

**Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi – Journal of Social Sciences**

**ISSN: 1306-7877 e-ISSN: 2147-5644**

**Eurocentrism in Antonio Gramsci’s Concept of Hegemony**

**Antonio Gramsci’nin Hegemonya Konseptinde Avrupamerkezcilik**

**Ahmet GÖRGEN**

Dr., Justus Liebig Universität Gießen, Siyaset Bilimi Enstitüsü

Gießen, Almanya

Dr., Justus Liebig Universität Gießen, Institute of Political Science

Gießen, Germany

ahmetgorgen@hotmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9647-2691>

**Makale Bilgisi / Article Information**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29238/tbd.2007.48081>

**Makale Türü / Article Types:** Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

**Geliş Tarihi / Received:** 30.11.2020

**Yayın Tarihi / Published:** 25 Aralık / December 2020

**Yayın Sezonu / Pub Date Season:** Aralık / December 2020

**Cilt / Volume:** 29

**Sayfa / Pages:** 55-65

Copyright © Published by Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi – Journal of Social Sciences.

All rights reserved [www.toplumbilimleri.com](http://www.toplumbilimleri.com)

## **Eurocentrism in Antonio Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony**

**Abstract:** This study is based on a research related to analyze the Eurocentrism in Antonio Gramsci's concept of hegemony. Recent analyses reveal that the notion of hegemony has been developed in the capitalist societies to explain the historical contest between bourgeoisie and proletariat. Strategies for the formation of hegemony, including using consent and coercion as well as the emergence of the counter-hegemonic struggle are the main components of Gramsci's conception. The capitalist economic model emerged in the Western social structure and Gramsci covered this in his analysis of the concept of hegemony. However, previous studies have limitations of explaining the Eurocentric nature of Gramsci's concept. With an analysis of the historical evolution of Eurocentrism and the notion of hegemony, this study aims to present the Eurocentric nature of Gramsci's concept of hegemony. The research findings are explained through analyzing the formation of the hegemonic position of US in the world politics.

**Key Words:** Eurocentrism, Antonio Gramsci, Hegemony, Capitalist Society, United States.

### **Antonio Gramsci'nin Hegemonya Konseptinde Avrupamerkezcilik**

**Öz:** Bu çalışma, Antonio Gramsci'nin hegemonya konseptindeki Avrupamerkezciliği analiz etmeye yönelik bir araştırmaya dayanmaktadır. Önceki çalışmalar hegemonya konseptinin kapitalist toplumlarda burjuvazi ile proletarya arasındaki tarihsel çekişmeyi açıklamak için geliştirildiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Rıza ve zorlamayı içeren hegemonya oluşturma stratejileri ve karşı hegemonik mücadelenin ortaya çıkışı, Gramsci'nin hegemonya konseptinin ana bileşenleridir. Kapitalist ekonomik model Batı toplumsal yapısında ortaya çıkmış ve Gramsci bunu hegemonya konseptine ilişkin analizinde ele almıştır. Önceki çalışmalar, Gramsci'nin hegemonya konseptinin Avrupamerkezcilik doğasını açıklama açısından sınırlı bir alanda kalmışlardır. Avrupamerkezciliğin tarihsel evrimi ve hegemonya konseptinin analizi ile bu çalışma, Gramsci'nin hegemonya konseptinin Avrupamerkezcilik doğasını sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma bulguları, ABD'nin dünya siyasetindeki hegemonik konumunun oluşumu incelenerek açıklanmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Avrupamerkezcilik, Antonio Gramsci, Hegemonya, Kapitalist Toplum, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri.

### **1. Introduction**

In the contemporary research and analyses, various interpretations of the concept of hegemony have made important contributions to understand the political, economic and social relations in the world. These contributions are mainly because of the meaning that Antonio Gramsci<sup>1</sup> attached to the concept of hegemony. Gramsci argues that the hegemony in the social sphere does not only relate to the use of power, it can also base on a veiled consent (Anderson, 1976: 32). Moreover, Gramsci explains also the structure of the hegemonic governance and the relations in the civil society for the transformation of the hegemonic positioning.

