

“Processing historical case studies into Systemic Geopolitical Analysis”

Ioannis Th. Mazis¹ and Markos I. Troulis²

Abstract: The current paper emphasizes on the debate referring to how historical case studies are processed in social sciences and humanities and which limitations have to be surpassed towards a clear-cut descriptive analysis. Systemic Geopolitical Analysis does offer the necessary set of methodological tools contributing to a reading of causes and effects without any deontological bias. To this aim, it uses a sequence of methodological stages for the description, the standardization, the terminology definition, the synthesis and finally, the draw of conclusions named as “sample of redistributions of power”. This last part is essentially followed by the geostrategic synthesis part; the descriptive and clearly scientific in which the geopolitical framework is given is followed by the subjective geostrategic one in which the challenges, dilemmas, threats and opportunities on behalf of a certain actor are presented. Based on this legacy, processing historical case studies is made with a clear distinction between objectivity and subjectivity or, in other words, between science with ontological reference and geostrategic recommendations. This paper replies to the epistemological legacy Systemic Geopolitical Analysis relying on as well as its core theoretical and methodological contribution.

Keywords: Systemic Geopolitical Analysis, Macrohistory, Thucydides, Epistemology, Anthro-Geography, Civilizational Pillar of Power, Ontology, Economic Geography

Date of Submission: 21-05-2020

Date of Acceptance: 08-06-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Macrohistoric analysis remains a desideratum for anyone seeking for adequately stabilized and well-documented conclusions in a sequence of cause-and-effect findings. What is a valuable asset of macrohistoric overview in international politics is its emphasis on systemic analysis beyond any microhistoric references to insignificant facts as well as its characteristic to focus on diachronic instead of synchronic effects.³ In this last case, causalities are not proven via a multiplicity of certain causes and effects and thus, they cannot represent a theory. Therefore, macrohistory is considered the basis of theoretical explanation with ontological reference and well-established argumentation on issues which are defined phenomenal, measurable and provable.

Systemic Geopolitical Analysis starts from the epistemological background of being “the geographical method that studies, describes and predicts the attitudes and the consequences ensuing from relations between the opposing and distinct political practices for the redistribution of power as well as their ideological metaphysics, within the framework of the geographical complexes where these practices apply”.⁴ This means that Systemic Geopolitical Analysis focuses on (a) systemic power pressures and not possible individuals’ actions, (b) description of ontology and not deontological or ideological evaluations and speculations, (c) strategic narratives not as ideological adherences but as behaviours of realpolitik legitimization. On this line of thought, it is accorded with macrohistoric prerequisites and offers a clear-cut panorama of distributions of

¹ Dr d’ État, Professor of Economic Geography and Geopolitical Theory, Head of the Department of Turkish Studies and Modern Asian Studies, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece.

² Dr / Post Doc., Adjunct Lecturer of International Relations Theory, Geopolitics and Turkish Studies, Department of Turkish Studies and Modern Asian Studies, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece.

³ Galtung, J. (1997) Macrohistory and macrohistorians: A theoretical framework. In: Galtung, J. and Inayatullah, S. (eds.) *Macrohistory and macrohistorians: Perspectives on individual, social and civilizational change*. London: Praeger, pp. 1-9. P. 3.

⁴ Mazis, I. Th. (2017) Methodology for Systemic Geopolitical Analysis according to the Lakatosian model. *Geopolitics Academic Dissertations*, LXVI, p. 676.

power, state actors’ inclinations, dilemmas and challenges on the basis of Thucydides’s descriptive historiographic and analytical legacy.⁵

The research aim of the current paper is to emphasize on the teachings of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis considering the processing of historical case studies in its methodology and the evaluation of its contribution towards an interscientific, multi-level and thus well-proven causality documentation and description. Therefore, the first part refers in brief to what is introduced by Systemic Geopolitical Analysis into the international politics debate, in the second part Thucydides and modern-time consistent scholars’ legacy on macrohistory is summarized and the third part evaluates comparatively the contribution of this research program to the construction of causal links when referring to historical case studies. This last desideratum is best reflected by Panayiotis Kondylis’s remark that “My core interest in my historical works is to tangibly explain the explanatory value of my general overview of human issues. If a specific theory can define over a common denominator and perceive in a common way issues and phenomena, which are distanced from each other on a first view, then this produces many advantages”.⁶

