# A  PHILOSOPHICAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE POSSIBILITY OF WORLD PEACE IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF IMMANUEL KANT

**BY**

**EMEJULU-OKEKE, JENNIFER**

**2012087027F**

**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY,**

**FACULTY OF ARTS,**

**NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY AWKA.**

**A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS, NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWRAD OF THE DOCTORATE DEGREE IN PHILOSOPHY**

**SUPERVISOR:**

**REV. FR. PROF. BONACHRISTUS UMEOGU**

**DECEMBER,2016**

**APPROVAL**

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, FACULTY OF ARTS,NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA.FOR THE AWARD OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (PhD) DEGREE IN PHILOSOPHY.

BY

_____                     _____

Rev. Fr. (Prof) B. Umeogu                    Date

Supervisor

_____                     _____

Rev. Fr. Prof. B. Umeogu                     Date

Head Of Department

_____                     _____

Prof.  Tracie Utoh-Ezeajugh                  Date

Dean Of Faculty Of Arts

_____                     _____

Prof. Ike Odimegwu                      Date

Dean SPGS

_____              _____

Prof Anthony U Uzoma

External Examiner              Date

## CERTIFICATION

EMEJULU-OKEKE JENNIFER with the registration number 2012087027F, a student of the department of philosophy in the Faculty of Arts of NnamdiAzikiwe University  Awka,  has satisfactorily completed the requirements for course and research work for the Doctorate Degree in Philosophy

---

REV. FR. PROF. B. UMEOGU

SUPERVISOR

---

REV.FR. PROF.B.UMEOGU

H.O.D  PHILOSOPHY

**DEDICATION**

To God Almighty and my Parents Mr. and Mrs. U. Emejulu.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER FOUR: KANT AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE IN**

**INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

## CHAPTER SIX: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

**Abstract**

Immanuel Kant in his political essays titled *Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan aim* and *Towards Perpetual peace* presents a political philosophy which is teleological in nature. Nature had designs for the human race within which the gems of the race could be realized. The establishment of a perfect civil constitution and the enthronement of liberty was the aim for which man was designed and nature was to bring this into reality through the natural tendencies in man.This he called antagonism or asocial sociability. This asocial sociability was the means through which men living in the state of nature, the state of all against all were able to create civilized society. The creation of the state created a peace within which the tendencies of man continued to move him towards nature's desired end. This same antagonism existed between nations in the international scene. The realist and liberalist outlook on international relations best describes this relationship. Convinced of the inevitable nature of the formation of this federation, Kant based his argument on reason, moral progress, freedom and protection of rights and providence. The federation was to curb the problem of antagonism, the abolition of war and its many evils and the establishment of world peace. Despite the creation of such a federation like the United Nations and  taking into consideration current happenings on the international scene today such as wars between and within nations, terrorism and continued hostility even under a supposed Peace; it is still in question if the federation of Free states can ensure world peace. This work uses the hermeneutic method to interpret Kant's reason for the inevitability of  the creation of the federation and the possibility of the attainment of international peace.It interprets his definitive and preliminary articles for attaining this peace both in theory and in practical international relations. It seeks establish that without coercive authority, the United Nations which was built on the Kantian model has not been able to completely ensure world peace. The Kantian model cannot ensure world peace because it does not provide solutions to the new challenges which our world faces today like terrorism, global warming and environmental change, threats of nuclear war, and others.

**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1. BACKGROUND TO STUDY**

The possibility of attaining world peace has been a topic in political discourse for as long as men have sought solutions to the problem of war and other challenges that face nations in the arena of international politics. Philosophers and political scientists/theorists have sought answers to the question of how to organize and regulate relations between nations on the international level and how to end war for good. Nations around the world have been divided along religious, economic and ideological lines. Nations around the world formed alliances with nations which they had common interests with. These interests were mostly economic and ideological in nature. From earliest times, nations formed alliances through marriages, contracts, treaties, etc with the aim of preserving peace and unity, economic advancement and territorial expansion. In modern times nations have engaged in diplomatic relations to foster cooperation and to prevent the costs of war. The first and second world wars are believed to be as a result of the failure of states to agree on issues of interest. War was believed to be the last resort to settle disputes among nations in cases where diplomacy failed to obtain peace.

The creation of the League of Nations was with the aim of fostering peace and avoiding war (this organization did not completely succeed in preventing the Second World War, and was replaced by the United Nations). The cold war was another period of conflict this time between the USSR and the U.S and their allies which lasted from the mid-1940s until the end of the 1980s.[1]Thenon alignment policy of Kwame Nkrumah was a response to that situation. There have been many attempts to formulate lasting and realistic policies and laws which can safeguard

the rights of nations, protect territorial sovereignty and foster peace and cooperation between nations. International law has existed for a long time. The oldest known treaty, preserved in an inscription on a stone monument, is a peace treaty between two city-states of Sumer, dating from about 2500 BC[2]. Many other know records of international law are found among the Jews as recorded in the Bible and also among the early Greeks and Romans. The *jus gentum* is one of such laws. All these laws stipulate the rules regulating the interaction between nations and some even stipulate the rules of warfare.

Political realism reflects a view of international politics which describes the relationship between nations as interest bound. Under this outlook, nations are not bound by friendship or morality but by interests and advancements of their position of power. Morality has little or no place in such a relationship. Military might rather advances a nation's position in the world. War is seen as a characteristic of this relationship and all nations arm themselves to the teeth to protect themselves and their positions. Although this outlook of international politics has been criticized by contemporary scholars, it remains an issue of debate until today because of the nature of the international political system. The idealist and liberalist perspectives of international relations developed as a response to the realist perspective because of its obvious flaws and its failure to recognize the possibility of change towards a more liberal view of international politics and the goodness in human nature.

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), a philosopher of the German extraction, from his work *Perpetual Peace* written in 1795 created the foundation for modern day efforts for the realization of world peace through the creation of international organizations such as the League of Nations which was replaced by the United Nations, European Union, African Union, etc. He  is known to have created the earliest foundations for the development of liberal theory. Differing from Realism,

Liberalism sees the possibility of mutual cooperation between nations based on their positive outlook of human nature and the possibility of changes in the current state of international relations. The creation of the United Nations reflected this positive outlook on the possibilities of good that could be achieved with mutual cooperation among nations. Many scholars agree that the League of Nations and its successor the United Nations were formed based on the Kantian prototype of the federation of free states. This is obvious in the emphasis on the protection of human rights, the protection of the sovereignty of member nations, the protection of world peace and the voluntary nature of membership. Above all, the absence of a federation of states with a central authority in the world is the idea of Kant because his ideas on the nature of this federation did not require a central authority. This is because Kant believed it will end in a despotic system; something which Kant abhorred.

Despite the creation of the United Nations and other international and continental organizations such as the European Union (E.U), the African Union (A.U), NATO, ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States), etc. the world has witnessed wars and conflict and still lives with threats of wars and further conflict. Kant hoped that humanity would progress from a state of war found in the state of nature (caused by man's asocial sociability or antagonism) into a civil society and the establishment of the perfect civil constitution would be possible because of the man's moral progress from brute to civil which was natures intent for man. Despite the efforts of the international community to ensure peace, conflict still marks international politics.

## 1.2. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The state remains one of the most complex of human institutions and the problems regarding its maintenance, sustainability and organization has plagued political philosophers from earliest

times. From the writings of Cicero, Plato , Aristotle, we find matters concerning the state, how it is to be run, to issues bordering on the qualities of a just state such as justice, fairness, crime and punishment. International politics has become a very important aspect of our studies in political philosophy because of the importance of securing peaceful coexistence among nations. The lessons of two world wars and other lesser wars are very costly and remain a reminder of the importance of peace.

Peaceful coexistence between peoples and nations is highly desirable but its actuality is a problem that has plagued human society since time immemorial. Our world has witnessed a lot of wars, many of them unnecessary. This is contradictory to the fact that all men claim to desire peace which is necessary for development. Immanuel Kant, a philosopher of progress, wrote his essay *Perpetual Peace* in order to create a solution to the problem of wars and to create peace between nations. In this essay, he sets out rules (preliminary and determinative articles for perpetual peace), to guide men to the attainment of this peace. How realistic is his proposal and how practicable is this thesis? One of the problems with his argument is how human nature which is so prone to antagonism and conflict can allow a state of peace among nations. Kant's argument on moral progress also seems too weak to support his thesis. In our contemporary society where terrorism and threats of war make peace almost impossible, the idea of cosmopolitanism and its practical application also is another problem which Kant's thesis has not addressed. This work examines Kant's proposal for perpetual peace, interpreting his ideas and how his ideas influenced the creation of the League of Nations first and then later on the United Nations. It also interprets how his theory has been played out in real international relations and opines that Kant's theory has some flaws which makes it incapable of addressing the problem of peace in our contemporary society. The U.N which is a brainchild of Kantianism also inherited

the flaws in Kant's thesis and its current structure is a problem because of its voluntary membership, lack of coercive authority and its inability to interfere in the affairs on individual nation states. It therefore, cannot completely ensure international peace.

## 1.3. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The relation between states in the international arena has always been a very important aspect of political philosophy. This area of study continues to be relevant especially in our technologically driven world and the threats that nuclear and atomic technologies pose to international peace. Nations of the world continue to live in conflict and fear of war despite the establishment of international organizations like the United Nations and their efforts to ensure regional, continental and international peace. This work was necessitated by the need to reinterpret Kant's political thought especially his work on Peace. This is due to the many misrepresentations and misinterpretations of Kant's ideas which have changed the meaning of certain aspects of his work especially on cosmopolitanism, war, the federation of Free states and Peace. This work also exposes the political philosophy of Kant to the world and to those who are not familiar with his work in this area of philosophy. Although Kant is not popular as a political philosopher, many of the issues which he raises in his political writings have continuous importance to our contemporary study of inter-state relations. With the fall of communism and the slow but steady increase of democratic states across the world, many scholars have raised the argument concerning the End of History theory and its insistence that the creation of liberal societies across the world would lead to a more peaceful existence among states. Kant's *Towards Perpetual Peace* captures this and has renewed a lot of interest to its relevance to our understanding of international politics. This work gives an interpretation of Kant's ideas and

examines the possibilities of Kant's proposal to end wars among nations and ensure peaceful coexistence.

## 1.4. SCOPE OF STUDY

As a contribution to political philosophy, this work covers the political philosophy of Immanuel Kant. It provides an understanding of international relations and politics from the period after the Second World War   i.e. from 1945 to present day contemporary times.  It covers the happenings on the scene of international relations from the cold war era to the adoption of liberal democracy by a majority of the world's nations and how this is related to Kant's ideas.   Kant's ideas on the origin of the state, his idea of historical progress, the nature of the international political scene and the reasons that led to the creation of international political organizations like the United Nations and how this has affected international relations. It covers Kant's contributions to several branches of philosophy like ethics, political philosophy and philosophy history. It also makes reference to possibility of the future of international political organizations.  Its points of reference and arguments  are based on Kant's political essays: "*Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan Aim*", and "*Perpetual Peace*".

## 1.5. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The significance of this work lies in its contributions to the area of political philosophy especially in the area of international politics. It exposes the contributions of Immanuel Kant to political philosophy. It also aids our contemporary understanding of international political relations and the different approaches or perspectives to the study of international relation and international politics. This work recaptures the importance of Kant's political writings to our contemporary society. Although Kant is not as popular a political theorist as he is an

epistemologist, Kant's political writings have a lot to contribute to the area of international politics. His work on perpetual peace laid the foundation for the adoption of liberalism as an approach to international relations and added a lot in the area of international peace. He created the groundwork upon which philosophers after him based their work in liberal international theory. It contributes to the various branches of philosophy like philosophy of history as it discusses the question of progress. It also contributes to social and political philosophy as it studies the state and international politics and ethics as it discusses the question of moral progress and political realism. It is also a contribution to the area of peace studies as it examines the nature of peace and how international peace which is a subject of concern to all human beings can be obtained. It contributes to the area of international relations and international politics as it discusses realist and liberalist ideas which have dominated international politics for decades.

## 1.6. METHODOLOGY

This work employs the hermeneutic method. The hermeneutical method is understood basically as the interpretation of meaning.

There are about four perspectives in the study of contemporary hermeneutics. They include: firstly, the conservative perspective which has the task of uncovering the original meaning of the action-texts as intended by the author object, a historical and a-contextual purposeful meanings are secured from the correct and the decidable interpretation. Secondly, The pragmatic or constructivist perspective has to do with interpretation of norms of a community, meaning here operates and is to be found in within the historical context of the interpreter and interpreted. Thirdly, The critical perspective whose purpose is the emancipator conventional wisdoms within

communities are challenged in order to address potential asymmetries. Fourthly, The radical (deconstructionist) perspective where texts and social action are treated as an endless play of signs that reveal and conceal knowledge through the play of difference and contradiction. The term hermeneutics can be traced back as far as ancient Greece to the Greek god Hermes who was the inventor of language and the interpreter between the gods and humanity[3]. In addition, the Greek term *hermeneutice*is central to Aristotles *On interpretation* which concerns the relationship between language and logic and meaning.[4] "Philosophical Hermeneutics has its theoretical origins in the work of the 19th century German philologist Frederick Ast. Ast's*Basic Elements of Grammer, Hermeneutics and Criticism* of 1808 contains an early articulation of the main components of what later became Known as the hermeneutic circle."[5] "Frederick Schleiermacher was the first to understand hermeneutics as the art of understanding itself irrespective of field of study. Gadamer holds that an act of understanding is always interpretative, another key element of Gadamer's hermeneutics is his insistence that interpretation, understanding or meaning cannot take place outside of practical application "[6]. Hermeneutics from the thoughts of scholars sited above goes beyond mere explication. "The interpreter always and necessarily comes to the table of the interpretative conversation or dialogue with a present concern that is grounded in a given epistemological or metaphysical horizon in which the interpreter dwells."[7]

Following the above stated trend, this work interprets the major positions of Kant on international political organization and its practical implementations in real world politics. It gives a different view on Kant's reasons for the inevitability of perpetual peace. It corrects wrong notions and misinterpretations of Kant's work and expounds on terminologies and concepts used by Kant in his political essays .

This work is divided into 6 chapters, Chapter One gives a general introduction to the area of study, giving a background to the research, stating the purpose of this research, the scope and significance of this research and also the method employed by the researcher in carrying out this research. Chapter Two is a review of related literature on the topic of discourse, where ideas of other scholar and philosophers are explored for a better understanding of the topic of study. Chapter Three expands of the concept of human nature and political realism and how Kant connects his concept of human nature to international law, it also considers the basis of Kant's conviction of the possibility of progress and the attainment of cosmopolitanism. Chapter Four is on the nature of peace and how Kant's work on peace led to the redefinition of international politics and the organization of the international political arena. It also discusses the dominant approaches to international relations and how these approaches have affected the pursuit of world peace. Chapter Five is an interpretative study of the preliminary and determinative articles for perpetual peace and analyses how these can aid the arrival at world peace. It also does a theoretical as well as practical interpretation of the Kantian proposal for peace side by side by contemporary efforts to achieve peace. Chapter Six is a summary and conclusion of the work.

## 1.7. DEFINITION OF TERMS

i. **Political realism**The most widely accepted approach to understanding international relations is called realism. Realists believe that nations act only out of self-interest and that their major goal is to advance their own positions of power in the world. The ideas of realism come from the writings of such historical figures as Sun Tzu of ancient China, Thucydidesof ancient Greece, and renaissance Italy's Niccolò Machiavelli.[3]  Realists believe that nations are not guided by

morality or friendship but by the interests. The aim for nations under this approach is to acquire power and further their interests.

**ii. Human nature**  This is basically the study of the human characteristics with the perspective of seeing the evil or goodness in man, there are several works in this area of philosophy as found in Machiavelli, Hobbes, Kant, Augustine, etc.

**iii. Natural law**A set of principles, based on what are assumed to be the permanent characteristics of human nature, that can serve as a standard for evaluating conduct and civil laws. These principles are believed to be set, unchanging and determine human actions and behaviors. This is considered the grounds for positive or municipal law.

**iv. International law** This refers to a set of rules that govern the relation between nations, these laws stand as guides for the activities and responsibilities of states towards each other and usually geared towards maintaining peace and cooperation among such states.This can be intercontinental, regional, continental, etc.

**v. Historical progress** This is based on idea that the world can progressively get better. The idea of Historical progress  depicts a coherent development of human societies from simple tribal ones based on slavery and subsistence agriculture, through various theocracies, monarchies and feudal aristocracies up through modern liberal democracy and technologically driven capitalism. "This evolution is not random, without reason or unintelligible, historical progress shows that events in history are purposeful and that history is directional."[4] history for this school of thought was moving toward a direction which end in the realization of liberal societies. Proponents of this view are Marx, Hegel, Kant, etc.

**vi. Peace** Kant describes perpetual peace as the "highest political good and an idea of practical reason towards which we must act as if it is something real. It is also defined as an end to hostilities, whether between human beings in the state of nature or between states in a state of war"[5].

**vii.    Cosmopolitanism** Kant describes cosmopolitanism as the matrix within which all the original capacities of the human race may develop[6]. It is a necessary step toward the solution of the greatest problem for the human species which is the attainment of a civil society which can administer justice universally[7].

# References

1**.** "Cold War" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All   rights reserved.

2. "International Law" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft   Corporation.  All rights reserved.

3.  " Political Realism" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft      Corporation. All rights reserved.

4. Tina Bots, " Legal Hermeneutics" *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Accessed  September 27 2016.  www.iep.utm.edu/leg-herm/

5. ibid

6. ibid

7. ibid

8. Fukuyama Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man. (*London : Penguin Books, 1992). p xii

9. Caygill Howard, *A Kant Dictionary*. (Oxford: Blackwell publishers, 1995) p. 314

10.  ibid

11. ibid

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Kant in his essay Id*ea of History with a Cosmopolitan Aim* held that human nature was evil and antagonistic and that this antagonism would lead men from their existence in the state of nature to the establishment of civil society or the state as we know it today. This antagonism which exists among men in the state of nature was also the same in the relationship between states in the international political scene. Realism in international relations was also characterized with the same antagonism found in the state of nature. Kant proposed that states would come together to form a union of states just as the men in the state of nature came together to create a state. He went further to set rules which he believed will preserve the peace.

Sullivan clearly projects this when he stated that Kant believed that the same self-interest that could drive individuals from the state of nature to a juridical society will drive nations towards an international federation, a league of nations in the form of a worldwide republic of sovereign powers[1]. This league of states would go a long way to prevent a constant state of war which pervaded the relationship among men in the state of nature. Kant was interested in preventing the state of war which pervaded the state of nature from being played out in the international scene.

For Kersting, the link between the republican government and the federation of Free states lies in the ancient affinity between the notions of peace and justice. To him, Kant's idea of perpetual peace is founded on 3 notions of right: "Kant's concept of peace is a secularized version of the traditional connection of *pax* and *iustia*- peace and justice which characterizes classical as well as medieval political thought. It asserts a connection between justice with the state and the

peacefulness between states and organizes peace as a system for the regulation of conflicts according to the standard of requirements of justice that are acknowledged on all sides[2]. It is clearly seen that's Kant's main purpose of suggesting international organization of states is for the promotion of peace and the development of the potentials of the human race as a species.

