

Institutions of the Global Metropolitan Order: The Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises (The G.M.M.M.)

Madalina Virginia ANTONESCU¹

¹ Independent expert. Scientific researcher, Ph.D., Bucharest, Romania.

Abstract: Taking into account the UN reports regarding the expansion and proliferation of the great cities, we can talk about XXIst century as a century of full urban rise. Urban policy is representing increasingly a field of great interest for the doctrine of global studies, surpassing the limits of the national politics. Within the present paper, approaching the issue in a futuristic method -and after a brief depiction of the main framework (by starting with the second half of the XXIst century) in which metropolises and megalopolises are expected to expand-, we shall offer several definitions for innovative concepts as: metropolization, global order of metropolises and megalopolises, regional/continental metropolitan arches. Also, we shall try to depict the general shape of some specific institutions for this type of global order, based on the main role of metropolises and megalopolises, inclusively to reveal the principal attributions of what we call here the "Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises", and also, to articulate some of "global metropolitan Charter" principles. The diplomatic relations between such new actors in relations with traditional political actors (states, intergovernmental international organizations) and also the concept of the "global metropolitan law" are also, approached into the present paper.

Keywords: *metropolization, global metropolitan order, Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises, metropolises, urban century.*

How to cite: Antonescu, M.V. (2022). Institutions of the Global Metropolitan Order: The Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises (The G.M.M.M.). *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 7(1), 39-53. <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumeneas/7.1/34>

1. The Global Metropolitan Order. The Global Charter of Metropolises and Megalopolises; the High Representatives of Metropolises and Megalopolises

The concepts of megalopolises and metropolises were explored by us in several academic papers. Thus, in a trans-disciplinary work, written during 1999-2000, and published in 2004, we treated broadly the issue of inter-metropolitan relations, networks of metropolises and space neo-colonies, within the framework of progressive consume of resources and of planet Earth incapacity to insure the food and water needs for the entire world population; this would mean, according our view, the start of the post-terrestrial globalization, through a brutal detachment of metropolitan networks away from huge, terrestrial, crowded peripheries exhausted by resources. Thus, it would finally appear state-cities on the terrestrial orbit, or isolated within secure areas, closed to the intrusions of chaotic peripheries (Antonescu, 2004).

As we exposed in some studies devoted to global institutions, into the context of the 21st century world, we should take into consideration: the evolution of the non-state actors, the massive and uncontrolled migratory flows which move suddenly on entire continents, the pollution and climate changes, the dangers caused by the progress of industrial technologies and pollution, the situation of the unique and fragile terrestrial ecosystems, impoverishment and financial crises with impact on countries or entire regions, depletion of drinking water resources and food crisis, migrations from the rural area to the metropolises, urban crime and urban terrorism (Antonescu, 2018).

Together with the advance and consolidation of the processes of objective globalization (noticing the expansion of connectivity among cities, continents, and different cultures), not only will the nation-states react (fighting to keep their identity and tradition), but a new kind of 'global gladiators' will appear, once with the rise of megalopolises and metropolises (the civilizations), as we explored in other studies (Antonescu, 2020).

New types of diplomacy will appear, during XXIst century, in our opinion, once surpassed the present stage of Westphalian world of states as originary, principal and sovereign subjects of contemporary international law. Another actors than states (as metropolises and megalopolises) will be, in future, involved in global activity of regulating global issues and challenges

of XXIst century postmodern world, including diplomacy of non-state actors (Antonescu, 2017).

At the beginning of the 21st century, it is necessary, according to our view, taking into consideration (with the elaboration of global institutions and regimes for environmental protection, and especially for the protection of global common goods) the increase of interconnecting the level between nature and human civilization (Antonescu, 2017).

We also explored in our previous scientific works some innovative concepts as “state-metropolis” and “metropolitan sovereignty”, to illustrate a pattern of political future organization based on the development of a set of regulations applicable at global/inter-regional level. Such order would concern, as main actors, only large cities, forming a metropolitan law, the law of the largest cities of the world, in which huge cities (metropolises, megalopolises) would receive a distinct legal quality, i.e. they become subjects of global metropolitan law (Antonescu, 2018).

