

INTERDEPENDENCE AND HEGEMONY IN EUROPE DURING THE PANDEMIC PROCESS

Ferdi T. GÜÇYETMEZ¹

Abstract

Crisis processes experienced in the international system and power gaps that emerged afterwards result in the new hegemonic powers filling that gap. In his work on the Peloponnesian War, Greek Historian Thukidididis explains the crises in the history of the whole world when he says “when one power is regressing and fears the competition of another rising power, the roads to wars open up one after the other.” Regardless of the type and extent of the crises, emerging forces are obliged to protect their new areas beyond protecting their own fields. Although these areas differ in the new global system, they have opened new doors at a time when the era of total war is over. Here, in these newly established 'game theories', countries have adopted new theories, while shifting the power struggle to another area. In this study, we will discuss how the European Union tries to establish the

¹Lecturer, Kent University, Faculty Of Humanities and Social Sciences,
E-Mail:ferdigucyetmez26@gmail.com

balance of power in the world system that is faced with a pandemic crisis and the struggle of European countries to become hegemonic power by using interdependence while integrating into this system.

Keywords: Gramscian, Interdependence, Balance of Power, Europe, Hegemony

Pandemi Sürecinde Avrupa’da Karşılıklı Bağımlılık ve Hegemonya

Özet

Uluslararası sistemde yaşanan kriz süreçleri ve sonrasında ortaya çıkan güç boşlukları, yeni hegemon güçlerin o boşluğu doldurması ile sonuçlanmaktadır. Yunan tarihçi Thukididis, Peloponez Savaşını anlattığı eserinde; “bir güç gerilerken, o sırada yükselmekte olan bir başka gücün rekabetinden korkmaya başladığında savaşımlara giden yollar ardına kadar açılır” derken, tüm dünya tarihinde yaşanan krizleri açıklamış olmaktadır. Krizlerin türü ve boyutu fark etmeksizin yeni ortaya çıkan güçler, kendi alanlarını korumanın ötesinde yeni sahip olduğu alanları da korumakla yükümlüdür. Bu alanlar, yeni küresel sistemde farklılık göstermekle birlikte, topyekûn savaş devrinin bittiği bir dönemde yeni kapılar açmıştır. İşte yeni kurulan bu ‘oyun teorilerinde’ ülkeler güç mücadelesini başka alana kaydırmakla birlikte yeni kuramlar benimsemişlerdir. Bu çalışmada pandemi krizi ile karşı karşıya kalan dünya sisteminde, Avrupa Birliği’nin güç dengesini nasıl kurmaya çalıştığını ve bu sisteme entegre olurken karşılıklı bağımlılığı

kullanarak hegemon güç olma yolunda, Avrupa ülkelerinin kendi arasındaki mücadelesini ele alacağız.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Gramscian, Karşılıklı Bağımlılık, Güç Dengesi, Avrupa, Hegemonya

Introduction

In each century, the international system gains momentum by reshaping itself according to the conjuncture, and as a result of this new formation, a country with a strong structure emerges. With the industrial revolution, the global power components that have changed over a hundred-year periods actually take new forms with the new balance policies of the authority that emerged as a result of a war. It is seen that European countries were the locomotives in the periods when new schools emerged. But XX century, the United States of America, which emerged from the dystopian school, is at the top of the global power pyramid (Kissenger, 1994). The idea of spreading American thought to the world, creating new schools, and the idea of creating a superpower combination by giving the appearance of a country with a clean past was the most radical attempt in all centuries. Acting on the interdependence theories and acting in the dominant power environment, the United States maintained this appearance until World War II. The realization of the dependencies of the countries were devastated by the world wars, when they had no other choice but to unite after the wars that were tired, created a new global jargon. The need for global powers to act with the interdependence theory. Although it shifted its axis towards this connection in a dominant power actor

such as The USA after World War II, it did not lose its resistance until the end of the cold war as a country that oscillated between the loneliness policy and these dependency relations.

The existence of an American authority having global power in the emerging or emerging new world order after the World Wars had a considerable pressure and effect on all countries of the world. In the war period when there was no balance of power in the international system, The USA was only putting the conditions and applying them to other states. America no longer wanted states to conceal secret agreements and form military units, and was openly pressuring European states for agreements. These American practices that Europe had to apply caused them to understand the importance of Europe's balance of power system. Here, after the pressure of these American missions, which we can describe as the breaking point for these theories to emerge, European leaders began to feel that they had to develop an approach. With the order of intrigue that started with the Industrial Revolution, the footsteps of chaos began to be heard for the third world countries. When highly prosperous countries sought new exploitation and dragged the world into chaos, The USA iron fist emerged, and they felt an unfamiliar order and pressure in their diplomacy.

Before entering the last century, the system of European states, whose expectations were fulfilled, seemed to be in unity. It is seen that Britain gained power rapidly in XVIII century. England during the War of the Spanish Succession between 1702-1713; by taking Gibraltar and the island of Minorca from Spain, it started to become a powerful state in the Mediterranean. The economic, political and social repercussions of this change of England paved the way for the great Industrial

Revolution that this country will undergo towards the end of the same century. The Peace of Utrecht in 1713, which was made at the end of the War of Succession, also preserved the system that Westphalia brought in 1648. States continued to regard each other as independent parts of the European system. These states can make peace or war with each other; they could easily form alliances between them. They were able to resolve their disputes through border change (land exchange), often without even going to war. Until the French Revolution, the main powerful states in the European political scene were France and England.