Kant's call for a republican constitution among this federation of free of states is also portrayed by Riley who reiterates Kant's preference for republicanism which to him is based on the idea of promoting world peace. He posits that: Kant's political writings emphasizes "the mutual need of republican constitutionalism and international federalism for each other and the dependence of constitutionalism itself through international lawfulness"[3]. Kant is known not to have favored democracy as a system of government because to him, it was an imperfect system of government. Kant's preference for republicanism is based on the idea of clear separation of powers which was the best system to preserve and promote human freedom in the state.

Kant's preference for a republican state is also clearly stated by Milner.  For her, Kant writes that a plurality of independent states "is still to be preferred to their amalgamation under a single power which has overruled the rest and created a universal monarchy. She  expresses strong reservations about a universal monarchy achieved by conquest. Kant does not, here or elsewhere, express such reservations about a liberal world republic achieved through a peaceful merger of republics".[4] Kant was not in favour of a system of states which would end up in tyranny and oppression. He sought that states would advance towards a league of republican nations who would be free and voluntary and not a system where states would have to give up their

sovereignty and answer to a leader of a one world government. The later would only lead to the worst kinds of despotism.

Gaubatz appreciates Kant's foresightedness and his ability to project a practical future of international politics in contemporary times. He sees Kant's prediction that republican forms of government would eventually dominate as bold given the time frame in which he wrote his political essays. He rightly argues that:

> Kant's prediction was a bold one. At the time, the number of democracies in the world could be counted twice on the fingers on one hand. His views have proved influential as well as prescient. Many of his ideas about the nature and causes of republican expansion have since been incorporated into the basic liberal creed. And while general enlightenment may seem elusive, some scholars have suggested that we are currently in the midst of an extraordinary global movement towards democracy.[6]

Gaubatz sees a very important contribution by Kant to political philosophy. Kant's political essays were written over 200 years ago but its relevance to contemporary international politics is obvious from the renewal of interests in his ideas about progress and the establishment of international organizations for the promotion of peace and fostering mutual cooperation among states. Although Kant's political philosophy is not considered his best contribution to philosophy, many aspects of his political writings cannot be ignored  as they continue to have relevance in our world today. It also has relevance to several aspects about the  political future of mankind which cannot be easily brushed off.

Cavallar identifies several aspects of Kant's cosmopolitanism that have been ignored. To him, Kant's interpreters have focused more on his legal or political cosmopolitanism: "a cluster of ideas revolving around perpetual peace, an international organization, the reform of international

law and what Kant has termed cosmopolitan law or the law of world citizens. Other types of cosmopolitanisms –moral, cognitive, cultural are usually neglected".[7] He went further to clarify that there are different kinds of cosmopolitanisms in Kant- Political, Legal or Juridical, Moral and Ethico-Theological cosmopolitanisms and these all form part of a comprehensive system and are fully compatible with each other given Kant's framework[8]. International relations theorists have been doing much work in this regard since the revival of interest in Kant's political writings. Several books and articles have been written and published in this effect.

Nussbaum in her essay titled *"Kant and Cosmopolitanism"* elaborates that the political philosophy of the Roman Stoics is central to the concept of cosmopolitanism. She traces the roots of cosmopolitanism to the stoics who invented from the Greek cynics the belief that one's humanity was a function of reason and that this universal human attribute granted each person the status of rational moral agent. This is elucidated by their coining the word *kosmopolites*meaning world citizens. This to her, this referred to a community of argument and aspiration as the prime source of moral and social obligations[9]. She also finds similarity between the cosmopolitanism found in *Towards Perpetual Peace* which is that of universal hospitality of Kant and that of Cicero: for instance their common emphasis on maintaining just moral conduct during wartime[10]. Although she finds similarities she also find differences for instances stoics such as Seneca did not make objections to colonialism as a moral abuse in the same manner as Kant. Kant viewed the sovereignty of nations as an inviolable right one which forms an integral part of his cosmopolitanism.[11] Kant's cosmopolitanism was based on the concept of freedom and equality of states under a universal system of voluntary membership to the League of Nations. He condemned colonialism because it was a violation of the sovereignty of states and it treated

human beings as a means to an end and not an end in themselves which was against the universal maxim .

Annah Arendt in her lectures on Kant's political philosophy differed from Kant on the issue of world citizenship. For her, it is an idealist concept because a citizen defined signifies having responsibilities, obligation and rights. These notions are only significant when confined to a particular geographical area. She does not subscribe to Kant's notion of a cosmopolitan citizen and views it as "spectator of the world"[12] instead of the generally accepted citizen of the world definition. This argument is based on her understanding of the concept of world citizenship. She ties the idea of citizenship to a particular geographical location. A citizen is identified by membership of a particular state and a concept of citizenship without this tie to a geographical entity is not realistic. A citizen of the world was to her a citizen of nowhere. Her disagreement with Kant stems from a misunderstanding of the concept of universal hospitality which Kant attached to the concept of cosmopolitanism. To Kant, cosmopolitan citizenship was attached to the idea of universal hospitality where a cosmopolitan citizen was accorded hospitality in a foreign country. And he or she was not to be harmed or turned away when in life threatening situations.

For Franke, Kant's contribution to the arena of international politics was not a matter to be overlooked because of some flaws in his argument. He argues that:

> Kant's reasoning was in many aspects correct as seen in our contemporary world as demonstrated by the existence of the United Nations devoted to the guarding of world peace as well as other regional and continental bodies such as the E.U governing the European economy thus enhancing the nexus between member countries. It can be said that

Kant established a theoretical ground for the practical establishment of these organizations[13]

In Franke's opinion Kant's contribution to the field of political philosophy was not to be disregarded completely because there are some flaws in his arguments. He rather hoped that with some reconstruction, it could help to shape the future understanding of international relations. It was Kant who first tried to write a universal history in philosophy and he set the trend for other philosophers of history to continue their work in the field. He strongly believed that Kant's political writings influenced the creation of international organizations both inside of Europe and in the world in general.

Similarly, Rauber agrees with the Kantian proposal for peace. He argues that it has been over 200 years since the publication of *"Towards Perpetual Peace"* and *The Metaphysics of Morals* and yet the full potentials of the Kantian legacy for legal and political theory has not been fully exhausted.[14] To him, Kant's Perpetual Peace was key to the creation of the U.N and although there is no mention of Kant in the U.N's records, he advanced historical and philosophical arguments to back his point. "The historical argument is based on the fact that Kant created a self contained comprehensive system of philosophy which in terms of thematic versatility and theoretical foundation has only seldom been truly challenged. His argument covers a wide range of issues and the solutions he proposes are well founded. Secondly, Kant's practical philosophy departs from the premise- the conception of man as a free and autonomous being. Thirdly Kant posits perpetual peace as the ultimate virtue and the main purpose of practical philosophy. Fourthly Kant's practical philosophy is not empirical in nature."[15]

The historical argument is based on the historical evaluation of the U.N. "in light of Kantian standards which for him bears considerable plausibility. Although the U.N was founded not less than 150 years after Kantian thoughts on perpetual peace was published, they have left traces in every state of the historical development from the merely philosophical conception to the present stage of political realization".[16] The foundation of the league of nations evidences this. After the demise of the League of Nations and the foundation of the U.N. Kantian ideas are still evident in its main purpose of preserving international peace.

Kleingeld also agrees with Kant's theory of perpetual peace and the creation of the international League of Nations. For her, Kant has been misinterpreted and misrepresented by scholars. She states that "Kant has been criticized for scaling back on empirical grounds the idea of a state of states to that of a voluntary non-coercive league of states while still maintaining that pure practical reason demands a state of states, secondly critics objects that a state of states is not a contradiction in terms and hence that Kant should not have rejected it on grounds of a conceptual incoherence. Thirdly critics regularly object that a mere league would not help bring about peace because there is no practical difference between a voluntary non-coercive league and no league at all".[17] She argues further:

> These criticisms are all based on misunderstanding of Kant's argument for the league of states in particular a misunderstanding of the relationship between his defense of the league of states and his claim that reason demands a state of states. Kant does not advocate the establishment of a non-coercive league of states. His arguments are consistent with his views of the right of states and state sovereignty. For her the lack of coercive authority can lead states to the near realization of the state of states.[18]

She is of the opinion that Kant's theory with some degree of reconstruction can be productive to present day political philosophy.

Hirsch also stated that Kant has been misunderstood by several scholars. To him, Kant proposes the cosmopolitan republic as the legal end of international law: a world state with comprehensive competencies and binding and enforceable laws only to that extent is it correct to claim that Kant is advocating a constitutionalization of international law.

> Therefore, scholars who call for a constitutionalization of international law in a form of multilevel legal system or conceive of present regimes such as the U.N. as a constitution are not following Kant in this respect. If we want to speak of a constitutionalization of international relations in a Kantian sense under the presumption of sovereign nation states, the only thing we can hope for is a legalization of international politics.[19]

There also seems to be a problem with his argument, proposing for a legalization of international politics calls for the establishment of a system which will enforce law and have the power to ensure the enforcement of these laws. This implies the one world government which Kant was trying to avoid by making the membership of such organizations voluntary and liberal. Such a system that was proposed by Hirsch leads us back to the despotism Kant sought to avoid.

Caranti confers a revolutionary title on Kant's writing concerning war and peace. He holds that, if we look at the history of the philosophical reflection on war before Kant, it is tempting to argue that:

> Kant is responsible for a revolution no less important than that carried out in the theory of knowledge. Although philosophers had traditionally thought that the root of the state's propensity to war was a reflection of the citizen's radical evil, (a state's bad

> behavioris a reflection of individuals moral corruption) Kant turned this upside down by showing that the bad setting of the state (i.e its despotic nature) is the real cause of war along with some of the bad attitudes of its citizens.[20]

This argument is based on the understanding that state structures can determine how its citizens will act. Bad state structures can lead to bad attitudes among citizens. A bad state structure such as bad systems of government eventually leads to anarchy and conflict. That was why Kant proposed a liberal system particularly republicanism.

Schattenmann was in agreement with Kant's idea of progress. He argues that Kant's theory of progress was delivered convincingly to save his political philosophy from being imaginary. For him, Kant's view of progress is realistically utopian. The goal of a universal order of law and justice set by Kant's political philosophy is not out of reach; some progress has been made in domestic affairs of states and more progress must and can be made especially in foreign affairs.[21] He also sees Kant's notion of progress as anti deterministic. He does not mean that our future is predetermined by dialectical processes beyond our control. If this were the case, the idea of freedom would be meaningless. The most important view which sets this argument apart is his view that political progress does not depend much on the moral progress of individuals as on the right sets of institutions. It depends more on what we actually do than on the reasons why we do what we do. It does not matter much if we do our duty because of external constraints or out of respect for moral law. Progress will be significant if and when institutions can make us do what we ought to do anyway.[22] This argument does not take into consideration the problem of human nature and private interests. Most of the time, institutions do not function as they should because people use these institutions to further their interests.

Reiss in analyzing Kant's argument on world government tries to formulate the main fundamental problems of Kant's doctrine. He opines:

> Kant himself argued that the central power of a world state would find it more and more difficult to exercise control and protect its citizens the further away its territories were from the center. The remoter territories would seek to become involved in war with their neighbors. Thus a world state would not lead to perpetual peace at all but to further strife. Moreover, the very attempt to set up a world state would be unlawful because it could interfere with the constitutional arrangements of existing states. No one has right to surrender its own sovereignty and abandon its constitution.[23]

This argument critiques the idea of a world state because of the obvious challenges of running a world government from a centralized system and the difficulties involved in the realization of such an ambitious plan. This argument is based on a misunderstanding of Kant's thoughts. Kant never advocated the surrender of state sovereignty for the sake of one world government. He was rather out to promote the sovereignty of individual states.

Mahmoudi also doubtful of Kant's claims argues that Kant's federation of Free states is vulnerable because of some ambiguities in its structure and rules, although he takes advantage of morality and motives of self interests for its justification. Since there are serious obstacles to establish world government which partly emerges from the pluralistic nature of societies in the world and partly comes from its complex structure, the world government still is an ideal among the unattainable desires of mankind.[24] For him, Kant's ideal league of nations is ambitious but not unattainable.

For Archibugi and Beetham, the question of how this peaceful order of states was to be achieved was still to be answered satisfactorily. One may argue that Kant has in mind a spontaneous process in which each country reaches its democratic stage through natural development without outside interference as opposed to some democratic crusade against the not yet republican states, in the case of an attack of a republic against a dictatorship. However it is undeniable that Kant's first article seems to provide both a criterion for deciding *apriori* who is right and who is wrong (because following this argument democratic states are naturally peaceful then they were certainly forces to embark on this enterprise) as well as a justification ex post facto (i.e from a point of view of the universal history) for democratic violence against non democracies: even if democratic violence was not legitimate, it at least served the goal of advancing the final goal of history that is the transformation of all states into republics which in turn would bring about peace.[25]

The desire to create a peaceful and stable world politics in light of Kant's perpetual peace raises some issues. Although Kant hoped that the transition from non democratic to democratic states across the world would follow a natural process based on the dictate of reason, there still lies the tendency of the already democratic states to want to hasten the evolution process. The tendency of some states or a group of states to try to hasten the transition process may lead to interference in the internal affairs of some states on others especially on democratic to non democratic states.

Waltz towing the same line, champions the neorealist reaction to Kant's revival and argues among other things that the Kantian project risks promoting a perpetual war (hot or cold) to render the world constitutionally homogenous. He goes on to state "because justice cannot be objectively defined, states legitimately holds different views about the just constitutional regime.

The imposition of some state's views on others automatically results in a perpetual war for perpetual peace"[26]

Such intrusions on the internal affairs of some states by others would instead of hastening the transition process, create needless strife among nations. Waltz's argument remains a serious issue in the relations between states. Yet to be democratic states are often the victims of the interference of stronger democratic states. This creates a tension which is not needed in the already tense field of international relations.

Huntley accepts the commonplace argument that Kant sees liberal states as tending to be more peaceful in their relations,[27] he however notes that any interpretation of Kant that focuses only on the domestic sources of liberal peace, "forecloses examination of the role of anarchy in the contemporary spread of liberalism and its link to liberal peace.[28] He also argues that when Kant identifies the role of nature in channeling human conflict, he should be understood as making arguments about the long term effects of anarchy through competition and socialization in the international system.

Appraising Kant's theory on international political organization, Harrison declares:

> Kant adopts a more differentiated notion of the organization of the international system than contemporary approaches allow for, enabling him to provide a theory of international relations which is able to account for the relationship between cultural change and progressive historical development. Kant's focus on the international system complements rather than contradicts a broader focus on world society which fits comfortably within both liberal and critical approaches to international relations. Kant provides a very strong precedent for what is generally regarded as extremely radical claims about the nature and constitution of the international system… this reveals that Kant's political writing still contains

considerable untapped potentials and may open up important new
arenas for future research within the discipline[29]

Behnke identifies a danger in Kant's theory; to him Kant focuses more on war than on peace and its attainment. Kant makes war much more the center of his political theory than peace. He states: "even in perpetual peace, the noble cause of peace as the expression of moral perfection (and economic interests) cannot distract Kant from his fascination with war as a historical force on the shaping of human subjectivity"[30]. He does not find Kant's fascination with war surprising, although peace seems to be the center of Kant's perpetual peace, war is rather the agent that creates historical progress. He further argues that: "

> Interested as he is in the (moral) progress of mankind through history, the stasis of peace cannot account for the changing subjectivity of man. For this, the dynamism of war has to be recognized as ontologically prior to and analytically more significant than peace. It is therefore not surprising that the moral progress of mankind that is at the core of Kant's political theory cannot be conceptualized with reference to the transformative capacity of war.[31]

Contrary to this idea, Kant did not consider war more important than peace neither does he place more emphasis on war. War to him is only a means through which nations are carved out, and through which nature moves the historical process driving man towards the attainment of Liberalism.

On the issue of war between liberal and no-liberal states, Borges clearly states that Kant does not prescribe war to spread liberalism across nations. Although Kant has been misunderstood in this light, to him Kant holds that the perpetual peace will be attained by the progressive reformation of the institutions of all countries until they attain a republican form of government. However,

this progress should not be imposed by war nor can a republican nation impose a liberal

constitution by force, to do so would be against the idea of rights which should guide our striving

toward a perpetual peace among nations.[32] Kant did not advocate the spread of liberalism by

force. Kant respected the rights and sovereignty of states and nowhere did he allow the use of

force or coercion to achieve the desired Liberalism he projects.

Defending Kant, Fiala argues that Kant does not sanction war nor does he glorify it. From Kant's

liberal perspective, war is to be avoided although it is a necessary component in the development

of history. He argues that Kant is of the view that:

> Nature has chosen war as a means of attaining its ends. These ends
> include driving human beings apart so that they might diversify
> and expand and also pushing together to form nations and states.
> Kant thus enumerates articles of perpetual peace which include the
> basic idea of restraint and justice in war … Kant's philosophy of
> history and his political philosophy thus point beyond war and
> condemn those activities such as terrorism and genocide which
> makes a livable peace impossible[33]

Nature has imbued man with certain qualities which were meant to lead man to the desired end

of the perfection of the human species. The antagonism in man was the cause of strife among

men and also the cause of progress. This antagonism was the case of wars and wars were only a

means through which the final end of liberalism could be achieved.

Agreeing with Kant, Ninkovic observes that the process to achieve world peace was still on

going. She contends and correctly too that:

> More than two centuries after the ideas of Kant were presented,
> humanity is still in the process of becoming enlightened as even
> though most of the people understand the importance of sustaining
> peace and know that the means to it is cooperation, neither the

>understanding of universal freedom and equality not the stage of
>perpetual peace has yet been achieved.[34]

Kant's emphasis on war as a means to peace has come under attack by scholars who find his reference to war more prominent than his reference to peace. To them, the dynamics of War have to be recognized as ontological prior to, and analytical more significant than, Peace. Coker has argued, that it is the experience of War that induced existential experiences; it is the encounter with the *extra-ordinary* of life-and-death combat that transforms our subjectivity. So it should come as no surprise that the moral progression of mankind that is at the core of Kant's political theory cannot be conceptualized without reference to the transformative capacity of War.[35] Coker's view of war is similar to Kant because they both see war as an instrument of nature used to transform human society.