As we already expressed in scientific communications on this issue, the megacities /megalopolises of this “urban century” - as UN defined this century- will behave, in our opinion, as key-actors, by shaping the whole profile of the international order. We are talking about a post-Westphalian world, by taking into account the hypothesis of metropolises’ growing importance, that will create a genuine order of infra-actors, an order of megacities (Antonescu, 2018, scientific communication *Metropolitan Diplomacy*).

In another scientific communication, we have tried to identify new modalities for future megalopolises to exert political power and dominance. Mega-cities of the future will adopt, in our view, some elements and visions of the past state-cities, enriching them, in the same time, with new urban, architectural and political concepts, appropriated to the new Meta-Antropocene Age ((Antonescu, 2018, scientific communication *The foundation of New Serenissima. Institutional political patterns of mega-cities starting from the second half of XXIst century- the beginning of XXII century*).

Metropolises and megalopolises, as new powerful actors, will start dominating and influencing the present international system (as inter-state classical type of system). In our opinion, together with metropolises and megalopolises (as present infra-state actors), civilizations will be the future global political-economical “gladiators” (Antonescu, 2018, scientific communication *The Global Order of Civilizations. Institutions of the Global Order of Civilizations. The Global Mediator of Civilizations*).

Starting from the second half of the XXIst century, due to the ascent of metropolises as main actors of a global post-state world, and assuming

the objective of blocking uncontrolled activities of non-state actors (TNCs, clandestine/paramilitary/underground networks), the metropolises will enact their own legislative bodies (through consolidated political and legal role of their own authorities as the General Mayor and the General Municipal Council) as being endowed with the legal force of a metropolitan genuine constitution (Antonescu, 2018).

According to our view, in future there will be created progressively, as effect of economic and political autonomous power of metropolises and megalopolises, “the great metropolitan areas”; such actors might build their own modalities of political legitimacy, an autonomous way of working, apart from the state and they might develop progressively their own patterns of sovereignties, personal and independent budgets, and distinct forms of leadership in comparison with the state ones (Antonescu, 2020).

In our opinion, the 21st century features the ascension of new non-state actors, which define what the UN have already described as the profile of this century (an “urban century”), i.e. *the metropolises and megalopolises*. According to the UN documents, urban population increased from 50% in 2000 to 60% in 2020, illustrating “a universality of the urban reality”, “an urban world” (Claval, 1981). Currently, all the regions of the globe record urban agglomerations, phenomena characterizing the expansion of metropolises and megalopolises, with demographic explosions and chronic poverty accelerating on a yearly basis: from 250 urban agglomerations with over 1 million inhabitants in 2000, up to 550 cities with over 1 million inhabitants in 2020 (Bonnet, 2000).

The authors who have studied this phenomenon call it *metropolization*. They have noted its existence at *global* level, both in rich, highly industrialized countries (metropolises powering the economies), and in third world countries (megalopolises displaying a high level of urban density and chronic poverty) (Bonnet, 2000).

According to the Routledge Encyclopaedia (Griffiths, 2005), *global cities* are defined as urban centres with over 3 million inhabitants, displaying a significant capacity to connect to other clusters of international urban population (trade, transports, communications, economy etc.). In the above-mentioned source, these urban centres represent “regional power centres and they act as hubs in a global information network”. In our opinion, the metropolises and megalopolises will become *political* actors (subsequently they will also become *subjects of global metropolitan law*), beginning with the mid-21st century, in the sense that they will be autonomous in relation to the states. At the same time, *heterarchical neo-medieval networks will expand among*

metropolises, as well as among the metropolises and other types of actors (Antonescu, 2020).

In the future, metropolises will be able to develop their own forms of sovereignty and citizenship in relation to their inhabitants, in relation to their territory and to their budget (their own currency, specific taxes which are not administered by the traditional state institutions). In our view, the heterarchies created by such rising actors (*vertical metropolises and traditional, horizontal metropolises*) will make an important object of study, starting with the second part of the 21st century, as “an urban century”, a period during which a new global order of metropolises and megalopolises (GOMM) will take shape.

