Journal for Ethics in Social Studies
ISSN: 2559 - 7612
Covered in: CrossRef; RePEc; CEEOL; KVK; WorldCat; Google Scholar

2018, Volume 2, Issue 2, pages: 14-32 | doi: https://doi.org/10.18662/jess/13

The Century of Mega-Daguos. The Charter of Peaceful Coexistence among the Mega-Daguos

Mădălina Virginia ANTONESCU[1]

[1] Ph.D., scientific researcher, Bucharest University, madyantonescu@gmail.com.

Abstract: The current paper discusses the origins of the concept of "daguo", a term used in the Chinese academic literature to refer to the "great powers". We will use a particular concept, i.e. "mega-daguo", to refer to *entities higher than the great powers* (states, in the classic sense), that is *new, trans-state or super-state actors of transcontinental or continental dimensions*. Such entities create fusions among different civilizations; they have a specific behaviour, distinct from the behaviour of great powers, as currently perceived by us, in the traditional sense of the term. The current paper analyses the typology of mega-daguos; we will refer to the post-Huntingtonian age, that of a world which has overcome the dualist paradigm of the "inevitable conflict" among the civilizations, *a world which has turned the principle of dialogue among the mega-daguos into a fundamental principle underlying a world of colossi*. The last part of the paper proposes a fundamental document of the new world of post-state actors (mega-daguos), for the 21st century. We will call it the *"Charter of peaceful coexistence among the mega-daguos"*, with an approach to the issue of reorganizing the UN, in order to be able to come to terms with such reality, in the 21st century post-state world based on a global law, in which post-state actors are also legally responsible for their behaviour and their decisions, at global level.

Keywords: *mega-daguo; trans-continental entities; trans-oceanic entities; politics of mega-daguo; 21st century order; Charter of Peaceful Coexistence among the Mega-Daguos; global law; post-state actors; post-Huntingtonian world; world of colossuses.*

How to cite: Antonescu, M.V. (2018). The Century of Mega-Daguos. The Charter of Peaceful Coexistence among the Mega-Daguos. *Journal for Ethics in Social Studies, 2*(2), 14-32. https://doi.org/10.18662/jess/13

1. Types of Mega-daguos

The mega-daguos of the 21st century can come in the most diverse shapes, resulting in variety of types (the groups of actors of continental or multi-continental, oceanic or transoceanic size are characteristic to all mega-daguos, as well as the colossal economic, military, civilizational force, exceeding by far the force of the "great powers", in the sense currently accepted in international relations).

Concerning the current forms of international organization, the pseudo-institutionalized groups, the proto-federations of EU-type states and the strategic partnerships developed among economic blocks, intergovernmental international organizations, either as defensive military alliances, or as simple cooperation and dialogue groups (which are not transformed into organizations), considering various geopolitical projects, various political and strategic views, various international structures, some of which are currently in the "international organizations" stage (multilateral dialogue level, based on the will of the equal and sovereign member states), we can identify a series of embryonic-stage mega-daguos, which can take shape and develop as such (assuming a strong and clear political and economic identity of mega-daguo), in the 21st century.

Thus, in our view, it is possible that various types of mega-daguos form and consolidate, shaping the 21st century global scene (as a post-state world), in a particularly different sense from what we imagine today:

- **Eurabia Mega-daguo**[1] (Antonescu, 2004: 90-91) (formed by resuming the Euro-Arabic partnership in a new, well-structured form, as compared to the current forms, and through the consolidation of a strategic dimension of cooperation among a federalized, strong UE and Middle East groups of states, considered to have strategic importance for the EU – a line of stability on the EU south border –; a partnership possibly based on reducing the risk of massive migrations towards the EU and on the forming of security and stability circles in the South-East of the Union, including the ring of a new Euro-Mediterranean Union). The strategic partnership between the EU and the Middle East space, applied in multiple multi-level forms of cooperation in the extended ring of stability of a federal EU – the hard nucleus of this mega-daguo – would be set the basis for the creation of a very clear political will of a trans-civilizational and transnational construction, based on the paradigm of the deep-rooted partnership

[1] New transnational entities being thus created entities which also include different civilizational spaces.

between the East and the West, the North and the South, between the EU with a Western decision-making nucleus and the Arab states from the area of the "extended Middle East"). The Eurabia mega-daguo will start from current, refreshed forms of dialogue, such as the Euro-Arabic dialogue, the Euro-Mediterranean partnership, from the creation of a large Euro-Mediterranean area, considering the creation of regional institutions for cooperation and coordination of the economic policies in the Southern Mediterranean area, to forms of regional, intra-Arabic and Euro-Mediterranean integration (Hadhri, 2001, as cited by Antonescu, 2004: 91). In addition, the Eurabia mega-daguo project will also start from the Euro-Mediterranean Union project, combine with the Strategic partnership for stability on the Southern borders of the EU, between the Union and the Middle Eastern and North African states. This mega-daguo entails progress in the stage of its trans-state and transcontinental consolidation, from the Western decision-making nucleus (coming from the practical inheritance of the EU functioning), to the creation of a mixed transnational bureaucracy (officials from the Arab states, from the North African states, from the EU states, independent from the states of origin), of specific decision-making structures (the Eurabia Council, the Eurabia Commission, the Eurabia Court of Justice, the Eurabia Minister of Foreign Affairs), which consolidate the foreign and domestic policies of this mega-daguo, strategic positions regarding its action in the 21st century global world, which meet the increased security interest of an EU overwhelmed by the migration phenomena coming from the Middle East and North Africa states, but which is also interested in the oil resources in the Middle East.

