

**FROM THE CONFLICT AMONG CIVILIZATIONS,  
TO THE GLOBAL CHARTER FOR PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE  
OF CIVILIZATIONS. GLOBAL INSTITUTIONS  
FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF INTER-CIVILIZATIONAL  
RELATIONS, IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY\***

MĂDĂLINA VIRGINIA ANTONESCU\*\*

**Abstract.** *In our opinion, the international political and legal order of the 21<sup>st</sup> century will be marked not only by the consolidation of the national-state as a political actor (following the trend of economic and political nationalism, of reassertion of the nations), but also by the ascension of new political mega-actors (the Civilizations), reflecting a neo-realist paradigm at global level. Thus, we must take into consideration that the contemporary world is already fundamentally shaped by the objective processes of globalization, as the nation-state must adjust and find new ways to face the challenges of this globalized world. With the advance and consolidation of the processes of objective globalization (with the enhanced exchanges of goods, of know-how, with the increase in and expansion of connectivity among cities, continents, and different cultures), not only will the nation-states react (fighting to keep their identity and traditions), but a new kind of 'global gladiators' will appear (the civilizations, mega-actors which will have a fundamental influence on the political-legal order of the 21<sup>st</sup> century). The present paper will analyse a few of the mechanisms, institutions, and political-legal methods of structuring and functioning of this order, from the standpoint of the "dialogue among civilizations" paradigm, as an alternative to the "conflict among civilizations" paradigm. In our opinion, the Global Mediator for Civilizations would be one of the global institutions required to harmonize the world of civilizations and to solve their issues. The Global Mediator for Civilizations would operate based on an underlying Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations, acknowledged by the great civilizations of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, i.e. political mega-actors – entities also born from the creation of civilizational alliances among states which identify themselves as members of a common civilizational area). In the present paper, the civilization is a political entity, as well as a legal entity, with the capability to take on a specific set of rights and obligations at global level, based on certain legal documents signed by the High Representatives of the Civilizations.*

**Keywords:** *global order of civilizations, Global Mediator for Civilizations, globalized world, political actors, Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations, High Representatives of the Civilizations, dialogue among civilizations*

---

\* 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.

\*\* PhD, Scientific researcher, Bucharest University, Romania; madyantonescu@gmail.com.

*The Distinction between Culture and Civilization.  
Civilizations, the New Political Actors of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century World*

As noted by S. Huntington, there is a distinction between empires, political systems, governments, which are “ephemeral substitutes, at the surface of civilization”<sup>1</sup>, and the very civilizations, which are “long-term adjustable realities, which develop and survive the political constructs”. The *dynamic* nature of the civilizations is also a notable aspect. Quigley identifies an evolutionary model of civilizations, covering seven stages (mixture, gestation, explosion, age of conflict, universal empire, decay, and invasion)<sup>2</sup>.

Of course, we cannot mistake the concept of “culture” for the concept of “civilizations”. The doctrine considers that the term “culture” refers to working the land, while a “civilization” is characterized by the citadel, the city, the fortification, and urbanism (specialized in military protection, and occurrence of the cities)<sup>3</sup>. The characteristic of a “civilization” is visible in its unique urban style and in the nucleus-citadel (the metropolis, mistaken for the decision-making nucleus, which expands civilization and ensures its cohesion, its unity).

The doctrine notes several categories of civilizations<sup>4</sup>:

- Civilizations with multiple nuclei (the Occidental civilization, the Babylonian civilization);
- Civilizations with a single nucleus (the Byzantine civilization, the Egyptian civilization, the Cretan civilization);
- Bipolar civilizations (the Indian civilization, the Greek civilization, the Arab civilization – Iran and the Arab world);
- Civilizations built on mixing and incorporation of ethnic or cultural units (higher level of variation, higher level of cultural-spiritual complexity).