According to some authors, differencing metropolises from states and small cities is to note “the existence of multiple relations *among the metropolises at international level*, a fact that is different from *the relations administered by capital city and small cities in a region*” (Bonnet, 2000, pp.20). The global urban network, which comprises world metropolises with various characteristics (economic, cultural, university centres, technology-research centres etc.), functions using *the criterion of functional proximity, rather than the criterion of geographical proximity* (Bonnet, 2000, pp. 200). As noted by Paul Claval (1981), the great metropolises are already organized territorially *above* regions and states; “the city no longer depends on its location in the surrounding rural space and its main function is no longer to sustain a rural space; it works for itself and for other urban spaces” (Bonnet, 2000, p. 200).

Once emancipated from the guardianship of the nation-states, the metropolises and megalopolises begin to shape the post-state profile of the 21st century, as *a global century of metropolises and megalopolises*.

As mentioned by the doctrine, the world metropolises (as political-legal and/or economic actors with decision power in the global order of metropolises and megalopolises, irrespective of the security architectures in which they are included, i.e. interregional or trans-regional networks, forming heterarchies or chains of mega-cities) must include “major functions and equipment which gives them the real power to initiate and control exchanges, to organize information and communication” (Bonnet, 2000, pp. 27). These metropolises are organized as what the specialists call “urban systems” (a set of mother-cities functioning as a unit, in a network, to form a universe-economy, controlled in a few central points of impulse, which are the main power centres for the other components, in this universe-economy (Bonnet, 2000, pp. 27). However, this definition includes *a non-egalitarian perspective* revealed by the connection to the territories of

dependence, which entail the existence of a series of main metropolises dictating or setting the strategic and decision-making agenda for the other components of the metropolitan network. Therefore, it is *an inter-metropolitan colonialism or a hierarchical power structure within a network*.

During the 20th century – early 21st century, the doctrine viewed “great world metropolises” as the headquarters for the governments of the great powers (a view specific to this period) or the place which hosted the headquarters of corporations or cultural heritage of the human civilization, as well as “political, intellectual, economic capital cities, i.e. complete cities that made history and that underlie the evolution of universe-economies” (Bonnet, 2000, pp. 27).

We define the GOMM as the “global order of metropolises and megalopolises”, the type of order based on a new political-legal category of actors: *the metropolises and megalopolises*, which are currently the infra-state actors (from a legal standpoint), not the political actors (we cannot talk about an autonomous politicization of the urbanism per se; at most, we can talk about local elections for the institutional structures specific to a metropolis, which are also included in the state system, being organized by the state institutions and representing the citizens of a city as part of a country, not the citizens of the city *per se*. Currently, metropolises and megalopolises do not grant citizenship to their inhabitants; they are not able to grant a citizenship that doubles/replaces the citizenship of the states where the metropolises and megalopolises in question are located. In a different perspective, the global law of metropolises is based on an internal law of each metropolis (*its Metropolitan Charter*), correlated with other Metropolitan Charters (in a system of specific regulations, at regional and global level).

The Regional Charters of Metropolises and Megalopolises set the rules for the legal structures of inter-metropolitan networks, covering regions of metropolitan development (the Regional Metropolitan Arches, the inter-continental Metropolitan Arches, and the trans-continental Metropolitan Arches).

In our opinion, this system of correlations among the Charters specific to each metropolis forms *an inter-metropolitan regional law*, associated with *specific regional institutions*, such as:

- A Regional Inter-Metropolitan Council.
- A Regional Inter-Metropolitan Court of Arbitration.
- A Regional Tribunal (its jurisdiction including litigations between states and metropolises, between states and other non-state actors, such as organizations, individuals, corporations).

- *Regional Metropolitan Arches*, as specific legal-political structures (such as leagues or federations of cities) set up between metropolises and megalopolises, organized in a unified geographic region. These structures are based on legal pacts specific to the RMA in question.

- *Inter-regional Metropolitan Arches* structured as inter-relation entities among several regional metropolitan arcs. They are based on a common legal pact (of the Inter-Regional Metropolitan Arch).