• **Euro-Caucasus mega-daguo** (a transnational entity for the 2nd half of the 21st century, focusing on the strategic partnerships developed among states from the extended Central Asia and a federal EU, with a decision-making nucleus highly motivated to expand the Union in the area of the extended Caucasus (region which includes states from the Southern Caucasus and the Northern Caucasus, also defining privileged relationships among the EU, Iran and Turkey, to the point of absorbing these neighbouring spaces into the young mega-daguo) (Antonescu, 2009: 83-87). This mega-daguo would be based on the idea of a dynamic Caucasian complex of extended security (which includes security partnerships, adding forms of regional integration, with aspects of common security, a unique currency area, a unique market among the EU and the Caucasus republics lato sensu, i.e. Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan and the seven republics in Ciscaucasia, currently included in the Russian Federation, as well as Iran and Turkey). Such mega-daguo would entail the following: a bureaucracy

independent from the member states (in a mega-daguo stage of consolidation and emancipation from the states and regions forming it), an Euro-Caucasus Commission, an Euro-Caucasus Council, an Euro-Caucasus Court of Justice, an Euro-Caucasian unique currency, a unique market, a unique foreign policy, Ministers of Foreign Affairs and an Euro-Caucasian (trans-regional) diplomacy.

• **Euro-Russia mega-daguo (or "extended Europe")**, based on initiating strategic partnerships and forms of cooperation, to the point of regional multi-sectorial integration between the EU and Russia, where the decision-making nucleus of the mega-daguo would be the EU, in a version, becoming in time a bureaucracy independent from the incorporated states (an Euro-Russian Council, an Euro-Russian Commission, an Euro-Russian Court of Justice, an extended Euro area, with Russia joining the Euro area). This mega-daguo can also be formed on the "Extended Europe, from Lisbon to Vladivostok" project (proposed by the Russians), based on two pillars: the French-German engine and Russia (Snyder, 2010; "State Duma Speaker", 2016; Timofeev, 2014).

• **Transatlantic Mega-daguo**, mainly (but not exclusively) formed by consolidating the USA-EU strategic partnership, up to forms of transcontinental integrations, partnership updated according to the challenges of the 21st century global world, which turns the Western world into the "First World"[2] (an elitist, closed world of postmodern civilization, which it overflows with waves of immigrants from the second and third worlds). This mega-daguo as well entails a series of aspects: development of a bureaucracy independent from the member states (the so-called transatlantic bureaucracy, a Transatlantic Commission, an authentic, unique transatlantic diplomacy), a Transatlantic decision-making Council, a Transatlantic Court of Justice.

• **Thalassocratic mega-daguo (the New Cartagena, the Atlantic block or what some would currently define as the "transatlantic empire"[3])**, which is understood as a planetary superstructure, with a unique decision-making centre represented by the US, defended entirely by

[2] Based on Robert Cooper's model of "the Three Worlds", in which the West (particularly the EU) represents the First World (Cooper, 2007: 60-63, 114). According to other authors, it is rather a "transatlantic divorce", with the EU gaining autonomy in relation to the other Western power centre, the United States (Khanna, 2008: 28-31).

[3]Starting from the doctrine acknowledgement of its status as a "hard global nucleus, for the global political stability and economic welfare", facing however sufficient "divergent aspects between the US and the EU, in various issues of global policy management (for example, the 2003 disagreement over Iraq)" (Brzezinski, 2005: 87-88).

maritime borders, with control over a considerable part of the Eurasian area, integrating the European West, Germany and Turkey, going towards the Far East (strategic "colonization" of countries such as Japan, Thailand and South Korea), extending control towards the Indian and Pacific Ocean (with military bases in key points such as San Diego, the Philippines, Guam, the Caribbean and Haiti) (Dughin, 2011: 78-79).

• **Eurasia mega-daguo - which is also known currently as the "Eurasian Empire" (Dughin, 2011: 141-142) -, with the decision-making nucleus in Russia.** The paradigm of the "Eurasian Empire" (Constantin, 2014: 155-157) is used in the works of other authors to underline the fact that it is an empire that cannot be mistaken for a nation-state or a regional power. According to these authors, the Eurasian Empire is created as a suprastate strategic and geopolitical block, built "at once, as a supra-purpose, as the expression of an extraordinary civilizational will"[4]. Upon careful analysis of the structure of this Eurasian Empire, according to the authors who have written extensively about this idea, this is a telurocratic mega-daguo, opposing the Atlantic Empire, the Empire of the New Cartagena or the thalassocratic empire. It is therefore a theory according to which there is a bipolar future in geopolitical terms, as well as in terms of competition between two blocks, but in conditions different from the cold war and with entities different from the Soviet block and the Atlantic block. The author emphasizes the fact that the Eurasian Empire must not be mistaken for and is not created to be a Russian empire or a revived Soviet empire. The Eurasian Empire is an original mega-daguo, formed of several empires (hence the originality of this perspective): this geopolitical, continental, gigantic block comprises several imperial structures, under military, strategic and political unification: the European Empire (in the European West, built around Germany and the Central Europe), the Pacific Ocean Empire (built in the East, around Japan), the Southern Empire (in Central Asia, built around Iran) and the Russian Empire, in the centre (as a vision, as a geopolitical project), but it also transoceanic (the geopolitical imperial ambitions to include the Pacific Ocean). It is the image of a mega-daguo formed of secondary empires, arranged in an original "confederation of large spaces", opposing the planetary Atlantic Empire, with the centre in the US (Dughin, 2011: 165-167).

