SSOAR

Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

The Thorny Path to Eternal Peace: Applying Kant's Ideas to the Global Situation

Herbermann, Marc

Postprint / Postprint
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Herbermann, M. (2014). The Thorny Path to Eternal Peace: Applying Kant's Ideas to the Global Situation. *E-Logos: Electronic Journal for Philosophy*, 21, 1-37. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-437138

Nutzungsbedingungen:
Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de

Terms of use:
This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

The Thorny Path to Eternal Peace

Applying Kant´s Ideas to the Global Situation

Marc Herbermann (March 2015)

Abstract

The following essay introduces the idea of eternal peace as Immanuel Kant conceptualised it and how it relates to the contemporary global society. Kant´s political philosophy still covers a wide range of current issues. He envisioned, for example, "a center of federative union for other States to attach themselves to" (Kant 1891a, 98) as a precondition for perpetual peace. We can ask in how far the EU can serve as such a role model. Kant firmly believes that a peace guaranteeing federation should consist of republics. Looking at the present global system, can we identify these republics? Do states have the right to establish a democracy through military interventions?

In spite of its consistency, unequalled depth of reasoning and its relevance to current developments, Kant´s concept of eternal peace still lingers in the shadows. Politicians often prefer to make wars. Some thinkers develop their own models for a peaceful world society, others engage in hermeneutic discussions in order to clarify Kant´s concept. They usually focus on one area of concern and scarcely back up their claims with empirical evidence. This paper, however, complements Kant´s ideas and relates them to current social, economic, political and cultural developments.

Content

Abstract....2

I. Introduction....4

II. Conditions for eternal peace....7

Preliminary Articles or the Negative Conditions for World Peace....7

Positive Conditions for World Peace....13

Republican Constitution....13

A federation of self-governing states and the reform or the dissolution of the UN....15

Universal hospitality....17

III. Public reason, antagonism and law....18

Forms of obstruction....18

Public reasoning and lightning conductors....18

No world peace without mutual tolerance of the great religions....19

IV. Respect for living beings....20

Taming the beast with law – working on a judicial order for a global society....20

Human beings and animals living together peacefully....20

Morals, law, publicity and universalisation....21

V. Conclusion....22

I. Introduction

Hyong Gak Sunim, an American who became a monk in the Korean Kwanum tradition, paraphrases his master Seung Sahn saying, “World peace is not possible… Also it is not necessary… Even the idea of world peace doesn't lead to world peace” (Hyongak 2012). This opinion on world peace seems to reflect the classical Buddhist stance: For millions of years the earth has been coming into existence and it has also been ceasing to be after a certain time in many cycles. According to Buddhist cosmology, the history of man began with the fourth immeasurable Asankhyeya Kalpa (Glasenapp 1946, 20–23)."Buddhists believe that the world was not created once upon a time, but that the world is being created millions of times every second and will continue to do so by itself and will destroy itself" (BDEAI 1998, 872). Since we cannot alter the course of the world as we know it, particularly as Zen Buddhism claims, before helping others, everyone should first develop personal abilities. According to this belief system, only complete insight into one's own “true nature” without thinking “too much” can really improve our lives and the situation of others (Seung Sahn 1997, 234, 263). Although the Buddha mediated in conflicts and discussed the preconditions of good government, Buddhism often regards pondering politics more as an obstacle to insight and liberation (Dhammanada 2002, 311–320).

After the end of the “Cold War” and in the early 21st century, war has become en vogue again. Politicians and journalists reflect more on the pros and cons of a particular war or on just war theories in general rather than on peace. The media, and even social scientists and philosophers, are ceaselessly occupied with credible military threats, military operations, arming opposition or government forces, surgical strikes, decapitation strikes, drone attacks, collateral damage and humanitarian interventions – whereas the peaceful settlement of conflicts rarely attracts attention.[1]

The meaning of “not necessary” in the citation at the beginning of this essay is vague. Does it indicate that world peace is not required, or does it imply world peace is avoidable? Moreover, what is meant by “world peace”? Hyon Gak Sunin leaves it open in his dharma talk. The Baha'í Religion, which was founded in Persia in the 19th century, states that “world peace is not only possible but inevitable. It is – the next stage in the evolution of this planet – in the words of one great thinker [A reference to Père Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955), author´s addition], 'the planetization of mankind' ” (BIC 1986, 1).

A third position avoids a staunch progress optimism and also a desperate pessimism. It is expressed in the wish to contribute to world peace and in the belief that it is possible but not inevitable. In today's integrated world, it is impossible to strive for one's own development and to leave aside the broader picture of political realities.

