

Velcho Stoyanov, Professor, Ph. D.

THE “NEW WORLD ORDER” – OLD PHENOMENON OF THE MODERN TIME

“New world order” (declared by George Bush Senior and the Club of Rome in the end of 20th century) is not a novice concept but is deeply rooted in history. New, however, are the unique circumstances under which it is constructed: wide-range and dynamic liberal globalization, collapse (in 1989) of the two-polarities world with two main leaders and the reign of a single super-powerful hegemony (USA) but with emerging new rivals (separate states or coalitions); growing role and importance of regional economic formations (with the EU as a prototype) and global corporations in the context of growing and intensifying environmental and cultural crisis; the economic (crisis) regularly reminds if itself too ... The discrepancy and/or disparity between the emerging liberal global society and the lack of global governance is intensifying well, being expected to overcome the “new world order”.

JEL: F01; F02

“New world order” and closely related with it world government or global governance moved to the top of agenda in 1990 (since the Gulf War for the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi occupation). Former US President George Bush Senior “declared in his speech to the American Congress the emerging of a “new world order ... that would bring world peace, justice and wellbeing”.¹

Next year, in the report of the Club of Rome, entitled “The First Global Revolution”, a similar statement belonging to George Bush can be found: “We are in the early stages of the creation of a new world order.”²

Those quoted statements were the first to announce the “news” that the emergence of a “new world order” has began. Since its official announcement it has turned into the topic of the day, subjected to scientific and journalist investigations, interpretations and reviews. The author of the current entry was tempted with a humble contribution in that sense.

The objective is triple, e.g. to demonstrate (and eventually to prove) that:

- the idea of a “new world order” and world governance is not a new one but on the contrary – it is rooted deeply in history;
- In the period since the World War I to the proclamation of the “new world order” by George Bush Senior, that idea was not on the agenda, it wasn’t publicly debated and was subjected to discussions and interpretations only or at least mostly by secret and semi-secret societies;

¹ *Nikolov, N.* The New Order (third edition). Sofia, 1994, p. 39.

² *King, A., B. Schneider.* The First Global Revolution. A Report of the Club of Rome for 1991. Sofia, 1992, p. 7.

- There are various interpretations and visions regarding the contents and the purpose of the “new world order” and the directly related global governance.

*

Stating that the “new world order” idea has deep roots in history, a couple of facts are taken into account: first, the idea of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra of “monarchy mundi” formulated in the distant 16th century and then, the first global utopia of Saint-Simon (1760-1825) having relation to the world governance (the Council of Newton, as he calls it, consisting of the 21 most deserving individuals who would govern the world).

Maybe even deeper roots of the idea for world governance could be found, as most ancient empires (and their emperors) have believed that they governed and ruled the world or had such a mania. That is true in the large degree for the Roman Empire and its emperors – Julius Caesar was even officially recognized as a God. In fifth century the Empire fell apart and the period of territorial and political disintegration began.

In fact, the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 whose treaties launched the idea of states’ sovereignty and equality has resulted to the establishment of an actual national state. The Peace of Westphalia has brought to Europe politics and has strived for mutual balancing of power between sovereign and (formally) equal national states, figuratively called “European (political) concern”. However, it was in Europe where the two world wars have exploded and even before the World War I there had been serious war clashes and collisions between European national states (with Napoleon’s marches as peak).

Some national states, however, such as Germany during the rule of Hitler or certain groups – Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis, for example, have demonstrated eager ambitions for enlargement of their perimeter through conquest and control over other sovereign countries. Hitler declared those ambitions and partially fulfilled aspirations of his the “New Order”.

Even earlier, soon after the Great Geographical Discoveries, the United Kingdom and other kingdoms (Netherlands, Portugal, France and Spain) have established a “new colonial order”.

It is known that Marxism has introduced and rationalized the idea of a global socialist revolution that would establish a new socialist order worldwide, while the former Soviet Union had the ambition and aspiration to fulfill that idea.

Some authors think that world major religions also strive and aspire to globalization and world domination. That is most true for Christianity during its missionary period, for Judaism with its claims to become world religion, and Islam (fundamentalism) that declared everyone who does not confess it infidels and limbs of the devil; the ultimate reality would be if everyone was a Muslim.

In the opinion of Arnold Joseph Toynbee, aspirations to universalism were evident in Hinduism and Buddhism too, i.e. the five “great religions” as he referred them (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism).

