intervene in discussions about sex to regulate population growth. Sexuality becomes a public issue.

Those who engaged in sodomy, masturbation, necrophilia, homosexuality, masochism, sadism, and so on were labeled as deviants (Michel Foucault, 2007, p. xxxix). Foucault shows the relationship between sexuality and power in Christian confessions. Here, a secret is revealed, and at the same time, the one who knows the secret becomes very powerful. The one who listens to the confession is the scientist, particularly the psychiatrist. In this position, the psychiatrist becomes the one who determines what is normal and what is pathological in sexual behavior.

By showing the connection between sexuality and power, Foucault underscores his fundamental thesis that power is everywhere. Power intervenes into sexuality through the discipline of the body and the science of the body, and through the politics of population that regulates birth. Power begins to administer bodies and regulate people's private lives. Along with this, resistance to power is also everywhere.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, discipline was the means to educate the body. Disciplines were expected to produce obedient bodies. This did not only occur in prisons but also in education, workplaces, and the military. Society then evolved along military discipline. Foucault argues that in the monarchical era, any new criminal punishment was only taken seriously when it involved elements of physical punishment (Seno Joko Suyono, 2002, p. 338-339).

The implementation of discipline is closely related to the power that controls. Foucault outlines that the phenomenon of body discipline is always controlled by two disciplinary instruments derived from military discipline in society. The first is through hierarchical observation, or the apparatus's ability to oversee everyone beneath it with a single criterion (Seno Joko Suyono, 2002, p. 424-426). The Panopticon, revealed in the form of a tower at the center of a prison, is a physical form of this instrument. With the Panopticon, the power of the warden becomes enormous because the prisoners strive to control themselves. They fear being watched. The mere presence of this structure is already a powerful mechanism of discipline and power.

The second instrument is the normalization of moral judgment and punishing moral offenders (Seno Joko Suyono, 2002, p. 435). In this case, deficiencies are equated with crime. In addition to being imprisoned, deviants are publicly displayed. The purpose is to show society how close humans are to animals, and how other humans will be treated the same way if they step outside what is considered rational by society. In the overall handling of these deviations, psychiatrists or authorities do not function as scientists, but as powers that judge.

Foucault imagines that the watchtower in panopticism, besides being operated by officials, could be used by many individuals with various interests. It could become a place for a philosopher eager to understand humans or even a museum of humanity. It could even become a space for those with minor sexual deviations to derive pleasure by spying on others. In panopticism, Foucault reveals the existence of power hidden within various institutions and establishments.

In his book *The History of Sexuality Vol. I*, Foucault presents five propositions about what he means by power, as follows:

1. Power is not something that is acquired, attained, used, or shared as something that can be held or even destroyed; instead, power is exercised from various places in relations that are constantly shifting.
2. Power relations are not hierarchical structural relations that assume there are those who dominate and those who are dominated.
3. Power comes from below, meaning that there are no longer any binary distinctions because power encompasses both sides.
4. Power relations are intentional and non-subjective.
5. Where there is power, there is also resistance. Resistance is not outside of power relations; everyone is within power, and there is no way to escape it (Michel Foucault, 1990, p. 94-95).

Foucault understands power differently from how it is commonly understood by most people, who are prone to fall into juridical notions of power. Power is not always centered on law or prohibition. For Foucault, this view is considered too simplistic, monotonous, uninventive, and likely to only reproduce the mechanisms of power that may currently be under critique.

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

According to Foucault, it is not enough to understand power merely as a negative relation, a binary system (the insistence of the rule), a cycle of prohibition, the logic of censorship, or even uniformity of the apparatus (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 83-84). Power should be viewed differently, not merely as a set of institutions that guarantee citizen compliance, subjugation, or domination of one group over another in society. Instead, for Foucault, power is: “First, the multiplication of force relations in which power operates. Second, power is a process that moves continuously, reinforcing or weakening itself. Third, power is a stimulus for relations of force that form chains or networks. Fourth, power as a strategy that mutually influences the institutionalization process manifested in the apparatus of the state and in the formulation of laws and various forms of social hegemony” (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 92-93). This perspective forms the basis for tracking how and through what mechanisms power operates in discourse.