But what does “world peace” mean? In the course of history, various meanings have been attributed to “world peace”. This essay does not distinguish “world peace” from “eternal peace”, although these concepts relate in different ways to time and space. We can identify some essential characteristics and conditions of a desired end-state, yet it is neither possible nor desirable to explicate it in detail. But first, let us define negatively the concept of “world peace” to prevent some misunderstandings. It is not an “Arcadian shepherd life”, a paradise or a state of universal contentment and kindness. Nor does the absence of war constitute Eternal Peace, and also not a Utopia or a society which is predominantly structured by religious principles.

A confederation of states that merely pursues economic liberties falls short of creating the right conditions for eternal peace. In his work "A Plan for an Universal and Perpetual Peace", published in 1833, Jeremy Bentham stressed that Britain and France should give up all their colonies. Since every nation wants to keep the military expenditures low and has an interest in "profitable industry" and trade, he assumes, states establish an international court which they empower to enforce international law and a body where they can openly discuss their disputes (Bentham 1843). Since the period of the Scottish Enlightenment, market apologists confuse free trade and consumer liberty with civil rights.

World peace is achieved, when the risk of human self-destruction and the mere law of power have disappeared and when the power of law has regained its place, when humans can express their views without being muted, prosecuted or punished, when rational and free consultations transform into international law which is respected without exception.

What is the guarantee of world peace? Stable and widely accepted institutions, interdependent republics under the rule of law and the respect for the law. Also a shift in human consciousness and attitudes enables constructive ways for solving conflicts. We can tread on the path to world peace, but it is long and thorny and we may walk into a dead end.

World peace is possible but it is not predetermined.

This essay examines which steps mankind in the 21st century has to take to achieve world peace. It refers to a great degree to the philosophical ideas developed by Immanuel Kant in his writing “Perpetual Peace”. His essay appeared in 1795, in the year in which a peace treaty between France and Prussia was signed in Basel.

The present essay does not provide a thorough and authoritative exegesis of Kant´s writing as a whole.[2] Instead the focus will be on the indispensable steps that he lays out for “world peace” and, moreover, contrary to debates of most philosophical specialists, this paper asks if and in how far these steps can be taken in the present.

In order to display the main aspects of "Perpetual Peace", this essay refers to some of the basic ideas of Kant´s philosophy. In his contribution to the 4th volume of the *Berlinische Monatsschrift* "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose"[3] (1784), Kant states that biographies of individuals may appear "tangled and unregulated" (IUHCP, p.3). Also, history seems to be "woven out of folly and childish vanity and the frenzy of destruction" (IUHCP, p.4). Yet, as rational beings, we are not bound to fate. We have the choice to look at history as if it were continually advancing. Kant sees the sign which gives reason to this belief in a specific moral sentiment, in the empathy of spectators for the ideals of the French revolution (Kant 1983, 351–368). The unsocial sociability ("ungesellige Geselligkeit") of human beings is the "means which nature employs to bring about the development of all the capacities implanted in men".[4] In the end, humankind is forced to solve the problem of "the establishment of a civil society" that universally administers "right according to law" (IUHCP, p.25). This problem will be solved internally and externally by means of a "perfect Civil union" and a "universal cosmopolitical institution".

"During the 1780s", as Pauline Kleingeld points out, "Kant advocated the establishment of a strong federation of states... During the 1790s, however, Kant began to defend the establishment of a league of nations without coercive powers (although he continued to mention the stronger form of federation as the ideal dictated by reason)" (Kleingeld 2006, 478–479).

It is not the right place here to go into detail on whether providence or the "mechanism of nature" will guarantee suitable conditions leading to world peace, but we have to touch this intricate discussion, partly put forward in the first supplement of Kant´s writing "Perpetual Peace". Kant believes that nature divides and unites. She employs wars to spread human beings all over the planet. Also the difference between languages and religions will first lead to pretexts for wars and hostilities. "However, as civilization increases, there is a gradual approach of men to greater unanimity in principles, and to a mutual understanding of the conditions of peace even in view of these differences" (IUHCP, p.114). "Mutual interests" bring nations together under a "universal Cosmopolitan right". Kant claims that this "is effected by the commercial spirit which cannot exist along with war, and which sooner or later controls every people" (IUHCP, p.114). Thus Kant discovers empirical reasons that speak in favour of a gradual pacification of humankind. On the other hand, he believes that we can neither find certainty based on facts that humankind is progressing toward eternal peace, nor is there any sufficient empirical evidence to the contrary (Kant 1983).

Kant believes firmly that we have to "act as if it is something real, though perhaps it is not; we must work toward establishing perpetual peace and the kind of constitution that seems to us most conducive to it" (MoM, Conclusion, p.160; PP, First Supplement, p.115). For "reason on the throne of the highest moral law-giving power, absolutely condemns war as a mode of right" (PP, Definite Articles, p.97).