Herbamas points out some textual contradictions found in *Toward Perpetual Peace* in which Kant defines the federation of peoples as both an enduring and voluntary association as well as permanent congress of states. The idea of constancy is portrayed as a sine qua non for the success of cosmopolitanism yet Kant simultaneously claims that any congress is a voluntary gathering of states that can be dissolved at any time.[36] He also disagrees with Kant's idea that liberal democracies are less likely to wage war among themselves, he also alleges that these same nations pursue belligerent policies in orientation to illiberal governments with the ostensible goal of enforcing human rights. He opposes Kant's affirmation that the international relations maintained by republican constitutional (or in contemporary interpretation liberal democratic) regimes are necessarily pacific.[37]

Mukhi states that although Kant was opposed to war, yet he believed that at no stage was this world free from wars, he interprets Kant thus:

> These are regular features of all generations. International justice can help in avoiding wars but only for sometime. Nations fought wars with the object of extending territories, acquisition of properties and also for satisfying the craze for war mongers for power. He however felt that chances of war in a democratic state was less as compared with other forms of government.[38]

Durant traces Kant's idea of perpetual peace to the revolution of 1795. For him, the revolution led Kant to the hope that republics would now spring up throughout Europe and that "an international world order would arise, based upon a democracy without slavery and without exploitation and pledged to peace. Kant calls for equality not of ability but of opportunity for the development and application of ability, he rejects all prerogatives of birth and class and traces all hereditary privileges to some violent conquest in the past."[39]

Russell agrees that such a society as prescribed by Kant was possible to attain given the right conditions. He argues " my conclusion is that a scientific society can be stable given certain conditions the first of those is a single government of the world, possession a monopoly of armed forces and therefore able to enforce peace"[40] The difference between Russell's position and that of Kant is that while Russell approved of a world government with a coercive power and the possession of armed forces to enforce law and control the world. Kant does not propose the possession of armed forces instead he opted for a voluntary membership of a league of states whose members were free to leave when they pleased. This remains a serious flaw in Kant's argument because without the possession of an armed military force there would too much difficulty in enforcing international law.

W.G F. Hegel in his book *The Philosophy of Right* rejects Kant's idea that perpetual peace is possible. He criticizes all hopes of a possible peace among nations resulting from Kant's peace pact. He further states:

> Kant had the idea of securing perpetual peace by a league of nations that would adjust every dispute. It was to be a power recognized by each individual state and it was to arbitrate in all cases of dissention in order to make it impossible for disputants to resort to war in order to settle them. This ideas presupposes an accord between states which would rest on moral or religious or other ground or considerations but in any case would always depend ultimately on a particular sovereign will and for that reason would remain infected with contingency.[41]

Hegel holds that treaties are based on particular and contingent reasons and not a sovereign reason above them. There is no judge above nation states, there can only be a mediator and this mediator is nothing but a particular will full of contingency. For him, there cannot by any stable association of states to mediate their conflict and avoid war. War is not something that we should try to exterminate; it is just the usual way of solving disputes among states.[42]

Covell buttress Hegel's position stating some obvious differences between his ideas and that of Kant "though Hegel affirmed the inherent legitimacy of the form of government to be found in the modern constitutional state, he did not follow Kant in claiming that the states that adopted it would be led to refrain from waging war in the defense of their rights.[43] And on the question of whether Hegel was of the view that war was evil and to be avoided at all costs he states that Hegel does not see war or conflict as intrinsically evil, Hegel see such conflicts as an important outlet through which citizens have the opportunity to do the duty of safe guarding the sovereignty of their nations.[44]

From all the above positions of philosophers and scholars on Kant's political philosophy, there is an obvious misunderstanding of some of Kant's major ideas. The idea that Kant focuses on war more than on peace is a major area of misunderstanding. Kant only saw war as a   means to the attainment of peace. He states:

> By wars, by the immoderate exhaustion of incessant preparations for war, and by the pressure of evil consequences which war at last entails upon any nation even through the midst of peace, she drives nations to all sorts of experiments and expedients; and finally, after infinite devastations, ruin, and universal exhaustion of energy, to one which reason should have suggested without the cost of so sad an experience,—viz. to quit the barbarous condition of lawless power, and to enter into a federal league of nations, in which even the weakest member looks for its rights and for protection not to its own power, or its own adjudication, but to this great confederation (FoedusAmphictyonum), to the united power, and the adjudication of the collective will.[45]

War is for Kant a means through which nature designs to lead men through different stages of destruction, merging and reconstruction of societies and states. This will go on for a long time until men discover that the costs of war are greater than the conditions of peace, and men will be led to quit the barbarism of the lawless state of nature and enter into a federation of free states which will ensure peace.

Another point of misunderstanding of Kant's political philosophy is on how states are to go about attaining this federation of free states. Although Kant hopes this process will be a gradual progressive movement, some states have taken it upon themselves as act in favour of this ideal. There now seems to be divide between democratic and non democratic states and this for some scholars has only led to more tension and the possibility of conflicts when nations are being coerced or persuaded to become democratic states.

This work asserts that the realist disposition that international politics must always be about mutual distrust and power politics is wrong. Kant's idea of liberalism cannot just be thrown away because its proposals seem a more reasonable approach to the attainment of international peace and the moral progress of mankind. Although there are some flaws as pointed out by some scholars and philosophers reviewed  in his work, there are certain aspects of Kant's political thoughts that have influence and relevance in modern day international development. The idea of moral progress makes Kant's thought stand out. Although he accepts the existing state of nature theory between states in the international political system, he makes his philosophy stand out in the way he proposes that humans are morally progressive. This idea of moral progressivism clearly explains why men who lived as brutes in the state of nature can mature and become more hospitable even to the level that he constructed the idea of cosmopolitan hospitality. This idea of moral progress has its shortcomings because even in our society today, war and violent conflicts still mar the peace efforts of international organizations.

The major problem with Kant's preliminary articles for perpetual peace is found in the absence of a coercive power to enforce international law. Lack of a military force or a standing army to govern the federation of Free states is a setback in Kant's theory. Although this was done with the intent of preventing the federation from falling into despotism and anarchy, it is still a problem which remains to be solved today. The divide between liberal democratic and non democratic states is also an issue that could be worsened with the absence of a coercive power to enforce international law, it would lead to a situation of all states for themselves and a scenario where stronger nations would rely on their influence to seek to persuade non democratic states to

adopt democracy as a system of government. Although this is clearly not the object or intent of Kant's writings, we find this obvious in the international politics of our day. A perfect example of this is the American led war on Iraq.

The lack of coercive military power leads to a system which cannot enforce its laws and is therefore a weak leadership. But on the other hand, an international organization with legitimate military power is problematic. Liberty of individuals living in the state and the rights of nations as sovereign entities will be a thing of the past. The progress which Kant so boldly proclaims will be marred. Democracies and their constitutions are all aimed at ensuring freedom and equality and protecting the rights and liberties of peoples across the world, such ideas will die a slow but certain death under such circumstance. Judging from the above, it is possible that the claims of the end of history have been made a little too prematurely because our international arena still reflects a realist outlook of every man for himself.

Finally, Kant's foundational argument which served as the basis for his idea of the inevitability of the formation of the federation of free states, that he was certain would  lead to the establishment of world peace was based on some factors. These factors are: firstly, that reason demands it. Secondly, that we have progressed morally as a race. Thirdly that Nature or providence has designed it to be so and lastly that freedom and the protection of rights of both individuals. These factors were ignored by the scholars who wrote on Kant's politics. Those who wrote on his idea of world peace did so without understanding the broader picture of Kant's arguments which embrace his idea of historical progress. Those who did like Schatternman paid too much attention of the role of institutions in moral progress. This work holds a different view from his position. Institutions might depict a trend of progress in society but does not depict any real moral progress. This is because despite the structural and institutional progress recorded by

modern civilization, there seems to be no equal moral progress in terms of making better moral choices. This is played out in the moral choices made by some advanced societies in the world such as the United States decisions on legalization of gay marriage and abortion. There is almost no mention about the role that human nature played in the progress from the state of nature to the creation of the state. The same antagonism that existed in the state of nature is still obvious in our contemporary society despite Kant's claim that man has matured. The wars in Iraq, Lybia, Syria, and the rise in terrorism both in Nigeria and other nations around the world are evidences of the fact that human nature has not changed. Kant's claims of moral progress and sublimation of human nature are major faults in his argument and are reason enough to marr the achievement of world peace.

# References

1. Sulivan Roger S., *An Introduction to Kant's Ethics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) p.21

2. Kersting Wolfgang, "Politics, Freedom and Order: Kant's Political Philosophy". *The Cambridge Companion to Kant* Ed by Paul Guyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) p.15

3. Riley Patrick, *Kant's political Philosophy*, (New Jersey: Rowan and Littefield, 1983) p. 5

4. Milner Helen, "International Relations" in *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Edited by Godin, Petit and Pogge. (London: Blackwell Publishing, 2007) p.310

5. Gaubatz K. Taylor, "Kant democracy and History" *Journal of Democracy* vol.7. No.4. (October 1996) p. 137

6. Cavallar, Georg, "Cosmopolitanisms in Kant's philosophy" *Ethics and Global Politics* vol 5, no.2 (Coation Publishing 2012) p. 95

7. Cavallar G., "Cosmopolitanisms in Kant's Philosophy" p. 96

8. Nussbaum Martha, "Kant and Cosmopolitanism" *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal,* Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press )1997 p.29

9. Nusbaum M., "Kant and Cosmopolitanism" p.37

10. ibid p. 38

11. Arendt Annah*, Lecture on Kant's Political philosophy,* Ed Ronald Beiner (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995) p.34

12. Franke Mark, *Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations and Critique of World Politics.* (New York: state Sniversity of New York Press, 2001) p.78

13. RauberJochen, "The United Nations- "A Kantian Dream Come True? Philosophical Perspectives on the Constitutional Legitimacy of the World Organization" International Law /Internationals Richt. Hanse Law Review vol.5. no.1. 2009 p.49

14. Rauber J., The United Nations- "A Kantian Dream Come True?" 52

15. Ruber J., The United Nations- A Kantian Dream Come True?" p.52

16. Kleingeld Paulina, "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's defense of a League of States and his Ideals of a World Federation." *European Journal of Philosophy*. (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004) P. 305

17. Kleingeld p., "Approaching Perpetual Peace" p. 305

18. Hirsh Hirsch Philip A. " Legalization of International Politics  on the (im)possibility of  a Constitutionalization of International Law from a Kantian Point of View" *Goettingen Journal of International Law* 4. 2012 p. 518

19. Caranti Luigi, "Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace? Reflections on the Realist Critique of Kant's Project" *Journal of Human Rights* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2006) p. 324

20. Schatenmman Marc, "Rethinking Progress- A Kantian Perspective". *The Harvard Review of Philosophy* viii 2000 p.64

21. Schatenmman op cit 65

22. Reiss Hans, Postscript, Kant: Political Writings -----------p. 271

23. MahmoudiSeyed Ali, "An Evaluation of Kant's Theory of Perpetual Peace in the Field of Contemporary Political Philosophy" *International Journal of Humanities* vol.15(2) 2008 p.68

24. Archibugi D., and Beetham D., *DorttiUmani e DemocraziaCosmopolitica* (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1998) p. 84-85

25. Waltz Kenneth, *Man, The State and War*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.) P. 113

26. Huntley Wade, "Kant's Third Image: Systematic Sources of the Liberal Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 40. 1996 p. 57

27. Harrison Ewan, "Waltz, Kant and Systemic Approaches to International Relations*" Reviews of International Studies* 28, (British International Studies Association, 2002)p.161

28. Behnke Andreas, *Eternal Peace, Perpetual War? A Critical Investigation into Kant's Conception of War----------- p.*2

29. Borges M.L., "War and Perpetual Peace". Ethic@Florianopolis, v.5, n.1 June 2006 p. 89

30. Fiala Andrew, "Terrorism and the Philosophy of History: Liberalism, Realism and the Supreme Emergency Exemption" *Essays in Philosophy* Vol. 3 Article 2. 2002 p.40

*31.* NinkovicNinkovic Paulina, "Kant's Conviction of the inevitability of perpetual peace*" Theories and Methods Of International Studies ----------p.*46

*32.* Coker Coker, Christopher, *Waging War Without Warriors? The Changing Culture of Military Conflict*. (Boulder, CO : Lynne Rienner, 2002) p.32-38

33. HerbamasJurgen, "Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace with the Benefit of two Hundred Years Hindsight", *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan ideal*, Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. (Massachusetts institute of technology press ,1997) p.117

34. Herbamas j., "Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace". p.117

35. Muhki H. R., *Political Thought* (India: S.D.B. Publishers Distributors, 2011) p.72

36. Durant Will, *The Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of The Great Philosophers Of The World*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, b1961) p.216

37. Russel Bertrand, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. (London: Routledge Publishers,1954) p. 228

38. Hegel W.G.F. *The philosophy of Right.*trans. T. M. Knox. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967) p.333

39.  Borges M.L., "War and Perpetual Peace". Ethic@Florianopolis, v.5, n.1 June 2006 p. 36

40. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right.* p. 333

41. Covell, Charles*, Kant and the law of Peace: A study in the philosophy of International Relations.* ( St Martins Press 1998 p.164

42. Covell C., *Kant and the Law of Peace.* p.164

43. Covell C., p. 64

44. Kant Immanuel ," Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan aim" *Toward perpetual peace and other writings on politics, peace and history,* Ed Pauline Kleingeld, (London : Yale University Press, 2006)  p.6

45. Archibugi D., and Beetham D., *DorttiUmani e DemocraziaCosmopolitica* (Milano: Feltrinelli, 1998) p 64

46. Arendt Annah*, Lecture on Kant's Political philosophy,*  Ed Ronald Beiner (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,1995) p907

47. Behnke Andreas, *Eternal Peace, Perpetual War? A Critical Investigation into Kant's Conception of War------------p7*

48. Borges M.L., "War and Perpetual Peace". Ethic@Florianopolis, v.5, n.1 June 2006

49. Caranti Luigi, "Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace? Reflections on the Realist Critique of Kant's Project" *Journal of Human Rights* (London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2006) p, 50

50. Cavallar, Georg, ”Cosmopolitanisms in Kant’s philosophy” *Ethics and Global Politics*Vol 5, no.2 ( Coation Publishing, 2012) p.95

*51.* Coker, Christopher, *Waging War Without Warriors? The Changing Culture of*

*Military Conflict*. (Boulder : Lynne Rienner, 2002)

52. Covell, Charles*, Kant and the law of Peace: A study in the philosophy of International Relations.* ( St Martins Press, 1998) p 164

53. Durant Will, *The Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of The Great Philosophers Of The World*. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961) p 216

54. Fiala Andrew, “Terrorism and the Philosophy of History: Liberalism, Realism and the Supreme Emergency Exemption” *Essays in Philosophy* Vol. 3 Article 2. 2002

55. Franke Mark, *Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations and Critique of World Politics.* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2001) p.52

56. Gaubatz K. Taylor, “Kant democracy and History” *Journal of Democracy* vol.7. No.4. October 1996 p. 137

57. Harrison Ewan, “Waltz, Kant and Systemic Approaches to International Relations” *Reviews of International Studies* 28, (Britain: British International Studies Association, 2002) p 161

58. Hegel W.G.F. *The philosophy of Right*.trans. T. M. Knox. (London: Oxford University Press, 1967) p 333

59. HerbamasJurgen, “Kants Idea of Perpetual Peace with the Benefit of two Hundred Years Hindsight”, *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Cosmopolitan ideal*, Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. (Massachusetts institute of technology press, 1997) p 117

60. Hirsch Philip A. " Legalization of International Politics  on the (im)possibility of  a Constitutionalization of International Law from a Kantian Point of View" *Goettingen Journal of International Law* 4. 2012 p.518

61. Huntley Wade, "Kant's Third Image: Systematic Sources of the Liberal Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 40. 1996 p 57

62. Kersting Wolfgang, "Politics, Freedom and Order: Kant's Political Philosophy". *The Cambridge Companion to Kant* Ed by Paul Guyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p.

63. Kleingeld Paulina, "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's defense of a League of States and his Ideals of a World Federation." *European Journal of Philosophy*. (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004), p. 363.

64. MahmoudiSeyed Ali, "An Evaluation of Kant's Theory of Perpetual Peace in the Field of Contemporary Political Philosophy" *International Journal of Humanities* vol.15(2) 2008.p 68

65. Muhki H. R., *Political Thought* (India: S.D.B. Publishers Distributors, 2011), p. 72.

*66.* Ninkovic Paulina, "Kant's Conviction of the inevitability of perpetual peace*" Theories and Methods Of International Studies -----------p46*

67. Nussbaum Martha, "Kant and Cosmopolitanism" *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997), p.37

68. RauberJochen, The United Nations- "A Kantian Dream Come True? Philosophical Perspectives on the Constitutional Legitimacy of the World Organization" *International Law /Internationals Richt. Hanse Law Review* vol.5. no.1. 2009 p. 52

69. Reiss Hans, Postscript, Kant: Political Writings---------

70. Riley Patrick, *Kant's political Philosophy*, (New Jersey: Rowan and Littefield, 1983), p.

71. Robert E., et al, *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy* (U.S.A: Blackwell Publishers, 2007), p. 271.

72. Russel Bertrand, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. (London: Routledge Publishers, 1954), p.228.

73. Schattenmann Marc, "Rethinking Progress- A Kantian Perspective". *The Harvard Review of Philosophy* viii 2000 65

74. Sullivan Roger S., *An Introduction to Kant's Ethics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.21

75. Waltz Kenneth, *Man, The State and War*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p.113

# CHAPTER THREE

# HUMAN NATURE AND THE PROGRESS TO COSMOPOLITANISM

## 3. The Man Immanuel Kant

He was born on April 22 1724 in Konigsberg, Prussia (now Kaliningrad, Russia)[1]. He  was born to pietist parents, a sect of protestants who lived sever, puritanical lives and emphasized faith and religious feelings over reason and theological doctrines. He studied at the University of Konigsberg and studied there from the age of 16 to 21. He studied under Martin Knutzen from whom he acquire knowledge of the philosophy of Christian Wolff, Leibniz and of Newtonian physics.[2] After the death of his father in 1746, he spent 9 years as a private tutor to various families. In 1755 he returned to Konigsberg and spent the remainder of his life there. From 1755 to 1770 he was a *Privatdozen* (unsalaried professor) as the university of Konigsberg and in 1770 he was appointed a professor of philosophy; a position which he held until 1797. He died after a period of illness on February 12, 1804.

Kant is of the German tradition and his comprehensive and systematic work in epistemology, ethics and aesthetics greatly influenced all subsequent philosophy especially the various schools of Kantianism and idealism.[3] He was one of the foremost thinkers of the enlightenment and one of the greatest philosophers of western philosophy.[4] Virtually no area of knowledge remained untouched by Kant. He lectured on Metaphysics, Logic, Ethics, Aesthetics, and philosophical theology as well as mathematics, physics, geography and anthropology. He also made significant contributions in the sciences, he also influenced later philosophers like Fitche, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, etc.

Some of his prominent works include: *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime(1781), Critique of Pure Reason(1781), Prolegomena(1783), Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals(1785), Critique of Practical Reason(1788), Metaphysical Foundations of the Natural Science(1786), Idea for a Universal History With a Cosmopolitan Aim(1784), An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment(1784), Conjectural Beginning of Human History(1786), Critique of Judgment(1790), Religion within the boundaries of Mere Reason(1793), On the Common Saying: This May be True in Theory but it does not hold in Practice(1793), Towards Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch(1795), Metaphysics of Morals(1797), The Contest of the Faculties(1782), Anthropology from a Pragmatic View(1798).*

## 3.1 The Idea of Historical Progress

Several theories have been propounded by philosophers, sociologist, anthropologists, and historians concerning the earliest forms of human political organization. Theories like the social contract, evolutionist, paternal, and warfare have all been used to explain how human societies grew from simple to complex, smaller to larger communities and onwards towards the state as we have it today. Mankind has organized its societies in different ways from the simple family unit headed by a father figure to larger communities headed by local chiefs and large kingdoms headed by all powerful monarchs. The demise of the rule of monarchs and military tyrants/dictators and the acceptance and adoption of liberal democracy in many nations around the world has led many philosophers to declare that human social and political organization had reached its peak. This peak in line with the idea of historical progress in Hegel, Kant and Marx reflected the attainment of the apex of human civilization.

