

INTRODUCTION

This book is about perpetual peace, but its subject matter is, in its tendency, comparable to those earlier essays that reflected on durable, everlasting or indeed eternal peace. In all these instances the issue was, and still is, reflections on the conditions in which peace is possible and also on the probability of these peace programmes being realised at any given time.

If explicit reference is made in the subsequent text to peace *on earth*, or perpetual peace, then this is not because the concept of eternal peace has been repeatedly and prominently addressed in the discussion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, notably of course in Immanuel Kant's essay, the philosophical peak of this discussion, and which indicated a downright endless history of successor discussions. Besides, the change in conceptual content is not based on the fact that talk about eternal peace might again give rise to the obvious and still frequently encountered misunderstanding that the relevant essays necessarily refer to utopian ideas, or to the creation of chimeras, or that they treat of a totally different, i.e. a transcendent, world.¹ These misunderstandings are already refuted by the early peace drafts, which endeavoured to present a contemporary peace concept, realisable in the given circumstances, in a realistic manner.² However, it is quite possible that the fixation of theoretical and practical discussion upon Kant's essay and its discourse supported such an erroneous perception. The specific concepts of the original German title of the present book, *Zum irdischen Frieden*, therefore signal nothing other than that its subject is peace under the conditions of the twenty-first century.

In consequence, this book contains no discussion of the early debate mentioned,³ and no further contribution to Kant studies, which, seeing that Kant has by now been reinterpreted infinitely often and certainly with new insights, are of gradually diminishing marginal utility today.⁴ Nor will there be a recapitulation of the history of peace ideas inside and outside Europe,⁵ let alone, as one would have to formulate today within the scientific community, a 'reconstruction' with a view to specific topical requirements. All such enterprises with regard to the history of ideas have been made repeatedly and in many places, and there is therefore no urgent need to continue them now.

Why then yet another discussion about peace, whose problems and dimensions must surely have been discussed in a vast amount of literature?⁶ My motivation for publishing this book was as follows. In many more recent essays on peace this is treated either in abstract general terms and more or less non-empirically, as it were in terms of a category (thus mainly in many contributions to political philosophy); or else it is (mostly without methodical reflection) presented as a sector, in regional terms (thus mainly in social science contributions) with the result, in the latter case, that the non-thematical partial worlds and the world as a whole rarely find themselves at the focus of analysis. However, the problems of peace present themselves not on an abstract general plane, but in specific concrete contexts; with the world as a whole, that favourite (abstract) point of reference of philosophical reflection, being just one of these. The peace-philosophy discussion in most cases lacks not only concreteness but also the mediation of the overall perspective, in each specific instance, of the partial worlds actually present in the world.⁷ On the other hand, sector-type analyses of partial worlds, however persuasively presented by social science (e.g. on the security dilemma inherent in Indian–Pakistani relations, on integration efforts in South America and elsewhere etc.) are incapable of offering a realistic overall picture.⁸

What, strangely enough, remains disregarded is the fact, elementary for an analysis of present-day peace problems, that today's world is, in its dimensions, an extremely stratified structure abounding in rifts, gradients and the asymmetries resulting from these: in an economic, social, cultural and political respect the really existing world is a downright quintessence of structural heterogeneity.⁹ Concepts that, because of their abstract nature or as a result of their insensitivity towards structurally different action contexts, simply, blind to experience, presuppose worldwide parallels, in other words a kind of homogeneity of the world, and therefore evade a fact-based contextualisation of arguments, cannot claim to be truly contemporary. Yet the simultaneity of unequal development in a persistently disjointed world renders factual categorical differentiation inevitable, even though it is lacking in most peace discourses or else smoothed out on a kind of Platonic model.¹⁰

Hence a contemporary essay on perpetual peace cannot in its analysis concentrate only on the security dilemma resulting from the so-called 'anarchy of the world of states'. Instead, this dilemma should itself be thematised in connection with a structural development dilemma that has meanwhile become a worldwide problem, since the concrete manifestation of the security dilemma depends largely on the development-conditioned situation of individual states within a markedly hierarchical world society. The constant talk, within the peace discourse, of the growing interdependence in the present world similarly lacks analytical persuasiveness, unless the widely differing interdependences existing in reality, along with their peace-policy implications, are analysed with regard

to their specific profiles. Besides, it is only on this basis that the question of the ‘interdependence of interdependences’ (Willy Brandt) arises. And a category with worldwide reference, such as ‘globalisation’, can be used meaningfully and make sense only if very disparate but simultaneously observable experiences are considered in the conceptualisation of globalisation: for example a relatively unproblematic globalisation that is enriching in economic, social and cultural respects (World I: ‘Globalisation de luxe’); differently, a globalisation that, in a few parts of the world, actually opens up an upward movement or upgrading within the hierarchy of an international division of labour (World II); next, a globalisation that, in major parts of the world, clearly accentuates an anyway existing, mostly politically virulent, developmental crisis and moreover provokes system-motivated and power-politically motivated struggles (World III); and finally: a globalisation that, in the world’s chronic problem zones, definable by failing or even failed states and violence markets, lets a political, socio-economic and cultural regression turn virulent over a wide area (World IV). Any contemporary peace discourse has to address such realities, quoted here by way of examples, and thus reveal the complexity of the really existing world and its partial worlds even in statements intended to generalise.¹¹

