

The Coronavirus pandemic and the transformation of international order: a short overview

Ababakr, Amer

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ababakr, A. (2022). The Coronavirus pandemic and the transformation of international order: a short overview. *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs*, 8(2), 266-280. <https://www.doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2282266a>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

Copyright © 2022 The author/s
This work is licensed under a CC-BY 3.0 license
(* Corresponding author
Peer review method: Double-blind
Received: 04.03.2022
Accepted: 21.03.2022
Published: 14.06.2022
Review article
DOI: <https://www.doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2282266a>

How to cite:

Ababakr, Amer. 2022. "THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL ORDER: A SHORT OVERVIEW".
Journal of Liberty and International Affairs 8 (2):266-80. <https://e-jlia.com/index.php/jlia/article/view/611>.



THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF INTERNATIONAL ORDER: A SHORT OVERVIEW

Amer Ababakr^{1*}

¹Cyprus International University - Lefkosa, Cyprus  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1868-7256> ✉ amir.mohammadbabekr@gmail.com

Abstract: *The Covid-19 pandemic has affected most of the world, adding health security as a new challenge. Instead of facing these challenges, some states move towards a system of competition and intolerance, which forms new patterns in the international order. This questions the impact of the pandemic on the strategic dynamics of the international order. This article argues that the global pandemic transforms the political system and the way of governing liberal democracy more than any other factor. It took the form of a variable, driver, and accelerator, and the established world order transformed into a new form of order. Using the descriptive-analytical method and the theories of international relations, the current study examined the impact of the pandemic on the strategic dynamics of the international order.*

Keywords: *Covid-19; Pandemic; International Order; IR Theories; Globalization*

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus outbreak in the world is considered a new world war because it has involved most states in various forms. The world after coronavirus will face various challenges in new security categories such as health, treatment, food, and drug security. Some states seem to be moving towards competition and intolerance rather than working together to meet these challenges. Eventually, will this competition and inconsistency lead to a new set of dynamics in the international arena, with a wide range of countries involved?

Despite these new dynamics, the Covid-19 pandemic cannot be considered an independent variable that changes the existing international order. Instead, it can be seen as a kind of 'variable' or 'accelerator' that will accelerate the change process in the existing international order. Therefore, there is little disagreement about whether the current international order has changed as the Covid-19 pandemic unfolds, how these changes will be intensified and deepened, or how the crisis should be managed. There is a difference of opinion. In this case, experts have had numerous discussions about it. All of these debates can help make international relations more dynamic right now. The current study first addresses the theoretical

perspectives and debates related to the post-coronavirus developments and then the geostrategic developments of the coronavirus pandemic within the existing international order. A coronavirus pandemic is undoubtedly a significant event with health, medical, social, economic, political, and security dimensions that have also affected global and international relations. However, as to what and how this affects, there are conflicting theoretical views on whether the corona crisis could fundamentally change the four structural, agency, normative-institutional, and pattern of interaction that underpin the existing international order.

Therefore, this article investigates the geostrategic developments caused by the coronavirus on the international order in the post-corona era. The coronavirus was able to transform the face of the world from a world full of color, cheers, and vibrancy to a silent, sad, and colorless world. Therefore, its scope of influence on the international order did not stop at that time, and it naturally imposed its effects on the post-coronavirus. The coronavirus outbreak has led some experts to say that the time has come to start changing the world order. Indeed, the beginning of the decline of American power, which many American thinkers, including Farid Zakaria, have spoken of in the post-American era, has begun to whisper about the change in the world order.

The coronavirus has become a pervasive challenge and a pandemic for all countries worldwide. The virus first appeared in China, but soon enough, almost all countries struggle with this disease. Every day, more people contract Covid-19 disease and die due to it. To that end, governments had enacted policies involving more significant intervention in areas beyond their legal authority, imposed restrictions on citizens within their own countries, and quarantined many cities and stock markets after another experienced a decline in its sales index and was falling. Companies, offices, and factories were closed down, and the international transportation system was almost shutting down.

Furthermore, in turn, it can be described as an international catastrophe. One of the most critical issues raised during the coronavirus outbreak is the post-Covid-19 world. Many believe that the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic and the failure of the great powers to stop this disease will cause the world order to change in the days after the coronavirus pandemic. Also, they argue that the time has come to start changing the world order. In fact, with the beginning of the decline of American power, many American thinkers such as Farid Zakaria have spoken of the post-American era. They have begun to whisper the change of world order.

