

International Progress Organization



Organisation Internationale pour le Progrès

– organization in consultative status with the United Nations –

Hans Köchler

President of the International Progress Organization
Chairman, Department of Philosophy, University of Innsbruck, Austria
Life Fellow, International Academy for Philosophy

**Civilization and World Order:
The Relevance of the Civilizational Paradigm in Contemporary International
Law**

Lecture delivered at the International Seminar on

“Multiculturalism and International Law”

organized by

Silk Road Institute of International Law and College of Humanities and Social Sciences
at Xi’an Jiaotong University

Xi’an, China, 13-14 April 2007

© Hans Köchler, 2007

www.hanskoechler.com

V3/26 April 2007

Check against delivery!

(I)

The civilizational paradigm in the era of global unipolarity

In the era of global *bipolarity* – during the Cold War – the norm of non-interference was one of the fundamental principles of the international order. It ensured the stability of relations between states on the basis of the notion of sovereign equality as enshrined in Art. 2 (1) of the United Nations Charter.

One of the most visible expressions of this post-World War II emphasis on non-interference in a nation's internal affairs was the commitment to a policy of *peaceful co-existence* between states with different ideologies, cultures, and value systems. This doctrine was indeed the very essence of the international order of peace established after World War II and it incorporated quite consistently the philosophy underlying the provisions of the UN Charter related to partnership and co-operation among states.¹

What, in modern terms, is being characterized as “co-existence among civilizations” was then ensured through the respect of the very principle of non-interference into each other's internal affairs. In that particular era (up to the end of the so-called “East-West conflict”) the term mainly, though not exclusively, applied to co-existence among state systems with distinct ideologies in the sense of competing philosophical and political world views.

On the basis of this interpretation in the overall framework of international relations (that was oriented towards the *stability* of the global system), we have outlined a general doctrine reflecting on the role of culture (civilization)² for the preservation of international peace. In a lecture delivered at Jordan's Royal Scientific Society in March 1974³ and in an international conference on “The Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations” held in Innsbruck, Austria, in July of the same year⁴ we tried to explain that a civilization (or ideology, meaning a particular world view and value system) can only fully realize itself through the encounter with other civilizations. What we characterized, at

¹ See General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), adopted on 24 October 1970: *Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations*.

² In the context of this paper, we understand “civilization” as the comprehensive world view, including a universal value system, that has shaped the social identity of a collective (grouping of people) and been sustained over a period of time; accordingly, “culture” is understood as a sub-system of a given civilization.

³ Hans Köchler, *Cultural-philosophical Aspects of International Cooperation. Lecture held before the Royal Scientific Society, Amman-Jordan* [1974]. Studies in International Cultural Relations, II. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1978.

⁴ Hans Köchler (ed.), *Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations*. Studies in International Cultural Relations, I. Tübingen/Basel: Erdmann, 1978.

the time, as the “dialectic of cultural self-comprehension”⁵ is indeed based on the principle of *mutual respect* which, in the realm of relations between states, is expressed in the norm of non-interference in the internal affairs. In our efforts at outlining the basic elements of an international order of peace we emphasized the structural similarity of what in modern terminology is called the “dialogue of civilizations” to the (political) doctrine of peaceful co-existence – and the mutual reinforcement between the two.

In a marked departure from the paradigm of co-existence as basic norm of the international order, the post-Cold War period has witnessed a steady erosion of the principle of non-interference, implying its subordination to the interests of an increasingly self-assured hegemonial power. Accordingly, international relations in the era of global *unipolarity* (in terms of the political order) have brought about a profound change in the understanding of international law as such. In the absence of a balance of power in the relations between states, the 19th century doctrine of humanitarian intervention (*intervention d’humanité*) has been revived and is increasingly used for the purposes of legitimizing traditional power politics in the guise of a “new world order.”⁶

At the same time, this new form of realpolitik in a unipolar framework – which often means resorting to the use of armed force outside the framework of the United Nations – serves as a tool of ideological, more specifically: *civilizational*, indoctrination by means of which the obedience of “resilient” nations is to be achieved. Frequently, this ideological strategy revolves around the hegemonial state’s particular, indeed parochial, understanding of the key terms of today’s global order, namely “democracy,” “human rights” and the “rule of law.”⁷ The wars against Yugoslavia (1999) and Iraq (2003)⁸, conducted in an essentially unilateral framework, are the most drastic examples of this new state of affairs that has brought about the virtual collapse of the post-war system of collective security as represented by the United Nations Organization.⁹

A doctrine that is based on the self-declared right of creating (to give the most visible and at the same time controversial example) a so-called “New Middle East” – by redefining, according to

⁵ *Cultural-philosophical Aspects of International Cooperation*, pp. 7ff.

