

The New Mediterranean Strategic Order

Sea Power, Sovereignty and the Hellenic Imperative in an Age of Regional Revisionism

Demetrios Tsailas (ret Admiral)

(He has taught for many years, operational planning, strategy, and security, to senior officers at the Supreme Joint War College. He is a member and researcher of the Institute for National and International Security)

Copyright: @ 2026 Research Institute for European and American Studies (www.rieas.gr) Publication date: 21 June 2026

Note: The article reflects the opinion of the author and not necessarily the views of the Research Institute for European and American Studies

Introduction: The Return of Geopolitics in the Mediterranean

The Mediterranean is entering a new strategic era. The post-Cold War order that shaped the basin for more than three decades, characterized by overwhelming American predominance, European economic influence, and a relatively stable maritime environment, is gradually giving way to a more fluid and competitive geopolitical landscape. The wars in Gaza and Syria, the confrontation between Israel and Iran, the growing activism of regional powers, and the re-emergence of great-power competition have collectively accelerated a profound restructuring of the Mediterranean strategic system.

Three interconnected developments define this transition.

First, hard power has returned as the primary currency of international politics. Military capabilities, deterrence, technological superiority, and the ability to project force are once again decisive factors in shaping regional outcomes. The assumption that economic interdependence and international institutions would progressively mitigate geopolitical rivalries has been challenged by a succession of conflicts

demonstrating that power remains the ultimate guarantor of security and political influence.

Second, the Mediterranean is witnessing the rise of assertive regional actors capable of independently shaping strategic developments. Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and increasingly Morocco are no longer merely responding to external initiatives; they are actively constructing their own spheres of influence through military modernization, economic statecraft, technological innovation, and diplomatic engagement. This trend reflects the emergence of a more multipolar Mediterranean order in which regional powers possess unprecedented strategic autonomy.

Third, maritime space has re-emerged as a decisive arena of geopolitical competition. Energy corridors, offshore resources, submarine communications cables, ports, logistics hubs, and critical maritime chokepoints have become strategic assets whose security directly affects both national prosperity and regional stability. The Eastern Mediterranean in particular is evolving into a zone where economic opportunity, military competition, and technological rivalry intersect with growing intensity.

Consequently, the Mediterranean can no longer be viewed simply as Europe's southern neighborhood or as a secondary theatre of international politics. It is becoming one of the principal geopolitical crossroads of the twenty-first century, a region where the interests of global and regional powers converge, where conflicts in the Middle East reverberate across Europe and North Africa, and where control of maritime connectivity increasingly shapes the distribution of power.

For Greece and the wider Hellenic world, these developments carry particular significance. Situated at the intersection of Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, and North Africa, Greece occupies a pivotal position within the emerging strategic architecture of the Eastern Mediterranean. In such an environment, sovereignty cannot be understood solely in legal or territorial terms. It increasingly depends upon the capacity of the state to secure its maritime domain, protect critical infrastructure, maintain credible deterrence, and influence the broader strategic environment.

From this perspective, the contemporary transformation of the Mediterranean represents more than a regional geopolitical adjustment. It marks the return of a strategic reality deeply embedded in the historical experience of Hellenism: that power, geography, and maritime security remain inseparable foundations of sovereignty. Understanding this evolving strategic landscape is therefore essential not only for assessing the future of the Mediterranean, but also for defining Greece's role within the emerging regional order.

The Return of Classical Geopolitics

The strategic developments unfolding across the Mediterranean and the wider Middle East signal the unmistakable return of classical geopolitics. From the continuing instability in Gaza and the uncertain reconstruction of Syria to the fragmentation of Libya and the confrontation between Israel and Iran, regional dynamics increasingly reflect traditional struggles over power, security, territory, and influence rather than the cooperative assumptions that dominated much of the post-Cold War era.

For several decades, many policymakers and scholars argued that economic globalization, growing interdependence, and the expansion of international institutions would gradually reduce the likelihood of interstate confrontation. The expectation was that trade, investment, and multilateral governance would create incentives for cooperation that would ultimately outweigh geopolitical rivalries. Recent events, however, have exposed the limitations of this assumption. Economic interconnectedness has not eliminated strategic competition; rather, it has often created new vulnerabilities that states seek to exploit or protect.

Across the Mediterranean basin, strategic realities are once again shaped by enduring factors that have historically determined the rise and decline of powers. Military capabilities remain central to the ability of states to deter adversaries and protect national interests. Control of maritime communication routes, energy corridors, and strategic chokepoints continues to confer disproportionate geopolitical influence. Technological superiority, particularly in the fields of unmanned systems, cyber warfare, artificial intelligence, and precision-guided weapons, has become an

increasingly decisive element of national power. At the same time, demographic resilience and internal political cohesion have emerged as critical indicators of a state's capacity to sustain long-term strategic competition.

The conflicts of recent years illustrate that power in the twenty-first century is exercised through a combination of conventional military strength, technological innovation, economic leverage, and information dominance. States that successfully integrate these dimensions possess a significant strategic advantage, while those unable to do so risk marginalization within an increasingly competitive regional order.

In this environment, sovereignty can no longer be understood solely as a legal status guaranteed by international law or international institutions. Formal recognition and legal rights remain important components of the international system, but they are insufficient when not supported by the practical capacity to defend national interests and protect strategic assets. The ability to secure borders, safeguard critical infrastructure, maintain freedom of navigation, and preserve national decision-making autonomy has become an essential dimension of effective sovereignty.