• **Pacific mega-daguo** (formed according to a possible view through the strategic Partnerships gradually developed by the US with the

[4] See the detailed theorization of the Eurasian Empire, in Aleksandr Dughin's work (Dughin, 2011: 141-142).

ally states in the Pacific Area)[5]. However, such a mega-daguo (a Pacific mega-daguo) can be formed by any other regional power considering itself to be a global power, in a post-Atlantic century (if we view the world as a reality in a perpetual state of conflict, mutation and change, not in a static state). For example, according to the theory of the Eurasian Empire (as a superstructure incorporating several regional empires), the Pacific Empire (in the East, dominated by Japan) is a component of the Eurasian Empire, dominated by the centre (Russia) (Dughin, 2011: 166-167).

• **Indo-Pacific mega-daguo**[6] (similarly, it is a type of future mega-daguo formed due to a geopolitical view applied by the US, by concentrating the military, strategic, economic power in the Pacific Ocean, defined as a central area of interest for the US, during the entire 21st century, being therefore a geopolitical direction of expansion for the entire century). In a second scenario, it may be a mega-daguo built by other powers aspiring to global influence, such as Russia, China, either as distinct entity on the 21st century global scene, or as part of an empire (Eurasian or an extended Chinese Empire etc.). Moreover, it is a future application of the American "two oceans military presence" concept (i.e. an American domination in the two oceans, Indian and Pacific), therefore a political construction which has the US in the decision-making centre and which is transoceanic (thalassocratic mega-daguo, in essence, with three planetary oceans under control and the centre under the domination of the main actor, the Atlantic Empire). On the other hand, in other geopolitical scenarios, we could witness a transoceanic mega-daguo formed and controlled by continental powers in a stage of global ascension (alone or already included in an Eurasian Empire): Russia, China or India (in the scenario in which it assumes the position of global power, with India being the traditionally dominant power in the Indian Ocean).

• **Atlantic-Indian mega-daguo** (which, in a scenario, can be based on the thalassocratic partnership between the United States and the

[5] With countries such as Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and even India. Starting from strategic views such as the one developed by H. Clinton (Clinton, 2011; Council on Foreign Relations, 2010; "The United States", 2009).

[6] Built by implementing a strategy (by regional and global powers such as the United States, India, for example), of a ***"double ocean" strategic concept*** (according to the actions of certain emerging or existing powers, in the Indo-Pacific area, in the 21st century, defined as the "Century of the Pacific", not only from the military or political viewpoint, but also from cultural viewpoint, or as a civilizational project) (Council of Foreign Relations, 2013; Karnad, 2015; Rajendram, 2014; Raman, 2015; Sajjanhar, 2016; Sukumar, 2015; Tewari, 2015).

countries in the Indian Ocean area – particularly based on the partnership with India, the traditionally dominant power in the Indian Ocean) (Cronin & Baruah, 2014; "US-India Joint", 2015). We must consider the legal and cooperation basis in key areas, which could underlie the configuration of a transoceanic political entity, with at least two regional actors (here, a global power at the beginning of the 21st century, such as the USA, and an actor aspiring to the status of 21st century global power, such as India): i.e. a strategic partnership focused on nuclear cooperation was signed in 2005-2006, between the USA and India (Frunzeti & Oprescu, 2013: 119).

• **Southern mega-daguo** (formed on the basis of the current BRICS organization of emerging countries, as a reaction to the increasing globalization gap between the South and the industrialized, postmodern and increasingly isolated North, in what will be called "the First World"). A transcontinental structure, with bureaucracy independent from the founding countries (currently organized in the BRICS group) (Graziani, 2012: 237-238).

• **Northern mega-daguo** (grouping all the countries with highly industrialized economies, except for Russia, starting from reducing the number of rich, decision-making countries at global level, located in the North – some sort of Northern G-7)

• **Asian mega-daguo** (gigantic political body, formed by expanding ASEAN, by developing current strategic partnerships among China, Iran, Central and South-East Asia states, as well as India).

• **TransAsia mega-daguo** (to differentiate it from the Eurasia mega-daguo), referred to by some as "the Great Mongol Empire" ("Chine, Iran, Russie", 2013), developed (in a scenario) by strengthening and expanding the current Cooperation Organizations from Shanghai or, in another scenario, focused on the Sino-Iranian axis, as a mega-daguo that includes China, Mongolia, Iran, as well as a Russia that opted for the development of its Asian dimension and which is no longer the centre of an empire, but a component of another continental project, controlled by China, in this instance) (Escobar, 2015).