The concept of hegemony, which is important to explain the governance relations within a domestic realm, also has the importance to explain international relations. According to Steven E. Lobell (2003), the hegemonic powers, who have different economic systems would develop different actions. As a matter of fact, two hegemonic powers during the Cold-War,

---

<sup>1</sup> Antonio Gramsci is an Italian Marxist who lived between 1891 - 1937. He was one of the most important Marxist theorists of the first half of the 20th century. Gramsci imprisoned in 1926 by the fascist regime in Italy until 1935. He became famous for his "Prison Notebook" written between 1929 and 1935. The book was published after his death in 1937 and became influential in the critical Marxist interpretation of the debates in political theory (Sassoon, 1991: 446).

separated as liberal and socialist through having imperial ambitions in their international relations practices, had different actions based on their political ideology. Moreover, in the post-Cold War period, as a result of globalization, there are new approaches as global hegemony and the global hegemonic relations. As a matter of fact, the United States (US) declared its single global power position after September 11, 2001, through the coercive policy in international relations. This positioning led the debate to add a new hegemonic relations dimension of the international politics. In this context, some scholars are arguing that these attempts are to return the imperial policies, others are arguing that this was a kind of the new hegemony of the world politics.

In the theoretical arguments, the notion of hegemony is explained as based on the historical development of the capitalist societies. The use of coercion and consent for maintaining hegemony and the cultural governance by the contribution of social actors within a capitalist structure are shown as the main components of hegemony. Having explained the link to the capitalism and capitalist economic model's emergence in the Western social structure, previous analyses did not make a comprehensive analysis of the Eurocentric nature of Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

This article aims to reveal the Eurocentric nature of Gramsci's concept of hegemony. To reveal this, a qualitative study on Gramsci's conception is conducted. Based on the comprehensive research and analyses, the main hypothesis of this article is that in its multidimensional nature Gramscian concept of hegemony is Eurocentric. This hypothesis is developed because of the Gramscian concept of hegemony covers western social and economic understanding and the political system for the analysis. Thus, the concept was developed by Gramsci for explaining the development of hegemonic relations in the Western Europe within the historical process of capitalist development. In order to explain the Eurocentrism in Gramsci's concept of hegemony, the first part of this article devoted to general arguments about the notion of hegemony and Gramsci's concept of hegemony. In the second part, the concept of Eurocentrism and the links to the concept of hegemony are explained. In the third part, the Eurocentrism within Gramsci's concept of hegemony is explained. In the fourth part, the Eurocentrism in the analysis of Gramsci's concept will be explained through the US case. The last part is devoted to the conclusion.

## **2. The Notion of Hegemony and Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony**

The origin of the word 'hegemony' based on "hegemonia" in Greek and it refers to an element within a system, which is more supreme or more predominant than other elements (Wilkinson, 2008: 120). It is also argued that the notion of hegemony is based on the dominance that meant the superiority of one nation over others (Wilkinson, 2008: 121). Even prior to Gramsci, the notion of hegemony had been a widely debated topic, within the Marxist theoretical approach as well as within the civilian social arena that positioned under the critical perspective.

Perry Anderson (1976) argues that Comintern<sup>2</sup> theorists gathered the concept of hegemony from Russian Social democrats and then Gramsci derived it from Comintern theorists. In this respect, there is a historical relationship to the evolution of the concept of hegemony between Gramsci and the Comintern theorists. The analysis of Comintern theorists in relation to the formation of hegemony is that the bourgeoisie hegemony occurs when a normal historical process does not happen to bring the proletariat in the power (Anderson, 1976). This could be categorized as the crisis environment for them. So, in the following process bourgeoisie hegemony fills the gap in the political system. According to Anderson,

---

<sup>2</sup> Comintern refers to the communist international or the third international that was active between 1919 and 1943. The main aim of the Comintern was to fight against to international bourgeoisie. So, this fight brought the Bolshevik revolution to the international level (See Weber, 1986).

homogenization of some historical forces could be regarded as the historical contingency that leaves other forces/social groups out of the hegemonic dynamics (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 63). In this sense, the historical contingency is the main aspect to analyze the emergence of the hegemony that clarifies the power struggle of the historical forces.