Progress is derived from the Latin word *Progressus* meaning an advance. In philosophy of history, it is the idea that the world can become increasingly better in terms of science technology, modernization, liberty, democracy, quality of life, etc[5]. Although this idea of progress is often associated with the western notion of monotonic change in a straight, linear pattern, there are also other versions such as the cyclical theory of eternal return (as found among the Stoics) or the spiral shaped dialectic progress found in Hegel

The early Greeks did not give an account of universal history as a process, Plato and Aristotle had a view of history as cyclical whereby regimes would replace each other because of mans obvious dissatisfaction with them. These regimes were embedded in a larger circle which would come to an end with cataclysms which would destroy all existing human societies and all memory of them leading mankind to start the historical process all over again from the beginning.[6] The first truly universal histories in the western tradition were Christian.[7] Although the Greeks and Romans made an effort to write histories of the known world, Christianity was actually the first to introduce the concept of equality of all men in the sight of God and thereby conceived the idea of a shared destiny for all the world's peoples. "Christianity introduced the concept of history that was finite in time beginning from Gods creation of man and ending with his final salvation; the end of history would be marked with judgment day that would usher in the kingdom of heaven and all earthly existence would end".[8] Fukuyama further states that:

> The particular events of history can become meaningful only with respect to some larger end or goal, the achievement which only brings the historical process to a close. The final end of man is what makes all particular events intelligible.[9]

Secular versions of a universal history were undertaken in conjunction with the establishment of the scientific method that we today associate with Galileo, Bacon, and Descartes. This method

assumed a possibility of knowledge and therefore the mastery of nature that was subject to a set of coherent and universal laws. Fukuyama states that "Knowledge of these laws was not only accessible to man as man, but was cumulative such that successive generations could be spared the efforts and mistakes of earlier ones. Thus the modern notion of progress had its origin in the success of modern natural science and allowed Francis Bacon to assert the superiority of modernity to antiquity on the basis of inventions like the compass, printing press and gunpowder.[10] The concept of progress as the cumulative and endless acquisition of knowledge was stated clearly by Bovier de Fontenelle when he maintains that:

> A good cultivated human contains so to speak all minds of preceding centuries, but it is a single identical mind which has been developing and improving itself ….the man in question will have no old age; he will always be equally capable of those things for which his youth is suited, and he will be ever more and more capable of those things which are suited to his prime…men will never degenerate, and there will be no end to the growth and development of human wisdom.[11]

This notion of progress was in the domain of scientific knowledge. Other notions of progress are found the works of enlightenment writers such as Voltaire, the French encyclopaedists, Turgot and Condorcet. But the most serious effort at writing universal history was undertaken by the German idealists. This idea of historical progress is also found in Hegel's though where he held that progress in history arises not from steady development but the blind interplay of the passions that led men to conflict, revolution and war. History proceeds through a continual process of conflict wherein systems of thought as well as political systems collide and fall apart from their own internal contradictions; they are then replaced by less contradictory and higher ones which give rise to new and different contradictions. The general idea held by this tradition is that history is progressive and is moving towards an end which will lead to liberal systems. Immanuel

Kant in his essay *An Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim* written in 1784 also proposed that history was moving towards the realization of a cosmopolitan state in which human freedom will be realized. To him all this movement or progress in history is driven by nature which directs human actions in the direction which will lead to its desired end.

Another school of thought contradicts the idea of a progressive purposeful history. They hold the idea that progress is a myth. To them events in history do not depict any sort of progress or improvement of the human condition. David Eder in his work tilled *The Myth of Progress,* stated that " the myth of progress states that civilization has moved, is moving and will move in a desirable direction, progress is inevitable… philosophers, men of science and politicians have accepted the idea of the inevitability of progress". He argues that this is erroneous and instead the advancement of civilization is leading to greater unhappiness and loss of control of the environment.[12]

## 3.2. **Kant's Notion of Human Nature**

Human nature and its possibilities have been discussed by many philosophers before Kant. In Thomas Hobbes *Leviathan,* he presents human nature as being selfish; man is moved to action not by his intellect or reason but by his appetites, desires and passions.[13] Each seeking his own preservation leads to competition and mistrust of others. "Further, every man desires that others should value him as he values himself and he is quick to resent every slight and all signs of contempt. So that in the nature of man we find three principal causes of quarrel: first, competition, secondly, diffidence (that is mistrust); thirdly, glory"[14] Machiavelli in his famous *The Prince* also presents a grim view of human nature. To him, human nature was selfish,

greedy, ungrateful, egotistic, and ambitious.[15] Men were materialistic and moved mainly by selfish ambition and it was necessary for the prince to bear this in mind. It was better to be feared than to be loved and the ends justified the means. Morality was not a necessary prerequisite for a just ruler. All the prince was to concern himself with was how to acquire and maintain power in his state.

In another tone, Hugo Grotius casts a different view of human nature. For Grotius, man is a superior and highly developed animal who, far removed from other animals was sociable. Man by nature is highly desirous of society life with others of his kind. Man was desirous of a peaceful society and by virtue of his intelligence is able to cooperate and coexist with his kind. Grotius held that even without necessity or lack, men are by their nature tuned to live in society.[16]

For Kant, there are three predispositions in man namely: "Firstly, The predisposition to animality in man as a living being. Secondly, the predisposition to humanity in man taken as a living and at the same time a rational being. And thirdly, the predisposition to personality in man taken as a rational and at the same time an accountable being".[17]

Man for Kant is therefore the sole rational creature on earth and reason sets him apart from other created beings. Animals are equipped with instinct to ensure their survival but man is a higher animal because he has gone beyond dependence on instinct for his survival.

> Reason in a creature is a faculty for extending the rules and purposes of the exercise of all its powers far beyond natural instinct; and it is illimitable in its plans. It works, however, not instinctively, but tentatively, by means of practice, through progress and regress, in order to ascend gradually from one degree of illumination to another.[18]

Man has been infused with these tendencies by nature which were meant to aid his survival in the natural state, was to use reason to create a comfort zone for himself against the harsh realities of his environment. Kant states this clearly when he posits:

> Having given to Man reason, and freedom of the will grounded upon reason, she had hereby sufficiently made known the purpose which governed her in the choice of the furniture and appointments, intellectual and physical, with which she has accoutered him. Thus provided, he had no need for the guidance of instinct, or for knowledge and forethought created to his hand; for these he was to be indebted to himself.[19]

To Kant, nature had assigned man these attributes to ensure his survival and for the perfection of the development of the human race. The tool which she used to bring about the development of these tendencies in man is the antagonism of these tendencies in the social state. This antagonism in turn becomes the cause of social arrangements founded in law. This antagonism refers to mans unsocial sociality i.e. the tendency to enter into the social state combined with a perpetual resistance to that tendency which is continually threatening to dissolve it. Each man has in him the tendency for sociality and unsociality. These tendencies exist side by side in all men. They lead him to the unsocial desire to force all things into compliance with his own intensions. A position to which he expects resistance form one consciousness of a similar spirit of resistance to others existing outside himself. This led to the awakening of mans ambitions, self-love or avarice and impels him to desire and demand distinction and recognition from his fellow men. This led to the development of human society form the savage state to the state of culture which consists peculiarly in the social worth of man; in this state, talents of every kind unfold, tastes are formed and mans thinking developed from the rude natural tendency to moral distinction onto determinate practical principles and finally into a social concert that has been pathologically extorted from the mere necessity of situation into a moral union founded on the reasonable

choice.[20] If not for these unsocial tendencies in man, an Arcadian shepherd's life would have arisen and men's talents would have been suffocated and stifled in their very gems. This antagonistic tendency in man was therefore ordained by nature to bring out mans potentials. The impulses which nature laid out in men's moral constitution, the source of that anti sociality and universal antagonism from which arose many evils also stimulated a fresh reaction of the faculties and by consequence, aided the development of the primitive tendencies. Mans unsocial sociality, and antagonism were therefore the traits in men that led to the advancement of human society from primitive state of existence to development of the state.

### 3.4. Kant's Proposal for the End of History

In the essay idea of history form a cosmopolitan point of view, Kant made an effort to undertake the writing of a universal history of mankind. Kant observed that human history has been marked by constant warfare and cruelty and from a direct look seems as though there was no pattern or purpose to it. But for Kant, considering the seemingly chaotic course of history and events that have taken place, one can only see the antagonism and mans unsocial sociality creating wars, destruction and animosity between men and nations. But looking at these events from a closer point of view one can see a slow but understandable evolution, just as found in the evolution and development of human reason as found in mathematics. No one individual could have discovered the whole of mathematics but the cumulative character of mathematical knowledge allowed each generation to build on the accomplishment of preceding ones.[21]

From the idea of a directional history Kant envisaged an end of history: a final purpose that was implied in mans current potentialities and which made the whole of history intelligible. This end

point was the realization of human freedom, "for a society in which freedom under external laws is associated in the highest degree with irresistible power i.e. a perfectly just civic constitution is the highest problem assigned to the human race"[22]The achievement of such a just civic constitution and its universal establishment throughout the world was to be the criterion by which one could understand progress in history. It would also provide the standard with which we could understand and interpret the events in history. The purpose of undergoing such a venture would be to ascertain if when taking all societies and all times into account, there was overall reason to expect general human progress in the direction of a republican government or what we know today as liberal democracy.

Kant also identifies a mechanism or a propeller which would move mankind to the higher level of rationality represented by liberal institutions. This mechanism was the selfish antagonist tendency in man: man's unsocial sociality. This unsociality leads to conflict between men, a state of war where all men are pitched against each other as they compete for recognition, desire to dominate others, pride and vanity. This unsocial sociality also led men to leave the state of war and enter into a civil society. The establishment of civil societies encouraged the arts and sciences so that those societies can remain competitive with each other. It was precisely mans competitiveness and vanity, his desire to dominate and rule which was the wellspring of social creativity ensuring the realization of potentials which would have otherwise remained dormant and unrealized.

Kant opined that the establishment of a universal civil state grounded on the empire of political justice was the highest problem which will be faced by the human species. Kant meant the

organization of nations into a universal political organization which will be characterized by complete freedom of men under a common system of law. He states further:

> Since it is only in the social state that natures purpose for man i.e. the development of all his tendencies can be accomplished, a state which combines utmost possible freedom and antagonism of its members the most rigorous determination of the boundaries of this freedom in order that the freedom of such individual may exist with the freedom of others.[23]

The establishment of a liberal state which will ensure the freedom and protection of the rights of each man under the law is natures intent for the human race and this for Kant is the symbol of the end of history. It is only by solving this problem of instituting a civil constitution that nature's intention for man can be achieved. Man being a creature which enjoys absolute freedom is then compelled to enter by necessity into that state where his freedom and that of his fellows is retrained by the civil community. These inclinations lead to the best effects: all the gifts of art and cultivation which adorn the human race, the most beautiful forms of social order are the fruits of the anti-social principle which forced to discipline itself and by means won from the very resistance of mans situation in this world, gives birth to the perfect development of the best gems in nature.

Freedom is then the characteristic of the civil constitution which is to mark the end of history. This interpretation has led several scholars of political philosophy to proclaim that history has ended in this century with the general acceptance of liberal democratic government by a majority of states across the world and also the agitation for democracy in states which are not yet practicing it.

### 3.5. Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is described in the essay *Idea of History from a Cosmopolitan Aim* as the matrix within which all the original capacities of the human race develop. It is a necessary step towards the solution of the greatest problem for the human species which is that of attaining a civil society which can administer justice universally.[24]This end cannot be realized within an individual state which participates in an antagonistic order of external relations. Kant focuses on a cosmopolitan system of general political security between states, one which he describes as a federation of peoples in which every state, even the smallest could expect to derive its security and rights not from its own power or its own legal judgment but solely from this great federation (*foedusAmphictyonum* ) from a united power and the law governed decisions of a united will. This cosmopolitanism was described by him as the goal which nature assigns the existence of the human species. For Kant, The cosmopolitan state then becomes the end and goal of all human social organization, the final form of political organization. It is not a constitutive but a regulative principle which demands that each individual not just each state, yield generously to the cosmopolitan society as the destiny of the human race.[25]

The establishment of such a federation is for Kant the greatest problem which the human race will face. It  is the last and the most difficult problem to be solved by man. It consists of finding a master for the animal tendencies in man. Man is an animal that so long as he lives among other men stands in need of a master for he abuses his freedom with regards to his equals and as a reasonable creature he seeks a law that may set bounds to the liberty of all, yet as a self centered animal he makes exception in his own favor whomever he so dares. He requires a master to curb his will and to compel him into submission to a universal will which may secure the possibility

of universal freedom. Since all men are animals with antagonistic tendencies it becomes a problem to find a master in their midst. This master (either one or many) also had a tendency to abuse his authority. This is a problem to which Kant sees no perfect solution because to him, "human nature is crooked and nothing straight can come out of it".[26]

The establishment of this civil constitution would depend therefore on a problem of a system of international relations adjusted to law and apart from this the problem cannot be solved. Kant posits that the same unsocial sociality or antagonism which existed between men in their relations with each other also exists in the organization of states; that is in the relation between states and not just merely as men in the same society. This inter-state relationship is also faced with the same uncontrolled liberty and lawlessness and each state relates to the other with the same antagonism as found between men. This state of enmity for Kant, was a tool through which nature intended to bring about her purpose for the human species. This enmity exists even in the highest cooperation for the purpose of attaining through the spirit of antagonism a state of rest and security i.e. by wars, and pressure of the bad consequences of war on nations will choose to refrain from wars and embrace a lasting peace through international cooperation by the establishment of a community of states or the commonwealth. He further states that:

> Finally, after infinite devastations, ruin, and universal exhaustion of energy, to one which reason should have suggested without the cost of so sad an experience,—viz. to quit the barbarous condition of lawless power, and to enter into a federal league of nations, in which even the weakest member looks for its rights and for protection not to its own power, or its own adjudication, but to this great confederation (FoedusAmphictyonum), to the united power, and the adjudication of the collective will.[27]

Nations realizing the evils and costs of war would not seek to engage in wars anymore. They would sacrifice brutal liberty for a more secure and peaceful environment enables by a civil constitution. Wars for Kant are only a means through which nature is rewriting human history to bring about new relations between states and by revolutions and dismemberment form new political bodies. These will undergo revolutions coming from internal or external attacks until at last a legal compact without a condition is achieved which like a well ordered commonwealth which can maintain itself by the way of an automation can be established. Kant affirms that human reason would lead men to an organization of a political sort – a civilization. Natures hand which forced men to develop his impulses in the form of the state of civilization (through the process of war, threats of war and the consequence of war) would also lead men to discover some law of counterbalance to the principle of antagonism of nations and to make this law effective introduce a federation of states and consequently a cosmopolitan condition of security.

## 3.6 Kant's Argument for the Inevitability of the Creation of the Federation of Free States

Kant's conviction of the inevitability of the establishment of a federation of free states is based on 3 reasons: first, he believed that it was a function of reason to lead man to this end. Secondly that man was morally progressive and thirdly that freedom was natural to man. These are explained below:

### 3.6.1. The Dictate of Right Reason

Kant held that entering the federation of Free states was necessary from reason. Reason, he declared, 'absolutely condemns war' and makes the achievement of peace an 'immediate duty'.

Such moral certainty could not be shaken by experience. Nature had imbued men with the characteristics to lead men to the realization of the potentials of the human race. Kant argues: "The mere fact that it gave human beings the faculty of reason and the freedom of will based on this faculty is a clear indication of its intent with regard to their endowments".[28] Nature had the intent of the full realization of the perfection of the potentials of the human race and the establishment of the federation of free states. On Kant's teleological view, the mixed tendency of humans to socialize but also to behave antagonistically toward others leads them to develop their rational potential— they develop skills, prudence, and self-discipline in the process. But, Kant believes, "with the general development of their rational capacities even their moral insight will ultimately also develop, and eventually they will gain in moral strength and moral disposition".[29]But the ills that arise from this, in turn, compel our species to discover a law of equilibrium with regard to the thing in itself. Productive resistance between many states which arises from their freedom, and to introduce a united power which lends force to this law.[30]Reason therefore calls for the end of violent conflicts and the adoption of liberalism. "From the throne of the highest moral legislative authority, reason looks down on and condemns war as a means of pursuing one's rights, and makes peace an immediate duty.[31]

### 3.5.2. Moral Progress

Kant believed that man was progressing morally and this maturity was expressed throughout the historical advancement of human society. The state of nature was characterized by strife and conflict and moral baseness while the more mature state of morality is reflected by the sublimation of war and the antagonistic tendencies in man. He goes further to state that:

> "We are civilized to superfluity in what regards the graces and decorum of life. But to entitle us to consider ourselves moralized

much is still wanting. Yet the idea of morality belongs even to that of culture; but the use of this idea, as it comes forward in mere civilization, is restrained to its influence on manners, as seen in the principle of honor, in respectability of deportment. Nothing indeed of a true moral influence can be expected so long as states direct all their energies to idle plans of aggrandizement by force, and thus incessantly check the slow motions by which the intellect of the species is unfolding and forming itself, to say nothing of their shrinking from all positive aid to those motions. But all good that is not engrafted upon moral good is mere show and hollow speciousness—the dust and ashes of mortality. And in this delusive condition will the human race linger, until it shall have toiled upwards in the way I have mentioned from its present chaotic abyss of political relations. [32]

The idea of man as a "progressive being" is intended to connect the goal of the development of the individual with the practice of liberty. While there was, of course, substantial disagreement between the different thinkers who held this view, three main features are clearly visible. First, there is a historical view about the developmental conditions for the possibility of a liberal political order. Only once human beings have attained a certain level are they "ripe" for freedom. Second, there is a challenge to the conservative view of the dangers represented by the self-determination of the citizen to the social order. And, finally, there is the emergence of a distinctive view of human self-fulfillment.[33]

Behnke interprets Kant's ideas thus:

> Within this dominant narrative of *Eternal Peace*, Man himself is the agent of History and its transcendence. Moral man is the author of the Eternal Peace, it is up to him to create the federation of states that shall be at the centre of an ever expanding pacific sphere. Man at this stage is autonomous, his subjection to Law self-imposed. Peace is either the outcome of the constant moral improvement of Man, or the by-product of the pursuit of economic or financial benefits, luring those still short of moral perfection. War in turn is the outcome of moral imperfection within agents, not the result of structural conditions or conflicting political identities and interests.[34]

Despite Kant's seemingly convincing argument, Schattenmann does not agree that political progress depends much on moral progress of individuals as on the right set of institutions. It depends more on what we actually do than the reasons why we do what we do. It does not matter much if we do our duty because of external constraints or out of respect for moral law, progress will be significant if and when institutions can make us do what we ought to do anyway.[35] From the above statement, it implies that moral and political progress is not based on individual actions but on the right sets of institutions to direct men's actions or push men to the desired direction. Contrary to Schattenmann's interpretation, Kant was also interested in institutions that was why he insisted on republicanism as the ideal system to be adopted by the federation of free states to protect the sovereignty and freedom of member nations.