Foucault sees power not as something possessed, because it is dispersed and continuously moving according to the mechanism of power dissemination in discourse (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 94). Power is everywhere and comes from everywhere. Power is a name given to describe a complex strategic situation in society. It does not come from rulers or the state, nor is it owned by any particular individual or class, nor is it a commodity that can be seized; power comes from everywhere and spreads everywhere (Madan Sarup, 2003, p. 126).

Power is a chain or a network or a strategy that spreads throughout a certain period. Therefore, it must be understood that in discourse, power relations are always immanent; they are always present in force relations and are a direct effect of dichotomous practices, inequalities, and imbalances (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 94). And what is inevitable in this model of power is both the affirmation and resistance of power. That is, where there is power, there will always be resistance.

Foucault's philosophical reflection on power is closely linked to the status of knowledge. Knowledge is conceptualized as power, which will never free people from the discourse of power. Knowledge itself is power that produces truth. Truth is determined by knowledge, which is then actualized in social discursive practices. In this context, truth is used as a conceptual tool to legitimize every political action with the aim of conquering or dominating others. The relationship between knowledge and power is at least based on Foucault's insight into the sublimation of the relationship between knowledge and power.

The sublimation of the relationship between knowledge and power is understood by localizing the “will to knowledge” of humans. To understand the concept of the will to knowledge, let us briefly refer to Foucault's discussion of sex and power in *The History of Sexuality* (1976). It was argued that since the classical period, when many people were caught up in the discourse on sexual repression, what actually happened was not sexual repression but rather the encouragement or stimulation to talk about sex. The stimulus to talk about sex from various institutions of power such as schools, churches, medicine, and so on, led to an explosion of discourse about sex. It was as if there arose a need to talk about and regulate discourse about sex with various justifications.

This stimulus was not just in the form of theory, but in the form of analysis, calculation, classification, and quantitative specification aimed at finding the rationality of truth (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 24). There was a strong desire to continuously discuss sex in the context of a discourse of repression. Sometimes this desire was based on an attempt to oppose power, uncover the truth, promise happiness, freedom, and even pleasure in a new world order (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 7). However, the issue does not lie in accepting or rejecting the discourse of sexual repression, but rather, if sex is said to be repressed, the question is, from where can we assert with conviction that sex is repressed?

It is clear that Foucault is not showing whether the discourse on sexual repression is true or false, but rather he is showing the pleasure of power through the continuous curiosity about sex. This includes who discusses it, the positions and viewpoints from which sex is discussed, and the institutions of power that encourage society to continually talk about sex (Michel Foucault, 1976, p. 94). This human curiosity is an integral part of the production of discourse on sex, which makes sex appear as an issue that seems necessary and relevant to discuss continuously. It is not just about talking about sex; it is about seeking the rationality of the truth of sex as a relevant issue to be discussed.

Examining the dynamics of the development of sex discourse as outlined by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality* (1976), what actually occurs is a compromise between knowledge and power in the discourse of sexual repression, giving birth to the truth of the discourse on sexual repression. According to Foucault: "There is no power without knowledge, and conversely, there is no knowledge without power. The relationship between power and knowledge is not primarily based on the freedom of an individual, but rather on the knowledge they possess" (Michel Foucault, 1979, p. 27). Knowledge about something enables someone to build a claim to truth about it. The danger of this truth is that it is accepted as the only truth, leading people to obey that truth. At this point, the existence of the subject can also be questioned. In this sense, the subject is always the product of the relationship between power and knowledge. The subject's activity is formed in relation to knowledge and power, whether to resist or dominate (Michel Foucault, 1979, p. 28).

To recognize the relationship between power and knowledge, Foucault offers several new strategies, as he did in his analysis of the discourse on sexual repression. "First, the hysteria of the female body: the female body becomes the object of analysis with the aim of ensuring fertility and all the duties that come from family life, including the life of the child. Second, the pedagogization of children's sex. The pedagogization of children's sex aims to prevent children's sexual behavior from deviating from both physical and moral dangers, both collective and individual. Third, the socialization of procreative behavior. Socialization in the form of instilling responsibility values into the social body to maintain the fertility of partners, including medical socialization as a birth control practice. Fourth, the psychiatric treatment of deviant pleasure. This is done by isolating biological and psychic instincts through clinical interventions that always feel the need to regulate and prevent all forms of sexual anomalies" (Michel Foucault, 1979, p. 104-105).