Moreover, the Leninist approach concerning the formation of hegemony relates to its political character rather than emerging only in the civil society. According to Leninist approach, hegemony is the main factor to determine the political leadership within a class or within the alliance of the related classes (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 55). In this regard, Leninism sees the notion of hegemony mainly related to the historical development of the classes. However, the Comintern theorist together with Gramsci moved beyond the concept of hegemony from Lenin's class alliance approach. The step that made Gramsci beyond to the class alliance was his evolution of thought, concerning the formation of hegemony, from the political arena to the intellectual and moral arenas that is in the area of the civil society.

Concerning the formation of hegemony, one of the most important strategies explained by Gramsci is the formation of the historical bloc. The historical bloc is explained by Gramsci as different classes' uniting as a bloc that includes an aim at the formation of the hegemony of this bloc (Gramsci, 1978: 462). According to Gramsci (1978: 462), the intellectual and moral leadership of the classes unites in the historical bloc like under an organized structure and with a concrete will. They generate a higher synthesis of ideological positions of the different classes as a collective organization. In this case, the intellectual and moral leadership is perceived as a center of the creation of ideological position of this historical bloc.

According to Gramsci (1971: 5), every social class and groups create their own organic intellectuals, and their aim is to widen the hegemonic position of their social classes and groups. In this sense, organic intellectuals of the historical bloc lead the direction, not only through convincing the members of various classes in the historical bloc, but also legitimizing the positioning of the historical bloc in the public sphere for the formation of their hegemonic position. Gramsci differs from other Marxist theories because of dealing with not only the struggle of the proletariat, but also other subordinated social classes. In Gramsci's conception, these social classes have complicated collective will. The ideological elements have been created by a class itself, which cannot be built with an outside effect of the specific social classes (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 87).

As a matter of fact, Gramsci did not publish a book, including his notes which were written in Prison between 1929 - 1935. After he died in 1937, Prison Notebook was published, including various collections. In this regard, there are some differences in Gramsci's opinions since various analyses and arguments about Gramsci's conception affected by the emergence of new perspectives on Gramsci's writings. In this sense, it sometimes causes seeing different perspectives of the same subject while the researchers were reading on the Gramscianism. Nevertheless, a common literature is originated from the works of Robert W. Cox, Stephen Gill, William I. Robinson, Anrico Augelli and Craig Murphy. Main problematic of Gramsci is how existing groups and social classes formed the hegemony through creating their own intellectuals and the bourgeoisie. Hence, in Gramsci's conception, if how the bourgeoisie got the power is understood, revolution would be succeeded through creating a new counter-hegemonic sphere. In this respect, Gramsci's concept of hegemony is based on the analysis of power relations within the capitalist society.

Realists regard the hegemony as it represents the dominance of one state over another. But for Gramsci, hegemony is formed through a social and political control mechanism. These controls have intellectual, ethical and cultural meaning when it continues through consent of the social classes and groups. Moreover, in the situation of non-existence of the consent situation anymore coercion comes to the fore in terms of applying physical power for the

maintenance of the hegemony. Even both notions living together for the continuation of hegemony, the relations among classes, state and civil society within hegemonic order based on consent rather than coercion. Gramsci's concept of hegemony in some cases gives priority to the consent for the formation of hegemony and in some cases a synthesis between consent and coercion mainly for the maintenance of the hegemonic order. In this respect, coercion and consent have been merged since the consent for the continuation of hegemony was protected by coercion (Barrett, 1997: 239).

In the various studies, Gramsci's concept of hegemony was moved to the international arena and was used to define international dominance in order to explain the formation of hegemony on the international level. The Gramscian analyses of international relations mainly contributed to understanding the debates in the post-Cold-War era. Thus, the single power position of the US in the world politics brought the notion of hegemony to the forefront. Especially, the notion of hegemony and world order are popularly debated in the analyses of the international relations. This is mainly because of Gramsci's concept of hegemony does not bind to the use of hard power in the international politics since it is between objective material forces and political ideas by basing on the cultural perspectives. So, these are the main issues in the post-Cold War era.