⁶ For details see the author’s analysis: *The Concept of Humanitarian Intervention in the Context of Modern Power Politics. Is the Revival of the Doctrine of "Just War" Compatible with the International Rule of Law?* Studies in International Relations, XXVI. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2001.

⁷ The author has analyzed this in his paper: “Civilization as Instrument of World Order? The Role of the Civilizational Paradigm in the Absence of a Balance of Power,” to be published in a comprehensive volume by Lexington Books, Langham, MD., USA (2007).

⁸ On the implications of the Iraq war for the contemporary system of international law see the documentation published by the author: *The Iraq Crisis and the United Nations. Power Politics vs. the International Rule of Law. Memoranda and declarations of the International Progress Organization (1990 – 2003)*. Studies in International Relations, XXVIII. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2004.

⁹ For details see Hans Köchler (ed.), *The Use of Force in International Relations – Challenges to Collective Security*. Studies in International Relations, XXIX. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2006.

the values of “Western” civilization, the basic precepts of the region’s predominant religion and its relation to society and the political order –, obviously constitutes the outright negation of the norms and principles of peaceful co-existence, and particularly those underlying the notion of a “dialogue among civilizations.”

This new approach towards international affairs and the related imperial (or neo-colonial) strategy¹⁰ have substantially been supported, in terms of ideological legitimation, by Samuel Huntington’s paradigm of the “clash of civilizations” which he advanced shortly after the end of the bipolar system of power.¹¹ Thus, the conceptual framework for the analysis of international relations has been characterized by a paradigm shift from *co-existence* to *confrontation* as the basic structural element of the international order – at least in the eyes (and some might say according to the wishful thinking) of the only remaining superpower. The replacement of the notion of co-existence by that of confrontation, as evidenced in the discourse initiated by Huntington, has undoubtedly served to legitimize the interventionist policies the world has witnessed around the beginning of the new millennium. Although not philosophically justified – and in no way consistent with the assumptions embodied in the international rule of law –, such a paradigm shift appears almost unavoidable in terms of *realpolitik*, namely as part of a hegemonial agenda in an essentially *unipolar* political and military order.

In light of this momentous development, the *civilizational paradigm* – according to which no nation can fully “realize” itself, i.e. shape its identity and develop its potential, unless it is prepared and able to relate to other civilizations on the basis of equality –¹² is of paramount importance for the upholding of the norm of non-intervention.¹³ Under the conditions of political and military

¹⁰ In regard to the Arab world see the author’s analysis presented in a lecture delivered shortly after the 1991 Gulf war: “Die Chancen einer liberal konzipierten Neuordnung der arabischen Welt,” *Liberal Club Vienna*, Austria, 10 April 1991. Cf. *Die Presse*, Vienna, April 12, 1991.

¹¹ “The Clash of Civilizations?,” in: *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (1993), pp. 22-49. See also his book: *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996. – For an evaluation of Huntington’s assumptions in the light of the developments triggered by the proclamation of a “New World Order” see the author’s paper: “The Clash of Civilizations Revisited,” in: Hans Köchler and Gudrun Grabher (eds.), *Civilizations: Conflict or Dialogue?* (Studies in International Relations, XXIV.) Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1999, pp. 15-24.

¹² For the philosophical principles underlying what we call in this paper the “civilizational paradigm” see the author’s article: *Philosophical Foundations of Civilizational Dialogue. The Hermeneutics of Cultural Self-comprehension versus the Paradigm of Civilizational Conflict*. International Seminar on Civilizational Dialogue (3rd: 15-17 September 1997: Kuala Lumpur), BP171.5 ISCD. Kertas kerja persidangan / conference papers. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Library, 1997.