These four strategies not only critique the traditional model of power, which is mostly based on punishment and prohibition, but also serve as a means to critically address the role of

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

institutions of power (such as: the church, medicine, education, psychiatry, social institutions, etc.) in reproducing truth as well as encouraging, stimulating, and spreading particular truths. This truth is what society accepts as knowledge. Moreover, supported by the authority of the power institutions, this knowledge becomes increasingly legitimized within society (Willem Batlayeri, 2019, p. 4).

Transformation of the Ottoman Empire's Government System in the Perspective of Michel Foucault's Power Theory and Modernity

The decline of the Ottoman Empire began to be evident after the death of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent in 974 AH/1566 AD. Because the Ottoman Empire was a large empire, this decline did not happen quickly but gradually and steadily (M. Bisri Djalil, 2017, p. 187). The Ottoman Empire, which had been a great empire for centuries with a high civilization, blended the great cultures of Persia, Europe, and Arabia. Over time, the Ottoman Empire began to experience a decline from the 17th century AD, and gradually its territories were lost or seized by other nations. As a climax, in the 20th century, precisely in 1923, the Ottoman Empire collapsed, its caliphate was abolished, and it was replaced by a republic. However, the country still retained the name Turkey due to their nationalism as the Turkish people (M. Bisri Djalil, 2017, p. 194).

The revolution in Turkey's political system from an Islamic caliphate to a secular state was caused by several factors, particularly viewed from the perspective of secularism proposed by Ali Abd al-Raziq, a Muslim thinker known for opposing the institutional concept of the caliphate. At that time, the majority of Muslims and scholars considered it obligatory for Muslims to establish a caliphate, as this issue was seen as final and deeply rooted among Muslims in general, and particularly in the Arab world. The factors that then answered the question of why Turkey made the revolution from an Islamic caliphate to a secular state are:

1. The failure of the caliphate in governance in the 1800s, leading to delegitimization by the people, which resulted in a change of the political system to a secular state.
2. The international constellation in the 18th-19th centuries that positioned Europe as a superpower (Yussa Azmi Naufal, 2016, p. 20).

In addition to these two main factors, there were several other reasons for the decline of the Ottoman Empire, which include:

1. The vastness of its territory. The administration of a country with such an extensive territory is very complicated and complex, while the Ottoman Empire's administration was inefficient. On the other hand, the rulers were very ambitious in conquering such vast lands, resulting in continuous wars with various nations. This drained many resources that could have been used to build the state.
2. The heterogeneity of the population. As a vast empire, the Ottoman Empire controlled an area that spanned Asia Minor, Armenia, Iraq, Syria, Hejaz, and Yemen in Asia; Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, and Algeria in Africa; Bulgaria, Greece, Yugoslavia, Albania, Hungary; and Romania in Europe. This vast territory was inhabited by a diverse population in terms

of religion, race, ethnicity, and customs. Governing such a diverse and widespread population required an organized government structure.

3. The weakness of the rulers. After the death of Suleiman the Magnificent, the Ottoman Empire was ruled by weak sultans, both in character and especially in leadership. As a result, the government became chaotic. This chaos could never be fully resolved and became progressively worse over time.
4. The culture of bribery. Bribery became a common practice in the Ottoman Empire. Any position that someone wanted to attain had to be obtained through bribes to the rightful authority. This rampant culture of bribery led to moral decadence, weakening the officials' integrity.
5. The rebellion of the Janissary army. The success of the Ottoman Empire's expansion was largely determined by the strength of the Janissary army. Therefore, one can imagine the consequences if this army revolted. The Janissary army staged rebellions four times: in 1525, 1632, 1727, and 1826.
6. The economic decline. The continuous wars caused the nation's economy to decline. Revenue decreased while government spending, especially for war expenses, remained high.
7. The stagnation in science and technology. The Ottoman Empire struggled to advance its knowledge and military strength. The lack of progress in military technology meant the empire could not compete with the more advanced weaponry of European enemies.

