METROPOLISES IN THE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: TOWARDS A 21ST CENTURY NEO-MEDIEVALISM?

MĂDĂLINA VIRGINIA ANTONESCU[*]

Abstract *The 21st century order represents, in our opinion, a dynamic order, having a complex nature, defined by state actors and especially, by decisions and actions of the non-state actors. The present paper premise is to explore, apart from these features, the multi-level governance of this 21st century order as post-Westphalian order, where multiple sovereignties are shaped, due to the existence of multiple levels of governance. The academics are using, as to define this process, the "neo-medievalist" term, to illustrate the diffuse, interconnected authorities and multiple levels of political decision, and also, the rising of non-state actors on the global framework. We consider that, among these global actors, there can be taken into account also, the metropolises and megalopolises, which, at present, from the perspective of the contemporary international law, haven't acquired the quality of being subjects of international law, as the states. Nevertheless, in a global order, based on a global normative regime regarding the non-state actors (in this case, the megalopolises and metropolises), and also, from the perspective of a global law, these actors are receiving the quality of subjects of global law, allowing them to assume responsibility before regional and international jurisdictional instances.*

Key-words: *metropolises, megalopolises, global governance, neo-medievalism, non-state actors.*

The World of Metropolises – New Global Actors

Specialists see the 21st century as "the first urban century, during which over 50% of the population lives in an urban environment"[1].

The doctrine also uses the complex concept of "*metropolization*", which refers to the fact that "economic and research activities are focused in major agglomerations, while other parts of these metropolitan areas are connected among each other, by a network of various exchanges"[2]. This process (*metropolization*) also refers to the

---

[*] Scientific Researcher PhD, Bucharest University; scientific collaborator with Romanian Academy of Scientists, vam55ro@yahoo.com.
[1] Cynthia Ghorra-Gobin, coord., *Dictionnaire des mondialisations*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2006, p. 242.
[2] *Ibidem*, p. 242.

"relocation of the global economy, anchored in a network of rival region-cities, as well as restructuring of the labour market, at infra-national level[3]. Therefore, according to the doctrine, the "organization of *a polycentric urban structure*" is compatible with metropolization.

At the same time, it is important to understand the cities as "refuges of solidarity, our defenders against the inhumane consequences of the globalization process"[4]. The function of identity protection, the territoriality function, the mobility ensuring function and the function of ensuring durable development are enumerated among the functions of today's cities. The city has a soul ("that force that enables it to breath, exist, progress is represented by each of its residents")[5].

The evolution of the human habitat, from the rural to the urban one has seen a stage of transition from *the expansion of cities and gaining the supremacy* of the urban world over the rural world (with the 20th century seen as a "century of urbanization), to the *stage of quality* of cities (with the 21st century seen as "a century of cities", where the decisive battle will be led over the *quality of urban life and the impact on urban human relations and the environment*, according to the doctrine)[6].

UN specialists warn about the impact of the demographic explosion in African and Asian countries on the quality of urban life: a 50% increase in the urbanized African and Asian population is estimated for 2030, from 35%[7]. Today, one billion people live in urban suburbs, a figure which will double in 2030, illustrating a generalized phenomenon of chaotic expansion of the cities[8] surrounded by outskirts that face a chronicized urban poverty, lack of access to drinking water and lack of hygienic life conditions. This situation of chronic destitution generated by the uncontrolled expansion of the cities, particularly in the outskirts, doubled by the exodus from villages to cities, is the underlying cause of phenomena of social violence, organized crime, civil revolts and other forms of violence[9].

Other authors consider that "the following decades will see the largest urban demographic explosion in small cities in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean or Asia, rather than metropolises"[10]. "By 2030, four out of five inhabitants of the world's cities will belong to developing countries"[11], which leads to a *connection between urbanization and underdevelopment,* the occurrence of cities which are suddenly faced with a double phenomenon: a demographic explosion and a low

---

[3] *Ibidem.*

[4] Jaime Lerner, former governor in Parana, Brazil and former Mayor of Curitiba, *Cuvânt înainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed., translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008, p. XIX.

[5] *Ibidem*, p. XIX.