- *Trans-regional Metropolitan Arches* (structured without considering the geographic rules, directly among metropolises located in various parts of the globe). They are based on an inter-metropolitan legal pact, concluded directly by the metropolises, by the components of the Arch in question.

These structures and specific legal regulations (regional, inter-regional, trans-regional) form the actual body of a coherent legal system, which we term “global metropolitan law”. This law can be consolidated in a subsequent evolution stage, taking a global dimension (*the Global Charter of Metropolises and Megalopolises*, with a specific set of global metropolitan institutions. In our opinion, starting with the early 22nd century, the *High Representatives of Metropolises and Megalopolises* are the direct diplomatic delegates of mega-cities, with competencies assigned by the decision-making institutions (collective or individual) of the cities (*City Halls, County Councils* etc.) to represent the cities in question, the latter being autonomous entities and subjects of global metropolitan law, in relation with other cities (of similar status) or in the collective organizations of metropolises (federations, leagues of metropolises, metropolitan conferences, regional and global metropolitan organizations specialized in or with competences in the field of GOMM).

2. Institutions specific to the global order of metropolises and megalopolises

Starting with the late 21st century, as the metropolises ascended, proliferated and became autonomous in relation to other traditional political actors, we can discuss the creation of a “global metropolitan law” (a legal framework covering the rights and obligations specific to these new political-legal actors, which are distinct from the states, from the corporations and from the intergovernmental, international organizations). In our view, the global metropolitan law is built on the *Regional Charters of Metropolises and Megalopolises*, which regulate the legal frameworks of the inter-metropolitan networks, covering regions of metropolitan development (*the Regional Metropolitan Arches, the Inter-continental Metropolitan Arches and the Trans-continental Metropolitan Arches*).

From this perspective, the global law of metropolises, progressively shaped and consolidated in the global order of metropolises and megalopolises, is defined as a body of legal regulations comprising both regional and trans-regional legal frameworks, which cover the new actors, *as well as their legal interferences in the co-existing orders* (the global order of civilizations, the international order, corporations and international organizations), plus a superior layer of legal regulation (in the third consolidation stage of this law), i.e. *a distinct body* of legal regulations configured at global level, by the global institutions of the GOMM.

If we were to imagine some of these GOMM institutions that are able to act starting with the late 21st century – early 22nd century, as this type of order is consolidated (as an expression and result of the proliferation and increasing importance of the metropolises and megalopolises, and of the global urbanization), such institutions could be:

- *The Interactive E-Council of Megalopolises and Metropolises,*
- *The Inter-Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce,*
- *The Permanent Online Platform for diplomatic relations among the metropolises and megalopolises,*
- *The Doges/Mayors, The Dogessas/Mayoresses of the global metropolises and megalopolises,*
- *The Metropolitan Councils (derived from the today City Councils),*
- *The General Assembly of Metropolitan Councils,*
- *The Metropolitan Corporate Colleges and their representatives attached to the metropolitan Doges/Mayors, to the Dogessas/ Mayoresses*
- *The Metropolitan Agencies attached to the metropolitan Doges/ Dogessas,*
- *The State Agencies attached to the metropolitan Doges/ Dogessas*
- *The Agencies of international organizations, attached to the metropolitan Doges/ Dogessas,*
- *The specialized Metropolitan Chambers (similar to the Ministries),*
- *The Metropolitan Guard and the Association of Metropolitan Guards and other public order forces,*
- *The Metropolitan Professional Bodies: the Urban Guilds.*

2.1. The Global Mediator of Megalopolises and Metropolises (GMMM) and other heterarchical metropolitan institutions

Due to the simultaneous proliferation of various types of non-state actors (civilizations, metropolises, and megalopolises), a particularity of the 21st century – 22nd centuries is the co-existence of several types of global or post-state orders:

- global order of civilizations (GOC),

- global order of metropolises and megalopolises (GOMM).