### **3. The Concept of Eurocentrism**

According to Edward Said (1978: 10), after the Renaissance and Reform processes, the development in science and technology brought the supremacy of the West. Moreover, with the emergence of the capitalist social structure and inequality of the other parts of the world as a result of colonial history, the hegemonic position of the West was formed (Said, 1978: 10). So, under this hegemonic positioning of the West, Eurocentric perspective was developed and widened to the world with the new conceptions supporting the Western supremacy. In this new identity construction process, Eurocentric thinkers gave supremacy over the Western self and lowered the Eastern cultural perspectives. This issue also affected to the emergence of one sided history, which is showing the West in the center of the human civilization.

The development of Eurocentrism and in relation to this the formation of Western identity perspective provided a progressive characteristic in the scope of rationality of the actions and the development of liberal social and economic models. These developments ensured that the West would deal with the political/economic developments in the world. So, this created an interventionist mentality for the Western political sphere. In this regard, major interventions were made in the name of widening the Western civilization that had a colonial perspective behind it. The historical narrative of Western colonialism concerned to present the East with all manner of regressive and anti-developmental debates. This treatment ensured that slavery and stagnation would be the fate of the East (McDougall, 2002: 197-198). So, the Eurocentric understanding separated the West as at the heart of enlightenment and the East as at the hearth of the medieval darkness in its least developed function.

Moreover, after the nineteenth century the idea of superiority of Europe over the East leads to increase the interventionist policies based on the western supremacy perspective over other nations of other parts of the world (See Amin, 1989). These changes also affected the social sciences in terms of the dominance of Eurocentric concepts. In this respect, the modernist approaches motivated the West to spread own thoughts over other nations by colonizing them. This colonization period affected the colonized countries to have instability in their political systems, especially after the colonization period. This could be related to the emergence of the anti-colonial activities in these colonized countries in a way of counter-hegemonic perspective explained in Gramsci's conception. However, at the end it affected to spread Eurocentric perspectives to these colonized countries, which made them a part of Western intellectual and social development process.

In the public understanding, Eurocentrism is regarded as an analysis that is made through focusing only on the values and the ideas that emerged in the West. Indeed, to be regarded as Eurocentric in research and analyses, it is not important to write only on the West. However, many Eurocentric books can be written about the other parts of the world, even about the global south. The important thing here is how the situation is seen and analyzed either with a Eurocentric perspective or other approach used to define the concept.

One of the important reasons of this incomprehensibility is because of the major analyses using the Eurocentric perspective is becoming under the research area of the social sciences. Since the development of social sciences has been mainly related to finding the analyses and the solutions to the social problems in Europe, the social sciences have grown with the Eurocentric concepts (Gündüz, 2014: 225). As a result of this, Eurocentric concepts dominate the research methods and analyses of the social sciences. According to Gurminder Bhambra (2007: 5), Eurocentrism is the imagination that considers the important developments in the history of Europe has a special influence in the historical development of the world. In this regard, Eurocentric is used to refer the writers, who explicitly celebrate all the things Western.

In relation to the explanations of Eurocentrism, Gramscian concept concerns the civil society for the formation of both hegemony and the counter hegemonic resistance. As a matter of fact, the existence of a powerful civil society is a European phenomenon that developed through the industrialization process. Within this civil society perspective of Gramscian scholars, major debates are going on the formation of the hegemony in its socially constructed nature. It is because of the existence of the civil society background of the hegemonic power. In this regard, because of the hegemonic power base of the civil society, probability for counter hegemony is shown very limited. Also, the general representation of the working class is regarded as captured by the power of global capital (Cox, 1987: 368-91). This is one of the issues that Gramscian concept of hegemony is analyzed within a Eurocentric conception because of it is based on the civil society background.

#### **4. Eurocentrism in Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony**

In the previous studies, Gramscian concept of hegemony was analyzed in its self-generated nature and its proactive inclination to the world politics. However, his conception's Eurocentric focus on the socially constructed developments in the West has not been researched for providing a comprehensive analysis dealing with the past and present situation. Importantly, the concept of Eurocentrism has been challenged by many Gramscian scholars such as Robert Cox through an analysis of the hegemonic nature of it (See Cox and Sinclair, 1996: 191 - 208). Cox has used Gramscian conception of hegemony for the analysis of the international relations to counter the dominant ideologies of the time such as neorealism. Even challenging major theoretical arguments of neorealism, his position of the critic always stayed under the Eurocentric perspective. This is mainly because of the nature of the development process of both theoretical positions, which were in the Western cultural perspective.