[6] *Ibidem*, p. XVII.

[7] Anna Tibaijuka, Executive Director, UN-HABITAT, *Cuvant inainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed. translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008, p. XIII.

[8] *Ibidem,* p. XIII.

[9] *Ibidem*, p. XIV.

[10] Christopher Flavin, President of Worldwatch Institute, *Cuvant inainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed. translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008, pp. XXI-XXIII.

[11] *Ibidem,* p. XXII.

quality of urban life, as well as pollution and the deterioration of the natural environment inside and in the outskirts of the cities, the expansion of suburbs, the occurrence of areas lacking utilities and developing uncontrollably. The lack of drinking water, of the minimum conditions of sanitation and domestic hygiene, the lack of access to education and a job, all these lead to an increased risk of criminality and violence in such cities.

Urbanization is regarded as a "global challenge to the progress of mankind and the observance of human rights"[12], plus the connection between the expansion of cities and the quality of urban life, as well as environmental protection. *Thus, the challenge of urbanization is doubled by the challenge of durable development* (defined as "meeting the needs of the present generations, without compromising the possibility of future generations to fulfil their own needs")[13].

From its very preamble, the Agenda 2030 document adopted under the aegis of the UN sets out the objective to "eliminate poverty in all its forms" (including its urban form) by 2030 and to "build inclusive, peaceful and sustainable societies"[14].

Resolution A/67/317 states that urbanization is the "direct result of the global demographic explosion", forecast at 9 billion inhabitants in 2050. Mega-cities are "now the most visible expressions of human existence on the planet and the characteristic specific to the Anthropocene epoch". The term used in 2000 by Paul Crutzen defines the "enhanced level of environmental change on Earth, caused by people" and it is a specific epoch on the geological time scale[15].

The effects of human civilization on nature and the planet Earth include irreversible changes or impact on the terrestrial ecosystems, large-scale intensive agriculture, deforestation, degradation of the water quality in rivers and change in their course, as well as urban development[16].

The synthesis Report of the General Secretary regarding the *Post-2015 Durable Development Agenda,* called '*The road to dignity by 2030 – ending poverty, transforming all lives and protecting the planet*'[17], the first of the six items included in the document refers to the necessity to counter poverty and inequality among human beings, which also entails the fight against urban poverty and inequality. The Report acknowledges that "new demographic t5rends are changing our world" and that "we are increasingly an urban world, with more than half the world's population living in towns and cities". One of the goals stipulated in the

---

[12] Kai N. Lee, *O lume in curs de urbanizare*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed., translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008, pp. 4-5.

[13] *Ibidem,* p. 4.

[14] UNGA, A/RES/70/1, distributed on October 21st 2015, resolution adopted by the General Assembly on September 25th 2015, «*Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*». www. un.org, accessed on 12.10.2015.

[15] UNGA Resolution A/67/317, Harmony with Nature, 27 Sept. 2012, https://sustainabledevelopment. un.org/ index.php?page=view&nr=1352&type=111&menu=35.

[16] Mark Lawrence, *The Anthropocene – Humans in the Earth System*, second interactive dialogue on Harmony with Nature, April 2012, www.harmonywithnatureun.org.

[17] UNGA Resolution A/69/700, distributed on December 4th 2014, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/ index.php? page=view&type=111&nr=6179&menu=35.

Report is to "make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable" (goal 11), which is related to all the other goals mentioned in this document.

Resolution 24/14 adopted by UN-HABITAT in Nairobi, on April 15th – 18th 2013, called '*Inputs for and support to the preparatory process of the third United Nations conference on housing and sustainable urban development*' (Habitat III) mentions again the major symbolic value of the document adopted in Rio de Janeiro in 2012, by the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (called '*The future we want*') and its stipulations regarding sustainable cities and human settlements. The document insists on Goal 7 of the Millennium Development Goals (regarding the suburbs and urban poverty, categorized as global challenge)[18].