“After the French Revolution and the internal turmoil of the Napoleonic Wars, European countries had achieved the balance of power with the Congress of Vienna in 1815. Thus, by making international cooperation more moderate with moral and legal ties, they also softened the trust in brute force. However, by the end of the 19th century, the European balance of power system returned to the principles of power politics, creating an even more brutal environment. Suppressing the enemy has become the valid method of diplomacy. When it came to 1914, the explosion point of all these events described above was experienced and the chaos that engulfed the world emerged. With the start of the world wars, Europe could never take the world leadership as before. From this point on, the new dominant power, the United States, emerged as the dominant player in diplomacy (Kissinger, 1994).”

In the period until the French Revolution, it is seen that small states can be effective in Europe due to the balance of power theory. One reason for this situation is military in nature. During this period, armies were generally small and weapons were considered simple.

Transportation difficulties, insufficient maps, and many other administrative and technical problems allowed only a small number of soldiers to be dispatched and managed on the battlefield. Consequently, a well-trained, disciplined and well-equipped and well-managed state army could defeat the army of a much larger country than itself. The Thirty Years' War was fought by armies of no more than 20,000 soldiers. Two typical examples of the influence of small states due to this military reason in the period in question are Sweden and Prussia.

The system of balance of power will be able to regain a structure that gives life rights to small states, only to a certain extent between 1815-1914. In real terms, it can only be seen after World War II. In other words, the full functioning of the balance of power system took 150 years after Westphalia; it took about 150 years for it to regain its former character.

After World War II, the world has undergone great changes. The international system has taken on a bipolar structure. With the defeat of Germany and withdrawal from the Central European region, a power vacuum occurred in this region. The United States and the Soviet Union came to the fore to fill this power gap (Mearsheimer, 1990).

After the World War II, the concept of power was redefined with the onset of the Cold War. Without participating in the balance of power, The USA settled in a position that balances countries that have become leaders of the balance of power. The United States was not a mechanism for the balance of power. However, it was the dominant force of this balance as the party that broke the balance in diplomatic relations. The United States, which dominated the weak European states with a victory without going to war, took advantage of the balance of power mechanism in this period when the bipolar world

emerged. However, this process would begin to disappear with the disintegration of the chaotic environment it was in. With the end of the Cold War, new equations would emerge and axial shifts in the power mechanism would be observed. With the emergence of the multipolar structure in the XXI century systematic, power definitions and concepts would radically change and regional dominant powers would emerge. The rising powers in this new order would create a new balance and open an era in international relations. The share of Europe from this period was that it was necessary to take the road of unity in order to be strong. The evolution of the power system starting from the Westphalian Treaty took shape only within the XXI century. The fact that Europe started to form a union caused a new door to open in the global order and to take its place in a new balance order against the forces established in the Asian region.

In addition to all these issues we've talked about, there is an analysis we have to say about America. This analysis is actually very important for the world balance system. It would be appropriate to explain this analysis through Charles Kindleberger. In the theory of hegemonic stability, Kindleberger claims that the reason for the formation of the 1929 economic crisis stemmed from the unwillingness of the United States to be a balancing power, based on the requirement of a hegemonic power for the smooth functioning of world trade. Kindleberger mentions the necessity of a strong and leading country for the stable survival of the world economy. The role that England assumed in the world economy in the 18th and 19th centuries was supposed to be undertaken by the USA in the 20th century, but the world experienced a great economic depression in 1929 because they did not take this role. The USA continued this role, which should be assumed at the

beginning of the 20th century, only after the Second World War, when the dollar became the world trade unit with the Bretten Woods Decisions and thus began to direct the world trade in a liberal sense, the world economy and trade system began to function (Rode, 2002: 23). If we continue to explain the role of the USA in the direction of the hegemonic stability theory, the USA did not abuse its power after the second world war and it is among the claims of Kindleberger that it helped the economies of Western Europe and Japan to develop and strengthen (Rode, 2002).

The period from the 1815 Vienna Congress until 1871 is called "European Harmonization". In this period of European harmonization, no power took steps to dominate the system. States in this period; They wanted to protect the current order by acting together against the ideas such as nationalism, liberalism, democracy and freedom, which started to be effective and spread after the French revolution (Yılmaz, 2007).

After five centuries of Western colonialism and the last 100 years with the American Empire, inequalities have continued to increase. While the unemployed and excluded people suffer concentrated in one part of the world, on the other, there are the forces that rule the world with a few technology tools. We are trying to make new theoretical determinations in the middle of a biological war age in this century, where we witnessed the integration of war systems and categorized war systems in the global world system. While the hegemony is not measured by the wars won in the field in the order where the balance of power is directed from bipolar system to multipolar system, we have entered into a process where economy and science come to the fore. While this is the case, new ways and searches for diplomatically winning are

also of critical importance for global powers. We need a reinterpretation of the global system in a period where the wars won on the front in the past have strengthened the hand diplomatically, and when states using new power elements effectively try to gain superiority in diplomacy.

At this point, implementing the policies of establishing superiority consisting of the components of the theory of interdependence and the balance of power system passes through the universality of both the intelligence, economic and technological dimensions of the states. Strong technological investments of states with strong currencies show their importance in times of global crises. Although this situation seems to be between the rising Chinese power and the United States after the Cold War, the number of countries taking place in this mutual equation in the multi-disciplinary system is increasing. In this system, there is no room for choosing a party, but it is known that there are many African countries that fall under the soft power of countries that do not spare their support economically. Based on this hegemonic system, we will try to explain the relations of countries by blending many international theories within this study and matching them with the pandemic part of power struggles in Europe and America. At this point, we will try to explain in which plane the European Union will take direction at the end of this crisis, as a result of the study we will deal with the theory of interdependence, soft power and balance of power.

