

Definitions of Hegemony and the European Union's Power Game

Benjamin A. Edgar

May 3, 2011

Faculty Advisor, Benjamin Jensen

University Honors in International Studies

School of International Service: B.A. International Studies

Paper Abstract

This paper is written to open a discussion of whether the EU can seek or attain world hegemony in the future. With many scholars discussing the rise of the BRIC countries, the economic power and political pioneering of the EU has been overlooked when considering rising world powers. Opening with a discussion of the definition of hegemony considering John Mearsheimer's Offensive Realism, A.F.K. Organski's Power Transition Theory, and Neo-Gramscian thought on International Relations, the paper turns to employing these ideas into an examination of current EU trends and statistics. Factors such as population growth, military strength, and the importance of ideas are all descanted in order to debate on the subject of EU hegemony. Also, the idea of autonomy's role in international organizations such as the EU is reflected upon in hopes to shed a theoretical light on power potential ceilings for these organizations in the international political order.

Introduction

America's struggles throughout the past two and a half years during the global financial crisis have yielded talks challenging its hegemonic power in the world. Its massive debt amounting to 58.9 percent of its GDP¹ and high unemployment, figures of February 2011 showed to be at 8.9 percent², are just two indicators displaying its economic struggles. Many popular periodicals such as *The Economist* have written articles warning about the rising powers of China and India and hint at a change of hegemony in the near future.³ The US still indubitably possesses the best-equipped armed forces and has the largest capacity for defense projections and spending. Yet, economic troubles have spurred power discussions in an unprecedented fashion, challenging the US' monolithic power of the past twenty years. So is a strained economic state able to maintain unipolarity? What other factors contribute to hegemony's rise to power and continued success?

This paper will examine in detail the factors that contribute to hegemony and world power movements. It will assess three theories and their commentary on what characteristics, scenarios, or trends would lead to a form of hegemony according to the frameworks of the respective models. First, A.F.K. Organski's Power Transition Theory will be descanted, recognizing quantifiable resourced-based dynamics like population, territory, and economic size among others to create a quadra-tiered hierarchy of the world's states. His comments on the top two tiers, the "dominant power" and "great powers", will be the most closely considered. Then, John Mearsheimer's theory of Offensive Realism will provide a basic realists' point of view on hegemony, inspecting factors mainly associated with military power and obtaining security.

¹ "Country Comparison: Public Debt." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site — Central Intelligence Agency*. 2010. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2186rank.html>>.

² "Latest Numbers." *The U.S. Department of Labor Home Page*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.dol.gov/>>.

³ Cox, Simon. "The Fastest Lap." *The Economist: The World in 2011* 3 Jan. 2011: 68. Print.

Lastly, neo-Gramscian thought and its remarks on cultural and theoretical movements' effects on hegemony will be discussed. The idea of historic blocs will be transposed onto the international level, following works by Robert Cox in attempts to apply Gramscian thought to the current discussions of hegemony.

After the above definitions are outlined, a secondary portion of the paper will compare the European Union's (EU) current and projected political, social, and economic trends with the definitions provided. Some of the definitions' tenets, like military capability, will be assessed in a very systematic and empirical fashion, via evaluating the EU's defense capabilities in various sectors such as number of deployable offensive forces, defense spending, etc. This type of analysis will be pertinent to Mearsheimer and Organski's theories especially. Other measures relating more towards Gramsci's social and cultural definition of hegemony will have to be analyzed via the "historic blocs" influence on regional economies and politics and will take a more qualitative approach.

The balance of power in the world is at an unprecedented age, approaching a time where hegemony may shift from one state to another without a major war (US to China). Equally so the Cold War established a new world security order, as it redefined why defense capabilities exist. Before the Cold War, military might was exercised for expansion purposes and territorial disputes, all the way until the fall of Hitler and the Third Reich. The most powerful nation would demonstrate its superiority by staging massive attacks over smaller nations to gain control. However after WWII, the macro-political geography of the world has remained relatively unchanged and the arrival of the "democratic peace" has brought a historically unmatched stability to at least the geographical borders of most states. So does this change open the door for international entities such as the EU to vie for hegemony? Without the need for offensive

demonstration of power and without a war to fight to gain that power, a redefinitional period for the typical concept of hegemony may be emerging.

Hegemonic Theories and Concepts

The past one hundred years of international relations has been wrought with industrialization, wars, and power transfers. Starting in England in the late 18th Century and spreading slowly throughout the world, the current age of industrialization has led to the struggle for power that is continually progressing in the current global climate. The main tenet of A.F.K. Organski's Power Transition Theory, which he outlays in his book *World Politics*, is that power derives from increased industrialization of a country. To be more specific Organski denotes three "major determinants of national power" which are "population size, political efficiency, and economic development."⁴ He posits that these three categories are effectively a measure of a country's potential power and that maximization of the above three measures will allow for an augmentation of this power.

Organski argues that the world's countries can be labeled in one of three stages. The first stage is the stage of potential power. The countries that exist in this stage are pre-industrialized and currently are diminishing in number.⁵ Some poorer African and Central American states could be placed in this stage and they have very little consequence to international politics because all their power is still yet to be realized by Organski's measures. The following stage is the stage of transitional growth in power and is seen as a state industrializes. During this second stage the country is actualizing a great deal of its potential power and its international influence is growing accordingly. Many "developing" nations stand in this stage today such as the BRIC countries because of their massive populations and belated economic growth as compared to the

⁴ Organski, A. F. K. *World Politics*, 2. Edition. Pg 338. New York: Knopf, 1968. Print.

⁵ Ibid., 338.

Western World. Lastly there is the stage of power maturity when a nation's rates of growth slow and relative power begins to decline. The United States is certainly the prime example of a country currently in power maturity as it has nearly completed the industrialization process and less developed countries are beginning to rival its production capabilities.

With this said, Organski states the reason for power shifts in the international spectrum is due to the fact that industrialization has occurred unevenly throughout the world. This gives way to his predictions of China, India, and possibly a united Africa becoming dominant powers in the coming years.⁶ He also envisions the global industrialization process as a finite cycle. He speculates that the future holds a new period of complete world industrialization where all countries have realized their full power potential. During this theorized period he is uncertain what factors will effect the balance and shifting of power between states and he even stretches to mention that states may not be the root of power during this time. Possibly a Huntingtonian Clash of Civilizations type theory will best explain power factions and conflict and present yet another function for the tested cultural theory.

Organski cedes that population, political efficiency, and economic development are not the only factors of power. Two other dynamics can help a country gain power in the world's hierarchy. The first, which is more historically applicable and Organski mentions is waning in affectivity, is imperialism as a means to power. Colonies can obviously grant extreme economic gains outside of a country's original territory but furthermore they create a relationship between the ruling and the oppressed country. A connection between Organski's theory and World Systems Theory would postulate that the dominant core countries would benefit disproportionately to the periphery countries being colonized adding power to the more industrialized and more powerful core countries. The second "other factor" of power is relations

⁶ Ibid., 341.

between nations. Organski takes this section to discuss the rationality of states when conducting foreign policy and their continued ties with various countries are important to the maintenance of their power. He also introduces his concept of “international order” which is roughly defined as a web of relations determined and headed by the “dominant power” at the time.⁷

The dominant power, in Organski’s terms, is effectively the hegemon. It pilots the international hierarchy by creating an international order according to its ideologies and economic needs. The dominant nation is satisfied because of its control over the current system. Next are the great powers. Great powers are nations with high potential and kinetic power like a current day China or an emerging India. These nations are either satisfied because they are favorably included in the dominant power’s international order, or they are a “challenger” to the dominant power, seeking to organize a rival order of their own.⁸ Organski concludes that there has never been a peaceful transition of power from a challenging great power who is unsatisfied with their role in the current world system. With this said, during the age of industrialization there has also never been a successful challenger to overthrow a dominant power because historically challengers have struck before they have reached equitable power to the dominant nation (an excellent example of this is Nazi Germany waging war against Britain and the Allied Powers in WWII). Middle powers could be developing nations who have been slow to industrialize and slower to achieve international power. They may have great power potential but have thus far failed to actualize this potential. Finally, small powers are those states with limited potential and limited actualized power. Small populations and extremely high government corruption are two characteristics of these states.