The ambitions and aspirations toward a “new world order” have been philosophical, political, economic and religious, or a combination between them.

It is considered that “the author of earliest and clearly declaration of establishing of a “new world order” is Dr. Quincy Wright, Professor in international law in Chicago”.³ In 1941 he has laid down his idea of it as “something opposite to the popular then Hitler’s “new order” ”.⁴ Professor Wright related the concept of the “new world order” with global government whose building and functioning will inevitably lead to restriction of national sovereignty, respectively independence and autonomy of states and nations, e.g. national states. For that reason, he could be considered as the originator and champion of the “new world order” idea in contemporary age.

*

The proverbial polarity model between the so-called real (or “fulfilled” according to the Holy Throne terminology) totalitarian socialism headed by the former Soviet Union, on one hand, and the Western democratic capitalism headed by the USA, on the other hand, has emerged soon after the First World War and gained strength after the Second World War. A continuing cold war was going on between these two opposite social systems. It ended in 1989 – surprisingly easy, quick and peaceful self-disintegration and self-destruction of socialism and adoption of Western path and values by the former socialist countries. Compressed expression of their transition or transformation was the creation of market economy and pluralistic democracy, both functioning on the ground of regulated private ownership on the factors or means for production. In fact, the Soviet Union has self-disintegrated and its essential nucleus Russia has turned into an economic midget, keeping however its status of military giant (according to Zbigniew Brzezinski). In that way, USA became the only superpower with no viable competition, i.e. monocacy world leader or hegemon. US’ first initiative in their new role was to organize and launch the coalition Bay War (with UN sanction) for the liberation of Kuwait from Iraqi’s military occupation, i.e. from Saddam Hussein’s regime.

Therefore, since 1989 a new global situation of a single-pole world with a single superpower (without viable competition) has emerged, with a single leader and hegemon – the USA. After the Gulf War, from the tribune of the American Congress, George Bush Senior declared the assertion of USA in their new role as the emergence of the “new world order”.

³ *Estulin, D.* The True Story of the Bilderberg Group. Sofia: “Bard”, 2004, p. 122.

⁴ *Ibid.*

It is obvious that during the Cold War, the two-polar world model was dominating and there was no formal reason to mention a “new world order”. Officially, the doctrine of peaceful joint existence between the two opposite socio-political systems and their leaders (Soviet Union and USA) prevailed. It turned out, however, that during that period the “new world order” idea has been elaborated in the West, respectively for a worldwide or global governance, but only or mostly in the framework of secret and semi-secret societies of the super-elite or the so-called establishment. “In fact, the International Relations Council (IRC) has began planning the new world order in 1942”.⁵ Moreover, similar plan has been drafted by other similar to IRC secret and semi-secret organizations of the super-elite and/or establishment.⁶

Due to insufficient knowledge for secret societies, probably information about them and their activity should be accepted with a pinch of salt (according to the advice of one of their researchers, M. Benson), but ignoring treaties on them is not the wisest approach, either.

We do not intend to overrate secret societies and we shall even quote two typical statements that give some idea of their role in the “new world order” and worldwide government or governance. Yet in 1962 (the year of the so-called Cuban or Caribbean rocket crisis), one of the famous figures in American and world business Nelson Rockefeller said: “The events of our day require transition to a “new world order”... that is in the stage of labour-pains.”⁷ Whole 12 years earlier (in 1950) James Warburg (son of the famous Paul Warburg, one of the founders of WMO and active participant in President Franklin D.

⁵ *Estulin, D.* Op. cit., p. 122.

⁶ We have in mind:

- Freemasonry or the secret society of the “free masons” – masons and their lodges;
- The Royal Institute on International Affairs (RIIA), founded in 1919 in Paris;
- Tavistock Institute founded in 1921 in London;
- The Bilderberg Club found in 1954 in the Dutch town of Oosterbeek and its hotel with the same name;
- The Council on international relations GPR, founded in 1919 in Magestique hotel, Paris;
- Trilateral Committee (TC), created in 1973 and involving super-elite figures from the USA, Europe and Japan;
- Council on International Relations created in 1974 whose sittings were believed to be attended by Mihail Gorbachov;
- The Committee of the 300;
- They speak of the Secret Council of Elders of Zion and their so-called Protocols but officially, Israel denies those statements and considers them a provocation against Jews.