New Order in Interdependence Theory

In the 21st century, the institutions of international crises established for armed conflict now provide defense services as strategy institutes. Tactical strategy applications should be progressed in a linear ratio with the basic policy system in line with the use of high strategy. We have passed from a system where economic opportunities are very important to support the armed forces, to an age where economy is important for technological equipment. The fighting power of countries can reveal a mutual dependency proportional to the production capacities of countries. In this new model, countries will lose their defense capabilities if their perspective on strategy is limited. When war dates and strategic moves are analyzed simultaneously, it will be seen that tactical defenses that change over time have a very close effect on armed struggle. While it is difficult to use the high strategy measure in the arms industry, which is focused on human power, military weapons, which are more technological and widely used, are the new models that make the countries primary and bring them to the dominant power point. However, interdependence has to increase in societies where war culture has changed with the transition to technology. Depending on the economic power of each country, his attempts to import directly in order to obtain cheap production can reveal a unilateral commitment in terms of defense of countries. Thus, while entering a period of bloodless victories, reducing the values of countries with the soft power factor reveals how important the loyalty theory is. The United States, which continued to rise during the bloody wars of European history, unlike countries that drifted towards world wars, said in 1898, senator Albert J. Beveridge:

“World trade should and will be ours and we will get it. We will surround the seas with our merchant ships; we will build a fleet worthy of our size. The great colonies that govern themselves, carry our flag, and work for us will line up along our trade routes. Our organizations will follow our banner on the wings of our trade. And with American law, American order, American civilization and flag, we will set foot on the shores that have been bloody until today but will soon be brilliant thanks to God” (Garaudy, 2004).

Another dimension that we need to examine while going through change in the global system is how far the unilateral dependency order can be maintained. Mr. Truman uses the following statements in this regard:

“There will come a time when we will have to get a lot of what the United States needs from outside. We must go to Labrador and Liberia and buy the target mine for our steel mills to work well. We have to get our copper from outside. It exists in Arizona and Utah, but we cannot give up on Chile's. There is tin in Bolivia and rubber in Indonesia, of course, I can make a whole list of what we need in other parts of the world” (Garaudy, 2004).

In the global system, while the rules of being the dominant power until the cold war period were measured by military performance in the field, it began to change with the spoils and cultural shock obtained from the exploitation countries during the Cold War years. The definition of dominant power, which changed with the end of the Cold War, had to be updated with the facts brought about by the mutual dependencies of the countries at some point. The “interdependence”

theory put forward by Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye has become the globalization discourse that came to the fore after the Cold War.

“Periodically, the Cold War process is the best example of the bipolar system in the international system. Here the power is distributed between the two superpowers. It continued steadily from 1945 to 1990. There has never been a war between these two superpowers. We can list the reasons why the bipolar system is more stable than other systems as follows: First, the possibility of conflict between the great states in the international system is low. Such a situation reduces the probability of a war between the great powers in the system. Secondly, since there are only two superpowers in the international system, deterrence policies are not effective. Third and lastly, since there are two superpowers in the international system, states are less likely to make miscalculations. (Mearsheimer, 1990).

Interdependence in the pluralist system refers to the conditions shaped by the mutual interaction between the actors in world politics between countries or between different countries. Mutual dependency; it is the complex set of conditions created by the connections and relationships created by the many channels of interaction between states and societies in an international system that lacks a definite hierarchical agenda (Keohane & Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 2001).

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye focus on the relationship between Power and Interdependence, which they use while drawing the theoretical framework of the concept of interdependence. Defending that Hans Morgenthau, one of the pioneers of the realistic school, ignores the functional relationship between political, military and

economic power, Keohane and Nye stated that a clear demonstration of the relationship between power and interdependence needs some concepts that constitute the nature of the relations between the parties. (Keohane & Nye, 2001: s.10).

The processes of economic interaction make an important contribution to the interdependence theory. Economic processes expand the material and intellectual sharing of values in relations between countries. It is possible to say that the economic interdependence that exists between the two countries is reflected in the political relations of the two states and sometimes gives direction to this relationship. However, for the continuity of the effects of economic processes; It needs to be supported politically and socio-culturally. Keohane and Nye divide the global developments in the international system into periods according to the dimensions of the concept. Accordingly, economic globalization came to the fore between the years 1850-1914, when trade and capital flow increased due to imperialism, and in a more broader period in the period 1914-1945 (Keohane & Nye, 2001, s. 233).

However, this process was taken to another dimension with the pandemic crisis and the necessity of redefining the theory at a time when the capital flow stopped, in a time when commercial activities did not matter in the imperialism system of the countries. With the availability of the vaccine in the progressive process of the pandemic, it is highly probable that the interdependence of the world countries will increase further due to the rapid spread of this information.

In this period, when mutual dependency turns into compulsory dependency, it emerges more with the behaviours of Germany and

France who want to establish hegemony. So, will this pandemic crisis create a hegemonic power?

Context of interdependence, supranational model of a restructuring of the EU system, the lack of a reciprocal mechanism for dealing with the crisis, members of the affects national security and the economy. Political, economic and social importance of the relationship is emerging in this period.