In our view, this is already *a type of global heterarchy*, seen as the simultaneous existence of several types of global orders intersecting in certain points, ***intersection which can generate common global institutions:***

- a *Common Council for the management* of common differences among the GOC institutions and the GOMM institutions,

- *regular diplomatic reunions and negotiations* regarding the foreign relations among the GOC and the GOMM diplomats,

- opening *diplomatic headquarters* for each order, within the boundaries of the other order (*the intersection of two types of globality*),

- Diplomatic Houses of the GOC and Diplomatic Houses of the GOMM (both being global types of diplomacies),

- Diplomatic Houses of the Regional Metropolitan Arches (regional diplomatic Houses from the GOMM) and Diplomatic Houses of the Inter-civilizational Arches (Houses specific to each Arch of the GOC). For example, their representatives can be delegated to the GOC headquarters in the GOMM institutions and vice versa,

- Inter-Metropolitan Chambers of Commerce (Regional Chambers of GOMM) and Inter-civilizational Chambers of Commerce (from GOC), mutually sending representatives.

In our view, during the 22nd century, an urban mega-century, the concepts of metropolises and megalopolises or cities (not necessarily with large densities and millions of inhabitants) will undergo fundamental changes, entailing:

- The occurrence and proliferation of *vertical cities* (which will rival the old, horizontal cities, attaching them as peripheral areas – designated for the maintenance of vertical cities – developing neo-medieval relations),

- The creation of *inter-metropolitan citizen leagues* and of *the regions of metropolitan development* (geographic regions),

- The creation of *traditional federations of metropolises* (horizontally), of new federations of metropolises (the *New Federations*, i.e. vertical metropolises), of *hybrid-federations* (with constitutional frameworks, a basic federative charter with a mixed structure, comprising horizontal and vertical metropolises),

- The *Great Global Metropolitan Arch (GGMA)*, a chain of globally inter-connected metropolises, irrespective of their nature – horizontal or vertical, which develop heterarchical relations (multiple levels of authorities that coexist and various institutional frameworks which regulate their functioning at various levels),

- The VAS entities (proliferation of the Vertical Architectonic Structures, i.e. coherent ThyssenKruppstructures¹, which form “cluster” metropolises or groups of vertical metropolises). The VAS administrators (with the role to manage the current affairs and the funds of the VAS) operate in a regional Board of Directors, being able to send delegates to the institutions of metropolises (both vertical and horizontal metropolises),

- *The New Serenissima Cities* (or sphere-cities positioned at the top of a tower, or “egg-in-the nest”, i.e. cities located *on thyssenkrupps-pillars* – towers significantly taller than sky-scrapers),

- *Upper or Orbital Serenissima Cities* (chain of cities positioned in Terra’s proximity, with adjustable, detachable areas, which can be recombined in common areas, temporarily connected to the New Serenissima cities (“cities in the sky”).

In our opinion, the ***institution of the Global Mediator of Megalopolises and Metropolises (GMMM)*** is an institution specific to the global order of metropolises and megalopolises, in the late 21st century-early 22nd century, when the global metropolitan law already takes shape as a specific body of legal regulations.

In a manner similar to another global institution which we propose for this period, i.e. the Global Mediator of Civilizations (considering the ascension of another type of distinct political-legal actors, i.e. the civilizations, and the creation of another type of global order, i.e. that of civilizations), the GMMM institution is *a global institution, specific to an order coexisting with the global order of civilizations*. These institutions have specific competences and they are created *via different founding documents*, being specific to two different world orders, in the 21st – 22nd century:

- The GMC is founded through the Global Charter of *Civilizations*,

- The GMMM is founded through the Global Charter of *Metropolises and Megalopolises*.

In our opinion, the main role of the Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises is to intervene (either on its own initiative or when notified by the metropolises and megalopolises under its jurisdiction), to mediate and solve issues involving the metropolises and megalopolises with specific legal personality, subjects of global metropolitan law. Therefore, we can consider the GMMM to be an institution designed for the *consolidation* stage of the GOMM, which entails the existence of a body of *global regulations concerning the GOMM*. Before this stage, there can be

¹As a new concept, for designing new architectonic ***ensembles*** (as proto-vertical ***cities*** or foundations for vertical ***cities***) of buildings, higher than the highest today sky-scrapers.