VIEWING THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC THROUGH THE LENS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORIES

Experts agree that the coronavirus pandemic is accelerating the changing of the existing international order. However, they do not have a shared outlook on these developments 'intensity and depth' or how they should be managed. Some theoretical approaches emphasize the importance of transnational cooperation and strengthening of international institutions, others on strengthening national governments and the need for economic independence, and others on the importance of international moral cooperation based on transcendental rationality

to deal with the coronavirus pandemic and its consequences. In the following, attention is paid to the most important ones.

The conservative liberal, which many believe represents the ruling current of the American international system in the context of the coronavirus pandemic, believes that while the pandemic will cause minor changes in the international system, it cannot be considered a geopolitical turning point. Joseph Nye, a well-known pioneer of the theory, believes that the coronavirus pandemic is unlikely to affect the international order profoundly. In this context, he emphasizes strengthening and continuing the liberal international order led by the United States. Nye argues that the United States can continue to lead the world because of its geopolitical, demographic, and energy advantages. According to him, the only thing that can change this situation is the nationalist approach of the new American leaders (Nye 2021). Conservative liberals see the only way out of the current coronavirus pandemic is to strengthen international cooperation and avoid nationalism.

Conversely, in contrast to liberals, reformist realists believe that with the coronavirus pandemic, the world will see the revival and return of national governments and strengthen their power. On the other hand, liberal globalization based on interdependence will be weakened. According to Realists, governments have not been able to work together to solve the coronavirus pandemic because of their 'selfishness' and 'independence'. This is despite the need for international cooperation in the face of the crisis (Tsarouhas 2021, 52). Realists have long been critical of liberal globalization, arguing that interdependence cannot change the anarchic nature of the international order because it will increase the vulnerability of countries as much as it benefits. Countries around the world are more vulnerable to economic globalization and interdependence than they used to be (Powell 1994).

The effects of the 2008 US financial crisis on other countries are undeniably evident. Stephen Walt, a well-known theorist of this theory, believes that in the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, governments have increased their interventions in the political-economic system to manage the crisis and control the emergency, which has led to authoritarianism in some countries, especially in West Asia, because these governments are not readily willing to return to their previous level of authority. Tensions between Donald Trump and New York Governor Andrew Cuomo over how to handle the coronavirus pandemic in this area signaled a shift from protectionism to authoritarianism. Under the pretext of managing quarantine in the country, Trump has called for interference in the internal affairs of US states, which has challenged the US system of federalism (Kissinger 2020). Although the United States is independent in many of its internal affairs, including health, food, economics, and so on, Trump has called for increased authoritarianism and authority over state affairs. This confirms the view of realists in the event of a coronavirus pandemic to strengthen national power and economic independence and increase authoritarianism in a country's system of government.

This theory believes in the possibility and necessity of 'change' in the existing international order because they consider this order unjust and based on unequal economic and ideological structures. Critical theorists have cited the example of unjust ideological structures in managing the coronavirus pandemic. Western liberal countries choose from among the coronavirus patients, and their medical system, like their socio-political system, is based on cost-benefit logic and principles. They abandoned philanthropy and did not prioritize elderly patients

in their medical services (Mngomezulu 2020). Accordingly, critical theorists have criticized the 'cost-benefit' reason based on 'instrumental reason' and, in contrast, have emphasized the 'benefit-benefit' logic based on 'moral-transcendental rationality'. The leading theorists are the famous German thinker Jürgen Habermas and the American theorist Noam Chomsky. At the level of developing countries, officials such as former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad are among the critical leaders. Mahathir Mohamad also criticized the US liberal policies in managing international politics in an article entitled 'Redrawing Governance in a Multipolar World' in the months leading up to the coronavirus pandemic at the Munich Security Conference (Lemière 2020). He attributed many of the problems in the Islamic world to US interventions and purely materialistic culture. However, critical theorists emphasize the need to avoid the cost-benefit nationalist logic and delegate more powers to transnational institutions.