An element important for the author and relevant for our study (based on the premise of *an aggressive political character of the civilizations, which transforms them into political actors able to influence and form a specific global, inter-civilizational order, similar to but not mistaken for the order of the states*) is the fact that the author considers the civilizations to be based on “societies developed according to *the same process of organizing a state*, i.e. they take a limited number<sup>5</sup> of similar political shapes, everywhere”. This view on the characteristics of a civilization includes: the existence of an urban life, a process of progressive organization similar to the state organization (not mistaken for the state, however, as *the civilization can have one or multiple state-nuclei. There are cases of civilizations without any state-nucleus*), as noted by S. Huntington. Another element characterizing a civilization is the progressive territorial expansion of the civilizational areas, from one generation to another<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Huntington, *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*, Antet Publishing House, s.l., 1998, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in S. Huntington, *op.cit.*, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Neagu Djuvara, *Civilizații și tipare istorice. Un studiu comparat al civilizațiilor*, translation from French by Șerban Broché, third edition, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006, pp. 24-25.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 44-45.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 25.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 24.

From a *naturalist perspective*, civilizations are regarded as flowers that follow an organic cycle: they grow, flourish, expand, and die. Thus, civilizations are regarded as *great organic bodies, cultural units with a life similar to that of plants*. The main issue of history sciences is that of overcoming descriptive boundaries when discussing civilizations, as well as the issue of identifying and isolating their fundamental characteristics, in order to assess similarities among civilizations and to identify the *patterns* of their evolution<sup>7</sup>.

According to this opinion, the term “civilization” includes both the spiritual side (the culture) and the technical and institutional-political side. Civilizations are regarded as *large political and institutional structures, distinct from the various forms of culture* arisen everywhere in the human societies<sup>8</sup>. Thus, a definition of civilizations is proposed, a definition meant to make a distinction from the cultures (which are simple components of a civilization): a civilization includes a multitude of ethnicities or several organized states; a civilization is the structure that creates a certain unity (its own unity) in terms of techniques, customs, arts and faith; a civilization is the entity with an evolution covering a very long period of time (over two thousand years). In general, civilizations undergo the *stages of the same schema of political evolution*<sup>9</sup> (it is acknowledged by default that civilizations and their political organization are compatible, therefore *civilizations can be political actors* as much as the states, without being mistaken for the latter).

Huntington uses the distinction between civilization and culture, introduced by the 19<sup>th</sup> century German theorists, who defined the “civilization” as a set of techniques, structures, technologies, material factors, while “culture” is a set of ideas, beliefs, spirituality, values, ideals, and arts<sup>10</sup>. For another part of the doctrine, “civilizations” are types of complicated societies, developed and capable of political organization, urban, dynamic as opposed to “cultures” (seen as a characteristic of rural societies, primitive and lacking change)<sup>11</sup>. French theorists considered this perspective to be rigid and unrealistic. F. Braudel considered that “it is impossible to separate culture from its fundamentals, from civilization, as both refer to the general human way of life”<sup>12</sup>. Braudel regarded civilization as a large cultural area, while E. Wallerstein defined it as “a chain of visions over the world, of customs, structures and culture – with both material and spiritual components”<sup>13</sup>. For Huntington, *religions* represent one of the most important objective elements defining civilizations, as dividing people into races is no longer relevant nowadays, since *civilizations and races do not coincide* (people belonging to the same race can be divided by civilization, according to the author)<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 22-23.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 22.

<sup>10</sup> Huntington, *op. cit.*, p. 57. See Viorica Ramba, *Ecologii culturale vechi și noi în pragul mileniului III. Repere sintetice din istoria culturii umane*, All Educațional, Bucharest, 1999, pp. 21-22. See also, Dumitru Zaiț, coord., *Management intercultural. Valorizarea diferențelor culturale*, Ed. Economică Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002, p. 78.

<sup>11</sup> S. Huntington, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 58.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 59.

It is admitted that *several states can form a civilization* (by default, such an approach acknowledges that states are simple components of a “civilization”). The states in a civilization are more connected amongst themselves than the states outside the respective civilization. The states forming a civilization will *prioritize* other member states of the same civilization for the creation of special diplomatic connections, they will develop economic interdependencies, they will be more willing to engage in fighting or common stands against enemies from outside the respective civilization area<sup>15</sup>.