Epistemological remarks on Systemic Geopolitical Analysis

Systemic Geopolitical Analysis evolves in the light of a neo-positivist approach absolutely correlated with the “classical” necessity of “(1) the unity of science thesis, (2) the distinction between facts and values, (3) the belief in regularities and (4) a commitment to an empiricist epistemology”.⁷ In this sense, its prioritization is the test of hypotheses and final validation through phenomena absolutely correlated with the ontological substance, which is best depicted in Robert Gilpin’s words: “In a world of scarce resources and conflict over the distribution of those resources, human beings confront one another ultimately as members of group and not as isolated individuals. Homo sapiens is a tribal species, and loyalty to the tribe for most of us ranks above all loyalties other than that of the family. In the modern world, we have given the name ‘nation-state’ to these competing tribes and the name ‘nationalism’ to this form of loyalty”.⁸ This means that collectivities offered the historical solution towards survival, an end desired by human beings from the first time appeared on earth.

Hence, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis has such an ontological reference being a geographical method and emphasizing on distribution of power, in accordance with the axiom that “epistemic evaluation is undertaken from what we might call ‘the epistemic point of view’. That point of view is defined by the aim at maximizing truth and minimizing falsity in a large body of beliefs”.⁹ It handles geographical space as the mater of human collectivities’ interactions and it analyzes them via a typological framework of four pillars; defense/security, economics, politics and civilization. These are primary synthetic elements of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and answer to the question of an inter-scientific and multi-factorial theoretical and methodological approach.

To this aim, there are three criteria accomplished. Firstly, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis embodies a paradigm and this is connected with the geographical prerequisite, meaning geography as the “the science approaching natural space as well as the dialectic syntheses of this space with human societies representing the ‘human spaces’. These dialectic syntheses are defined geographical spaces”.¹⁰ According to Thomas Kuhn, paradigm represents a broader view and consequently, a “Weltanschauung” systemizing scientific research on the basis of specific prerequisites and terms. Thus, it is considered the archetype before the further scientific knowledge and the reading of ontology.¹¹ For this reason, paradigm as a notion contributes to the convergence

⁵ Mazis, I. Th., Troulis, M. and Domatioti, X. (2019) The Thucydidean Legacy of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and Structural Realism. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, 8 (10), pp. 45-50.

⁶ Kondylis, P. (1998) *The invisible chronology of thought: Answers to 28 questions / To aorato chronologio tis skepsis: Apantisis se 28 erotimata* (in Greek). Athens: Nefeli. P. 14.

⁷ Wight, C. (2006) *Agents, structures and international relations: Politics as ontology*. New York: Cambridge University Press. P. 20.

⁸ Gilpin, R. (1986) The richness of the tradition of political realism. In: Keohane, R. (ed.) *Neorealism and its critics*. New York: Columbia university press, pp. 301-321. Pp. 304-305.

⁹ Alston, W. P. (2005) *Beyond ‘justification’: Dimensions of epistemic evaluation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. P. 29.

¹⁰ Mazis, I. Th. (2002) *Geopolitics: Theory and praxis / Geopolitiki: Theoria kai praxi* [in Greek]. Athens: Papazisis and ELIAMEP. P. 30.

¹¹ Lijphart, A. (1974) The structure of the theoretical revolution in international relations. *International studies quarterly*, 18 (1), p. 42.

of multiple research methods and scientific proposals.¹² Paradigmatically, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis refers to geography and from that point of view, this is its source of ontological reference and consequently, methodological arthrosis.

Secondly, Karl Popper’s predictability prerequisite is also served as the named theoretical approach produces a methodology concluding to the description of a sample of redistribution of power.¹³ Under this lens, it uses certain and stable geopolitical data in order to predict the tendency of actors’ behaviours and the stabilizing/destabilizing components included in the limits of the system. Prediction is one of parametrical results of the auxiliary hypotheses after the measurable pillars of power (defensive, economic, political and civilizational), the structure seen as the set of the pillars being the components of system, the units under study (nation-states, international institutions and economic regimes) and the systemic space (combinations of causes and effects towards the articulation of a causality).¹⁴ Measurability is a necessary parameter, since prediction is impossible without a full reading of the distribution of power and the tendencies of potential change; thus, prediction is based on the measurement of all the crucial components and its aggregate results consistently from a careful choice of geopolitical indicators, simple as well as complex.