⁷ Ibid., 364.

⁸ Ibid., 366-367.

Lastly, Organski writes on the factors contributing to the likelihood of a challenger engaging in war to ascertain the position of the dominant nation. He includes four points in his analysis. The first is the potential of the challenger as it begins to rise. He mentions that if the challenger's potential power is approximately equal to the current dominant nation then a war is likely. Consequently, "the risk of war, then, is also reduced if the challenger is so large that its future dominance is obvious to all."⁹ Secondly, the speed at which a challenger rises to power can help deduce whether a war is on the horizon or not. If a state's potential power is being realized at extremely rapid rates, Organski notes that nationalistic sentiment and a state pride is developed, which increases the likelihood of the challenger becoming violent. Third, if a dominant nation can be flexible and accept its maturing power, then a war is not inevitable. This is to also say that if a dominant nation can envision itself thriving in the proceeding international order then it may cede power in a peaceful fashion. The last factor that Organski details is the relationship between the dominant nation and the challenger. During the power transition from the UK to the US as a global hegemon, there were some unpredictable moments in the transatlantic bond (namely the Suez Canal conflict) but the allies were ultimately able to emerge amiably. A war is certainly more probable if the two states in contention are not allied.

So how now can Organski's theory be operationalized in order to analyze the EU in light of this discussion? Evidently there must be measures of population, government efficiency, and economic development compared such as population totals, GDP growth, and corruption rankings. These will shed light on the potential power of the EU and will allow for the analysis of whether the EU has reached the stage of power maturity. If it is still in a stage of growth, this

⁹ Ibid., 372.

will allow us to compare the EU's statistics to other great powers and will validate or terminate the suggestion that the EU could become a hegemon, according to Organski.

Another point of analysis that is dear to Organski's theory will be how they rise to power. Indubitably the EU is a satisfied state in the current international system wherever they lie in the hierarchy so do they pose a threat of war? According to Organski's theory, hegemony is not a choice but instead a lauded stop on the progression of industrialization, so although the EU may not be interested in becoming a dominant power they may one day claim that title by simply outperforming the leading state. All the above will be taken into consideration when evaluating the EU's power potential according to Organski's theory of Power Transition.

Mearsheimer's theory of Offensive Realism, outlined in *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, highlights a standard understanding of power in the context of international relations with a slight modification. He asserts that the struggle for power is mainly assumed because of the absolute anarchy of the current international system. In realist mantra and in a very zero sum way, Mearsheimer posits that states strive to attain hegemony in the shortest term possible in order to achieve security. This conduct Mearsheimer has coined "power maximization", mentioning also that "great powers are determined largely on the basis of their relative military capability."¹⁰ He ignores subtle measures of states like individual leaders or ideologies labeling them as excess descriptions to the over veiling political goals of every state.

He also follows the ideas descanted in E.H. Carr's *The Twenty Years Crisis*, that notions of status quo power are not concrete because the nature of the international relations system is one that is constantly in flux. Powerful nations, nations that have a strong military and are willing to exercise their prestige, will never settle for a second or third tier position in the global political

¹⁰ Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Pg. 5. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.

spectrum because their sole guarantee of achieving security is through hegemony. Mearsheimer and Carr also deny the significance of liberalist perceptions like the League of Nations or the United Nations retaining any power in the international political environment because there is no autonomy present to support decisions reached. To be precise, there is no hard power evident behind their treaties.

On page 55 of his book Mearsheimer discerns between two types of power, “latent power and military power.”¹¹ Latent power is of lesser importance to Mearsheimer however it is still worth defining. A state’s latent power is comprised of “the socio-economic ingredients that go into building military power” and is “largely based on a state’s wealth and overall size of its population.”¹² Here it must be mentioned that he does not consider wealth and military power to be synonymous, because a wealthy country has no obligation to convert their resources to military strength. Yet, in this respect Offensive Realism shares some of the same tenets as Power Transition Theory in that potential power is of some importance. In fact Mearsheimer himself concedes that latent power is the “raw potential (a state) can draw on when competing with rival states.” But Mearsheimer differs from Organski because of this second component of power. According to the theory of Offensive Realism military power is of the utmost importance. A state’s military power, and subsequent position in the global power hierarchy, is measured via its army and supporting air and naval forces. Even in a nuclear world Mearsheimer argues the prime importance of land forces and equally posits the significant obstacles that large bodies of water hold for power-projection. This is why he believes that land forces are the most important to security, because a state cannot win a major war with strong air and naval forces

¹¹ Ibid., 55.

¹² Ibid., 55.

alone. Continuing this train of thought, he leans on a historical view of international security, that “the most dangerous states are continental powers with large armies.”¹³

Another central aspect of his theory is that regional superiority is a state’s means to security. Mearsheimer is dubious that a true global hegemony will ever arise because of his speculation on long distance force projection (however this could be challenged in the near future with exceptional long-range strategic lift capabilities and technologies emerging). The main fashion in which states vie for regional hegemony is through war and use of their military. However these wars are not always fought in the regions in which states are trying to gain power. Mearsheimer uses the term “balancing” to describe the practice of actively halting aggression in other areas of the globe. He cites the First Gulf War as a prime example of the US attacking an aggressor in order to squelch the copy-cat wars of conquest that might have arisen. Similar to this is the US and its allies’ current participation in Libya, using its military capability to neutralize a kinetic situation and stifle the thoughts of any other North African dictators who had similar notions of suppression. To summarize his regional power argument, Mearsheimer concludes that “regional hegemons act as offshore balancers in other areas of the world” and this stability gained abroad allows them to function in a more stable environment in their region.¹⁴

In his concluding chapter, Mearsheimer argues for the continued importance of realism in the 21st Century. He maintains that state interests will always be at the core of international politics and for this reason the era of international institutions, while in its heyday, will not realize more power in the future. Sovereignty in international relations is of too high importance to be compromised and will be the quietus of international institutions. States will essentially sever

¹³ Ibid., 135.

¹⁴ Ibid., 141.

the institutions from inside out because of differences in policies and this act of protecting sovereignty contributes to the anarchic nature of the world political system.

So Mearsheimer's conceptualization of power is that it is an instrument to realizing security. States however are not content with gaining a certain amount of power, instead their goals lie in achieving absolute power or hegemony. Therefore, hegemony to Mearsheimer is a method of obtaining security for a state and is obtained via a hierarchical list of relative military capability. This list is constantly in flux and no fixed hierarchy will solidify because of realism's fundamental belief in anarchy. So, land, air, and naval force sizes will be assessed. Size of military forces will be the main arm of the analysis. With this said, Offensive Realism also maintains that the express utilization of the military is an essential aspect of achieving power, so military autonomy is also an important factor to be measured. Especially in context to the EU, this measurement will be a crucial point of analysis.

Communist and socialist ideologies clashed violently with democratic ideals during the 20th Century and the ensuing battles produced wars of unforeseen magnitudes. Social issues may have been the basis for most of the conflict that erupted during the 1900s and much commentary was generated previous to the conflict regarding the advantages and disadvantages of both sides. Antonio Gramsci, one of the most influential Marxist thinkers, was a foremost philosopher on the relatable subject of cultural hegemony. Gramsci's notions of class conflict are the launching point for the neo-Gramscian school of thought in international relations, which employs his writing to an international level. His social analytical brilliance is both extolled and criticized by international relations scholars but the neo-Gramscian school of thought provides an excellent framework with which to analyze hegemonies.

In order to discuss neo-Gramscianism a thorough background of Gramsci's writings on hegemony must first be outlined. Gramsci's concept of hegemony is based on a national scale and largely references historical social occurrences. His belief is that a hegemon arises when a social class obtains an idea or philosophy that is superior to the other existing classes. In Section 44 of the first of his *Prison Notebooks* Gramsci descants the Italian Moderates' retainment of power during the late 1800s. He argues that the Moderate Party intellectuals were significantly more politically avant-garde than other Italians and therefore established themselves as the primary ruling party, furthermore condensing themselves into a party of power within the nascent Italian state.¹⁵ Other Italian political parties were inherently subordinated in comparison due to the imminent power shift in state politics. This power shift actually creates a ruling class and a governed class due to the notable difference in the social group's beliefs. Gramsci's theory posits that this phenomenon of political power occurs "spontaneously in periods during which that given class is truly progressive; that is, it pushes the whole society ahead."¹⁶ So Gramsci's definition of power is more an argument of influence and superiority via ideas and political action than any Mearsheimerian definition of military power.