*In other words, civilizations are entities larger than states, which generate a special sense of belonging to people from the same civilization area.* Another distinction from other civilizational entities refers to the cultural identity (particularly the religious identity, according to Huntington).

### *The Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations. The Global Order of Civilizations*

One aspect relevant for the field of international relations is the fact that *it is not possible to set fixed and clearly determined boundaries of the civilizations, as well as start or end points. The structure of civilizations changes over time, under the impact of the political change within their societies (which can redefine the civilizational membership, moving away from the mother-civilization and making a political and cultural choice to become closer to or enter a new civilizational area).*

Therefore, it is very important to note *the dynamic nature of civilizations, which is closely related to the political side, with the political options* (of the nucleus-states or of a group of states within the respective civilization, which *can make the political decision to withdraw from the respective civilization, choosing to identify and assume certain political and cultural values which bring it closer to another civilizational area*). In this case, we must also note that, if a Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations is to be adopted in the future, it will merely be a document meant to *record a certain configuration of the civilizations (political actors superior to the states), at a certain moment in time.*

We could consider the fact that it would be a Charter concluded:

- By only the *nucleus-states* of the 21<sup>st</sup> century civilizations;
- Or by *all the nucleus-states of each 21<sup>st</sup> century civilization;*
- Or by *all the states forming a 21<sup>st</sup> century civilization;*
- Or *directly by the 21<sup>st</sup> century civilizations (as political structures, with international legal personality, distinct from the member states).*

Thus, the Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations *depends directly on the dynamic capacity of the civilizations, on their flexibility, on the fact that civilizations can be reorganized in the meantime, receiving new states, according to the religious or cultural identification assumed by these states, for political purposes*). The Charter *would be merely a legal inter-civilizational document* (a body of regulations and legal principles universally applicable, in the global order of civilizations), which would record the existence *of a certain constellation*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 59-60.

of civilizations, *at a certain point in history*, a constellation formed mainly on the basis of political criteria of affinity (considering the fact that there are cultural affinities and mutual cultural loans among all the civilizations, being impossible to consider that the civilizations maintain their purity, eliminating any elements borrowed from other civilizations). Under these circumstances, on the basis of political interests, the states forming a civilization can find cultural elements in common with another civilizational area, because we cannot say about any civilization that it is a perfectly original entity, outside any influence and civilizational loan, particularly considering the long historic duration of such a structure). It is essential to understand this *phenomenon of permanent civilizational interaction*, through which the cultures of people overlap and interact permanently.

A characteristic of the *contemporary civilizations* which have already begun to form the global order of civilizations is the fact that *these are types of civilizations in a permanent and intense relation of cultural exchange, of civilizational loans, given the objective processes of globalization*. Unlike the civilizations of other centuries, using the chronological criterion as a reference and looking at the evolution of civilizations *throughout a century*, we can say that *the first half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century* has seen a *significantly greater and more intense impact of globalization* over the civilizational areas than any other century<sup>16</sup>. Thus, one of the phenomena noted in our century is the ever-tighter relation between the domestic policies and foreign affairs, between the national and the international legislation, increasingly marked by the occurrence and expansion of *transnational and global legal regimes, in various domains* (human rights, biodiversity, culture, regulation of organized crime, trade, global financial regimes, occurrence of global, regional, and multilateral governance networks, including the practice of annual summits organized by G7, EU, BRICS; FMI, MERCOSUR, ASEAN etc.)<sup>17</sup>. If the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century recorded two or three congresses or conferences a year, over 4,000 events/year are organized nowadays (Zacher, 1993)<sup>18</sup>. These phenomena indicate the creation of a global quasi-institutionalized network, formed of conferences, think-tanks, policy networks, meetings at all levels, unequal from the standpoint of political importance, domain of interest, jurisdiction, power and space limitation. They form a *global network of trans-cultural connections, which form the essence of a transnational political regime* called “*effective global governance*”, in which not only the nation-states, but also a multitude of other actors are the exclusive actors. However, *not even the cosmopolitan law* (to global governance), currently taking shape under the strong impact of the objective processes of globalization, accepts civilizations as new political actors; therefore, it does not take into consideration (for now) the conditions, the premises for the occurrence of a *global law of civilizations*. It is, however, important to note that,

