

مجلة

كلية التراث الجامعة



رقم الايداع في دار الكتب والوثائق 719 لسنة 2011

مجلة كلية التراث الجامعة معترف بها من قبل وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي بكتابها المرقم
(ب 3059/4) والمؤرخ في (2014/ 4/7)



The just war and the lasting peace project in thought Immanuel Kant the politician

Dr. Ruqqaia said

AL-turath Univirsity

Introduction

The idea of peace is an old idea that the sages of ancient times turned to, and it was carried by the Stoics since the third century BC, when they recognized the necessity of fearing humanity and liberating itself from the differences between languages and religions. From the tenth century AD until the eighteenth century, Father (Dusan Bieber) laid in Europe a project to establish a permanent alliance between all nations, Christianity, and to guarantee to all contracting states the safety of their lands and their protection from any external aggression led by Islam. As for the thinker (Emmanuel Kant), the philosophers were the most interested in the idea of peace, and this book is the best evidence for declaring the establishment of peace between peoples and an alliance between peoples as well, and it is a way to eliminate wars and their woes that afflict countries, and (Kant) had announced in his book Assumptions about (Beginning of Human History), "The greatest evil that afflicts civilized peoples arises from war, not in the sense of the present or past war, but in the sense of perpetual preparation for the next war.

"And push back tyranny, because the tyrants themselves cannot dispense with the national wealth, which does not grow except in the shadow of peace and freedom. His book also on (Critique of the Queen of Judgment), phrases stating that war, as a formidable force of nature, while long-term peace generates with the spirit of profit and commerce, a kind of thick colloquial selfishness. And if the philosopher had published his book in (Critique of Pure Reason), (Critique of Practical Reason), (Critique of the Queen of Judgment), here he refers to the importance of human freedom and metaphysical ideas, on firm foundations, so there is a difference here between two tendencies, which are the mental trend and moral belief. It is natural for him to complete the political theory with this book, which is that man is civil by nature, and he is always a member of a society.

so this society should not be barbaric, but rather organize an organization that allows each individual to exercise his freedom and achieve his moral goal, and this effort is achieved in a goal that is freedom, At its core and principles, which includes legislation and regulation. Kant devoted some books to the theory of truth, including the book (Metaphysics of Arts), and defined truth as the sum of conditions that suit our freedom and the freedom of others, according to a comprehensive law of freedom. (Kant) believes that no matter how a nation emerges from the state of nomadism, the freedom of its citizens was not safe from every danger, and because the world is not one nation, but rather a group of nations, and it is difficult to imagine a single government that can rule the entire world, but it is clear that many Nations make such relationships and repeat them, but international treaties and charters did not represent only a temporary truce, and in order for the individual to achieve his ability to

establish a body of nations in order to document his abilities through it and also achieve his abilities through it, and
to have supervision over this legal community, which distinguishes civilized nations.
problem

This problem stems from the question: Does the permanent peace project, which is based on a set of clauses and which includes a set of peace agreements between countries, constitute a real framework for ending wars?

Hypothesis

The hypothesis of the research answers the question posed in the research problem, which is that the terms of the peace agreements had a role in ending wars or alleviating conflicts between countries.

Research importance

Given the increase in victims of wars and armed conflicts between countries, the permanent peace project had a great impact, which was put forward by the German thinker and philosopher Immanuel Kant, as many agreements had a major role in ending wars and armed conflicts.

Search objective

The research highlights the importance of wars and the progress that states enjoy from the use of weapons, and given the large number of conflicts, the research provides an analysis of the permanent peace project put forward by the thinker Kant.

The first topic: the mechanism of achieving peace

When (Kant) wrote about the permanent peace project, he formulated specific articles in which he laid out the necessary conditions that make the end of war possible. Here is a clear summary of the peace project:

1-A peace treaty is not considered a treaty if it involves the intention of its contracting parties to a matter that would provoke war again, because such a concealed intention makes the treaty a truce and nothing more. As for real peace, any possibility of war must be eliminated.

2-Any independent country, whether small or large, cannot be owned by other countries through inheritance, exchange, purchase or gift, because the state is considered a person who has the right to dispose of himself.

3-Permanent armies must be abolished over time, because they are a permanent threat to peace, in addition to that when we push the soldier to stop his life in order to kill others while targeting himself, we are here treating man as a machine and nothing else.

4-National loans should not be held for the external disputes of the state because these loans, in addition to conducting the war, lead to bankruptcy.