Additionally, the decline of Turkey in the 17th century occurred due to a worsening socio-economic condition with three primary reasons:

1. Population explosion. There was a fundamental change in the population structure of the empire, which impacted its economic and financial systems. Turkey's population doubled.
2. Weak domestic economy. The domestic economic policies of Turkey faced challenges from new economic strategies promoted by European nations, leading to the worsening of Turkey's economy and the abandonment of its foreign relations.
3. The rise of European power. The emergence of new political forces in Europe accelerated the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. These new powers emerged due to technological advancements in Europe, which triggered the rise of new economic and military forces. This not only changed the way Islamic societies lived but also had an impact on humanity as a whole.

When comparing the classical concept of power from the 16th to 18th centuries, several clear differences emerge that contrast with what Foucault explained:

1. In feudal times, power was agrarian, tied to the ownership and control of land as an economic resource, and also industrial in factories. The relationship was top-down, repressive, and exploitative for the sake of domination, particularly under capitalism. Power was exercised for surveillance purposes. In modern society, power is expressed

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

through sovereignty, laws, and regulations, imposing discipline to create social stability and cohesion.

2. In terms of social and political organization, power was not centralized in the state or political rulers. Instead, power spreads through social relations.
3. In the classical discourse, power was the result of competition, war, domination, and the human desire to control others. For Foucault, power is a direct result of separation, inequality, and imbalance (discrimination) power arises from internal differences. In reality, these differences are shaped and play out in workplaces, families, institutions, and various groupings.

Foucault's position in relation to historical thinking includes: First, Foucault's contribution to the philosophy of history, though with many important methodological implications, is more focused on critical and in-depth studies of themes (material history). Second, Foucault's view of history is more subtle, nuanced, and concerned with the things that were previously unnoticed by philosophers. As Fernand Braudel described the importance of geographical history: "Too many important events go unnoticed beneath the flow of social trends." His profound reflections shaped much of his analysis, such as on epistemes, power, and beyond.

Third, Foucault pioneered a more advanced and complex perspective than earlier thinkers, such as Karl Marx. Marx viewed power concretely, particularly in terms of social and economic relations (the economic conflict between the proletariat and the capitalist class). Foucault delved deeper, seeing power through how we speak about reality, how we act, and how we treat certain issues. For example, how we discuss mental illness (madness), prisons, and abnormality shapes how we treat these subjects. Power plays a role in social processes that people are often unaware of. This is an important contribution to historians in understanding and analyzing structures of power. Foucault's ideas contribute an important approach to conventional and traditional intellectual history.

Fourth, Foucault's entire historical analysis is often a dismantling of hidden realities in history, particularly the collaboration between knowledge and power. Knowledge, even when established in scientific communities and followed by many adherents, is not simply about the power of ideas; it also involves many aspects, factors, and actors within an episteme, especially through power. Fifth, the ideas and concepts put forth by Foucault are mostly original in their approach to the problems he explores. His originality made his thinking deeper and more complex than existing theories.

Sixth, the essence of the above is that Foucault is a historian, but since he dislikes that label, he is better described as a philosopher who critiques history by exposing the past, including its falsities. It may be more appropriate to call him a "paradigm philosopher," especially regarding the paradigm of history. He rejected being called a historian or philosopher of history because it would narrow his thinking to just one field. In reality, he disrupted not only history but almost all scientific paradigms. As a consequence of his fundamental work in philosophy, Foucault's deconstruction of the foundations of knowledge makes it difficult to

categorize him within a particular discipline. He himself was not fond of rigid disciplinary categorization. His ideas, which "bombard" history, psychology, culture, gender, anthropology, politics, and more, make disciplines, in his view, relative and difficult to sustain (Moeflich Hasbullah, 2007).

For Foucault, power refers to the mechanisms and strategies in organizing communal life (Michael Foucault, 2002, p. 127). In this sense, power originates from various sources and is interconnected. Acknowledging the structures that perform specific functions, power finds its origin within these structures. From the idea of power as a strategy and mechanism, several methodological aspects of power become the focus of Foucault's attention.