The analyses based on Gramscian concept of hegemony mainly deals with the formation of hegemony starting from the civil society level (Gramsci, 1971: 181). In this respect, as explained previously, it is the most useful to analyze the formation of the hegemony in the countries where civil society is developed. Not surprisingly, these countries are in the West as well as the countries emerged under Western cultural development process. So, this makes them be under the domination of Eurocentric perspectives.

Moreover, the reformulation of Gramsci's concept of hegemony for applying to the analyses of international relations is developed also as Neo-Gramscian perspective. It is mostly used to analyze the decline of the power of historical hegemonic countries such as the decline of the British Empire and the emergence of the US hegemony in the post-WWII period. As it is seen

in the historical examples, even in the analysis of international relations, Eurocentrism is majorly seen in the applicability of the Gramscian analysis. However, these all arguments show the effect of Eurocentrism to the analyses in Gramsci's concept of hegemony as well.

Gramsci's early analyzes give important evidence of the applicability of his analysis to the international relations. In *Southern Question*, Gramsci analyzes the inequality between the North and the South of Italy. In this respect, his starting point of the analysis is the ethnic exploitation of the North towards the South (See Gramsci, 1995). Later, he developed his conception for the analysis of the competition between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In this regard, his ideas have been shaped from the existence of inequalities not only in the proletariat - bourgeoisie competition, but also including the peasants and the other subordinated groups in the society. So, in Gramsci's conception, with the alliance of the proletariat and other oppressed groups, a historical bloc could be formed with a new counter-hegemonic perspective against to the hegemonizing dynamics of the bourgeoisie (Gramsci, 1978: 462).

Moreover, starting from the North - South Italy example, this perspective provides the way of analysis in international relations concerning the coalition of subordinated countries against to the existing hegemonic power of the world. In this regard, the major dynamics of the formation of hegemony and the transformation of it with a counter hegemonic process are the important implications of Gramsci's conception. However, as explained previously, this conception considers a strong civil society base of the formation of the hegemony as well as the emergence of a counter hegemonic process. This is applicable to the historical development of the West, which created a Eurocentric perspective on the process.

In the recent process, most of the Gramscian theorists concern global relations rather than the international relations because of the influence of globalization process that came from a similar base of the development in the West. In this regard, the core analytical focus of the governance relations in the global politics again coming from a Eurocentric perspective because of the hegemonic position of the US in the world politics in the post-Cold War period. According to Robert Cox (1987: 216-17), the widening Eurocentric perspectives in global level is related to the economic, social and political development in the West. So, these all developments brought the Eurocentric perspective to the fore as the major acceptable solutions of the problems in global relations.

Moreover, starting from the colonial past and the industrialization process with the side effect of the colonialism, globalization is also the product of development process of the West. Thus, this inevitably brought the Western cultural, economic and political perspectives to the forefront in a way of widening the Eurocentric perspectives. In this regard, counter arguments as well as critical debates position again from the Eurocentric perspective that are seen as a sole remedy to be against to this hegemonic process (Blaut, 1989: 265).

Overall, in the most analyzes based on the Gramscian perspective, major idea is the critique of the hegemonizing dynamics of the bourgeoisie and the global hegemonic actors on the international level, which carry dominant Western capitalist practices and norms from the Western core into the non-Western periphery. In this case, the critical positioning of Gramscian analyzes against to the current level of global relations provides the new strategies. These strategies are produced in the Western social and cultural perspective as both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic perspectives emerge in the historical development process of the West. In sum, Gramscianism produces a Eurocentric conception of both the domestic and global levels.