### 3.5.3. Rights and Freedom

Kant places great emphasis on freedom. The idea of freedom is central to Kant's writing on political philosophy because he believed nature was pushing man on to the realization of his potentials. He clearly state in his essay "Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan aim"

> To quit the barbarous condition of lawless power, and to enter into a federal league of nations, in which even the weakest member looks for its rights and for protection not to its own power, or its own adjudication, but to this great confederation (*FoedusAmphictyonum*), to the united power, and the adjudication of the collective will.[36]

The individual right of each member state was to be protected by the union. Kant it seems was particular about the protection of the rights of all states in the union without respect to their size, race or economic strength. The term general will is a direct influence of Rousseau who was the

first to create the concept of individual wills making a collective will in which all the collective

will represent the will of one individual. This is a direct reflection of what envisaged for the

federation. A federation of free men guided by reason and the moral perfection cultivated over

centuries, united under a voluntary system of international cooperation and political system for

the preservation of world peace.

Kant categorizes public right to into three namely, individual right, constitutional right,

cosmopolitan right. Kleingeld states:

> In Kant's theory of international peace, all three parts of
> public rights come into play: the rightful regulation of the
> interactions among individuals required the rule of law within a
> rightful state; the rightful regulations of the interactions among
> states or their representative and foreign individuals requires the
> rule of cosmopolitan right. Kant's theory of right is inherently
> cosmopolitan and includes not just a theory of the state but also
> a theory of international right and cosmopolitan right.[37]

All these three public rights are grounded on the idea of external freedom, Kant states that the

idea of right is determined from the concept of freedom as applied in the external relations

among persons . Right is therefore "the restriction of the freedom of each to the condition of its

being compatible with the freedom of everyone to the  extent that this is possible in accordance

with a general  law and public right is the sum of external laws that make such a universal

harmony possible"[38]

### 3.5.4.Nature's Design

The attainment of this federation of free states to Kant is designed by nature of what Kant calls

providence. Nature uses her devices to ensure the attainment of this goal, he states: "this

guaranteed is given by no less power than the great artist nature (*naturadaedelarerum*) while the mechanical course is clearly exhibited by a predetermined design to make harmony spring from human discord, even against the will of man."[39]

Nature is moving man to the realization of the potentials of the human race. Nature does this through the following means:

First and foremost, "She has made it possible for all human beings to live all the regions of the earth that they populate. Secondly, through war, she has driven humankind in al directions even into the most inhospitable in order to populate them. Thirdly, through war she has compelled them to enter into more or less legal relations with one another"[40]

Nature wills that man should act in a particular manner to further her aims, but she does not control the human will. Kant went further to explain this "when i say that nature wills that this or that ought to happen, I do not mean that she imposes a duty upon us to act thus ( for this can only be done by practical reason acting free of compulsion) but rather that she does it herself regardless of whether we will to do it or not) [36] Man is compelled either by internal differences to submit to public laws or by external wars, states were formed by such means( that is, through small communities bonding to form states to protect themselves from external aggression)

Nature uses religion and language to spate states to create enmity and war in order to prevent all men being bond together into one despotic state. Growth in culture and humankind's gradually coming within the reach of agreements led to mutual understanding and peace. This peace is brought by lively competition among men[41] Nature also uses the spirit of trade or commerce to unite men because war cannot co-exist with this spirit of trade Kant elaborates:

> Since among all of the powers (means) subordinate to state
> authority, the power of money is likely the most reliable, states
> find themselves forced (admittedly not be motivations of
> morality) to promote a noble peace and wherever in the world war
> threatens to break out, to prevent it by means of negotiations just
> as if they were therefore members of a lasting alliance.[42]

Nature therefore uses all these means to ensure the actualization of her aims which is the perfection of the gems in men and the establishment of the perfect civil constitution. She does this with or without the help of man although Kant hopes that men can aid Nature to reach her goals faster.

Cosmopolitanism was therefore an inevitable end of human political development for Kant. Renewed interests in Kant's political writings because of its prescriptions for peace led to the development of international organizations to pursue world peace.

# References

1. Turner , William, "Philosophy of Immanuel Kant" *The Catholic Encyclopedia*Vol 8. (New York: Robert Appleton Company 1910) .  Accessed 10 Sept, 2016 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08603.htm>
2. DuignanB., and Bird. O.B., "Immanuel Kant" *Encyclopedia Britannica*  Accessed 11sept 2016 https://www.britannica,com/bigraphy/immanuel-kant
3. Dunignan and Bird, "Immanuel Kant"
4. Lawhead William, *A Voyage ofDiscovery* (U.S.A Wadsworth Thomson Learning , 2002), p.325.
5. Wikipedia "Progress"  Wikipedia  online Encyclopedia  (March 2014) Accessed 5 may 2014 en.m.wikipedia.org/progress_(history)
6. Straus L., *Thoughts on Machiavelli* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1958 ), p. 229.
7. Fukuyama F.,  *TheEnd of history and the Last Man* (U.S.A.: Penguin books, 1992), p.56.
8. Eder David, M., "The Myth of Progress" *The British Journal of Medical Psychology Vol XII.* p.1
9. ibid
10. ibid
11. Fukuyama , *The End of History and the Last Man, p.* 57
12. Nisbet R. *Social Change and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), p.104.
13. Appadorai  A. *The Substance of Politics* (New Delhi Oxford University Press, 1968), p.111.
14. Copleston F. *A History of Philosophy VL 5 Hobbes to Hume* (Great Britain: Burns and Oates, 1969), p. 32.
15. Mukhi H. R.  *Political Thought* (Delhi: Surjeet Book Depot, 2011), p 347
16. Copleston  F. *A History of Philosophy VL 3 Ockham to Suarez* (Great Britain: Burns and Oates, 1969), p. 329.
17. Kant Immanuel, *Ideaof  A Universal History from a Cosmopolitan point of view*( Indianapolis: Bobbs and Merrill, 1968), p. 2.
18. Kant, *Idea of a Universal History* p.2.
19. ibid p. 3.
20. ibid p.5.
21. ibid p. 11-13.
22. *ibid*, p. 4.
23. *Ibid*  p.5.
24. ibid
25. Caygill H.,  *A Kant Dictionary*. (United kingdom: Blackwell Publishers,1995),   p. 137-138
26. Kant, *Idea of A Universal Histor,y* p. 5.
27. ibid
28. Kant, *Idea of A*UnivesalHistory*, p. 12.
29. Kant (8:21, 26). Cited in Kleingeld, p. 480.
30. Kant, *Idea of Histo*ry, p.12.

31. Kant Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Trans Campbel Smith (London: Swan Sonnenshein&co Ltd, 1903), p.80.

32. Kant*, Idea of a universal history,* p.5.

33.  Rosen Micheal,   *Man As A Progressive Being: The Liberal View Of Progress And Its Downfal,l*p. 7.

34. Behnke, Andreas, "Eternal Peace" as the Graveyard of the Political: A Critique of Kant's *ZumEwigenFrieden*", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 36(3), (2008.)P. 7.

35. Schatteman Marc, *Rethinking Progress- A Kantian Perspective. The Havard Review Of Philosophy VII (2000)* p. 65.

36. Kant, *IdeaofHistory,* p. 6.

37. Kleingeld Paulina, "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's defense of a League of States and his Ideals of a World Federation" *European Journal of Philosophy.* (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004),  p. 480.

38. Kant cited in Kliengeld 480-1

39. Kant, *Perpetual Peace,* p.85.

40.  ibid p.87.

41. Ibid  p. 90.

42.  Ibid p. 90.

43. ibid  p.92.

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**KANT, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND THE PURSUIT OF WORLD PEACE.**

After the First World War, efforts by nations to prevent a reoccurrence of such a disastrous event led to a review of the approaches to the understanding and definition of international relations. States around the world increased their concerns regarding international relationships and how these relations should be conducted. This led to the development of new international organizations to foster peaceful coexistence between nations. This was also marked by the development and emergence of new schools of thought on the nature and practice of international relations. International organizations like the league of nations were founded and after the second world war, made way for the  creation of the United Nations. Other international organizations like the E.U (European union), NATO (North Atlantic t), OAU (organization of African unity) now A.U (African union), ECOWAS(Economic organization of West African states) and other international, continental, or regional organization emerged to foster peaceful coexistence between nations.

## 4.1. Definitions of Peace.

Peace occurs between heterogeneous groups and is characterized by a lack of conflict and freedom from fear of violence. Commonly described as the absence of hostility, peace often involves compromise and therefore is initiated with thoughtful listening and communication to enhance and create mutual understanding[1.] Etymologically, the term peace originated most recently from the Anglo-French *Pes* and the old French *Pais* meaning peace, reconciliation, silence, agreement (11th century)[2]. But *Pais* itself comes from the Latin *Pax* meaning peace, compact, agreement, treaty of peace, tranquility, absence of hostility, harmony.[3] Johan Galtungin

his book *Theories of Peace*, stated that peace is a concept that does not have one generally accepted definition. He identifies three different meanings of peace:

> First of all there is the old idea of peace as a synonym for stability or equilibrium. This concept of peace also refers to internal states of a human being, for instance: the person who is at peace with himself. This covers the concept of law and order and does not exclude the idea of violence even if it was used to create this law and order… then there is the idea of peace as the absence of organized collective violence in other words, violence between major human groups, particularly nations but between classes and between racial and ethnic groups because of the magnitude internal wars can have. This kind of peace he refers to as negative peace…then there is the third concept of peace which is less clearly defined. This peace is a synonym for all other good things in the world community, particularly co-operation and integration between human groups, with less emphasis on the absence of violence. This he refers to as positive peace. This concept would exclude major violence…but tolerate occasional violence.[4]

Galtung'sdefinitions of peace gives us two different types of peace, namely: negative and positive peace. Negative peace gives room for violence while positive peace does not. Realist notion of peace resemble negative peace while the liberalist notion of peace resembles positive peace.

4.2. **The Concept of Peace in Kant.**

Peaceful coexistence between persons and nations has been an ideal which is greatly desired by all but seldom reached. Domestic and international organizations have been created with the

intent of ensuring that war and conflict are abolished from human society. Peace has been often defined loosely as the absence of war but Kant gives a deeper and different meaning of peace.

Kant described peace as the cessation of or end to hostilities whether between human beings in the state of nature or between states in a state of war.[5] Peace here is seen as an ideal which all nations and persons are expected to aspire to. Kant describes perpetual peace as the highest political good and an ideal of practical reason towards which we must act as if it is something real.[6] Something real, actualizable and attainable.

Kant's notion of Peace is more embracing than just the absence of war because calmness or absence of physical war does not constitute or entail actual peace. Threats of war, tension and hostility, mutual suspicion among nations does not constitute Peace. The Cold War era is an example of such a peace. Kant's writing on peace inspired a change in the approach that nations took towards attainment of world peace. Kant's work on peace inspired the development of the liberalist approach to international relations. Prior to the revival of Kant's writing on Peace, the realist approach dominated international relations but because of the negative peace which promoted, theorists looked to Kant's ideas because it promoted positive peace.

## 4.3. IDEALISM AND REASLISM IN CRISIS RESOLUTION FOR WORLD PEACE

Kant's political writings redefined how nations conducted their relations with each other. Prior to the development of liberalism, nations most often adopted the realist approach. The realist approach dominated international politics even after the creation of the U.N which was founded with the aim of fostering peaceful relations between states and preventing any future wars. Idealism and realism are the most prominent approaches to international relations and many nations have adopted either in their quest to attain peace. Mbaegbu proposes 'Alternative

Realism' as an alternative approach to resolving conflicts between nations. He holds that adopting only one of either realist or idealist principles cannot ensure peace. He clearly states:

"This is why we contend that alternative realist principle which adopts violence in its rational end, should be used in likely situations that tend to blow out of proportions. It should be used as a heuristic while respecting the fact that idealism could also work in certain situations and should not be applied consistently."[7] He also recognizes that sometimes dialogue fails and nations may resort to other means to resolve conflicts. He does not prescribe to strict adherence to either idealist or realist principles but any one needed at the moment to resolve conflict. He argues further : "In any case, where values of equal proportion conflicts with each other, it is our humble submission that the one that produces the greatest good for the greatest number should be given utmost priority."[8]

### 4.3.1. Political Realism

Ordinarily, the word realism is taken from the word real or concrete or pragmatic or practical. It connotes violence in its usage here. Mbaegbu describes it thus: "As a concept, it is widely discussed with scorn yet attracts more results and existential involvement. Existentially, it is a real life drama. Anthropologically, it is intertwined with man and ethically, it is both decripto and prescripto praxis, interplay of what obtains in real society."[9] Political realism is a school of thought in international relations which explains international relations in terms of power. It is the view that world politics is driven by competitive self interest. Realists therefore believe that the decisive dynamics among countries is a struggle for power in an effort by each to preserve or preferably   improve its military security  and economic welfare in competition with other countires.[10]Realists consider this power struggle as a zero sum game in which a gain for one

country is a loss for others, they are also prone to seeing humanity as inherently divided along cultural. Religious and national loyalty lines.[11]

Political realism emerged as a result of the second was and the failure of nations to preserve the peace. The horrific results of that war was blamed on the power politics played by the then great powers that controlled Europe and world politics in general.

For Donnelly, realism is a tradition of international theory centered on four propositions:

- The international system is anarchic . There is no actor above states capable of regulating their interactions. States must arrive at relations with other states on their own rather than it being dictated to them by some higher controlling entity. The international system exist in a state of constant antagonism

- States are the most important actors

- All states within the system are unitary rational actors, states tend to pursue self interest, groups strive to attain as many resources as possible

-  The primary concern of all states is survival.

States build up military power to survive which may lead to security dilemma.[12]

The realist perspective is based on the idea that humanity is not entirely benevolent but rather selfish and competitive. This perspective was brought into philosophical consideration by philosophers such as Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes who viewed human nature as egocentric. To them, "the individual's intuitive nature is made up of anarchy. In the same way, the state emphasizes an interest in accumulating power to ensure its security in an anarchic international system. This power is understood in terms of military capabilities."[13]A key concept to understanding realism in the international distribution of power is referred to as system polarity.

"Polarity refers to the number of blocs or states that exert power in an international system- a multi-polar system is composed of three or more blocs, a bipolar system is composed of two blocs and uni-polar system is dominated by a single power or hegemony."[14]

Under unipolarity, "realism predicts that states will band together to oppose the hegemon and restore a balance of power. All states desire and seek hegemony under the realist perspective as a sure means to ensure their security. Other states in the system are spurred to prevent the emergence of a hegemon through power balancing. Dryzek confirms this when he argued that realism emphasizes the danger of the international system where war is always a possibility and the only source of order is the balance of power."[15]

Balance of power is a mechanism which operates to prevent the domination of any one state in the international system, it is sometimes viewed as a naturally occurring phenomenon or a situation that came about fortuitously. At other times it is believed to be a strategy consciously pursued by states. States engineer such balances to counter threats from other powerful states and so ensure their own survival. This balance of power is measured by military strength. The main aim of balance of power is not to preserve peace but to preserve the security if states if necessary by means of war. The exercise of power by states towards one another is sometimes called *Realpolitik* or power politics.

### 4.3.1.1. History of Political Realism

Realism is not a new concept, it has its roots in the ancient period. Rourke traces realism to ancient thinkers like:

- Sun Tzu (544-496 B.C.) the Chinese general and author of *The Art of War*
- Thucydides (460-399 B.C.) a Greek historian and author of the *Peloponnesian War*

- Kantiliya *(*4thcentury B.C.) Minister of the Mauryan Emperor of India who wrote in Arthashastra " a king shall always endeavor to augment his own power".

- More recently realism also marked the diplomacy of such statesmen as Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898) the iron chancellor who engineered the unification of Germany under Prussia's control.[16]

Machiavelli who is known to have redefined realism urged princes to concentrate on expedient actions to stay in power including the manipulation of public and military alliances. For him, men should take their bearings on interstate relationships not by how philosophers have imagined they ought to live but on how they actually live and that the best of states would have to emulate the policies of the worst states if they were to survive.[17]

Thomas Hobbes is also known to have created the contemporary notion of the state of the relationship among nations as similar to that found among men in the state of nature. In *The Leviathan* (1651), he argued that humans have an inherent urge to dominate which often causes them to become enemies and …to endeavor to destroy or subdue one another"[18]

Although several other thinkers contributed to realism, the present understanding of realism as a perspective or approach to international relations began around the years surrounding world war two (1939-1945) as the dominant theory in the developing academic discipline of international relation scholarship.[19]Idealism  developed as a response to realist theories and the failure of European powers to prevent the second world war. Many other strains of realism developed with different perspective on how nations should relate on the international scene.

### 4.3.1. Classical Realism

As realist theory evolved it grew into two major branches known as classical realism and Neo realism. Classical realism holds that it its fundamentally the nature of man that pushes states and individuals to act in a way that places their interests above ideological ones. The classical realists are pessimistic about human nature which form them is dark and evil and this is the cause of political struggle among people. classical realists trace their intellectual heritage to Thomas Hobbes who presented in his the Leviathan a state of nature which was anarchical in which life was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short[20.] In such a world, all fear for their security, industry is impossible, there is no government and hence there is no room for morality or justice. Hobbes and Machiavelli to some extent served as guides to operating this anarchical real, they see this state of nature among nations as the only true analogy for relations among nations.[21]

Classical realists hold that it is wrong for nations or leaders to allow morality or ideology or anything instead of power to govern their foreign policy . They hold that human nature is immutable and it is not prudent to conduct foreign relations based on trust or good faith, interests should be the governing factor. Leaders of nations use their power to advance the interests of their own nations with little regard for morality or friendship. In order to survive leaders must build their powers and feelings of friendship or morality that might make them vulnerable to more ruthless adversaries, conflict and war.[22]

Prominent classical realists in the 20th century include Hans Mogenthau, his opponent on the Vietnam war Henry Kissinger, the national security adviser and secretary of state to president Richard Nixon, French general and president Charles de Gaulie and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, E. H. Carr.