This reality is particularly relevant in the Mediterranean, where competing claims over maritime zones, energy resources, migration routes, and regional influence have intensified. The growing importance of the Eastern Mediterranean demonstrates that geopolitical competition is increasingly linked to the control of maritime spaces and the infrastructure that supports modern economies.

More than two millennia ago, Thucydides identified a fundamental characteristic of international politics: security ultimately depends upon the capacity of political communities to safeguard their interests within an international system where uncertainty and competition are permanent features. While the instruments of power have evolved dramatically since the Peloponnesian War, the underlying strategic logic remains remarkably familiar.

The Mediterranean of 2026 increasingly reflects this reality. It is becoming a geopolitical arena characterized by shifting alignments, competing regional ambitions, technological rivalry, and renewed struggles for strategic influence. Understanding

this return to classical geopolitics is essential for assessing the evolving balance of power in the region and for defining the strategic choices that confront states positioned at its center—including Greece, whose security and prosperity have always been intimately linked to the dynamics of the Mediterranean system.

The Trump Doctrine and the Reconfiguration of American Power

Contrary to repeated predictions of an American strategic retreat from the Middle East, the second Trump administration has reasserted United States influence across the wider Mediterranean and Middle Eastern strategic space. Rather than withdrawing from the region, Washington has adopted a different model of engagement—one that prioritizes strategic outcomes over institutional processes and emphasizes power relationships over traditional multilateral diplomacy.

This approach represents a significant departure from the interventionist doctrines that shaped American policy during the first decades of the post-Cold War era. The objective is no longer the ambitious transformation of regional societies through state-building projects or prolonged military occupations. Instead, American strategy increasingly focuses on managing the regional balance of power, containing hostile actors, securing critical maritime routes, and strengthening partnerships capable of preserving a favorable strategic equilibrium.

The emerging doctrine is characterized by several interconnected elements. First, the United States has embraced selective engagement, concentrating resources on issues directly affecting its strategic interests while avoiding costly commitments that offer limited geopolitical returns. Second, bilateral arrangements have become increasingly important, allowing Washington to exercise influence through tailored relationships rather than broad multilateral frameworks. Third, strategic partnerships with key regional actors have assumed a central role in American policy, reinforcing local capabilities while reducing the need for direct American intervention. Fourth, economic leverage—including investment, sanctions, energy policy, and technological cooperation—has become an essential instrument of geopolitical competition. Finally, deterrence through the credible threat of overwhelming force

remains a cornerstone of American strategy, particularly in relation to Iran and other revisionist actors.

Within this framework, the Abraham Accords represent far more than a diplomatic breakthrough between Israel and several Arab states. Their strategic significance lies in the gradual construction of a new regional security architecture linking Israel, the Gulf monarchies, and the United States within a framework of shared interests. This emerging alignment is driven not only by common concerns regarding Iran but also by broader objectives that include technological cooperation, economic integration, energy security, cyber defense, and regional stability.

The Eastern Mediterranean has become one of the principal arenas in which this strategic architecture is taking shape. Israel's expanding partnerships with the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia, combined with growing cooperation in areas such as advanced technology, intelligence sharing, maritime security, and critical infrastructure protection, are gradually reshaping the geopolitical landscape of the region. The convergence of Israeli technological capabilities, Gulf financial resources, and American strategic support is creating a new center of gravity in Mediterranean affairs.

From a broader geopolitical perspective, this development reflects a fundamental shift in the nature of American power projection. Rather than serving as the sole architect of regional order, Washington increasingly functions as the strategic coordinator of a network of allied states whose interests converge around maintaining stability, containing revisionist challenges, and safeguarding vital economic and maritime corridors. This model allows the United States to preserve influence while reducing the costs traditionally associated with direct intervention.

For the Mediterranean as a whole, the implications are profound. The region is witnessing the emergence of a security system increasingly structured around flexible coalitions, strategic partnerships, and overlapping interests rather than formal alliances alone. The resulting balance of power is likely to shape the future of regional conflicts, energy development, maritime security, and technological competition for years to come.

For Greece, these developments carry particular significance. As a key ally of both the United States and regional partners participating in this evolving architecture, Greece occupies a strategically advantageous position within the emerging Eastern Mediterranean order. The challenge for Athens will be to leverage this position in a manner that strengthens national deterrence, enhances maritime security, and reinforces its role as a pillar of stability within a rapidly transforming geopolitical environment.

Thus, the reconfiguration of American power under the Trump administration should not be interpreted as a return to traditional hegemony nor as a continuation of strategic retrenchment. Rather, it represents the emergence of a new geopolitical framework based on selective leadership, regional burden-sharing, and balance-of-power politics—a framework that is increasingly shaping the future strategic landscape of the Mediterranean.

Israel's Strategic Ascendancy

The attacks of 7 October 2023 and the series of conflicts that followed have fundamentally transformed Israel's strategic position within the Eastern Mediterranean and the broader Middle East. While the immediate aftermath of the attacks exposed significant intelligence and security shortcomings, the regional military campaigns that followed demonstrated Israel's capacity to rapidly restore deterrence, project power across multiple theatres, and adapt to an increasingly complex security environment.

