The main contradiction of modernity is that under the influence of globalization processes the world community, in fact, becomes more and more, according to all the parameters of social life, a single holistic system. At the same time, there are no governance mechanisms adequate to this holism. Moreover, global governance, which cannot emerge spontaneously, is not being built intentionally and theoretical discussions about it are rather rare today, not being in the center of everyone's attention as they deserve to be. Besides, governance in general and global governance in particular, unlike regulation, cannot emerge spontaneously. This issue is to be discussed below; now I would like to make some points about why it happens.

First, we talk about a principally new, unprecedented situation related to governing an extremely complicated and huge socio-natural system, which human beings never encountered in their history. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that experience accumulated by the humankind and the certified approaches to resolving complex problems are not valid any more. At the same time, no new approaches have been worked out.

Second, the world community, in spite of the increasing interdependence of different countries and peoples, still remains fragmented, divided into autonomous and self-defining structures, which function in accordance to their own laws targeting, first of all, their private profits and interests. These are nation-states, multinational corporations, and confessional systems, such as Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, etc.

And third, globalization itself and its numerous consequences remain a subject of serious discussions. Such discussions often conceal the main thing: globalization is, first of all, an objective historical process and not a project specially designed by someone, or someone's insidious plan and intention.

This should be emphasized because if rethinking globalization processes and their circumstances we would focus on subjectivity and pay attention, first of all, to who benefits from it and who behaves in which way, than we would start searching perpetrators and discussing globalization scenarios. In this case one faces inability to distinguish between the objective, natural course of events of social development and the subjective human activity. The former, of course, is the basis of such a development but it is not sufficient to provide governing complex systems without adequate structures and mechanisms. Thinking globally, on can not help recognizing the state of affairs: there are no structures and mechanisms of government adequate to the holistic global world. That is why, in my opinion, it is not productive to look
for perpetrators or those responsible for globalizations. Moreover, such approach engenders illusions and is dangerous because it complicates the business and distracts from real solutions for the topical problems.

In case of understanding globalization first of all as an objective historical process (this is my position), one should look for means of resolving globalization- engendered problems ( including governing social systems ) in the sphere of structural changes of world society. This approach is based on a proposition that complex systems, or, at least, biosystems (human being is a part of them) in their development are regulated naturally, basing on natural laws. Here one can talk about self-regulation of complex systems. Apart from that, social systems are also governed, because an active element plays an important role in their development. This active element is a human being who, limited by his / her capabilities, consciously influences various parameters of development. It is evident that planetary-scale social system, being formed now, should also be not just self- regulated but also governed.

It is important to distinguish between regulation and government, because they are not the same. Government is a higher type of regulation, as well as development is a higher form of movement. That is why there can be no development without movement while we can commonly see movement without development. Similarly, governance presupposes regulation, while regulation can take place (occur) without governance.

Thus, via regulation (as well as self-regulation) one can solve the task of the most optimal functioning of a system, creating the most favorable conditions for interaction of different components of this system. Regulation is aimed at concerted actions of various part of a whole and can be done consciously (when a human being plays the regulative role), or spontaneously (when we talk about self- regulating systems). For example, the biosphere as a whole is a self-regulating system, whose balanced development is supported by the law of struggle for survival.

Unlike regulation, governance is always done with purpose and presupposes achieving a concrete result. Thus, general governance and global governance in particular can not emerge spontaneously or naturally. It only can take place in a society and can only be built consciously, purposefully and following certain logic, which provides specific parameters of such a governance. Here, unlike in the case of regulation, one always can find an active source—subject of governance, setting some goals and providing their achievement.

In this context we can talk about historical dynamics of development of social relations. For example, primitive people in the period of savagery and, at the large extent, in the period of barbarity, relations were regulated by force and survival of the strongest. As for governing social relations in the full sense, it emerges later, together with settled way of life, labor division, formation of a state and, finally, formation of the first civilizations. Such governance is already based on realization of certain interests and purposefulness. It does not replace natural regulation, but rather is supplementary to it, making social development more predictable and less contentious. This is how all social systems evolve, of which nation-states have become the largest and the most well-built.

From the mid-20th century the situation has principally changed, because due to globalization process the whole of humankind becomes a holistic system. It more and more looks like a single holistic organism basing on the central parameters of social life (economic, political, informational, etc.), on its interaction with natural environment, on exploring world ocean, outer space, etc. In other words, the anarchy of international relations has been gradually put in order.