¹³ Apart from this normative nexus, the relationship between the principle of non-intervention and civilizational diversity has been emphasized by Onuma Yasuaki also in the factual sense: “The principle of non-intervention has protected the civilizational diversity within national boundaries.” (“A Transcivilizational Perspective on Global Legal Order in the Twenty-first Century: A Way to Overcome West-centric and Judiciary-centric Deficits in International Legal Thoughts,” in: Ronald St. John Macdonald and Douglas M. Johnston [eds.], *Towards World Constitutionalism. Issues in the Legal Ordering of the World Community*. Leiden/Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2005, pp. 151-189; p. 165.)

unipolarity, i.e. in the absence of a balance of power, the actual *multipolarity of civilizations* – a fact of which the process of globalization has made us even more aware – is an essential element documenting the need for an order of co-existence, aimed at the avoidance of war between civilizations with competing claims to universality.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the most serious threat to a peaceful global order indeed emanates from the tendency, on the part of the political hegemon, to translate the *political* into *civilizational* unipolarity, thus emboldening that power's claim to political supremacy and eliminating the very rationale of *equality* as fundamental norm of international relations – in regard to states as well as civilizations. If this process is not being reversed, the global system may gradually return to a state in which the *maxim of self-help* replaces the *commitment to the rule of law* and where the *raison d'être* of a multilateral organization such as the United Nations is basically put into question.¹⁴

We shall not delve here into the details of the archetypical hegemonial project of redefining, or reshaping, entire civilizations according to the ideological model (or “civilizational paradigm”) of a global hegemon – by means of which that nation claims “making the world safe for democracy,” while in reality adapting it, if need be by means of armed force, to its own national interests. It does not need further mention that such an approach is not compatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which are based on the equality of states, nor with those of UNESCO, which are founded on civilizational (cultural) multipolarity. We have laid bare the elements of this imperial strategy in an earlier lecture on “Civilization as Instrument of World Order?”¹⁵

(II)

The ambiguity of the civilizational paradigm

We shall rather deal with the issue of a peculiar *ambiguity* of the civilizational paradigm in the context of the present unipolar system, something which, in our analysis, constitutes a major challenge to the modern doctrine of international relations:

¹⁴ For details see the author's analysis: “The United Nations Organization and Global Power Politics: The Antagonism between Power and Law and the Future of World Order,” in: *Chinese Journal of International Law*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (2006), pp. 323-340.

¹⁵ International Symposium “Civilizations and World Orders,” organized by Bilim ve Sanat Vakfı / Foundation for Sciences and Arts, Istanbul, Turkey, 13 May 2006.

- (a) On the one hand, the civilizational paradigm is being used by those who are interested in perpetuating the present unipolar power constellation to *construe a threat* to international peace and stability. The emphasis on the potentially hostile nature of civilizations different from the Western system of values has more than once served to legitimize the interference into the affairs of other nations, including even outright war. In particular, what is being characterized as the “global war on terror” has acquired the aura of “civilizational war,” i.e. a war *between civilizations* or, in the self-interpretation of the intervening party, one *in defense of civilization* (as understood by the self-proclaimed representatives of the dominant civilization, which is often defined, and reasserted, by means of vilification of others,¹⁶ as Huntington’s dictum of the “bloody borders of Islam”¹⁷ vividly illustrates). Against the background of what Samuel Huntington has described as a potential “clash of civilizations,” this appears to be the approach of the United States, as is evidenced most drastically in the ongoing military-cum-reeducation campaigns in the Middle East and Central Asia.¹⁸
- (b) On the other hand, the civilizational paradigm serves as the very rationale for proving the validity, indeed indispensable nature, of the norm of non-interference. In this context, the existence of other civilizations is not, first and foremost, seen as a threat to peace and stability (as narrowly defined in relation – or more precisely: subordination – to the hegemonial power’s parochial interests), but their flourishing and mutual enrichment is perceived as essential antidote to war. The respect of the principle of “sovereign equality” (Art. 2 [1] of the UN Charter) is seen as *conditio sine qua non* for the peaceful development of all civilizations existing at a given point in time. This is the *United Nations* approach as evidenced in the initiative of the “Alliance of Civilizations.” The underlying philosophy is based on the understanding that the advancement of a civilization – alongside and in interdependence with others on the basis of (normative) equality – is an essential human right in the collective sense.

¹⁶ In this context, the interested party understands its own civilization as the *paradigmatic* one.

¹⁷ “The Clash of Civilizations?,” loc. cit., p. 35.