The cumulative effect of the conflicts in Gaza, Lebanon, Syria, and the confrontation with Iran has been the emergence of a more assertive and strategically influential Israel. Despite considerable political polarization, international criticism, and the economic burdens associated with prolonged military operations, Israel has demonstrated several enduring advantages that continue to distinguish it from other regional actors.

Foremost among these is operational military superiority. The Israel Defense Forces have displayed a capacity to conduct sustained military operations across

multiple domains simultaneously, integrating air power, missile defense systems, cyber capabilities, intelligence assets, and precision-strike technologies. The effectiveness of Israel's layered air and missile defense architecture, combined with its ability to project force well beyond its immediate borders, has reinforced its position as the most capable military actor in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Equally significant is Israel's technological dominance. The country's advanced defense-industrial base, expertise in cyber security, artificial intelligence, unmanned systems, and missile technologies have become critical instruments of national power. In an era where strategic competition increasingly extends into the digital and technological domains, Israel's innovation ecosystem provides a substantial comparative advantage. The country's ability to transform technological innovation into military capability and geopolitical influence has become one of the defining characteristics of its strategic posture.

A third pillar of Israel's ascendancy is intelligence effectiveness. Although the events of October 2023 revealed vulnerabilities, subsequent operations highlighted the remarkable depth of Israeli intelligence capabilities. The integration of human intelligence, cyber operations, surveillance technologies, and advanced data analysis has enabled Israel to operate with a level of situational awareness that remains largely unmatched in the region. Intelligence superiority continues to serve as a force multiplier, enhancing both deterrence and operational effectiveness.

Perhaps most important, however, is the strategic depth that Israel has acquired through its expanding network of partnerships and alliances. Historically constrained by geographic limitations and regional isolation, Israel has progressively reduced its strategic vulnerability through diplomatic normalization and security cooperation with key Arab states. The Abraham Accords marked the beginning of a broader geopolitical realignment whose significance extends far beyond diplomatic symbolism.

The confrontation with Iran has further accelerated this process. The growing convergence of interests between Israel and the Gulf monarchies reflects a shared assessment of regional security challenges and an increasing willingness to coordinate

responses. What is emerging is not a formal alliance in the traditional sense, but a strategic framework built upon common interests in regional stability, technological cooperation, intelligence sharing, maritime security, and the containment of revisionist actors.

This development reveals a critical reality for the future of the Mediterranean and the Levant. The regional balance of power will increasingly be shaped by the interaction between Israeli technological and military superiority, Gulf financial and investment capacity, and sustained American strategic support. Each component reinforces the others: Israel contributes innovation, advanced defense capabilities, and operational expertise; the Gulf states provide financial resources, investment capital, and growing diplomatic influence; while the United States offers strategic coordination, security guarantees, and global power projection.

From a geopolitical perspective, this emerging axis may represent the most consequential strategic realignment in the Middle East since the end of the Cold War. It is gradually creating a new center of gravity that extends from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Arabian Peninsula and increasingly influences developments across North Africa and the broader Indo-Mediterranean space.

For Greece and the wider Hellenic world, the implications are substantial. Israel has become a key partner in energy cooperation, defense collaboration, intelligence exchange, and maritime security. The strengthening of relations between Athens, Jerusalem, and other regional actors provides opportunities to reinforce stability in the Eastern Mediterranean while contributing to a broader framework of strategic cooperation. At the same time, the emergence of this new geopolitical configuration requires careful assessment, as it will inevitably influence the future distribution of power, the management of regional crises, and the security architecture of the Mediterranean basin.

Israel's strategic ascendancy should therefore be understood not simply as the consequence of recent military successes, but as part of a broader transformation of the regional order. In an era increasingly defined by technological competition, multidomain warfare, and shifting alliances, Israel has positioned itself as one of the

principal architects of the emerging Eastern Mediterranean strategic system. The extent to which this new alignment endures may well determine the geopolitical trajectory of the Mediterranean for decades to come.

Turkey: The Neo-Ottoman Maritime Challenge

From a Greek strategic perspective, Turkey remains the most consequential revisionist actor in the Eastern Mediterranean. Unlike many of the region's current crises, which may evolve or eventually subside, the challenge posed by Turkey is structural in nature, rooted in geography, historical ambition, demographic weight, and a long-term strategic vision that transcends individual governments or political cycles.

Over the past two decades, Ankara has pursued a comprehensive strategy aimed at transforming Turkey from a regional stakeholder into an autonomous geopolitical power capable of shaping developments across multiple theatres simultaneously. This strategy reflects a broader ambition to establish Turkey as a pivotal actor linking Europe, the Middle East, North Africa, the Black Sea, and increasingly Sub-Saharan Africa. The result has been the gradual emergence of a foreign policy that combines military power, economic penetration, diplomatic activism, and ideological influence within a coherent framework of regional expansion.

Turkey's strategic objectives are evident across several interconnected domains. In the maritime sphere, Ankara seeks to reshape the balance of power in the Eastern Mediterranean by contesting established interpretations of maritime jurisdiction and sovereign rights. Simultaneously, it has pursued influence in Syria and Libya in order to secure strategic depth, project military power, and shape political outcomes along its southern flank. Beyond the Mediterranean, Turkey has steadily expanded its economic and diplomatic presence throughout Africa, while maintaining a growing role in the Balkans through economic investments, cultural diplomacy, and political engagement.