II. Conditions for eternal peace

In different works, Kant explains his views on politics, war and peace.[5] His philosophy apparently seems to fall into certain divisions. But if we take a closer look at it, we notice that all his works are intertwined. For instance, Kant developed his epistemology with a clear idea that science can only thrive if scientists enjoy the freedom to communicate and to express their views. This freedom, however, has to be granted by laws that can be enforced by a state.

Kant introduces his last influential work with the statement: " 'The Perpetual Peace' - These words were once put by a Dutch innkeeper on his signboard, as a satirical inscription over the representation of a churchyard" (PP, 77). He writes his last influential work about war and peace like a treaty. His essay is a kind of revised condensation of all of his thoughts on this matter. He distinguishes between "Preliminary Articles" that constitute necessary / negative conditions for world peace and "Definitive Articles" as positive conditions. The "Preliminary Articles" are either characterised as strict laws (S) or laws which do *not* need to be applied strictly or immediately, that have a subjective breadth in respect of application (-S).

Preliminary Articles or the Negative Conditions for World Peace

1. 'Standing armies shall be entirely abolished in the course of time' (-S).
2. 'No conclusion of peace shall be held to be valid as such, when it has been made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war' (S).
3. 'No state having an existence by itself — whether it be small or large — shall be acquirable by another state through inheritance, exchange, purchase or donation' (-S).
4. 'No national debts shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the state' (-S).
5. 'No state shall intermeddle by force with the constitution or government of another state' (S).
6. 'No state at war with another shall adopt such modes of hostility as would necessarily render mutual confidence impossible in a future peace; such as, the employment of assassins (percussores) or poisoners (venefici), the violation of a capitulation, the instigation of treason and such like' (S).

The history of humankind is scattered with broken peace treaties. It is impossible to analyse them and their ramifications in this essay. Therefore, let us have a look at some focal events and developments in the last twenty years. Let us also examine the politics of several central players. In the last century, during the Balkan wars in the nineties, armistices and peace treaties were not worth the paper they were written on. If we examine the so called "peace process" in the Middle East, we can easily see that one treaty is being breached after the other. The state of Israel was founded on the basis of the allocation and purchase of land, but to a greater extent on the expulsion and expropriation of the original inhabitants of Palestine (Diner 2002; Krautkrämer 2003; Pilger 2007a; Pappé 2008). Palestinians and Arabs call the expulsion of the Palestinians, the ethnic cleansing of the region, the constitution of the state of Israel and the ensuing wars "Nakba", a disaster (Khoury 2012).

In a gesture of benevolence, the Palestinians, leading a poor life in the West Bank and a miserable life in the Gaza Strip, occasionally hear the promise of peace just to observe that after a certain period of time, when public attention is distracted by dubious terror alerts, their leaders and compatriots are executed without legal justification, civilians and children are killed, their land gets further occupied, and their homes, trees and other belongings get devastated. The "peace process" in the Middle East does not exist; it is a catch phrase used by local leaders to receive the goodwill of mighty donors aimed at deceiving the public.

How long will it take until all "standing" armies are abolished? Apparently the Nobel Peace Prize Laureate who currently leads the United States has an interest in arms reduction talks. He proclaimed his desire for a nuclear free world and signed an arms control agreement with Russia in 2010 (Baker 2010a; Baker 2010b). But how much weight do his words have when „the US intends to spend approximately one trillion dollars on modernising its nuclear triad [nuclear-armed bomber aircraft, submarines and ground-based missiles, author's addition] over the next three decades" (Asghar 2014)?

In the course of the last twelve years, since the start of the third Gulf War in 2003, the US has accumulated a staggering total outstanding public debt of 18 trillion dollars as of February 2015 (USDoT 2015a). A great deal of this debt accounts for "external affairs". More than a third of the combined public debt is owed to various foreign nations (USDoT 2015b), and used for leading wars (Wittmer 2013).

*

Since the end of the Cold War, the modern Law of Nations as it evolved after the Second World War has been trampled underfoot. Western media convey the impression that it seems to be normal and justified for some powerful states to "intermeddle by force with the constitution or government of another state" whereas other states are being critically scrutinised. Iran and China, which are often portrayed as aggressive, refuse to guarantee their citizens the civil

rights people enjoy in the West. But how often do these nations march into other countries?