In our opinion, in the complex world of the 21st century, the *proliferation and diversification of non-state actors* can lead to the occurrence of *polyarchic* forms of governance. Defined literally as "governance by the many", polyarchies usually describe states which are not centrist or personalistic[19]; Occidental democracies are considered to be polyarchies, but *in our opinion the limit of the definition is represented by understanding polyarchy in exclusive relation to the concept of "state"*. However, in the complex and dynamic world of the 21st century, a post-sovereign world build around *governance principles other than the Westphalian principles* (which can no longer ensure order in an *already globalized system, dominated by non-state actors)*, it is important to consider *an extended, flexible definition of polyarchy.*

Thus, in our opinion, the traditional definition of polyarchy as "governance by the many"[20] must also consider *governance methods*[21] *applied by non-state actors* who are *fully rising* at the moment (we can talk about a *transnational soft power governance, i.e. an informal governance,* exercised through influences over the governments in entire regions, by the non-state actors such as transnational companies, churches, religious cults or global NGOs etc.), or have an extremely strong economic, cultural, political-administrative and social *potential, which is yet to be used.* In the last case, we are talking about a certain category of non-state actors, i.e. metropolises and large metropolises (megalopolises). From a certain perspective, these actors are rather *infra-national*, yet their economic, political, cultural, commercial, financial, social or religious potential *can exceed by far the strict borders of the state* where the respective metropolis and megalopolis is located. These actors can become *transnational or even global players* in the complex world, which organized according to a multi-tier governance model, at beginning of the 21st century.

In this *model with multiple levels of authorities* interconnected among each other, the state would merely be one of the levels of governance, being in a

———————

[18] www.unhabitat.org , accessed on March 31st 2015.

[19] Graham Evans, Jeffrey Newnham, *Dicționar de relații internaționale,* translated by Anca Irina Ionescu, Universal Dalsi Publishing House, 2001, p. 455.

[20] *Ibidem,* p. 455.

[21] Governance/authority is not synonymous to the notion of "government". The first term envisages "broader meanings than the term 'government' and does not entail the exercise of a legal and sovereign authority". *Ibidem,* p. 219.

complex relation with both *supra-national*[22] actors (supra-state organizations, global organizations, non-state global actors, global corporations, churches, cults, global NGOs etc.) and *infra-national* actors (large cities).

The State-Metropolis Reshaping Sovereignty – Towards a Metropolitan Sovereignty, Antagonistic or Complementary to the State or Federation Sovereignty?

In our opinion, *given the post-Westphalian organization of the current world,* we are facing (and we must be able to *understand* the in-depth restructuring of the 21st century global order) *a change in the organizational model*: the objective process of globalization shows the superseding of the classic Westphalian model, in which the only main visible, sovereign and decisional actor, the only one with the monopoly of legitimate violence, is the nation-state.

The 21st century global order adds *a diversity of non-state actors* to the equation, which influence or will influence the current inter-state system and the contemporary international law, in an in-depth manner, yet to be analysed in its entire complexity. In the future, we may witness the development of *a set of regulations applicable at global and/or inter-regional level, concerning only the large cities, forming a metropolitan law, the law of the large cities of the world*, in which *the large cities (metropolises, megalopolises) receive a distinct legal quality, i.e. they become subjects of global metropolitan law*. From another perspective, that of *the principle of equality of rights among all the cities,* it could be argued that all the cities in the world should be recognize as subjects of global metropolitan law and should *have distinct legal relations, from a position of equality*, with various global and/or regional organizations representing the cities of the world or the regions of the planet.

In our opinion, there is great potential for the development *of the metropolitan law* in the 21st century, although the current international legal studies pay little to no attention to it, focusing on the study of multinational corporations, in terms of non-state actors.

We consider that the 21st century world will be a *polycentric world*, i.e. a world structured according to *a model with multiple decision-making centres*[23]*,* given the fact that the societies affected by globalization tend to *favour the occurrence, proliferation and diversification of the non-state actors*, whence the occurrence of the *multi-tier forms of governance and new sovereignties* (developed by *quasi-state* actors, such supranational organizations similar to the EU)[24].