5-It is prohibited for every state to interfere by force in the system of another state in its government because this article is derived on the grounds of considering nations as persons who have their own sanctity and who alone have the right to dispose of their affairs.

6-No country in war with another is allowed to commit hostile acts such as killing, poisoning, violating the terms of surrender, and inciting treason that may, upon the return of peace and the lack of mutual trust between the two countries, because we must not forget that the purpose of war itself is to establish peace. on firmer and more stable foundations⁽¹⁾.

In fact, these are preliminary articles. As for the three final articles, they stipulate the positive conditions for peace, which are:



1- The civil constitution of every country must be a republican constitution, meaning that the legislative authority that decides war must be issued by the will of the people and the executive authority should be separated from it. He makes those who are subjected to the suffering of the evils of war the ones who are asked to report it, and because the absolute ruler may see war as a distraction to be distracted by, and leaves the task of finding reasonable reasons for its justification to the diplomatic corps, which represents a preparation for the mission.

2-The law of peoples must be based on the alliance between free states, and it must be recognized that civilized peoples who are still with their international relations in a state of barbarism and have been from war, are the only refuge. For a current war, it neither abolishes nor corrects a state of latent war in the souls, and the mind on his throne is the first source of every moral legislation, and he absolutely denies that war is a path to truth, and makes the state of peace, a direct duty, and the only way to comply with this duty is the uprooting of the disease From its roots and the replacement in all international relations of the state of nature, and because the nations themselves were founded on the basis of free contract between individuals, means their reunification within a peaceful alliance.

This alliance is considered peaceful and free at the same time. No country can be compelled to join this pact. Rather, it is sufficient to believe that one of the major countries has made an alliance with some of its neighbors, and soon every civilized country is called to benefit from the fruits of the system that guarantees its safety from every aggression. 3- The right of the foreign inmate in terms of international legislation and is limited to honoring his abode without a country having the right to interfere in the affairs of another country, and because it is the duty of every nation to protect its internal sovereignty, and because all that a foreigner asks for is when he arrives in a country that they do not treat him as an enemy, but This is not included in the category of countries with religious intolerance ⁽²⁾.

These are the conditions for peace set by (Kant) the philosopher, but the philosopher's task does not end there, but rather completes the procedure to implement the peaceful alliance on the ground, and here he mentions and says, "Nature itself offers positive guarantees. It can live together or not by itself on one area, and the difference of religions was one of the factors that emphasized this division, which seems to have turned into the union of nations into a monarchy at the expense of freedom, and pushed people to imitate republican systems, which are by their nature peaceful and led to exchanges business from its initial isolation and make it converge peacefully to search for common interests.

The philosopher believed that the future of humanity could be happier than its past, and our duty is to always submit to the matters of politics that are subject to moral law, and to listen to the voice of conscience and to the directives in nature and history that call us to do our best to achieve the higher purpose of the universe, as it calls us Until we believe that divine providence will complete that hoped-for coalition between virtue and happiness. The one who looks at Kant's moral philosophy does not see supplication because they know that Kantian philosophy is the furthest thing from German philosophies from nationalistic tendencies and fanaticism, because it is a human philosophy with the most beautiful and loftiest meanings of humanity⁽³⁾.

As (Kant) mentions here, as long as the owners of practical politics look at the owners of theoretical politics with arrogance and arrogance, and consider them wise, they do not pose any danger to the state whose principles must be derived from experience. His views shock the philosopher, so he does not denounce them and does not find in them a danger to the state, and

this is a precautionary condition by which the author tries to conceal from himself every misconception or misrepresentation. To achieve lasting peace between nations Article One: A peace treaty is not considered a treaty if the intention of the parties to it involves a matter likely to provoke war.

Such a treaty confirms (Kant) that it is nothing more than a truce or according to armament, not a peace that cuts off the enemy, and (Kant) described that a kind of this peace is a dubious stuffing and that a peace treaty must eliminate all causes of war in the future, even if those reasons were Unknown, at the time by contract, and if the secret involves a desire to seize the appropriate opportunity in the future to advance, with old allegations, and that one of the parties is keen to stipulate them, and anyone sacrifices that he is not strong in fighting and that the dignity of kings, as the ministers are elevated, should be lifted from him. Consider who wants to see it as it is.

Article Two: Any independent country, whether small or large, may not be owned by another country by way of inheritance, exchange, purchase or gift.