Those are the most important secret and semi-secret organizations. Some authors (M. Benson, for example) list also the Federal Reserve System (or Fed) and even the European Union. There are secret symbols on the dollar banknote of USA (see *Benson, M.* Inside Secret Societies: What They Don't Want You to Know. Sofia: Dilok, 2006; *Heckethorn, C.* Secret Societies of All Ages and Countries (in three volumes). Sofia: Miriam, 2007; *Ovason, D.* The Secret Symbols of the Dollar Bill. Sofia: Dilok, 2006; *Estulin, U.* Op. cit.; *Ginsberg, A.* Protocols of the Elders of Zion. Sofia, 2007, etc.

⁷ Quote from *Estulin, D.* Op. cit., p. 247.

Roosevelt brain trust) offhand stated before the Senate International Relations and Trade Committee: “We shall achieve world government, notwithstanding whether you like it or not – by force or by concord.”⁸

It is believed that the utmost uniting factors determining secret societies’ members, are the “deep purses” and aspiration to become even wealthier. Here, we have in mind the statement of UK former Minister of Defense Denis Healey: “World events do not occur by accident. They are made to happen, whether it is to do with national issues or commerce; and most of them are staged and managed by those who hold the purse strings.”⁹

Mentioned authors emphasize on the role of secret societies in the construction of the “new world order”. In the declassified report of US National Council of Investigation, respectively FBI, entitled “The World In 2020”, however, explicitly focuses on the “new world order”. In the report, “possible (future, i.e. up to 2020 – V.S.) worlds” are described,¹⁰ presented as four possible scenarios:

1. The world according to Davos, i.e. continuing process of liberal globalization and even if China and India become giants, the USA will maintain their hegemony.

2. The world as a *Paix Americana* – “USA superiority could survive changes in the world political landscape and to contribute for the emergence of a new, diversified world order”.¹¹

3. World of a new *caliphate*, i.e. domination of Islamic religious identity that could challenge Western rules and values;

4. World related to the *cycle of fear*, meaning that the “concerns for spreading of certain kinds of weapons could lead to large-scale preventing security measures against possible attacks, measures threatening to lay the foundations of an Orwell world”.¹²

Maybe a fifth scenario (world or world order) is possible, too, taking the shape and character of a combination of abovementioned options (if unforeseen surprises do not happen).

“However, in spite of those future challenges, the USA shall maintain their huge (global, V.S.) advantages.”¹³

The report concludes that “by 2020 any state will not be able not will be willing to play that role (of the USA, author’s note). Even if the current (“new

⁸ *Estulin, D.* Op. cit., p. 121.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁰ *The World In 2020.* Official Report of FBI (declassified). Sofia: “Colibri”, 2007, p. 76.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 77.

¹³ *Ibid.*

world”) order is in danger, USA is prepared for another one... and in 2020 they shall (continue) play key role in the world order.”¹⁴

We can reason that the idea of a “new world order”, respectively of a world government and its fulfillment has been part of the Cold War arsenal. Moreover that the other “polarity” worked in the sake of the worldwide socialist revolution idea, therefore for a “new world socialist order”. the other “polarity”, usually the former Soviet Union, had its own secret and not so secret organizations, the utmost of them being the Communist International (the Comintern) and its operative unit, the mythical Committee for State Security KGB.

Yet, the official position between the two “belligerent states” during the Cold War was that of “peaceful co-existence”, obliging them to be politically polite and formally correct to each other. Certain positive influence in that sense had the international organizations, e.g. UN.

Typically, after the Second World War, that is during the Cold War there was a boom of international (interstate) organizations.¹⁵ Seemingly, they are also part of the “new world order”, where unions and coalitions between states are of utmost importance and their international cooperation in the framework of world international organizations. NATO does not fit well in that “formula”, especially after the falling apart of its opposite military union, the Treaty of Warsaw. Meanwhile, NATO is reconsidering its strategy and objectives, aiming at keeping world peace and security, but also keeping in mind three issues: firstly, that the USA shall continue to play key role, secondly, “frictions” between EU and USA on the creation of European defense and security forces and their relations with NATO; and thirdly, the accusations of Russia (during the rule of Putin) toward USA that NATO is replacing the UN.

It could be stated that if by 1989 the “new world order”, respectively the worldwide or global governance have been an objective and strategy of the establishment and its secret societies, after the “end of the story” (citing Francis Fukuyama) their objective and strategy (for a “new world order” and global or cosmopolite governance) becomes a necessity and objective of the official American policy. The latter results from the more and more blatant *discrepancy*

¹⁴ The World in 2020..., p. 77, 225.