### 4.3.2. Neorealism/ Structural Realsim

Neorealism also portrays politics as a struggle for power but they hold that the cause of conflict in the international system is its anarchic (irregulated) structure.[23] This anarchic structure comprises of sovereign actors (states) which answer to no higher authority. With no overarching authority to provide for security or order results to a self-help system in which each state must rely on its own resources to survive and flourish because there is no impartial authority to settle disputes, states resort to force to achieve their interests[24]. The neo realists do not focus on human nature but instead focus on the anarchical structure of the international system. While states remain the principal actors, greater attention if given to the forces above and below state through levels of analysis or structure agency debate, here the international system is seen as a structure acting on the state with individuals below the level of the state acting on the state as a whole.[25]

## 4.4. Idealism

Idealists believe international law and morality are the key influences on international events that power alone. Idealists think that human nature is basically good and that good habits (such as telling the truth in diplomatic dealings with other nations) education and the existence of international organizations such as the UN to facilitate good relation between nations will result in peaceful cooperative international relationships.[26]Idealists see the world as a community of nations with potentials to work together to overcome mutual problems. Although they accept that different peoples exhibit different codes of behavior, cultural norms, values, habits and tastes, they contend that humans are fundamentally the same. Regardless of our differences, humans all desire the same things in terms of security, welfare, recognition and respect.[27]

Wilson opines that to the idealists the international anarchy of competing nations was the underlying cause of the catastrophic world war one and thus the principle of sovereignty and the institution of the balance of power needed to be checked and abolished to prevent a reoccurrence of such events. Collective security, compulsory adjudication of disputes, national disarmament, open diplomacy and international colonial accountability were the most cherished policy prescriptions of inter war idealists, some even went further to call for international police force and complete international oversight of armaments production.[28]Idealists hold that there is no essential compatibility between nationalism and internationalism. There is a natural division of labour between nations, each nation has its special task to perform, its special contribution to make to the wellbeing of humanity. If all nations were to act in this spirit, international harmony would prevail.[29]

Idealism in international relations was popular and active in the 1920's and 1930's following the First World War. The United States president Woodrow Wilson and other idealists hoped for a peace with the establishment of the League of Nations an international organization that existed from 1920 to 1946. The failure of the league of nations to stop the outbreak of the second world war in 1939 led to a rethink of idealist principles with realists blaming the idealists of fantasizing on what should be instead of on how it actually is.[30]Prominent idealists include Woodrow Wilson (the 28th U.S. president), Alfred Rimmern (a British scholar of international; relations) and Philip Noel-Baker (British politician and Nobel prize winner)

## 4.5. Liberal Theory

Liberal theory also known as liberalism contends that people and the countries that respect them are capableoffindingmutualinterestsandcooperatingto achieve them, at least in part by working

through international organizations and according to international laws.[31]Liberals reject the realist contention that international politics is inherently and exclusively a struggle for power, this does not mean that liberals dismiss power as a factor but they add morality, ideology, emotions (such as friendship and mutual identity), habits of co-operation and even altruism as factors that influence the behavior of national leaders and the course of world politics.[32]

Like realism, liberalism is not a new approach to world politics, part of what we have today as modern liberalism is resurrected idealism.[33] Liberalism developed as a response to the developments in the international arena. Realism gained strength among scholars during the period between the outbreak of World War II and the depths of the cold war in the 1950's, in the 1970's when the cold war was ending, the international landscape looked different and liberalism resurged.[34]

Liberalism in contrast to realism which created a mindset of conflict saw the need for ways which values such as peace and justice could be realized and also stressed. They noted that the expanding role of the U.N.(united nations), the growth of the E.U. ((European union) and many other examples of international cooperation and charged that realism could not explain such changes.[35]Liberals believe that international relations evolved through small changed over time, they focus on the interdependence of nations and the mutual benefits they can gain through cooperation with each other.[36]

### 4.5.1. Classical Liberalism

Liberalism like its opponent realism also split into two schools of thought namely: classical liberalism and neo liberalism. Classical liberalism is the older of the two schools and a direct

descendant of idealism. Classical liberalism is based on the view of its proponents on human nature. Classical liberalists share an optimistic view about human nature. In this sense, they trace their intellectual heritage or lineage to political philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). Rousseau in his works The Social Contract(1760) argued that humans had joined together in civil societies because they found it easier to improve their existence through cooperation rather than competitive self-reliance.[37]

## 4.5.2. Neo Liberalism

Neo liberalism also called neoliberal institutionalism emerged in the 1980's as a new liberal response to realism. They hold that international institutions can play an important role in resolving conflicts and that it makes more sense for nations to cooperate and work towards long term national gains rather than focusing on short term individuals gains.[38] Neo Liberalism developed in the 1970's and 1980's somewhat parallel to neo realism, they argue that competition among sovereign state in an anarchical world system causes conflict. For them, the system is rather marked by complex interdependence: stating that countries are tied together through trade and other economic, social and other exchanges that both increase cooperation and limit conflict. This complex interdependence also promotes the increased use of international law and the creation of more and stronger international organizations to deal with the expanding ties among nations.[39]Neo liberals agree with realists that self interest informs nations choices but they do not share the pessimism of realists about the possibility for international cooperation instead they hold the nations can cooperate fairly often because it is in their best interests to do so[40]

**Marxism**

Marxist theory of international relations are less popular than the realist, idealist or liberalist approaches although it is also considered as an alternative approach as any other. After the fall of communism in the soviet union in 1991, this theory as shelved because of the fall of communism and the widespread acceptance of liberalism and democracy. Marxists view of international relations as an extension of the struggle between the classes with wealthy nations exploiting poorer countries. They study mainly imperialism and its exploitative practices.[41]They look at the unfair and exploitative aspects of the worlds rich and poor nations. This approach is rooted in the theory of imperialism developed by Vladimir Lenin just before the communist revolution of Russia in 1917[42.] Marxists see economics as both the cause and potential solutions to the problem of war among nations.

### 4.6. Constructivist Approach

Michael Barnett describes constructivist international relations theories as being concerned with how ideas define international structure, how this structure defines the interests and identities of states and how states and non-state actors reproduce this structure[43]

Constructivism is fast becoming popular because the obvious weaknesses of both the realist and liberalist approach and their inability to prevent conflict among nations. while realism deals mainly with security and material power, and liberalism looks primarily at economic interdependence and domestic-level factors, constructivism most concerns itself with the role of ideas in shaping the international system; indeed it is possible there is some overlap between constructivism and realism or liberalism, but they remain separate schools of thought. By "ideas"

constructivists refer to the goals, threats, fears, identities, and other elements of perceived reality that influence states and non-state actors within the international system. Constructivists believe that these ideational factors can often have far-reaching effects, and that they can change materialistic power concerns.

## 4.7.    Other Approaches

In the 1980's and 1990's a number of new approaches to international relations emerged: Feminist, post modern and peace studies. Feminist approach emphasizes the import of gender roles among the politically powerful in understanding how foreign policy is developed and why nations behave the way they do[44.] Post modern approaches call into question the basic categories and methods by which international relations has traditionally been studied, arguing that international relations scholarship is an arbitrary discipline invented by powerful self-interests to advance their own agenda[45.]Peacestudiesis an interdisciplinary approach to questions of war and peace, openly promoting peace over war. Peace studies teaches that scholars can learn more about certain international relations  such as diplomacy by becoming involved in them[46.]

## 4.9. International Organizations and International Relations

International organizations were established with the aim of making them the regulator of international relations. Examples of international organizations include the United Nations (UN), the World Bank (*see* International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), the International Committee of the Red Cross, and Greenpeace.

According to Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia "International organizations fall into two main categories: intergovernmental organizations and nongovernmental organizations. Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) have national governments as members. Hundreds of

IGOs operate in all parts of the world. Member nations have created each of these organizations to serve a purpose that those nations find useful. Membership can range from as few as two member nations to virtually all nations"[47]. The UN and its various agencies are IGOs  so are IMF, World Bank, G-8, OPEC, etc. International  organizations are constituted by international law as independent entities separate from states that make them up as their founders and their members. They are legal entities that can sue and be sued.

Modern International organizations had its beginning from the creation of the League of Nations which was formed in 1920 after the First World War in a bid to prevent a re-occurrence of that tragic event, but with the failure of the league to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939, and it ended in 1945. The United Nations which is the most influential international organization today was founded in 1945. After the founding of the United Nations, several other international organizations have been created all with the aim of fostering international relations.

International organizations have emerged as important actors in international relations. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its work coordinating the efforts of IGOs, NGOs, and states to write, sign, and ratify the international treaty banning the use of land mines[48]. International organizations are now able to pressure states into adopting certain courses of action. When a state will not act, international organizations can mobilize individuals to take action. In some matters, such as disaster assistance or aid for refugees, states have come to rely on international organizations to provide essential services that states are not willing or able to offer.

# References

1. Wikipedia "Peace" en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/peace 10 Sept, 2016

2. Online Etymology Dictionary.   Accessed 10 Sept, 2016 en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/peace

3.  Benner Jeff, Ancient Hebrew Research centre. Accessed Sept 10, 2016   http://ancient-hebrew.org/27_peace.html

4. Caygill Howard, *A Kant Dictionary,*  (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995), p. 314.

5. Caygill Howard, A *KantDictionary*, p. 314

6. Rourke John, *International Politics On The World Stage* (USA: McGraw Hill, ---), p. 20

7. Mbaegbu Celestine, "Realism, Idealsim and conflict resolution in Nigeri: A Philosophical Study" *Mgbakoigba: Journal of African Studies*. Vol 5 No. 2. June 2016 p. 69

8. Ibid

9. Ibid p. 63

10. Rourke John, *InternationalPolitics*, p.20.

11. Donnelly Jack, "The Ethics of Realism" in Christian Reus-Smith, Duncan Snidal (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook Of International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.150.

12. "Realism (international relations)" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia

13.  "Realism" Wikipeda.

14. Dryzek John, "Political Science" Microsoft Encarta 2009 [DVD] (Redmond, W.A: Microsoft corporation, 2008)

15. Dryzek John, "Political Science" Microsoft 2009

16. Rourke John, *International Politics on the World Stage* p 20

17. Fukuyama Francis *The End of History and the Last Man*  p. *145*

18. Rourke  John, *International Politics on the World Stage*, p. 21

19. Ibid p. 21

20. Hobbes Thomas *The Leviathan* Pt1 Chap xii

21. Milner  Hellen, "International  Relations"  in  *A   Companion  To  Contemporary  Political Philosophy*. Goodin, Petit and Pogge (Eds) (UK: Blackwell publishing, 2007), p.214.

22. Rourke John,  *International Politics*, p. 21.

23. Dryzek John, "Political Science" Microsoft Encarta 2009 [DVD]

24. Rourke  John, *InternationalPolitics*, p21

25.  " International Relations" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia

26. Wilson  Peter  "Idealism  in  International  Relations"  in  Dowding  K.,  *Encyclopedia  of Power*. (USA: SAGE publications,)2011 p 332-333

27.  Wilson Peter, "idealism in International Relations" p. 332-333

28. Microsoft  Encarta  "international  relations"  Microsoft  Encarta  2009  [DVD]  (Redmond, W.A: Microsoft corporation, 2008)

29. Wilson Peter "Idealism in International Relations" p. 332-333.

30.  Microsoft Encarta "International Relations"

31. Ibid

32. Rourke John, *InternationalPolitics*, p.23.

33.  ibid p. 23.

34.  ibid p. 24.

35.  ibid

36.  ibid

37. Microsoft Encarta "International Relations"

38. Rourke John, *International* Politics, p 24

39. " Microsoft Encarta "international relations

40. ibid

41. ibid

42. ibid

43. ibid

44. Barnet Michael, " Social Constructivism" in *The Globalization of World Politics*. Baylis, Smith and Owen (eds) 4thed OUP p. 162

45. Microsoft Encarta "international Relations"

46. ibid

47. ibid

48. Howard Peter, "international Organization" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# THE POSSIBILITY OF WORLD PEACE IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF IMMANUEL KANT

Immanuel Kant in his Essay *Perpetual Peace* prepared a manuscript which was meant to guide nations in their relations with each other. The essay contains six preliminary articles and three definitive articles all aimed at providing guidelines for nations to follow on the path to achieve perpetual peace. Kant convinced that peace between nations was possible wrote this essay to guide nations towards this ideal. Kant's essay was received with a lot of mixed reactions. While some scholars applauded it, others considered it a fanciful contraption cooked up by a near senile philosopher. Careful reading and reflection of Kant's essay led to renewed interested in his political writings. Kant is known to have influenced to formation of the League of Nations whose structure was similar to Kant's prescription of ideal interstate relations. The U.N which succeeded the League of Nations is also built based on Kant concept of a federation of free states. With the end of the cold war and the widespread acceptance of liberal principles across the world, renewed interest in Kant's political writings resurfaced. Scholars of international relations taking into cognizance the recent events in the international arena have argued that liberalism represented by the dominance of liberal democracy worldwide had marked the end of history because no other system could satisfy the political animal in man who seeks to be recognized, given equality and liberty. Others argue that sure pronouncements have been made prematurely. The democratic peace theory also came to popularity in intellectual circles because of its claim to provide peace. Kant's writing on the possibility of perpetual peace and its shortcomings have been debated on as the international area remains a highly unpredictable terrain.

## 5.1. **Kant's Preliminary Articles for Perpetual Peace**

1. "No treaty of peace shall be regarded as valid if made with the secret material for a future war"[1]

If a treaty were to make reserve for a future war or if the parties involved in the peace treaty were still holding on to some old clams but were too exhausted by their current conflicts, whatever treaty they sign would not be valid because it would amount to a mere cessation of hostilities but not a guarantee for peace. All peace treaties must therefore be made to end all future wars.

- "No state having an independent existence whether it be great or small shall be acquired by another state through inheritance, exchange, purchase or donation"[2]

Such a practice for Kant was an immoral action because it went again the second proposition which states to treat all men as an end in themselves and not a means to end. This is because the state is not a piece of property ,"it is a society of human beings over who no one but itself has the right to rule and to dispose… and to gift it on to another state is to do away with its existence as a moral person and to make of it a thing"[3]

- "Standing armies (*Miles Perpetus*) shall be abolished course of time"[4]

The possession of a ready army to Kant already threatens others because it portrays a constant readiness to fight. It creates a competition or uneasiness between nations concerning their security in the face of other nation's larger armies and each nation constantly strives to be ready in case of an attack which may or never come. In this situation, in the words of Kant, "peace at last becomes even more oppressive than a short war, these standing armies are themselves the cause of wars of aggression, undertaken in order to get rid of this burden"[5] Kant also condemns "the idea of using men as fighters (to kill or be killed) implies using them as machines and

instruments in the hand of another (the state) which cannot be easily reconciled with the right of humanity in our own person"[6]

- "No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the state"[7]

Nations should not incur debts to wage wars of expansion because at the end, its innocent citizens suffer the effects of the repayment of such debts which may lead to bankruptcy of the state because of the huge costs of war. Lending of such monies should not be institutionalized.

- "No state shall violently interfere with the constitution and administration of another"[8]

No state has the right to interfere in the affairs, administration or constitution of another state. Kant differentiates between a state which had failed (i.e. divided itself into two through competition with each part laying claim to the whole) and a state which is only struggling with internal problems. In the first instance, for Kant

> Here yielding assistance to one faction could not be reckoned as interference on the part of a foreign state with the constitution of another for here anarchy prevails…but in the second instance,…so long as the inner strife has not reached this state where the interference if other powers would be a violation of the rights of an independent nation which is only struggling with internal disease, it would therefore itself cause scandal and make the autonomy of all states insecure[9]

- No state at war with another shall countenance such modes of hostility as would make mutual confidence in a subsequent state of peace: such are the employment of

assassins (*percussores)* or of poisoners (*verefici),* breaches of capitulation, the instigating and making use if tracking (*perduelli*) in the hostile stage

All the afore mentioned strategies are dishonorable, because for peace to be ensured, certain kind or level of confidence in the disposition of the enemy must exist even in the midst of war because in the absence of the sense of good faith, wars would lead to wars of annihilation which is injurious to the desired perpetual peace.

## 5.2 Kant's Definitive Articles for Perpetual Peace

**1.** The Civil constitution of each state shall be republican

Kantchooses the republican constitution over every other for some reasons:

- It is founded in accordance with the principle of the freedom of the members of the society as human beings
- It is in accordance with the principle of dependence of all as subjects of a common legislation.
- It is accordance with the law of the equality of the members as citizens "since it arose from the pure concept of right, has also the prospect of attaining the desired result, namely: perpetual peace"[10.]

Kant bases his reasoning in the fact that under this republican constitution, the consent of the citizens is required before the republic can go to war. When this situation arises, it is always thought over more seriously because the people will be bear the brunt of the war because they do the fighting and financing of the war themselves. In contrast with a despotic government where the leader makes the decision more readily and easily because he does not feel the impact

if war  directly; he commands man to fight till the death while he sits on his throne feasting and incurring huge debts(both human and material). Kant differentiated between the democratic and republican constitution. Democracy for him is despotic because  it establishes executive power since all decree regarding – and if need be against- any individual who dissents from them. Despotism is the principle in pursuance of which a state arbitrarily puts into effect laws which it has itself made : consequently it is the administration of the public will but it is identical with the private will of the ruler. Republicanism is the political principle of severing the executive powers of government from the legislature. Democracy was to him not truly representative because – whole people who carry their measure are really not all but only a majority, so that here the universal will is a contradiction with itself and the principle of freedom[11].

2.  The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of Free states.

Kant sees the relations between individuals in the state of nature as similar to that of states in the international scene with no laws or authority to govern their affairs because of this, Kant hoped that like the individuals in the state of nature, who gave up some their freedom to create the civil society or state. He further states:

> Every state for the sake of its own security may and ought to demand that its neighbor should submit itself to conditions similar to those if the civil society where the rights of every individual is guaranteed, this would give rise to a federation of nations which however would have to be a state of nations…. That would be a contradiction[12].

Kant does not suggest that states be fused into one nation with one central authority because this to him was a contradiction of  the notion of rights which he sought so much to protect. He states:

> For the term states implies the relation of one who rules to those who obey- that is to say of law giver to subject people and many nations in one side would constitute only one nations which contradicts our hypothesis since here we have to consider the right of one nation against another in so far as they are so many separate states and are not to be fused into one[13.]

The absence of a central authority to preside over the relations between states left a situation where war was the only means through which differences were resolved. Without a compact between nations however, this state of peace cannot be established or assured. Hence, there must be a particular alliance of some sort which we may call a covenant of peace. This covenant of peace is different from a peace treaty because the former would seek to put an end to war forever while the later aims to put an end to one immediate war. This alliance formed by states does not take away the power of the state but aims at the preservation and security of the freedom of the state for itself and of other allied states at the same time[14.]

Kant believed that this federation of Free states was practicable although he did not believe that it would come suddenly, he hoped that it would start somewhere and then spread across the world. He opines:

> For if fortune ordains that a powerful and enlightened people should form a republic which by its very nature is inclined to perpetual peace- this would serve as a centre of federal union for other states wishing to join and thus secures conditions of freedom among the states in ascendance with the idea of the law of nations. Gradually through different unions of this kind, the federation would extend further and further[15.]

3.The rights of men as citizens of the world shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality

By cosmopolitan right or universal hospitality Kant means the claim of a foreigner to be treated without hostility even while outside his home country. Kant bases his argument on the reasoning that the right to present themselves to society belongs to all mankind in virtue if our common right of possession of the surface of the earth which as it is a globe, we cannot be infinitely scattered and must in the end reconcile ourselves to existence side by side: at the same time originally, no one individual had more right than another to live in any one particular spot[16.]

The cosmopolitan right of all peoples implies that one can visit any nation on earth and not be harmed or be treated with hostility but enjoy peaceful stay and cooperation with the inhabitants of that country. This cosmopolitan right reflects the rights of the host country to and the hospitable treatment reflects the rights of persons to travel outside their home country without fear of ill treatment or harm. This pushes the cosmopolitan idea to its reality. Kant also considers the colonial mission of the western "civilized" nations perpetuated against African nations, the Americas and Asian countries and other countries which were regarded as "no man's land" despite the presence of a native population as a denial of the rights of the original owners of the land and gave the foreigners the claim to land that had owners before their visit.