This power shift, Gramsci argues, is created most effectively not by a traditional social war-like rebellion, which he calls a "war of movement", but instead by a "war of position." By this he means that the state-societies of Western Europe during the 19th Century historical period, in which his analysis is based, were too powerful to be taken down simply by a kinetic revolution and instead first support of the ideology must be attained. Gramsci called each of these rising and falling movements "historic blocs."¹⁷

¹⁵ Gramsci, Antonio, and Joseph A. Buttigieg. "Section 44." *Prison Notebooks*. NYC: Columbia UP, 1992. Print.

¹⁶ Ibid., 137.

¹⁷ Ibid., 138.

A historic bloc is the political manifestation of a successful ideology and it is the lifecycle of a socially dominant class. He states that new social structures emerge as hegemonic only when the existing structure has exhausted its full potential. There are three “levels of consciousness” of a historic bloc, meaning that blocs can be measured in their rise to power. The first is the “economico-corporative level” where the interests and the ideals are recognized solely within the core group or founders of the organization.¹⁸ The second level is “solidarity or class-consciousness” during which the whole class recognizes the ideology. But during this level the historic bloc is still not hegemonic in nature and the social class only realizes economic benefits.

Lastly, however is the hegemonic level where “the interests of the leading class” are brought “into harmony with those of the subordinate classes” and are thus institutionalized and fully politicized.¹⁹ As Robert Cox, a neo-Gramscian to be discussed in more detail later, explains in his article *Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations* “the movement towards hegemony is a ‘passage from the structure to the sphere of superstructures’ ...passing from the specific interests of a group or class to the building of institutions.”²⁰ An important part of this institutionalization is that it satisfies the subordinate groups, allowing for the emerging hegemony to please the opposing political influences. Theodore Cohn goes so far to say that “the ruling class gains the active consent of the subordinate class on the basis of shared values, ideas, and material interests.”²¹

Although most of his theorizing lay in the national realm, Gramsci did comment lightly on international politics. One of his chief points was to stress that “changes in the military-strategic

¹⁸ Cox, Robert. "Gramsci, Hegemony, and International Relations: An Essay in Method." Print. Rpt. in *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*. By Stephen Gill. New York City: Cambridge UP, 1993. 49-66. Print.

¹⁹ Ibid., 52.

²⁰ Ibid., 57.

²¹ Cohn, Theodore H. *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice*. Pg. 122 New York: Pearson/Longman, 2005. Print.

and geo-political balance, can be traced to fundamental changes in social relations” as Robert Cox interprets in his above-mentioned article. But Gramsci did not discount the state in any way, in fact he valued it as the superlative actor in international relations saying that change within the state was first necessary before international power shifts occurred. This is brilliant commentary, that social uprisings eventually give way to international power changes.

Furthermore, historical evidence of this idea is abundant. The two most prominent examples are the French and American Revolutions, where a historic bloc emerged and later produced significant hegemonic influence.

Neo-Gramscians have much of the same commentary as their theoretical precursor however they expand the Italian philosopher’s ideas into modern day context. Two of their main ideas are critically important to defining modern Gramscian hegemony, both of which are a reflection of the hegemony’s power. The first is the role that international institutions play in supporting a hegemonic state. Cox outlines five points^{*} by which a hegemony can reflect its power through international organizations, which can be fundamentally summarized by a quote from his article, “international institutions embody rules which facilitate the expansion of the dominant economic and social forces but at the same time permit adjustments to be made by subordinate interests.”²² This is to say that international organizations are born out of and/or shaped by the present hegemony so their functions will intrinsically support the goals and governing practices of the hegemony. The US’ free trade and democracy mantra has supported burgeoning growth in international organizations such as the UN and the WTO since their inception in the mid 20th Century. Indeed these organizations’ momentum is slowing with the waning power of the US

^{*} (1) They embody the rules which facilitate the expansion of the hegemonic world orders; (2) they are themselves a product of the hegemonic world order; (3) they ideologically legitimate the norms of the world order; (4) they co-opt the elites from peripheral countries and (5) they absorb counter-hegemonic ideas.

²² Ibid., Cox, 61.

during the latter years, but the trend posited by neo-Gramscians is certainly visible in a historical context.

The other neo-Gramscian idea pertinent to defining hegemony is passive revolutions. These revolutions take place in subaltern nations and are the adoption of the current hegemony's social and economic structures. Passive revolutions are a form of a sphere of influence but are not necessary political in nature like the sphere of influences seen during the Cold War. Instead they are reflections of the economic norms of the time. Passive revolutions are positive events for hegemonies because they restructure third world countries in a way that allow for ease of trade and diplomatic relations. As Cox says, "a world hegemony is thus in its beginnings an outward expansion of the internal (national) hegemony established by the dominant class."²³ A historic bloc that emerges seeks hegemony within the state and once this is captured if the social superstructures are sound enough, they will soon resonate throughout the globe. No better an example exists than that of the American Revolution and the subsequent American hegemony. The democratic governing style has permeated the world and reached many poorer and developing nations. Not only has this phenomenon given way to the democratic peace theory, but it has also strengthened trade relations and increased global economic efficiency making more of the world more accessible to the US government and economic interests.

So the neo-Gramscian school of International Relations measures hegemony through influence in international organizations and influence in governing and social structure in developing and subaltern countries. To discuss the neo-Gramscian definition of hegemony regarding the EU, I will analyze the EU's historic bloc and break down the historical events that allowed the intergovernmental system to emerge. I will also examine their influence in current

²³ Ibid., Cox, 61.

international institutions and reflect upon the emerging regional organizations to analyze how closely they mirror the EU's ideals and goals.

The Hegemony of the European Union

Before the discussion is fully fleshed out, I must quickly "define" the European Union, or at least frame it in a fashion that will give context to the statistics that will be presented. When I refer to the EU in the following analysis I mean the EU-27, the 27 states that comprise the EU after their 2007 enlargement occurred, unless otherwise specified. At points, I will break to consider future enlargements from applicant states and some of the extraneous effects that these additions could have however the main focus will be given to the current EU-27, so as to avoid speculation.

A.F.K. Organski

First, let us examine Organski's Power Transition Theory and its parameters for power growth. Above, it was determined that population, government efficiency, and economic development were the main methods of measuring Organski's theory. Population will be appraised most obviously in total people, but also via demographics, looking at age components, and percentage of foreign nationals. This will display more concretely the potential for economic and military growth in the coming years for the EU. Government efficiency will largely be evaluated on corruption indexes like the yearly index produced by Transparency International. Lastly, economic development is easily analyzed by classic indicators pertaining to GDP growth rates. The first measurement, population, will be inspected in the following paragraphs.

The first real figure of population to consider is total population. According to the CIA World Factbook, the EU had a July 2010 estimate of 492,387,344 people, placing it comfortably

in third position globally behind China (1,336,718,015) and India (1,189,172,906) but ahead of the USA (313,232,044).^[24] ^[25] ^[26] So this would suggest that the potential power of the EU according to population is third in the world, greatly above its biggest challenger, the USA, but greatly below the two ahead of it. With this said there are some other considerations to be accounted for when analyzing population in light of Organski's theory. The first is the population growth rates for each of the respective countries. While it is interesting to note the population at any given time, it is equally if not more valuable to be able to observe how the population will evolve over time. The EU's population growth rate in 2010 was at an almost stagnant 0.098%, which on world rankings would place it at 186th. China and India's were higher, but not globally impressive at 0.493% and 1.344% respectively.* In conjunction with this, the EU's population is of the most aged and aging in the world, with 17.33% at 65 years and older and only 15.44% under 14 years old. China, Brazil, and India are significantly lopsided in this respect favoring the younger population as none of them have above 9% of their population above the age of 65.

These statistics are significant to Power Transition Theory analysis because they show the demographics of the nation at hand, which is one of the main purposes of Organski defining potential power in terms of population and economic development. The EU is certainly an industrialized region as its economy has already shifted to two-thirds service oriented production. At the same time, the aging characteristic of the EU population hinders their

²⁴ "East and Southeast Asia: China." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ch.html>>.

