

through empirical information, an account of the struggles of the United States defense establishment in responding to the changes in the security environment. In the end, *The uncertainty doctrine* is a study that brings a contribution to political studies. Specially, by laying open some of the main processes between agencies of a great power in the attempt to resilience national policy, in particular defense policy, in a new security environment.

Tudor Salanțiu

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5378-6874>

DOI: 10.59277/AIIGB/2024.63.33

*The historicity of international politics: Imperialism and the presence of the past*, Klaus SCHLICHTE and Stephan STETTER, (eds.), New York, Cambridge University Press, 2023, 280 p.

The volume proposed by Schlichte and Stetter as editors is a collective volume that follows to answer methodological questions regarding the significance of the recognition that international politics has a history. Distinct from the importance of this question, it is necessary to admit that it enjoys a certain appreciation because it addresses how history exists in international relations (IR) and how we should write a history of the field. In light of the complex research on the historiography of IR, it is possible to suggest that the volume addresses the sensitive subject described by the mode of historicity of IR. In our opinion, interest in the topic appears due to two facts. First, due to the theoretical crisis that sparked the largely ahistorical set-up of theories<sup>6</sup>. Secondly, due to a philosophical problem that brings into discussion the presence of the past (history) in the presentation of the present (evolution of reality). From an IR methodological point of view, the two facts are not individual but are connected through the importance of history as an argument. This fact represents a position and develops an argument against the trend of philosophy dissolution, which follows the disregard of history in the description of factuality.

Through these points of view, the work proposed by the two editors leaves the impression of a study that searches for the arguments of the subject in the works of Herbert Lüthy, Gamader, and Braudel. Nevertheless, the book follows to explain how the IR theorizing around the Eurocentric underpinning defines the limits of history explanation and how much we can neglect historical analysis in references. To sustain their position, the editors use the topics of the chapters to develop a conceptual angle from the extensive European scholarship based on the concept of historicity. The methodology used to sustain their point is developed around the concept of historicity as an instrument that offers the possibility of theorizing the presence of the past in IR as a general case. In particular, however, historicity is used to address the temporal dimension of international politics as a mode of narration. The main idea related to the concept of historicity presented in the volume is the assumption that the past is not over, will continue to exist, and will be developed through the present. The claim of this assumption appears from the fact that studying the relationship between social and policy, policy and economy, and policy into the world is about development in international relations vocabulary, the notions about "world history." Secondly, and related to the realist paradigm, the historical past is both about knowledge and its validation, and how we report to the present and the future through what we know. This is the logic invoked in IR analysis when the temporal extension of concepts is discussed, which makes it possible for the past to exist in present vocabulary based on

---

<sup>6</sup> Barry Buzan and Richard Little, *Why international relations has failed as an intellectual project and what to do about it*, „Millennium: Journal of international studies”, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2001, p. 19–39.

concepts used to express maps and practices. Yet, there is an additional technical stage associated with the language mechanism and vocabulary of IR that sustains the logic that makes international politics what it is meant to be.

On that basis, the authors of the chapters have developed six different modes of historicity that guide the analysis based on their contributions to the subject. Based on this approach, the aim is to show what is in the backdrop when we survey the social realm of international politics as a historical dimension constantly present in the theoretical framework. Due to that, the entire framework of the book is advanced through the historicity of foreign policy, from the return to imperial grandeur observed in the present philosophy of some political actors. From political studies, this approach is about the meaning and legitimization of post-imperial politics. Thus, the volume is not a plea for accepting historical arguments invoked in different situations, but to be able to explain how historical claims appear in foreign policy discourse and practices. I believe that this is a crossroads in the study proposed in this volume due to two reasons. First, because the history is seen beyond the framework, it generates data about facts or events that should be known. What the authors of the volume added through the use of historicity is a dimension that addresses contemporary structures and events through cross-cutting thematic issues that link the past with the present. Second, the backdrop developed for the subject of the volume instead of putting in the past some issues as imperialism followed to approach the transcendental links of the concept from the past to a contemporary form. This choice is based on the centrality of the concepts that are imprinted on several levels of international politics. The admission of this stage is important because it underlines both academic and policy requirements to engage in a more profound manner with the concepts in the context of IR history evolution.

Nevertheless, the volume knows a shortcoming that emerges from the interpretive frame offered to the past of international politics in the present of international relations. For example, the imperial practices of the past are presented as an informative frame for the contemporary international politics associated with the historical glory achievement. In short, imperialism, centralism, and international politics are perceived as issues of security, while interventions in various political formats are drawn as a reaction that challenges the disciplinary hegemony that suppressed history and power dynamics in particular. Even if for history or the realist paradigm this state does not appear as an issue, this situation raises some concerns about the incapacity to escape from power logic and to see in the historical sociology of IR a distinct but convergence dimension of the same field.

This short overview offers, in sum, a manifold reason to approach the *historicity of international politics* and to offer, through historicity, a view of the global world. In many ways, the turn of world complexity to the historicity of the relationship between the past and present represents a greater consideration of hierarchies from the convergence of two points of view. Due to that, the volume present an interest both from methodological view, and also from arguments which are offered to the subjects studied in chapters.

Tudor Salanțiu

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5378-6874>

DOI: 10.59277/AIIGB/2024.63.34

*Südost-Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur Südosteuropas*,  
Regensburg, Band 81, 2022, 526 p.

Ediția din anul 2022 a anuarului Institutului pentru cercetarea Europei de est și de sud-est din Regensburg (Leibniz-Institut für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung) este dedicată cercetării istoriei și