¹⁵ Immediately after the First World War the League of Nations was founded (UN), an association which the USA has refused to joined. Yet before the end of the War, several international financial organizations have emerged – the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. After the WWII the League of Nations transformed into the United Nations (UN) and its numerous bodies and institutions, most important of them being UN Security Council. Almost all sovereign states are UN members.

We have to mention several more international organizations of utmost importance - GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) which in 1996 was renamed in WTO (World Trade Organization); OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) with its antipode international structure – “Group 77”; since 1975 the heaviest international structure – G-7 + 1 has started to function, the club of the most powerful and influential countries.

between global financial-economic processes and activities, on one hand, and national foundations and nature of political governance, on the other; against global economic subjects there should be a global political subject, e.g. globalized world supposes and requires global governance. Certainly, that is easy to be said but extremely difficult to be done. Albert Einstein saw in national governance something more complex than physics and we can only imagine what he would say on global governance if he was our contemporary? Having in mind, however, that laics cannot deal with physics and science but thrive in politics.

At this stage, the announcement of "new world order" and global governance was made, some initial steps were made, but the real work lies before us. In fact, since the wane of Treaty of Warsaw, former Soviet Union and socialist system from the international scene, the "new world order" has turned into necessity and has attracted growing scientific and journalistic interest, and thirdly, the global world came high on the agenda.

*

We consider that the design of a "new world order" is related to certain matters that cannot be ignored. Four main issues are taken into consideration:

- Accelerated *liberal globalization*, growing interdependence between states and national economies running parallel to the corrosion of national sovereignty, independence and autonomy of states; partial sovereignty of regional and international structures (organizations);

- The fact that since 1989 the USA has turned into the only superpower with enormous economic, military, political and cultural power and influence; in fact, the USA are the *almighty world hegemon*, proclaimed to be the new world empire;

- growing *risks and threats*¹⁶ – from environmental related also to the nuclear threat, to the illegal trafficking in drugs, weapons, human beings (and even of human organs, probably), and terrorism. Any of those risks should not be underestimated but terrorism is defined (by the USA after the tragic 9/11 2001) for the top enemy of the modern democratic world and total global war was declared on it (by the President George Bush). Terrorism has gotten incredibly wide economic dimensions – approximately 1.5 trillion USD. We already speak of "economy of terrorism" whose financial-economic operations (in spite of the imposed limits) are compared to the GDP of France;¹⁷

- the growing importance of *regional economic groupings or integration communities* and mostly, their prototype – the European Union (EU). It strives

¹⁶ See Beck, U. Risk Society. Sofia, 2001.

¹⁷ See Halaf, M. "The Economy of Terrorism" – the new world threat. – Dnevnik Daily, 4.02.2008, N 24.

not only to intensive enlargement (probably to reach the borders of former Roman Empire) and to political unification and establishing its own defense and security forces. There are discussions of “European dream” and “European model of new world order”. United Europe is an economic colossus but according to Zbigniew Brzezinski it remains military midget. It, however, demonstrates certain desire and aspiration to transform into a military giant.

One of the fundamental questions of united Europe concerns the relations and interrelations with Russia in the context of General Charles de Gaulle’s statement about a “Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals” and even to Vladivostok.

Before 1989, between the two sides of the Atlantic Ocean there had been perfect union and interaction, but then frictions appeared. The strongest friction between united Europe and USA has occurred in the beginning of the USA and coalition war against Iraq, respectively against Saddam Hussein regime (without a sanction of the UN). It turned out that Europe, although united, cannot resist adequately the USA. It was even called an “American protectorate” and the so-called “new Europe” was juxtaposed to the “old Europe”. For the first time, united Europe has shown disunity, but it is even more disunited on the issue of the recognition of Kosovo independence.

Obviously both the USA and EU have learned that the opposition between them is not favorable for any of them, with the new global forces and players emerging on the horizon. Here, the BRIC group – Brazil, Russia, India and China is referred to, without underestimating Japan; also, an alliance between some of the mentioned states as an antipode of the USA. In the referred FBI report, such possible alliance could also emerge between Russia, China and Pakistan.