---

[22] For example, a part of the doctrine considers that the EU is organized on the basis of the multiple-authority governance model, i.e. a neo-medieval model. See Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Uniunea Europeană, imperiile antice şi imperiile medievale. Studiu comparativ,* Lumen Publishing House, Iaşi, 2008, pp. 10-11. Cf. Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Uniunea Europeană şi organizaţia internaţională. Studiu comparativ de drept internaţional,* Lumen Publishing House, Iaşi, 2009, pp. 528-530.

[23] Graham Evans, Jeffrey Newnham, *quoted op*., p. 455.

[24] Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Uniunea Europeană şi organizaţia internaţională. Studiu comparativ de drept internaţional,* Lumen Publishing House, Iaşi, 2009, pp. 520-523. Similarity in Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Instituţiile Uniunii Europene în perioada post-Nisa. O perspectivă de drept constituţional*, Lumen Publishing House, Iaşi, 2007, pp. 47-48.

Willy Brant's model (through the Commission on global governance, from 1995) proposes a *an extended concept of global governance*[25], seen as "a relation among governments at world level, with the active involvement of the non-state actors (NGOs, citizen movements, global multinational and media corporations")[26], concept which "includes official institutions and regimes with executive powers, as well as informal engagements regarding which the people and institutions have come to an agreement or which they perceive as protecting their interests"[27]. We are talking about the development of a world which is significantly different from what we understand the world of nation-states to be, a nation based on specific principles and legal norms.

Metropolises: Autonomous Centres of Governance and Administration. Metropolitan Sovereignty

The world of multi-tier governance also entails the occurrence of certain forms of transnational citizenship, as well as the occurrence and legal acknowledgement (in the metropolitan law) of certain *forms of urban citizenship (metropolises and megalopolises as subjects of global metropolitan law)*. Thus, it could be considered that, with the rise of metropolises and megalopolises as new global or regional actors, we are also witnessing the *shaping of certain quasi-state like forms of cities* (including *the occurrence of urban sovereignties,* up to the development of legitimate forms of violence – through the *City Charter – the metropolitan police,* with tasks far *extended and strengthened* regarding the control and countering of multiple phenomena of urban organized crime, up to the point of receiving *special tasks related to countering urban terrorism* etc.).

In such *state like-megalopolises and metropolises (the shaping of a world of state-cities in the complex 21st century order is highly possible)*, the role of the city municipality would be *better consolidated as compared to the current role.* This hypothesis starts from the premise that metropolises and megalopolises turn into state like entities (state-cities), through increased autonomy, up to the point of separation from the central state administration, hypothesis which reminds of the pre-Westphalian world, dominated by state-cities and empires, or even empire-cities.

The role and tasks (set in a *City Charter*) of the *mayor in a metropolis or megalopolis and of the city council* would suffer a major transformation under these conditions, becoming the role of a true governor, with a council of public affairs as government, which manages the city funds and makes decisions regarding the future of the city, as a distinct entity. In this hypothesis, the *state-city* would have the right to trade on its own behalf, the right to makes its own decisions about investing the public money, the right to its own budget, the right to development

---

[25] Also see Graham Evans, Jeffrey Newnham, quoted op., pp. 209-210. David Held, Anthony MCGrew, David Goldblatt, Jonathan Perraton, *Transformări globale. Politică, economie și cultură,* translated by Ramona-Elena Lupașcu, Adriana Ştraub, Mihaela Bordea, Alina-Maria Turcu, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004, pp. 74-75.

[26] Marie-Claude Smouts, Vario Battistella, Pascal Vennesson*, Dictionnaire des relations internationales. Approches, concepts, doctrines*, Dalloz, Paris, 2006, p. 251.

[27] *Ibidem,* p. 251.

and expansion, the right to negotiate on its own behalf regarding matters which are of direct interest, the right to protect its inhabitants (by virtue of a legal relation of metropolitan citizenship) wherever they are on the planet, the right to have its own representatives at state level (in *Great Assembly of the Main Cities of the State)*, as well as at the *Great Regional Assemblies of Metropolises* – in a region of the planet –, and the right to send a representative to the *Global Organization of Metropolises and Megalopolises* (as an institution representing the interests of all metropolises and megalopolises in the world at global level and having the task to set the norms of a global metropolitan law).