So, "during the last two centuries there has emerged increasing number of lessor more implicit principles that regulate the establishment of nation-states and their behavior within the framework of the global state system. This very system has spread all over the land surface of the world. Even uninhabited Antarctica was provisionally parceled among seven nation-states. Moreover, the U. N. Convention on the Law and the Sea (1982) allows each coastal nation state to exercise full sovereignty over a territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles and limited jurisdiction in an exclusive economic zone up to 200 nautical miles. The development of the unclaimed sea bed is to be regulated by an international organization".
From this viewpoint, it is evident that humankind has reached a frontline, behind which spontaneous regulation of social relations can not last any longer. It should be supplemented with conscious and purposeful building of systemic governance, because the world of global relations without effective global governance would encounter serious testing.

Nowadays our world is like a tall ship, which has so far no steering wheel, but is already being brought by wind from a relatively safe haven to the open sea. Its crew, stuck in conflicts and making no efforts to provide governing the ship, inevitably becomes hostage of circumstances and natural elements. The world community, having entered the era of global interdependence, should acknowledge the danger of uncontrolledness of the modern world and to start acting in concord and with purpose. If not, this state of affairs promises nothing good for it. Without effective governance, the world community will only slide more and more into the abyss of increasing conflicts and contradictions.

Thus, the modern humankind simply has no alternative to global governance, which should be built at any price and as soon as possible. But to solve this task, it is needed to answer several principal questions:

—How global governance is generally possible and what is the logic of this governance?

—Which are the main tasks of global governance?

—Which prepositions for building global governance we already have?

—What kind of international organizations and bodies corresponds (or will be able to correspond after some degree of reform) with the essence and principles of global governance?

—Which obstacles can be found in the way towards building global governance?

—Which principal decisions and at which level should be made as the first and the next steps in achieving the goals set?

—Who can and should take responsibility for building global governance?

—Finally, what is the price and who should pay it?

So, how global governance is generally possible?

In the decision of this problem we already have the certain theoretical and practical results. Theoretically this problem was seriously investigated by I. Kant, V. Solovyov, N. Berdyaev, K. Jaspers and others. If we shall address to practice we shall see, that the world community has accumulated, during its history, a significant experience of governing large social systems—states, empires, kingdoms, confederations, unions, blocs, etc. State has proven in practice to be the most wide-spread and vivid form for organizing social life. Morality and law are the central instruments of social governance, through which one can provide the strongest influence on social consciousness and human behavior. We should also emphasize ideology, politics, economy, finance, culture, etc., through which social systems are also directly or indirectly governed. But morality and law, with no doubt, dominate these factors, because they literally penetrate and fasten together all the other spheres of social life, being, by this or that way, subdued to moral and legal norms and laws. Today, when globalization makes the whole world community a holistic system, governing this system becomes a demand of the time and it should be built taking into consideration the whole experience accumulated by humankind in this sphere.

It is also evident that global governance should be based on the historically tested principle of separation of legislative, executive and judiciary powers.

In this regard one can and should talk about the World Parliament, World Government and World Law. To see them realized, as well as to build an effective planetary system of governance, we should create adequate conditions, of which the most important are:

Universally meaning moral foundations, i. e. we should form universal values and universal morality for the planet. They should not replace, but enforce and amplify morality and values of different peoples.
It seems that the Universal declaration of human rights, equating all people in their right to life, freedom and property, should be the starting point for the formation of such a morality.

A single legal system is another necessary condition for global governance, together with a planetary system of adaptation and implementation of legal norms universal for all countries and peoples. We should emphasize, that we talk not about international law, being already well-developed at the level of interstate and regional relations, but about global law, which would be really universal. Such a law does not presuppose abolishment of legal systems of separate states or regional structures, of international legal acts and institutions. It is important, but, that the former should be brought with correspondence with the latter and should not contradict them.

Global governance also means providing cooperative security and uniting efforts in maintaining it through various forms of cooperation. First of all, we talk about economic cooperation, which already successfully evolves in the modern world in the form of multinational corporations, consortiums, joint ventures, etc. World trade has already made all peoples of the planet involved into the single market of labor, goods and services.

Planetary political cooperation is the next needful condition for global governance. It should provide resolution of conflicts and peaceful coexistence through compromising and resolving disputes taking into consideration the maximum of interests of different parts. Global political cooperation, unlike economic one, still is to be built, because in this sphere relations are built so far on absolute priority of national and corporative interests.

Military cooperation, existing nowadays at the regional level and meeting the defense tasks of separate countries and peoples (i.e., protecting them from external threats), should be replace by police forces providing law and order, protection from criminal activities.

The last world financial crisis has shown once again that coordinated planetary financial policy is a necessary condition for global governance. It is evident, that it is hard and even impossible to implement coordinated financial policy without a single currency.