Thirdly, in accordance with predictability criterion,¹⁵ Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is correlated with Imre Lakatos’s points¹⁶ that empiricism shows the way towards validation without one-dimensional and “mono-theoretical” approaches. In other words, the five stages of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis ((a) title decode, definition of the geopolitical complex as well as of the geopolitical factor, description of systemic levels – i.e. sub-systemic, systemic and hyper-systemic, (b) definition of the pillars of power – i.e. defensive, economic, political and civilizational, (c) choosing the geopolitical indicators – i.e. simple or complex, (d) synthesis and comparative analysis of the geopolitical indicators, (e) presentation of the geopolitical sample of redistribution of power tendencies)¹⁷ offer a multi-dimensional description of a case study under examination and contribute to reaching specific results via exhaustive measurement tests. Even if as a methodological approach is not characterized by hard rules, it is a procedure interwoven with basic and stable parameters, since Systemic Geopolitical Analysis recognizes (re)distribution of power as a central factor in reading interstate politics and the historiographic as well as individual current cases’ overview contributes towards reaching stabilized conclusions.

The introduction of systemic parameters in the analysis of international phenomena is identified with the geographic basis of history and thus, a theoretical proposal is produced in accordance with pragmatological aspects.¹⁸ In the light of the afore-mentioned remarks, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is fed by the “living laboratory of history” and produces theory as far as homogenized conclusions shape specific causalities.

Theory and history

Edward H. Carr describes in his acclaimed “What is history?” that “history is, by and large, a chapter of accidents, a series of events determined by chance coincidences, and attributable only to the most causal causes”.¹⁹ In this phrase, Carr summarizes the essence of macrohistory; i.e. the significance of emphasizing only on “causal” and “important” facts. In this way, he sets the limits for theory-making adequately identified with

¹² Kuhn, T. (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press. Pp. 10-11.

¹³ Mazis, I. Th. (2012) *Metatheoretical critical approach of international relations and geopolitics. The neopositivist frame / Metatheoritiki Kritiki Diethnon skhesseon kai Geopolitikis. To neothetikistiko plaisio* [in Greek]. Athens: Papazisis. P. 94.

¹⁴ Mazis, I. Th. (2012) op. cit., pp. 366-367.

¹⁵ Lakatos established his argumentation on predictability with reference to three levels: “a) as an important aim of the research programs; b) as a procedure -a key method- for increasing our scientific knowledge both theoretically and empirically; and c) as the way to assess the scientific character of knowledge claims -means for evaluating results. At all these levels he envisions a close connection between prediction and novel facts”. Gonzalez, W. C. (2001) Lakatos's approach on prediction and novel facts. *Theoria – Segunda Epoca*, 16 (3), pp. 499-518.

¹⁶ Mazis, I. Th. (2012) op. cit., pp. 213-214.

¹⁷ See: Domatioti, X. (2018) *Systemic geopolitical analysis. Interscientific and multi-methodological approach / Sistimiki geopolitiki analisi: Diepistimonikotita kai polimethodologiki prosegkisi* (Foreword by Ioannis Th. Mazis) [in Greek]. Athens: Leimon.

¹⁸ See: Kaplan, R. D. (2013) *The revenge of geography: What the map tells us about coming conflicts and the battle against fate*. London: Penguin Random House.

¹⁹ Carr, E. H. (1961) *What is history?* London: Penguin books. P. 98.

ontology and thus, adequately explainable. According to Carr, “history therefore is a process of selection in terms of historical significance [...] History is a ‘selective system’ not only of cognitive, but of causal, orientations of reality. Just as from the infinite ocean of facts the historian selects those which are significant for his purpose, so from the multiplicity of sequences of cause and effects he extracts those, and only those, which are historically significant; and the standard of historical significance is his ability to fit them into his pattern of rational explanation and interpretation. Other sequences of cause and effect have to be rejected as accidental, not because the relation between cause and effect is different, but because the sequence itself is irrelevant”.²⁰