<sup>16</sup> In another opinion, the future of the culture is not yet one completely defined, but in full shaping: can we talk about a global culture or, on the contrary, about an opposite phenomenon, of diversifying cultures (moving towards formation of tribes, as alternative to globalization of culture)? See Viorica Ramba, *op. cit.*, pp. 458-460.

<sup>17</sup> David Held, 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, pp. 77-79.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 79.

nowadays, one cannot talk about “pure civilizations”, which develop under isolation; on the contrary, *civilizations permanently influence each other, all becoming elements of a global network of civilizations*, which is a preliminary process before *the shaping of the global order of the actual civilizations*. As noted by the doctrine, currently, the states can no longer make foreign affairs decisions as they used to, being influenced by the transnational regimes, by the existence of the global governance<sup>19</sup> (i.e. by the phenomenon of creation and expansion of the *transnational legal regimes*, created at global and transnational level, which the state connected to the globalized world has the obligation to consider and to transfer into its domestic legal regime).

Under these circumstances, civilizations become political actors which act *at an already shaped global level, as elements of a global network objectively created* under the impact of specific phenomena, characterizing the 21<sup>st</sup> century forms of globalization. However, in our opinion, it is *significantly easier for the civilizations* to assert their position as distinct political actors, in a global order already characterized by *a multitude of political actors* at transnational, infra-national, multilateral level. As noted by the doctrine, *the expansion of the international corporations’ scope*, of the technological and institutional transformations, of the new communication technologies *brings forward the centralism of national cultures* and has a higher impact on the coherence, originality, and precise territorial boundaries of a current civilizational area<sup>20</sup>.

Globalization is seen as a shift in ideas, commodities, people, objects, signs across regions, which submits the national cultures and civilizations to a continuous flow of cultural exchange and civilizational influence<sup>21</sup>. Thus, some talk about the forming of a *global culture* (formed of elements of the consumerist culture, of a popular culture at global level, in a commercial and symbolist sense)<sup>22</sup> or about a *global civilization* (a set of legal regulations common to all the civilizational areas, a common way of life, a pattern of cultural beliefs, shared at global level).

The global order of civilizations will also be marked by *a special type of power (the soft power or cultural power)*, which can be used by the political actors (nucleus-states, component-states or even civilizations as distinct global actors) *for the projection of power* in other civilizational areas and *for the structural modification* of a rival civilization (attracting states from this area or destroying them, which results in weakening the respective civilization). In order to exercise this cultural power, *current civilizations need their own mechanisms and sets of institutions* (including colonial education establishments, training the teachers, owning technologies capable of projecting this power both as far as possible and as stable as possible)<sup>23</sup>. Cultural globalization is also possible due to *a global media network*, which creates *a certain type of global culture* by selecting information and distributing it at global level. Such type of culture influences all the current civilizations, irrespective of their geographical area and their historical specificity, irrespective of their organization and their forming states.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 81.

<sup>20</sup> David Held, *op. cit.*, p. 373.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 374.

<sup>22</sup> Viorica Ramba, *op. cit.*, pp. 458-460.

<sup>23</sup> David Held, *op. cit.*, p. 375.