Russia or the former Soviet Union intervened in various countries with military force, for instance, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, in Afghanistan in the 1980s and in Chechnya in the 1990s. Some of these interventions were very harsh, like the war in Afghanistan between 1979 and 1989. There is evidence, however, that the United States provoked the invasion of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by aiding the Mujahideen, and their resistance to the pro Soviet government in Kabul in the summer of 1979. Moreover, the United States funded these "freedom fighters" in the ensuing war with billions of dollars (Pilger 2007b; Chossudovsky 2005, 23–37). Nevertheless, the Soviet Union contributed to the destruction of Afghanistan and the death of hundreds of thousands of Afghans until 1989.

Other military operations by the traditional antagonists of the West were also fought with much media attention. Russia's intervention in Georgia produced tens of thousands of refugees, but with less than a thousand people killed in August 2008, it resembled little more than a skirmish (IIFFMCG 2009). In March 2014, NATO Secretary-General Rasmussen called Russia's incorporation of Crimea a "military aggression" (Dews 2014). In fact, at this time Russia did not lead a war against Crimea. Of course, it supported secessionism, but it organised a peaceful referendum. Even in September 2014, evidence of an overt Russian "invasion" of Ukraine with tanks, artillery and truck convoys is not supported by reliable intelligence (Parry 2014). The sanctions against Russia are based on the claim of "Russian armed forces" fighting in Ukraine (CEU 2014). But in February 2015, the Chief of Staff of Ukraine's Armed Forces, General Viktor Muzhenko, said that the "Ukrainian army is not fighting with the regular units of the Russian army" (Zuesse 2015).

All these military operations and occupations of states which were regularly portrayed as evil by the Western mass media were surpassed by the interventions of the "leader of the free world". "[S]ince the end of World War II", according to U.S. historian William Blum, "the United States has endeavored to overthrow more than 50 foreign governments, most of which were democratically elected; grossly interfered in democratic elections in at least 30 countries; attempted to assassinate more than 50 foreign leaders; dropped bombs on the people of more than 30 countries … [and] attempted to suppress a populist or nationalist movement in 20 countries" (Blum 2013, 1).

In the first decade of the 21st century, particularly the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq were at variance with Kant´s fifth Preliminary Article. Both interventions were fought after a massive disinformation campaign with ostensible reasons (Chossudovsky 2005; Rampton and Stauber 2006; Pilger 2007b; Rich 2006). Kant states that nations have the right to defend themselves.[6] Moreover, he anticipated the right of the international community "to maintain or restore international peace and security" (UN Charter, Article 42; compare MoM, § 60).

On 7 October 2001, the armed forces of the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, France, and the Afghan United Front (Northern Alliance) started Operation "Enduring Freedom". In spite of Colin Powell`s promise before the launch of the operation (New York Times / Reuters 2001), nobody presented substantial evidence to the Taliban that Osama bin Laden or Al-Qaeda were behind 9/11 (Griffin 2010). Enduring Freedom was by no means an act of self defence and the war fought against Iraq did not remove a threat to "international peace and security" (Resolution 1441 (2002), adopted by the Security Council on 8 November 2002). On the contrary, it plunged a region into disaster and made the world less peaceful and secure.

The fifth principle forbids the interference in the ruling bodies of another state by force. But what does force exactly mean in the fifth preliminary article? This question is hardly discussed in papers on Kant´s "Perpetual Peace". Of course, it would be in line with Kant´s general reasoning to approve or to disapprove of customs, laws and actions of another state in public. By contrast, he would strongly disagree with a military intervention for "regime change" or an invasion in order to nullify the constitution of another state. This ban would be different, after all, if it was evident that a state had been broken into several pieces which represented "different states". Applying a classical *divide et impera* strategy, staging false-flag operations, siding in a civil war, funding an armed resistance towards a government or organising training camps for paramilitary gangs in order to dismantle an intact state would clearly violate Kant´s idea of national sovereignty.

Societies in a troublesome transitional phase can determine their fate without "humanitarian interventions" carried out by Western "democratic" states. Mass protests forced the resignation of the leadership of the former Democratic Republic of Germany which sealed the end of a totalitarian regime in Central Europe. This peaceful revolution was of course enabled by a skilful convergence of both German states and Gorbachev's policy of *glasnost* and *perestroika* which brought fundamental change to the former Soviet Union.

