**Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Social Sciences**
ISSN: 2284-5747 | e-ISSN: 2458-1054
Covered in: ERIH PLUS, CEEOL, J- GATE, CrossRef, CrossCheck, Google Scholar, Ideas RePeC, Econpapers, Socionet, KVK, WorldCat, ICI Journals Master List - Index Copernicus.

2025, Volume 14, Issue 2, pages: 1-18| doi: https://doi.org/10.18662/lumenss/14.2/117

# Global Order of Civilizations: Institutions of the Global Order of Civilizations. The Global Mediator of Civilizations (the GMC)

**Mădălina Virginia ANTONESCU** [1]

[1] Ph.D., Scientific Researcher, Bucharest University, Romania;
vam55ro@yahoo.com; ORCID:
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5860-7716;

**Abstract**: *During the 21st century, new powerful actors will start dominating and influencing the present international system (as an inter-state, classical type of system). In our opinion, alongside metropolises and megalopolises (as present infra-state actors), civilizations will be the future global political-economical stage "gladiators". Nevertheless, we cannot reduce the civilizations (as complex ensembles of trans-regional and even continental identities) to the religious element, but we have to treat them as multi-dimensional actors, capable to express a distinct political will at global level, through a specific framework of future institutions, and capable to respect rules of a new global order. We prefer to call that type of order, deeply influenced by civilizations, as "the global order of civilizations" (generating a future inter-civilizational law). One original institution of the second half of this century, in this type of order, that we are proposing, is "the Global Mediator of Civilizations/GMC", as situated to a superior level in comparison with the present United Nations Organization (that is an inter-state conventional type of framework, still not appropriate for regulating and implementing the principles of a Civilizational Magna Charta, neither to exert control over the civilizations, as trans-state mega-actors, into the 21st century).*

**Keywords:** *Global Mediator of Civilizations (GMC), global order of civilizations, inter-civilizational system, new global gladiators, Magna Charta of Civilizations, institutions, Global Council of Civilizations, High Representatives of Civilizations, metropolitan order.*

**How to cite:** Antonescu, M. V. (2025). Global order of civilizations: Institutions of the Global Order of Civilizations. The Global Mediator of Civilizations (the GMC). *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Social Sciences, 14*(20, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.18662/lumenss/14.2/117

©2025 Published by In Manifest Network in partnership with LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

**From the international system to the inter-civilizational system. Inter-civilizational management and its principles**

In Alvin Toffler's view, the non-state actors will be the new global gladiators of the 21st century. However, Toffler considers that the non-state actors are only the multinational corporations or the *underground empires* (Antonescu, 2005, 17). He highlights *the pre-state world* (seen as "the world before the chimney", an "amalgam of state-cities, of ports controlled by pirates, feudal principalities, religious movements and entities, all fighting over power and assuming rights that are currently considered exclusive prerogatives of the governments"), as opposed to *the world of nation-states*, seen as "more standardized and uniform". According to Toffler, "we are now moving back to a more heterogeneous global system …that propels religion once more to the centre of the global stage, … as well as the growing global power of the Catholic Church, through the papal diplomacy which has figured recently in major political changes from the Philippines to Panama." (Toffler, 1995, 454-455). According to the Vatican diplomats, "the recent changes all across Eastern Europe were, in large measure, triggered by Pope John Paul II" (Toffler, 1995, 455).

However, reducing the civilizations to the "great religions" representing them, reducing them only to their religious aspect (which is rather a cultural view, not a complex analysis of a civilization) is a simplistic approach; for other authors, on a contrary, the civilizations are not reduced to the purely religious cultural aspect; instead, they "entail the coexistence of multiple ethnic groups or states organized on a certain territory, which have achieved unity in their mores, techniques, beliefs, recording a similar evolution" (Djuvara, 2008, 22).

According to Toffler, new entities (clandestine actors, underground or criminal empires, private empires, as well as corporations) emerge besides the religions (seen as actors able to influence the global politics). Toffler even proposes a "global council of global corporations" (which would, however, represent a direct danger both to the world of nation-states and to the ascending worlds, to the metropolitan world, as well as to *the inter-civilizational system, i.e. the political mega-actors*). *When compared to the multinational corporations, the civilizations are mega-actors* and we are considering the example of state-civilizations such as Japan, China, India, which bring more contributions to the 21st century economy (seen as "an Asian century") than any corporation or group of corporations. Similarly, *when compared to the corporations*, the financial and economic power developed as such by the *global metropolises and megalopolises* is far superior to the corporations and the groups of corporations, which are

*mere actors depending on the politics of a metropolis.* A metropolis has the power to favour or remove corporations from its territory or the public life, through a simple piece of bureaucratic paper about a tender being won or lost. In our opinion, in the future, *corporations will depend directly on the policies of metropolises and megalopolises* regarding the former, as well as on the higher-level policies, *developed by civilizations as major political actors, in trans-continental projects. For example, the corporations will depend on the political decisions related to global or regional projects (like OBOR), implemented by the* ***state-civilizations*** *(China, India, Japan).*