According to the statistics, developed countries have witnessed a massive migration of the population from the rural areas, on account of the industrial revolution, which led to the occurrence of megalopolises[28]. A sudden increase of the urban population is now recorded in developing countries[29]. Currently, almost half of the world's population lives in the cities. *Mega-cities* occur in developing countries, on account of the demographic explosion, which leads to an urban phenomenon of chronic poverty, given the "occurrence of vast slums, in the suburbs of metropolises, populated by millions of extremely poor people"[30].

According to the studies, at this moment, there are approximately 30 cities with a population of over 100 million inhabitants, 20 of which are located in developing countries[31]. In 2050, the estimated population increase in Asia will be of 58.5%, which leads to an *overload* of the large Asian cities due to the demographic explosion, to the *expansion* of other Asian cities (up to the level of metropolis), and to *an increase in the number* of Asian megalopolises.

Historians of urbanism and civilization have already come to the conclusion that *there are already state-cities*, using Singapore[32] as an example, where a nation of 3.7 million citizens occupies a territory of only 704 km^2 at low water, with a demographic density of over 6,000 inhabitants per km^2, which is the largest in the world[33].

Returning to a world order dominated by new actors (*the state-cities*) with the legal quality of *subjects of global metropolitan law* and developing *specific metropolitan sovereignties* (based on *politicizing* the membership of permanent inhabitants of a mega-city), in a manner similar to that of the world order in the antiquity (dominated by the Mesopotamian state-cities and others, some of which creating empires over time)[34] can be a form of rise of urbanization from an economic-social process to a universal *political* stage.

If Westphalianism in its traditional sense is an order composed, created and maintained by the sovereign will of the nation-states, *the advanced, let's say*

---

[28] John Julius Norwich, coord., *Marile orașe din istoria omenirii*, translated by Ligia Caranfil, Art Publishing House, Bucharest, 2010, p. 14. Welson Owen, coord., *Marele Atlas ilustrat al lumii*, translated by Graal Soft, Litera Publishing House, Vidrașcu și fiii Publishing House, 3rd edition revised and updated, Bucharest, 2016, pp. 28-29.

[29] *Ibidem,* pp. 28-29.

[30] *Ibidem.*

[31] *Ibidem.*

[32] John Julius Norwich, coord., *quoted op.*, p. 220.

[33] *Ibidem,* p. 266.

[34] *Istoria universală,* vol. I, *Preistoria și antichitatea*, translated by Laura-Florina Drăghici and Dana Ducu, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 2012, pp. 100-107, pp. 179-185, pp.191-193, pp. 200-204, pp. 219-220.

postmodern, form of Westphalianism would be based on the state-city in the 21st century, on the state like metropolis, to be more specific.

This would entail *a metropolitan global order* (from the premise of the "*fundamentally urban 21st century*"), based on *democratic forms of governing the megacities.* There would be forms *of urban democracy*, typical of the administration and general management of the large cities and, depending on the characteristics and specific of each metropolis, *the General Mayor of the Metropolis* (a true governor), helped by a *Metropolitan Council* (with enhanced powers, specific to a true government of the city) would exercise a power of the metropolis which, in a strongly urbanized global order, influenced by the urban mentality, by the constant migrations from the rural area to the urban area, by the expansion, diversification of metropolises, proliferation of metropolises, would become *a political form* of organizing the metropolitan power, *distinct from the state power.*

In our view (if we pay attention to *the development potential of the global urbanity meanings)*, the 21st century as an urban century may witness the rise of a new category of quasi-state actors (metropolises and megalopolises), the shaping of certain forms of *city sovereignties,* up to the point in which *multilateral* organizations or entities take shape for cooperation and representation of cities in certain region, at regional level, entities such as *the Organization of Metropolises in the Pacific Region or the Regional Organization of Metropolises in the Central and Northern Europe.* Each mega-city is represented and has one vote, decisions are made by consensus, based on the *principle of equality of rights and obligations among all the mega-cities* – seen as *entities with their own equal city sovereignty, irrespective of their size and power.*