Religious tolerance is necessary as the most important condition for peaceful coexistence and constructive interaction of different people, independent on their religious beliefs or non-beliefs.

Scientific and technological cooperation, as well as cooperation in the sphere of health and education presuppose building conditions for a balanced cultural and social development of various continents and regions of the planet.

Common (world) language for international communication is needed to support conversation in various spheres of social life and to develop intercultural interaction. As known Korean philosopher Yersu Kim marks: "A culture can be compared, within limits, with a language. A culture, like a language, is a system of symbolic meanings that serve the common needs of its members".

Of course, we have not listed all conditions needed for building a system of global governance. But these are the most important ones, without which the rest will have no sense.

Now let us talk about the central tasks for global governance to resolve. First of all, it should provide adaptation and implementation of universally coordinated decisions allowing to regulate social relations in the main spheres of social life purposefully and effectively. This means, of course, providing sustainable and balanced world socio-economic development and financial regulation, resolving the issues of health, education, environment and nature management, fighting international crime, preventing armed conflicts, etc.

Do we now have premises for the formation of global governance? It seems to me that we can definitely answer “yes”. First of all, it is related to the sphere of social consciousness being globalized more and more.

In fact, we have to deal now with a world outlook, which was born in the Antique time and is called “cosmopolitanism”. But there is a huge difference between the past and the present in this regard. In the ancient times, starting from cynics, who were the first ones to proclaimed themselves citizens of the world, and up to the middle of the 20th century, cosmopolitan ideas remained a domain of a very insignificant
part of broad-minded people. Absolute majority of the population considered such ideas, at best, ironically. Now the global vision of the world and feeling of belonging to the whole humankind becomes more and more a mass phenomenon.

Here it is important to note, that global it is not necessary to oppose local. As the Japanese philosopher Naoshi Yamawaki has properly told: "The global and local viewpoints are seen as interdependent, and particularity and universality (or transversality) is regarded as inseparable. . . The cosmopolitan Self understands himself or herself as a member of the Earth, i. e. a cosmos in which all of humankind lives. Yet, it must be emphasized that this notion of cosmopolitan Self must be combined with other dimensions of understanding of the Self that are characterized by cultural-historical differences or particularities. Each individual who holds each multidimensional Self has the responsibility for his or her past and must make efforts to understand others who live in different culturesiv.

We can, thus, talk about the emergence of global consciousness at the planetary scale, based on common values and behavioral norms. For example, all people, independently on their status and residence, nationality, confession or race, behave, in principle, in the same way and follow common ethics and logic of conduct at an international airport, or aboard a plane, at a railway station, or in a carriage, at supermarkets, during sport contests, at world resorts, international exhibitions, festivals, conferences, and so on. There are no significant discussions here on such issues as good and evil, justice and injustice, what is “good” and what is “bad”, decent or non-decent. Common wellbeing, security and respect to human dignity are perceived in such situation as indisputable values because of their evidence.

The above-said is, of course, a necessary condition for building the system of global governance, but not a sufficient one. Among the existing premises to implementation of global governance one can stress also a well-developed at a planetary scale transportation network allowing to move along the Earth within hours. It is possible not only for political and business elite, but for a significant part of the active population of the planet. We should also mention a single information zone, which emerged on the basis of modern telecommunication technologies, along with space communication and monitoring systems, modern mass media allowing each inhabitant of the planet to be (on-line) virtually at every spot of the Earth. This provides a possibility to make decisions quickly and to control their implementation on-line independently on distances. Without this, global governance is not possible.

A single language of communication is also important for global governance. By nowadays, the English language has become such a one due to several reasons we have no possibility to dwell on.

Now let us talk about basic obstacles being in the way of building global governance.

Absolute majority of modern states is functioning on the basis of principles, which had been formed when humankind remained fragmented and demonstrated no holism. Ruling elites of various actors of international relations, which have become an organic part of the existing network, continue thinking fragmentarily even now, in spite of changes demanding a systemic, global vision of the world. From these positions they produce and sustain unfounded fears regarding the loss, as a result of globalization, of original cultures of different people, of national identity, etc. Devoted to the position of independence and national sovereignty, conducting active policy of patriotism and nationalism they are not ready to share even insignificant part of their authorities with supra-national structures. But we talk about relatively significant authorities, which will have to be handed over to World Government and the other global governance structures.

First of all, we mean security issues. This presupposes gradual reforming and diminishing national armed forces with final integration of them into a single system with common command. Police structures, remaining locally and regionally based, will also require common planetary coordination.