In our opinion, *the 21st century world* will not be led by corporations or criminal underground empires. Instead, it will be led by *the metropolises and megalopolises* (particularly by the ones that have developed their economic and financial power, as well as by the ones with a major symbolic-religious impact) *and by the civilizations,* seen as political actors and subjects of new bodies of law (*metropolitan law, inter-civilizational law).*

In parallel with the rise of the corporations (which, in Toffler's view, are interested in bypassing the governments and laying a claim to direct representation in global institutions, from a position of equality with the states), *in our opinion, the other actors such as the civilizations and metropolises will develop their own regulatory levers, institutional and political in nature, to influence the global, regional decision-making processes, in their own interest or in the interest of their coalitions.*

It is much more difficult for these actors "to attack an established organization in the world of the nation-states (such as the UN)", as proposed by Toffler, to win the right to vote in this world (Toffler, 1995, 459).

However, in our opinion, *new global organizations* will emerge in the 21st century world, organizations meant to manage the relations between the new political actors (and subjects of law, at the same time), *which will be the civilizations and the metropolises* (*to the detriment of the multinational corporations*).

Toffler describes the main event of the 21st century (as geopolitics of the new actors), as being the rise of the non-state actors (multinational corporations), a characteristic of the post-state world (Toffler, 1995, 453-454).

However, we consider that the 21st century world is a type of global order (the maturing stage of the international system) dominated by *superior non-state actors,* as the economic, cultural and technological force of a nation-state (*the civilizations, but also the megalopolises or the coalitions of megalopolises in a certain region or on a certain continent*). In a world of *global flows of ideas, capital, commodities, people* (Held et al., 2004, 76-78), we can witness *atypical coalitions* (non-geographical coalitions) between metropolises, created through simple financial-economic connections and "virtual common cooperation areas", which ensure a coherent economic force, *despite the separating geography.*

Connecting several metropolises separated geographically (from several continents, from different civilizations) in a coalition of a meta-political type (*policy detached from the dependence on the territory, which has become important through the virtual strategy)* becomes the great challenge of the 21st century: a typical megalopolitan coalition emerges, reuniting the most diverse metropolises. Such coalitions are the "Bombay, Hamburg, Paris, New Delhi, Barcelona, Tokyo" coalition, "New York, Zürich, London" coalition, the "Shanghai, Moscow, Singapore, Hong-Kong" metropolitan coalition or the "Riyadh-Astana-Sankt Petersburg-Milano" coalition. Any combination of metropolitan network is possible, because *the 21st century and its politics will be post-state and highly flexible, even atypical for the classic understanding of the current politics.*

We are more likely to consider that we are witnessing the transition to a new stage, a stage of meta-politics (politics detached from the concept of territory, a political view which depends on the online space, as the power networks are built on connections and interests, on online transfers). *Meta-politics* is a form of understanding and applying the political principles typical for the 21st century deterritorialization and breaking away from the world of states. Both the metropolises and the civilizations will use the online environment to create a new type of politics, as well as to sign the *Inter-metropolitan Cooperation Charters* and the *Inter-Civilizational Cooperation and Dialogue Charters*, which will define the relation framework of this type of post-political system.

We could also see the 21st century as *a century of breaking away from the physical time, besides breaking away from the territory. As it moves online, politics recorded two fundamental mutations* (the breaking away from the territory, state, time). Politics becomes a connection method for new actors (metropolises, megalopolises and civilizations), which will create a new type of political message and will exercise political dominance without depending on the power granted by the geographical vicinity and the temporal closeness. Online space and the evolution of technologies (including military technologies) will provide the possibility to create methods, technologies, strategies (and even build private armies, which are fast and move quickly) to protect their interests in case of attack (when the new dangers of the flexible world generated by the 21st century will occur, dangers such as the massive, incontrollable human migrations, at continental level) or will provide them with the capacity to lobby the states in order to be defended by the weapons of the latter (as *metropolitan coalitions with semi-autonomous political statuses* in relation to the states*).*

Toffler started from the idea that "we are witnessing *a significant shift of power* from individual or groups of nation-states to the Global Gladiators"

(Toffler, 1995, 462); however, he could not anticipate the magnitude of this power shifts towards the second half of the 21st century, *when the metropolises and civilizations will dominate the power game at regional and global level.*

*Post-politics in the new age (megacron)* (Antonescu, 2005, 22) will be initiated under the impact of the precipitated rise of the new actors such as the metropolises (which will form true *chains of trans-continental or global metropolises, detached from any connection to geography*) and the civilizations (actors that will break into *actors depending on the geography* and *mixed actors*). Some civilizations will be based on the state, while others will be formed of regions which can simultaneously be part of multiple civilizations (a region can participate in the creation and activation of distinct civilizations, given its geographical position, in which case *a certain protocol to protect the interests of civilizations* must be concluded among the civilizations participating as political actors).