We could say that currently *the nucleus state/states of a civilization must be able to exercise some cultural power at global level, or at least at regional level*, by owning media outlets capable of projecting their cultural vision of the world, to as many distinct civilizational areas as possible. In our opinion, we are currently witnessing an unprecedented process *of intensification of the influence over the given civilizational areas (through the global culture), via the global media outlets. Global culture* (a mixture of elements, information, ideas, hybrid way of life projected through music, television, cinema, fashion, the Internet, which corresponds to a transnational ideology or a certain religious vision, projecting a certain vision of the world, either through state-actors, or through non-state actors, individuals, networks, organizations etc.) is not mistaken for *a civilization* (formed of several states or a state with several peripheral areas), which occupies a concrete geographic region and is *politically organized in a manner similar to the state*.

This type of *global culture* which has a deep and permanent influence on the civilizations, as well as on the nation-states, is the *result of the transnational action taken by large media industries, large flows of people (large migrations, which also contribute to the phenomena of cultural globalization and pressure, change, cultural impact on civilizations)*. It is difficult in modern times to implement closed cultural policies, censor and stop ideas, cultures, a way of life outside the respective civilization, the products, ideas, and groups of people coming from other civilizational areas<sup>24</sup>. At the same time, *it is a natural way of protecting the distinct nature of civilizations, and their right to identity* against the homogenization of cultures and imposing a superficial, hybrid culture, a consumerist blend without history and tradition, called “global culture”.

According to Huntington, there are several civilizations in *modern times*: the Chinese civilization (with a single nucleus-state), the Japanese civilization (with a single nucleus-state)<sup>25</sup>, the Hindu civilization (with a single nucleus-state), the Islamic civilization (Iran and the Arab states, plus the Turkish and Malaysian cultures – therefore, multiple nucleus-states), the Orthodox civilization (Russia, for now, as a single nucleus-state), the Occidental civilization (multiple nucleus-states in Western Europe, the US, Australia, New Zealand), the Latin-American civilization (which incorporates indigenous cultures that existed in Europe, a separate civilization, yet closely connected to the Western world by a special bond), the African civilization (in terms of very strong African tribal identities, existing everywhere on the African continent, forming a sense of the cultural and historical African identity, with South Africa as a nucleus-state)<sup>26</sup>.

As pointed out by S. Huntington, the current relations among civilizations have created *a true multi-civilizational system, shifting from a stage dominated by the uni-directional impact of a civilization on all the other civilizations, to a stage of internal and multi-directional interactions among all the civilizations*<sup>27</sup>. Starting from the definition provided by Hedley Bull for “*an international system*”<sup>28</sup>, we can consider that civilizations are a “*inter-civilizational system*”,

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 417.

<sup>25</sup> Huntington, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 67.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 75.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 78.

when two or several civilizations (and their forming states, by default) are in sufficient contact with sufficient mutual impact on their decisions, in order to be perceived as parts of a systemic structure.

### *The Global Law of Civilizations*

Although Huntington defines civilizations as strict cultural entities<sup>29</sup>, which cannot have the political and legal capacities of the states (*a restrictive definition*, in our opinion, considering the *political side* is also an essential component of the civilization, i.e. the empire/empires or political structures claiming their position as representatives of the respective civilization), in the global order of civilization as a type of post-state order, we can say that, by virtue of a new body of regulations (distinct from the current international law, which is the expression of a Westphalian system) called here *a global law of civilizations*, the civilizations receive the quality of subjects of this law.

Although *civilizations are not subjects of international public law at the moment*, they cannot conclude treaties through their representatives, they cannot maintain order/set justice/collect taxes, they cannot declare wars or cease hostilities as the states do, *with the evolution of the international order in a global order focused on the new actors (the civilizations)*, we can talk about *new subjects of global law and about other entities with legal responsibility*, according to this new global law.

*The global law of civilizations* is therefore a body of regulations and imperative principles, opposable *erga omnes* (regarding all the states signing the Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of the Civilizations, and members of the *Organization for Dialogue and Cooperation of the Civilizations*). On one hand, this body of legal regulations will be issued as a result of the good practices in the relations among states and among civilizations (global law created as common law and subsequently written down in the form of regulations and principles). On the other hand, it will be created as an effect of a global-level legislative authority, with direct competencies regarding the civilizations. It is a version of post-state order, in which *civilizations become legal and political actors dominating the states*, due to the need for enhanced protection and for ensuring the security of human societies, in relation to the global dimension and diversity of the global threats, *exceeding* the individual efforts of the states to solve these threats, as well as the existing inter-state cooperation frameworks. In this type of post-state order specific for the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *civilizations become the original and main subjects of law* in relation to the states (in the global order of civilizations, the term “sovereignty” is considered flexible, in order to allow the transfer of protection and security competencies of the group of states declared to belong to a certain civilization, to the superior level of *civilizational governance*).