¹⁸ For an illustration of the global geopolitical context see: *The Baku Declaration on Global Dialogue and Peaceful Co-existence among Nations and the Threats Posed by International Terrorism*. International Progress Organization. Baku, Azerbaijan, 9 November 2001, at www.i-p-o.org/Baku_Declaration.pdf.

The dichotomy between the *antagonistic* and *co-existence-related* paradigms of civilization – implying contradictory, even mutually exclusive theories of international relations – is mirrored by the dichotomy between *unipolarity* and *multipolarity* in terms of the juxtaposition of the *unipolar* structure of the international system at the political level and the *multipolar* dimension of the contemporary world order as regards to the simultaneous existence of a multitude of civilizations (i. e. civilizational diversity). The latter has been particularly emphasized as a “guiding principle” in the Report of the High-level Group of the Alliance of Civilizations.¹⁹

A similar dichotomy has been developing due to the economic implications of the disappearance of the bipolar balance of power, an event which has further accelerated what is commonly characterized as the process of “globalization”²⁰: We refer here to the antagonism between *civilizational multipolarity* (as an undisputable global reality) and the ever increasing tendency – or pressure – towards *socio-cultural uniformity* resulting from that very process. Within the framework of an increasingly unrestrained “consumer society,” the latter tends to “absorb” hitherto independent socio-cultural environments.

As is more and more becoming obvious under the circumstances of liberalized markets (that operate according to the rules of the World Trade Organization), globalization is itself, at least to a certain extent, a corollary of *political unipolarity*, i.e. the hegemonial rule of the one global superpower. In this context, the dynamism of globalization appears indeed as a mixed blessing because that process may further strengthen the hand of the dominant global player in political terms, indirectly reinforcing the confrontational paradigm we have referred to earlier and, thus, “undermining” the paradigm of co-existence among equals (in terms of political entities as well as of civilizations).

(III)

The significance of the “Alliance of Civilizations” under the conditions of a unipolar world order

Under the circumstances of this juxtaposition of unipolar and multipolar structures, mirrored by the antagonism between the paradigms of confrontation and co-existence in the civilizational as well as the political and legal realms, we have to ask the basic question as to the priorities to be set for the

¹⁹ Guiding principle 1: “An alliance of Civilizations must by nature be based on a multi-polar perspective.” (*Alliance of Civilizations. Report of the High-level Group. 13 November 2006.* United Nations: New York, 2006, p. 5.)

²⁰ On the concept of “globalization” in the context of modern international relations theory see Hans Köchler (ed.), *Globality versus Democracy? The Changing Nature of International Relations in the Era of Globalization.* Studies in International Relations, XXV. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2000.

further development of international relations and, more specifically, the future prospects of the *international rule of law* insofar as it is based on the principle of sovereign equality and the related norms of non-interference and peaceful settlement of disputes. The very future of the United Nations Organization will depend on the answer to those questions.²¹

One of the basic measures to counter the trend described here and to eventually reverse the course towards civilizational uniformity and the “unilateralization” of international affairs will be the *strengthening of the civilizational paradigm* within the United Nations system – in the sense of a “dialogue among civilizations” as outlined by us under scenario (b). In this context, the launching of the “Alliance of Civilizations” by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with the co-sponsorship of the Prime Ministers of Spain and Turkey, is not merely of symbolic, but of special political significance.

Before we go into the details of evaluating the initiative’s possible impact on the further development of international relations and its significance in terms of the international legal order in particular, we should have a look at the terminology. In terms of semantics, the combination of the words “Alliance of Civilizations” is to be taken as a metaphorical phrase. It describes an effort aimed at the *co-existence* among civilizations on the basis of non-interference and mutual respect. In the strict sense, the word “alliance” is only applicable to entities of international law (juridical persons such as states); it principally relates to the realm of politics, not of culture or civilization. Cultures may co-exist and, through co-existence, mutually enrich each other without, as incorporations of structurally different value systems and divergent world views, necessarily being “allied” with one another. Cultures – or civilizations as the universal framework of a community’s perception of the world, comprising cultures as sub-systems – are not themselves actors, but collective expressions of the actors’ perceptions; their historical development and interdependent relationship is the principal subject of *hermeneutics*.²² Those whose identity is shaped by the respective civilization are in turn the ones who decide between the options of “alliance” (co-existence) or “clash” (confrontation), depending on their evaluation of the civilizational paradigm in the context of their specific understanding of international affairs.