However, the basic principles mentioned above are especially crucial for interdependence in the theoretical framework. Here, first, how to manage the crisis and how the system will react must be determined. When the reactions of the countries are examined, it is determined that they based on building power over each other, instead dependency. The world of international relations is quite accustomed to such events. Still, the reason why countries forget about death and want to continue their systems as a superior power in such a vital issue can be discussed at this point. Human, by nature, lives in a power-oriented manner and wants to maintain immortality with his state. At this point, it is seen as the right time to establish hegemony to become a global power or a regional actor. However, the global environment does not allow this much. While many theorists mention that dependency is sustainable, many theorists mention that this period ends interdependence.

Keohane and Nye claim that Hans Morgenthau ignored the functional relationship between military and economic power. However, they stated that a clear demonstration of the relationship between Power and interdependence is in need of some concepts that constitute the nature of the relations between the parties (Keohane & Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 2001).

“Interdependence creates some of the classic problems of political strategy because of the burden that the behavior of the state and major non-state actors will put on other actors of the system. These affected actors, if their capacities are sufficient, will react politically in order to avoid imposing an obligation to adapt on them. From a foreign policy perspective, the challenge facing governments is how to benefit from international trade while maintaining as much autonomy as possible. When evaluated in terms of the international system, the problem is about how to create and maintain a mutually beneficial cooperation pattern despite the competitive efforts of governments aiming at manipulating the system in their own interests. (Holsti, 1978).

In the analysis of interdependence policy, it should not be anticipated that the consequences of interdependence will automatically benefit other issues. The point is not that interdependence totally nullifies power; on the contrary, interdependence and potential power patterns in a given area are closely related, just like the two sides of a coin. For this reason, analysis to be made by establishing in relation to other power elements will be more healthy and efficient (Baldwin, 1980).

Interdependence has been criticized as a marginal theory by a group led by 'New Realists'. Waltz described interdependence as a myth and stated that maximizing their security is still the top priority foreign policy goal for states. According to Waltz, who calls military issues "high politics", the welfare and wealth enhancement policies put forward by the interdependence theorists are included in the scope of "secondary policy" and are of relatively low importance. The interdependence paradigm, which has also been criticized for underestimating the role of states in international politics, has been accused of ignoring the realities of the current international system, which is still

determining the relations between states in many areas. (Waltz, 1970).

Definitions can be made in the light of comments made by Waltz, Gramsci, Morgenthau, Nye and many other theorists. Nevertheless, let alone globalization, is the current liberal system collapsing? Isn't it necessary to question the current order with this question? Also, did Kissinger anticipate these periods when he was talking about a new world order? It is useful to make the readings considering this. It is necessary to examine the pandemic issue by considering all these.

We are in a time when a new world order is formed due to the pandemic. We tried to explain the basis of the interdependence theory by creating a historical chronology above. As we have noted, while the smaller states before the French revolution were interdependent, this can now appear in the larger model. Even if the industrial revolution, which started with the countries entering into a revolution, increased dependency, as a result of the spread of this development to the world, the countries were closed to themselves and became less dependent than before. Especially gaining independence economically is very important for the future of countries. The discourse of many theorists on the theory of economic interdependence demonstrates this reality. Economically interdependent countries run the risk of losing power without engaging in military strife. In the West, many countries, especially America, may face weakness in places where their economic power depends. The vortex that European society entered with the world wars was used efficiently by the American economy and lobby. Later, this path leading to the decision to unite among themselves reminded that interdependence should change with interdependence. Europe, which resolved the integration with what happened

afterwards, took measures against what is happening today. Trying to overcome the pandemic crisis as a union, Europe is more advantageous than other states. However, the power struggle that emerged within the European Union with the recent separation events has reappeared during the pandemic process. States trying to establish economic superiority during the pandemic process entered into a new initiative with the soft power theory. At this point, a theory as a complex dependency emerges. The pandemic process and the compulsory and complex addiction system will cause a change in Europe.

Compulsory Dependency Theory after the Interdependence Theory

While examining the theory of mutual dependency in the last ten years, it is necessary to consider not only the relations existing between the dominant powers but also the countries that are trying to participate in the competition within the borders they have drawn in their own region. Although the interdependence theory made itself felt with the pandemic, especially in Europe, the dependency that emerged with this theory shows us that it has emerged in a weakness for countries. In this respect, when examining the relations between two or more countries in the interdependence theory, it is also very important that the existing relations or the relations that have to exist are multi-dimensional.

We have observed that the interdependence of countries with each other has become more widespread with globalization in the period of combating epidemics that have come back to us recently. The closure of the borders, the nations of the world who have to turn inward,

emphasize the importance of the transportation system in general. Making common policies in global crises is of critical importance for hegemonic countries. In these periods where diplomacy gains a high level of importance, common solutions are sought for crises and it is observed that countries that have fought for hundreds of years in global crises such as pandemics and faced with world wars are associated. However, this convergence does not mean that a hegemonic power gives opportunity to other states that want to absorb itself. It emerges as the winner of this situation with the least loss in global crises like this. Historical war strategies have reflected this situation into the future many times in the field.

Commander Thukidididis, who lived in the 400s Before Christ (BC), explains the Peloponnesian Wars between Sparta and Athens, which lasted for 27 years, with the struggle for hegemony. It is known that the reason for the emergence of this war was the activities of Sparta against Athens, which started to disrupt the hegemonic balance of power. Although Athens has more hegemonic power, Sparta ventures into war in order to prevent it from taking this leadership. However, as a result of the prolonged war and the wear and tear of the people, things got worse, so the winner of the war seemed to be Sparta, but the Persians, who were independent from these two countries. Yes, there is a winner in the 27-year struggle on the field. However, this side, which lost power in military, economic and social terms, unintentionally offered an opportunity to the Persians who were willing to become another hegemonic power.