On Perpetual Peace is designed to offer those realisations, insights and assumptions, and especially knowable worldly-wise knowledge, that are important for a contemporary differentiated understanding of the present and near-future worldwide peace problems. The informative intention of the present book – if not in its title or contents, then certainly in its motivation and presentation – follows the classic Kantian model: In the preliminary reflections (Chapter 1) a non-peace-conducive action slogan (‘si vis pacem, para bellum’) is very briefly criticised and the ‘para pacem’ slogan is presented in outline. In the subsequent voluminous second section (Chapter 2) the strategic defining conditions for peace – the so-called ‘civilisatory hexagon’ – are briefly developed. The question is: Through what and how does peace constitute itself under the complex conditions of our present? This is followed by a third section (Chapter 3) with the paradigm-like pointed discussion of the no less important, though strangely enough scarcely ever asked, question: Through what and how does peace-policy reason, i.e. a reason promoting peace, constitute itself? A fourth section (Chapter 4) discusses critiques of previously published expositions on the civilisatory hexagon. These four sections (Part I of the book) gather together the core statements on perpetual peace.

In a second part of the book the Supplements further develop specific aspects of the definitions and corresponding experiences. The First Supplement (Chapter 5) presents four sets of peace programmes arrived at on an empirical basis: i.e. complex peace-policy programmes proving that

peace-theory and peace-policy discussion requires not a reduction of analytical complexity but its increase. The *Second Supplement* (Chapter 6) thoroughly analyses historical experience of the creation of a zone of stable peace and the opportunity of extending it.

The contributions in the Appendices of the book (Part III) elucidate fundamental structural states of affairs whose knowledge is indispensable for an understanding of the peace-policy problems in today's world and for an appropriate set of peace programmes. Here conceptual differentiations are developed, such as are not only suggested but positively demanded by a complex analysis of reality, i.e. the present-day situation of the world. These differentiations concern the dilemmas (Chapter 7) built into the structure of the present-day world, the diverse experiences with interdependence (Chapter 8), especially, with a view to development problems, those that, contrary to common assumption, are worldwide (Chapter 9). The differentiations moreover concern the globalisation discourse, which, in its customary form, is today especially characterised by a lacking sense of structurally disparate action contexts. This discourse is elucidated by examples taking particular account of the problems of cultural globalisation (Chapter 10).

These four chapters of Part III will also render plausible the methodological premise of this book, which is the result of factual insight and not simply of some arbitrary approach – more precisely the result of a way of arguing in which disparately located action context are seen in a differentiated, i.e. a context-sensitive, way. The consequence of this is that, on such a basis of reality-saturated experience, the politically motivated peace discourse is similarly exposed to an appropriate cue to move towards argumentative differentiation, without such analytical or practice-oriented argumentation losing the synoptic view of the complex, yet structured set of peace-policy problems in which the world finds itself. As the modern, and more especially today's, world is increasingly a unit of structural weight of its own, albeit a staggered unit of non-homogeneous, though interrelated, parts, an appropriate assessment of the situation can anyway only be achieved in so far as a synoptic analysis of the world's overall structure and its structurally diverse 'partial worlds' is accomplished.¹²

One final observation at the beginning: the title of this book is no swindle with labels. The book deals with *peace*, hence not with violence or war. Research into the courses of violence and war is important and its essential findings do, of course, whenever necessary, flow into this book.¹³ Such research, however, remains inadequate while the core question of causes-of-peace research calls for an answer – i.e. what are the restrictive and promoting conditions and premises necessary for the 'architecture' of a durable and stable peace, one that is a peace that is marked by

sustainability. The fact that bridges are generally possible between one and another focus of research, and hence also intellectual attention, is documented in this book, as well as the fact (notably in Chapter 3) that in the peace discourse there are meaningful conceptual bridges between diverse levels of the peace problem – the macro, meso and micro levels.