• **United American mega-daguo** (by expanding the strategic Partnerships among the states in the Northern part of the American continent and the states of Latin America, developing common trading areas, common markets, continental bureaucracies independent from the member states, developing visions, strategies and policies specific to the mega-daguo as such, not to the included states): from the Central-American Common Market, to a Common Market of the United America, from

MERCOSUR (Dussouy , 2011: 79-80, 86-91)[7], the Andean Pact and the Tripartite Pact among Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and transcontinental free trading areas, to the unique currency area, a Continental Council of the United America, a Pan American Commission etc.

• **Chinafrica mega-daguo.** In our opinion, a realistic approach is to consider the possibility of creating such a transcontinental giant, which unites two distinct continents through political, economic, commercial connections, as well as through massive movements of population from one continent (Asian) to the African continent, in the context of strategic partnerships in multilateral cooperation fields (from the information, to the import of know-how, direct investments in projects on the African continent, for the development of its infrastructure and economy). The increasingly visible interest in the African continent displayed by China determines us to consider the shaping of a Chinese foreign political (and economic) strategy, in relation to Africa, for the entire 21st century, meant among others to affirm China as a global power in this century (Frunzeti & Oprescu, 2013: 221-222). We note the increasing interest displayed by China as a fully ascending global power in the African continent, particularly in the areas with oil resources, the continuity of the China-Africa reunions, China's direct involvement in Angola, Congo, Sudan, with the continent as an immense distribution market for the Chinese products, for the Chinese labour force, for the investments, Chinese non-refundable financial loans, a market of raw materials. Following the summits with Africa, China doubles its financial aids and goes as far as cancelling debts of certain poor African countries, thus becoming the most important trading partner of Africa (Frunzeti & Oprescu, 2013: 222).

• **Eurafrica mega-daguo** (Iancu, 2010: 85-91)**,** based on the reinvigoration and development of the current forms of strategic partnership among the UE and African states (including the development of tools called MEDA, of regional integration projects, such as the Mediterranean Union created in 2008, at the initiative of France). According to certain authors, the project emphasizes the increasingly active involvement of the EU in Africa, beside other projects, such as involvement of the EU in stabilizing certain East-Central (Sudan) or West-Central (Congo) African areas, the increasing amount of development aids provided by the EU in Africa, countering Islamic terrorism and cooperation in the power industry field. In another view, Eurafrica represents one of the three Eurasian regions (being the

[7] Dussouy (2011) speaks about a fluvial interconnection of the continent and a Brazilian strategic regionalism

Occidental region, which comprises Western Europe and Africa), beside the axial region (Eurasia, de facto) and the Oriental region (Pacific), with all these regions dominated by the paradigm of the Eurasian Empire (formed of several secondary empires) (Dughin, 2011: 55).

• **Islamic mega-daguo** (based on the criterion of categorizing the spaces depending on religions and cultures), which includes great Asian spaces – and more – converted to the Islamic culture, such as Indonesia and Malaysia[8], wherefrom the major strategic reconfigurations and surprising strategic alliances of the rival mega-daguos.

• **Postmodern mega-daguo** (an Extended Postmodern World, including the Asian area, open to the postmodern culture, through the culture of technologies and telecommunications)

• **Eurasian mega-daguo according to Dughin's view** (a multi-level, transoceanic and transcontinental super project, which includes: the European Empire, with Germany as the main component, the Pacific Empire, the Central Asia Empire, with Iran as the main component, and the Russian Empire, with the components deriving from a confederative principle and limited sovereignty) (Constantin, 2012: 54-55).

• **EUDKAMPF Telurocratic mega-daguo** - also referred to as the Eurasian Empire of the End (Dughin, 2011: 101-102) -, according to Pârvulescu-Thiriart (the Belgian school of geopolitics), which comprises a gigantic continental construction, based on the Paris-Moscow-Berlin block and opposing **another mega-daguo (thalassocratic)**, referred to by the authors as "**the Atlantic Empire**" (Simileanu, 2010: 287, 336).

• **Hybrid mega-daguo** (towards the end of the 21st century, among weakened states and the new global actors, strong ascending metropolises, independent from the states, on the territories of entire continents): Moscow-Teheran-Ankara mega-daguo, London-Paris-Berlin mega-daguo, Shanghai-Teheran mega-daguo, Mumbai-Calcutta-Dacca-Rangoon-Bangkok mega-daguo etc.

2. Post-Huntington Era (from the Conflict among Mega-daguos, to a World of Dialogue among Mega-daguos)

The paradigm of "dialogue among mega-daguos" proposed in the present paper originates from the paradigm of *"dialogue among civilizations"*, inspired by principle *of cooperation among states* (in the current international Westphalian law). The transcontinental and transoceanic entities to be developed in the

[8] Population of Islamic orientation: 87% in Indonesia, 53% in Malaysia (Sellier, 2006: 12-13).

21st century *do not necessarily take the shape of states*, since there is already *a global post-state order*, with transnational or infra-national entities, with an increasingly important role, multiplying the decision-making levels and reducing the decision-making power of the states, at all levels.