Here (Immanuel Kant) asserts that the state is not a commodity like a patch, but rather it is a human group that no one else is allowed to impose his authority on, and to dispose of its affairs, and that the state is like a tree trunk that has its own origins, as if it were a plant, meaning that intervention strips it of its moral character. And no one is ignorant of the extent of the dangers that Europe has been exposed to because of the illusion of beating and possession. Article Three: The armies must be permanently abolished over time ⁽⁴⁾.

And because these armies, according to Kant, seem to be always ready for war and ready for it at all times, and they are considered a threat to other countries, as motivated by that race in armament, an increase that does not stop at their limit, and since the expenditures that are allocated for that would otherwise make the matter Peace is more severe From the short war, the armies become more aggressive, and the intention is to relieve those burdens, and (Kant) adds to that is hiring soldiers to fight or kill in the sense that their transactions are done according to a mechanical machine, which is inconsistent with human rights, and this is not the case for For military exercises, which volunteer citizens carry out to ensure their safety and the safety of their homeland, from the external enemy. As for what some countries deliberately hoarding of money, it may have a great effect on mobilizing permanent armies, because it may push countries that see a threat to war to initiate preventive aggression. Assessment of its danger could be used as an instrument of war ⁽⁵⁾.

Article Four: National loans should not be held for the sake of the state's external disputes. Where, in order to achieve the interest of the national economy, the state resorts to requesting aid from abroad or from within, to improve roads or store crops, then this means of acquiring money is an unquestionable and unquestionable means. However, the system of dealing is based on contracting loans to an extent that does not stop, even if they are surrounded by guarantees. This system, in Kant's opinion, is a modern innovation, as a pretext for the intervention of some countries, in the affairs of others, it is a dangerous financial power, and a treasure for igniting war It exceeds the total of what other countries own, and there is no way to exhaust it, except with an expected deficit of taxes.

(Kant) attributes to this ease in igniting war, along with the inclination of the rulers to human instinct, which in his opinion is considered an obstacle without solutions to peace, and the obstacle should be removed and a preparatory material for permanent peace should be placed,

especially since the bankruptcy of the state, in his opinion, changes the fate of the state itself, and therefore the alliance here It is a must for every country. Article Five: No state may interfere by force in the system of another state or in the way it is governed. (Kant) raises a question about how to intervene here and what are the justifications for the intervention?

Perhaps here the intervention and its justifications are attributed to the disadvantages of the state, in front of the nationals of another state, but these disadvantages may benefit the other state, or you may consider it a warning to it, provided that the bad example given by a person who is free to act for another person, is not blasphemy for that person. And the opposite may happen, as if internal disputes occurred in a state, and led to its division into two parts, each of them representing a special state for itself, claiming its right to sovereignty over all, then giving aid to one of them, from a foreign state, is not considered an interference from this In that system, due to the discord and chaos between them, he (Kant) here provides a justification for both states, and unless he finds a solution to this kind of internal conflict, the interference of foreign states in the affairs of the people only combats corruption.

Its internal affairs, without being directed by another people, would be an infringement on the rights of the people themselves, and a destabilization of the independence of the states themselves ⁽⁶⁾.

Article Six: No country at war with another has the right to allow that country to engage in hostile acts such as assassination, poisoning, violating the terms of surrender and inciting treason, which, upon the return of peace, would lead to a loss of trust between the two countries. In Kant's opinion, these are considered reprehensible. Even during war, some confidence in the enemy's feelings must be maintained, otherwise it is impossible to agree between the two parties, on any peace, and the fighting turns and becomes a war of extermination and annihilation, although war in Kant's opinion is considered A person is forced to take his right by force, while he is in the stage of instinct, as there are no courts to decide matters by force of law, and in this stage (Kant) stresses that neither of the parties is said to be unjust because such a description presupposes the issuance of a judicial ruling before, but rather the result In the battle, it is considered the decisive factor, in the matter, but also the decisive factor in the ruling, and it also decides on which side the right is found, even if it is a disciplinary war, and between states is far from imaginable. For both of them, and to the elimination of every legitimate right, do not leave permanent peace a place and stability.