Given the threats to US hegemony, particularly the deterioration of its soft power position in managing the international coronavirus pandemic 'which even the president had underestimated', some theorists predicted that the coronavirus pandemic would hasten the process of international power transfer and the formation of post-Western international relations. Of course, there is a complete consensus among experts on this point. Joseph Nye believes that a hegemonic power, in addition to having undisputed material power, which is a set of economic and military power, must also be culturally and normatively a universal hegemonic culture. China has no such power (Nye 2021). Given the decline in US hegemony and the rise of China as an economic power with successful experience in managing many crises, including the coronavirus pandemic, it can be concluded that a 'Bipolar order' or 'Multipolar order' will be formed with a Sino-US focus, which will weaken the US international position day by day. However, while we may not see a shift in international relations towards a Chinese hegemonic order in the short term, China's growing power, especially in recent years, promises to move to one of the poles.

THE CHANGING OF INTERNATIONAL ORDER UNDER THE STRATEGIC EFFECTS OF THE CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC

The Covid-19 pandemic as an accelerating variable, in addition to influencing theoretical debates and theories of international relations, has also affected the strategic developments and dynamics of the international system, the most important results of which include the following: in the weakening of globalization, many believe that the coronavirus pandemic in the world has led states to conclude that they must separate. It no longer makes sense to unite the world. They believe that 'in order for the security of countries' relations not to be compromised, their economic dependencies must be separated. They conclude that there should be a reconsideration of the 'international supply system' and the international transmission network "emphasizing the independent role of states and domestic authorities", at least in the case of health goods (Makin and Layton 2021, 347). Since then, the coronavirus pandemic has exacerbated these intertwined international systems and the inefficiency of states in dealing with it (Barzani and Jalal 2021, 34). Due to the lack of independence of many states in the production of medical goods and services, including the production of diagnostic kits, advanced respirators, and effective drugs, and as a result of the interconnected production networks and supply of

medical goods among many states, especially Western countries, any independent and effective action by each of these states has faced difficulties and challenges.

It is worth mentioning that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, global supply and demand chains were tied to the US state. Due to the existence of a single chain, a system of shared interests was created for most countries; “as this global system of supply and demand expanded, so did the conflict between powers” (Carreño *et al.* 2020). This system, which resulted from US rule and governance after the Cold War, created a fascination and popularity for some international powers that used it to manage the international system. The United States acted as the ‘regulator’ of this global supply-demand chain, resulting in the formation of a White House-centered global convergence and the resolution of crises with US intervention and involvement. An example of this was the US government’s role in resolving the 2008 financial crisis by intervening and manipulating global economic markets.

However, the problems of recent years, especially after the outbreak of the coronavirus pandemic, which posed serious challenges for the United States, have challenged its role as a ‘regulator of the global supply and demand system’. This situation, accompanied by a kind of break-in globalization, has left the United States more insecure and vulnerable (Debata Patnaik and Mishra 2020). This is because it is no longer considered a regulator of the global supply and demand system ‘global hegemony’, but the evolving problems caused by the coronavirus pandemic have reduced US global maneuvering and intensified global competition, which is putting the global interests of the United States in danger. Under these circumstances, as Realist thinkers of international relations argue, convergence between states is no longer an issue, and many actors see themselves as “losers of globalization” (Keohane 2021, 117). Because globalization and the integration of countries into trade and economic unions have not solved a problem for them in times of coronavirus pandemic, this independent and complex international system has added to their problems. This group of Realists concluded that due to the inability of this system, and consequently the efforts of countries to maintain economic independence and self-help, globalization is cracking and collapsing. As a result, we will see a kind of ‘centralism’ in countries’ government systems or international supply and demand systems.

Furthermore, the ‘regional influence’ of actors increased competition. Following the spread of the coronavirus pandemic throughout the world and, consequently, the rupture in globalization, one of the concepts gaining importance and subjectivity is the issue of ‘regional influence’. The Rand Institute addresses this issue in a report entitled ‘The Impact of Covid-19 on Strategic Movements in the Middle East’. The paper identifies the region’s most important post-Covid-19 consequences, such as the development of the Iran-US confrontation on the periphery and additional Russian and Chinese interventions in the Middle East, which, if the crisis persists, will transform the region’s security. (Kaye 2020). Many thinkers believe that today’s world moves where the United States can no longer contain its regional influence. Hence, it must recognize the regional influence of competitors. Leading Harvard professor Graham Allison, in a new article in *Foreign Affairs Magazine* (March-April 2021) titled ‘Regional Influence Must Be Recognized’, shows the flag of returning US ships from the region to explain the reduction of US influence in different parts of the world and, consequently, the acceptance of competition by the great powers (Allison 2020). In addition, Graham Schuler, a well-known Neoclassical Realist, also redefined ‘power and security’ in an article in the same *Foreign Affairs* magazine, stating that

with the coronavirus pandemic, we are witnessing a phenomenon called 'We are a World of Regions' and moving towards a more geopolitical world. Schuler cites China's competition in the Pacific and regional powers' presence in the Gulf as examples of the post-Covid-19 world.