As any player entity in the 21st century global system, functioning as a post-state system, the mega-daguos will be equipped with all the instruments, mechanisms and functions required for unified, coherent, legitimate action, *according to the criteria of this new world.* These entities will be engaged in complicated political relationships with both small actors and the other mega-daguos with whom they will have to coexist or which they will have to confront.

A. *Starting from the premise of a realistic global world, in which the mega-daguos interact only on the basis of the paradigm of conflict, of clashing,* we can say that we will witness a world of tensions, wars, conflicts among entities, which are not necessarily organized into concrete civilizational areas, well delimited and rival, searching for regional or global supremacy. The mega-daguos can embody both *a single civilization* (in which case it attempts *to impose its type of civilization* in the continental or transoceanic areas *which it virtually controls,* creating peripheral worlds shaped according to the values of its civilization) or, in the second scenario, unlike other civilizations, they can *integrate several distinct cultures and civilizations,* if they are political entities *with control over several continents or several oceans.* A conflict among the mega-daguos does not necessarily entail only the study of the conflict among civilizations. *The mega-daguos are multi-civilizational entities*, which do not have to be united by the same language, religion, history, common habits or a sense of natural community among the peoples. In a global world in which humanity becomes a great family and the planet Earth is our home, everyone's home, the humanity's home, the mega-daguos *are entities based on somewhat forced, artificial structures, arising from common necessities and interests* in political, military, economic or commercial cooperation, and in regional or continental *investments and projects*, developed on the territory of several states (common projects), rather than emerging from natural associations, based on a history, on a common past, on a shared sense of common destiny. Maybe this very dimension (the artificial nature of these relationships) is one of the vulnerabilities of these colossuses, determining their outcome in a conflict among mega-daguos.

B. *If starting from the scenario of a global world characterized by a mature political view, which promotes tolerance, respect, coexistence and a peaceful rise of the mega-daguos* (either under the pressure of planetary threats against the entire humanity and sufficiently constant to maintain this status quo – for example,

the threat of climatic changes, the frequency of great natural disasters, the need to ensure the protection of human beings at a level as extended as possible – starting from the human right to peace, the right to a peaceful global environment, the right to durable development, the right to durable prosperity, the right to a clean, unpolluted, durable environment, the right to durable cities), we discuss the functioning of mega-daguos *based on the paradigm of dialogue, of cooperation among them.*

Thus, in this scenario, *the principle of cooperation among the mega-daguos* in a global world that faces planetary threats and challenges, regarding the humankind, biosphere, planet Earth, not only a specific state or community, would represent *the mandatory legal basis* (sanctioned in *the global documents*, signed and assumed by all the representatives of the mega-daguos).

3. A Charter of Peaceful Coexistence among the Mega-daguos. UN Reformation to Reflect this Reality. New Institutions and Norms, New Global Regimes Able to Regulate the Activity of the Mega-daguos, for a Peaceful Post-State World

In this hypothesis, we consider *a global world* (post-Westphalian, post-state), in which the nations have decided to unite into transcontinental or transoceanic political superstructures.

Therefore, the 21st century global order will entail *an improvement in the current international (inter-state) law and the creation and development of a global law (of certain global legal regimes*, such as the human rights; the rights and obligations of the states – as components of the mega-daguos; the planetary rights and responsibilities of the mega-daguos; a legal relationship among the non-state actors such as transnational companies and mega-daguos), in a world characterized by *the expansion of the durable development paradigm*, up to the level at which it has a universal legal status mandatory for all the actors.

The global environmental law (also including *the set of rights of the planet Earth*, which has to protect itself *through its special proxies,* in the relationship with the mega-daguo, as well as with the transnational companies, *against the policies, strategies, measures* with destructive impact or causing degradation and pollution, occurred as a result of the fact that the mega-daguos and transnational companies fail to observe the universal guidelines and principles of durable development), *the global law of metropolises* (as a distinct type of international law, in which non-state actors such as *cities, metropolises and megalopolises* begin to develop legal and political relationships among themselves, directly, without the involvement of the states, everywhere on the globe), *the global law of mega-daguos* (which acts as international law)*and the*

global commercial law (private law, legal commercial relationships among the mega-daguos and the transnational companies or among the mega-daguos) are only *some of the fields of law* to operate in a 21st century global world separated from the current Westphalian paradigm.

It is clear that, unlike transnational companies, mega-daguos cannot exist in the conditions of international law and in the context of the principles applying to the current Westphalian world, although in process of globalization. Mega-daguos are however entities specific to and dominating ***a 21st century that has reached the peak of globalization*** (not construed as a process of political domination exercised by one power at world level, but *as an objective phenomenon which allowed the world to overcome the Westphalian stage).*

In this world dominated by the actions, principles and interests of the mega-daguos, it is necessary to start the configuration of global political-legal regimes for the structuring of the global world with *global legal documents* with a value similar to that of today's UN Charter, the Declarations regarding the rights and obligations of the states, the principles of cooperation among states etc.

One of the underlying legal documents which, in our opinion, should create order in the world of these colossuses could be *a Charter of Peaceful Coexistence adopted by the mega-daguos, in the sense of concretely applying the paradigm of "dialogue among mega-daguos".* As said before, this paradigm *finds its roots in the current paradigm of* "dialogue among civilizations"; *however, we must not mistake* the civilizations for multi-civilizational and transcontinental entities, i.e. mega-daguos.