On the contrary, *in another non-Westphalian version,* we could consider *another form* of organizing the global urban power (organization of the mega-cities based on an *integrationist and hierarchic* model of power). In this scenario, the mega-cities function based on *neo-functionalist principle of progressive multi-sectorial integration in the megalopolises*, which are seen in this context as *entities with supra-city tasks,* positioned at a political and hierarchical decision-making level *superior to the metropolises*). Based on this hierarchical metropolitan mode, a *series of specialize organizations with global decision-making power* would take shape at global level: the Global Organization of Metropolises (with a *Global Metropolitan Council*), with decision-making powers for all the metropolises on the planet, an entity which takes shape through *the transfer of* metropolitan specific *competences* from the member-metropolises to the global supra-metropolitan entity.

In the *third scenario,* the metropolitan organization *would be a polyarchic organization*, i.e. the distribution of power in the global metropolitan system would be made among *several centres of power*, avoiding to focus it in one centre of power or organizing it according to a hierarchical model of power, with clearly defined, overlapping levels of authority. The *metropolitan polyarchy* would entail the existence of multiple centres of power in this system, *which distribute the decision-making power or influence equally, within the system (hard/soft metropolitan power), based on a balance of power between the strongest*

metropolises. In the second subversion of this polyarchic model, the metropolitan polyarchy would entail *an equal contribution of power, within the global metropolitan system, according to a "starfish" model, in which the components are equal, they participate equally in the world of decisions, where there is are no rules, no leader, no hierarchy, no hierarchically supreme president/ruler*[35] *of the metropolitan system.* In such a system, the actors (metropolises) communicate with each other without observing a hierarchy predetermined or defined in a document and without coercive rules. Cooperation and interaction among metropolises as distinct and equal entities, in a leaderless system, without headquarters (as a nucleus of power for the entire system) are made on equal bases, without the power to penalize the elements which make different decisions. However, the system organized as a network of metropolises is capable of making functional decisions, based on the *equalitarian cooperation among the participating actors.* It is a form of non-hierarchical flexible organization, in which the power and knowledge are distributed *at the level of the entire* network of metropolises.

The specialists currently notice the existence of *an original type of network* of metropolises, expanding at global level and forming the so-called "*world metropolitan archipelago*"[36]. It consists of *six centres of metropolitan power* and it is defined by a series of common functions (financial, political, scientific research centres, headquarters for world organizations), which currently cover the *transatlantic Western civilization.* According to the specialists, the 21st century will see the *Asia-Pacific region* becoming a "new metropolitan arc", with six city centres[37].

The Metropolitan-Type Neo-Medievalism

Besides the versions of post-Westphalian worlds presented above, there is another *scenario of metropolitan international world, similar* to the inter-state world organized on the basis of the Westphalian model (with *sovereign and independent state entities*). According to this *first hypothesis* (an atomized world, based on the model of *multiple and rival* authorities, a world of cities with a very well structured identity, with policies aimed at maintaining this identity), in a world of cities, which are seen as distinct subjects of international metropolitan law, *the cities are organized on a rather Westphalian model* (with Leagues and Confederations of cities, reunited on the principle of equality of rights, some sort of *city multilateralism*).

There is *a neo-medieval model* of *multiple, yet interconnected* city authorities, in the *second hypothesis* of metropolitan world which can be consolidated in the 21st century (as an urban century). In this model, instead of being rivals, the authorities form an extended, regional or inter-metropolitan network of entities *with competences shared through transfers of competence* (tasks transferred from small cities to the metropolises). This model can include *Parliaments of the Regional*

---

[35] Ori Brafman, Rod A. Beckstrom, *Steaua de mare si paianjenul. Puterea de neoprit a organizatiilor fara lider,* translated by Iuliana Raluca Hiliuta, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 2010, pp. 26-28.

[36] Cynthia Ghorra-Gobin, *quoted op.*, p. 243.

[37] *Ibidem,* p. 243.

Metropolises, where the metropolises from the state territories are represented (*the Lower Chamber of Metropolitan Representation*), where the citizens of metropolises from a certain region of the planet send their representatives for *a unitary, coherent, sustainable policy, at region level.*

Neo-medievalism operates with *transfers of competences at various levels* and it is *compatible* to the proliferation of *numerous centres of city power*, which are interconnected, getting past the authority and sovereignty of the states.