For now, however, the USA remains indisputable hegemon and uses its status of such. It is said that if it was not the USA to keep global peace and security, the world would turn into improvident chaos and that statement sounds quite reasonable. One can hardly deny, however, (that was the argument and accusation of “old Europe”), that the US acts unilaterally and do not take into account the opinion of their closest allies and partners, treating them as vassals.¹⁸

It is obvious that the construction of a “new world order” is a complex and conflicting process. Most essential issues concern mainly to: who should be the engineer of that “new world order” and subject of world or global governance; what its objectives, tasks and nature should be; how to build the machinery for its functioning.

Undoubtedly, the first two issues are of completely political nature, while the third one has expert and technical meaning but inevitably attracts political interest.

¹⁸ Statements of the ministers of France and Germany Hubert Vedrin and Joschka Fischer.

Considering the subject of global or cosmopolite governance, usually focus falls on the *USA* (since they have NATO, as well), and the *UN* that for over half a century manages and coordinates cooperation between states and nations worldwide, has rich experience, its own armed forces and can issue sanctions, military including; the foundations of international judiciary under UN aegis are formed as well.

Some experts suggest a completely new international structure to be established, fulfilling the functions and tasks of global state governance or world government.

Whoever the subject of global governance might be, *USA* as an indisputable world hegemon will hardly accept the "formula", e.g. the concept and mechanism of world governance even if they don't play key role. The *US* has managed to conquer that privilege. Like Napoleon, the United States has crowned itself with the world leadership and global governance.¹⁹

Another major question of the "new world order" refers to the objectives, tasks and nature of the global or cosmopolite governance. It is probably the most complex. Once the structure implementing world governance and executing "new world order" is created, inevitable the issue if its prerogatives arises and mostly what needs to be achieved from or through global governance in the sense of:

- providing the structure or institution for cosmopolite governance, all prerogatives, functions, tasks and powers of classic national state whose governance capacity will be transformed into that of a large municipality;
- national state will remain chief subject of state system and state governance, while the global governance subject will implement only delegated functions and coordinate national states' activity.

It seems that in the process of speeding globalization during growing and enlarging environmental crisis and the ensuing risks and threats, the first option is more appropriate although also more difficult. The abovementioned FBI report foresees that until 2020 the state will remain the chief subject of international political relations.

The nature of the "new world order" and global governance is equally important and interrelated to its objectives and tasks. Its nature is reasonably determined by the features of market and globalization. At that stage, both market and globalization have definitely liberal, even liberal-corporative nature, and some authors refer to state as a certain type of corporation of politicians and bureaucrats.²⁰

¹⁹ Napoleon was not in good terms with the Holy Throne, but the Pope agreed to crown him when Napoleon was made emperor. But during the ceremony, Napoleon took the crown from the pope's hands and put it on his own head.

Similar story is told about Stalin. When someone spoke to him about more diplomatic approach to the Holy Throne, Stalin asked spontaneously: "How many divisions does the Pope have?"

²⁰ See *Martin Van Creveld, M. The Rise and Decline of the State. Moskow, 2006, p. 11.*

Here, we would like to pay attention to the growing necessity (pleaded for by most authors) of a certain humanization, socialization and introduction of morale and ethics in market and globalization. It is true that the stronger liberalism, stronger the stimuli for labour, production (in the widest sense) and efficiency. In the past two decades, however, in all liberal economies that is accompanied by enormous in size and range socio-economic differentiation, dehumanisation, desocialization, desolidarization, cultural crisis, social pressure and social insecurity. Anyway, those are negative “by-products” of the super-liberal market provoking most of the negative phenomena and processes in the modern world – from drugs to terrorism.

The statement of Zbigniew Brzezinski that “USA took leading role in four crucial areas of global power (military, economy, technology and culture, but we should also add political – author’s note, V. S.)... American excellence formulates a new world order that not only copies but also institutionalizes abroad many features of the American system.”²¹ Probably, what Brzezinski called “copying” and “institutionalization of the American system abroad” explains why the globalization and new world order with USA as engine are accepted and conceived as Americanization of the world.

The other colossus of theoretical and real politics, Henry Kissinger, implied that the “new world order” “is going to involve at least six powerful forces – USA, Europe, China, Japan, Russia and maybe India, as well as numerous middle and small (not all, however – author’s note) countries”²². Therefore, in his opinion the “new world order”, at least initially, will not encompass the whole world, but there will hardly remain state and people untouched (directly or indirectly) from that order.