²⁵ "South Asia: India." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html>>.

²⁶ "North America: United States." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>>.

* Most of the current population boom is happening in Africa and the Middle East but their low rankings in overall population and Organski's other measures limit them from becoming the dominant power or even great powers in the very near future.

potential power in two ways. First, the labor force is shrinking and the number of individuals available for economic production contracts accordingly. Smaller relative labor forces mean smaller production as compared to growing countries and higher stress on the generous social systems maintained by many of the EU governments. Also, the number of people at hand for armed forces decreases as the population becomes older because military service is certainly an age-sensitive task. So the population totals are not sufficient to accurately examine the potential power of a country because so many characteristics of the population give further information towards the real analysis that Organski is trying to reach. With the above statistics considered it is likely that China and India have much larger potential power than the EU due to their higher total population, growth rates, and lower median age.

Table A^[27] ^[28] ^[29] ^[30]

<i>Country</i>	<i>Population (2010 total)</i>	<i>Population Growth Rate (%) (2011)</i>	<i>Median Age (Years) (2010)</i>	<i>Net Migration Rate (x/1000) (2010)</i>
EU	492,387,344	0.098	40.2 ³¹	1.48
China	1,336,718,015	0.493	35.5	-0.33
United States	313,232,044	0.963	36.9	4.18
Brazil	203,429,773	1.134	29.3	-0.09
India	1,189,172,906	1.344	26.2	-0.05
Turkey	78,785,548	1.235	28.5	0.51

Two other considerations must be addressed when regarding the EU's population. Unlike many countries who have solid boundaries and are not likely to acquire vast new territories and their contained populace, the EU has a secondary means of growth outside of traditional

²⁷ Ibid., China, India, US - CIA.

²⁸ "Europe: European Union." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ee.html>>.

²⁹ "South America: Brazil." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/br.html>>.

³⁰ "Middle East: Turkey." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html>>.

³¹ "Median Age Projections." *European Environment Agency*. European Union, 2010. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/figures/median-age-projections>>.

population growth rates. Expansion has accounted for the majority of EU population growth since its origination. The 2007 enlargement of Bulgaria and Romania alone accounted for 29.3 million new EU citizens, or an almost 6% net gain in overall population with no birth acceleration rates. In addition, the EU presently has outstanding applications from Croatia, Macedonia, and Turkey. While Croatia and Macedonia do not represent potential material gains in the categories outlined above, Turkey genuinely mimics the population behavior of BRIC countries. Its over 78 million citizens would correspond to a roughly 16% population increase for the EU, not to mention that only 6.3% of Turkey's citizens are 65 and older. This would greatly increase not only the potential labor and armed forces of the EU but it would also contribute to the overall economic development, given that Turkey is a still industrializing country.

The last attribute to be discussed concerning EU population is net migration rates, or the impact of immigration on the statistics considered above. Immigrants are having a distinct impact on the way that the EU conducts politics and major countries such as France and Germany have fallen out of favor of immigration as of late.^{[32] [33]} Multiculturalism is taking its toll on the EU and in Organski's terms it does not contribute power to the country. In fact the reason that population is a resource of power for Organski is that it produces economic and military might. Immigrants are not allowed to enlist in the military and have recently had difficulties finding employment and integrating into European society. With this said, they are not only reducing the overall value of the social government programs of many European countries, further hindering economic gains, but they are also not able to support the country's

³² Connolly, Kate. "Angela Merkel Declares Death of German Multiculturalism." *The Guardian UK*. 17 Oct. 2010. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-germany-multiculturalism-failures>>.

³³ "On a Mat and a Prayer." *The Economist: 70 or Bust* 9 Apr. 2011: 59. Print.

militarily. So Organski would posit that only educated, well to do immigrants would help a country's power, whereas poorer immigrants, as the EU is experiencing, only encumber a country's economic development.

Considering the above analysis, the EU seems to have reached its point of power maturity according to population measures. Its total population is third on world rankings which at first glance this would bode well for its power potential. However upon further analysis it is clear that its population is aging and its growth rates are much lower than that of other industrializing countries. The sole method in which the EU stands to increase its power potential via population is through further enlargement with younger, highly populated, and industrializing countries like Turkey.

Organski's next measure is government efficiency, which will be assessed via analyzing corruption levels. Control of corruption is sighted as an ample way to gauge government efficiency because it manages waste within the governing system and decreased the likelihood that corruption will stifle growth.³⁴ As with population, corruption levels can and should be broken down when analyzed as a form of gaining power within a state and on an international level. The EU and the USA enjoy lower corruption levels than many developing countries but are still plagued with various types of government corruption. The levels of corruption and their importance to Power Transition Theory will be discussed in the following paragraphs. The ratings provided were found in the Transparency International Corruptions Perceptions 2010 Index (CPI) which inputs information gathered from twelve global institutions in order to present a survey regarding corruption levels in many of the world's countries.

³⁴ Hauner, Daniel, and Annette Kyobe. *Determinants of Government Efficiency. IMF Working Paper*. International Monetary Fund, Sept. 2008. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2008/wp08228.pdf>>.

Traditionally the West is perceived as a group of elite, civilized countries and, especially pertaining to the discussion of corruption, is lands ahead of developing and Third World nations. According to studies amassed by Transparency International this outlook is mostly correct. The USA holds a 7.1 corruption rating on a scale of 1-10, 10 being the least corrupt. To give some context, the USA is ranked 22nd out of 178 countries with their score of 7.1, the top rating belongs to Denmark, New Zealand, and Singapore at 9.3 and at the bottom is Somalia at 1.1.³⁵ The EU average for the CPI is 6.1 which would place it tied for 30th in the world, just a few notches below the US' mark and placing them in the top 20th percentile for corruption levels worldwide.³⁶ Countries such as Italy, Bulgaria, and Romania, with weathered pasts in mob related activities pull down the otherwise relatively uncorrupted EU stronghold of Western Europe. China has a mark of 3.5, India 3.3, and Brazil 3.7, all placing far below the level of perceived corruption within the EU. But it is important to dissect these government inefficiencies and ascertain which type of corruption is actually occurring in the EU compared to developing countries.

Maybe just as important to this study as the CPI is Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer (GCB). The GCB helps to decompose the results found in the CPI by interviewing citizens at a national level and assessing their observations regarding corruption. According to the GCB, its "European Region", which consists of the EU27, Iceland, Switzerland, and Norway, is the least likely to engage in bribery, along with North America.³⁷ In fact only 5% of those interviewed admit to paying a bribe within the past year whereas 54% in

³⁵ "Results." *Corruption Perceptions Index 2010*. Transparency International, 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results>.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ "Global Corruption Barometer 2010." Transparency International, 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2010>.

India and 10% in China admit to the same.³⁸ Yet petty bribes are not the main concern of government efficiency, and although they could be the cause of leaky EU borders, they are not materially affecting policy delays and government decisions within the EU. Instead, political parties tend to be the most corrupted aspects of national governments, especially within the EU and North America. Transparency International cites Denmark, Germany, and France as having some of the most corrupt political parties in the world even though their overall rankings are fairly lofty.³⁹ At the same time, India and Brazil also suffer from corrupt political parties and many of the world's elite and rising democracies made this list. Because of the nature of domestic power politics, corruption levels will likely remain high within democratic nations' political parties in the near future. China is largely exempt from this impediment because of the Communist Party's near monopoly over domestic politics. Within the EU, the corruption of political parties could definitely have a part in obstructing EU-level policies from passing through the parliament.

Another measure of government efficiency when discussing the EU that is largely unquantifiable but equally inevitable, is the inherently multicultural and multinational platform it operates upon. The first obstacle this presents is one of language. The EU employs an insatiable amount of translators and interpreters to service its vast government institutions in Brussels and throughout Europe. Documents, transcripts, and communiqués take incredible amounts of time to be translated into the 23 official languages of the EU. Any follower of the American political system will not be hesitant to testify to the longevity associated with the process of passing a bill

³⁸ "Visualizing the Global Corruption Barometer 2010." Transparency International. 2010. Pg. 1. http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2010/interactive

³⁹ "Visualizing the Global Corruption Barometer 2010." Transparency International. 2010. Pg. 2. http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2010/interactive_2

or law within the US Congress and its hearings and documentation all occur in English. When adding 22 more languages it is easy to observe how the process would inescapably be slowed.