In the last decade, research on international regimes has made great progress. Consensus has been achieved on the definition of international regimes as principles, rules, norms and procedures around

which expectations in a particular area of international relations are integrated. There are problems with implementing this definition: especially when the concept of the international regime exceeds the institutionalized consequences of formal interstate agreements, the boundaries between regime and non-regime situations become blurred. (Simmons & Haggard, 1987).

Wars for hegemony have been replaced by diplomacy and system change has been made necessary. Complex dependence arises when reality and power are mutually defined. Mutual dependency is in a period that does not require continuity. Because changing conjuncture and political systems can lead to structural changes.

In *Power and Interdependence*, three main characteristics of complex interdependence are specified: firstly, the political goals of the state are not determined within the framework of static hierarchies, they are subject to barter. Second, the existence of multiple communication channels between societies also increases the variety of political instruments, which strictly limits the ability of foreign ministries to control the foreign affairs of states. Finally, military power is largely unrelated (Keohane & Nye, 2001: s. 89).

Interdependence is generally defined as the interactions between states and non-state actors in the international economy. While it was possible to define it as military until a hundred years ago, it has an important place in liquidity today. Theory complexity stems from the exchange of goods, money, people, and information between countries. Interdependencies as a result of political changes between countries are not exactly the same. To be able to speak of interdependence, we need to consider the costs and benefits of the interaction between two or more parties.

We saw international organizations not as the fulcrum of descriptive law, but as those that institutionalize political links and in which trans-governmental policy, coordination and coalition could take place. International organizations have more influence on the agendas of states and their influence on outputs in terms of ocean politics compared to international financial relations. In the intervening decade, the view has been adopted that international organizations are facilitators rather than lawmakers. The number of such organizations increased, some of them such as the International Monetary Fund - their scope of action expanded, but these organizations made little effort to develop real supranational capabilities. (Keohane & Nye, 2001: 90).

Norman Angell, a British economist, argues that in an international system where the international division of labor is widespread, conflicts between states can be resolved peacefully. According to him, the need for two people in a boat that is far from the shore and receiving water in the open sea explains the interdependence. While one of these two people is obliged to draw a globe and the other to drain the water leaking into the boat, they do not dare to throw each other out of the boat. They both need each other to survive and have to work in harmony. (Angell, 1989). The American political scientist Richard Rosecrance supported a form of commercial liberalism, as Angell did in the first decade of the twentieth century. He did not state that, unlike Angell, interdependence would inevitably triumph over the logic of sovereignty. However, he argues that taking into account all circumstances, the future of international relations will be characterized by a shift in the priorities of states from the logic of military competition to the logic of trade and mutuality. (Salamon, Roach, & Griffiths, 2011).

As trade between states increases, these states will become more mutually dependent on products. This two-way dependency between states is called. Joseph Nye states that policy choice has a highly social and particularly perceptual center of interdependence on costs and values. Liberal theories of interdependence are based on ideas about trade and economic relations (Keohane & Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 2001).

All these theories ultimately work better in political economy over the political and military spheres. In our opinion, a country has economic benefits due to its superiority over other countries in the production of goods and services that are both financially expensive in the markets and the most suitable to produce, that is, it has a "comparative advantage". Free trade is also important in luring states into networks of economic interdependence that make the costs of international conflict and war so high that it is almost impossible to think about it. Free trade also has positive benefits as it enables different peoples to unite around common values and common trade culture in a way that they can understand each other better (Robert, 2006).

According to David Ricardo's theory of relative advantages, states should produce goods that have the best competitive power and can produce the cheapest (Dietz & Cypher, 1998). The more expensive goods they produce should be purchased from the states that produce them more cheaply. Thus, interdependence-centered relationships will be established between states. As long as the parties gain benefit in the continuation of these relations, they will not want the said relationship to deteriorate. This will reduce the likelihood of situations such as conflict and war. From this point of view, states are essentially commercial states (Dietz & Cypher, 1998). Therefore, it would not

be wrong to claim that interdependence not only leads to peace but is also a rational choice for all actors. However, it is not that every country that we want to reach increases its dependency capability by producing a good. Ricardo's theory leads to greater crises in global crises, especially in production goods whose raw material is food. States that are dependent on the cross in the food production mechanism will face famine and will have to cope with the domestic crisis.

The ability to cooperate and communicate can create opportunities for defining interests and pursuing strategies that cannot be implemented in a world where the only knowledge gained about other states is about their choices and their power resources. Just as in the *Convict Dilemma*, players' communication with each other changes the nature of the game, so organizations increase the communication skills of states and ensure mutually beneficial agreements to contribute to the common language of the state administration; so they change the results (Keohane R. O., 1982). Cooperation can take place without regimes or even open negotiation. As Axelrod points out, cooperation will develop as actors define their own interests in response to the strategies of others (and choose a new strategy) (Keohane & Nye, 2001).

As a result, interdependence shows us that it directly affects the balance of power. Although the Ricardian approach we mentioned above binds countries to each other, it also causes the balance of power to deteriorate. The loyalty of dominant countries to other countries may be necessary for the peace of the world, but it can also be seen as a weak point for this country. One branch of the soft power theory on which Nye emphasizes can overlap with this interdependence relation. Of course, just because a weak state has a share in production will

have a very weak effect on a country that is a dominant power. However, it can create a danger for countries with equal economic power.

In addition to all these, the efforts of countries to establish hegemony over the union in a period of leadership competition within the European Union is another part of the study. In a crisis period when states that seem strong should have a stronger word, the dominant countries in Europe are using the soft power theory mentioned by Nye. Kissinger says in his book "Diplomacy": "the aim justifies the means used". States that want to have an impact on the citizens of the country during the crisis period use all means for power control.