Zbigniew Brzezinski emphasizes that “such unprecedented American hegemony has no competition” but in the same time is asking himself if “it will remain indisputable in the following years?”²³ However, Charles Kupchan states that the end of American age is inevitable and summons the USA to prepare for it.²⁴

Of course, there is nothing eternal in this world, however American hegemony remains a status quo. How long? Only the future can tell.

In the opinion of A. Georgiev, the “new (world) order continues to be constructed by large states and to be designed for them.”²⁵ Generally, that is true but the attribute “large” should also include “developed, wealthy and

²¹ *Brzezinski, Z.* The Grand Chessboard. Sofia, 1997, p. 32, 33.

²² *Kissinger, H.* Diplomacy. Sofia, 1997, p. 15.

²³ *Brzezinski, Z.* Op. cit., p. 38.

²⁴ See *Kupchan, Ch.* The End of the American Era. Foreign Policy and the Geopolitics of the Twenty-first Century. Sofia: Riva, 2004.

²⁵ *Georgiev, A.* Europe in the Global Order. Sofia: “Trakia – M”, 2006, p. 94.

powerful” (states). Undeniably, the USA remains chief constructor and engine of the “new world order”.

“Birth-pains” of the “new world order” continue and the “world state is ... more potential than real one”.²⁶ In the same time, however, M. Allbrow says that “actually, global state already functions ... each time when a person realizes the common planetary problems and makes efforts to act in their favour”.²⁷ By global state he actually means the virtual global civil society, appropriately termed by Ulrich Beck “*world society without a (world) state*”.²⁸

Undoubtedly, the United States is the chief engineer and engine of the “new world order” but in fact the UN is in charge with its construction. We have in mind the already established special *Commission on global governance* that has designed a Concept on global governance (plus a Project for our future or future coexistence). According to Daniel Estulin, that concept envisions:

- introduction of global taxation and a tax on extracted quantities petrol;
- establishing a permanent army with the UN and constructing a military headquarter with the UN;
- establishing a Council on Economic Security;
- providing powers to UN to impose fees and taxes on global resources for its budget, but also specific modes of exploitation;
- suspension of the right of veto of the permanent Security Council members;
- introducing Parliamentary representation of “civil society”, i.e. nongovernmental (civil) organizations;
- founding of a new Council for civil petitions with the main responsibility and role to support nongovernmental organizations’ participation in global governance;
- founding of a new International Court for criminal violations that will be in charge to settle legal arguments between nations;
- establishing International court as a permanent tribunal imposing punishments for crimes against humanity, war criminals including;
- compulsory nature of its verdicts;
- increasing the prerogatives of UN Secretary General.²⁹

In spite of the progress toward building of the “new world order” and cosmopolite governance, there are no reasonable grounds for optimism. According to one of the researchers of the “new world order”, D. Held, the main reason for the lacking or insufficient optimism is that “in national state there is a

²⁶ Allbrow, M. The Global Age. Sofia: “Obsidian”, 2001, p. 265.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 264.

²⁸ Beck, U. What Is Globalization? S., 2002, p. 159.

²⁹ See Estulin, D. Op. cit., p. 139-150.

contrast between power of people and power of state”.³⁰ In the cosmopolite governance (as D. Held puts it) that contrast will deepen for the following reasons:

- crisis of liberal democracy that will aggravate under global governance;
- unclear role of the corporations, from political and social point of view, although it is not that vague on the background of the erosion of national state. Apparently, global corporations already follow the path of their prototype – East-Indian Company that had its own army, flag and has even emitted its own currency, i.e. it had statutory functions;
- too liberal nature of market and globalization, close to social Darwinism;
- unclear procedures and tools for selection of the global authorities’ ingredients of power and governance and monitoring over their activity, as well as of the relations between them (global institutions), on one hand, and national and regional authorities, on the other.

One can conclude that the “new world order” and directly related to it global governance are in a process of active construction. There one can see how a new kind of capitalism is emerging, a new type of global order, a new type of society (with new culture), a new type of personal life, since they will be all different from the previous stages of social development”.³¹ Obviously, according to Ulrich Beck, crucial and complex changes in life of societies and individuals are going on, that cannot be deemed easily.

In fact, although uneven, the battle “con” and “pro” the new world order continues. That is a battle against its essence and nature.³²

If we look back in history, we shall see that there have been battles, armed including, The Second World War is (almost) completely a result from Hitler’s ambitions and aspirations for establishing of such order; the concept of a “new (world) order” laid in the center of the Cold War, too.