The neo-medievalism of cities, as a global model of organization for the 21st century world, is based on a world in which the states are weakened, disintegrated, international private violence is restored (the states lose monopoly over the legitimate violence) and transnational organizations are developed[38] (in this case, regional metropolitan organizations occurred and are consolidated at global level, to represent the interests and rights of the metropolises in relation to other actors generated by the globalization, as well as with classic state actors).

The state and the international system focused on the nation-state are no longer the premise of the organization patter for the *neo-medieval urban world* which takes shape in which hypothesis as a post-state world, an increasingly *transnational* world, given the intensification of globalization processes.

The city-based neo-medieval system (i.e. the *occurrence of state-cities*, about *state like metropolitan forms of government, which use private forces,* proprietary or leased, to ensure order and control the phenomena of organized crime and urban violence) also entails a phenomenon of "overlapping jurisdictions, segmented authorities and multiple loyalties, the occurrence of authorities based on a horizontal pattern, rather than a hierarchical model of power"[39].

What the global world of mega-cities organized according to the neo-medieval pattern lacks is a unique, supra-metropolitan, global governance, one single authority superior to all the metropolises on the planet (*the Supreme Council of all the Metropolises*, for example). No mega-city has supreme authority over a certain territory, region or the entire planet. Instead, *mega-cities must share their authority, on specialized segments, with the vassals at lower levels*[40] (province cities, towns, townships), as well as with *other power centres* (post-state, transnational, religious cults, for example – the Assemblies of Eastern Orthodoxy Representatives from the Eastern Metropolises).

The world of the future, an urban world by excellence, will develop regional or global entities at transnational and metropolitan, as well as civilizational level (religion, culture, technology), entities which will share their authority with the mega-cities[41].

At the other end – as we see it – we have the version of *global metropolitan integration of all the mega-cities forming one single world city.* Technically, a metropolitan super-entity occurs at the level of the entire planet, as an "inevitable process resulted from the merging of all the local megalopolises into a single

---

[38] Graham Evans, Jeffrey Newnham, *quoted op*., pp. 380-381.
[39] *Ibidem,* pp. 380-381.
[40] *Ibidem.*
[41] Also see David Held *et all*, *quoted op*., pp. 101-103.

city, as the result of the expansion of residential and industrial areas"[42]. An "*ecumenopolis*" occurs here for two reasons: "increase in the total volume of buildings and proliferation of residential suburbs with low-storey villas and gardens"[43]. According to the specialists, the planet will be dominated by the logic of city expansion in the near future, by a fundamentally urban lifestyle.

Conclusions

In a world *already in process of globalization*, the 21st century promises to be *an era of expansion and consolidation of the urbanization trend.* Due to the existence of *already global legal regimes* (such as environmental protection, sustainable development etc.), it is possible that a *law specific to mega-cities, called global metropolitan law,* take shape and regulate the relations among the mega-cities, acknowledge their distinct legal quality of *subjects of global metropolitan law*. In the future world, it is possible to witness *a confrontation among the global actors, the mega-cities*, which form areas of control and domination over entire regions or areas of transoceanic control, true transcontinental empires of the 21st century complex order. The 21st century can bring *an encore* of a historical stage *dominated by the ascension of state-cities*, which generated their own empires (for example, the Thallasocratic empires of the Antiquity)[44].

In a *global order of the state-cities,* in which the metropolises and megalopolises form their own *political bonds* with their inhabitants and have *a distinct representation right* at the level of regional and global organizations, the neo-medieval model *competes against* the current Westphalian model, based on which the world of sovereign states is organized.

In the 21st century, *a century of cities,* these currently infra-national actors, the mega-cities, can develop *their own forms of sovereignty* and, besides their own funds, they can have their own forces to ensure order within their metropolitan area. The mega-city-specific *institutions*, such as the General Mayor and the Metropolitan Council, can see *a strengthening of their tasks*, up to the level of *political tasks of governance* concerning these distinct non-state actors detached from the administration of states and becoming the *main actors* in a global urban world in *full process of post-state legal and policy regulation.*

---

[42] Arnold Toynbee, *Orasele in miscare*, translated by Leontina Moga, Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1979, pp. 263-264.