The starting point of this new global civilizational stage can be represented by these *atypical metropolitan coalitions*, which infuse the civilizational areas with networks of common interests (economic, financial, cultural, spiritual, religious, social, the implementation of great environmental strategies), with a shared vision based on an *Inter-Metropolitan Charter of Cooperation.*

The term "civilization" is far superior to the term "culture". In the 21st century, the term "civilization" will refer to *a distinct type of political actor competing against the state and integrating it in large structures, which are based on* organic or non-organic *common elements* (language, mega-nation, common regional history, common origin, even common political leaders – for political civilizational structures such as the EU, with the existence of a set of common institutions as an element of cohesion for a type of European civilization).

Civilizations will be *political actors with rights and obligations,* able to create their own networks of allies, vassals, areas of influence, based on their strategies and specific interests regarding their survival and prosperity or their expansion and domination. They will be able to delimit exclusive areas, sovereignty areas or "grey areas" (ungoverned areas), in *geopolitics of civilizations* (Antonescu, 2008).

As political actors, civilizations *are entities distinct from* the states in a manner not fully conceptualized currently (in an order still based on the Westphalian view of the pre-eminence of nation-states).

In our opinion, the **following stages** are identified **in the evolution of civilizations**, from the perspective of the discipline of international relations (which will treat them as political actors distinct from the states, in the neo-realist approach, through the paradigm of "Conflict among

civilizations", or in the approach based on the harmonious society, through the paradigm of "Dialogue among civilizations"):

- **A proto-stage** in the evolution of civilizations moving at international level (the stage of becoming aware of the distinct political force of the civilizations, and of assuming the political character distinct from the states);
- **Completion of transformation** of civilization, which will become political actors distinct from the states (the civilizations assume *autonomous legal personalities*, distinct from the states, in their foreign policies). For example, the EU has a distinct legal personality in the founding treaties (ratified by the Treaty of Lisbon). The EU claims to represent the European civilization (although there are controversies regarding whether the EU represents the historical, traditional civilization of Europe or if it assumes a new, specific, postmodern identity, which is not derived from the historical one).
- **The deliberate action** of the civilizations **as political and legal actors distinct from the states**. This is a stage in which **the inter-civilizational relationships begin to take shape** as a result of the interactions of civilizations as actors distinct from the states from the political-legal standpoint. Civilizations begin *to self-identify as political-legal entities distinct from* the states (except for state-civilizations such as China), *even superior* to the states (a concept of supranationality). In founding or amending treaties, they begin to assume a standalone legal personality, their own exclusive competencies, competencies shared with the states, their own interests and distinct strategies in relation to other civilizations, which allow them to assume their position *as global actors.*
- **The global stage** of inter-civilizational relations. Civilizations are defined as *global actors*; they enter specific relations and *these relations become global.* Civilizations act as *elements in a coherent structure called "global order", a standalone order,* and they create their common law, a set of principles and rules for their interactions, which represent a specific body of regulations, which we shall call "*the Global Law of Civilizations".*
- **The institutionalization stage** in the order of civilizations. *The relations among civilizations will be organized as models of peaceful interaction, of dialogue and cooperation* (for example, conflictual models of interaction among civilizations will not be encouraged, given their destructive potential superior to the states – but we do not exclude the possibility that specific institutions to manage conflicts among civilizations will be created, such as *a Management Council for Inter-Civilizational Wars*).

- **The coexistence stage** of the global order of civilizations alongside the international order (there may be intermediary stages, in which one of these orders has a diminished importance, in favour of a post-state or post-civilizational world).
- **The maturing stage of the global order of civilizations** (this order becomes the dominating order in relation to the international order as we currently know it, **while the inter-civilizational law** will dominate the international law in its current form.

In terms of *typology,* there may be:

- Civilizations consisting of *states* (multiple), *state-civilizations* (the Chinese civilization, the Indian civilization), civilizations *consisting of trans-state or even trans-continental regions* (the civilization of the Balkans, the Eurasian civilization, the Levant civilization, the Mediterranean civilization); for example, it can be considered that the project of the *Mediterranean Union*, a French initiative, is *a civilizational project*, which reunites the participating countries in a distinct, trans-continental civilization (the civilization built around the *Mediterranean basin*)( Khader, 2007; Tobelem, 2021; UfM, n.d). The second stage would be the transformation of the Mediterranean Union (as an organization currently based on inter-state cooperation) **into a political actor as civilization**, with the right to appoint its own representatives and to delegate them in international organizations such as the UN, the EU or attached to states.
- *Continental or Thalassochratic civilizations*;
- *Regions which are part of multiple civilizations simultaneously*. These regions are political actors with standalone legal personality, in which case specific agreements are concluded, in order to harmonize the interests and strategies between the civilizations which include common regions or states.