Competition resulting from the coronavirus pandemic can take shape at the geopolitical and ideological level in the region. Reducing energy prices and, consequently, increasing or decreasing the presence of powers in peripheral regions, for example, the presence of Russia and China in West Asia, the presence of Saudi Arabia in Yemen, the presence of Iran in peripheral regions, etc., can lead to geopolitical rivalries between the powers of this region. Falling oil prices could also increase ethnic-security conflicts within different countries. For example, 90% of Iraq's budget depends on oil which could lead to instability given the social unrest in recent years that has led to Prime Minister Adel Abdul-Mahdi (Brankston *et al.* 2021, 369). On the other hand, these rivalries took place between different political systems and ideologies on managing and overcoming the coronavirus pandemic.

In addition, the importance of religion and ethics during the pandemic has emerged in the current context among many religious leaders and even political scientists who pay attention to the importance of religion in the coronavirus and post-coronavirus world. According to Daniel Winston, a professor at the University of California, Corona is a 'divine punishment'. Therefore, all world leaders must address this essential human dilemma through solidarity, closeness to each other, and altruistic practices. The 2035 Atlantic Council report also addresses this issue. In the new (coronavirus) context, the report said we must have a renaissance in economics, politics, religion, and spirituality (Prazeres Bohl and Zhang 2021). The critical point made by some scholars and officials, and even claimed by the President of the United States, is 'praying' to God, and those in times of human despair, God is the only savior of humanity. This shows that transcendental and metaphysical issues are gaining strength even among those who do not have much faith in spirituality and morality (Bahi 2021, 89). Religious scholars and theologians raise the issue of sincere cooperation among different religions. They say that Islam, Judaism, Christianity, and other divine religions must have stronger ties and work together to fight this disease.

SHOULD THE WORLD GET READY FOR THE NEW ORDER?

After the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the system of international relations was based on the 'balance of power' system. This meant that power in the world was evenly distributed among the powerful European states by joining or separating. This created a balance of power between countries and thus prevented one state from dominating the other states. After World War I, and the defeat of Germany, a new system called the 'Collective Security System', was introduced by then-US President Wilson (Andreatta and Koenig-Archibugi 2010, 215). Consequently, all states, 'not just the great powers', sought to choose a cooperation strategy to achieve world peace. With the failure of the collective security system to establish and maintain world peace, the victorious and powerful nations of World War II established a bipolar order centered on the United States and the Soviet Union. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, a new order reigned in the world. At present, different theories about world order are being proposed by thinkers (Caplan Reis and Grasten 2021, 11).

Some believe that a hierarchical system rules the world, while others use 'unipolar-multipolar' term. In any case, the United States sees itself as the superpower of the current world order. The decline of American power, which many American thinkers, such as Farid Zakaria, have spoken of since the post-American era, has led to whispers of a change in the global order.

Covid-19 has caused many international structures to show their practical inefficiency (Ramsey and Chen, 2021). In the current context, states worldwide have tightened their grip on the global economy, leading to economic nationalism and economic independence. Even Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte stressed: First, let us defeat the virus, then think about Europe, and if necessary, say goodbye to the EU, without even thanking it. (Kahl 2021). In the current context, states worldwide have tightened their grip on the global economy, leading to economic nationalism and economic independence. They have begun to stockpile food and increase their strategic reserves. After all, it looked like we would see more nationalism and less globalism. In addition, Henry Kissinger, a former secretary of state and national security adviser to the Nixon and Ford administrations, in an article in the Wall Street Journal, refers to the global outbreak of the coronavirus and its economic and political consequences (Kissinger 2020). In this warning, Kissinger predicts that the political and economic crises caused by this disease will continue for a long time and future generations. The American political theorist also warned of the weakening of nations' relations due to the virus and the collapse of regional and international social ties.