What distinguishes contemporary Turkish strategy is the increasing integration of military capabilities with geopolitical objectives. Turkey's indigenous defense industry has become a central pillar of national power, with particular emphasis on unmanned systems, missile technology, electronic warfare, and naval modernization. The international success of Turkish drone platforms has enhanced Ankara's influence across multiple regions while simultaneously reinforcing its image as a technologically capable middle power. Meanwhile, the modernization of the Turkish Navy reflects a long-term commitment to maritime power projection and the protection of what Ankara defines as its strategic interests at sea.

Within this context, the concept of the *Blue Homeland (Mavi Vatan)* must be understood as far more than a naval doctrine. It constitutes a comprehensive geopolitical vision that seeks to redefine Turkey's role in the maritime spaces surrounding the Anatolian peninsula. By linking questions of sovereignty, energy security, maritime jurisdiction, naval power, and national identity, the doctrine provides the intellectual foundation for a more assertive Turkish presence across the Eastern Mediterranean, the Aegean, and the Black Sea.

For Greece, the significance of *Mavi Vatan* lies not simply in its legal or cartographic claims, but in its broader strategic implications. The doctrine challenges the existing maritime order, questions established interpretations of international maritime law, and seeks to alter the regional balance of power in ways that directly affect Greek sovereign rights and strategic interests. As such, it represents one of the most important manifestations of contemporary Turkish revisionism.

The evolving situation in Syria further illustrates the strategic opportunities that Ankara seeks to exploit. The emergence of a new political order in Damascus has enhanced Turkey's influence along its southern border while providing new avenues for military cooperation and economic penetration. Similarly, Ankara's flexible engagement in Libya—including its ability to maintain relations with competing factions—demonstrates a pragmatic approach designed to maximize Turkish influence regardless of shifting local dynamics. These developments strengthen

Turkey's strategic depth while extending its reach into critical Mediterranean and African corridors.

At the same time, Turkey's ambitions should not be viewed as limitless. Economic vulnerabilities, political polarization, inflationary pressures, and unresolved domestic challenges continue to constrain Ankara's ability to translate strategic aspirations into sustainable geopolitical gains. The durability of Turkish influence will ultimately depend on the country's capacity to maintain economic stability, preserve social cohesion, and support the financial burden associated with prolonged strategic competition.

Nevertheless, from a Hellenic strategic perspective, the Turkish challenge cannot be assessed through the prism of temporary diplomatic fluctuations or changes in political leadership. The underlying drivers of Turkish behaviour are likely to endure because they derive from enduring geopolitical realities. Turkey's geographic position, demographic scale, military capabilities, and aspiration for regional leadership will continue to shape its strategic conduct regardless of who occupies the presidential palace in Ankara.

For Greece, this reality reinforces a fundamental strategic imperative: the maintenance of credible deterrence and maritime superiority remains indispensable. The challenge posed by Turkey is not episodic but systemic. Consequently, Greek strategy must be based on long-term planning, sustained military modernization, resilient alliances, and a clear understanding that the Eastern Mediterranean will remain a principal arena of strategic competition throughout the coming decades.

In this emerging Mediterranean order, Turkey's trajectory will remain one of the defining variables shaping regional stability and the future balance of power. Understanding the scope and logic of Ankara's ambitions is therefore essential for any comprehensive assessment of the strategic environment confronting Greece and the wider Hellenic world.

The Strategic Rise of the Gulf Monarchies

One of the most consequential yet frequently underestimated developments in the contemporary Mediterranean is the emergence of the Gulf monarchies as influential geopolitical actors beyond their traditional sphere of influence. Over the past decade, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates have progressively transformed themselves from hydrocarbon-based economies into ambitious strategic powers capable of shaping political, economic, and security developments across the wider Mediterranean basin.

This transformation reflects a broader evolution in the nature of power within the international system. Whereas Gulf influence was once primarily associated with energy exports and financial wealth, Riyadh and Abu Dhabi increasingly employ their economic resources as instruments of long-term geopolitical strategy. Capital, technology, infrastructure investment, and diplomatic engagement have become central components of a sophisticated statecraft designed to project influence far beyond the Arabian Peninsula.

The strategic footprint of the Gulf monarchies is now visible across multiple dimensions of Mediterranean affairs. Their financial resources play a critical role in post-conflict reconstruction efforts, particularly in states weakened by war, economic crisis, or institutional fragility. Their investments increasingly shape energy corridors linking the Middle East, the Eastern Mediterranean, and European markets. Their involvement in ports, logistics hubs, transportation networks, and digital infrastructure demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of how economic connectivity translates into geopolitical influence.

Equally significant is their growing role in the technological transformation of the region. The Gulf states have invested heavily in advanced technologies, cyber capabilities, artificial intelligence, renewable energy, and innovation ecosystems. Their strategic partnerships with Israel, accelerated by the Abraham Accords, have further enhanced their access to technological expertise and security cooperation. What is emerging is a new axis of economic and technological integration that

extends from the Gulf to the Eastern Mediterranean and increasingly influences the regional balance of power.

This evolution is particularly evident in the relationship between the Gulf monarchies and Israel. What began as a process of diplomatic normalization has developed into a multidimensional partnership encompassing trade, cybersecurity, defense technology, intelligence cooperation, and investment. The combination of Israeli technological innovation and Gulf financial power has created a strategic synergy with implications that extend well beyond bilateral relations. Under American strategic sponsorship, this emerging framework is becoming an increasingly important pillar of regional stability and economic development.