First, the role of law and rules. Foucault said, "Power does not always work through repression and intimidation; rather, it works through rules and normalization" (Konrad Kebung, 2008, p. 121). All rules and laws are not seen as the result of decisions made by rulers or specific institutions but as a synthesis of everyone's power, born from agreements. Rules born from collective consensus hold a greater power in communal life. Second, the goal of power. The purpose of power mechanisms is to shape every individual to have dedication and self-discipline in order to become a productive person. Each person is given space to think, develop, and freely express their aspirations for collective progress.

Third, power is not localized but is everywhere. Awareness of the strength of a state and society is not limited to just leaders but arises through cooperation between individuals and institutions oriented towards productivity. For example, through communication between leaders and their citizens, unity is created in a dialogical atmosphere leading to a shared vision. Fourth, upward-oriented power (Michael Foucault, 2002, p. 127). In this sense, power within individuals and institutions is communicated in such a way that it forms a collective consensus. In other words, the outcome of this power communication process results in collective power or, in Thomas Kuhn's words, a shared paradigm. Thomas Kuhn viewed that each individual's basic perspective is communicated collectively, leading to a shared basic perspective. A paradigm does not initially refer to the perspective of each individual, but rather to a shared basic perspective (Thomas Kuhn, 2000, p. 43).

Fifth, the combination of power and ideology. Every member of society generally shares the same dream of recognition for each individual, oriented towards collective welfare. This hope must align with collective power. All laws and regulations are directed towards achieving that goal. Thus, every social relationship is always a relationship of power (hegemony of power). Power exists in every social relationship, and the foundation of social reality is productive and invisible power that permeates all aspects of life, including knowledge and social practices, which ultimately creates (Siskandar, 2008, p. 100).

Conclusion

The change in the governance system of the Ottoman Empire from an Islamic caliphate to a secular state did not occur spontaneously, but was caused by two main factors: the failure of the caliphate in governance during the 1800s, which led to its delegitimization by the people,

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

and the International Constellation of the 18th and 19th centuries, which saw Europe emerge as a dominant superpower. In addition to these two main factors, the change was also driven by shifts in social conditions due to interactions between the society and European nations, as well as stagnation in science and technology.

Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity focuses on power mechanisms and strategies for organizing collective life, which include: First, the role of laws and regulations (all rules that emerge from collective consensus carry a deeper power in communal life); Second, the objectives of power (shaping individuals to have dedication and self-discipline to become productive individuals, providing space for thinking, growth, and freely expressing aspirations for the common good); Third, power is not localized but is found everywhere (awareness of the power of a state and society is not limited to leaders alone, but is a collective effort from every individual and institution with a productive orientation); Fourth, power directed upwards (the communication process of shared power will result in shared power); Fifth, the combination of power and ideology (recognizing each individual's role towards the collective welfare).

References

- Ali, K. (2000). *Sejarah Islam dari awal hingga runtuhnya dinasti Usmani (Tarikh Pra Modern)*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Amiruddin, H. (2000). *Konsep negara menurut Fazlur Rahman*. UII Press.
- Askim, J., Bach, T., & Christensen, J. G. (2024). Political change and administrative turnover in meritocratic systems. *West European Politics*, 47(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2022.2148195>
- Batlayeri, W. (2019). *Konsep kekuasaan menurut Michel Foucault*.
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (2003). *Teori postmodern, interogasi kritis* (I. Rohmani, Trans.). Boyan Publishing.
- Bertens, K. (2001). *Filsafat Barat kontemporer Prancis*. Gramedia.
- Castro-Gómez, S., Kopsick, K., & Golding, D. (2023). Michel Foucault and the colonality of power. *Cultural Studies*, 37(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2021.2004435>
- Cherem, Y. A., & Zahreddine, D. (2021). Integration, conflict, and autonomy among religious minorities in the late Ottoman Empire: The Greek-Catholic (Melkite) Church and sectarian turmoil in Mount Lebanon and Damascus. *Estudos Internacionais*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.5752/P.2317-773X.2020V8N4P59-79>
- Djalil, M. B. (2017). Kemunduran dan perkembangan politik Turki Uthmani. *JURNAL LENTERA: Kajian Keagamaan, Keilmuan dan Teknologi*, 3(1), March.
- Fatarib, H., Meirison, Saharuddin, D., Bahar, M., & Karimullah, S. S. (2023). Sultan's Law and Islamic Sharia in The Ottoman Empire Court: An Analysis of The Existence of Secular Law. *Al-Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum Islam*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.29240/jhi.v8i1.4908>