Overall, the outbreak of the Covid-19 throughout the world and the imposition of staggering costs on states have prompted many to speak of a shift in power in the international arena. Throughout history, the rules of international relations and crises have shifted. Undoubtedly, the Covid-19 pandemic is one of the greatest humanitarian crises of the last few centuries. Of course, it should be noted that the signs of change in the world order first appeared many years ago, and the decline of the United States as the creator of the current order is the biggest reason for the possibility of global change. The growth of nationalist tendencies and the fading of liberal doctrines and norms will accelerate this process.

THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC AND THE 'GEOMETRY OF POWER'

Some believe that we will see the end of liberal globalization, while others consider that humanity will experience another kind of globalization, centered on China. So much so that the current globalization and liberal order, based on America's undisputed hegemony and role-playing, is now shifting to China. In this regard, we should not ignore the actions of Trump, who, with the slogan 'America First' and the policies he adopted, actually dealt a heavy blow to the liberal world system of which the United States itself was the architect after World War II. Therefore many Liberals attacked him (Li 2021). Of course, there is much consensus that the coronavirus disease is a driver of the transfer of power from the United States to China. However, there is also a belief that this transfer of power geometry cannot be fully hoped for soon. This is because of China's strategic isolation, unlike the United States, which has a global NATO arm and prominent allies such as Europe, Japan, South Korea, and many other East and West Asia. The United States has a security-defense pact with 130 countries, while China has territorial and border problems. In addition to the US World Military Aristocracy, the United

States has bases in 96 parts of the world, including 43 countries and islands, or has the right to use them. The number of Chinese overseas bases is only three, which is conditional (OHCHR 2021). The US has strategic dominance over the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. However, China dominates only part of the China Sea south and east of the Pacific, also associated with intense US competition and presence.

The Covid-19 pandemic's other influence stems from the competition between different political systems and beyond, between opposing political ideologies, over how to manage and emerge victorious from this crisis. Which model of government and governance can best manage the coronavirus pandemic is a critical issue and plays a decisive role in the post-coronavirus international system. Noam Chomsky believes that after the Covid-19 pandemic, we will see two kinds of political order and governance model: one is the strengthening of authoritarian and extremist authoritarian states; the other is actual democratic states accountable to the people, 'not necessarily liberal democracies' who want more legitimacy and popular responsibility (Grieco 2018). Another model would be a return to the restored welfare states because neoliberal states have been widely criticized for failing to intervene in health care and public health - for being uneconomical and incompatible with the cost-benefit logic of capitalism - which has clearly shown its harmful effects and inefficiency in the Covid-19 pandemic. We see a clear example of welfare states today in the Scandinavian countries. Hence, some argue that the neoliberal order should be redefined and replaced by a reformed form of the welfare state (Basur and Kliem 2021). Responsible governments come to power and play a more significant role in the public sphere, especially for health care and public health and welfare.

The Covid-19 pandemic and its management in European countries have also affected the European Union. This is primarily based on the fact that today, the European Union is the 'sick man of Europe'. This Union is not in a favorable or even acceptable position internally and globally. Despite all the efforts made to strengthen this Union, it faces problems and challenges in internal cohesion and international mapping. In its internal structure, it has lost one of the main pillars of the Union, namely England, with the election issue (Capan Reis and Grasten 2021). During the Covid-19 pandemic, the rapid growth of casualties in the EU and the inability to manage and support the EU organization to control the disease and meet the medical needs of EU countries resulted in whispers heard in public circles and politicians of some EU countries to end cooperation with it. There are three different and conflicting views on what and how the Covid-19 pandemic will affect the fate and future of the European Union:

A pessimistic and radical view that believes in the collapse of Europe, proponents of this case has been working to make the actual transcript of this statement available online. As a result, the crisis and how it will be managed will accelerate the process of leaving the EU, which began with the election (Carreño *et al.* 2020). They argue that signs of this situation are now evident in Europe. Some opposition figures in EU countries are also talking about the possibility of considering the country's exit plan from the European Union.

In contrast, some argue that the Covid-19 pandemic did not lead to the EU's demise but rather encouraged convergence and collaboration inside the EU. Since the EU does not have the necessary institutions and mechanisms for the collective management of the Covid-19, such mechanisms will be created after the Covid-19 pandemic (Tsarouhas 2021, 53).