"The leadership envisaged by Nye is based on a political behavior that encourages other states to contribute to the stability of the international system. In other words, this leadership model is based on the principle that states are encouraged to waive their short-term earnings for their long-term interests based on the stability of the international system. (Keohane & Nye, "Two Cheers for Multilateralism", 1985). Great states have no problem relinquishing such short-term interests as they make much broader definitions of interest in the international system and expect their initiatives to affect world politics (Keohane & Nye, "Two Cheers for Multilateralism", 1985). However, in this leadership model, which is sustainable in non-hegemonic international conditions, excessive number of states pursuing policies that are completely independent from other states may cause discontent among powerful groups within the leading states and thus erode the willingness of the leader states to waive their short-term interests" (Keohane & Nye, "Two Cheers for Multilateralism", 1985).

Some of the issues mentioned above need to be put into theory. At this point, Immanuel Wallerstein, one of the most important pioneers

of "world system theory", argues that the superiority in the economic field leads to the superiority in the political and military field. Emphasizes that in order to achieve hegemony, superiority must be obtained in the fields of production, trade and finance. (Wallerstein, 2005). Once the superiority in these three areas can be attained at the same time, the position of hegemony can only be reached. Critical theory will be centered in this study as it explains hegemonic declines and rises better.

While the role and positions of the countries have been reshaped with each event, the latest order change has emerged with the pandemic crisis. Countries wishing to assume a leadership role within the Union started off by trying to gain financial advantage. Here we are witnessing the return of compulsory commitment to a war of hegemony.

Transforming Compulsory Addiction into Hegemony

Theories based on hegemony, in defining the hegemonic order, are united in that it is a regular but hierarchical international order. At the top of this hierarchy is the hegemon. The hegemon approaches the lower ranks of the hierarchy with two important tools, "brute power" and "persuasion". (Keohane R., 1991). In Gramsci, he defines hegemony as "intellectual-moral orientation" based on "consent" rather than "force" (Gramsci, 2007).

Realist thinkers who emphasize power, especially military and political power, defend the "theory of hegemonic stability". Hegemon is when a strong state controls or dominates less powerful states (Gilpin, 1999: 29). The concept of realist hegemony is based on the

assumption of a hegemonic nation-state and recognition of its power for the stability of the international system (Gilpin, 2011).

German political science and historian Ulrich Menzel defines imperialism as a softer and more variable form of hierarchical structure in international relations than hegemony in comparison to the rise and fall periods of empires (Menzel, 2015: 29).

The reason for many of the wars in Europe that started from Westphalia and reached the world wars was due to the hegemonic struggle between the states in Continental Europe. Germany, which is one of the countries that wants to have a say in the continent and wants to dominate many countries in the continent, has played a leading role in the outbreak of world wars. France, which was attacked by Germany in both world wars, made various initiatives by stating that Germany should be kept under control especially after the Second World War. At this point, while the world, which is in the process of global crisis, is trying to cope with the economy and health technology, European states may have entered a power struggle within themselves.

Although Europe is now in a good position as world trade, preventing wars and achieving lasting peace within the continent took place immediately after World War II. Moreover, the removal of hostility between Germany and France after the Second World War resulted in an increase in the interdependence of the economies and the exchange. One of the most important reasons of the wars taking place in continental Europe was hegemony struggles in the continent. It is not possible to state that there was an absolute winner of these centuries-long struggles, sometimes one and sometimes the other state seized power in the continent and succeeded in establishing its hegemony. One of the struggles for hegemony in continental Europe took place

between France and Austria-Hungary for many years. The struggle for hegemony between France and Austria-Hungary was not only between the two states, but also between the dynasties that ruled the two countries. No state has been able to perpetually impose its hegemony on other states or states and maintain its existence in this way, by not accepting the hegemony of any state that can disrupt the balance policy in Continental Europe, and has always aimed to ensure balances between the powers in the Continental Europe. From time to time, he struggled to restore balances. Thus, the British did not participate in the power struggles in Europe as actors, but were able to intervene that could change the balances. (Gollwitzer, 1972: 245-283).

What we have tried to convey in the part so far; The dependency theory was related to the fact that it affects countries differently each period. The issue of dependency, which we have examined in a very wide area, may have been an important factor in the transition from conflict to establishing unity in Europe. However, the separatist movements that have reappeared within the union are dragging the countries into an order that prevents them from moving freely. While the institutionalization efforts of the European Union continue, they have taken quite a step forward in terms of interdependence with legal, social and economic agreements.

However, with the departure of England, the first spark emerged. Considering the European Union as a burden for itself, Britain took the first step of the separatist movement with this radical decision. Britain, which is freed from compulsory dependency hegemony, may be the first voice of separation bells for other countries. However, when it comes to the pandemic period, the financial crisis within European countries has brought the countries in need of union to the

fore. The Covid-19 Pandemic crisis, which has a great impact on the market as capital, has revealed the countries that have survived with the aid of the union to weak countries. However, countries such as Spain and Italy, which say that they cannot benefit from these resources on equal terms, are quite uncomfortable with this situation. The power struggle of Germany and France in unity has been reignited with this crisis. At this point, the compulsory dependency we talked about turns into a hegemony. Despite its population of approximately 500 million in the world, the race to become a hegemonic power in the region which has approximately one third of the world's gross domestic product (GDP) is quite important. The EU is the biggest trade power, making almost a third of the world trade alone. The European Union, seen as the largest market in the world, is the dominant actor in international trade negotiations.