## Paradigm of the "Conflict among civilizations". Methods of organizing institutions and structures "able to manage the shock of civilizations" and overcoming this shock

Currently, *most of the doctrine tends to focus on the concept of "civilizations"*, without using terms such as "order", "coherent international system" or "coherent political/quasi-political actors". Instead, it prefers to overuse, maybe in a simplistic approach, *a dichotomic view of civilizations* (Ghorra-Gobin, 2006, 55-56). Thus, civilizations are regarded as "*actors in a permanent state of*

*conflict*" and they are obligated to create *realistic* power plays (Smouts et al., 2006, 46-47), to participate *in inter-civilizational conflicts* in order to gain an imperial reputation (according to a pyramid model, entailing a hegemonic figure, a dominating or imperial civilization, which controls the entire system under its rule, according to its vision). Therefore, we can talk about *a continental globalization* (based on the criterion of a continental civilization dominating the entire world): Asian globalization, American globalization, Eurasian globalization (consisting of a hegemonic trio – the EU -Russia, China – as three regional economic-political blocks, illustrating an economic trilateral that dominates the world, as an alternative to the American globalization), similar to the globalization of the triad (USA-EU-Japan) (Toffler, 1995, 426-427), between 2000 and 2010, which is currently (2019) already considered obsolete and surpassed by other types of globalizations (the Chinese globalization or *Pax Sinica*).

During the period of American unilateralism (which is considered to have begun when the USSR officially fell in 1990) (Ghorra-Gobin, 2006, 15-16), until the rise of other globalizations (seen as political processes assumed by great powers and managed from the perspective of a soft/economic power or a hard-military or mixed power), in the early 2000s, globalizations such as the Eurasian globalization (EU – Russia – China), the Euro-Atlantic globalization (EU – USA) or simply OBOR (China's economic mega-project, which has already evolved to a universalist stage), civilizations have reached the point in which they influence de facto the political scene of the world, according to an increasingly significant *neo-realist* model (in 2019, we already talk about "*the commercial wars among civilizations*", concept introduced by the USA to define new power dynamics and a soft competition at global level, among civilizations with a global action range - see the concept of "commercial wars" (defining relations between USA and China, in 2018-2019) or between USA and the EU.

Based on the premise that the scene of the future (beginning with the end of the bipolar paradigm, when the cold war was over) will be *a neo-realist one* (based on conflictual relations among actors), most of the doctrine *pictures the civilizations as supra-state actors* (in general), which are able to act based on specific objectives, interests and strategies, in a global power game. In this realistic power game (a zero-sum game), *civilizations attract and impose their domination* (Huntington, 1998, 228) (based on a specific conceptual model) over international, regional organizations, over other non-state actors. According to Huntington, "the world will be ordered based on civilizations or it will not be ordered at all. In this world, the nucleus-states of the civilizations are sources of order within the civilizations and among the

civilizations, through the negotiations with other states, forming a world of areas of influence". We can also discuss *the use of large migrations as an instrument of inter-civilizational war* (for example, an offensive of the Islam against the Occidental European civilization, considered to be in decline) or *neo-colonization* (soft/cultural or classic).

The paradigm of "the Conflict among civilizations" (Huntington, 1998, 15-159) brings up the need to *manage the relations among civilizations* (in order to achieve a harmonious, peaceful international order), the need for an advanced science of macro-management (*the management of civilizations* as complex structures, which entail a type of superior management of the states or transnational corporations). This *science of civilizational management will dominate the 21st century, in which civilizations will rise and expand in the international political world.* Moreover, we can state that the contemporary international political scene is *increasingly more influenced by the rise of the new actors* (there is even a scenario in which the great confrontation among the major actors of the 21st century no longer follows the rules of international relations; instead, it will be *a specific, post-state confrontation exclusively among the non-state actors,* i.e. among civilizations as supra-state mega-structures and transnational corporations). This type of future can change the face of the international world in the second part of the 21st century.

***Institutions we consider capable of managing the "Conflict among civilizations" paradigm:***

- ***The Management Council for Inter-Civilizational Wars*** (when an actual conflict occurs). According to Samuel Huntington, "the sources of conflict can be found in the fundamental differences regarding the society and culture" (Huntington, 1998, 333, 460). The author notes "the USA's extraordinary difficulty adjusting to the inter-civilizational age, as an age in which the global politics is shaped by the cultural and civilizational connections; the USA tend to sanctify types and models of policies inherited from the cold war or before, instead of adjusting to the new world".
- ***A Global Organization of Civilizations*** (a very large forum with recommendation attributions, a framework for dialogue among civilizations), with the role to reduce the tensions among the civilizations;
- ***An International Tribunal to solve the issues among civilizations*** (as subjects of civilizational law) – activated when there are legal conflicts among civilizations;
- ***A Global Mediator among Civilizations*** (activated in the preliminary stage or to replace the intervention of the tribunal);

- ***An Inter-Civilizational Diplomacy (consisting of High Representatives of Civilizations,*** attached to the decision-making headquarters of a civilization – as a political actor – as well as to the representative organizations of civilizations).