This crisis led to the transfer of more healthcare powers from national governments to EU institutions, which strengthened and deepened European transnationalism. Accordingly, Europeanists such as Habermas emphasize the need to avoid nationalism and unilateralism in dealing with this crisis and its collective management. Habermas, for example, has recommended the establishment of a joint coronavirus pandemic fund in the European Union.

In the form of Realism, the third view is that the EU will see a kind of divergence. Vertical and horizontal convergence in Europe weakened, and the North-South divide in the EU intensified. Because the Southerners are most affected by the Covid-19 and have not received any help from the Northerners (Makin and Layton 2021, 347). It also deepens the East-West divide in the Union between old and new Europe. Eastern countries remain in this Union because they have more benefits from joining it.

In contrast, there will be a greater tendency to diverge in Western European countries. It is also envisaged that in the process of divergence, some of the powers and powers of national sovereignty that the members had delegated to the Union would be taken back. As a result, Europe will see a kind of spill-back. Also, as the European Union's democratic deficit continues to be compensated, it seems that the role of the people in determining their destiny will increase in the form of holding all-out polls to realize divergences. The depiction of the post-Corona world situation reflects essential developments in the international system, including the weakening of globalization, the rise of global-regional competition, the recession and the challenge of the global economy, and the weakening of international cooperation. In addition, the performance of Western liberal states in adopting the cost-benefit logic and economic-health dichotomy during the Covid-19 pandemic has left the Western liberal-democratic model incapable in the face of many current international crises. On the other hand, it increases the tendency towards 'socially responsible states' that simultaneously play a more significant role in public service and consider human values independent of material gain in times of crisis.

The Covid-19 pandemic's effect at the international level is the change in patterns of friendship and enmity in international relations. The patterns of interaction between international actors change and transform. On the one hand, the positive interaction of cooperation between some Eastern powers, such as China and Russia, increased. Bilateral trade between Russia and China increases thanks to high energy prices, increased Russian coal exports to China via Far Eastern ports, and increased gas flows through the Power of Siberia pipeline. According to opinion polls, these favorable trends are also evident to the general population in both countries. The pandemic did not affect ordinary Russians' favorable feelings toward China (Pan 2021).

On the other hand, as the competition between China and India intensifies, China's handling of the Covid-19 pandemic has bolstered the country's skepticism in many sectors in India. The Indian government's rhetoric has been restrained, reflecting the country's need for medical supplies from China and its desire to maintain a stable relationship. Nevertheless, Beijing's handling of the Covid-19 pandemic has exacerbated Delhi's underlying strategic and economic concerns. India's pharmaceutical sector imports most of its advanced pharmaceutical ingredients from China. Another concern is Chinese entities exploiting the crisis and China's apparent early recovery for various purposes (Madan 2021).

Another outcome of the Covid-19 pandemic is the likelihood that cooperation between Iran and the Gulf Arab states has strengthened in resolving the ongoing situation. Qatar, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates have delivered humanitarian aid to Iran during the Ebola pandemic. The UAE extended an incredibly kind gesture by sending flights carrying WHO experts to the Persian Gulf country. This outreach appears to be motivated by three factors. Aid may help these Gulf states soften any planned Iranian hostility toward their neighbors and earn some credit for their 'acts of kindness' globally. By offering medical assistance now, Gulf powers may be exposing the regime's inability to care for its citizens. The crisis may make Iran more receptive to de-escalating hostilities to address domestic issues (Singh 2021).

Furthermore, authoritarianism is increasing in Western Asia, characterized by the repression of opposition. The epidemic has had the most immediate impact on Southeast Asia's governance through the acts of leaders who have used the crisis to expand their powers and punish political adversaries. The most widespread power grabs have occurred in Cambodia, the Philippines, and Thailand, the three countries that have trended poorly in recent years. In handling the pandemic in Southeast Asia, Vietnam and Singapore led the way with their early national responses (Harding 2020).