Kant rightly observed that the idea of cosmopolitan right is not a fantasy but a compliment of the unwritten code of law constitutional as well as international and necessary for the public right of mankind in general and thus for the realization of perpetual peace. He him, "the relationship between nations which is increasing readily has now extended so enormously that a violation of right in one part of the world is felt all over it[17.] Perpetual peace for Kant was a realizable project

to which all mankind was to aim for.  It was not an occurrence which would come suddenly but slowly with these rules to guide the process.

## 5.**3 Kant's Republican Constitution and Modern Day Liberal Democracy**

Kantwas convinced that the republican constitution was the best constitution which would uphold the transition into the liberal society. He clearly rejected democracy on the grounds that it was despotic. For Kant, the republican constitution was supreme and important because it was necessary in the path to perpetual peace. The rights of the citizens to decide to go to war or not was a strong point in the favour of his choice of republican constitutions. This in Kant's thought was necessary because it would lead to fewer wars. This is because the people are the ones who suffer more when wars breakout, the people bear both the human and material costs of war. With this in mind Kant hoped that wars would be reduced to the barest minimum.

In our contemporary society, democracy has been accepted as the closest to Kant's version of a constitutional republic.  Liberal democracy is a political ideology and a form of government in which representative democracy operates under the principles of liberalism. It is characterized by free fair and competitive elections between multiple distinct political parties, a separation of powers into different branches of government, the rule of law in everyday life as part of an open society, and the equal protection of human rights, civil rights, civil liberties and political freedoms of the people.[18]

Our modern liberal democracy reflects realistically what Kant intended when he wrote about a constitutional republic being the path to the realization of perpetual peace. Liberal democracy is built on the twin pillar of freedom and equality and these are enshrined in the constitution of the

liberal states. Freedom and equality are two qualities that Kant's republican state was built to protect.

## 5.4 TheFederation of Free States and the United Nations

Kant  proposed a federation of free states as another sure path to the achievement of perpetual peace. Although there is confusion and misrepresentation concerning what Kant meant by his federation of free states, some scholars have interpreted it to mean a one world government. Others see it just as Kant intended for it to be: a federation of free states. Kant stated clearly in the article perpetual peace that he hoped for the establishment of a federation of free states and not a one world government. Kant envisaged that men would as reasoning beings decide to leave the lawlessness associated with the state of nature among nations and enter into a union. This union was to protect the rights of each state in the union. The role of reason here is to direct men to avoid war and its huge costs and enter a union that ensures peaceful coexistence between states."Reason therefore calls for the end of violent conflicts and the adoption of liberalism. "from the throne of the highest moral legislative authority, reason looks down on and condemns war as a means of pursuing one's rights, and makes peace an immediate duty.[19]

The United Nations was formed as result of Kantian ideas of attaining peace, although there is no mention of Kant in any of the UN documents, there are close similarities between the Kantian federation of free states and   the UN.  Howard captures this :In the late 18th century, Immanuel Kant proposed a federation or "league" of  nations. Kant held that such a federation would allow countries to unite and punish any nation that committed an act of aggression. This type of union by nations to protect each other against an aggressor is sometimes referred to as collective

security. Kant also felt that the federation would protect the rights of small nations that often become pawns in power struggles between larger countries[20].

Rauber finds a contradiction in Kant's proposal for the federation of free states. To him, in the first definitive article for perpetual peace the constitution has to be republican on the first level between individuals, an analogy built on the interstate constitution would have to comply with this criteria too. The logical conclusion of Kant's moral reasoning should be a postulation of a republic of republics…an argument which Kant certainly was aware of  when he honours the world republic as a positive idea.[21] Instead of insisting on the foundation of a republic of states, Kant contradicts himself by insisting on a loose federation of free states- the league of nations…..the justification Kant offers for his deviation from the positive idea turns out to be rather unkantian his arguments are inconclusive and the question for what he has in fact said might better be followed by the question what he should have said[22].

Habermas set out to correct perceived inconsistencies in Kant, which he relates to the nature of the federation of free states( which instead of being a state of states in inconsistent and contradictory)  follows from the fact the  citizens of a world republic would have to give up the substantial freedoms they already enjoy  as members of  a nation state namely inter alia cultural, religious and political autonomy. Habermas paints another side to this dilemma, a different kind of sovereignty: a shared sovereignty, he further states: "this ignores the possibility of a shared sovereignty within a federalist multi level state system. Not every competence would have to be transferred to the world republic: in fact the various nations could still be subject to different domestic laws because the domestic republics could retain legislative powers in most areas[23]

From Habermas' argument, the world republic was possible despite Kant's obviously rejection of the idea based on his observation that liberty, state sovereignty and rights may be compromised by this world republic. But Habermas' and Rauber's argument take for granted the possibility of a despotic world state which would lead men back to a chaotic world order . Chaotic in the sense that the liberty, equality  and freedom which Kant sought to preserve and promote was seriously threatened by this world state which Habermas so readily suggests. The result of such despotism would be revolt and revolution and a breakdown of law and order and a possible return to the state of nature which men took great pains to leave by creating civil society.

The very nature of the United Nations reflects the Kantian proposal for the federation of free states. The United Nations remains a free federation of states with voluntary membership which works to foster peaceful cooperation among nations. The United Nations is the world's largest international organizations with a membership of 193 countries; it does not have coercive authority over all the states on earth. It is only a legal organization whose decisions are binding on her members although the organizations can use its powers to coerce nations to take actions which they would not have ordinarily. The United Nations welcomes all peace loving states to her membership and all nations whether great or small are granted an equal status. The sovereignty of all member nations is respected irrespective of economic standing in the world.

The United Nation's influence on international politics is significant and cannot be ignored. The main goal of the first founders was to avoid a third world war, and in that respect, till date the organization has succeeded. It has peacefully resolved numerous international disputes since its founding and has established a set of rules for the use of force in the contemporary world. Although these rules are not always followed, the United Nations has nevertheless established

itself as a significant player on the world stage. Although it has succeeded in preventing a third world war till date, it has not been able to prevent other wars like the U.S led war on Iraq, among others.

**5.5 Cosmopolitan Right and State Sovereignty**

Kant's cosmopolitan right ensures the safety of a traveler who is away from home. It ensures that he is treated without hostility or harmed while in a foreign country. The third definitive articles for perpetual peace  clearly states this. It was Kant's hope that all persons should enjoy rights and freedoms even while not in his country of origin.  Kant did not mean that all men had rights over other territories outside that of the home states but that a person should be accorded the same respect at home and while he is away from home by his host state: by virtue of all men being part of the human race. There is also another side to that article: the right of the sovereign to claim their land as theirs. The reason why a person is called a visitor is that he is not an original inhabitant of a place, it means that the visitor has come from another place to a new place which already has inhabitants. The visitor meets the original occupiers of the land on his arrival which makes him a newcomer to that very place. It follows logically that the visitor is new to a place where there are already inhabitants. The original occupants are the owners of the land and the visitor is passing through. This shows the difference between the original inhabitants and visitors.

The owners of the land have every right to claim their land s the original owners of the land. This is in contrast with what was done during the years of colonialism when powerful nations took advantage of poor less powerful nations in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world to dominate and exploit them in the name of civilization missions.

This also brings to mind the provisions of the second preliminary article for perpetual peace which states : no state having independent existence whether great or small shall be acquired by another state through inheritance, exchange, purchase or donation" [24], this article was to ensure that such practices were not to be repeated again because each nation has a right to exist and be independent Kant argues that the state is not a piece of property that can be exchanged or own because "it is a society  of human beings over whom no one but itself has the right to rule and to dispose …and to graft it to another state is to do away with its existence as a moral person and to make of a thing " [25]Kleingeld rightly observes: "Kant's introduction of cosmopolitan right into his theory of right shows that he realized that world peace requires not merely peace between sates but also peaceful behavior of states and foreign individuals towards each other"[26]

Although Kant hoped that cosmopolitan right would take the rights of the individual beyond the borders of the state, it is not always the case. The relations between states also goes a long way to affect the relations of its citizens toward each other.  A citizen of a liberal state may not always receive the same reception if he/she travels to a rival nation or an illiberal state.

## 5.6 Democratic Peace and the Abolition of War

The end of the cold war and the adoption of liberal democracy by a majority of nations across the world led to the conclusion the liberal democracy was the victor of the cold war. The fall of communism which was the rival of liberal democracy led to the conclusion that it was the final form of human government. The widespread clamor for liberal principles around the world seemed to prove this. This was seen a victory of liberal principles over illiberal ones  and the confirmation of the Kantian idea of the end of history.

The democratic peace theory holds that democracies by nature do not go to war with one another, a fact which historically has guaranteed peace between democratic states arguable without exception[27]. This theory offers a strong empirical attack by the liberals against the realist hegemony in American international relations theory. This theory can be traced to Immanuel Kant's work titled perpetual peace: Kant held in this work that peace is a reasonable outcome of the interaction of states with a republican form of government[28].

This theory is also based on the belief that democratic states share a common normative dedication to liberal ideas and means they engage in are publicly justified in the first instance as attempts to preserve a way of life and private enterprise[29]

Levy stated that the democratic peace theory " Has attracted attention for a number of reasons, it is the closest thing we have to an empirical law in the study of international relations". For Owen it poses an apparent anomaly to realism, the dominant school of security studies and it has become an axiom of U.S foreign polic[30.] Pugh observes that an important part of democratic peace is that liberal democratic states share a common normative dedication to liberal ideas and they frequently employ liberal justification for going to war.[31]

Liberal ideas is the source, the independent variable behind the distinctive foreign policies of liberal democracies. These ideas give rise to two intervening variables, liberal ideology and domestic democratic institutions which shape foreign policy. Liberal ideology prohibits war against liberal democratic states. Democratic institutions allow these drives to affect foreign policy and international relations.[32]

Liberalism is more tolerant of its own kind than other systems…….once liberals accept a foreign state as a liberal democracy, they adamantly oppose war against that state. The rational follows

from liberal premises *ceteris paribus,* people are better off without war, because it is costly and dangerous. War is called for only when it would serve liberals i.e. when it would  likely enhance self-preservation and well being.[33] This classification of nations as either liberal or illiberal has created a division even in international relations as liberal democracies band together due to similar interests. Since it has been established that liberal democracies do not go to war with other democracies, does it mean that they do not go to war with illiberal states?

Kant aimed for the end of all wars and hoped that the adoption of liberal principles will help mankind get rid of wars and the huge loses that they bring. The establishment of a league of federation of free states was to enable nations to overcome the realist assumption that war is inevitable in international relations. The adoption of liberalism in international relations was meant to eradicate war completely or to minimize it as much s possible. Despite the growth in number in liberal states, this democratic peace has not been completely achieved.

Kant has been misinterpreted as sanctioning war for the spread of liberal principles. Many liberal democratic nations seem to see themselves as advocates of liberalism and will use any means necessary to ensure that liberal principles are adopted across the world. The adoption of liberal democracy by all nations around the world is an ideal to which Kant wanted all men to aspire to achieve but the means through which this would be done has been interpreted wrongly. Many liberal states believe that war can be used to spread liberal principles to other nations. The U.S led war on Iraq was waged based on the idea that Iraq was illiberal and had acquired nuclear arms which threatened the peace. The U.S which saw itself as the leader of the free world saw it as a moral duty to impose their ideas of liberalism and declared war on Iraq, with the purpose of liberating the people of Iraq from a dictatorship under Sadam Hussein. The fall of the Ghadafi led administration  in Lybia was also engineered by the liberal nations who were protected by

their guise of liberating the Libyans from the gross violation of human rights which had reached the level of receiving a humanitarian intervention mission. This was not what Kant proposed, the perpetual peace was to be attained by the progressive reformation of the institutions of all countries until they attain a republican form of government. However, this progress should not be imposed by war nor can a republican nation impose a liberal constitution by force. To so this would be against the idea of right which should guide our striving towards a perpetual peace among nations [34] With this situation of war still existing between nations, the Kantian project of perpetual peace seems to have hit a snag because the divide between illiberal and liberal nations has created a tension between nations who still operate under the realist perspective which war becomes a means of settling disputes.

## 5.7 Rethinking World Peace in Kantian Thought

Kant set out in *TowardsPerpetual Peace* to set out rules which he hoped would address the problems faced in the relationship between nations which led to war. Perpetual peace is an ideal to which all were to aspire. Kant's preliminary and definitive articles for perpetual peace set out guidelines which were to guide nations on the road to the attainment of this peace. All Kant's prescriptions are plausible and are objective in their pursuit of perpetual peace. Renewed interests in Kant's work on perpetual peace have laid bare the role of the U.N as an instrument to aid in the achievement of this peace.

### 5.7.1  The Problem with Cosmopolitanism

Kantdescribed cosmopolitanism as the matrix within which all the original capacities of the human race may develop.It was the goal and end of all human social organization and the final form of human political organization. This cosmopolitan goal was also not to be an easy task to

accomplish because of the nature of the relationship between states which was marked by antagonism. Kant's Cosmopolitanism paints a rosy, blissful picture of a world where the rights of individuals are respected even outside their home states. Despite Kant's depiction, of a world that has progressed politically, morally there are still many contemporary developments that have made it hard and almost impossible to achieve.

Terrorism and religious fanaticism and intolerance have limited the practicability of this cosmopolitan ideal. Nations have tightened their security because of the increase on terror attacks, fear and actual threats of terror attacks. Citizens of countries linked with terror groups do not enjoy cosmopolitan freedoms and rights in other countries because of fear (from their perceived victims).  This is clearly played out in our world as we see that persons from countries linked to terror groups are sometimes barred from entering into some countries especially those under risk of being attacked. This prevents the free movement that Kant envisioned would exist between nations under a cosmopolitan system.

Cultural differences between nations can also hinder cosmopolitanism and its actualization. Nations are still divided by cultural, religious and political ideologies which sometimes results to hostility to cosmopolitan ideas which prescribes that any traveler away from home should enjoy cosmopolitan right to hospitality and freedom. This not always the case in real life for instance the Syrian ISIS situation where there is open violation of human rights and lawless administration run by a fundamentalist a religious sect. It is obvious that not citizen of a liberal nation will enjoy any such cosmopolitan rights from a country overrun by illiberal religious fanatics.

### 5.7.2.  The Question of Moral Progress

Kantbased his argument on the inevitability of the formation of the federation of free states on many reasons: one among them being the idea of moral advancement or progress. Kant believed that reason is the source of moral law. Moral law is presented to us as a categorical imperative. It tells us what we ought to, should and must do, it does not depend on any prior conditions or subjective wants or wishes and it contains no qualifications.[35] Since such moral law does not depend on any external directions or source, he holds that reason is the giver of such laws " a rational rule is one that is universal and consistent, it is universal in the sense that it is a rule that applies to all people at all times and in all circumstance; it is consistent and does not lead to any contradictions"[36]

Since reason led men to the formation of or creation of civil society, it will also lead men to the formation of the federation free states. This movement from the primitive antagonism and competition for the goods of nature, to an organized society with a government, social and cultural integration: Kant concluded that man had progressed morally. To have moved from a state of primitive existence in the state of nature to a more matured existence under a government, was a move in the direction of a desired end, which depicts a form of improvement from lawlessness in the state of nature. Behnke following Kant's line of thought declared that " within this dominant narrative of eternal peace, man himself is the agent of history and its transcendence. Moral man is the author of the eternal peace, it is up to him to create the federation of states that shall be at the center of an ever expanding pacific sphere."[37]

Man is the major actor and the creator of all institutions social, political, cultural, etc but the problem with this idea of moral progress however lies in the ability if these new structures to function as they should. Schattenman argues that "political progress does not rely on moral

progress as much as on the right sets of institutions, institutions should make us act in the right manner"[38] Schattenman's observation raises questions which are relevant to our present day society. Moral progress entails an improvement in our ability of make right and wrong decisions, it depicts: that we are more conscious of right and wrong actions, that we are more humane that previous civilizations and that our organizational structures and institutions are more functional and efficient because progress in reason and morals should reflect in our institutions. Institutional progress does not imply complete moral progress because humans have the tendency to thwart them for their own gains. Taking Nigerian and her democratic system as an example brings this point home. Nigeria practices democracy just like the United States but our brand of democracy seems to be different. The problem we face today in our country lies not in democracy but in our own pattern of adoption and practice. Therefore the problems of achieving peace lies not in the structures but in our ability and willingness to practice their stipulations as we should.

### 5.7.3.    Freedomand Inequality

Kant intended that the establishment of the federation of free states would   protect the sovereignty of each member state. It was meant to protect smaller weaker nations from the power struggles between them and stronger larger ones and from general power squabbles that arise from the relations between nations. The United Nations is the biggest international organization with the highest amount of state membership (193) compared with other international organizations. Despite the great strides it has taken and the number of successes it has recorded, there still remain some problems with its administration, mediation and intervention.

The security council of the U.N has five veto members : Britain , Russian, the U.S, China and France. The veto power of these members contravenes the concept of equality of nations. These

nations often use their veto to promote their interests and to meddle in the affairs of other nations. The distribution of this veto power has left Africa in the dark and there is no one there in the security council to promote her interests. These powerful nations have used their powers to topple governments, and to destabilize the lives of millions of people in the world today. Examples are Libya, Syria, etc. This does not represent the Kantian interest in the preservation of freedom and equality but it is a reality of our present day world politics.

### 5.7.4. Human Nature

Kant portrayed a notion of human nature as evil and crooked in " *Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan Aim"* but he also believed that over time those tendencies to conquer and dominate would be tamed and that man would progress to a more mature stage in his development. Man who was a brute in the state of nature matured into a civilized being over time and would lead to the establishment of the perfect civic constitution that would administer justice globally. Realist and liberalists approaches in international relations shows the interplay of this world view. Realists hold that human nature is evil while liberalists hold that man can be good to promote his interests. This work asserts that human nature is unpredictable and man can rise above his base and vile desires but can also fall into the oily depths of morally degradation. Human nature has not changed or matured as much as Kant proposed. We still find the desire to dominate in our world today over 200 years after the death of Kant. Economic interests and cultural and ethnic differences, terrorism and global warming all show us that human nature has not changed as much as Kant projected

### 5.7.5. The Actuality of Kantian World Peace

Actuality and potentiality are two concepts found in the works Aristotle.

>The concept of actuality is the change or activity that represents an exercise or fulfillment of a possibility when a possibility becomes real in the fullest sense. Potentiality on the other hand generally refers to any possibility that a thing can be said to have. Aristotle did not consider all possibilities the same and emphasized the importance of those that become real of their own accord when conditions are right and nothing stops them.[40]

Kant's proposal for peace going by Aristotle's theory of actuality and potentiality would fall into the realm of actuality if it had met all of Kant's conditions which are stipulated in Kant's preliminary and definitive articles for the attainment of perpetual peace. This is obviously not the case as these conditions have not been met and the likelihood of them being met in this decade is remote.  This leaves it in the realm of potentiality because following the revival of Kantian thoughts on peace, and the establishment of the United Nations, there is an incomplete implementation of his prescriptions.   The U.N. despite its efforts has not been able to achieve world peace due to some problems in its structure.  The U.N by its nature is an organization with voluntary membership where nations are free to join and leave without restriction. This is one weakness that reduces the powers of the U.N.: the laws of the U.N are not binding on non members. Although it can rally support from its members to impose sanctions on nations that adopt non liberal or policies that threaten the peace, it cannot interfere in the nations  affairs because that would amount to a violation of its sovereignty. The territorial integrity or sovereignty of a nation remains a very important aspect in the life of a state because it prevents any body or nation from interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign nation.