²¹ On the prospects of the United Nations Organization in the post-Cold War context see the author’s treatise: “Quo Vadis, United Nations?,” in: *Law Review*, Polytechnic University of the Philippines, College of Law, May 2005, pp. 49-65.

²² For details see the author’s paper: “The Philosophical Foundations of Civilizational Dialogue,” in: *Future Islam*, “Insight,” New Delhi, September/October 2006, www.futureislam.com. – The methodological framework of cultural hermeneutics has been worked out by Hans-Georg Gadamer. See his *Hermeneutik I: Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 5th ed. 1986.

We shall now briefly deal with the international law aspect of civilizational dialogue insofar as it helps us to situate the Secretary-General's initiative within the framework of norms incorporated by the Charter of the United Nations Organization. The purpose stated in Art. 1 (2) of the UN Charter is of particular relevance for the dialogue among civilizations as a crucial "strategic" goal of international relations in an era that is characterized by the absence of a balance of power: "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace[.]"

An active policy of promoting civilizational dialogue can be seen as major contribution to the achievement of that purpose. Furthermore, by implication, any measure aimed at *imposing* a particular value system or civilizational (cultural) identity upon a nation is an act that runs counter not only to the very philosophy the United Nations is based on, but constitutes an outright contradiction to the principle of the "sovereign equality" of nations (enshrined in Art. 2 [1] of the Charter) which is an intrinsic element of the "international rule of law."

The detailed proposals and implementation recommendations of the High-level Group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the purpose of outlining a viable strategy for an "Alliance of Civilizations" have to be seen in that context.²³ By their very nature, those proposals are not binding legal principles through which a new architecture of international relations could be built; nonetheless, through their implementation, they will facilitate the achievement of one of the UN Charter's main purposes, namely that of peaceful co-existence among nations.

In that regard, special importance is to be given to the measures proposed in the field of education. In Section VII (Recommendations) the report calls for expanding "global cross-cultural and human rights education" through, *inter alia*, providing for a "balance and integration of national history and identity formation with knowledge of other cultures, religions, and regions."²⁴ This basic aspect of what we call "civilizational hermeneutics" has been highlighted in our analysis on "Cultural-philosophical Aspects of International Cooperation" (1974) and in the final resolution of the International Progress Organization's Conference on "The Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations" of 29 July 1974. In that resolution, the I.P.O. had invited regional organizations, "especially those working in the framework of the UN family, to set up or to sponsor the creation of regional Institutes of Culture in other geographic areas of the world, with a view to spreading a coherent and

²³ See the Report of the High-level Group issued on 13 November 2006, loc. cit.

²⁴ Op. cit., p. 33.

non-nationalistic knowledge of the cultures of the planet ...”²⁵ We had called for this measure on the basis of the assumption “that in the modern perilous era the main task and the mission of any cultural foreign policy must be the quest for peace”²⁶ and had characterized the efforts to better understand other cultures (civilizations) as prerequisite of shaping an individual’s as well as a group’s social identity. Thus, civilizational “self-comprehension,” in our analysis, is to be perceived as a dialectical process that necessitates the recognition of the “other civilization” on an equal level.²⁷

Similarly, in the Communiqué issued upon the conclusion of the international symposium on “The Concept of Monotheism in Islam and Christianity” (1981), the International Progress Organization had called for a concrete program of action “in order to examine and rectify all school textbooks”²⁸ from a viewpoint which is very close to the approach of today’s Alliance of Civilizations, emphasizing the knowledge of other cultures as intrinsic element of national identity formation.²⁹ Equally, in its recommendations of November 2007, the High-level Group of the Alliance of Civilizations suggested the convening of “curriculum-review panels” to scrutinize educational curricula in order to ensure that “they meet guidelines for fairness, accuracy, and balance in discussing religious beliefs ...”³⁰ It goes without saying that what is stated by the experts in regard to religions applies to the civilizational perception of the “other” in general.