In these remarks on macrohistory, the Thucydidean legacy is also depicted. The ancient historian “believed that establishing the facts with the greatest possible accuracy was crucially important for his purpose: to understand and illuminate the workings of human nature, especially in the realms of politics, international relations and war”.²¹ Thucydides was “selective” in not taking into account any individual reactions, while he insisted to focus on truth in order to shape specific causalities. This was an innovation for his time, but it has still remained a desideratum until our time. He refers to the notion of “sequence”, namely the repeat of specific facts derived from specific causes and thus, empiricism becomes the sole safe choice of a historian to analyse human behaviour in the context of a collectivity. His aim was clear and it was depicted in the “essential approach of truth beyond his era” in order to be “valid and useful for the next generations”, while he distinguishes his material by grading it in line with its causal dynamic, classifying it accordingly (“kategoriai” and “diekdikiseis”) comparatively analysing them with “the most real truth”.²² In another possible case, Thucydides could have given emphasis “not only on Pericles but also on Aspasia, his espouse, citing any kind of spicy stories”.²³

The historiographic categorization of the facts cited is absolutely necessary for the theoretical analysis following the descriptive part. For example, Thucydides ignores any kind of meaningless anecdotes and elaborates his narrative focusing on the technique of periodization for interrelating facts and organizing his material.²⁴ The introduction of some kind of standardization is surely ahead of his era, but it is also neglected today by many scholars desiring to analyse on an idealist and utopian basis and to present their conclusions as “the” undisputable “real truth”. In fact, it is their own “real truth” characterized by ideological bias and personal representations; namely, what is considered geostrategy in geopolitical theory and it considered clearly subjective. Besides, “world history is the process by which the uncontrolled natural will is disciplined in the direction of the universal, the direction of subjective freedom”.²⁵

Following the afore-mentioned remarks, it becomes obvious that a theoretical approach has to be pervaded by ontological references in order to be diachronic as well as offering broad and strong explanatory value. Nevertheless, how can ontology be defined? In the margins of the inter-historical theoretical debate, ontology is distinguished into two dimensions. Firstly, it can refer to “a catalog of objects, processes, and factors that a given line of scientific research expects to exist or has evidence for the existence of: ontology as bestiary, so to speak, concerned with what exists, or with the general principles on which such existence might be determined”.²⁶ Therefore, a theory with clear-cut ontological reference is absolutely correlated with description and at least, before tending to evaluate or speculate, it warns accordingly the reader and does not present this subjective evaluation as “the real truth”. Secondly, ontology refers to the epistemological conceptualization of historical description and analysis and accordingly, to the process of knowledge production. Of course, this is clearly identified with the point of objectivity, however, this distinction aims to clarify what is the process for decoding ontology and how this is conceived in the scientific context.

²⁰ Carr, E. H. (1961) op. cit., p. 105. See indicatively: Carr, E. H. (1979) *The Russian Revolution: From Lenin to Stalin*. New York: The Free Press.

²¹ Kagan, D. (2003) *The Peloponnesian War*. London: Penguin Books. P. 491.

²² De Romilly, J. (2010) *The human grandeur in Pericles’s century / To anthropino megaleio ston aiona tou Perikli* [in Greek]. Athens: Oceanida. Pp. 33-35.

²³ De Romilly, J. (2010) op. cit., p. 35.

²⁴ De Romilly, J. (1988) *History and reason in Thucydides / Istoría kai logos ston Thucydidi* [in Greek]. Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation. P. 65.

²⁵ Hegel, G. W. F. (1988) *Introduction to the philosophy of history*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company. P. 93.

²⁶ Jackson, P. T. (2011) *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. London: Routledge. P. 28. Also, see: Troulis, M. (2016) Conditions of science and the ontological background of international relations theory / Zitimata ontologias kai epistimonikotitas tou pediou ton diethnon scheseon: Ypenthimisi ton katavolon [in Greek]. *Political and social sciences*, 2, pp. 7-21.

Evaluating the contribution of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis

Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is correlated with the theory-making and macrohistoric legacy described above and this is undoubtedly reflected into three of its contributions. Beyond territorial politics,²⁷ some mere emphases indicate its awareness of and tendency towards macrohistory. However, before referring to them, it has to be mentioned that Systemic Geopolitical Analysis as a scientific program introduces a methodological tool for decoding international phenomena on an inter-scientific and multi-factorial basis. It is neither some kind of political philosophy itself nor an undisputable worldview (Weltanschauung). Its philosophical background is identified with realpolitik and the reading of international politics through the notion of power and its distributive consequences among the actors as long as “power is not just one inactive tool in a personified God’s hands or a personified history. It is the essence of Being (sein), which is not just idle and inactive, but it represents self-development motivated by its own principal power. On the logical-ontological level this self-development is inclined towards the conceptual entirety and on the historical level towards the realization of freedom. From this point of view, power can be found everywhere; in nature, in history and also in the philosophical logic as the expression of God’s thinking. It is not necessary, hence, to be debated. Its essence and action is profound via the changes of Being and the – sometimes undisputed – upper morality is justified through these changes”.²⁸