The influence of the Gulf monarchies is equally visible throughout the broader Mediterranean landscape. In Egypt, Saudi and Emirati investments have become essential components of economic stability and development. In Lebanon, Gulf financial support continues to provide critical assistance amid prolonged economic and political crisis. In Libya, Gulf actors remain important stakeholders in the country's evolving balance of power. In Greece, investments in infrastructure, energy, tourism, and real estate reflect a growing recognition of the country's strategic position as a gateway between Europe, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Middle East.

The significance of these developments extends beyond individual projects or economic transactions. They reveal the emergence of a new geopolitical model in which influence is exercised not primarily through territorial control or military intervention, but through the strategic allocation of capital. Sovereign wealth funds, investment partnerships, infrastructure financing, and technological cooperation have become instruments of statecraft comparable in importance to traditional diplomatic and military tools.

For the Mediterranean as a whole, this represents the financial dimension of contemporary geopolitics. Strategic influence is increasingly measured not only by the ability to deploy military force but also by the capacity to finance reconstruction, shape economic networks, control investment flows, and participate in the

development of critical infrastructure. The Gulf monarchies have recognized this reality earlier than many other actors and have systematically integrated economic power into their broader geopolitical strategies.

From a Greek perspective, the rise of the Gulf monarchies presents both opportunities and strategic considerations. Their growing engagement in the Eastern Mediterranean offers avenues for investment, energy cooperation, technological partnerships, and regional stability. At the same time, it underscores the necessity of understanding that the future balance of power in the Mediterranean will be shaped as much by economic networks and investment flows as by military capabilities and diplomatic alignments.

Ultimately, the strategic rise of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates reflects a broader transformation of the Mediterranean order. The region is no longer defined solely by the interaction of military powers and traditional state actors. It is increasingly shaped by financial influence, technological innovation, and long-term strategic investment. In this evolving environment, the Gulf monarchies have emerged not merely as participants in Mediterranean affairs but as indispensable architects of the region's future geopolitical landscape.

Europe's Strategic Absence

While the Mediterranean is experiencing a profound geopolitical transformation driven by renewed power competition and the emergence of ambitious regional actors, the European Union finds itself in an increasingly paradoxical position. Economically, Europe remains one of the world's largest markets and a major source of investment, technology, and regulatory influence. Strategically, however, its ability to shape developments in its own southern neighbourhood appears increasingly limited. The result is a growing imbalance between Europe's economic weight and its geopolitical relevance in the Mediterranean basin.

The origins of this strategic constraint are both structural and political. The Russian invasion of Ukraine fundamentally altered European security priorities, redirecting diplomatic attention, financial resources, and military planning toward the

Union's eastern frontier. While this shift is understandable given the magnitude of the challenge posed by the war, it has also reinforced a continental focus that often underestimates the strategic importance of developments unfolding across the Mediterranean and the Middle East.

Yet the Mediterranean remains inseparable from Europe's long-term security and prosperity. The region directly affects European energy security, maritime trade, migration flows, terrorism, and economic stability. Events in North Africa, the Levant, and the Eastern Mediterranean routinely generate consequences that reverberate throughout the European continent. Despite this reality, Europe often appears reactive rather than proactive, responding to crises after they emerge rather than shaping the strategic environment in which they develop.

This strategic passivity becomes increasingly evident as several critical trends accelerate simultaneously. Migration pressures continue to challenge European cohesion and domestic political stability. Competition over energy resources and transportation corridors is intensifying as states seek to secure access to alternative supplies and critical infrastructure. Regional powers—including Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Morocco—are expanding their influence through military, economic, and diplomatic means, often filling spaces where European leadership is absent or inconsistent.

The consequence is a gradual erosion of European influence within a region that historically constituted one of its most important geopolitical spheres. While individual European states occasionally exercise significant influence, the European Union as a collective actor has often struggled to formulate a coherent Mediterranean strategy capable of matching the scale of contemporary challenges. Divergent national priorities, differing threat perceptions, and institutional constraints continue to limit Europe's capacity to act as a unified geopolitical power.

For Greece, this reality carries important strategic implications. Membership in the European Union remains a cornerstone of Greek foreign and security policy. The Union provides significant economic benefits, diplomatic leverage, and a framework of political solidarity that contributes to national stability and prosperity.

European institutions continue to serve as valuable instruments for advancing Greek interests and reinforcing the country's international position.

However, the evolving strategic environment also reaffirms a fundamental principle of statecraft: no alliance, institution, or external partner can substitute for national capability. International support is most effective when it complements, rather than replaces, a state's own capacity to defend its interests. In an era marked by geopolitical uncertainty, sovereign capabilities remain the ultimate foundation of national security.

For Greece, this means that European solidarity must be viewed as an important strategic multiplier rather than as a substitute for national preparedness. Effective deterrence, maritime security, military modernization, and resilient critical infrastructure remain responsibilities that cannot be outsourced. Equally important is the cultivation of regional partnerships capable of enhancing stability and strengthening Greece's position within the evolving balance of power in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The deepening strategic relationships with the United States, Israel, Egypt, and key Gulf states reflect this logic. These partnerships do not replace Greece's European orientation; rather, they complement it by providing additional layers of security, cooperation, and strategic flexibility in a rapidly changing environment. Such a multidimensional approach is increasingly necessary in a Mediterranean characterized by fluid alignments and growing geopolitical competition.