Yet, lingual differences will not stop the EU from becoming a hegemon and although it does create significant dams to the river of EU politics it does not stop the water from running. The more noteworthy problem that the EU's cross-cultural nature stages is the varying traditions, norms, and goals of each member state. The EU was originally formed to increase economic growth and interdependency among Western European nations with the expectation that political cohesion would follow. To an extent this theory has unfolded and peace has been realized within the borders of the EU and its preceding institutions but an easy distinction can be made between peace and outright political unity. Indeed many barriers have been deconstructed within the past half-century regarding European political cooperation, yet major powers such as the British, are cautious to take this union too far. This timidity paired with the fact that all EU states have their own national agendas and goals has proven to be a difficult obstacle to overcome when addressing various political themes like military use, treaties, and elections. It is important to note that in the Organskian measure of political efficiency the EU suffers a remarkable setback because of the comments mentioned above. For example China, India, Brazil, and basically any other sovereign nation does not have the limitations of multiple state influences when making policy decisions. Their governments do not suffer this deficiency and therefore they are relatively more competent to enact policies, especially pertaining to international relations.

So even though their political parties are fairly corrupt, the EU stands well ahead of other great powers in overall corruption ratings with many member states standing as prototypes for other countries to adhere to. This means that at state level, many of the member states are exemplary in the efficiency of their governments. But this is not the measure that accurately

projects the EU's governing ability as a whole. When examining EU-wide governance, intangibles of lingual disparity and state goals mean the EU has to cope with these additional variables and other state-bodied international actors do not. This gives the EU an advantage in corruption levels but a disadvantage in the incomparable category of interstate cooperation in governance.

Finally economic development must be considered when weighing the potential power of the EU. The two factors to be examined are GDP growth rate, in order to ascertain the where the EU stands in overall economic growth, and GDP per capita growth rates, which will pit an economic indicator in contrast to one of the population indicators mentioned above.

During the years 2005 through 2009 the EU and much of the world suffered periods of slowing, and sometimes negative, growth due to the economic crisis. Yet not all states had significant difficulties during this time as is evidenced by the economic production of China and India maintaining growth rates of 11.4% and 8.2% respectively. However the EU and the US economies endured a difficult economic era during in the late 2000s. The statistics in Table B would definitively suggest that the EU has reached a point of power maturity according to economic development indicators because relative to other major economic producers its growth rates are markedly subordinate. Even accounting for the economic crisis that gravely effected the West the EU's GDP growth rate has not touched the double-digit growth that China has reached during the past three decades. With China surpassing a struggling Japan earlier in 2011 to ascend to the second largest economy in the world, Germany's fourth ranked economy posts the highest position for a sinking European market.⁴⁰ Admittedly, the debt crisis struck the Europeans unusually hard compared to other regions of the world but there is no guarantee that

⁴⁰ Flanders, Stephanie. "China Overtakes Japan as World's Second-biggest Economy." *BBC - Homepage*. 14 Feb. 2011. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-12427321>>.

growth rates will rise back to their even sub-Chinese and Indian levels. Furthermore, the EU's 1% GDP growth rate from 2005 to 2009 is padded by Eastern European countries' booming economies due to the 2004 and 2007 enlargements. This would propose that the bulwark economies of Western Europe experienced a period of terrible growth even before the economic crisis set in. By means of GDP growth rate, the EU does not compare to developing countries like China, Brazil, or even India.

Table B⁴¹

<i>Country</i>	<i>GDP Growth Rate (% avg 2005-2009)</i>	<i>GDP per Capita Growth Rate (2005-2009)</i>
EU	1.00	16.79
China	11.40	116.29
United States	1.00	8.12
Brazil	3.60	71.29
India	8.20	48.23

Another telling economic development indicator pertaining to GDP is the GDP per capita growth rate. As is displayed in Table B, aside from the US, the EU has the smallest GDP per capita growth rate from 2005-2009 of any of the other countries listed. China grew 100% more during this period showing that its economy and living standards are growing at a much higher pace than the EU's. Other than the fact that China has not yet reached a stage of economic maturity, this disparity could be attributed to a number of factors. One is that the EU's 2004 and 2007 expansions brought in many countries that stood to grow vastly in this department. Namely Romania and Belarus were, and still are by European standards, very poor and because of the trade benefits their GDP is rising at an incredible rate.⁴² This yields similar analysis to the GDP measure mentioned above in that the Eastern European nations included in the expansions

⁴¹ "World dataBank: World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance." The World Bank. Updated 14 Apr 2011. <http://databank.worldbank.org>

⁴² "Romania and Bulgaria GDP - Google Public Data." *Google*. Web. 12 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.google.com/publicdata?ds=wb-wdi>>.

during the 2000s represent a large share of the GDP per capita growth that is occurring in the EU. So there is evidence of a fractalization of EU economic development where the Eastern European economies are prospering and growing at astronomical rates because of their newly obtained access to the EU market and Western European economies are realizing a state of economic maturity. Organski would likely pair Western Europe and the United States into a comparable group when analyzing economies and he would posit that they are approaching their ultimate level of potential power in regards to economics. Especially in contrast to China, India, and Brazil's figures, the EU's economy has largely stagnated during the past decade.

Considering all of the above analysis, according to Organski and his theory of Power Transition the EU does not possess the assets or the potential power to become the dominant power. The EU has reached its point of power maturity as its population ages and its economy's growth rate continues to slow. Relative to the world's developing nations the EU is falling in the ranks of overall population, labor force projections, and GDP growth. However, not all is negative regarding Organski's measures of power though as many of the EU's countries rank very highly in anti-corruption indexes and government efficiency at a nation level is excellent. They also stand to benefit from further expansions, namely the expansion of Turkey, which would augment and economically invigorate their population. But these few positives do not equal enough power potential in comparison to the rising powers of China and India to warrant a sincere Organskian discussion of EU hegemony. The EU will remain a great power for the foreseeable future because of the sheer volume of its economy and its international political clout, but material economic growth is dubious and the EU has ultimately reached the stage of power maturity.

John Mearsheimer

Now the paper will turn to John Mearsheimer's Offensive Realism to discuss whether the EU has the ability to become a hegemon. As descanted above, Mearsheimer has two elements of power that are central to his theory. The first is latent power, which is essentially Organski's measure of power potential. He cites total population and economic strength as the major components of latent power, however to Mearsheimer these are not extremely important factors in determining the total power of a state. While Organski argues the developmental and potential side of these elements, Mearsheimer is a literalist, a realist, and states that solely because a state possesses a large population and a strong economy does not cement the fact that they will convert these resources into hard military power. According to Offensive Realism Organski's measures of potential power are the means to the end of military power. In this light, this paper will not discuss Mearsheimer's concept of latent power and reiterate the findings outlined above in the Organskian discussion. Instead the dialogue will shift to the weightier topic of military power. Below the size, force projection, and budgets of the EU and other militaries will be outlined in order to construct a military hierarchy to which Offensive Realism devotes so much importance. Then a deliberation on autonomy's role in military power will ensue to ascertain its relative importance in any country's quest for hegemony. First, the paper will discuss the overall military power of each of the separate EU nations combined and then during the discussion of autonomy, the structure of how troops are deployed at an EU level will be analyzed.

The first element to be considered in estimating a state's military power is size. The main characteristic for this measurement is total number of troops on active duty. When combining each of the EU member states' active troops their collective number trumps any other country's in the world. In 2010, the EU member states had a total of 1,879,413 troops on active duty,

surpassing even the US' count of 1,580,255. India's armament aimed at deterring the Pakistanis placed them in third at 1,325,000 (other notable countries can be found in Table C). Touching upon the recurring theme that Turkey is an applicant to the EU, it is worth mentioning that with a Turkish accession the EU's military forces have the potential to grow by 27%, not to mention the prestige and historical efficiency of the Turkish army. By this mark the EU should be the region most able to protect itself and therefore most able to achieve the highest mark of security. But of course the analysis is not this simple. Another aspect to be considered is military spending, as this will give an idea of how much of the latent power of the country is being employed to be converted to military power. The EU is not the world's principal spender as the US easily takes that distinction, however it is second by a sizable amount spending a cumulative \$287 billion in 2010 on defense.