Regional Mediators for the metropolises and megalopolises, with the competence to mediate and solve the issues, based on the Regional Metropolitan Charters and on the bodies of legal regulations applicable at regional level to this subject of regional metropolitan law. This stage entails the existence of specific heterarchical structures, called *Regional or Inter-regional Metropolitan Arches*, which are specific to the GOMM as early as their first stages of evolution. These structures have a legal status similar to that of the international intergovernmental organizations in the current international law.

It is also important to consider the *principles of the regional metropolitan Charters, which must include the general and express interdiction* regarding any form of colonialism, metropolitan imperialism or imperialism exercised by other types of actors against the metropolises, in order to avoid unequal relations, based on domination, power, colonialism in the inter-metropolitan relations, in the corporation-metropolis relations, or in the metropolis-state relations. In this manner, a balance is reached between the GOMM and other types of coexisting orders (in the 21st – 22nd century), avoiding the wars started by the states or corporations to conquer colonial territories from the metropolises (emancipated and with the status of subjects of regional metropolitan law) or vice versa.

Based on the *Regional Metropolitan Charters*, which expressly stipulate this type of interdiction, the *Global Metropolitan Charter* is created in the stage of the global metropolitan law. This charter focuses on the principles regarding the equality *among all the metropolises and megalopolises, which are acknowledged subjects of global metropolitan law* (initially, they were subjects of regional law), the peaceful resolution of issues among them and other entities (state and non-state), the obligation to cooperate in order to promote mutual trust and peace within the GOMM, the obligation to implement the principles of sustainable development and to support a harmonious relation with nature, a type of post-consumption circular economy of recycling and preservation of the land ecosystems, the obligation to call the specific global institutions to regulate the regional or global issues with impact on the stability of the GOMM, the obligation to observe the autonomy of the other metropolises and megalopolises, which are subjects of regional and global metropolitan law, the obligation to promote the principle of gender equality in the metropolitan functioning and decision-making etc.

Regarding the GMMM, this institution is meant to organize a coherent functioning and to maintain it among all the components that are subjects of global metropolitan law, within the GOMM.

If in stages prior to the creation of the GMMM, the Regional Mediators of Metropolises and Megalopolises can have competences (regarding the functioning of *regional, inter-regional or trans-regional orders* of the metropolises and megalopolises, based on a set of common rules established by common consent -an overlapping of multiple levels, metropolitan networks that operate based on specific Charters, which reveals the *complexity of the metropolitan heterarchies*, specifically due to the complexity of the functions fulfilled by the metropolises-), in the subsequent stage (i.e. the stage of globalizing the regulations, in an order such as the GOMM), the main role of the Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises is to maintain *a real balance among the actors, based on the principles of the Global Metropolitan Charter* (global geopolitical role), by preventing the occurrence of issues among them (in certain cases, the GMMM has the competence to take action on its own initiative to preserve the stability and functioning of the global metropolitan network, if it is endangered by the instability – issues – occurred in one or two regional metropolitan networks). In other words, the GMMM has the competence to intervene in order to regulate the issues threatening the stability of the GOMM (for which it is directly responsible), including issues occurred at the level of regional, trans-regional and inter-regional metropolitan networks, as *a decision-making authority superior to the regional mediators at these levels*.

The competences of the GMMM can include:

- finding global solutions *by initiating global agreements for various issues* (regulating the issues, protection of the global environment, setting holistic rules for harmonization with nature, for the functioning of the metropolises and megalopolises within patterns of circular economy focused on massive recycling,

- discouraging the structural imbalances among the GOMM actors (preventing the creation of unequal economic poles, i.e. poor pole/rich pole among the GOMM metropolises),

- encouraging a sustainable development among the GOMM components, in order to maintain a coherent functional framework and a harmonious operation of the GOMM.

The GMMM also has the competence to initiate global agreements *specialized in various issues* (preserving the cultural heritage of humanity, by discouraging and solving the issues between the metropolises and other actors concerning territories or interests regarding or affecting the cultural or natural heritage of the humanity), to solve *political issues between metropolises, megalopolises or between them and other actors* (state and non-state) – commercial issues fall under the jurisdiction of regional tribunals or regional inter-

metropolitan chambers of commerce, for mediation and resolution. In addition, the GMMM has the competence to initiate global agreements regarding common markets between the metropolises and megalopolises, areas of free exchange and global agreements entailing a political dimension, between the metropolises and megalopolises which are subjects of global metropolitan law.