From a broader Hellenic perspective, the lessons of history remain highly relevant. Greece has often achieved its greatest strategic successes when it combined participation in broader alliances with the cultivation of its own national capabilities. The preservation of sovereignty has never depended solely on external guarantees but on the ability to integrate alliances, geography, economic resilience, and military power into a coherent national strategy.

Ultimately, Europe's relative strategic absence in the Mediterranean does not diminish the importance of the European project. Rather, it highlights the necessity

for Mediterranean states—and particularly Greece—to assume a greater degree of responsibility for their own security and regional role. In the emerging Mediterranean order, influence will increasingly belong to those actors capable of combining national strength with effective partnerships and strategic vision.

For Greece, the conclusion is clear. European solidarity remains indispensable, but the protection of Hellenic interests will continue to depend primarily upon Greece's own capabilities, its maritime power, and its ability to act as a proactive rather than reactive actor within the evolving geopolitical landscape of the Mediterranean.

Maritime Power and the Hellenic Strategic Tradition

Perhaps the most enduring lesson emerging from the contemporary transformation of the Mediterranean is the renewed centrality of maritime power. While technological innovation has altered the character of warfare and globalization has reshaped patterns of economic interaction, the strategic significance of the sea remains fundamentally unchanged. Indeed, the conflicts and geopolitical rivalries of recent years have reaffirmed a timeless reality: control of maritime space continues to be one of the principal determinants of national security, economic prosperity, and geopolitical influence.

For Greece and the wider Hellenic world, maritime power is not merely a component of defense policy. It is a historical condition of national existence. The development of Hellenic civilization, from the city-states of antiquity to the modern Greek state, has been inseparable from the sea. Geography, commerce, culture, and security have all been shaped by the maritime environment that surrounds the Greek world.

History repeatedly demonstrates this relationship. The victory at the Battle of Salamis secured the survival of the Greek city-states and altered the course of Western civilization. The maritime networks of the Byzantine era sustained imperial influence across three continents. The commercial and naval traditions of the Greek diaspora contributed significantly to the preservation of Hellenism during periods of

foreign domination. In the modern era, maritime commerce and naval capability have remained fundamental pillars of Greek economic strength and national security.

This historical experience has produced a strategic culture in which sea power is not simply an instrument of military policy but an expression of national identity and geopolitical reality. For Greece, maritime superiority has consistently been linked to sovereignty, independence, and prosperity. Conversely, periods of maritime weakness have often coincided with strategic vulnerability and external pressure.

The strategic environment of the twenty-first century reinforces rather than diminishes this historical lesson. The sea remains the principal medium through which trade, energy, information, and military power circulate. However, the definition of maritime security has expanded considerably. Contemporary maritime power extends far beyond the traditional protection of shipping lanes and territorial waters. It now encompasses a vast network of critical infrastructure upon which modern societies depend.

Among the most strategically significant assets are offshore energy facilities, undersea pipelines, submarine communication cables, ports, maritime logistics hubs, and digital communication corridors. These infrastructures constitute the nervous system of the contemporary economy. Their disruption—whether through conventional military action, cyber operations, sabotage, or hybrid warfare—can generate consequences as severe as those produced by direct military attacks.

The Eastern Mediterranean exemplifies this new reality. Energy discoveries, expanding trade routes, digital connectivity projects, and growing geopolitical competition have transformed the region into a complex strategic environment where military, economic, and technological dimensions are increasingly interconnected. The protection of critical maritime infrastructure has therefore become a central requirement of national security.

In this context, maritime power must be understood as a multidomain concept. Effective maritime security requires the integration of naval forces, air power, cyber capabilities, intelligence assets, space-based surveillance systems, and strategic

partnerships. The ability to maintain maritime situational awareness, secure critical infrastructure, and deter potential adversaries depends upon the coordinated application of these instruments rather than on naval strength alone.

For Greece, this necessitates a comprehensive maritime strategy capable of addressing both traditional and emerging challenges. Naval modernization remains essential, but it must be complemented by advanced intelligence capabilities, cyber resilience, integrated air and missile defense systems, and enhanced cooperation with regional partners. The objective is not merely the defense of territorial waters but the preservation of freedom of navigation, economic connectivity, and strategic autonomy across the broader maritime domain.

From a geopolitical perspective, Greece's unique geography further amplifies the importance of sea power. Positioned at the crossroads of Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, and North Africa, Greece occupies one of the most strategically significant maritime locations in the world. The Aegean, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the approaches to the Black Sea collectively form a space where global trade routes, energy corridors, and regional security interests converge. Geography therefore grants Greece significant strategic opportunities, but it also imposes corresponding responsibilities.

As classical maritime theorists such as Alfred Thayer Mahan and Julian Corbett argued, sea power ultimately serves political objectives. Maritime strength is valuable not as an end in itself, but because it enables states to protect national interests, secure economic prosperity, and shape the strategic environment in their favor. In the contemporary Mediterranean, where geopolitical competition is intensifying and regional balances are evolving, this principle remains as relevant as ever.

For Hellenism, the conclusion is unmistakable. The sea continues to represent the decisive strategic domain through which sovereignty is exercised and national interests are defended. The emerging Mediterranean order will increasingly reward those states capable of securing maritime spaces, protecting critical infrastructure, and integrating technological innovation with traditional naval power.