Notes

1. See Wolfgang Burgdorf, 'Chimäre Europa'. *Antieuropäische Diskurse in Deutschland (1648–1999)*, Bochum 1999.
2. See the list of peace plans since the Renaissance in Kurt von Raumer (ed.), *Ewiger Friede*, Munich 1953; Hans-Jürgen Schlochauer (ed.), *Die Idee des ewigen Friedens*, Bonn 1953; John Sylvester Hemleben, *Plans for World Peace through Six Centuries*, Chicago 1953; Jacob ter Meulen, *Der Gedanke der Internationalen Organisation in seiner Entwicklung*, vols. 1–3, The Hague 1917–40. Evidence that the peace drafts did not emerge aloof from political reality is provided by Thomas Fröschl (ed.), *Föderationsmodelle und Unionsstrukturen. Über Staatenverbindungen der frühen Neuzeit vom 15. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1995. Without trying to be really topical, this volume exhibits an almost day-to-day topicality if one compares the early discourses with those that took place in the so-called constitutional convention of the European Union (2002/3).
3. See a detailed documentation, along with evaluation, in Anita and Walter Dietze (eds), *Ewiger Friede? Dokumente einer deutschen Diskussion um 1800*, Munich 1989.
4. On the more recent reception of Kant's essay *On Eternal Peace*, mostly in connection with the bicentenary of that publication and a consequential discussion, see Otfried Höffe (ed.), *Immanuel Kant. Zum Ewigen Frieden*, Berlin 1995 (with an extensive bibliography also of the earlier literature on Kant's essay); Matthias Lutz-Bachmann and James Bohman (eds.): *Frieden durch Recht. Kants Friedensidee und das Problem einer neuen Weltordnung*, Frankfurt/M. 1996; Reinhard Merkel and Roland Wittmann (eds), 'Zum Ewigen Frieden'. *Grundlagen, Aktualität und Aussichten einer Idee von Immanuel Kant*, Frankfurt/M. 1996; Matthias Lutz-Bachmann and James Bohman (eds), *Weltstaat oder Staatenwelt? Für und wider die Idee einer Weltrepublik*, Frankfurt/M. 2002; Comprehensive interpretations of Kant's essay in the context of his philosophy were offered by Wolfgang Kersting, *Wohlgeordnete Freiheit. Immanuel Kants Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*, Frankfurt/M. 1993, 2nd edn.; Volker Gerhardt, *Immanuel Kants Entwurf 'Zum Ewigen Frieden'. Eine Theorie der Politik*, Darmstadt 1995; Otfried Höffe, *Königliche Völker. Zu Kants kosmopolitischer Rechts- und Friedentheorie*, Frankfurt/M. 2001.
5. See the brilliant survey by Wilhelm Janssen, 'Friede. Zur Geschichte einer Idee in Europa' in: Dieter Senghaas (ed.), *Den Frieden denken*, Frankfurt/M. 1995, pp. 227–275, as well as Michael W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace*, New York 1997.
6. An extensive selected bibliography on the basic literature alone will be found in Senghaas, *Den Frieden denken*, pp. 490–503.
7. This does not have to be the case, as superbly proved by the volume of Christine Chwaszcza and Wolfgang Kersting (eds), *Politische Philosophie der internationalen Beziehungen*, Frankfurt/M. 1998.
8. The state of affairs is banal and is being continually confirmed by a multitude of new publications.
9. The concept originates, as would not be suspected differently, in development research. There it means a stratified socio-economic, sociocultural and political reality, whereby the stratifications stem from symbiotically interlinked but hierarchically related modes of production. See Dieter Senghaas, *Weltwirtschaftsordnung und Entwicklungspolitik. Plädoyer*

- für Dissoziation*, Frankfurt/M. 1977, pp. 21ff. The concept originated in the Latin-American *dependencia* discussion ('heterogeneidad estructural').
10. An analytical differentiation, not from a scholar but from a practitioner, is found in Robert Cooper, 'Gibt es eine neue Weltordnung?' in Dieter Senghaas (ed.), *Frieden machen*, Frankfurt/M. 1997, pp. 102–118; more extensively: Cooper, *The Post-modern State and the World Order* (n.d., accessible via the internet). *Idem*, *The Breaking of Nations. Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, London 2003.
 11. This four-part world analysis is found in Dieter Senghaas, 'Die Konstitution der Welt – eine Analyse in friendenspolitischer Absicht', in *Leviathan*, vol. 34, issue 1, 2003, pp. 117–152.
 12. Such analytical mediation finally concluded with the presentation of a state of affairs, presupposes in the cognition process the so-called progressive–regressive method proposed paradigmatically by Jean-Paul Sartre – i.e. a continuous switching, in the cognition process, between empirical analysis of detail and the analysis of overall connections, continuing along those lines at least until one believes one is able to present a cognitively defensible finding. Finding then means: the exploration of a state of affairs emerging and consolidating in the cognition process, hence its analytical elaboration as a subject-related theory-constituting process. See Jean-Paul Sartre, *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, vol. 1, *Theory of Social Practice*, Hamburg 1967, Chapter 1.
 13. On causes-of-violence research see now Wilhelm Heitmeyer and John Hagan (eds), *Internationales Handbuch der Gewaltforschung*, Wiesbaden 2002; on causes-of-war research see Manus Midlarsky (ed.), *Handbook of War Studies*, Ann Arbor 2000, 2nd edn.