Conclusions

In our opinion, the late 21st century – early 22nd century period will represent the evolution from an “urban century” to a “mega-urban century”, i.e. a century built mainly on the new actors that will ascend on the global scene and will compete against the states, the corporations and any other sorts of actors. *The relations of inter-connection and cohabitation among the multiple orders* (the inter-state order, the global order of civilizations, the global order of metropolises and megalopolises, plus the incipient order of vertical cities – which are not necessarily metropolises, but rather high-end cities, in the sense that they are structured vertically to avoid urban agglomeration) will display a *return of neo-medievalism*, forming a complex network of authorities which function simultaneously, at various levels of these global orders.

New institutions specific to the global order of metropolises and megalopolises, mentioned in the case briefly analysed by us, will emerge and they will shape and consolidate this type of relations among the new actors (the metropolises and megalopolises, as well as the vertical cities). The role of the institution we named the Global Mediator of Metropolises and Megalopolises will be a particularly complex one. The GMMM will intervene to regulate and remove differences (of political nature, most likely) among these actors (new cities, such as the vertical cities, and the old cities – horizontal cities; among metropolises in general, irrespective of their type, and other actors), to maintain the stability of this specific type of global order.

Acknowledgment

Scientific participation to the World Congress Lumen, 26-30 May 2021, Iasi, Romania, LUMEN, 2021, Iasi.

References

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

- Antonescu, M. V.(2020). 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 21st Century. In *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International relations*, 17(1). Publishing House of the Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations “Ion I. C. Brătianu” of the Romanian Academy.
- Antonescu, M. V. (2018). The Foundation of New Serenissima. Institutional Political Patterns of Mega-Cities Starting from the Second Half of XXIst Century World. Proceedings of the *5th Central and Eastern European Lumen Scientific Conference*, Czech Republic. <http://lumen.international/lumen-nashs2018/program-working-papers/>
- Antonescu, M. V. (2018). Regional and Global Institutions in a Global Order of Megacities. Proceedings of the International Conference RSACVP Lumen, Suceava, 26-29 aprilie 2018. http://conferinta.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/BT1_Working-papers_LUMEN-RSACVP2018ESDPAL2018_Conferences.pdf
- Antonescu, M. V. (2018).Metropolitan Diplomacy. The Global Metropolitan Law and Principles of Metropolitan Diplomacy. Proceedings of the International Conference RSACVP Lumen, Suceava, 26-29 aprilie 2018. http://conferinta.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/BT1_Working-papers_LUMEN-RSACVP2018ESDPAL2018_Conferences.pdf
- Antonescu, M. V. (2018). The Global Order of Civilizations. Institutions of the Global Order of Civilizations: The GMC/Global Mediator of Civilizations). Proceedings of the 5th Central and Eastern European Lumen Scientific Conference, Hradec Kralove, Czech Republic, 20-21 September 2018. <http://lumen.international/lumen-nashs2018/program-working-papers/>
- Antonescu, M. V. (2017). Global Eco-Diplomacy and New Evolutions in the International Law. *Univers Strategic Journal*, VIII, (30), pp. 185-197. <https://iss.ucdc.ro/revista-pdf/us30.pdf>
- Antonescu, V. M. (2017). Global Diplomacy, in the Context of Global Governance. *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty*, Section: Law, V(1), 29-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18662/lumenlaw.2017.0501.03>
- 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. (2018). New Institutions for the 21st Century Global Order of Peace: The Mediator for Global Peace. *Logos Universality Mentality Education Novelty: Law*, 6(1),1-12. <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumenlaw/01>

- Antonescu, M.V. (2004). *Uniunea Europeana, un imperiu al sec. XXI? Spre o civilizatie a Uniunii Europene* [The European Union, an empire of the century. XXI? Towards a European Union civilization]. Cartea Universitara.
- Claval, P. (1981). *Marile metropole mondiale* [The great world metropolises]. Institutul European.
- Griffiths, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Encyclopaedia of international relations and global politics*. Routledge