Such a Charter should define:

• The principle of equality of rights and obligations for the mega-daguos, in the global legal order

• The principle of promoting and observing the human rights, for all the mega-daguos, as well as the obligation *to observe the decisions made by global institutions* regarding the protection of the human being, in relation to the mega-daguos and any other entity

• The principle of development of internal order for each mega-daguo, based on observing the human rights, the human freedom and dignity (*the human being as a universal citizen, with globally acknowledged rights,* guaranteed by both the global institutions and by all the mega-daguos)

• The principle of mutually beneficial and peaceful cooperation (not for arming purposes and for the endangerment of the global political order) among the mega-daguos ("win-win cooperation")

• The principle of peaceful ascension of the mega-daguos

• The principle of mega-daguos contributions to the creation of transcontinental and transoceanic blocks of prosperity

• The principle of mega-daguos contributions to the creation of a peaceful, safe global environment

• The principle of mutual trust among the mega-daguos and *pacta sunt servanda*

• The principle of using global institutions and regimes to promote the economic and social progress of the peoples, in order to maintain global peace and security

• The principle of mega-daguos contributions to the creation of a global order of justice, tolerance, prosperity, economic safety of the peoples and human beings

• The principle of peaceful settlement of situations which can cause tensions and of avoiding wars

• The principle of durable development, observed at the level of internal order within each mega-daguo, in the relationships among the mega-daguos, as well as at global level, with the mega-daguos maintaining relations in good faith with *the global institutions* in charge with *verifying if* the legal obligations regarding durable development are fulfilled and with *penalizing* the mega-daguos which breach the treaties and principles of durable development, at global level, at the level of relations among the mega-daguos, as well as within their internal order

• The principle according to which, in its actions and policies, each mega-daguo observes and promotes the rights of the planet Earth, the preservation and passing on to future generations of a healthy, clean environment, with sufficient resources to ensure the prosperity of future generations

• The principle of building environmentally-friendly, post-consumerist societies, based on a limited exploitation of renewable resources, on a momentum of technology, on waste recycling industries and on eliminating the waste of resources

• The principle of global penalization of the aggressor

• The principle according to which arming is discouraged

• The principle of observing and preserving the areas included in the heritage of the humanity and of the global public goods

• The principle according to which the mega-daguos respect the portions of seas and world oceans, which are legally considered „free seas"

• The principle of peacefully using space and the celestial bodies

• The principle of peaceful contribution to good global governing

• The principle of good neighbour relations among the mega-daguos and

• The principle of encouraging the construction of eco-metropolises

• The principle of global liability for encouraging and sponsoring global terrorism

• The principle of peaceful coexistence among the mega-daguo and

• The principle of non-intervention in the internal order of another mega-daguo.

It is debatable whether we can discuss key-concepts for the Westphalian world, such as sovereignty or nation, in the 21st century. These concepts were also the legal creation, the result of a specific political view, which have led to the creation of an international order that focuses on the state-national political entity.

We will have to wait and see whether the global world dominated by the mega-daguos will be structured in a manner similar to the Westphalian order, around the idea of sovereignty and nation (in which case we can discuss about *sovereignties of the mega-daguos*, a world of certain transcontinental and transoceanic mega-entities with the same sovereignty as the states today, *a world of mega-nations*, as mega-communities living on the territory of several continents or different oceanic spaces, included however in the same political entity).

In the first case, if the mega-daguos were sovereign entities, it would be possible to introduce *the principle of sovereign equality among the mega-daguos* in the Charter of Peaceful Coexistence (which means that the sovereignty of a mega-daguo is a transcontinental and transoceanic sovereignty, assumed by a mega-community of ethnicities and peoples with a common political and legal identity in a global world – that of *citizen of a mega-daguo*, with a set of specific rights and obligations – a transnational identity, as compared to today's nations and states).

The 21st century global world dominated by mega-daguos would become a world ordered by transnational legal regimes, from the legal and political point of view (as compared to the current states and nations), generating *transnational citizenships, transnational institutions and forms of organization,* with *intervention* components and mechanisms on the territory of several continents, oceans and seas and in relation to communities and peoples living within strictly determined legal and political limits of these mega-daguos. In this case, one can discuss a territorial jurisdiction, an exclusive competence of the mega-daguos over the communities, peoples and individuals within their territorial limits of legal and political control, limits (let's not use the Westphalian concept of "borders") acknowledged on the global political map of the 21st

century world, as a post-Westphalian world. Although falling into the category of post-states, *up to a certain level,* the mega-daguos *would turn to certain political concepts of organization specific to the world of states, yet they would apply them to an essentially post-state world.* In this first case, as sovereign entities, *when acting and making decisions, policies and strategies,* the mega-daguos *would not be penalized, controlled by any kind of global institutions*; in this hypothesis, *we are talking about a an atomist world of mega-daguos, autonomous, with no higher authorities generated by the global order.* They, the mega-daguos, would be the only entities generated by the global order, entities which do not follow the decisions of any global authority superior to them.