- Foucault, M. (1976). *The history of sexuality* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction* (Vol. 1). Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Seks dan kekuasaan* (S. H. Rahayu, Trans.). Gramedia.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Wacana kuasa/pengetahuan* (Y. Santoso, Trans.). Bentang Budaya.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Arkeologi ilmu-ilmu kemanusiaan* (B. Priambodo & P. Boy, Trans.). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Grigoriadis, I. N. (2023). Developing Archaeology and Museology in the Ottoman Empire, Turkey, and Greece: Théodore Macridy, an Ottoman Greek “Liminal Scientist.” *European Journal of Archaeology*, 26(2). <https://doi.org/10.1017/eea.2022.45>
- Grosjean, P. (2011). The institutional legacy of the Ottoman Empire: Islamic rule and financial development in South Eastern Europe. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2010.05.003>
- Haris, A. H. (2020). History of the ottoman empire and its contributions in sociopolitical aspects from 14th century until 20th century. *Journal of Al-Tamaddun*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.22452/JAT.vol15no1.6>
- Hasbullah, M. (2007). *Konstruksi pemikiran Michel Foucault tentang sejarah*.
- İnal, O. (2021). One-humped history: The camel as historical actor in the late ottoman empire. In *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (Vol. 53, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743820000987>
- Kuhn, T. (2000). *Peran paradigma dalam revolusi sains* (T. Sumarjan, Trans.). Remaja Rosdarya.
- Leksono, K. (2002). Berakhirnya manusia dan bangkrutnya ilmu-ilmu. *Majalah Basis*, 01-02, Tahun ke-51 (Januari-Februari).
- Merzić, O. (2022). Useful Enemies: Islam and The Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought, 1450-1750. *Journal of Balkan Studies*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.51331/b007>
- Naufal, Y. A. (2016). *Revolusi sistem pemerintahan Turki dari khilafah Islamiyah menuju negara sekuler* (S1 thesis). Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Penulis LESFI. (2002). *Sejarah peradaban Islam dari masa klasik hingga modern*. LESFI.
- Rosli, N. (2022). Transformation of Religious Institution in Turkey from the Ottoman Sheikh ul-Islam to the Modern Diyanet Institution. *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.121.01>
- Sarup, M. (2003). *Poststrukturalisme dan posmodernisme: Sebuah pengantar kritis* (M. A. Hidayat, Trans.). Jendela.
- Shafir, N. (2019). Moral revolutions: The politics of piety in the ottoman empire reimagined. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 61(3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417519000185>

Changing Ottoman Empire's Government System: Michel Foucault's Theory of Power and Modernity

- Siskandar. (2008). Kesiapan daerah dalam melaksanakan ujian nasional. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Pendidikan*, 5(1), April.
- Thohir, A. (2004). *Perkembangan peradaban di kawasan dunia Islam*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Walden, D. K. S. (2023). Organizing Modernity. In *Sound and Sense in British Romanticism*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009277839.010>
- White, J. M. (2023). Slavery, Freedom Suits, and Legal Praxis in the Ottoman Empire, ca. 1590-1710. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 65(3). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S001041752300004X>
- Yanatma, S. (2022). Dominance, collaboration and resistance: Developing the idea of a national news agency in the Ottoman Empire, 1854–1914. *Journalism*, 23(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920924174>
- Yatim, B. (2010). *Sejarah peradaban Islam*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Zhou, W., shi, Y., Zhao, T., Cao, X., & Li, J. (2024). Government regulation, horizontal cooperation, and low-carbon technology innovation: A tripartite evolutionary game analysis of government and homogeneous energy enterprises. *Energy Policy*, 184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2023.113844>
- Zürcher, E. J. (2019). Young Turk Governance in the Ottoman Empire during the First World War. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 55(6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2019.1590820>