Likewise, the so called "Arab Spring" proved to a great extent that nations can get rid of despotic rulers on their own. The ousting of President Ben Ali in Tunisia and the overthrow of Egyptian President Mubarak in the first months of 2011 sent shock waves across the Western world. The global elites wanted at least to manipulate the course of events in Arab states that threatened to fall apart. In Egypt, for example, the Muslim Brotherhood, which was considerably supported and trained by Western interest groups (Cartalucci 2012), won the presidential election in June 2012. In Libya, the leading Western powers pulled the emergency brake with the installation of no fly zones in March 2011. The objective was surely not to prevent a genocide which could not sufficiently be substantiated (Herbermann 2011; Kuperman 2011). The alleged genocide, however, helped to spread the news of a bloody Libyan "civil war" and served to justify a military intervention by the U.S., Great Britain and France. Under the cover

of the "Arab Spring" these three imperialistic powers supported warlords, reduced "a modern welfare state to piles of rubble" (Blum 2013, 163) and initiated the emergence of a regime which should be more conducive to Western interests. The barbaric assassination of the former Libyan leader on 20 October 2011, without any trial, openly displayed the new rulers´ contempt for the rule of law. The plan to "democratise" Libya with a bunch of thugs backfired, at the latest, as US Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and some of his colleagues were assassinated on 11 September 2012.

Western states are employing a similar script in Syria as they did in Libya. The mainstream media labels the military confrontation a civil war. In reality, it is a proxy war where foreign actors try to exploit internal tensions to their advantage. The established media rely to a great extent on questionable sources (Guillard 2013; Hart 2013; Naureckas 2013) and spread the story of a brutal dictator that has to be ousted because he fights against "his own people" with all weapons available, even by employing sarin gas. Syria is of course no beacon of liberty and civil rights. "It nonetheless constitutes the only (remaining) independent secular state in the Arab world. Its populist, anti-Imperialist and secular base is inherited from the dominant Baath party, which integrates Muslims, Christians and Druze" (Chossudovsky 2011). Significant parts of the Syrian population support the Syrian government despite manipulated reports otherwise in the mainstream media (Bartlett 2014).

From the outset, journalists claimed that President Assad ordered the shooting of peaceful protesters. Actually the uprising started in Daraa and, at that time, Syrian security forces fought against armed protesters (Chossudovsky 2011; Kahn 2011; Meyssan 2011). Euronews, BBC and CNN, on the other hand, broadcast pictures of burning hospitals, damaged houses and mutilated corpses, and they blamed the destruction mostly on Syrian government forces.

But who is behind the opposition? The majority of Syrians refuse an armed power struggle in Syria (Hussein, Hänsel, and Bock-Luna 2013). Many oppose the Syrian government. Various groups, like the National Coordination Committee for Democratic Change (NCB), express their opposition in a peaceful way.

But as the conflict approaches, armed and radical groups have steadily been gaining traction. The "Free Syrian Army" consists mainly of renegades from the Syrian army. The Al Nusrah front is fighting against the Syrian state but also against the Free Syrian Army (Meyer and Heck 2013). The Al Nusrah front is likely to be responsible for the chemical weapons attack near Damascus on 21 August 2013, not the Syrian government (Hersh 2013). Other paramilitary groups, mujahideen fighters and death brigades are partly funded by the West, Saudi Arabia and Qatar (Dickinson 2014). Thousands of these fighters, which now also operate under the Name IS, received their education "in techniques of irregular warfare, sabotage and general terror …" at secret US training camps in Jordan in 2012 (Engdahl 2014).

Chemical weapons are not the problem in Syria. But the interference into Syria`s internal affairs by foreign armed groups, and the fierce hostilities that continue unabated. The compromise in the United Nations Security Council reached at the end of September 2013, however, prevented another illegal military intervention against a sovereign state.

The fifth principle prohibits the interference by force into state affairs by other states. The sixth principle closely correlates with the fifth principle. It speaks against the instigation of treason and the use of malicious weapons. In Kant´s time, the employment of snipers and spies, the use of poison or other similar tactics fell under the category expressed in the sixth principle. Today one could also subsume weapons of mass destruction. The situation at the present time is far more perilous because the employment of these weapons not only "renders mutual confidence impossible in a future peace", but could lead to a quick and complete annihilation of the world as we know it.

The sixth preliminary article prohibits several tactics. Sowing the seeds of treason, massive bombing campaigns on defenceless states and employing "low-radiological-impact nuclear weapon[s]" (Gsponer 2006) in order to dismantle a nation – these activities being its contemporary realisation. Operation "Enduring Freedom" in Afghanistan included the support of dubious warlords. In Afghanistan and in Iraq, the allied forces used depleted uranium weapons, which are likely to be responsible for miscarriages and abnormalities besides contributing to environmental contamination.