### **5. Eurocentrism in Gramscian Analysis: The case of US Foreign Policy**

After explaining the Eurocentric nature of Gramsci's concept of hegemony, it is important to explain the process of the emergence of hegemonic powers and its connection to the international politics to better analyze the case of US hegemony. In the Western capitalist societies, as the Eurocentric analyses clarifies, the capture of hegemony includes three areas such as in the political, intellectual and moral. Firstly, it includes the combination of various forces, which have strategic importance as the subjects with the specific interests. This process continues by attributing alternative interests to them and then prevent them following an alternative way of these interests. It was previously mentioned that within the Eurocentric nature of Gramscian conception, the civil society is a place, where hegemony was formed. According to Bob Jessop (2005: 171), hegemony requires the consent of different classes in political, intellectuals and moral leadership to the hegemonic power. In this regard, in the Gramscian perspective, the analysis of the formation of the US and the capitalist hegemony within, reveals that it has developed through basing on the civil society which includes various cultural, class and historical identities.

Secondly, the process of the emergence of hegemonic powers includes the realization of a national-popular project, which covers the interests of the dependent-class forces. In this regard, hegemony requires first of all to have a common ideological point of the various classes that is formed by the organic intellectuals. This ideological point is followed by the classes engaged in the historical bloc to have a common strategy to acquire hegemonic positioning. Besides, this ideological point is designed by considering the ideas of the different classes in the historical bloc and for convincing others for legitimizing the attempts of the formation of their own hegemony. In the colonial history of the US, this process of the development of the national popular project has been based on the Eurocentric perspective. This is because the dominant capitalist ideology that was developed in the historical process brought the cultural hegemony of the European immigrants and the position of others from Asia and Africa remained limited as a result of the exclusion from the dominant identity perspective (Blaut, 1989: 266-67).

Third, it includes the definition of a particular political paradigm (Jessop, 2005: 174). Jessop (2005: 174) expresses that the formation of hegemony in Western capitalist societies is the normal process of acquiring the power. In this respect, hegemonic projects are achieved to get support from all social forces, and hegemonic power is connected to the dominant class fractions rather than dependent class or non-class forces (Jessop, 2005: 176). So, this shows, at the same time, hegemony in terms of material interests mainly occurs within the Western societies. In this respect, this leads the research to explore that this kind of hegemonic relations with a material interest position includes a strong civil society background of the hegemonic powers and the analysis requires using Eurocentric perspectives. Besides, the social relations in the US based on the values of the capitalist society that includes material interests in the development of the social relations.

Concerning the analysis of the case of the US hegemony with the Gramscian lens, since 11 September 2001, the US left the multilateral approach policy and adapted the policy of pre-emptive attack and regime change by force. So, with this approach, recognition of sovereignty of the nation-states, which was agreed by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, were left and this has been a revolution in international relations. It is important to note that the approach of the US for the formation of hegemony during the Cold War was through acquiring the consent of the other countries such as the countries in the Atlantic Alliance (e.g., Western Europe, Greece and Turkey). So, limiting the hegemonic formation in the Atlantic region shows the certain Eurocentric cultural and material perspective (Ikenberry, 1989: 399). This is one of the most important indications of the Eurocentrism in the Gramscian analyses pointing to the formation of the US hegemony.

Moreover, having coercion within the Gramscian concept of hegemony for the continuation of the hegemonic power of the US in the post-Cold War is regarded as the violence based approach that moves away from the consent based concept of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971: 129). Being a hegemonic state requires showing its own economic and cultural model's advantages and keep alive the desire to this model by other people within the other countries. Toward the end of the 1990s, especially after the Asian Crisis, in the words of Gramsci as weakening the hegemonic power, the consent approach in the US hegemony weakened.

The new US approach intended to suppress the local/global instability by creating a powerful army, which promoted the US is the only country that has global interests and showed the ultimate goal to create an empire by establishing a security system based on the US interests. As explained in Gramsci's conception, coercion and consent exist together within a hegemony to shape the direction of the power. However, in the empire, a country's actual or potential use of power over other countries and the influence of internal and external policy reflexes exist. In the understanding of the empire, there is the strategy of continuous expansion and inclusion of the new fields in the sovereignty area of the empire (Meiser, 2017: 23). In connection to this, especially during the George Bush administration in the US, at the time of the the Iraq war in 2003 'shock and awe' strategy was applied to create a hegemonic position of the US in the region. According to Terrence E. Paupp (Paupp, 2009: 172), "the administration assumed that both God and the fortunes of history had blessed their ventures by virtue of the power that came to be vested in them after the events of 9/11." This could be explained as the Iraq War aimed at widening the Eurocentric values that have been developed in the historical process in the US. So, this brought important reactions that could be explained with Gramsci's conception of the emergence of the counter-hegemonic sphere in the Middle East. Besides, notable studies show that the anti-Americanism increased in the Middle East after the Iraq War in 2003.