Such war must be prohibited and the means leading to it must be prohibited, and the means that I mentioned above are in themselves reprehensible if we resort to it once, and it does not end with the end of the war, but rather by passing it to peace, eliminating the intention, such as the use of spies, which is a means used to exploit the mediocrity of the enemy. With the aforementioned laws, they are considered from the point of view of prohibited laws, but there are no more than that there are peremptory laws, and they are effective immediately after their issuance without regard to the circumstances and to nullify what is taken from the direct nullification procedure, as in Articles (1,5,6) and laws such as Article (2,3,4), are considered flexible and broad laws without departing from the rule of the legitimate right, meaning that their implementation is subject to circumstances, subject to postponement, with the purpose remaining, and provided that the implementation date does not extend to an indefinite period, however, the postponement of the date for the return of freedom Which was usurped from several peoples, postponed indefinitely, such as what happened with the Emperor (Augustus),

while he was making promises that did not come at the time to fulfill them, and the matter is permissible only in returning freedom, but in postponing its response, and the prohibition here is intended, how to acquire that must be excluded In the future, it is absolutely not related to the state of possession, and is considered permissible by all countries, according to public opinion⁽⁷⁾.

The second topic: to achieve lasting peace between countries The state of peace between people living side by side is not an innate state, as the innate state at least represents a state of war, which is if it is a state of permanent and declared war, but at least it involves a constant threat of aggression. Cessation of war is not a guarantee of peace if there is no guarantee, which is to be under a legal status, because it is permissible to treat the neighbor as the enemy.

“The city constitution in every state shall be a republican constitution.” In the sense that the only constitution derived from the idea of the social contract on which every legal legislation for a people must be based is the republican constitution, because it is based on the principle of freedom, which members of the group embrace as individuals, and on the principles of subordination of all to one common legislation, as they are Addressed by this legislation, it also implies equality, between those addressed as citizens, and therefore it is the constitution in itself in terms of right is the original, upon which all kinds of constitutions in the city are built, and here (Kant) wonders if the constitution alone can achieve lasting peace ? ⁽⁸⁾.

The republican constitution, in addition to the purity of its source, in that it is based on the pure source, from which the idea of truth stems, has the advantage of showing us on the far horizon a result that we aspire to, which is lasting peace. How? And because if the decision that war should occur, or not, can only be taken with the consent of the citizens, which is an inevitable matter in the republican constitution, because it is natural that as long as they are required to condemn themselves to the suffering of the evils and disasters of war, they are forced to hesitate or think long The matter is before they embark on a dangerous game like this, as they must engage themselves in the midst of war, share their money in its expenses, and bother to rebuild what he created behind it.

Never, because wars are constantly renewed, while the constitution in which the citizen is not, and therefore it is a non-republican constitution, the decision to war in it is less thoughtful and contemplated, because the guardian is not a member of the state, but is its owner, and because he fears that war will affect In his material, sniping, or in a role of fun, and here he can decide the war, which are the reasons as if it were a trip for fun, and he does not care to leave the task of justifying it to the diplomats because they are always ready for that (war) ⁽⁹⁾.

In order to avoid confusing the republican constitution with the democratic constitution, we must specify several points, which are: the state system can be divided, either according to the difference of persons who hold the supreme power, or according to the way in which the ruler is in the rule of the people, whoever this ruler is, and the first system, It is precisely called the Regulator of Sovereignty, and it is divided into three types, which are either to assume power The supreme is one person, or many in solidarity, or all citizens, meaning (autocratic, aristocratic, democratic, the authority of the prince, the authority of the nobility, the authority of the people). As for the other system, which is related to the way the government uses its absolute power, it is based on the constitution derived from the general will, which makes all of the people a people.

The principle of separation between the legislative and executive powers, and the authoritarian rule, in which the President of the Republic assumes the rule of his own free will, and the legislation of laws that he legislated himself, and it expresses a rule in which the private will takes the place of the general will (the will of the people), and democracy is among the forms presented He mentioned it, and it is the authoritarianism that establishes an executive authority whereby everyone expresses their opinion about one person, and even against one person, because he differs with them in opinion, here the will of everyone, representing the will of everyone, is not really true, and this makes the general will, in contradiction with itself and with freedom ⁽¹⁰⁾.

In fact, any form of judgment, which is not representative, is not a picture of the exact meaning, because one person cannot be a legislator and implementer of his will at the same time, just as it is not permissible to include in the logical analogy that the universality is in the major premise at the same time. The inclusion of the partial under the totality in the minor introduction, and if the other two political images are always defective that they pave the way to this kind, that they can nevertheless accept a form of government in conformity with the spirit of the system in which the representation of the nation was achieved, as it was (Frederic II) He declares that he is nothing but a servant of the state, while democracy makes this impossible because everyone in it wants to be a master.