## Dughin's dualist geopolitical view: An axis of Continental civilizations versus an axis of Thalassochratic civilizations (USA-Japan-Great Britain)

From the perspective of the paradigm of "Conflict among civilizations", S. Huntington is not the only name to be quoted as an example of theoretician of this paradigm.

Al. Dughin is a theoretician of civilizations who proposed an extremely interesting approach to this concept, based on which multiple analyses can be made, including a comparison with the other theoretician of civilizations, Samuel Huntington (who coined the phrase "Conflict among civilizations" in the discourse of international relations).

Curiously, Dughin *seems to accept a neo-realist premise* of its theory, *assuming the same general vision as Samuel Huntington.* Dughin proposes a dichotomic approach to the international relations (continental civilizations and Thalassochratic civilizations) (Constantin, 2014, 131-132) – by starting with the present, not necessarily in the future – therefore, civilizations different in nature, with different purposes, which build different areas of influence, and which are in conflict over global supremacy.

If *Huntington builds his theory on a multipolar type of scenario,* in which he mentions several civilizations (approximately seven) in an inherent relation of conflict, in order to gain influence over other civilizations (Huntington, 1998, 63-68), to expand and become a "global civilization" (the ultimate purpose of a civilization with imperial ambitions), *from the very beginning, Dughin categorizes civilizations into "terrestrial" and "oceanic"*, without leaving much room for an authentic multipolarity. According to Dughin (who proposes an overview without paying attention to the particularities of the civilizations, their distinct nature, their distinct interests), the "continental civilizations" (or fire civilizations) wage a tough battle against the "Thalassochratic civilizations", in which context it is not the particularities of the comprised civilizations that are important, but the overview of the alliance (Dughin, 2011, 23-27, 143-146).

## Beyond the conflict: paradigm of the "Dialogue among civilizations" and the "Alliance of civilizations" project

Civilizations, seen as *complex actors*, *are not interested merely in conflict relations* (or the primitive action stage). As they mature, they understand the need for cooperation, for dialogue, in order to ensure the right of future generations to a safe, prosperous, developed planet. *The principle of mutually beneficial development* can be transferred to the relations among civilizations, in order to ensure the progressive building of *an order of civilizations, by using the creative energies to fulfil a list of common interests*, instead of destroying the world (similarly, *the principle of harmonious international society* can be transferred to the reorganization of the world of civilizations, following a pattern of cooperation and trust).

*There is a certain history* regarding the need to conceptualize inter-civilizational relations, in the 21st century world. Thus, we need to mention some steps relevant to the topic:

- Address of the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mohammed Khatami, at the "Dialogue among civilizations" round table, UN, New York, September 5th, 2000;
- Speech delivered by the High Representative of the UN for the Alliance of Civilizations, Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser, before the UN General Assembly, on the "Culture and development" debate (Al-Nasser, 2013);
- The "Dialogue among civilizations as a new type of approach to international relations"), authored by MR Hafeznia, Tarbiat Modarres University (TMU), Teheran, Political Geography Department (Hafeznia, 2005; 2006).

The paradigm of "Dialogue among civilizations" was born from a critical view of the paradigm of "Conflict among civilizations", as an alternative to it. For some, "the Dialogue among civilizations" is connected to an equation of "democratic globalization", in the sense of avoiding hegemonism in international relations (AAPSO, 2004), in a world of civilizations as entities equal from a political standpoint. In other views, the dialogue among various religions and cultural traditions should be used for "the transition to a new multipolar stage, in which all the traditions are acknowledged as the foundation of the entire human civilization" (Kapur, 2007). A globalized world in which the diversity of civilizations is respected and which "is connected to the values of peace and harmony" (concepts borrowed from the Chinese view of a "harmonious society"). In a different

view, the multi-civilizational and multi-polar world order proposed by Huntington is not a desirable solution for the danger of a conflict among civilizations ("since it would suggest the existence of macro-regional, multi-civilizational powers, which are on the verge of colliding"), and that a more appropriate solution is "a process of regional integration, based on multi-culturalism and dialogue", as well as on introducing the concept of "peace" as an antidote for a possible negative politicization of the cultural differences, at a global scale (Petito, 2016). Huntington's model would be summarized in a few elements - three rules for a possible framework of his view of the multi-civilizational order (Petito, 2016). Thus, in this vision above-mentioned, the rules according to Huntington, are: the rule of absence (the centre-state should refrain from intervening in conflicts among other civilizations); the rule of common mediation (nucleus-states should negotiate to limit or stop the creation of war fronts or fractures among the states in their civilization); the rule of common features (people from all the civilizations should search for and expect an expansion of the values, institutions, practices they have in common with people from other civilizations).