The US army already employed toxic weapons in the Gulf War in 1991 ("Desert Storm"). After more than a decade of starvation and genocidal UN sanctions, weapons based on depleted uranium and phosphor were used in operation "Iraqi Freedom" (2003) (Adriaensens 2005). The remnants of these weapons affect an entire area for generations. Neglecting their duties as an occupying power,[7] propagating (Watson 2005; Hirsh and Barry 2005) and putting the "Salvadorian option" into practice, (Fuller 2007; Kelly 2013) the Allied forces contributed to widespread chaos and destruction (Falk, Gendzier, and Lifton 2006; Simons 2008a; Simons 2008b). If we assume that the Iraqi government is to a large extent under control of the U.S. administration, there are of course no problems in the relationship between the U.S. and Iraq on the governmental level. But if the Iraqi government is not just a puppet regime, there can be no confidence between these two states for decades.

World peace is hanging by a thread. The mere possession of nuclear weapons leads to inconceivable dangers. After World War II, several accidents occurred with nuclear material or with the deployment of nuclear weapons which were on trigger alert or even exploded (Simons 2009, 20–26). But these accidents are downplayed and hardly known to the public. There will be no peace on earth if nuclear weapons can be employed by single states at will. However, it is unlikely that all nuclear states will abolish their nuclear weapons in the near future. Therefore, various treaties have been made to restrict the development of nuclear weapons and to remove the risk of proliferation. The world doesn't need new suggestions on how to deal with nuclear weapons or how to end the nuclear arms race. Instead, existing treaties need to be clarified and the nuclear powers have to comply sincerely with them. A well informed public could compel politicians to do so and to adhere to the principles which are laid down in international law.

Positive Conditions for World Peace

The second section of Kant´s work contains the definite articles for a perpetual peace between states (Kant 1891b, 88–104). It deals with Public Right, the Right of Nations and International law and finally with the Universal Right of Mankind. Kant puts forward three articles as „conditions of perpetual peace":

1. 'The civil constitution in every state shall be republican.'
2. 'The Right of Nations shall be founded on a federation of free states.'
3. 'The rights of men as citizens of the world in a cosmo-political system, shall be restricted to conditions of universal hospitality.'

Republican Constitution

According to Kant, the republican constitution is the only one „which arises out of the idea of the original compact upon which all the rightful legislation of a people is founded" (PP, p.89). „[T]he consent of the citizens as members of the state is required to determine at any time the question, 'Whether there shall be war or not?' " (PP, p.90). The possibility of public approval or assent is central in Kant´s political philosophy. In order to avoid the „horrors of war", Kant assumes, the citizens of a republic would not easily opt for war.

Kant distinguishes between the highest authority in a state, which is laid out in the constitution and "the mode of government" which is either despotic or republican. "Republicanism regarded as the constitutive principle of a state is the political severance of the executive power of the government from the legislative power" (PP, p.91). For the people, the mode of govern-

ment is more important than the constitution of a state, Kant claims (PP, p.93). He seems to have anticipated the contemporary use of the glimmering concept of democracy that does not hold water when applied.

In fact, some states regard themselves as democracies, but in reality they operate more like oligarchies. In past centuries, the United States has established a two party system. It is hardly imaginable that these two parties, which are closely related to the most potent capital interests and the power elite of the United States, represent the broad population of this country. We can neither find a socialist nor a green party representative in the US Congress. On fundamental issues (foreign or economic policy), the positions of the major parties forming a "bipartisan elite" barely differ.[8] Therefore, it is no surprise that mass protests, which were unparalleled in history, could not stop a president from waging an illegal war against Iraq in 2003 (Walgrave and Rucht 2010). The last elections should have made it abundantly clear that in order to become president of the United States, the capability of raising hundreds of millions of dollars triumphs over sound political programs.[9] Being president means serving the interests of donors which particularly consist of financial institutions on Wall Street. For this money must be repaid in the form of beneficial policy. Moreover, looking at the American elections one cannot help having the impression that the candidates are vying to gain the favour of the most influential power groups first and then defame their opponent instead of communicating details to the public about reasonable and transparent programs.

The United States Congress is also dominated by the rich. "Among the 100 members of the US Senate you find 40 millionaires, and 123 among the 435 members of the House [The United States House of Representatives, author's addition]" (Hamm 2010, 1009). Thus, one may call it fantasy that the majority of United States citizens are represented in Washington.

Does the separation of powers work in the United States? The Congress, for instance, should watch over the administration by funding the army or by controlling military expenditures. Only Congress can declare war, not the President. It can exercise its exclusive power to remove or impeach the President. But it failed to exert this duty during the so called "War on Terror".[10]

Obama trod in the footsteps of his predecessor. He led his country to war against Libya without the approval of Congress. While US led wars fail to make the American people safer, frequent and new wars at least serve the interests of the industrial-military complex. For this reason, foes and threats have to be devised and the costs of war have to be externalised. Moreover, Obama accomplished a kind of costly inverse state socialism. In European welfare states, taxes are used to finance public goods; whereas in the United States a considerable part of tax payers' money went to "bailout" unsound financial institutions which were allegedly "too big to fail". Was this in line with public interests?