[43] *Ibidem*, pp. 263-264.

[44] About the theory of empires as flexible, private or political, clandestine or assumed empires, post-modern empires, see Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Uniunea Europeană, un imperiu modern?,* Cartea Universitară Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005, pp. 15-17. About the state-cities of the Antiquity, which generated empires, see Mădălina Virginia Antonescu, *Uniunea Europeană și imperiile antice și medievale*, *quoted op*., pp. 105-130, pp. 373-381.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Antonescu, Mădălina Virginia, *Instituțiile Uniunii Europene în perioada post-Nisa. O perspectivă de drept constituțional*, Lumen Publishing House, Iași, 2007;

Antonescu, Mădălina Virginia, *Uniunea Europeană și organizația internațională. Studiu comparativ de drept internațional,*Lumen Publishing House, Iași, 2009;

Antonescu, Mădălina Virginia, *Uniunea Europeană, imperiile antice și imperiile medievale. Studiu comparativ,* Lumen Publishing House, Iași, 2008;

Antonescu, Mădălina Virginia, *Uniunea Europeană, un imperiu modern?,* Cartea Universitară Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005;

Brafman, Ori, Rod A.Beckstrom, *Steaua de mare și păianjenul. Puterea de neoprit a organizațiilor fără lider*, translated by Iuliana Raluca Hiliuță, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 2010;

Evans, Graham, Jeffrey Newnham*, Dicționar de relații internaționale,* translated by Anca Irina Ionescu, Universal Dalsi Publishing House, Bucharest, 2001;

Flavin, Christopher, President of the Worldwatch Institute, *Cuvânt înainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, edition translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008;

Ghorra-Gobin, Cynthia, coord., *Dictionnaire des mondialisations*, Armand Colin, Paris, 2006;

Held, David, Anthony MCGrew, David Goldblatt, Jonathan Perraton, *Transformări globale. Politică, economie și cultură,* translated by Ramona-Elena Lupașcu, Adriana Ștraub, Mihaela Bordea, Alina-Maria Turcu, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004;

Istoria universală, vol. I, *Preistoria și antichitatea*, translated by Laura-Florina Drăghici and Dana Ducu, All Publishing House, Bucharest, 2012;

Lawrence, Mark, *The Anthropocene- Humans in the Earth System*, Second Interactive Dialogue on Harmony with Nature, April 2012, www.harmonywithnatureun.org;

Lee, Kai N., *O lume în curs de urbanizare*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed., translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008;

Lerner, Jaime, former governor in Parana, Brazil and former Mayor of Curitiba, *Cuvânt înainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed., translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008;

Norwich, John Julius, coord., *Marile orașe din istoria omenirii*, translated by Ligia Caranfil, Ed. Art, Bucharest, 2010;

Owen, Welson, coord., *Marele Atlas ilustrat al lumii*, translated by Graal Soft, Litera Publishing House, Vidrașcu și fiii Publishing House, 3rdedition revised and updated, Bucharest, 2016;

Tibaijuka, Anna, Executive Director, UN-HABITAT,*Cuvânt înainte*, in vol. *Starea lumii. Viitorul nostru urban,* The Worldwatch Institute, Linda Starke, ed., translated by Nicolae Damaschin, Technical Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008;

Toynbee, Arnold, *Orașele în mișcare*, translated by Leontina Moga, Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1979;

UNGA Resolution A/67/317, Harmony with Nature, 27 Sept. 2012, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&nr=1352&type=111&menu=35;

UNGA Resolution A/69/700, distributed on December 4th 2014, https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=111&nr=6179&menu=35;

UNGA, A/RES/70/1, distributed on October 21st 2015, Resolution adopted by General Assembly on September 25th 2015, «*Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*». www.un.org, accessed on 12.10.2015;

Vlăsceanu, Mihaela, *Organizațiile și cultura organizării*, Trei Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002;

www.unhabitat.org, accessed on March 31st 2015.