Here we can say that the greater the number of persons who are in control of political power, the greater their representation, the closer the political system is to the republican system, and there is a tendency to rise to it with many reforms. This is the reason for the arrival of the legislative system.

Monarchy, as for democracy, it is not attained except through revolution, but there is no doubt that the way of governance for the people is much more important than the formal state system, even if the disparity in this system is consistent with the purpose, and for the system of government to be consistent with the idea of right, it must be representative Because this system is the only one that can establish a government under it, a republic, and without it, no government, whatever its constitution, is an arbitrary, tyrannical government, and the security of a republic from the old republics, which allegedly knew this correct republican system, and therefore it was inevitably to end to tyrannical rule, even if tyranny is easier when the tyrant is one person ⁽¹¹⁾.

Final Article Three (to achieve lasting peace): "The right to download a foreigner in terms of international legislation is limited to honoring his abode." Here (Kant) stresses that honoring the abode of a foreigner means the right of every foreigner not to be treated as an enemy from the country from which he came as long as he is peaceful. Because this requires special agreements that allow him to receive hospitality. Rather, his right is limited to the right of visitation, which is the right of every human being, to make himself a member of society by virtue of his participation in the ownership of the surface of the land on which we live. The land has spread without limit, and it was necessary for them to meet with each other, as it includes a number of different countries, and does not merge into one specific state. If we look at what the savages show their attachment to freedom that is not regulated by law, which is about fighting a constant fight, and their preference for that clumsy freedom over rational freedom, and if this is considered barbarism, a lack of civility, and degeneration of the human

being, then what is the moral of the civilized peoples that each constitute an organized state that Do you want to get out of such a miserable situation? ⁽¹²⁾.

But the reality is different. Every state makes the criteria for its greatness and decreasing the description of the people as greatness, in not submitting to any external legal obligation, the guardian or the ruler, sees his glory and pride in the ability to act in the afterlife of people and leads them to sacrifice themselves without fear for himself.

Dangerous defense of an issue that has nothing to do with them. All the difference between the savages of America and the savages of Europe is that they have already devoured many herds of their enemies, while these know how to exploit their defeated enemies and prefer to benefit from them in order to increase their followers and multiply the necessary tools for conquests of a wider and far-reaching extent. In fact, when we think about the meanness of human nature in the free relations between peoples, while in the case of civility it is obscured by the intervention of the government, we find what leads us to the fact that the word of truth has not been completely excluded from the politics of war, and that there has not yet been a country that has the courage to profess this doctrine. The custom has been until today that politicians refer to jurists such as (Hugo, Grotius), as justification for declaring war, and because their jurisprudence is dyed with a philosophical and diplomatic color that could not win the slightest strength. legitimacy, and because states are not subject to collective external coercion, although we have not witnessed that any state decided to enter according to its claims, convinced of the arguments of intervention ⁽¹³⁾.

But all the ways of honor and honor that any state performs, even with words, is not devoid of evidence that in man there is a moral aptitude, which remains strong despite the apathy that he is experiencing in this time, which motivates him to overcome the principle of evil inherent in himself, and he cannot deny it even if it was not Likewise, the states that seek war have not been able to utter the word of truth, and truth is considered a privilege and a gift of nature to the forces by which the weak are defeated, to obey it.

It is not in the power of states, if they want to defend their right, to resort to litigation as people do before the courts, but their path is to war. It is always possible to assume a new argument for it that no one can call it unfair, as long as each one, in that case, is the judge in his case. On the other hand, the international law regulating relations between individuals who live not bound by law differs in that it obliges them to get out of that situation. Because states possess a legislative constitution, which makes them free from all compulsion, imposed on them by other states, which they want to submit to them, according to their views, about the right to a legitimate constitution, the widest scope, but reason is considered the highest source of all legislation, moral, which absolutely condemns the adoption War is a way to truth and makes peace a state of direct duty, and since it is impossible to establish this state without the peoples' charter, it was necessary to conclude an alliance of a special nature that we might call, (the peace pact), which differs from the peace treaty, because it would eliminate Forever about eternal wars, while a peace treaty is an end to war and one.

The purpose of this alliance will not be to gain power in favor of a state, but rather its aim is to preserve a guarantee of its freedom and the freedom of other allied states without the need to submit to general laws or to mutual coercion. it should extend, little by little, to all the nations, and bring them to lasting peace, and for if the fortune of a strong and enlightened people is to be organized into a republic, a government whose nature tends to permanent peace, this



republic will be the center of a federated alliance, as other nations can, To join it is a guarantee of its freedom in accordance with the idea of international law, and the scope of this alliance will expand day by day thanks to the willingness of countries to join it.