As we mentioned above, after the Brexit vote, the roles and importance of Germany and France in the Union increased. The global economic crises experienced are an issue that should be discussed separately for Germany. Finally, in the economic crisis affected by the pandemic epidemic that affected the whole world, Germany's strong economy increased the importance of Germany in the European Union. In a period when the economic crisis affected the whole world, the increasing economic power of Germany and the stagnation of the economies of other countries in parallel to this made it stronger in the decisions to be taken within the Union. Immigration problems with Brexit and the Arab Spring raised the issue that it should be a dominant force in the European Union. Failure to comply with the regulations, institutions, and decisions taken by the heads of state and government of the European Union has shown that there is a sanction

problem within the union. The existence of undefined distribution of powers among European Union institutions increases the need for joint action and cooperation within the Union.

It is not enough to have a strong economic structure in order to attain the position of a hegemonic country in the Union. At the same time, it is necessary to have an active foreign policy understanding. In order to be strong, it is necessary to have economic and political resources, but also to have a will to achieve the goals. At this point, France and Germany are in a race to show their influence, especially in deportation operations. France plays a very active role militarily and economically in the region of Central Africa and North Africa. In addition, France, which is located next to the Greek Cypriot Administration in the Mediterranean region, continues its activities with Greece. Especially active with oil exploration companies in the Mediterranean region, France also sent warships to the region. France, which was in Libya recently, has now followed a very active policy in Lebanon and showed that it is also active in the Middle East region. On the other hand, Germany sent warships to the region to show its effectiveness in the Mediterranean region and made many statements on behalf of the European Union. It should be noted that he is making his statements on behalf of the union. Increasing tensions in the Mediterranean region trying to play a mediating role in the government of Germany, Greece and Turkey in the name of maintaining unity on issues related to co-decision work. In Libya region, military companies and Germany, which helps economically, are trying to be wherever France is.

When we look at other countries, countries such as Italy and Spain are far behind in this power race as they could not overcome the Covid-19 Pandemic crisis. This is why Italy and Spain have made several

statements to leave the union. Italy, which cannot manage the process well and was most affected by the crisis, can survive only with private oil exploration companies in the Mediterranean. Beyond that, countries that do not have any economical power now hope to benefit from the economic support of the union for their own people. At this point, as an opportunity, we are watching the hegemony power struggle of Germany and France in the region.

During the Covid-19 pandemic process, Germany's attempts to impose the solutions it offers in line with its national policy without adapting it to the European Union are likely to be met with a reaction in the Union. Rather than such an approach, reaching the solutions required for the Union together with the member states is more likely to be accepted. Only in this way will Germany be economically strong, which will increase the possibility of imposing itself. However, the hegemony of Germany within the Union will not be accepted if France plays an active role in this process. The harmony tried to be achieved within the Union may take the opposite direction and lead to disintegration and as a result, separations from the Union may occur. If they decide to act together with France and agree to rule together, it is possible that the forces will collide one day, even if this process goes on for a while.

If countries that are successful in the struggle for hegemony make this struggle sustainable, there will be a continuous progress in terms of the resources they have. The one who has more resources in the race for hegemony, the more advantageous. In the struggle for hegemony, those who have enough weight to change the balance of power between rival states in whatever direction in the capitalist world economy can be successful. The country that carries this struggle across

borders and is successful thinks it will be successful. So why is there a fight for hegemony when there is no struggle for the balance of power? Because Germany and France thought that they were successful in the balance of power, they entered a race for hegemony. In our opinion, a country that is not capable of balancing in the balance of power cannot establish or maintain its hegemony. Germany tries to prove that it provides the balance of power by using this feature in the bilateral talks on behalf of the union. For example, the tensions in the Mediterranean region, the European Union members of the Union to enter Greece by way of the tension between the community advocacy Turkey, Germany, this description fits our our. In other words, we say that a country that does not have a say in ensuring union of power cannot be a hegemonic power. France lags behind in this regard. France, which is active in a wide geography in the Mediterranean, Middle East and Africa, exhibits a more aggressive policy. He is in a conversation with direct threat rather than a constructive agreement like the German. This aggressive attitude is a potential force that will move Germany forward inside and outside of Europe. In other words, France ends its own hegemony before it even starts. Aggressive and aggressive structures in the global order are now history. We can also witness the leadership of Germany in the XXI century, when we observe the achievements of the states approaching with the Soft Power element.

Instead of Conclusion

European states, which have faced many wars until the 21st century, have struggled with many epidemics. Europe started a new era with the 1648 process, fought among themselves for many years before and after this period. These wars were for hegemony. However, instead of

globalization and hegemony, they had to get closer to each other with mutual dependence. Countries that fought for centuries did not quit the war of hegemony until the mutual dependency system emerged. While the struggle for supremacy continues among themselves despite being united after the World Wars, on the other hand, hegemony war is waged against the world. The epidemic that took place while these wars continued over the economy and technology shifted the world to another area.

Just as the role of the capitalist world economy as a capital accumulation base in the global system came to a state with the scale and resources of the United Kingdom and the United States in the late XVII and early XVIII centuries, the role of world sovereignty in the beginning of the 20th century did not apply to a state with the scale and resources of the United Kingdom. It came too big.