Regarding the evolution of the regulations on civilizations, as legal and political proto-actors acknowledged by the states and by the UN (in the 21st century inter-state order, in process of transformation), we can mention some main documents adopted on international legal stage, as: Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations (2001, A/ RES/56/6)( United Nations, 2001); plenary meetings of UN states on the event called "United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations" (November 2001, A. RES/56/3) (United Nations General Assembly, 2001a); proclamation by UN of the year 2001 as "The United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations" (A/RES/53/22) (United Nations General Assembly, 2001b).

As Reports of the UN Secretary-General, there are to be mentioned some main documents as: the Report of the Secretary-General on Public Information Activities for the UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations (A/AC.198/2002/3) (United Nations General Assembly, 2002a); the Report of the Secretary-General (the UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, A/56/523 from 2001) (United Nations General Assembly, 2001b). We can also take into account the various round tables on this item, as the Letter dated 15 October 2001, from the Permanent Representative of China to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General, called "Twenty-first Century Forum- Symposium on Dialogue among Civilizations", held in Beijing on 11-12 September 2001, UN document A/56/471 from 2001; the Letter from 9 October 2001 (A/56/458) from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General, having as title "Tehran Declaration of

Environment, Religion and Culture"; the so-called "Salzburg Reflections" (A/56/419), Letter dated 27 September 2001, from the Permanent Representative of Austria to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General.

Other documents, relevant for this issue, are: the Report on the Establishment of the Centre for Dialogue among Civilizations (UN document A/54/291); the Letter dated 08/31/99 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, to UN, addressed to Secretary-General; the Report on the Seminar on the theme "Inter-Civilizations Dialogue" (Tehran, 13-14 December 1999), UN document A/54/290; the Letter dated 08/30/99 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General; the Panel Discussion on "Dialogue among Civilizations: A New Paradigm", Executive Summary (A/54/263); the Letter dated 08/17/1999, from the Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General; the adoption of the text of Tehran Declaration on Dialogue among Civilizations, held in Tehran (3-5 may 1999), A/54/116; the Letter dated 05/25/99 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General; the Athens Declaration "The Heritage of Ancient Civilizations: Implications for the Modern World" (A/54/60), letter dated 01/06/1999 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the UN addressed to the Secretary-General.

## Towards a Higher Stage of "the Dialogue among civilizations": the Global Order of Civilizations

If we base our discourse on the premise that the civilizations are new political actors of the 21st century (political mega-actors, in relation to the nation-states and to the classic Westphalian world), it is important to also take into consideration that *the civilizations, the new political actors, can create an inter-civilizational system overlapping* the international system or *interfering with the latter* in ways which are to be analysed.

In a *stage of maturing and consolidation*, this inter-civilizational system (which can enter a preliminary stage of *political realism* among actors, of confrontation and zero-sum game) can transform into *a Global Order of Civilizations*. We also take into consideration the meanings of the "harmonious society", of the principles of "peaceful coexistence" in the Chinese doctrine (already expressed in today's world of states, as a doctrine of China). *"The harmonious society", the principles of "peaceful coexistence"* are elements which will set the stage for the new sets of concepts based on which this new global order will be created, starting with the second half of the 21st century.

In our view, the Global Order of Civilizations represents a type of *post-realist* order based on conceptual, institutional, regulatory elements, on principles of co-existence, of cooperation *of the civilizations, as elements of a single global network, each space having its specific features and its civilizational representative in the Global Council of Civilizations.*

## Global institutions of the GOC: the Global Mediator of Civilizations

We must take into consideration that *the inter-civilizational world will be highly influenced in the 21st century by a world which has already begun to develop, i.e. the metropolitan world* (Antonescu, 2018, 29-43). *Civilizations,* as political actors and distinct subjects of law, will have to create diplomatic, cultural relations, relations of cooperation in the information technology, technology, social, political field, *with the world of metropolises, a fully ascending world, which will set its own rules, will develop its own body of regulations* (the inter-metropolitan law), its own set of international institutions (inter-metropolitan, more precisely) and will send its own representatives to the institutions of the global order of civilizations (in the GCC, for example).