In the second scenario, the global world would generate not only mega-daguos, *but also global institutions and regimes superior* to the level of mega-daguos, with the ability to control, verify and even penalize them, *in case of failure to comply with the global regimes* (created directly by global institutions, not as a result of the exclusive and sovereign will of the mega-daguos). Thus, it would be a version of *global world organized hierarchically, with a set of global institutions at the* top: a **Global Affairs Administration Council, a Court of Justice for Global Affairs, a Court for relations among the mega-daguos, a Global Decision-making Council, High Representatives of the Global Order for the relationship with the Mega-daguos** (*also* with the capacity to *penalize*, for which reason they are *more important* than simple ambassadors of global institutions with the role to supervise the global impact of actions and decisions made by mega-daguos, attached to the decision-making institutions of each mega-daguo), **a Global Court for the Impact on Nature and the Planet Earth** (with competence not only over the mega-daguos, but also regarding the decisions, strategies of transnational companies), **High Representatives of the Rights of Nature and of the Planet Earth** regarding the effects of economic, migration, political, military actions and decisions on nature and on Earth; **a Global Council of Durable Development etc.**

In both scenarios, we take into consideration *a post-state global world*, i.e. clearly a type of world dominated by *entities completely different from* the states or transnational companies (today's transnational commercial world). It is a post-state world, a world in which institutions are par excellence dedicated to this form of international system such as the UN must reform (in the radical sense mentioned above, turning into authentic global institutions) or disappear in order to make room for global post-state institutions (for example, ***the Cooperation Organization of Mega-daguos***).

The purpose of these *global institutions* (drastically reformed or newly created) is to regulate *the new reality, that of a global world dominated by mega-daguos, a world of transcontinental and transoceanic colossuses*, in which states are no longer relevant, a world born out of combining transnational regimes (commercial, economic, political, of regional integration), which have reached the next level (the creation of the global world *de facto*). These new institutions and new legal, political, economic regimes are meant to *order, control and penalize the activity and functioning of mega-daguos*, in order to avoid or minimize as much as possible the fall of the global order into chaos, in an endless clash between these two colossuses, each interested in global supremacy, irrespective of the costs.

The global world can be maintained as a peaceful world only based on the principles of peaceful cooperation among these new entities, with the aid of a set of global documents legally and politically assumed by them, such as the *Charter of peaceful coexistence among the mega-daguos and the Charter of Durable Development of the Global World, the Charter of Rising of Eco-Metropolises, the Treaty to Discourage the Arming of Mega-Daguos or the Pact for Observance of the Human Rights by the Mega-daguos*, as well as other documents based on the set of principles presented by us, as an example.

Conclusions

As seen above, the mega-daguos represent a special type of post-state actors, which will act in a world that has overcome the paradigm of conflict among civilizations (and which has turned the principle of peaceful coexistence among mega-daguos into a fundamental principle for the global regulation of the legal regime directly concerning them). We are talking about a global world of the 21st century, a post-Westphalian world, in which the great powers have been replaced by transcontinental and transoceanic colossuses, incorporating various civilizations and cultures and being sometimes capable of creating civilizational fusions among them, unimaginable in today's world.

It is a world of post-state colossuses, in which the UN Charter based on the idea of pre-eminences of the sovereign states can no longer cover these evolutions generated by the new global stages, by advanced regional integration and civilizational fusions (born even during periods of inter-civilizational confrontation and conflict).

In other worlds, in order to reach a superior stage of a global policy of harmony, of peaceful coexistence among the mega-daguos, an incipient stage of conflict among the mega-daguos must be overcome, for the latter to

understand the value of a world of peaceful negotiations, of tolerance and dialogue among them. The world of the 21st century can witness the formation of mega-daguos through war or following civilizational conflicts, or as a result of the need for protection and survival experienced by certain civilizations, under the threat of creation or expansion of certain belligerent mega-daguos. It is important that, during the second evolution stage of the mega-daguos, the global law be sufficiently consolidated to be able to impose a unitary, limitative legal regulation to all these post-state actors, represented by what we call **the Charter of Peaceful Coexistence among the Mega-daguos** (with common institutions, possibly entailing the creation of a **Council of Representatives of Mega-daguos**), to protect the human civilization from the perspective of planetary wars.

Acknowledgment

The present article represents only the personal opinion of the author and it does not involve in any form any other natural person or legal entity. All the rights over the present text are reserved. The quotations from the present text are made by mentioning the author and the complete source.

References

Antonescu, M. V. (2009). Noi dimensiuni strategice ale Uniunii Europene la începutul sec. al XXI-lea. *Geopolitica, 7*(32), 83-87.

Antonescu, M. V. (2004). The Geopolitics of Regional Groups in the Arab Space at the beginning of 21st century. *Geopolitica, 2*(S9-10), 90-91.

Brzezinski, Z. (2005). *Marea dilemă. A domina sau a conduce* [Great dilemma. To dominate or lead] (R. Ştireanu, Trans.). Bucharest, Romania: Scripta.