Due to new weapons, the soldiers of Western war leading powers have become more protected, yet civilians in the affected areas and the environment have to pay the price. With the help of allied "foreign fighters" and mercenaries, less soldiers from intervening nations are dying and an uncritical public, streamlined by the mainstream media, remains silent. Under these conditions, we cannot expect the United States to move toward world peace.

A federation of self-governing states and the reform or the dissolution of the UN

Some national leaders and various thinkers advocate a centralised world state. Also in the Bahá'í religion, a world state is a culminating point in the evolution of mankind. Alexander the Great, Ashoka, Trajan, the Caliphs, King Edward VII and several other emperors dreamt of an everlasting Empire ruled and dominated by one culture and one state. Before the start of the Gulf War in 1991 and after it, in speeches to a joint session of the United States Congress, the American President George Bush proclaimed a "new world order" as one of his objectives, a "world where the rule of law supplants the rule of the jungle…" (Bush 1990) "In the words of Winston Churchill, a world order in which 'the principles of justice and fair play protect the weak against the strong' "(Bush 1991). After leading a dreadful war with some hundred-thousand Iraqi deaths and the contamination of large areas in Kuwait and Iraq, he praised in Orwellian language "the wonderful performance of our military". "Even the new world order cannot guarantee an era of perpetual peace. But enduring peace must be our mission" (Bush 1991).

Some analysts allege that George Bush, his successors and the global elites work in favour of a Anglo-Saxon empire[11] and a world government (Marshall 2009). This hypothesis sounds plausible since the wars of the new century help to maintain a "Pax Americana" and influential economic institutions back the "dollarization" of the world by binding weaker nations to harsh financial obligations (Chossudovsky 2003).

Kant disapproved of a world order with a dominant centre or an omnipotent world state with a world government. Kant clearly foresaw the "terrible despotism" which a world state would create.[12] For that reason, he favoured a confederation of equal states. This idea was in some respect the precursor of the League of Nations, the UN and the European Union. The idea of a confederation of states may sound idealistic since we know that states usually do not sacrifice their autonomy or abandon rights unless they are forced to do so.

In the first half of the 20th century, war seemed to be the right way to deal with irreconcilable differences among European states. But today, we see the European Union awarded with the Nobel Peace Prize in 2012. There is ample reason to question the decision to award the Nobel Peace Prize to the EU since some of its members took part in wars of aggression. But one must concede that on EU territory there has never been a war between member nations.

At the end of the Second World War, decades of peace between European nations were unthinkable. Therefore the EU serves as a model for sharing rights and duties in order to settle internal conflicts not with violence but with peaceful yet sometimes persistent negotiations.

Obviously, sovereignty understood as the political self-determination of a nation erodes in a globalised world with „multinational corporations and internationally influential private banks" (Habermas 1997, 122). Kant clearly understood that no state can securely determine its own fate.[13] He anticipated, as previously mentioned, increasing economic dependencies between states. Very unlikely, however, could he have imagined the rapid global circulation of information, products, money and human beings as we experience it today. On the other hand, a mere empirical analysis misses the mark of Kant´s reasoning. Even increasing interdependency in a globalised world cannot dispossess states of their sovereignty. Otherwise, one would not speak of states. States have at least the power to react to the demands of other states or multinational corporations by formulating laws. According to Kant, sovereignty means the ability of a people to enact laws. If, on the contrary, states have the power to intervene at will, if they can shape the process of lawmaking of other states, then sovereignty will be rendered impossible and states will cease to be.

Another objection regularly raised against Kant´s idea of a path to "eternal peace" claims that "the commercial spirit" can indeed "exist along with war". Karl Marx, Max Weber, Jean Paul Sartre and numerous other intellectuals and social scientists explained that imperialistic powers can in fact profit from wars by exploiting and dominating the labor forces and markets of subjugated foreign countries. There is some plausibility for this, but a "series of empirical studies find that states that trade extensively have a lower risk of interstate militarized conflict" (Hegre 2005, 29).

We can only think in short time spans, as Kant declares. Presumably, in the long run global powers will only have one choice: Either they will abandon the arms race and the leading of trillion dollar wars (See for instance: Stieglitz and Bilmes 2008) or their economies will collapse. As a matter of fact, economic dependence grows in a globalised world. However, we have to raise the question, have wars or military expenditures decreased?