Returning to the definition of *the Global Order of Civilizations* and identifying possible structures thereof, we would like to propose the institution of the Global Mediator of Civilizations, as follows:

- The Global Mediator of Civilizations is conceived as an institution specific to an inter-civilizational world which has reached maturity, which has coagulated in a specific global order. It is a flexible institution (*functional in any type of system*, from a unipolar imperial order to a world with main civilizations in competition, as well as in the multi-level neo-medieval system). It has competencies regarding the *specific mediation (exclusively among civilizations member of the World Pact of Civilizations,* acknowledged as such according to the criteria stated in this Pact, as political and legal actors). The Global Mediator of Civilizations *is a key-institution for the peaceful resolution of issues among civilizations, exclusively through mediation (*as the GCC does not have competencies regarding mediation; it also handles debate and recommendations). Mediation in the inter-civilizational system is more powerful than turning to jurisdictional institutions (tribunals), which are a feature specific to this order (absence of special inter-civilizational jurisdictions, such as a tribunal of civilizations). With the inter-civilizational law being coordination-oriented, it will be preferable to use mediation solutions (preventive or actual resolutions for issues) not associated with a direct jurisdictional method, which suggests a diminishing of the freedom of civilizations, in their specific system.

***Besides the Global Mediator of Civilizations,*** in our opinion, other types of institutions specific to this order can emerge ***in this type of meta-political order*** (since the civilizations are complex entities, superseding the strict view of the current policy, as they combine and overlap the *political* element with elements of cultural anthropology, of civilizational geopolitics, of civilizational security etc.):

- ***The Global Council of Civilizations***, institution created through the World Pact of Civilizations, in order to manage the inter-civilizational relations, in a political and regulatory manner. In this body, all the civilizations (defined as such based on a set of criteria to identify a civilization in relation to other entities – local cultures, global cultures – as a political actor) will be equally represented, with equal rights and obligations. It is a global forum where the civilizations assemble and cooperate politically.
- ***High Representatives of Civilizations (HRCs)*** will be special delegates of the civilizations, with competencies to represent these entities, members of the Global Council of Civilizations, from a political and legal standpoint.
- ***Regional Offices to connect the global level (Global Council of Civilizations) to the metropolises.*** They are entities which will make sure that a supreme body representing the civilizations (GCC) meets with political and legal distinct actors (the metropolitan world, which supports the civilizations through its economic power) and that negotiation and information exchange between these two parties run properly.
- ***Regional Offices to connect civilizations (the inter-civilizational system, i.e. each civilization individually) to the metropolises.*** In other words, these offices will function as points of contact, mediation, negotiation among distinct actors, specific for the 21st century world (seen as a post-state world). Such offices will ensure *a connection between the world of civilizations* (between any civilizations acknowledged legally and politically by other civilizations, as distinct actors, according to the World Pact of Civilizations) *and the world of metropolises.* Metropolises will pressure the global institutions of the order of civilizations (they will pressure the civilizations as political and legal actors, the GCC, the Global Mediator of Civilizations) to be acknowledged *as distinct political and legal actors*, with the right to be represented *in the global order of civilizations.*

- ***High Representatives of Metropolises with GCC (HRMs)*** Being acknowledged by the civilizations as political actors and subjects of law (in the metropolitan law as well as in the global law of civilizations), the metropolises will be able to delegate their own representatives (*metropolitan diplomats*), special attachés and plenipotentiaries of the metropolises, in the structures and institutions, negotiation councils, and in mediation councils.
- ***The Common Council of Metropolises and Civilizations* (*CCMC)***, special organism that ensures the institutional and legal-political framework for *negotiation and cooperation* between the world of civilizations and the world of metropolises. Metropolises will be able to send their own representatives to this body, before accessing the superior level of mediation and cooperation ensured by the GCC.

## Certain conclusions

The present paper was based on the premise of the post-state nature of the 21st century world, looking at it from a perspective different from Toffler's. If, for Toffler, the new global gladiators are the multinational corporations and underground empires, we consider that other fully rising entities are the new global gladiators (civilizations, metropolises, megalopolises). We consider that, in the future, they will be capable of forming their own bodies of rules (metropolitan law, inter-civilizational law) specific to orders distinct from the world of states (the metropolitan world and the global order of civilizations).

In the present material, we have also proposed a preliminary set of institutions specific to the future functioning of the global order of civilizations, considering the quality of political actor distinct from the states, assumed by the civilizations starting with the second half of the 21st century (some already act as distinct political actors, such as China, Japan, India, the state-civilizations). In this context dominated by the transgression of politics (as construed today, intrinsically connected to the state, to the territory and to time) and by an evolution to meta-politics (a type of politics detached from the territory, the state, time, anchored in the connections and the specifics of the virtual space), *atypical coalitions of civilizations will be formed, as well as atypical coalitions of metropolises, which will change the shape of tomorrow's world.*

In our opinion, the Global Mediator of Civilizations is conceived as *an institution specific to the global order of civilizations, which enters a stage of maturing and consolidation*, during the second part of the 21st century, possibly even earlier (as the post-state model of world order advances), institution which will manage the relations among the new global gladiators (civilizations).