However, this epidemic experienced after the Brexit process and global crises were sufficient to disrupt all balances. When we look at Europe, all the member states of the union were closed to themselves during the crisis and ignored their extensive partnerships. This situation will raise question marks for the future of the EU. When the policies of the European Union leaders in this process are examined, we see that they focus on national policies rather than a global struggle to be carried out on the epidemic. In the struggle for Hegemony in the European Union, Germany and France seem to be ahead of any of their rivals in terms of their resources. A politically efficient European Union can create the confidence to strengthen its potential. It can be said that an ever-expanding European Union alone has the necessary material and ideological resources to fulfill the minimum administrative functions in a world where chaos is increasing. However, if we

ignore the increasing chaos and management problem within the union, we would have made the analysis wrong. The thesis we have established in this study is that a balance of power can be established with mutual dependency and a country that is strong enough to provide this balance of power can establish its hegemony over other countries. This is the system we wanted to tell from the very beginning. If we approach this theoretically, we can say that we have established a link between the Gramscian understanding of hegemony and Joseph S. Nye's understanding of soft power. So that you can evaluate this concept as the adaptation of the soft power concept to international relations through the Gramsci understanding of hegemony.

In the new global order, instead of being fed from chaos, we have passed to a system where those who are strong enough to end chaos come to the fore. On the other hand, we can call this soft power theory. Countries that are solutions to chaos and crises will follow the path by gaining the trust of the states in their regions. This trust is economic, political and military recovery for the country. The era of countries' exploitation of their own resources is not over yet. However, the fact that countries that claim to be against the exploitation system have a say is an indicator of the changing order.

Therefore, it can be said that evaluating the soft power of political organizations also means evaluating their potential to become hegemonic power. According to Joseph S. Nye, soft power is the ability to get what you want by attracting yourself instead of using force or giving money. This power comes from the charm of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies. Soft power increases when policies appear legitimate to others (Joseph, 2005). The most important

indicator of the European Union's success in presenting its own interests as universal and the interests of the general is its soft power.

According to Robert Cox, the most important mechanism by which world hegemony expresses itself through universal norms is international institutions. International institutions form a set of rules that facilitate the development of the world order. They reduce the influence of anti-hegemonic ideas by ideologically legitimizing the world order and enabling the elites of peripheral countries to be included in the system. (Cox, 1996).² Here, we have worked out that the steps taken with mutual dependency can be used as a soft power factor as much as possible. The point where the pandemic crisis and other crises will show similarities is that the country that will reach out to the losers in this crisis will establish the hegemony and its own order. The country that will succeed in establishing the balance of power will continue as the strongest country in the European Union and carry the leadership. How long will the European Union remove this hegemony and dissolve? can be discussed in another article. However, every step to be seen within the European Union is a bigger step taken to take its place in the world order.

²Robert Cox's writings have had a profound influence on recent developments in thinking in world politics. This book brings together for the first time his most important essays, grouped around the theme of world order. The volume is divided into sections dealing respectively with theory; with the application of Cox's approach to recent changes in world political economy; and with multilateralism and the problem of global governance.

Bibliography

- Angell, N. (1989). "The great illusion revisited: The international theory of Norman Angell". *International Studies Review*, 341-358.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1980). "Interdependence and Power: A Conceptual Analysis". *International Organization*, 34(4), 471-596.
- Cox, R. W. (1996). *Approaches to World Order (Cambridge Studies in International Relations)*. Cambridge: Cambridge Publisher.
- Dietz, J. L., & Cypher, J. M. (1998). Static and Dynamic Comparative Advantage: A Multi-Period Analysis with Declining Terms of Trade. *Journal Of Economic Issues*, 32, 305-314.
- Garaudy, R. (2004). *Le Terrorisme Occidental*. France: Paperback.
- Gilpin, R. (2011). *Uluslararası İlişkilerin Ekonomi Politikası*. Ankara: Kripto Yayınları.
- Gollwitzer, H. (1972). *Geschichte des Weltpolitischen Denkens*. Göttingen: Ruprecht.
- Gramsci, A. (2007). *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Holsti, K. J. (1978). "A New International Politics?". *International Organization*, 32(2), 513-530.
- Joseph, N. S. (2005). *Soft Power*. London: Public Affair.
- Keohane, R. (1991). "The United States and the Postwar Order: Empire or Hegemony?". *Journal of Peace Research*, 28(4), 437-438.
- Keohane, R. O. (1982). "The Demand for International Regimes". *International Organization*, 36(2), 155.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1985). "Two Cheers for Multilateralism". *Foreign Policy*, 61(3), 28.

- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2001). *Power and Interdependence*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Kissenger, H. (1994). *Diplomacy*. United State of America: Pandora.
- Mearsheimer, J. (1990). "BacktotheFuture: Instability in Europe AftertheColdWar". *International Security*, 5(1), 12.
- Menzel, U. (2015). *Die Ordnung der Welt. İmperium und Hegemonie in derHierarchie der Staatenwelt*. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Robert, H. (2006). "Montesquieu on Commerce, Conquest, War and Peace". *Brooklyn Journal of International Law*, 33(1), 2-25.
- Rode, R. (2002). *Weltregieren durch Internationale*. MÜNster: LIT Verlag.
- Salamon, M. S., Roach, S. C., & Griffiths, M. (2011). *Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Düşünürler ve Teoriler*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Simmons, B., & Haggard, S. (1987). "Theories of International Regimes". *International Organization*, 41(3), 28.
- Wallerstein, I. (2005). *Modern Dünya-Sistemi*. (L. Boyacı, Çev.) İstanbul: Bakış Yayınları.
- Waltz, K. N. (1970). *The Myth of National Interdependence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Yılmaz, M. E. (2007). "Wethphalia'dan Günümüze Savaş". *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, 4(14), 12-45.