In this sense, the contemporary return of maritime geopolitics does not represent a new phenomenon for Greece. Rather, it marks the reassertion of a historical constant that has shaped the destiny of Hellenism for centuries. The preservation of sovereignty in the twenty-first century, no less than in antiquity, will depend upon the ability to transform maritime geography into strategic advantage and national power.

The Emerging Mediterranean Century

The Mediterranean is entering a new historical phase—one that may prove as consequential as the geopolitical transformations that followed the end of the Cold War. The strategic assumptions that dominated the region for decades are gradually being replaced by a more fluid and competitive order characterized by shifting alliances, technological disruption, maritime rivalry, and the resurgence of power politics. The Mediterranean is no longer a peripheral theatre influenced primarily by external actors; it is becoming one of the principal geopolitical crossroads of the twenty-first century.

What distinguishes this emerging era is that it will not be defined primarily by ideology. Unlike the Cold War, when competing political and economic systems structured international relations, the new Mediterranean order is increasingly shaped by tangible factors of power and geography. Strategic competition revolves around access to energy resources, control of maritime routes, technological superiority, critical infrastructure, demographic resilience, and the capacity of states to project influence beyond their borders.

Geography has reasserted itself as a decisive factor in international politics. Maritime chokepoints, energy corridors, logistics networks, and strategic coastal zones are once again becoming central components of geopolitical competition. At the same time, technological developments—ranging from artificial intelligence and cyber capabilities to autonomous systems and advanced surveillance technologies—are transforming the means through which power is exercised. States that successfully

combine geographic advantage with technological innovation will possess significant strategic leverage in the decades ahead.

The Mediterranean of the future will therefore be shaped by a diverse constellation of actors pursuing overlapping and often competing objectives. The United States is likely to remain the principal external power, preserving its role as a strategic balancer and guarantor of key security arrangements. Israel has emerged as a leading technological and military power whose influence increasingly extends beyond the Levant. Turkey continues to pursue an ambitious vision of regional leadership supported by military modernization and maritime expansion. The Gulf monarchies, particularly Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, are steadily translating economic power into geopolitical influence through investment, infrastructure development, and technological partnerships.

At the same time, North African states are becoming more assertive in defining their own strategic futures. Morocco's expanding regional diplomacy, Egypt's role as a critical security and energy actor, and the evolving political dynamics across the Maghreb suggest that North Africa will play an increasingly important role in shaping Mediterranean affairs. The region's future balance of power will not be determined solely by traditional Middle Eastern actors but by a broader network of states extending across both shores of the Mediterranean.

Against this backdrop, Europe's position remains uncertain. While the European Union retains enormous economic influence, its strategic coherence continues to be tested by competing priorities, internal divisions, and an increasing focus on its eastern frontier. Whether Europe can reassert itself as a decisive Mediterranean actor remains one of the central unanswered questions of the coming decades.

For Greece, however, the strategic implications are unmistakable. The country can no longer afford to view itself primarily as a frontier state of Europe or as a passive observer of regional developments. Its geographic location, maritime character, and network of partnerships place it at the center of the evolving Eastern

Mediterranean system. The challenge is therefore not merely to adapt to change but to actively shape the emerging regional order.

This requires a strategic vision grounded in realism and supported by sustained national investment. Naval modernization must remain a long-term priority, ensuring that Greece retains the capacity to protect its maritime interests and contribute meaningfully to regional security. Credible deterrence remains essential in an environment characterized by revisionist pressures and geopolitical uncertainty. Strategic autonomy—understood not as isolation from alliances but as the ability to act effectively within them—must continue to guide national defense planning.

Equally important is the protection of maritime sovereignty in all its dimensions. This includes not only territorial waters and maritime zones but also the critical infrastructure upon which economic security increasingly depends. Energy installations, submarine communication networks, ports, logistics hubs, and digital corridors represent strategic assets whose security is inseparable from national sovereignty.

Finally, the emerging Mediterranean century will demand investment in national resilience. Economic strength, technological innovation, institutional effectiveness, demographic sustainability, and social cohesion will be as important to national power as military capabilities. States that fail to strengthen these foundations will struggle to compete in an environment where geopolitical influence increasingly depends upon the integration of economic, technological, and military resources.

For the Hellenic world, the stakes are particularly high. Greece occupies one of the most strategically significant locations in the Mediterranean basin, positioned at the intersection of Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, and North Africa. Geography has once again become destiny, but geography alone is never sufficient. Strategic relevance must be cultivated through vision, preparedness, and the effective use of national power.

The Mediterranean century that is now emerging will reward states capable of understanding the enduring relationship between sea power, sovereignty, and

geopolitical influence. For Greece, the challenge is not simply to preserve its position within this changing environment but to establish itself as a central maritime power whose stability, capabilities, and strategic partnerships contribute decisively to the future security architecture of the Eastern Mediterranean. In this sense, the coming decades will not merely test Greece's resilience—they will determine the extent to which Hellenism can transform its historic maritime inheritance into strategic leadership in a rapidly evolving regional order.

Conclusion: The Hellenic Imperative

The transformation of the Mediterranean ultimately reaffirms one of the oldest and most enduring lessons of strategic history: sovereignty is not merely a legal status conferred by international recognition, nor is it guaranteed by treaties, institutions, or declarations alone. Sovereignty is, above all, the practical capacity of a nation to defend its interests, secure its strategic environment, protect its critical assets, and preserve its freedom of action in an increasingly competitive international system.