Global law is another necessary element of global governance system. It is not equal to international law and is to be constructed in the future. While international law related to bi- and multilateral relations between international actors functions for a long time and is relatively effective, global law, which would embrace the whole planet, we have not yet managed to build. Even offensive crimes of Somalian pirates, harmful for many countries involved into ocean trade, have not forced international community to create a
legal barrier to this outrage. This state of affairs is mainly caused by the absence of adequate world structures and necessary procedures, which would provide working out, adaptation and unequivocal implementation of legal norms obligatory for all countries and peoples. This task in principle can not be resolved outside global governance system. But global governance is also not possible without legal support. Thus, the processes of building global law and global governance should be conducted simultaneously.

*Socio-economic backwardness* of a significant part of world community and a huge gap between excessive wealth and poverty at the planetary scale is another important obstacle in the way of building global governance. This task also can not be solved without mechanisms of coordination of global socio-economic development and planetary system of financial regulation.

Introduction of a single currency has become the demand of the time. It has been demonstrated by the last world financial crisis. Now dollar in a way plays the role of the world money, but it can not resolve the problem in principle, because of its being a national currency depending on decisions of one state—the U. S. World currency as a universal purchasing unit should be equally independent from various actors of international relations, of which states are the most important ones. It is evident that such currency, as well as world language as the means of intercultural and international communication, should be indispensable conditions for building an effective global governance.

Now let us discuss the issue of which international organizations and structures correspond (or could correspond after some reforming) the essence and principles of global governance.

Since modern states are sustainable and effective enough social systems, while modern political elites last for self-sufficiency and independence, the humankind is to fulfill a complicated and not so short passage to organized and governed world community. Thus, a *confederation of nation-states* can be, in the foreseeable future, the most optimal form for organizing social life for the purpose of global governance. It would provide reasonable balancing between global and national interests. Complicated but generally positive experience of the European Union is a basis for sound optimism with regard to this issue.

The World Constitution should be based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Although it is not perfect from the viewpoint of various cultures and traditions, it has fully proven its humanistic orientation, as well as effectiveness and vitality.

Basing on the principle of separation of powers, the U. N. can pretend to become the legislative power, or World parliament. But this organization should be seriously reformed to acquire the functions of the legislative power. Since it will adopt laws and legal norms mandatory for all countries and peoples, it is important to ensure their equal representation in this legislative body of global governance. Evidently, the formation of the World Parliament should be gradual: from representatives of separate countries to direct elections. First steps and evolution of, for example, the European Parliament, may serve a good example in resolving this issue.

The executive power is to be created virtually from a scratch. In some extent, G7, which, under the influence of the last financial and economic crisis started to evolve into G20, could become in the future a prototype of an executive power structure where all countries and nations are represented equally. But this prospect is too distant and hardly foreseeable, what makes resolution of this issue particularly topical against the background of increasing global problems. Evidently, serious contractions the humankind will inevitably face in the near future, will open new opportunities for a radical decision in this regard.

*Judiciary power*, directly connected with the formation of global way, should be built up from a scratch. The world community has some experience in this regard and it can become the basis for the future world court, whose sources can be seen in the Nuremberg, Hague and European human rights courts.

Some words regarding which principal decisions and at which level should be made initially and afterwards to achieve the goals set.

Decisions regarding building the global system of governance should be made, of course, at the planetary level. A World Conference, roughly analogous to the World environmental conference in Rio-
de-Janeiro (1992), could become the first step. It could also be a Word summit of heads of all states, which would work out principal approaches to global governance. In the future operative tactical and strategic decisions would become more and more the prerogative of the newly emerging structures.

Finally, who can and should take responsibility for building global governance and what is the price and who should pay it?

First of all, this responsibility lies on the world academic, political and business elites, i.e., on people having adequate worldview, possessing necessary knowledge, have the strongest authorities and material resources. On the other hand, the most developed countries (the USA, the EU, China, Russia, India, Brazil and others) should take initial basic responsibility for building the system of global governance. They also should carry the main burden of financial support of are form of modern international relations. This does not mean, however, that there should be countries or nations at our planet, which would be free from their own reasonable contribution into common expenses.

Someone may say that it is all a utopia, and that global governance is impossible, while above-listed arguments in its support are insufficient. This viewpoint has its right to exist, because we can not so far provide a final proof of the truth of our statements. Someone can question correctness and sequence of the steps proposed and this person may also be right, because we discuss a topic having no analogies in human history. That is why it is so important to observe the possibility of global governance from different angles, including the position of philosophy, which, unlike science, is oriented not so much towards finding concrete, final solutions but towards broadening the scope of various approaches to resolution of a problem. Such philosophical analysis is especially valuable where exact scientific methods have not been worked out yet, but the situation needs immediate resolution. The problem of governing contemporary global world is such a case.
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