With reference to its contributions on the basis of macrohistory, the first is related with its emphasis on economic parameters of political configurations in diachrony, while this is found in line with the Thucydidean legacy as far as “Thucydides’s History can be read as an examination of the impact of a profound commercial revolution on a relatively static international system. [...] [Thucydides] may be said to have been a political economist – perhaps the first – and almost all realists have followed him in this appreciation of the intimate connection between international politics and international economics”.²⁹ What is called “(re)distributive consequences of actors’ initiatives” was noted by Thucydides and it has been adopted by modern scholars as an undisputed cause of destabilization and war (uneven growth). Systemic Geopolitical Analysis derives from economic geography as a sub-sector of geography analysing “the economic characteristics of both collective and individual entities”.³⁰ Furthermore, it clarifies that economic regimes represent examinable poles next to nation-states and international institutions³¹ and finally, it considers economic space as dialectically secondary, namely hyper-structural and causative.³²

For the reasons above, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is said to measure and analyse on the basis of power redistributions taking place on a long-term basis and affecting international relations decisively, since economic geography is linked to macrohistoric fermentations not able to change via timely evolutions. In a different case, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis would have focused on human beings’ temper, psychological parameters or even para-historical speculations and evaluations. On the contrary, it sets priority to stably read redistributions, observed on a long-term basis and determining actors’ behaviors and more specifically, their grand strategies; i.e. their well-established inclinations, challenges, prospects, strategic aims and definition of means to be mobilised.

Secondly, it has been underlined that the civilizational pillar of power is the most important among the four pillars analysed in Systemic Geopolitical Analysis. It reflects countable and uncountable geopolitical indicators correlated with ontology, neglecting at the same time the imaginary and in these terms, any kind of deontology (sollen). With regard to civilizational pillar, the contribution of the research program is proven reversely; undisputedly, the civilizational is a macrohistoric identification, but remaining methodologically to the “distinctively important” as well as measurement is an extremely risky procedure. This is because civilizational geopolitical indicators are unclear and their selection has to be scientifically coordinated. For this reason, it “focuses on four aspects of power influential exercise by nation-state entities or other international

²⁷ On the importance of Ratzelian “living space” (lebensraum), it has been described that: “Land limits space of life in water and water limits space of life in land. Even for human being, who dominates water, land is still the sole place where is able to settle. Anthropogeography and Political Geography emphasize on the meaning of sea for the others’ lives. However, only 135 million sq. km of land belong to human being. Man starts from land and arrives to land during his transfers. Before all these the establishment of states evolves, in these terms, at these 135 sq. km of land of current geomorphology”. Mazis, I. Th. (2014) *Friedrich Ratzel’s Living Space / O zotikos choros tou Friderikou Ratzel* [in Greek]. Athens: Herodotus. P. 196.

²⁸ Kondylis, P. (2000) *Pleasure, power and utopia / Idoni, ischys kai utopia* [in Greek]. Athens: Stigmi. P. 81.

²⁹ Gilpin, R. (1986) op. cit., pp. 308-309.

³⁰ Mazis, I. Th. (2012) op. cit., p. 346.

³¹ Mazis, I. Th. (2012) op. cit., p. 367.

³² Mazis, I. Th. (2012) op. cit., p. 349.

actors” and “the spheres of geographical influence are grouped within each hub (or framework of hubs) of the new poles of international power”.³³

This means that Systemic Geopolitical Analysis indicates the importance of civilizational fermentations, but it also gives emphasis on those indicators which determine the fate of these fermentations. In other words, civilizations represent entities to be examined in correlation with the overall geopolitical substance of the planet and not isolated from each other. Besides, this is where the inter-scientific and multi-factorial desideratum is accomplished by Systemic Geopolitical Analysis; the Thucydidean “real truth” is concluded via this desideratum and not as sole parts. Such holistic inter-scientificism and consistent multi-factorialism is reflected by the focus on “human spaces” (human geography), which are represented by the dialectic syntheses of natural space and human societies. These syntheses define geographical spaces.³⁴ Clearly referring to ontology, human geography or anthropo-geography starts from the inter-historically tested and verified hypothesis that “every clan, tribe, state or nation includes two ideas, a people and its land, the first is unthinkable without the other”.³⁵

