

## AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON OUR CONTEMPORARY WORLD<sup>1</sup>

**Prof. Dr. Emil Constantinescu**  
*President of Romania 1996-2000*

It seems that challenges of the present are so urgent and important, that we are very often bind to come up with an answer even before we face the signs of a future which is mostly under the uncertainty sign. But in the meantime, world is rapidly changing around us. To talk about a way, in which we may face the third millennium, represents first of all, an intellectual challenge. Claiming to bring a really new perspective may seem audacious. In a globalised world, which announces the knowledge society we cannot conceive **present** but as a subordinated **future**. Present itself reveals as a **memory** of the future.

In order to elaborate a long-term common strategy to assure the global and regional peace, it is necessary for us to make an effort of understanding and anticipating the evolution or involution tendencies of the world we live in. The changes within the security environment can be understood only if we take into account the challenges within the nature of the international relations, the rules, the norms, the actors' typology, the goals and the action mechanisms. This is a big challenge by the WJP and for the people working together coming from different countries.

Why? Because our contemporary world can be characterized as a uni-polar one, with an anarchic periphery. Within this context, even a super-power like the USA cannot act by itself, but only together with others. The West itself is multipolar and uneven. The Western multipolarism is generated by the domestic democracy and the one present within the international bodies and institutions it had created.

Every state security should adapt itself to the post-modern society. In our contemporary world, states can no longer be divided in blocks because the reactions following different interests lead to changing the alliances and the opposite parts due to different topics or subjects. On one hand, it is a reflex of the contemporary world democratization, but also of the governments' pragmatism forced to respond to the needs of their own citizens.

Problems of the transition towards democracy, along with the delay in consolidating the new independent states, **create** on their turn, risks directly connected to the states and governments political legitimacy that put under question mark the fighting capability against the institutionalized corruption, but also against mafia type cores which blocks the new states consolidation. Populism represents one of the threats to the democracy global model. Populism can lead to weakening the power and efficiency of the key democratic institutions, of the independency of **justice**, **mass media** and **army**. These elements, along with the existing old frozen conflicts arouse concerns both about the dividing tendencies with the new independent states, but also about the terrorist elements transit, as well as about maintaining the backward mentalities, generating attractiveness towards authoritarian administrative models.

---

<sup>1</sup> *WJP in Malawi, March 13, 2013*

Talking about global problems, because our organization is named World Justice Project, I remember a recent story. Thomas Friedman, *New York Times* editorialist, has visited India to study the miracle of a new IT young generation on the spot. After showing the way Internet can help small companies to act efficiently, anywhere in the world, a young Indian IT specialist said to him: “Now the land is flat”. The book “*The World Is Flat*” inspired from his experience, brought Thomas Friedman the Pulitzer Prize and is an international best seller. It is true, **but** only for people having access to the Internet.

The so-called contemporary flat world has deep transversal faults, which, like in many geological structures, make a direct connection between layers with different characteristics on small areas. The Indian story, well known today through the Internet, of the five blind men, who, touching different parts of an elephant – feet, trunk, ivory fangs, its back or tail -, described different beings or things, represents a more appropriate image of the world reality, which shocked me several times during the experiences I came across in many places on earth, as a geologist, as a statesman or as a representative of the civil society.

This is why I believe that the long way towards a global solidarity, which is the ultimate shape of freedom, should begin from the interior of every nation, local community or even family, where we can often find many of the contradictions we consider as specific for the discrepancies between the North and the South, the East and the West.

In my opinion, addressing globalization only as an egalitarian force, in the negative sense as it is discussed today, is not productive. The technological imperialism, promoting the consuming culture to the detriment of cultural diversity and national identities are irrefutable realities. But equally real is the perspective of an equality of chances that is opening now especially to the younger generation, and which will be the first beneficiary of the professional mobility on the global labour market.

Conflict prevention and post-conflict situations management require a more comprehensive and balanced vision, which would take into account the interests of different ethnical and religious communities, the states duties and their citizens’ natural rights, the conjectural and long-term interests of the regional actors. It cannot be elaborated without involving representatives competent to express the voices plurality, questions and aspirations of billions of people.

Not understanding “the other’s” motivations have lead, during the time in our history, to adopting many mistaken foreign politics decisions, which triggered into conflicts or wars. That is why the “common values” objective seems to me today of such an importance for the new structure of the international relations.

So far, both major powers and international organizations like UN, UNESCO, as well as civil society try to create a political culture of security through negotiation and cooperation. In order to promote peace and understanding in the world one searches the lowest common denominator around which we can agree upon. My belief is that we must put forth much more. If we want to achieve a true peace and understanding between people, we should focus not on the **lowest common denominator**, but to relate to the **highest common denominator**.

Twenty years ago, people from Central-eastern Europe to Central Asia and recently people from North Africa and Middle East, were ready to fight and die for freedom and democracy.

In a new millennium, let us discover **faith**. Not to use it, as in a long mankind history, against others, but to understand our mission on Earth. **Peace** is the name of God. Only human arrogance made man forget the message of God, whatever the name we give him in our language or in our faith.