Table C⁴³ - Active Duty Troops

EU Total	1,879,413
Brazil	327,710
United States	1,580,255
Turkey	510,600
Republic of China	290,000
India	1,325,000

Table D⁴⁴ - Military Spending 2010 (in millions of 2009 USD)

EU Totals	287,972
India	34,816
USA	687,105
Brazil	28,096
China, P. R.	114,300

⁴³ Hackett, James. "The Military Balance 2010." International Institute for Strategic Studies; (ed.) (2010-02-03). London: Routledge.

⁴⁴ "SIPRI Military Expenditure Database." *Welcome to SIPRI*. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2011. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>>.

Lastly, force projection is a significant measure to Offensive Realism because of the theory's emphasis on regional power and "balancing." Mearsheimer argues that maintaining conflicts abroad are often a way to ensure security within the surrounding area of the state. This is evidenced by the US' involvement in the Middle East during the past two decades. The US has possessed long-range strategic lift capabilities (LRSL) since the 1980s with its use of the Boeing C-17 and other previous models. Until the early 2000s they were the only nation with the ability to move troops globally via aircraft in a timely manner to respond to the needs of crises and war. As the EU defense industrial base modernizes and other countries obtain LRSL via procuring C-17-style aircrafts, the expectation is that these capabilities are another asset to a modernized military.⁴⁵ Yet the EU's attempts at securing LRSL are infamous for being riddled with financial and technical setbacks and the Airbus A400M is almost synonymous in the aviation world for failure. But the Europeans are intent on using their own means to develop a LRSL aircraft and the process has been sustained through various deals between EADS and Airbus.⁴⁶ Currently many other countries maintain these capabilities, while the EU remains stubborn in its efforts to manufacture them itself.

So the above paragraphs give a mixed analysis of the amalgamation of the EU member states' spending, soldiers on active duty, and LRSL capabilities in regards to their relativity to power as defined by Offensive Realism. They rank highly in the total number of troops and total defense spending, but rarely is the EU considered a military powerhouse. This is because the EU battles with an obvious but crucial obstacle that is the kryptonite to its hegemony, according to

⁴⁵ Leeuwen, Marcel Van. "Kuwait C-17 GLOBEMASTER III Aircraft and Related Support." *Aviation News EU*. International Aviation News, 24 Sept. 2010. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.aviationnews.eu/2010/09/27/kuwait-c-17-globemaster-iii-aircraft-and-related-support/>>.

⁴⁶ Chuter, Andrew. "Deal Reached To Continue Troubled A400M Program - Defense News." *Breaking International Defense News*. Defense News, 7 Apr. 2011. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6174013>>.

Mearsheimer's definition of power. Indeed the following analysis concerning autonomy is a complicated one, but vital enough to discuss in detail.

Historically, modern Europe has relied on the US for security. In the early 1950s the significant Western European powers signed into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which largely protected Europe from an imposing Russia and allowed the US to retain Western Europe under its sphere of influence. Although the World Wars are fresh in the minds of most Europeans, most countries have been able to enjoy a relative security throughout the past half-century because of the dominance of the US military. Not until the recent development of the European-wide defense industrial base and the even more recent Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) have European nations maintained modern and credible armed forces. Inarguably, the US still comprises the fortuitous majority of NATO's forces today and primarily drives the organization's policy decisions.

Yet not all European militarized action comes from NATO and the role of the CSDP is certainly growing. This is the legislation that will warrant the most focus from this paper because it is an EU idea, not inclusive of the US or any other non-EU states. It is most likely that EU-led military power will emerge from this venue than from any other under the assumption that the US will continue to be the backbone of NATO. With this said, the power, influence, and operational capabilities of the EU through the CSDP are very limited and lack validity from the international community. The CSDP has evolved out of numerous agreements through the EU's history to become the peacekeeping and peacemaking force that it is today. And the role and significance of the collective agreements being bartered during the past twenty years has grown with the EU as their common security policies have produced eight military missions since 1999, some as close as Bosnia and others as far reaching as Somalia. The main

point of contention is that these missions more closely correlate to UN peacekeeping missions than NATO militarized efforts. Although the importance and power of the CSDP is growing, it still only offers a very basic toolset with which to operate.

This is why autonomy is key to Mearsheimer's definition of power when appraising the EU. Most countries are able to exercise complete control over and leverage the full power of their armed forces in times of attack or war. However in terms of the EU, the CSDP does not synchronize member states' reaction to an armed conflict like NATO's Article V does.⁴⁷ This means that if Germany was attacked, Germany would turn inward to its own forces and then secondly to NATO forces for a response. So conforming to Mearsheimer's theory, the EU statistics descanted above cannot be considered a legitimate measure of EU force. In fact there is no measure of EU force until a NATO-styled agreement can be reached amongst just the EU's member states. Effectively, the EU cannot be credibly considered a hegemon because until military autonomy is granted to the EU-level government the only statistics of substance are the separate member states' defense spending, the number of soldiers on active duty, and so forth. With this measurement not only will no single European state come close to vying for hegemony, but the EU will not be even considered as a hegemonic candidate. This means that the coordination efforts of the defense industrial base and the training mechanisms in place to increase cohesion across borders are not material factors to the cause of EU hegemony until the political changes occur to cede sovereignty to the supragovernmental level. So Mearsheimer would put forward that the EU not only does not rank high enough on the scales of spending, active troops, and LRS capabilities, but he would also maintain that the lack of sovereignty at

⁴⁷ *Official Text: The North Atlantic Treaty*. NATO, 4 Apr. 1949. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>.

the supranational level is a crippling factor to the EU becoming a hegemon. This trend is applicable to any intergovernmental organization that should arise in the future similar to the EU.

The analysis so far has rested on the idea of global hegemony, a concept that Mearsheimer argues is an impossibility given the current complex, globalized system of international relations but by other scholars is widely accepted as potentially feasible. Instead, Mearsheimer posits that states can hope to gain security through regional hegemony, a classification for which the EU certainly qualifies. The EU has attained a sphere of influence surrounding Europe allowing them to conduct their economic successes throughout the past half-century. The means by which they assured this security was obtained outside of Mearsheimer's theoretical framework. Instead of bulking up their military they reaped the benefits of America's military growth during the Cold War by signing the NATO agreement. Even though it was a group of similar European countries that signed the NATO treaty and not the EU, the associated security has allowed the EU to conduct its political and economic affairs in a peaceful fashion. So the EU is actually a bit of an anomaly to Mearsheimer's theory because it has been able to enjoy the benefits of a regional hegemony (regional security) without having the strongest military forces. Instead through its political osmosis of Eastern European states it has turned foes of the Cold War into allies of today. So, the EU has been able to mimic the behaviors of a regional hegemon without possessing all of the Mearsheimerian characteristics of one because of NATO's involvement in greater European security.

The central tenets of Offensive Realism struggle to help define the EU as a global or regional hegemony. Globally, by its definition, it is not equipped to argue the case because Mearsheimer rejects the possibility of global hegemonies. Yet, when supplanting his basic measurements of regional hegemonies to a global level we see that the EU as a whole still does not rank strong

enough in military spending and long-range strategic lift capabilities. This, along with their relative ineptitude of military actions due to sovereignty constraints discounts them from achieving global hegemony. Regionally, the EU walks and talks like a hegemon. They benefit from the security and stability that other regional hegemonies do but they are not encumbered with the constant strain of having to maintain a top ranking military. So the EU, and all similar intergovernmental organizations, are ultimately aberrations when considering regional hegemony in the context of Offensive Realism.

Antonio Gramsci

Antonio Gramsci's liberalized conception of hegemony is a far cry from the military-based analysis of Offensive Realism. The Italian theorist did not appraise power by the number of troops or the funds exhausted on a military campaign, instead he was focused on the power of emergent ideas within a state. Gramsci noted that once a war of position was won, a war of movement could be waged in order to exchange power to the subsequent historic bloc. The following paragraphs will then be used to outline the historical events that facilitated the EU's historic bloc. A consequential discussion will follow on the limits of the EU's expansionary power in consideration of EU world hegemony.