Of course, this second characteristic is positioned in the opposite of Samuel Huntington’s argumentation on “the clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order”³⁶ and his tendency to a one-sided analysis of international politics on the basis of civilizational clashes. Huntington tends to neglect state-centric analysis forming a new – post-Cold War – reading of international politics in conjunction with a relevant reasoning of antagonisms.³⁷ Although he uses hypotheses of political realism to elaborate his argumentation, he concludes in positioning himself next to a utopian context of analysis, surely away from the ontological prerequisite of a clear-cut descriptive systemic theory either of geopolitics or international relations theory. On the contrary, Systemic Geopolitical Analysis prioritizes its “civilizational point” in interrelation with the rest ontological substance of international politics, it sets nation-state at the epicentre and hence, its macrohistoric analytical overview is interdisciplinary, phenomenological and in the end, impressively effective, while measurement is in accordance with all the afore-mentioned epistemological and conceptual remarks.

A third indication-contribution of macrohistoric essence in Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is the final stage of its methodology; namely the “sample of redistributions of power”. In this last stage and up to this sample, the amalgam of the previous stages is presented and consequently, the geopolitical analysis as well as the descriptive part comes to an end. After the “sample of redistributions of power”, geostrategic synthesis – namely the subjective part – takes place. Hence, evaluation is clearly cited in the aftermath of a descriptive analysis and thus, it does not derive without a necessary scientifically oriented conceptual background. This objectivity and descriptive orientation classifies Systemic Geopolitical Analysis among the macrohistorically evolved methodological approaches succeeding in distinguishing geopolitics from geostrategy and thus, indicating “the important” and “the diachronic” rather than “the insignificant” and “the synchronic”.

II. CONCLUSION

In the current paper, the epistemological prerequisite of emphasis on macrohistory has been noted vis-à-vis Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and its contribution in modern scientific debate on international politics. The research program’s consistent methodology and mainly, its interest in remaining descriptive in the margins of its five methodological stages, define it as a clear-cut depiction and analysis of historical case studies. The afore-mentioned set of characteristics derives from Thucydides’s legacy as this is presented in his magnum opus “Peloponnesian War”,³⁸ while processing historical case studies into Systemic Geopolitical Analysis is considered a task finally correlated with minimizing falsities in a series of hypotheses made.

Upon setting the framework of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and clarifying its epistemological-level contribution, a description of the overall conditions for theory-making was cited as well as three basic

³³ Mazis, I. Th. (2014) op. cit., p. 53.

³⁴ Mazis, I. Th. (2002) op. cit., p. 30.

³⁵ Churchill Semple, E. (1911) *Influences of geographic environment on the basis of Ratzel’s system of anthropo-geography*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. P. 51.

³⁶ Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. London: Simon & Schuster. See also: Mazis, I. Th. (2004) A critique to critical geopolitics or “who is afraid of modern geopolitical analysis?” / Kritiki stin kritiki geopolitiki i “poios fovatai ti synchroni geopolitiki analysi?” [in Greek]. *Geostrategy*, 5, p. 148.

³⁷ Shahi, D. (2017) The clash of civilizations thesis: A critical appraisal. *E-International Relations*. Accessed at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/04/02/the-clash-of-civilizations-thesis-a-critical-appraisal/> [25/5/2020].

³⁸ Thucydides (2005) *The history of the Peloponnesian War / Istoría tou Peloponissiakou Polemou* [in Greek]. 8th ed. Athens: Bookstore of Estia.