More importantly, competition between the United States and China has become more militant. The pattern of cooperation between the United States and Europe also weakened, and the pattern of competition between the two strengthened. Evidence for this claim is that today we see more cooperation and coordination outside the Western world. However, in the Western world, we see a deepening gap between the two sides of the Atlantic (Europe and the United States). So, Europeans were very dissatisfied with the US position, especially during the Trump era. In the post-Crown international system, intra-bloc competition intensifies in the Western world.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from what has been suggested that the Covid-19 pandemic affects all four components of structure, agency, normative-institutional, and pattern of interaction that are the basis of the existing international order. First, political systems and liberal governance are subject to change domestically. Second, new actors and powers outside the West strengthened. As a result, at the structural level, the material structure of the international system, which means how the units are arranged, also changes. At the normative-institutional level, liberal values, norms, and institutions based on liberalism as an ideology that legitimizes the established international system are weakened and transformed. Eventually, the pattern of interactions means patterns of friendship, enmity, competition, and cooperation between international actors.

Consequently, whether we like it or not, the post-Covid-19 international system is different from the existing international system and the order established within it. We must prepare ourselves for a post-Covid-19 world in which the nature of the political order and the way of governing are different. According to this article, the Covid-19 pandemic radically transforms the political system and current liberal democracy more than any other factor. In the form of a variable, driver, and accelerator, the established world order is transformed into the

following forms: It changes the patterns of friendship and enmity in international relations. The positive cooperation between Eastern powers, such as China and Russia, has increased. The possibility of cooperation between Iran and the Arab countries to manage the current crisis has also increased. Authoritarianism is on the rise in West Asia. The economies of Western countries are in a recession. Single-product economies such as oil can be challenged in Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Russia. Competition between China and India has intensified. The competition pattern between the United States and China has become more militant. The pattern of cooperation between the United States and Europe has also been weakened, and the pattern of competition between the two has been strengthened. Collaboration and coordination are increasing outside the Western world.

In addition, it widened the gap between the two sides of Atlantic Europe and America. The intra-bloc competition has intensified in the West. The Covid-19 pandemic is a mediating variable from the realists' point of view, a disturbing variable from the American point of view, and an independent variable from the idealists' point of view that can move the United States from the independent security balance variable to the disruptive function variable. A united Europe as a second power continued to follow the United States, and beyond the Covid-19 pandemic, the Union's power and role at the international level have greatly diminished. The bottom line is that liberal globalization also faced many challenges in the post-Crown world, and we are witnessing the strengthening of nation-states and economic mercantilism.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Acknowledgments:

Not applicable.

Funding:

Not applicable.

Statement of human rights:

This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any authors.

Statement on the welfare of animals:

This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any authors.

Informed consent:

Not applicable.

REFERENCES

1. Allison, Graham. 2020. "The New Spheres of Influence Sharing the Globe With Other Great Powers". *The Foreign Affairs Magazine*, 20 March. Access 14 November 2021. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-02-10/new-spheres-influence>
2. Andreatta, Filippo, Koenig-Archibugi, Mathias. 2010. "Which Synthesis? Strategies of Conceptual Integration and the Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate". *International Political Science Review* 31(2): 207–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512110364258>
3. Bahi, Riham. 2021. "The Geopolitics of COVID-19: US-China Rivalry and the Imminent Kindleberger Trap". *Review of Economics and Political Science* 6(1): 76-94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/REPS-10-2020-0153>
4. Basrur, Rajesh, Kliem, Frederick. 2021. "COVID-19 and International Cooperation: IR Paradigms at Odds". *SN Social Sciences* 1(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-020-00006-4>
5. Barzani, Sami & Jalal, Rayan. (2021). "Students' Perceptions towards Online Education during COVID-19 Pandemic: An Empirical Study". *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 8(2): 28-38.
6. Brankston, Gabrielle, and et al. 2021. "Socio-Demographic Disparities in Knowledge Practices and Ability to Comply with COVID-19 Public Health Measures in Canada". *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 112(3): 363-75. <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-021-00501-y>
7. Capan, Zeynep, Reis, Filipe, and Grasten, Maj. 2021. "The Politics of Translation in International Relations". In: Zeynep Gulash, Filipe dos, Grasten, eds. *The Politics of Translation in International Relations*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-19.
8. Carreño, Ignacio et al. 2020. "The Implications of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Trade". *European Journal of Risk Regulation* 11(2): 402-10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2020.48>
9. Debata, Byomakesh, Patnaik, Pooja and Mishra, Abhisk. 2020. "COVID-19 Pandemic! It's Impact on People Economy and Environment". *Journal of Public Affairs* 20(4): 23-72. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2372>
10. Grieco, Joseph. 2018. "Realism Neoliberal Institutionalism and the Problem of International Cooperation". In: Katzenstein, ed. *Cooperation among Nations*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 27-50.
11. Harding, Brian. 2020. "Is Coronavirus Making Southeast Asia More Authoritarian?". *The United States Institute of Peace*. June 2020. Access 20 March 2022. <https://www.usip.org/publications/2020/06/coronavirus-making-southeast-asia-more-authoritarian>
12. Kaye, Dalia. 2020. "COVID-19 Impacts on Strategic Dynamics in the Middle East". *The RAND Corporation*, 26 March. Access 10 November 2021. <https://www.rand.org/blog/2020/03/covid-19-impacts-on-strategic-dynamics-in-the-middle.html>
13. Keohane, Robert. 2020. "International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory". Oxford: Routledge.