Chine, Iran, Russie, un nouvel empire mongole? [China, Iran, Russia, a new Mongol empire]. (2013, June 02). Retireved from www.realpolitik.tv/2013

Clinton, H. (2011). America's Pacific Century. Retrieved from http://foreignpolicy.com/2011

Council of Foreign Relations. (2010, October 28). Clinton's Speech on America's Engagement in the Asia-Pacific. Retrieved from www.cfr.org

Constantin, I. (2012). *Axa Moscova-Teheran în contextul viziunii lui Alexandr Dughin* [The Moscow-Tehran axis in the context of Alexander Dughin's vision]. *Geopolitica*, *46*(2), year 10.

Constantin, I. (2014). *Rusia. Paradigma eurasiatică- între teorie şi realităţi geopolitice* [Russia. Eurasian Paradigm - between geopolitical theory and realities]. Bucharest, Romania: Top Form.

Cooper, R. (2007). *Destrămarea naţiunilor.Ordine şi haos în secolul XXI* [Destruction of Nations. Orders and Chaos in the 21st Century] (S. Huluban, Trans.). Bucharest, Romania: Univers Enciclopedic.

Cronin, P. M., & Baruah, D. M. (2014, December 02). The Modi doctrine for the Indo-Pacific Maritime Region. Retrieved from http://thediplomat.com/2014/12/the-modi-doctrine-for-the-indo-pacific-maritime-region.

Dughin, A. (2011). *Bazele geopoliticii şi viitorul geopolitic al Rusiei* [The basis of geopolitics and the geopolitical future of Russia] (vol. 1) (V. Roşca, Trans.). Bucharest, Romania: Eurasiatica.ro.

Dussouy, G. (2011). Eau et espace politique: voie navigable et integration territoriale des grands espaces [Water and political space: waterway and territorial integration of large spaces]. *Geopolitica, 9*(41).

Escobar, P. (2015, March 25). *À l'Ouest rien de nouveau, on détruit; à l'Est on construit* [In the West nothing new, one destroys; in the East we build]. Retrieved from http://lucien-pons.over-blog.com/2015

Frunzeti, T., & Oprescu, S. (2013). *Lumea marilor puteri (2011-2013)* [World of Great Powers (2011-2013)]. Bucharest, Romania: Top Form.

Graziani, T. (2012). The BRICS and the construction of the multipolar system. *Geopolitica*, *44-45*(1), year 10.

Iancu, A. A. (2010). Building the cooperation between Africa and the European Union. *Geopolitica, 35*, year 8.

Karnad, B. (2015). India's strategic diffidence. In R. B. Stiftung (Coord.), F. Godement (Ed.), *What Does India Think?* (pp. 85-90). London, UK: European Council on Foreign Relations.

Khanna, P. (2008). *Lumea a Doua. Imperii şi influenţă în noua ordine globală* [The Second World. Empires and influence in the new global order] (D. Mitronescu, Trans.). Iaşi, Romania: Polirom.

Rajendram, D. (2014, december 19). From "Look East" to "Act East"- India shifts focus. Retrieved from https://www.dw.com/en/from-look-east-to-act-east-india-shifts-focus/a-18141462

Raman, S. (2015). PM Modi's foreign policy breaking new grounds: Is the current Indian media coverage enough? Retrieved from www.firstpost.com/india/pm-modis-foreing-policy-breaking-new-gronds-is-the-current-indian-media-coverage-enough-2490802.html

Council on Foreign Relations (2013, March 11). Remarks by National Security Adviser Donilon: The United States and the Asia-Pacific in 2013. Retrieved from www.cfr.irg/asia-and-pacific/remarks

Sajjanhar, A. (2016). *Modi gets an A plus for his handling of foreign policy in 2015*. Retrieved from www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-3381352

Sellier, J. (2006). *Atlasul popoarelor din Asia Meridională şi Răsăriteană* [The Atlas of the Peoples of Meridional and Eastern Asia] (I. De Hillerin & M. Stan, Trans.). Bucharest, Romania: Niculescu.

Simileanu, V. (2010). *Geopolitica şi centre de putere* [Geopolitics and power centers]. Bucharest, Romania: Top Form.

Snyder, M. (2010). Vladimir Putin's vision of a socialist European Free Trade Zone that stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. End of the American dream. Retrieved from http://endoftheamericandream.com

State Duma Speaker: We need a Greater Europe from Lisbon to Vladivostok. (2016, June 16). Retrieved from www.fort-russ.com/2016/06/state-duma-speaker-we-need-greater.html

Sukumar, A. M. (2015, December 15). A shift from style to substance. A data driven analysis of Mr. Modi's foreign policy interventions in his second year in office indicates no sharp disjunctures from the stated views of previous governments. Retrieved from www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed

Tewari, M. (2015). India's strategic opportunities. In R. B. Stiftung (Coord.), F. Godement (Ed.), *What Does India Think?*. London, UK: European Council on Foreign Relations.

The United States and the Asia-Pacific Region: Security strategy for the Obama Administration. (2009). Retrieved from www.cnas.org/files/document

Timofeev, I. (2014). From Lisbon to Vladivostok' how the notion of a Greater Europe is at risk. Retrieved from https://rbth.com/opinion

US-India Joint Strategic Vision for the Asia-Pacific and Indian Ocean Region. (2015, January 15). Retrieved from http://foreignpolicynews.org/2015/01/25/u-s-india-joint-strategic-vision-asia-pacific-indian-ocean-region