**Acknowledgments** | *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 of the present text can be made by mentioning the author and the complete source.*

*This is a scientific paper presented in 2018 at the 5th Central and Eastern European Lumen Scientific Conference, Hradec Kralove, Czech Republic, 20-21 September 2018, LUMEN Research Centre Social and Humanistic Studies, http://lumen.international/lumen-nashs2018/program-working-papers/.*

**Statement on the Use of AI Tools** | *No AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing, editing, or data analysis for this manuscript. All work is original and completed solely by the listed author.*

## References

Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO) (2004). http://www.aapsorg.org/en/archive-en/74-information/publications/451-clash-of-civilizations.html

Al-Nasser, N. A., (2013). Speech delivered by the High Representative of the UN for the Alliance of Civilizations, Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser, before the UN General Assembly, on the "Culture and development" debate. https://www.unaoc.org/2013/06/statement-by-his-excellency-mr-nassir-abdulaziz-al-nasser-un-high-representative-for-the-alliance-of-civilizations-before-the-united-nations-general-assemblys-thematic-debate-cultur/

Antonescu, M. V. (2008). Conceptul de civilizaţie în relaţiile internaţionale la începutul sec. al XXI-lea: câteva comentarii. *Geopolitica, 26*, numărul special „Globalizarea relaţiilor inter-civilizaţionale".

Antonescu, M. V. (2018). Metropolises in the Global Governance: Towards a 21st Century Neo-Medievalism?. *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Social Sciences*, *7*(1), 29-43. https://doi.org/10.18662/lumenss/03

Antonescu, M.V. (2005). *Uniunea Europeană, un imperiu modern?* Ed. Cartea Universitară

Constantin, I. (2014). *Rusia. Paradigma eurasiatică- între teorie şi realităţi geopolitice.* Top Form

Djuvara, N., (2008). *Civilizaţii şi tipare istorice. Un studiu comparat al civilizaţiilor,* ed. III, Humanitas

Dughin, A., (2011). *Bazele geopoliticii și viitorul geopolitic al Rusiei.* (vol. 1), Eurasiatica.ro

Ghorra-Gobin, C., (2006). *Dictionnaire des mondialisations.* Armand Colin

Hafeznia, M. R. (2005). Dialogue among civilizations as a new approach for international relations.

Hafeznia, M. R. (2006). Dialogue among Civilizations as a New Approach for International Relations. In *The Future of Life and the Future of our Civilization* (pp. 351-360). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4020-4968-2_42

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., Perraton, J. (2004).*Transformări globale. Politică, economie și cultură.* (trans). Polirom

Huntington, S. (1998). *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*. trad. Radu Carp, Antet

Kapur, J. C. (2007). Roadblocks to a 'dialogue of civilisations'. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues*, *11*(3), 186-190. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48505008

Khader, B. (2007). *L'Union Méditerranéenne: Une Union de projets ou un projet d'Union.* https://iremmo.org/archives-confluences-mediterranee/les-analyses-de-cm/lunion-mediterraneenne-une-union-de-projets-ou-un-projet-dunion/

Petito, F. (2016). Dialogue of civilizations in a multipolar world: toward a multicivilizational-multiplex world order. *International Studies Review*, *18*(1), 78-91. https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viv030

Smouts, M-C., Battistella, D., Vennesson, P. (2006). *Dictionnaire des relations internationales. Approches, concepts, doctrines,* Dalloz

*The International Journal of Humanities, 12*(1), 21-30. https://eijh.modares.ac.ir/article-27-6975-en.pdf

The Union for the Mediterranean (UfM)(n.d). https://ufmsecretariat.org/who-we-are/

Tobelem, B. (mis à jour le 18.01.2021). Qu'est-ce que l'Union pour la Méditerranée?. *Toute l'Europe comprendre Europe.* https://www.touteleurope.eu/l-ue-dans-le-monde/qu-est-ce-que-l-union-pour-la-mediterranee/

Toffler, A. (1995). *Power shift. [Puterea în mișcare*]. trans. Columbeanu, M., Antet XX Press

United Nations (2001). *Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations (2001, A/ RES/56/6)* https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/56/6

United Nations General Assembly (2001a). *Resolution adopted by the General Assembly [without reference to a Main Committee (A/56/L.6)] 56/3. United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations* (November 2001, A. RES/56/3). https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/56/3

United Nations General Assembly (2001b). *United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations. Report of the Secretary-General(*A/RES/53/22*).* https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/451803/files/A_56_523-EN.pdf

United Nations General Assembly (2002a). *Report of the Secretary-General on Public Information Activities for the UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations (A/AC.198/2002/3).* https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/458924/files/A_AC-198_2002_3-EN.pdf