The history of the EU is very much in tune with a Gramscian cultural revolution but subtle differences reveal themselves throughout its inception. After WWII, the Western European powers of the time were intent on fashioning a European system that would make Germany and France economically dependent upon each other so as to prevent the possibility of another war. Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet, two French politicians and intellectuals, drafted the Schuman Plan founding the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which conglomerated the French and German coal and steel markets. During the 1950s, when the Schuman Plan was

signed, the coal and steel were massively traded goods in the European markets so France, Germany, Benelux, and Italy all agreed to merge their markets so as to create higher efficiency and interdependency. The idea at the base of this historic bloc was to fuse economic and political means, or rather to leverage economic opportunities to achieve the political end of peace. Soon after, many Western European countries noticed the benefits of this arrangement and applied for membership; a cultural revolution was born.

It was not until 1973 that additional European states were allowed into the EU. Membership gradually grew from the 1980s-2000s as the union started to solidify into a more cohesive and more serious commitment. During this time the ideology of a unified Europe blossomed. The Maastricht Treaty in 1993 established the Euro zone creating a common currency for many of the EU states. Furthermore it instituted the Copenhagen Criteria, a set of guidelines that applicant states must conform to before entrance into the union. Finally during the 2000s, the

"Membership requires that the candidate country has achieved stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and, protection of minorities, the existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with competitive pressure and market forces within the Union. Membership presupposes the candidate's ability to take on the obligations of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union."⁴⁸

EU expanded into the Eastern Bloc nations, chipping away at Russia's Cold War sphere of influence by adding countries like Romania and Belarus. Democracy had certainly congealed as the dominant governing force in Europe.

The above quote from the Copenhagen Criteria embodies the ideology of the EU that drove its historic bloc. It is comprised of democratic values, human rights, and the basis of a market

⁴⁸ "Accession Criteria." *Enlargement*. EUROPA - European Commission, 30 Oct. 2010. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/enlargement_process/accession_process/criteria/index_en.htm>.

economy. These characteristics have been prevalent in most powerful countries in the past half-century, especially in Europe, but the political climate had to be ripe for a political union to be formed. Thus comes the importance of the many wars and contrasting political dogmas in Europe leading up to the Schuman Plan. Fascism, Communism, Democracy, and other forms of governance had clashed unsuccessfully in the preceding years and the inherent ramifications manifested themselves into massive interstate conflicts. This turmoil leading up to the 1950s set the perfect ideological stage for the cooperation and need for interdependency that modern international institutions support.

Two points must then be descanted regarding the formation of the EU and its subsequent rise to power. First, in the Gramscian model, who is the dominant class? This question can be answered in two fashions. The first is that supporters of democracy and interdependent free markets were the dominant class in this cultural revolution. Promoting these ideals and forming the superstructures of the ECSC and the proceeding European supragovernmental organizations ousted any legitimate threat of power from the communists and fascists. In fact WWII could almost be viewed as a premature attempt at a war of movement by Hitler's Fascist uprising. He did not attain enough support in the "greater state of Europe" at the time to successfully overthrow the Allied Powers. So in this light supporters of democracy comprised the dominant class while fascists and communists were thrust into the subordinate class. And while they were depressed into taking a lessened political role, the democratic system allowed them to represent themselves as much as the populous desired. This perfectly supports Cohn's thoughts that, "the ruling class gains the active consent of the subordinate class" in a cultural revolution because although being ousted from power they are still theoretically able to be elected to government

positions.⁴⁹ The second response to the dominant class question is that Western Europe could be viewed as the leaders. France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux countries originally came together as economic allies to build a new international social and economic structure for Western Europe. The prominent ideology permeated throughout Western Europe during the 1970s and 1980s while the Cold War was at its height. Europe was the closest battleground for the battle of democracy against communism. Once the Berlin Wall was toppled in the late 1980s interest in the European Union spiked as Eastern European states were allowed to become free market democracies. This makes the EU historic bloc a very interesting case because it was founded by the dominant class (Western Europe) and is the envy of the subordinate class (Eastern Europe).

This leads to the next point of consideration, the method with which the EU rose to regional hegemony. Traditionally, according to Gramscian thought, a kinetic war is necessary to shift power in any given setting after a war of position is won. However the EU did not require a war of movement to win the war of position in Europe. Arguably, WWII could be sighted as the war of movement because it paved the way for the following social structure, but the ideology of a unified Europe did not exist before the war. The fashion in which these events unfolded does not conform to Gramscian theory on historic blocs and for this reason the EU is an exception yet again to a prominent hegemonic theory. Except unlike Offensive Realism, which had trouble generally framing the EU as a hegemon, Gramscian theory identifies with the historic bloc that the EU has established, but not the method of its rise to power.

It is easily ascertained that the EU is the regional hegemon of Europe. Throughout its democratic osmosis of the region its ideology has established a historic bloc that is not

⁴⁹ Cohn, Theodore H. *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice*. Pg. 122. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2005. Print.

legitimately threatened by any other in Europe. But regional hegemony is quite different than global hegemony and neo-Gramscians, unlike Mearsheimer, allow for the idea of a global hegemon. So the next paragraphs will be devoted to determining the extent of the EU's power, or the limit of their expansionary potential. The following considerations will be evaluated: the EU's influence in shaping international organizations and the hindrance of preexisting regional conflicts.

One of the key aspects of neo-Gramscian thought in international relations is the idea of passive revolutions. These revolutions occur in subaltern nations and do not take the active form of the war of position and the subsequent war of movement. Instead they are elongated reforms by a given state's society as a whole that match up with the current hegemony's social, economic, and political system. This is a reflection of the hegemony's power or influence throughout the world because it demonstrates that their historic bloc can be effective in regions other than its own state. Passive revolutions played a large part in the Cold War with the bipolar stratification of power further manipulating many countries under either the US or USSR's sphere of influence. Many times being under this sphere of influence meant transforming to communist or democratic ideology and with the help of foreign aid these reforms were attainable in the short run. The democracies were largely the successful passive revolutions because the US emerged as the sole hegemony following the Cold War.

In respect to the EU, not much evidence is present currently to support the idea that other regions are engaging in a similar politico-economic structure. Many new regional international organizations are arising and strengthening in power, such as ASEAN and the African Union but their mission statements aim at enhanced cooperation rather than interdependency. As outlined above, the EU's explicit cause was to create economic interdependency to accelerate the

peacemaking process in post-war Europe. These newer regional organizations are intended more heavily to “accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development” and increase “transparency and accountability.”^[50] ^[51] So to a certain level the EU’s success and growth in global may have inspired regional organizations to aspire to become stronger entities, but it is not fair to say that passive revolutions have occurred in the wake of the rising EU power during the past half century.

Another area to analyze the EU’s influence in international institutions is to inspect their ability to sway decisions and policy in organizations such as the United Nations (UN). Alluding back to Robert Cox’s five points in determining a state’s authority in international organizations it is evident that many of the EU’s interests are represented in the UN’s agenda. The UN indeed “ideologically legitimates the norms of the current world order” and likewise “co-opts the elites from peripheral countries.”⁵² However the repeated phrase “hegemonic world order” is a complicating one and evokes the analysis that the UN, and many likewise international organizations, are a product of the United States’ hegemonic world order following WWII, not Europe’s. The US’ interests are generally aligned with the EU’s, besides some humanitarian issues, so this correlation makes historical sense. However neo-Gramscians would argue that the US is responsible above Europe for this formation of values.

The future of EU power in such organizations looks to be diluted as the discussions of growth in membership of the UN Security Council develop into more realistically considered reform. Even though Germany is one of the more seriously revered candidates, Japan, India, and

⁵⁰ "Overview." *The Official Website of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*. ASEAN, 2009. Web. 17 Apr. 2011. <http://www.aseansec.org/about_ASEAN.html>.

⁵¹ "Vision and Mission." *African Union: A United and Strong Africa*. Web. 17 Apr. 2011. <<http://au.int/en/about/vision>>.

⁵² Cox, Robert. "Gramsci, Hegemony, and International Relations: An Essay in Method." Print. Rpt. in *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*. By Stephen Gill. New York City: Cambridge UP, 1993. 49-66. Print.