Moreover, the US foreign policy in the post-2000s is based on freezing the historical problems within its own structural features such as with the EU and Russia and creating solutions alone for international problems that relates the own interest policies (Yıldızoğlu, 2003: 344). These types of imperialistic approaches to shape the world politics under own hegemonic position include the content of the new global policy of the US. In addition to them, the recent power politics of the United States over other countries overlaps with the coercion policy of the hegemonic power to protect or continue its hegemony as explained by Gramsci's concept of hegemony. So, this situation could be explained as the US hegemony, which was created mainly by consent after the WWII, continues and expands with the coercion mainly during the post-Cold War era. This includes widening Eurocentric values and also being against to them in the resistance movements of the countries in which the hegemonic position of the US is aimed to be formed. So, the analysis of this attempt of the formation of US hegemony and resistance movements in the Gramscian lens as the hegemony - counter-hegemony debate requires looking through Eurocentric perspective.

The main difference between imperialism and the hegemony is while hegemony is directing the relations with various mechanisms without having an upper political structure, imperialism sets up sovereignty with the upper structures. In this respect, global institutions play an important role in increasing the influence of hegemonic power over other countries. Thus, according to Keohane (1984: 39), as the hegemonic power in the world politics, it is accepted from the US to "protect the international political economy that it dominates from incursions by hostile adversaries." This historical positioning is mainly related to the idea of the universal significance of the Western civilization as explained by Max Weber (1930: 13). In this regard, the main fact in the post-WWII and also the post-Cold War period is that the hegemony of the US and the Eurocentric values continue in the world politics. So, a Gramscian analysis of the existence of these global institutions stays on their visibility for the continuation of the US hegemony. Namely, the analyses stay within the Eurocentric perspective, both for presenting

the existing situation and the critique of it. Moreover, it is important to clarify that the hegemony does not only need to be coming from a capitalist society. However, the hegemony can be a strategy, even for a socialist background of a country, because of the imperialist nature, can cause to the emergence of a new hegemonic power. The most important example to this argument was a competition between NATO and Soviet Union during the Cold-War period as liberal and imperial hegemonic powers, both were Eurocentric of the development of the political ideologies they follow.

In the light of these arguments, the foreign policy approach of the US in the post-WWII is based on the formation of its hegemonic power with the consent of the countries under the Atlantic Alliance. However, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the new opportunities in the world, especially for the countries in the West affected the US policy to be more interventionist through military power. This foreign policy approach shows that the US tries to maintain its hegemonic position through coercion. Moreover, this policy approach can be regarded also imperialistic without having an upper political structure or empire approach because of the tendency of the US for staying in the policies of the countries where military intervention has been made. Indeed, this is the different faces of the same reality. But the important thing here is, the global hegemony perspective of the US is Eurocentric in terms of the political ideology behind it. Moreover, the analysis or critique of the US hegemony is also Eurocentric because of the materialistic conception behind it. Overall, since the Gramscian concept of hegemony emerged from the analysis of the formation of hegemony in the West and created a new strategy of counter-hegemony against to the existing hegemonic power, this makes the analysis performed in Gramsci's conception as Eurocentric.