(IV)

Conclusion:

The universal relevance of the civilizational paradigm for a global order of peace

Similar to our hermeneutical approach, the Alliance of Civilizations is oriented towards the “paradigm of mutual respect among peoples of different cultural and religious traditions.”³¹ No nation can claim civilizational superiority unless it is setting itself outside the consensus that also underlies the international rule of law. As we have stated elsewhere, this implies, in terms of international realpolitik, “that the privileged global power will not anymore try to command obedience by ‘civilizational subordination’”³² and will desist from using the civilizational paradigm

²⁵ Hans Köchler (ed.), *Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations*, p. 142.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ For details see Hans Köchler, *Cultural-philosophical Aspects of International Cooperation*, chapter IV, pp. 7ff.

²⁸ Hans Köchler (ed.), *The Concept of Monotheism in Islam and Christianity*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1982, p. 133.

²⁹ Point VII/1/a of the Report of the High-level Group referred to above.

³⁰ Report of the High-level Group, VII/4, p. 34.

³¹ Op. cit., I/1/5, p. 4.

³² “Civilization as Instrument of World Order? The Role of the Civilizational Paradigm in the Absence of a Balance of Power.” Advance version published in *Future Islam*, “Insight,” New Delhi, July/August 2006, www.futureislam.com.

for the legitimation of the use of force against other nations. “Any civilization’s claim to exclusivity and superiority – in the sense of negating the intrinsic value of other civilizations – is a recipe for war. Such an approach negates the very idea of world order as a system of norms agreed upon – on the basis of mutuality – by states and peoples that represent different civilizations”³³ and, thus, contradicts the basic principles on which the United Nations Organization is founded. The very notion of *human dignity*, invoked in the Preamble to the UN Charter, implies, at the collective level, the norm of mutual respect among civilizations and is, as we have explained elsewhere,³⁴ at the roots of any *legitimate* system of norms governing the relations among states.³⁵ This excludes, almost by definition, an approach that associates world order with a “dominant civilization.”

As we have tried to explain in the outline of our argument, the rationale of peaceful co-existence – as incorporated in the UN Charter and implemented, albeit imperfectly, over several decades since the end of World War II – is also that of civilizational dialogue. The principle of non-interference, as basic norm of international law, corresponds to that of civilizational tolerance. The basic *legal* norms governing the relations between states mirror the *hermeneutical* principles of civilizational dialogue. In terms of public awareness – though not of legal validity – one reinforces the other.

Thus, the “civilizational paradigm” takes its legitimate place in the international law doctrine of the 21st century. More than previous centuries, our era – due to the rapid process of globalization – will be characterized by the dynamic interaction of different civilizations, shaped around sovereign states none of which will be in a position to claim (civilizational) superiority unless the ever more precarious world order will descend into a state of total anarchy. More than in previous epochs, the international rule of law will be embodied by, and become visible to, the international public in the principles underlying the co-existence, if not partnership, among civilizations.

Global peace will be more and more tied to, or identified as, “civilizational peace.” The developments upon the end of the bipolar world order (that, to a large extent, was characterized by the rivalry among *ideologies*) have initiated a process that may bring about a new perception of the very system of international law – as an order of norms which, in their relevance, go far beyond the parameter of relations between self-contained nation-states and take account of the increasingly more

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ *The Principles of International Law and Human Rights. The Compatibility of Two Normative Systems*. Studies in International Relations, V. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1981.

³⁵ Onuma Yasuaki, in his analysis of the civilizational paradigm in contemporary international law, reaches a similar conclusion: “Considering the problem of civilizations is of crucial importance to conceive of legitimate legal order in the 21st century world ...” (Op. cit., p. 154)

complex *multicultural realities* at the global level.³⁶ At the same time, this process will give new urgency to and underline the continued validity of the interdependent norms of *national sovereignty* and *non-interference* as cornerstones of a *just* world order of peace and co-operation among *all* nations and peoples on the basis of *equality*.³⁷

³⁶ On the impact of the multicultural paradigm on the concept of the nation-state see, *inter alia*, the author's analysis: "The Concept of the Nation and the Question of Nationalism. The Traditional 'Nation State' versus a Multicultural 'Community State,'" in: Michael Dunne and Tiziano Bonazzi (eds.), *Citizenship and Rights in Multicultural Societies*. Keele: Keele University Press, 1995, pp. 44-51.

³⁷ This term is to be understood in its *normative* meaning (in terms of equal rights at the individual as well as the collective levels), not as *factual* equality.