The nature of the U.N. as an international body comprised of different nations with different interests. Sometimes the efforts of the U.N is thwarted by this. It is sometimes different to get support from the members who do not share same interests even if their issue at stake is positive

and for the improvement of the human condition. It takes nations which are interested in issues at stake to make a move to assist or to control a negative situation.

The laws of the U.N are supposed to be binding on her members. All member states are supposed to accept the resolutions and laws reached in the pursuance of peace. But this is not always the case. Some nations ignore some of the U.N's laws because they do not conform with their interest or agenda. The U.N has  not been able to enforce its law on its own members who have ignored laws. This inability of the U.N to enforce and ensure obedience to her laws has weakened the U.N. Many idealists argue for a world government with legitimate power to enforce its laws because of this obvious inability of to enforce laws and adequately punish defaulters. The problem here is not just nonconformance to laws by members but a challenge on the strength of the union as a whole. Powerful nations like the U.S have been known to take action without the consent of the U.N for instance the war in Iraq, the U.S. sought the approval of their agenda from the U.N and got non but still went ahead to invade Iraq and  no action was taken against her.

The abolition of all standing armies which Kant proposed in the his third preliminary article can only be truly possible if the United Nations had a membership of all the world's countries and had a coercive authority to ensure that all nations would comply with her decisions. The disarmament attempts of the United Nations have not been too successful as many nations despite sanctions by the UN have still continued to increase their nuclear capabilities.

# References

1. Kant Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Trans Campbell Smith (London: Swan Sonnenshein&co Ltd, 1903), 107

2. Ibid p. 108

3. Ibid p, 109

4. Ibid p.110

5. ibid p. 110.

6. ibid *p. 110.*

7. ibid *p.* 114.

8. Ibid *p.* 121.

9. ibid *p. 121.*

10. ibid p. 128.

11. Ibid *p. 129.*

12. ibid*, p.* 129.

13. ibid *p. 134.*

14. ibid *p.* 135.

15. ibid *p.* 138.

16. Ibid *p. 138*

17. ibid p. 138

18. " Liberal Democracy" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia

19. Kant Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Trans Campbell Smith (London: Swan Sonnenshein&co Ltd, 1903), 80

20. Howard Peter "United Nations"Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved

21,RauberJochen, the United Nations- "A Kantian Dream Come True? Philosophical Perspectives on the Constitutional Legitimacy of the World Organization"  *Law Internationals RichtHanse Law Review* vol.5. no.1. (2009) p 65

22. Marini Gulianat ," Kant's idea of a World Republic" in Byrds and Hruschka  (eds) *Kant and Law* (Ashgate&Aidershot, 2006), p. 372-375

23.  HabermasJugen cited in Rauber p 65-66

24.  Kant, *Perpetual Peace,* p. 108.

25. ibid p. 109

26. Kleingeld Paulina, "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's Defence of a League of States snd his ideals of a World Federation" *European Journal of  Philosophy*. (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing ltd, 2004).p. 499

27. Pugh Jeff, "Democratic Peace Theory: A Review and Evaluation" CEMPROC working paper series( 2005), p. 3.

28. ibid  p. 3.

29/ Doyle Michael, *Ways Of War And Peace;Realism, Liberalism And Socialism* (New York: W.W. Norton& Company , 1997) , p.286-287

30. Owen John, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace" in *International Security* Vol 9 no2 .( Harvard College and Massachusetts institutes of technology, 1994), p.  87.

31. Pugh Jeff, "Democratic Peace Theory"   p.5

32 Goldstein Judith &keohane Robert, ideas and Fereign Policy: Beliefs, intsttutiona and Political Change. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,1993)  13-17

33 Owen John, " How  Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace" p. 95.

34.  Borges M. L., "War and Perpetual peace"  Ethics@Florianopolis V5, NP1 (June 2006),  p. 89.

35. Caygill Howard*,  A Kant Dictionary* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995) , p. 314.

36. ibid  *p.* 314.

37. LawheadWiiliam, *A Voyage of Discovery.* (Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2002) p. 342

38. ibid  P.342

39 Behnke Andreas, *Eternal Peace, Perpetual war, A Critical Investigation into Kant's Conceptiion of War_____*p. 7

40. Schattenman  Marc, "Rethinking Progress- A Kantian Perspective" *The Harvard Review of Philosophy* vii (2000) p.65

# CHAPTER SIX

## EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

### 6.1. Evaluation

Kant proposed that world peace was a realizable ideal and that it was the intent of nature that men pass through various stages of development of society till it culminated to an end which is the establishment of a perfect civil constitution of mankind. This for him was nature's purpose for man. Kant like the social contract theorists presented a state of nature which was chaotic and anarchic with each man seeking after his own interests. Human nature was egocentric and crooked but this was natures intent. Man was made up of characteristics which was meant for pushing history forward. History was not just a series of unconnected events which happened randomly but a chain of purposeful events which was leading to nature's purpose which was the perfection of mans potentials and the creation of the perfect civil constitution of mankind. This characteristic Kant called asocial sociability. This asocial sociability was the cause of conflict among men in the state of nature. Men realized that entering into a compact to form a state was more profitable than being in a state of nature and the state was formed. Kant also stated that there exists a state of lawlessness and anarchy among nations just as there was in a state of nature. This was also the reason why the nations should make a compact to protect each one and the whole. The United Nations was created in line with Kant's prescription and is working towards ensuring that world peace is attainable.

Kant's essay toward perpetual peace contains six preliminary articles for perpetual peace and three definitive articles which are all aimed at attaining perpetual peace. Kant lists six rules which are all aimed at achieving peace among nations. The rules are:

1. no peace settlement which secretly makes reservations for a future war shall be considered valid

2. No independently existing state shall be able to be acquired by another state through inheritance, exchange purchase or gift.

3. Standing armies shall gradually be abolished

4. The state shall not contracts debts in connection with its foreign affairs

5. No state shall forcefully interfere with the constitution and government of another state

6. No state shall itself such hostilities in wartime as would make mutual trust impossible

The definitive articles include:

1. The constitution of each state shall be republican.

2. The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states

3. The rights of men as citizen of the world shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality.

These rules were all made to aid states in the transition to perpetual peace. Kant was convinced of the possibility of world peace and he presented several arguments to prove his conviction. He uses the argument from reason where he professes that reason will lead men to the realization of peace, this will come about when men tire of constant war and its obvious costs will decide to work with neighboring states to form a republican government.

He also holds that nature wills for men to live in the federation of free states and so nature uses her agents to move history with man. She holds that man can hasten the end and support nature's motives although without man she will still achieve her goals. He argues that nature guarantees the establishment of this federation through the following means:

1. She made it possible for human beings to live in all corners of the world

2. Through war she drove men to all directions of the earth even the most uninhabitable places are home to man

3. She has compelled men to enter into legal relation with each other through war

Man entered a legal arrangement because of either internal or external wars. Nature also uses trade and commerce to unite men. She has also used religion and culture to divide men and prevent them from forming one despotic state. Nature was working toward the establishment of the perfect civil constitution.

Kant also holds that man has progressed morally as well as intellectually and in institutional advancements as well, this describes the transition from anarchy in the state of nature to the creation of civil society.The international arena provides us with a clearer understanding of Kant's reason for presenting his argument in the manner he does. Realism, idealism and liberalism are the most popular approaches or perspectives through which international relations are analyzed. The realist approach see human nature are evil and unchanging therefore international politics should be conducted based on interests with the possibility of war as a means of settling disputes. The idealist describes the ideal international system and sees human nature as intrinsically good, this approach asserts that cooperation, friendships and morality could be a good part of international relations and nations could profit from mutual cooperation than from war. The liberal approach is an offshoot of Kant's thought. It is a direct offspring of idealism and holds similar views. It holds that mutual cooperation benefits nations more that the cut throat tactics employed by the realists.

Liberalism became very popular after the fall of communism at the end of the cold war. The increase in the number of democracies around the world led to the  conclusion by writers such

as Fukuyama Francis that liberal democracy was the final form of human government and marked the end of history. The democratic peace theory became popular among scholars of international relations because of its promise that liberal democracies where more peaceful and would eliminate the problem of war permanently. This has led to the increase of conflict between liberal and illiberal states with liberal seeking to ensure the world wide adoption of liberal democracy. This had led to the downfall of some regimes which are known to be illiberal even without the collective effort of the nations of the United Nations. Some scholars have argued that the democratic theory rather creates a state of war between liberal and illiberal states until the establishment of liberal democracies worldwide. Globalization also creates new challenges for the pursuit of peace. "While contemporary globalization shows increasing democratization, deepening interdependence and disaggregating actors.It also includes dark sides in terms of inequality and global terrorism"[1].

Taking a closer look at Kant's work on peace, it is obvious that Kant provided the foundation upon which later efforts aimed at attaining world peace are based. The ideas Kant projected are impressive considering the time in which he wrote. His ideas are known to have influenced the creation of the United Nations which has the largest number of member states in the world today.

6.2. **Conclusion**.

Kant's theory of Cosmopolitanism faces a lot of challenges. Despite the fact that wars between nations have been reduced, this ideal is still problematic to implement. Modern challenges in our contemporary world like terrorism, global warming and nuclear capabilities have rather increased the tension between nations. This led Threats of war and terror attacks have limited

freedom to travel freely around the world. Cultural and religious divides have separated nations and marred relations between states. "it seems that "Perpetual Peace" in world politics may be difficult to achieve in the near future, contemporary new phases of the world that the post cold war era provides faces new types of conflicts such as global terrorism although instance of waging war among states have decreased"[2]

Moral progress is still an ideal which man may never completely attain because human nature is unpredictable and despite Kant's conviction of moral progress, wars and conflict still pervades international relations. Institutions can show progress but the problem is running those institutions as they should be. Systems are created and thwarted by the same humans who created them.

The United Nations was created to promote world peace and despite its efforts at achieving this, there still remain some internal problems in the U.N. The veto power of the 5 permanent members of the Security Council is a problem and needs to be addressed if the U.N is to be truly representative. This veto power has led to inequality between member states in an organization where the vote of each state should count. The veto power gives these nations a right to act without control and consequence. These actions have long reaching effects on the rights and freedoms of citizens around the world.

Finally , The main weaknesses of Kant's argument for perpetual peace lies in  his federation of free states' lack of coercive power to enforce laws and to prevent nations from engaging in acts the endanger the peace. The federation of free states is the prototype upon which the UN was built and serves the main function of maintaining peace and promoting development but it can only sanction but cannot use military might to enforce its laws. Without a coercive authority, to

enforce laws and ensure justice, world peace may remain an illusion. Kant's foundational argument on moral progress, and the role of reason in creation of the federation of free states is also problematic Given these conditions, Perpetual Peace is not completely possible in our world; it remains in the realm of possibility and not actuality.  St. Augustine stated this in his writing where he declares: "we always realize that in this present life that we are mere travelers in a foreign land, for our true home is in heaven and only there can we find true peace"[3].

# References

1. OzkanErsan, "The Realist and Liberalist Positions on the Role of International Organizations in Maintaining World Order" *European Scientific Journal* (June, 2016) Edition Vol 12 No. 17 p. 94

2. OzkanArsan, 94

3. Augustine, *City of God*, Trans Gerald G. Walsh, Demetrius B. Zema, Grace Monahan, Daniel J. Honan  (New York: Doubleday Image, 1958), p. 17.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Appadorai  A*., The Substance of Politics.,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Archibugi D., and Beetham D., *DorttiUmani e DemocraziaCosmopolitica.* Milano: Feltrinelli, 1998.

Arendt Annah*, Lecture on Kant's Political philosophy,* Ed Ronald Beiner Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Augustine, *City of God*. Trans Gerald G. Walsh, Demetrius B. Zema, Grace Monahan, Daniel J. Honan.  New York: Doubleday Image, 1958.

Barnet Michael, " Social Constructivism" in *The Globalization of World Politics*. Baylis, Smith and Owen (eds) 4[th]ed OUP 2006

Behnke Andreas, *Eternal Peace, Perpetual War? A Critical Investigation into Kant's Conception of War-----------*

Borges M. L., "War and Perpetual peace" *Ethics@Florianopolis* V5, NP1 June 2006.

Caranti Luigi, "Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace? Reflections on the Realist Critique of Kant's Project" *Journal of Human Rights*.  London: Taylor and Francis Group, 2006.

Georg  C.,  "Cosmopolitanisms in Kant's philosophy"  *Ethics and Global Politics*vol 5, no.2. Coation Publishing 2012

Caygill Howard,  *A Kant Dictionary*. United kingdom: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

Copleston  F., *A History of Philosophy VL 3 Ockham to Suarez.* Great Britain: Burns and Oates 1969

Covell, Charles*, Kant and the law of Peace: A Study in the Philosophy of International Relations.* Chicago: St Martins Press, 1998

Donnelly Jack, "The Ethics of Realism" in Christian Reus-Smith, Duncan Snidal (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook Of International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Doyle Michael, *Ways Of War And Peace;Realism, Liberalism And Socialism*, New York: W.W. Norton& Company , 1997.

Durant Will, *The Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of The Great Philosophers Of The World*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.

Fiala Andrew, "Terrorism and the Philosophy of History: Liberalism, Realism and the Supreme Emergency Exemption" Essays in Philosophy Vol. 3 Article 2. 2002

Franke Mark, *Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations and Critique of World Politics.* New York: state Sniversity of New York Press, 2001.

Fukuyama Francis, *TheEnd of history and the Last Man*, U.S.A.: Penguin Books 1992

Goldstein Judith &Keohane Robert*, Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Harrison Ewan, "Waltz, Kant and Systemic Approaches to International Relations" *Reviews of International Studies* 28, British International Studies Association, 2002

Hegel W.G.F. *The philosophy of Right.* Trans. T. M. Knox. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

HerbamasJurgen, "Kants Idea of Perpetual Peace with the Benefit of two Hundred Years Hindsight", *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan ideal*, Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997.

Kant Immanuel ," Idea of History with a Cosmopolitan Aim" *Toward Perpetual Peace and other Writings on Politics, Peace and History,* Ed Pauline Kleingeld. London : Yale University Press, 2006

Kant Immanuel, *Ideaof A Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View* Indianapolis: Bobbs and Merrill 1968

Kant Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay*. Trans Campbell Smith London: Swan Sonnenshein&co Ltd, 1903

Kersting Wolfgang, "Politics, Freedom and Order: Kant's Political Philosophy". *The Cambridge Companion to Kant* Ed by Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Marini Gulianat ," Kant's idea of a World Republic" in Byrds ads Hruschka (eds) Kant and Law"---------

Milner Hellen, "International Relations" in *ACompanion To Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Goodin, Petit and Pogge (Eds) UK: Blackwell publishing, 2007.

Muhki H. R., *Political Thought* India: S.D.B. Publishers Distributor, 2011

Ninkovic Paulina, "Kant's Conviction of the inevitability of perpetual peace*" Theories and Methods Of International Studies -----------*

Nisbet R. *Social Change and History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1969)

Nussbaum Martha, "Kant and Cosmopolitanism" *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal,*Eds James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1997.

Owen John, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace" in *International Security* Vol 9 No.2 Harvard college and Massachusetts institutes of technology, 1994.

Reiss Hans, *Postscript, Kant: Political Writings ----------*

Riley Patrick, *Kant's political Philosophy*, New Jersey: Rowan and Littefield, 1983

Robert E., et al, *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy,* U.S.A: Blackwell Publishers, 2007.

Rosen Micheal,   *Man as A Progressive Being: The Liberal View Of Progress And Its Downfall-- -----------*

Rourke John, *International Politics On The World Stage*. New York: McGraw Hill,-----

Russel Bertrand, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. London: Routledge Publishers, 1954.

Schattenmann Marc, "Rethinking Progress- A Kantian Perspective".*The Harvard Review of Philosophy* viii 2000

Straus L., *Thoughts on Machiavelli.* Glencoe: Free Press, 1958.

Sulivan Roger S., *An Introduction to Kant's Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Waltz Kenneth, *Man, The State and War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

**JOURNALS**

Gaubatz K. Taylor, "Kant democracy and History" *Journal of Democracy* vol.7. No.4. October 1996

Hirsch Philip A. " Legalization of International Politics  on the (im)possibility of  a Constitutionalization of International Law from a Kantian Point of View" *Goettingen Journal of International law 4. 2012*

Huntley Wade, "Kant's Third Image: Systematic Sources of the Liberal Peace." *International Studies Quarterly* 40. 1996

Kleingeld Paulina, "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's defense of a League of States and his Ideals of a World Federation." *European Journal of Philosophy*. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.

MahmoudiSeyed Ali, "An Evaluation of Kant's Theory of Perpetual Peace in the Field of Contemporary Political Philosophy" *International Journal of Humanities* vol.15(2) 2008

Mbaegbu Celestine, "Realism, Idealism and conflict Resolution in Nigeria: A Philosophical Study" *Mgbakoigba: Journal of African Studies*. Vol 5 No. 2. June 2016

OzkanErsan, "The Realist and Liberalist Positions on the Role of International Organizations in Maintaining World Order" *European Scientific Journal* June, 2016 Edition Vol. 12 No. 17

Pugh Jeff, "Democratic Peace Theory: A Review and Evaluation" CEMPROC working paper series 2005

RauberJochen, The United Nations- "A Kantian Dream Come True? Philosophical Perspectives on the Constitutional Legitimacy of the World Organization" *International Law /Internationals Richt.Hanse Law Review* vol.5.no.1. 2009.


**ENCYCLOPEDIAS**

Coker, Christopher, *Waging War Without Warriors? The Changing Culture of*
Cold War" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation.

Dryzek John, "Political Science" Microsoft Encarta 2009 [DVD] Redmond, W.A: Microsoft corporation 2008

DuignanB.,        and        Bird.        O.B.,        "Immanuel        Kant" *EncyclopediaBritannica*https://www.britannica,com/bigraphy/immanuel-kant  11sept 2016

Howard Peter "United Nations"Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved

"International Law" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation.        All rights reserved.

Liberal Democracy" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia en.m.wikipedia.org/liberal_democracy accessed 12 /07 /2015

"Progress" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia March 2014 en.m.wikipedia.org/progress_(history) accessed 5 may 2014.

Political Realism" Microsoft ® Encarta ® 2009. © 1993-2008 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

Realism (international relations)" Wikipedia online Encyclopedia en.m.wikipedia.org/realism 5/5/2014

Turner , William, "Philosophy of Immanuel Kant" *The Catholic Encyclopedia*Vol 8. New York: Robert Appleton Company 1910. 10 Sept, 2016 <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08603.htm>

Wilson Peter "Idealism in International Relations" in Dowding K., *Encyclopedia of Power*. New York: SAGE publications, 2011.