The geopolitical developments examined throughout this analysis—the return of power politics, the reconfiguration of American strategy, Israel's growing regional influence, Turkey's maritime revisionism, the rise of the Gulf monarchies, Europe's strategic uncertainty, and the renewed importance of maritime security—are not isolated phenomena. Together, they signal the emergence of a new Mediterranean order in which power, geography, technology, and economic resilience will once again determine the hierarchy of states.

For Greece and the wider Hellenic world, this transformation carries profound implications. Positioned at the intersection of Europe, the Balkans, the Middle East, and North Africa, Greece occupies a geopolitical space where regional and global interests increasingly converge. Such a position offers significant opportunities, but it also imposes strategic responsibilities. Geography provides advantages only to those states capable of converting.

In this respect, the contemporary Mediterranean environment confirms a fundamental reality that has shaped the history of Hellenism for millennia. The sea

remains the decisive strategic domain through which security, prosperity, and political autonomy are secured. From the naval triumphs of antiquity to the maritime traditions of the modern Greek state, sea power has consistently served as the bridge between national survival and strategic relevance. Today, in an era defined by multidomain competition, maritime power encompasses not only naval strength but also the protection of energy infrastructure, digital networks, commercial routes, critical technologies, and the broader maritime ecosystem upon which national prosperity depends.

The states most likely to prosper in the emerging Mediterranean order will be those capable of integrating geopolitical vision with technological innovation, economic resilience with military credibility, and national cohesion with effective alliances. Strategic relevance will increasingly belong to nations that understand how to operate simultaneously across the military, economic, technological, and informational dimensions of power.

For Greece, this requires a sustained commitment to deterrence, maritime superiority, strategic adaptability, and national resilience. It requires investment not only in defense capabilities but also in technological innovation, critical infrastructure protection, energy security, and human capital. It demands a strategic culture capable of anticipating change rather than merely reacting to it. Above all, it requires the recognition that alliances, however valuable, are most effective when supported by robust national capabilities and a clear understanding of national interests.

As I have consistently argued in my strategic analyses, history provides a clear and enduring lesson: nations that fail to appreciate the relationship between sea power and sovereignty ultimately risk strategic marginalization. Conversely, those that understand the geopolitical significance of the maritime domain acquire the capacity not merely to defend themselves, but to shape the regional order in accordance with their interests and values.

The Mediterranean of the twenty-first century is entering a period of renewed strategic competition. The era of uncontested stability has given way to an environment characterized by shifting balances of power, technological disruption,

and geopolitical uncertainty. Yet within this uncertainty lies opportunity. For Greece, the challenge is not simply to adapt to a changing Mediterranean but to help shape its future.

The Hellenic imperative, therefore, is clear. Greece must embrace its identity as a maritime power, strengthen the instruments of national sovereignty, and cultivate the strategic vision necessary to navigate an increasingly complex regional environment. Its future relevance will depend not merely on its geographic location at the crossroads of continents, but on its ability to transform that geography into strategic advantage, maritime influence, and enduring national power.

In the final analysis, the future of Hellenism in the Mediterranean will not be determined solely by the actions of great powers or regional rivals. It will be determined by Greece's capacity to translate its history, geography, and maritime heritage into a coherent strategy for the century ahead. Those states that understand the strategic logic of the sea will remain masters of their destiny; those that neglect it will increasingly find their future shaped by others. The challenge before Greece is therefore not simply one of defense, but of strategic leadership in an emerging Mediterranean century.

Bibliography

Corbett, Julian. *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911.

Davutoğlu, Ahmet. *Strategic Depth: Turkey's International Position*. Istanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2001.

Gray, Colin S. *The Leverage of Sea Power*. New York: Free Press, 1992.

Gürdeniz, Cem. *Mavi Vatan Yazıları*. Istanbul: Kırmızı Kedi, 2019.

Feldman, Shai. *Israeli Nuclear Deterrence: A Strategy for the 1980s*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Inbar, Efraim. *Israel's National Security: Issues and Challenges since the Yom Kippur War*. London: Routledge, 2008.

İşeri, Emre, and Ahmet Sözen. "Turkey's Geopolitics in the Eastern Mediterranean." *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 24, no. 3 (2022): 377–394.

Kaplan, Robert D. *The Revenge of Geography*. New York: Random House, 2012.

Lesser, Ian O. *Turkey, the United States and the Delusion of Geopolitics*. Washington, DC: German Marshall Fund, 2020.

Mackinder, Halford J. "The Geographical Pivot of History." *The Geographical Journal* 23, no. 4 (1904): 421–437.

Mahan, Alfred Thayer. *The Influence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1890.

Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2001.

Schelling, Thomas C. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Spykman, Nicholas J. *The Geography of the Peace*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1944.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Rex Warner. London: Penguin Classics, 1972.

Till, Geoffrey. *Seapower: A Guide for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge, 2018.

Tsakonas, Panayotis J. *The Incomplete Breakthrough in Greek-Turkish Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)*. Montego Bay, 1982.

Valinakis, Yannis. *Greece's European Strategy*. Athens: Papazisis, various editions.

Yadlin, Amos. *Strategic Assessment of Israel's National Security*. Tel Aviv:
INSS Publications, various editions.