However, the modern “new world order” is built under unique circumstances:

- a one-polarity world with a single strong and powerful hegemon;
- dynamic, large-scale, even total globalization and growing inter-dependence between states with globalizing national economies;
- emergence of more and more powerful regional economic block with EU as a prototype;
- worldwide provision of information to the information (network) society, whose symbols are computers, mobile phones, networks; we also speak of “network society” and “flat world”;

³⁰ *Held, D.* Democracy and the Global Order. From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance. Sofia: “KH”, 2004, p. 75.

³¹ *Beck, U.* Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. Sofia, 2001, p. 8.

³² Exciting description of that battle is found in the book of the famous Canadian ecologist and antiglobalist Naomi Klein *Fences and windows* (Sofia: “Iztok-Zapad”, 2004).

- a growing socio-economic (with other dimensions as well) gap between the North and the South, between the "golden milliard" and the rest, (growing) part of whom fall in the category of "excluded", respectively doomed;
- deep environmental crisis, raw materials, demographic and cultural including; more and more frequently, democracy crisis is mentioned; maybe, it is reasonable to speak of crisis of education and healthcare (if not total, then affecting many countries, Bulgaria including);
- gradual spreading of nuclear and other weapons for mass destruction, impeding the control over them;
- growing illegal trafficking in drugs, weapons, human beings;
- well organized and mass international terrorism;
- launching the idea that humanity future salvation must be found in its migration to another planet.³³

In short, growing number of authors are concluding that modern humanity is facing the alternative of a *global catastrophe or global salvation!*

In periods of hardship, hope and trust usually focus on science (or scientific and technical advance) and wisdom (if Earthly wisdom is limited, search for cosmic wisdom begins). Today, hope and trust are focused in science and wisdom again.

Anyway, there is certain dose of optimism coming from Lisbon where the *Lisbon Treaty* was signed on 20th October 2007 (amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European community) that is liable to ratification by the 27 Member States' Parliaments. Articles 3 and 5 state: "EU strives to ... a strong, competitive social market economy... combats social exclusion and discrimination and promotes social justice and protection...

It contributes for peace, security, sustainable development of the planet, solidarity and relationships between peoples, free and fair trade, elimination of poverty and protection of human rights and children's rights in particular, and for the strict observance and development of international law, with a focus on the observance of UN Rules of Order principles...

It respects state's essential functions, especially those aiming to provide its territorial wholeness, to maintain public peace and guard national security."

Lisbon Treaty consists mostly of solemn declarations that evidence of a certain degree of guidance and intentions. Their theoretical consideration and practical implementation are pending. Anyway, they outline European or regional order that has to integrate and fit into "new world order" which is necessary in the circumstances of total globalization and interdependence.

Of course, "competitive *social* market economy" brings some light in the (social) tunnel, that is in the "modern world twisting in agony", conditioned by the economic, political, spiritual, cultural and environmental crisis that

³³ N. Ryorih believed that initially humanity was seeded on the Moon which was devastated and it moved to the Earth...

accompany it, together with corruption, illegal trans-border trafficking in weapons, drugs, human beings, terrorism... The overall societal crisis that has gripped contemporary (mostly Western) world requires an overall approach to overcome it. Such an approach is provided by the Parliament of world religions through creation of a (new) *world ethos*. It is “nor new world ideology, nor unified world religion beyond the existing ones, nor domination of a single religion above all others. Ethos means basic consensus in regard with the existing and connecting us values, stable criteria and essential individual principles. Without basic consensus on ethos, every community is threatened from chaos or dictatorship, while persons are doomed to despair. It is believed that the world ethos will achieve “better individual and global order... *a stable world order*”, i.e. “fair social and economic order” that can overcome the “dramatic world situation”.

Therefore, “there is no sustainable world order” without “basic consensus on the present and connecting values”, as “there is no world order without world ethos and world justice”. We have to avoid the danger of “man driven by greed to lose his “soul” ... the essence that makes him (different from all other species) a human”.³⁴

15.IV.2008

³⁴ Declaration of the world ethos by the Parliament of World Religions. Chicago, 4.09.1993. Sofia: “KH”, 2005, p. 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11. See also *Kung, H.* World Ethos Project. Sofia: “KH”, 2003.