And if a people had said that there should not be a war between us because we want to make ourselves a state, that is, to install on us a legislative, executive and judicial authority that seeks peace in settling our disputes, this would have been an understandable saying, or if the people said that there should not be a war between me and other countries, and that I would not admit that a legislative authority guarantees my rights to me as I guarantee them hers, so it is not understood on the basis that I want to establish reassurance about my right, if not, on the basis of the federal system, which is considered a social and civil pact that the mind must give to The idea of international law. The idea of the right of peoples, if it was intended by the right of war, would have no meaning at all, if it was meant by the right to decide what is just, and not according to an external law, comprehensive and restricting the freedom of each individual according to special rules, i.e. the use of force and violence.

In the eyes of reason, states, in terms of their mutual appearance, have no way to get out of the state of war, which is imprisoned in it by the absence of laws, unless they give up, like individuals, their unbridled freedom, and submit to the compulsion of general laws, thus forming a league of nations, which is constantly growing to include Another is the matter of the peoples of the earth, all of them, but people's perception, the people's throat prevents them from taking this path, so they deny what is true, even if the republican situation is not comprehensive and affordable, but the negative annex of the alliance is permanent and its area is always expanding, and that it can distract people from the path of war, and curb Those passions that are contrary to humanity, but will always be a source of fears that the bonds of those fears are broken ⁽¹⁴⁾.

Final Article Two: "The law of the peoples should be based on a federation among free states." When peoples become states, like individuals in a state of instinct, they attack each other by virtue of their neighbourhood, and each people, in order to guarantee its security and safety, must ask the other to participate in a civil system similar to the constitution and see in it a guarantee of all his rights, which is the system of the alliance of peoples. , but it will not be for every single state, because if this was done, the idea would involve a contradiction, as every state assumes the existence of a relationship between a ruler and the ruled. In their relations, because the original is that the land is common between them and not to anyone, and the uninhabited areas of the land have been divided as property, shared.

But if the right to land in a foreign land does not go beyond the conditions that facilitate the attempt to establish commercial relations with the people, and in this way three continents can be linked, with friendly relations, and it ends with organizing a general legal organization, and it is intended that the human race will approach with the universal, universal legislation ⁽¹⁵⁾.

And if we look at the European countries that take the dishonorable way, and the trading countries in particular, we will be terrified of the horror of the injustices committed by those countries in their visit to foreign peoples, and those who discovered the American countries, and the countries of the Negroes, they considered them a country without owners, because they did not value it, and when the Europeans entered The countries of India called for the rise of foreign forces under the pretext of establishing commercial offices, so with these forces they tightened the noose on the citizens, and set the fires of war between the different countries in

that vast area, and spread hunger, rebellion, treachery, and so on. By approaching its borders, without entering it and the second by approaching, but the one European Dutch people prevented them from mixing with the citizens, so they lived in their country as if they were prisoners, and what is worse is that the Europeans did not benefit from anything from these oppressive methods, and that all the commercial companies that are about to collapse and that the sugar islands do not return as a resource It is real and is only useful in a direct way, and it aims at new, benign purposes, and aims to encourage European wars, and it performs this service, and it is countries that pretend to be religious. Powers and want to consider them as distinguished countries that preserve the good Sunnah. As for the delusions held between peoples, the entire earth is in disparity in its power, and it has reached such an extent that the sanctity of the right is being insulted from the place of the earth, and it reverberates everywhere, and the idea of universal legislation is no longer an imaginary image of the truth. Rather, it is necessary for that written law that includes international law, civil law and the law of peoples, which must rise to the rank of the general law of humanity as a whole, and then to a permanent peace in which we can not aspire to continue to approach it except by that one condition ⁽¹⁶⁾.

Annex I: On Ensuring Lasting Peace The one who gives us the guarantee of this peace is nothing less than the great artist whose name is Nature, for her automatic being stream says openly that her goal is to simplify the people, and despite them the wing of harmony and harmony.