## **6. Conclusion**

As a conclusion, an intensive theoretical and empirical study of this research reveals that Gramsci's concept of hegemony is mainly developed in the Western societies where the capitalist domination exists. In notable studies, the notion of hegemony is categorized as liberal and imperial within the Eurocentric perspective. As it is seen in Gramsci's concept of hegemony, Gramscian understanding is much more Western oriented, especially to make a diagnosis and create strategies for the solution of the problem. In this study, the analysis of the case of the US foreign policy reveals that the formation of the hegemonic position of the US in the world politics developed on the Eurocentric perspective in the historical process. This has been mainly related to the dominant position of the Eurocentrism in the US as a result of the migrations from Europe and the colonial activities based on the idea of the supremacy of the European values. Besides, the formation of the hegemony of the US in the world politics widened this Eurocentric perspective. In this sense, major analyses based on the Gramscian conception on the formation of the US hegemony and the counter hegemonic struggle in the world politics stayed in the Eurocentric perspective through using the same terminology and the cultural values developed in the West. In this respect, the research corroborates the hypothesis that the Gramscian concept of hegemony is Eurocentric. This statement doesn't mean that the Gramscian concept cannot propose any aspects of the debates on hegemony and counter-hegemonic movements in Eastern and Southern countries. However, some policy proposals based on Gramscian analysis can be wrong for the countries, where the same historical developments in Europe could not be achieved in the social, political and economic matter. In this respect, for a valid policy proposal or a correct research outcome, the researchers first have to understand the nature of Eurocentrism in Gramsci's concept. Subsequently, they need to develop the non-Eurocentric concepts or the hybrid concepts, based on the level of influence of the Western cultural perspective, for the non-Western countries, where there are different social and political cultures and historical developments.

## References

- Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism*. London: Zed Books, 1989.
- Anderson, Perry. "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci". *New Left Review* 100, (1976), 5-79.
- Barrett, Michele. "Ideology, Politics, Hegemony: From Gramsci to Laclau and Mouffe." *Mapping Ideology*. ed. Žižek, Slovoj. 235-264. London-NewYork: Verso, 1997.
- Bhabra, Gurinder K. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Blaut, James M. "Colonialism and the Rise of Capitalism." *Science & Society* 53/3, (1989), 260-96.
- Cox, Robert W. *Production, Power and World Order*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- Cox, Robert W. & Sinclair, Timothy J. "The Global Political Economy and Social Choice (1991)". *Approaches to World Order*. ed. Cox, Robert W., 191-208. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. and Eds. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from Political Writings 1921-1926*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1978.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *The Southern Question*. Trans. and annotated by P. Verdicchio. West Lafayette, IN: Bordighera, 1995.
- Gündüz, Mustafa. "Kültür ve Medeniyet Bağlamında Batı Merkezci Eğitim ve Eleştirisi." *İnsan & Toplum* 3/6 (2014), 223 - 243.
- Ikenberry, John. "Rethinking the Origins of American Hegemony." *Political Science Quarterly* 104/3 (1989), 375-400.
- Jessop, Bob. *Hegemonya, Post-Fordizm ve Küreselleşme Ekseninde Kapitalist Devlet*. İstanbul: İletişim, 2005.
- Keohane, Robert O. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London, New York: Verso, 1985.
- Lobell, Steven E. *The Challenge of Hegemony: Grand Strategy, Trade and Domestic Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- McDougall, E. Ann. "Discourse and Distortion: Critical Reflections on Studying the Saharan Slave Trade." *Outre-Mers. Revue d'histoire* 89/336 (2002), 195-227.
- Meiser, Jeffrey W. "Liberalism". *International Relations Theory*. ed. Stephen McGlinchey et. al., 22-27. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing, 2017.

## *Eurocentrism in Antonio Gramsci's Concept of Hegemony*

Paupp, Terrence E. "Questions and Answers About Resistance to American Hegemony". *The Future of Global Relations*. ed. Terrence E. Paupp. 171-192. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Sassoon, Anne S. "Prison Notebooks". *The Dictionary of Marxist Thought (Second ed.)*. ed. Bottomore, Tom et. al., 446 - 447. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1991.

Weber, Hermann. "Kommunistische Internationale". *Lexikon des Sozialismus*. ed. Thomas Meyer et. al., Köln: Bund-Verlag, 1986.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. trans. T. Parsons. London: Routledge, 1930.

Wilkinson, David. "Hegemonia: Hegemony, Classical and Modern." *Journal of World-Systems Research* XIV/2, (2008), 119-141.

Yıldızođlu, Ergin. *Hegemonyadan İmparatorluđa*. Istanbul: Everest, 2003.