indications of the research program’s identification with descriptive analysis and macrohistory. In the light of the relevant argumentation, not only its substance was described, but also the conditions for an objective, ontologically oriented and descriptive theory-making were presented in total. Besides, the modern debate on international politics is characterized by many partisan divisions unfortunately widening from time to time and spilling over from geopolitics to geostrategy, without any scientific prerequisite and under the cloak of “nominal” science. For this reason, the thoughtful stance of people desiring to get into theoretical reading of historical facts is more than necessary to the aim of accordingly reading current international relations phenomena.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Alston, W. P. (2005) *Beyond ‘justification’: Dimensions of epistemic evaluation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- [2]. Carr, E. H. (1961) *What is history?* London: Penguin books.
- [3]. Carr, E. H. (1979) *The Russian Revolution: From Lenin to Stalin*. New York: The Free Press.
- [4]. Churchill Semple, E. (1911) *Influences of geographic environment on the basis of Ratzel’s system of anthropo-geography*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- [5]. De Romilly, J. (1988) *History and reason in Thucydides / Istoría kai logos ston Thucydidi* [in Greek]. Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation.
- [6]. De Romilly, J. (2010) *The human grandeur in Pericles’s century / To anthropino megaleio ston aiona tou Perikli* [in Greek]. Athens: Oceanida.
- [7]. Domatioti, X. (2018) *Systemic geopolitical analysis. Interscientific and multi-methodological approach / Sistimiki geopolitiki analisi: Diepistimonikotita kai polimethodologiki prosegkisi* (Foreword by Ioannis Th. Mazis) [in Greek]. Athens: Leimon.
- [8]. Galtung, J. (1997) *Macrohistory and macrohistorians: A theoretical framework*. In: Galtung, J. and Inayatullah, S. (eds.) *Macrohistory and macrohistorians: Perspectives on individual, social and civilizational change*. London: Praeger, pp. 1-9.
- [9]. Gilpin, R. (1986) *The richness of the tradition of political realism*. In: Keohane, R. (ed.) *Neorealism and its critics*. New York: Columbia university press, pp. 301-321.
- [10]. Hegel, G. W. F. (1988) *Introduction to the philosophy of history*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- [11]. Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- [12]. Jackson, P. T. (2011) *The conduct of inquiry in international relations: Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. London: Routledge.
- [13]. Kagan, D. (2003) *The Peloponnesian War*. London: Penguin Books.
- [14]. Kaplan, R. D. (2013) *The revenge of geography: What the map tells us about coming conflicts and the battle against fate*. London: Penguin Random House.
- [15]. Kondylis, P. (1998) *The invisible chronology of thought: Answers to 28 questions / To aorato kondrologio tis skepsis: Apantisis se 28 erotimata* (in Greek). Athens: Nefeli.
- [16]. Kondylis, P. (2000) *Pleasure, power and utopia / Idoni, ischys kai utopia* [in Greek].
- [17]. Kuhn, T. (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [18]. Lijphart, A. (1974) *The structure of the theoretical revolution in international relations*. *International studies quarterly*, 18 (1), pp. 41-74.
- [19]. Mazis, I. Th. (2002) *Geopolitics: Theory and praxis / Geopolitiki: Theoria kai praxi* [in Greek]. Athens: Papazisis and ELIAMEP.
- [20]. Mazis, I. Th. (2004) *A critique to critical geopolitics or “who is afraid of modern geopolitical analysis?” / Kritiki stin kritiki geopolitiki i “poios fovatai ti sinchroni geopolitiki analysi?”* [in Greek]. *Geostrategy*, 5, pp. 139-160.
- [21]. Mazis, I. Th. (2012) *Metatheoretical critical approach of international relations and geopolitics. The neopositivist frame / Metatheoritiki Kritiki Diethnon skhesseon kai Geopolitikis. To neothetikistiko plaisio* [in Greek]. Athens: Papazisis.
- [22]. Mazis, I. Th. (2017) *Methodology for Systemic Geopolitical Analysis according to the Lakatosian model. Geopolitics Academic Dissertations, LXVI*, pp. 675-686.
- [23]. Mazis, I. Th., Troulis, M. and Domatioti, X. (2019) *The Thucydidean Legacy of Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and Structural Realism*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, 8 (10), pp. 45-50.
- [24]. Shahi, D. (2017) *The clash of civilizations thesis: A critical appraisal*. *E-International Relations*. Accessed at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2017/04/02/the-clash-of-civilizations-thesis-a-critical-appraisal/> [25/5/2020].

- [25]. Thucydides (2005) *The history of the Peloponnesian War / Istoría tou Peloponissiakou Polemou* [in Greek]. 8th ed. Athens: Bookstore of Estia.
- [26]. Troulis, M. (2016) *Conditions of science and the ontological background of international relations theory / Zitímata ontologías kai epistimonikótita tou pediou ton diethnon scheseon: Ypentímisi ton katavolon* [in Greek]. *Political and social sciences*, 2, pp. 7-21.
- [27]. Wight, C. (2006) *Agents, structures and international relations: Politics as ontology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ioannis Th. Mazis, et. al. “Processing historical case studies into Systemic Geopolitical Analysis.” *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(6), 2020, pp. 48-55.