And the name of care, given that what is manifested in it is a goal that controls the course of things, and considering that goal is a deep wisdom, emanating from a sublime cause, managing things, to achieve the ultimate goal of the human race. Nature, just as we cannot extract from it, but, it is necessary, we must suppose, its existence by thought, whenever we want to return the image, things to their ends, in order to have an idea of their possibility, by analogy with the making of human art. But if the idea of their relations And its relevance to the purpose that reason directly imposes on us (the moral end), is a transcendent idea in theory. In practical terms, in terms of the idea of permanent peace, to which direction is required the mechanics of nature, it has a belief basis that confirms its existence as a real existence, and the word nature, When it is a way of pure consideration, not a way Religion, as it is, is more appropriate to the limits of the non-human reason, which, in terms of the relation of effects to their cause, must be confined to the limits of possible experience. his purposes, and we must, before all that guarantee a more precise statement, have a look at the conditions which Nature has prepared for the people who are disturbed on her wide stage, those conditions which finally make the guarantee of peace necessary, and we must then see in what manner Nature has ensured This guarantee ⁽¹⁷⁾.

Its temporary measures are limited to:

1. It made it easier for people to live in all regions of the earth.
2. It made them, by means of war, spread throughout every part of the earth to inhabit it.
3. It also forced them, through the war, to conclude legal and illegal relations. We also find that the nature that created these resources from animals and benefiting from their meat and benefiting from their wood, without which its people would not have been able to manufacture their boats and weapons, and not to build huts in which to live, and occupied themselves with fighting animals and making them incline to peace among themselves.



And nature, when it has made it easy for people to live everywhere on earth, has tyrannically wanted this life to be a necessity to which they are subject even if they are unwilling, without the idea of the duty that obligates them in the name of moral law entered into this necessity and war is the means that nature has taken to achieve this purpose, and in fact we are We see peoples who show us the unity of their language and the unity of their upbringing, and the idea that leads us to the essence is that nature achieves permanent peace, and it brings man to a goal that his mind dictates to him, and thus in order to support his moral goal, and to consider any kind of guarantees that nature offers, to ensure that he implements what was required of him. Man is his performance, but according to the laws of his freedom, although this freedom is obligatory by nature, which deals with the three aspects of public law, namely (civil law - peoples law - universal law) ⁽¹⁸⁾.

It can be said that nature imposes on every people who meets a neighbor who narrows it down, which makes him organize himself in a specific state to have a power that is greater than it can resist. Angels, and that people, with their inclinations to selfishness, are unable to reach this lofty order. As for the interpretation of nature, it expresses a general will, and from here it suffices to establish the state, which is based on the destruction of humanity, limiting the effects of hatred for each other so that the result is satisfactory to the mind. And every person becomes compelled to be righteous if he does not hear the voice of the law based on good morals, and the problem here is that a large, sane group demands the guarantee of the law on the one hand, and on the other hand it disavows the law or escapes from it.

To raise such a problem is not difficult, because on the one hand, the mechanism of nature is what reconciles the differences between citizens through the application of the law. themselves, here (Kant) emphasis on the constitution rather than on the law on the grounds that the constitution is the primary instrument of organization in the state ⁽¹⁹⁾.

In fact, the idea of peoples' law requires separation between many neighboring countries, and in this case the state of war, if the federal alliance does not prevent the occurrence of aggression, then in the eyes of reason it is better than joining those countries under the banner of one state, meaning the more the territory expands, the weaker the strength of the laws. And that tyrannical rule does not end, but there is no state or ruler and does not desire permanent peace, but nature does not want that based on the difference of peoples, languages and religions, and this difference is rooted and a source of pretexts for war, but it may lead to the prosperity of civilization and an increase in convergence in principles through reconciliation and peace And since money is the most powerful means that the state possesses, the state has seen itself compelled to make efforts to carry out an action based on peace.

Secret Material for Peace: Establishing a secret article for peace is something that contradicts the content of that article itself, objectively, but from a subjective point of view, it is necessary that the article and the provisions of philosophy regarding the terms of permanent peace be taken into consideration by the countries preparing for war, and it may seem a waste of the legislative authority, which is attributed to it.

The greatest measure of wisdom is to ask its nationals to guide it to the principles of its behavior towards other countries. States secretly call on their nationals to conceal their intention to announce their opinion through freedom of expression and opinion, and there is no need here for a special agreement between countries, because that is included before in the Obligation, which is derived from the universal intellect, and we do not mean here that the state prefers the



principles of philosophy, but rather it must listen to the views of philosophers first of all, and because (Kant) sees that the man of law above all is the balance of the state and sees the necessity of carrying the sword in accordance with the requirements. On the other hand, he sees that philosophy may propose a peaceful solution first and foremost to avoid entering into war, and because laws may need reform or modification, here resorting to philosophy is considered the ideal solution in Kant's opinion, and it is described that philosophy is the servant of theology, and there is no hope that Kings become philosophers, not philosophers Kings are as much as there is a corrupt ruler who corrupts the authority itself, and here it is necessary to resort to the rule of reason, and because civilized peoples do not accept that the class of philosophers should be on the level of permanent silence, but rather let them have the freedom to speak and express their opinions, because here is an important matter because it is a guide for humanity to behave. The correct way, however, is that philosophers are unable to mobilize large crowds to rise up against the tyrannical ruler, so we cannot deprive them of the suspicion of propaganda⁽²⁰⁾.