14. Keohane, Robert. 2021. "The Global Politics Paradigm: Guide to the Future or Only the Recent Past". *International Theory* 13(1): 112-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752971920000445>
15. Kissinger, Henry. 2020. "The Coronavirus pandemic Will Forever Alter the World Order". *The Wall Street Journal*, 3 April. Access 10 November 2021.
<https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-coronavirus-pandemic-will-forever-alter-the-world-order-11585953005>
16. Lemièrè, Sophie. 2020. "The never-ending political game of Malaysia's Mahathir Mohamad". *The Brookings Institution*, 30 October. Access 22 November, 2021.
<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/10/30/the-never-ending-political-game-of-malaysias-mahathir-mohamad/>
17. Li, Xirui. 2021. "Why China and the United States Aren't Cooperating on COVID-19". *East Asia Forum* 24, Access 19 November, 2021.
<https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2021/07/24/why-china-and-the-united-states-arent-cooperating-on-COVID-19/>
18. Madan, Tanvi. 2021. "How is the coronavirus outbreak affecting China's relations with India?". *The Brookings Institution*. June 2021. Access 20 March 2022.
<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/04/30/how-is-the-coronavirus-outbreak-affecting-chinas-relations-with-india/>
19. Makin, Anthony, and Layton, Allan. 2021. "The Global Fiscal Response To COVID-19: Risks And Repercussions". *Economic Analysis and Policy* 69, 340-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2020.12.016>
20. Mngomezulu, Bheki. 2020. "The Politics of the Coronavirus and its Impact on International Relations". *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 14(3): 116-25. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR2020.1271>
21. Nye, Joseph. 2021. "Soft power: the evolution of a concept". *Journal of Political Power* 14(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2021.1879572>
22. OHCHR. 2021. "In Defence of a Renewed Multilateralism to Address the COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Global Challenges: Report". *UN Human Rights: Office of the High Commissioner*, 18 September. Access 29 November, 2021.
<https://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/IntOrder/Pages/covid19-multilateralism.aspx>
23. Powell, Robert. 1994. "Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate". *International Organization* 48(2): 313-44.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706934> (accessed 27 November 2021).
24. Pan, Yanliang, 2021. "Post-Pandemic, Russia and China Must Improve Migration Governance". *Carnegie Moscow Center*. June 2021. Access 20 March 2022.
<https://carnegiemoscow.org/commentary/86089>
25. Prazeres Tatiana, Bohl, David and Zhang, Pepe. 2021. "China-LAC Trade: Four Scenarios in 2035". *Atlantic Council*, May 2021. Access 18 November, 2021.
<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/in-depth-research-reports/china-lac-trade-four-scenarios-in-2035/>
26. Ramsey, Austin and Chen, Amy. 2021. "Rejecting Covid-19 Inquiry, China Peddles Conspiracy Theories". *New York Times*, 12 October. Access 10 November, 2021.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/25/world/asia/china-coronavirus-covid-conspiracy-theory.html>

27. Singh, Manjari. 2021. "The Influence of Coronavirus on Diplomatic Relations: Iran, China, Gulf Arabs, and India". *The Washington Institute for Near East Policy*. May 2022. Access 20 March 2021. <https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/influence-coronavirus-diplomatic-relations-iran-china-gulf-arabs-and-india>
28. Tsarouhas, Dimitris. 2021. "Neoliberalism Liberal Intergovernmentalism and EU–Turkey Relations. In EU-Turkey Relations: Theories, Institutions, and Policies". In: Reiners and Turhan, eds. UK: Palgrave Macmillan Cham. 39-61.