In other words, the global law of civilizations will include an *egalitarian component* (based on the principle of the *right to identity of each civilization* and from the principle of *legal equality among civilizations*), being an inter-civilizational body of regulations, which will be superior to the states (now becoming secondary

<sup>29</sup> S. Huntington, *op.cit.*, p. 62.

actors, simple components of the order of civilizations), stemming progressively from the legislative activity of the special authority (*the Global Council of Civilizations*), as well as from the legal practice at global level in *courts handling conflicts between states and civilizations* (between components and the civilizational legal entity), as well as from the legal practice in *courts handling strictly inter-civilizational conflicts* (litigations between civilizations, as legal-political actors). We must not mistake the activity performed by the *Global Mediator for Civilizations* (an activity which falls under the diplomatic, political, mediation scope, handling the arbitrage between civilizations, instead of being a specifically legal activity) for the *activity of these courts*, which form the institutionalized global order of the civilizations, starting with the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In our opinion, the global law of civilizations *originates in what is currently a set of international conventions (concluded among states)*, regarding the field of human rights (the right of each individual to participate in the cultural life, the cultural rights *lato sensu*), as well as the obligation of the states to cooperate (in the cultural field). We can mention examples of international documents currently in force, which will be *sources of legal inspiration* for the future body of legal regulations to form the global law of civilizations: Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Co-operation (UNESCO, 1966); Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies/adopted by UNESCO (1982); Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992); Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003); Intergovernmental Conference on Institutional, Administrative and Financial Aspects of Cultural Policies (1970); Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (UNESCO, 2001); Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972); UNESCO Declaration concerning the Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage (2003); UNESCO Constitution (1945).

In the post-state world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, *the Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations* as a document concluded directly among civilizations (as subjects of global civilizational law) can stem from *a set of legal principles already defined* in the current international law (which only concern rights and obligations *of the states* at this point, referring to “cultures” – term used in the UNESCO Constitution/1946).

### *Global Institutions for the Management of Inter-Civilizational Relations*

A civilization and a political entity *can coincide, but this is not a rule* in the evolution of civilizations; thus, a civilization can comprise multiple political units (several empires, federations, nation-states, confederations, each with its own form of governance)<sup>30</sup>.

The global order of civilizations cannot exist *without global institutions* for the regulation of relations among civilizations, the new preeminent actors of this type of 21<sup>st</sup> century order. If currently *the conflict among civilizations* is an unconventional threat to peace, against which *there are no legal methods in the current international law to provide an adequate and prompt response* (a body

<sup>30</sup> S. Huntington, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

of legal regulations focusing on the states, hence its limitation and its incapacity to handle unconventional threats), we consider that, in the future, this conflict will be manageable and controllable using the *rules provided by the global law of civilizations*.

*The global order of civilizations* is a concept which can define *several types of international orders in the future*, reflecting the increased importance of these new political actors (the civilizations) in relation to other actors (the nations, states, regions etc.). Thus, we should consider *various models of future post-state worlds*, in which the global order of civilizations can be:

- The expression of a single strategic vision of a post-state world, of a *single dominating civilization (an imperial civilization)*.

- The expression of a *common agreement of the states to respond to and remove the conflict between civilizations*, by exercising their sovereign and common will to set up a *global law* meant to regulate the relations among civilizations.

- The expression of a *common will of two powers/of a group of powers* representing different civilizations.