Conclusion:

The idea that there is an agreement between ethics and politics, or the disagreement between the two issues, is primarily due to the science of work. Because this word includes absolute laws that we must act according to, and we claim that we cannot perform what is obligatory, because if it were so, it would be necessary to erase the idea of morals and the field takes a turn around the states because whoever had authority cannot afford the people to dictate laws to him that connects the state with them. Until the matter is that she refuses to submit to the law that is imposed on her from outside, she does not submit to the rulings of other countries about the way she should take, and it is certain that if there is no freedom and no moral law based on it, and if everything that results from the mechanism of pure nature, then politics is art. Using this mechanism to control people, which is all practical wisdom, and the idea of truth is a word devoid of meaning.

If there is a duty to be added to a reasonable hope regarding the application of the law and its authority, but by proceeding in a steady progress to infinity, then a permanent peace which must be replaced by what they have mistakenly called peace treaties, and that it is better to be called truces, and not a hollow idea, but rather a problem if its solution is addressed little by little. Its approach has increased its purpose, for it is appropriate for us to hope that such progress will be achieved in a shorter and shorter period of time.

margins

(1) Immanuel Kant, A Project for Permanent Peace, translated by Othman Amin, Cairo, Egyptian General Book Organization, 2006, pp. 7-8.

(2) Immanuel Kant, A Project for Lasting Peace, a previously mentioned source, pp.9-10.

(3) The previous source, p.11.

(4) Ali Al-Marhej, The Concept of Perpetual Peace in Kant's Philosophy, Al-Sabah newspaper, website- <http://alsabah.iq>

(5) Analysis of Immanuel Kant's text for lasting peace (Philosophy and Values), Philosophy Club website, website- <http://www.philoclub.net>

(6) Gore Vidal, Perpetual War for Lasting Peace: How We Got So Hated, Website- <http://kutib-lilajhiza.info>.

(7) Immanuel Kant, A Project for Permanent Peace, a previously mentioned source, pp. 33-34.

(8) Immanuel Kant, A Project for Permanent Peace, a previously mentioned source, pp. 41-42.



- (9) The previous source, p. 43.
- (10) Zuhair AlKhuilidi, For Permanent Peace- Imperial Kant, website - <http://www.worldfculture2020.com>
- (11) previous source.
- (12) mary ghazal/the concept of peace from kant/ <http://www.syr-res.com>.
- (13) the previous source.
- (14) Zuhair al-Khuwailidi, Theory and Practice of Immanuel Kant, Civil Dialogue, p/6710, 2020, link - www.ahewar.org/debat/show.art.asp?aid=696144
- (15) Khaled Hindawi, Kant's Project for Perpetual Peace - Philosophy and Archeology, Hewar website, link - www.alhiwartoday.net/node/9838
- (16) Michel Foucault, Surveiller et punir, Gallimard, Paris, 1976, p30-31.
- (17) Muhsin al-Muhammadi, Kant and his ideal model for the establishment of a universal moral community, Middle East website, website-aawsat.com/home/article/588341/%D8%A7%D{6%D8%B7-D9% 88%Dadobe6%
- (18) Anwar Muhammad Faraj, A Critical Evaluation of Kant's Permanent Peace Project within the general framework of his philosophy, published research, College of Law and Politics, University of Sulaymaniyah, 2022, The electronic link - www.researchgate.net/publication/325171409_tqym_nqdy_lmshrw_alislam_aldaym_lkant_dm
- (19) Khalil Naji, Kant and the cause of lasting peace, blogs, Al-Jazeera website, website- www.aljazeera.net/blogs/2017/11/19/%D{3%D8%A7%D{6%D8%B7%D pictures @2%D8
- (20) Wael Sabra, Towards a project for global scientific peace, website- mashroo3na.com/%D8%A5%D8%B5%D8%AF%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%AA/%D9%85%Dabli