Brazil are equally in the running and the latter two, while still representing democracy, are developing nations with different political and economic agendas. Regionally, the EU plays a leadership role in organizations like the OSCE and the Council of Europe which strengthens the evidence of their regional hegemony according to the neo-Gramscian definition, but these organizations only stand as proof for a regional hegemonic order. Unfortunately for the EU, the OSCE and the Council of Europe stand little chance to blossom into global institutions, which means that the existing Euro-centric inspired international organizations will not be at the helm of global politics.

Aside from the EU's influence in international organizations another limit on its power can be found in the boundaries of the ideology of its historic bloc. The EU's power growth has been propelled by its ability to gradually absorb surrounding countries via promoting its ideology of economic interdependence. While the idea of peace through economic reliance seems impeccable, two flaws put limits on its potential. One seems trivial, but the underlying implications are material. The name, European Union, suggests that membership to the Union will not be extended beyond the geographical borders of Europe. This also holds a certain elitist connotation that the EU has been quick to shun by accepting member states such as Romania and Bulgaria, but would it be so quick to expand if Azerbaijan or Georgia were to meet the Copenhagen Criteria? This leads to the second limitation of preexisting regional conflicts. Empirical evidence already suggests that the EU balks when faced with applications from conflicted nations. A perfect example of this is the Turkish-Cypriot conflict that has been a major reason for the EU denying Turkey membership since its application in 1987. Although Turkey would be a valuable asset to the EU, militarily and economically, the existing membership of Greece, dating from 1979, halted authentic accession discussions. Such a

conundrum manifests itself in various different cases, for example Georgia's relationship with the EU is tainted because of the European's insecurity with Russia. This expansionary constraint on potential power is not a concern in the same way to Gramscians as it would be to followers of Organski and Mearsheimer, instead it literally decreases the number of states that it can absorb into the Union. Its ideology can only expand to a restricted number of countries that are able to meet the Copenhagen Criteria and not have limiting preexisting conflicts.

According to Gramsci, globally, the EU does not pose a threat to becoming a hegemon because it doesn't have the military resources or political will to stage a war of movement on the ideology's behalf. Regionally, the EU should comfortably rest in its place of hegemony because there is no sincere counter-hegemonic threat or ideology to challenge the existing historic bloc. Its superstructures are very secure on the European continent but simply not strong enough globally to vie for world hegemony.

Conclusion

A.F.K. Organski's Power Transition Theory suggests that industrializing states have the most power to gain as economic and demographic resources meld with political efficiency to create power growth. After comparing leaders in his three most important measures of population, government efficiency, and economic development the data displayed the EU's aging population and relatively mature economy definitively debunks the possibility of EU hegemony. Organski's Power Transition Theory favors developing countries with booming economies and populations such as China, India, and Brazil.

John Mearsheimer, the originator of Offensive Realism, set much more strict standards for hegemons. His theory suggests that only regional hegemony is attainable and that states strive for this in order to gain security. As his theory is a strain of traditional Realism, Mearsheimer is

very much interested in the military power of a state and posits that states try to obtain the best and largest militaries in order to ensure security. Because of this constant competition, the international political order is in constant flux. With this said, the EU cannot be looked at as a regional or global hegemon according to Mearsheimer. They have neither the military capabilities, the political venues, nor the central control over a unitary military force to be rightly considered in this right. However, the EU is able to enjoy the security of a regional hegemon because of the overlap of member states with NATO. This interesting anomaly makes the EU a special case in Mearsheimer's analysis of hegemonies.

The Italian Gramsci offers the most abstract of the three theories examined in this paper, but the discussion proved to be just as fruitful. Gramsci's ideas of cultural and passive revolutions and historic blocs have materially manifested themselves in different fashions since their theoretical recognition in the 1880s. Many hegemonies, Gramsci argues, require a war of position before a war of movement can be won. If both are successfully executed, then one historic bloc gives way to another, and social movements are simply the flow of dominant ideologies moving throughout history. Neo-Gramscians supplant his ideas to an international level and furthermore stress the importance of influence through international institutions as a marking of power. The EU is certainly a regional hegemon by Gramscian standards, their historic bloc of political peace through economic interdependency and democracy has swept the continent during the past six decades. However globally their influence in international organizations is not strong enough and is ultimately secluded to Europe and its immediate surroundings.

This paper has outlined, defined, and operationalized major hegemonic and power theories and explored their applicability to the European Union's existing and potential power. Through

statistical and historical research the findings are that the EU has widely reached the height of its power and its power growth potential has leveled off. It will likely remain a great power in the foreseeable future because of its still strong and advanced economy and military support from the US.

Bibliography

"Accession Criteria." *Enlargement*. EUROPA - European Commission, 30 Oct. 2010. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/enlargement_process/accession_process/criteria/index_en.htm>.

Chuter, Andrew. "Deal Reached To Continue Troubled A400M Program - Defense News." *Breaking International Defense News*. Defense News, 7 Apr. 2011. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=6174013>>.

Cohn, Theodore H. *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice*. Pg. 122. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2005. Print.

Connolly, Kate. "Angela Merkel Declares Death of German Multiculturalism." *The Guardian UK*. 17 Oct. 2010. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-germany-multiculturalism-failures>>.

"Country Comparison: Public Debt." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site*. 2010. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2186rank.html>>.

Cox, Robert. "Gramsci, Hegemony, and International Relations: An Essay in Method." Print. Rpt. in *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*. By Stephen Gill. New York City: Cambridge UP, 1993. 49-66. Print.

Cox, Simon. "The Fastest Lap." *The Economist: The World in 2011* 3 Jan. 2011: 68. Print.

"East and Southeast Asia: China." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ch.html>>.

"Europe: European Union." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ee.html>>.

Flanders, Stephanie. "China Overtakes Japan as World's Second-biggest Economy." *BBC - Homepage*. 14 Feb. 2011. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-12427321>>.

"Global Corruption Barometer 2010." Transparency International, 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2010>.

Gramsci, Antonio, and Joseph A. Buttigieg. "Section 44." *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992. Print.

Hackett, James. "The Military Balance 2010." International Institute for Strategic Studies; (ed.) (2010-02-03). London: Routledge.

Hauner, Daniel, and Annette Kyobe. *Determinants of Government Efficiency. IMF Working Paper*. International Monetary Fund, Sept. 2008. Web. 4 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2008/wp08228.pdf>>.

"Latest Numbers." *The U.S. Department of Labor Home Page*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.dol.gov/>>.

Leeuwen, Marcel Van. "Kuwait C-17 GLOBEMASTER III Aircraft and Related Support." *Aviation News EU*. International Aviation News, 24 Sept. 2010. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.aviationnews.eu/2010/09/27/kuwait-c-17-globemaster-iii-aircraft-and-related-support/>>.

Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Pg. 55-441. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.

"Median Age Projections." *European Environment Agency*. European Union, 2010. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/figures/median-age-projections>>.

"Middle East: Turkey." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tu.html>>.

"North America: United States." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>>.

Official Text: The North Atlantic Treaty. NATO, 4 Apr. 1949. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>.

"On a Mat and a Prayer." *The Economist: 70 or Bust* 9 Apr. 2011: 59. Print.

Organski, A. F. K. *World Politics, 2. Edition*. Pg 338-372. New York: Knopf, 1968. Print.

"Overview." *The Official Website of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations*. ASEAN, 2009. Web. 17 Apr. 2011. <http://www.aseansec.org/about_ASEAN.html>.

"Results." *Corruption Perceptions Index 2010*. Transparency International, 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results>.

"Romania and Bulgaria GDP - Google Public Data." *Google*. Web. 12 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.google.com/publicdata?ds=wb-wdi>>.

"SIPRI Military Expenditure Database." *Welcome to SIPRI*. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2011. Web. 16 Apr. 2011. <<http://www.sipri.org/databases/milex>>.

"South Asia: India." *Welcome to the CIA Web Site - Central Intelligence Agency*. 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2011. <<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html>>.

"Vision and Mission." *African Union: A United and Strong Africa*. Web. 17 Apr. 2011. <<http://au.int/en/about/vision>>.

“Visualizing the Global Corruption Barometer 2010.” Transparency International. 2010. Pg. 1-2.

http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2010/interactive.

“World dataBank: World Development Indicators and Global Development Finance.” The

World Bank. Updated 14 Apr 2011. <http://databank.worldbank.org>.