- A global order of *unipolar civilizations* (dominated by a single dominating civilization-empire); a global order of *bipolar civilizations* (expression of all the civilizations' will to cooperate peacefully) or a *network-type civilization* (one single universal civilization, which incorporates all the traditional civilizations, without creating hierarchies among them and without taking shape around a nucleus-civilization or a dominant civilization).

In our opinion, *a set of global institutions* can be created in the global order of civilizations, institutions which are capable of managing the political, legal, and diplomatic relations among civilizations (as political actors and subjects to the law of civilizations), at a political-legal level superior to the states. Proposed institutions:

- the *Global Mediator of Civilizations* (with competencies in the field of mediating among the High Representatives of Civilizations, in case they choose a to solve their inter-civilizational issues by mediation, not by taking a global jurisdictional path);

- the *Global Council of the Planet's Civilizations* (with the role to protect and promote dialogue among civilizations, to prevent conflicts among civilizations and to stimulate the coexistence and tolerance among civilizations, based on a Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations);

- the *Global Court for Issues among Civilizations* (according to the global law of peace, meant to handle the asymmetrical and unconventional challenges to peace; the civilizations become subjects of the global law of peace, they represent themselves before the global justice, before this Global Court, through High Representatives of Civilizations);

- the *tribunals for strictly inter-civilizational conflicts* (litigations among civilizations, as legal-political actors) – courts inferior to the Global Court for solving issues among civilizations, but superior to *the tribunals for conflicts between states and civilizations*;

- *the tribunals for conflicts between states and civilizations* (between components and the civilizational legal entity) – courts inferior to the Global Court for solving issues among civilizations;

– *the Council for the Promotion and Management of Cooperation and Dialogue among Civilizations*;

– *the High Representatives of Civilizations* (special representatives of civilizations, as distinct political actors – in the inter-civilizational political and diplomatic relations, as well as in the relations between the states and the respective civilization, as well as special representatives of the civilizations, defending their rights before the above-mentioned courts)

– *the Organization for Dialogue and Cooperation among Civilizations* (multilateral framework, bringing together states and civilizations – as distinct political actors –, which issues a body of regulations specific to the inter-civilizational order. The participants in this organization harmonize their political positions, and their various visions of the diplomatic relations between them, creating a legal document called the Charter for Peaceful Coexistence of Civilizations, which is a priority to them).

### Conclusions

In this paper, we attempted to provide a brief analysis of the evolution of certain new political actors, distinct from the states, i.e. the civilizations, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (a century of cultural globalization), actors which will progressively become subjects of law for a specific legal order, which we conventionally call “the global law of civilizations”. To this end, in the present paper, civilizations are explained and understood as primordial political actors of the global system in the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as well as original, primordial subjects of this specific law.

We are trying to diversify the range of relations that civilizations can create in the future, in what we call their *specific* political and legal order, superior to that of the states (global order of civilizations). Thus, moving away from the inherent limitations of the paradigm of conflict among civilizations, we have proposed a series of global institutions necessary for a paradigm of mutually advantageous dialogue and cooperation among civilizations (*in our opinion, the Global Mediator of Civilizations is only one of these new global institutions, which we estimate will be created during the second half of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as a response to the rise of these global gladiators, i.e. the civilizations, on the global political stage*).

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Djuvara, Neagu, *Civilizații și tipare istorice. Un studiu comparat al civilizațiilor*, translated from French by Șerban Broché, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Humanitas Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006;
- Held, David; McGrew, Anthony; Goldblatt, David; Perraton, Jonathan, *Transformări globale. Politică, economie și cultură*, translated by Ramona-Elena Lupașcu, Adriana Ștraub, Mihaela Bordea, Alina-Maria Turcu, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004;
- Huntington, Samuel, *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*, Antet Publishing House, s.l., 1998;
- Ramba, Viorica, *Ecologii culturale vechi și noi în pragul mileniului III. Repere sintetice din istoria culturii umane*, All Educațional Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999;
- Zaiț, Dumitru, coord., *Management intercultural. Valorizarea diferențelor culturale*, Ed. Economică Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002.