The data of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) on military spending seems to reveal a clear trend (Perlo-Freeman et al. 2013; SIPRI 2013b). At first sight, expenditures on military spending have been constantly rising over the last two decades. We can look, for instance, at the military spending of the United States between 1992 and 2013. Spending in 2013 - $618.7 billion, expressed in 2011 dollars - was 26 per cent higher than in 1992. But US-military spending reached its climax at the end of 2010 at 720.3 billion dollars (47 per cent more than in 1992), since which time it has been declining (SIPRI 2015; Sköns 2013).

Several occurrences have contradicted the general trend towards higher military expenditures. According to SIPRI, “World military expenditure did not increase in 2011, for the first time since 1998” (SIPRI 2012, 8). The peace research institute also tells us, "the extent of organized violence at the end of the decade was lower than at its beginning" (Ibid, S. 5). The trend of decreasing military spending continued in the following years. “World military expenditure in 2013 is estimated to have been $1747 billion, representing 2.4 per cent of global gross domestic product … The total is about 1.9 per cent lower in real terms than in 2012”.

Let us now have a closer look at the period between 1992 and 2013. In the years between 1992 and 1998, the military expenditures of Canada, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany and France were continually decreasing. After 2001, on the other hand, military spending in the United States, the United Kingdom and China reached new heights, whereas other countries like Belgium, France, Germany and Serbia exited the spending frenzy. A fundamental regression analysis reveals that the slope of the curve of military spending for Belgium, France, Germany, Switzerland, Taiwan and some other countries was negative between 1992 and 2013.[14] Among 137 countries examined, the military budget of Germany increased the least, and the military expenditures of the United States increased the most. Among the nations without “peace dividend”, we find Saudi Arabia (3rd), Russia (4rd), Brazil (6th) and also nations whose military expenditures constantly went up between 1992 and 2013, regardless of global trends, like China (2th), India (5rd) and South Korea (7th).

Universal hospitality

In the third definitive article, Kant defines “hospitality” as “the right of a stranger in consequence of his arrival on the soil of another country, not to be treated by its citizens as an enemy” (PP, pp.100-101). On the other hand, the guest has no other right than to enter “into social intercourse with the inhabitants of the country” (PP, p.102). In his explanation of the definitive article, Kant gives negative examples to illustrate what is not meant by hospitality. Before the 18th century, several states believed they had the right of conquest instead of a mere right to visit another country. Also today, we see that powerful states believe they have rights to the land, the mineral resources and the assets of other countries.

According to the third definitive article, it may be possible to conclude that everyone should be able to live in another country as a guest as long as he or she adheres to the social norms of the country. Somebody applying for political asylum could only “be turned away, if this can be done without involving his death” (PP, p.101). For that reason, the practice of deportation of foreigners or prisoners to countries where their lives are at risk violates the third definitive article.

III. Public reason, antagonism and law

For Kant, it is necessary that the "maxims of the philosophers ... shall be taken into consideration by states that are armed for war" (PP, p.116). Kant expresses this demand ironically in a "secret article". Indeed, one could consider it as the core of his thoughts on perpetual peace. A philosopher is not just a university specialist but anyone who uses reason in the public sphere to debate on matters of war and peace (Gerhardt 2011). In terms of modern political philosophy, Kant argues for a kind of deliberative democracy, in which rulers and conversational partners are learning and „willing to yield to the force of the better argument" (Steiner 2012, 4).

Forms of obstruction

In modern societies, whether states regard themselves as democracies, "people`s democracies" or republics, public reasoning is enabled, maintained and restricted by the mass media. Accordingly, people get informed, disinformed or manipulated in different societies. If the free flow of ideas and reason, as Immanuel Kant suggested, is a condition of world peace, then mass media play a pivotal role in enabling or preventing world peace.

In states with autocratic rulers, like in China, Iran, North-Korea, Saudi Arabia or Sudan, dissenting opinions in the public sphere are bluntly suppressed. To openly express a view which is not in line with the official doctrine in these countries amounts to a crime, and the perpetrator is usually punished and confined. On the other hand, it is permissible but not praiseworthy to criticise the government in many Western countries. However, in Western countries well founded criticism of established views can also be highly risky and troublesome. People in permissive societies do not usually appreciate what it means to enjoy a reasonable degree of freedom of the press.

Public reasoning and lightning conductors

It is a truism that the rulers of a country and those of the world demand a supportive mass media. To lock up every dissident is impossible, of course. How then does the elite bring about public debates which are in variance with their interests? For a couple of years now, we have been witnessing an increasing concentration of media enterprise, their centralisation in the hands of six single companies: AOL Time Warner, Disney, Vivendi, Viacom, Bertelsmann, News Corporation or individuals like Rupert Murdoch or Silvio Berlusconi (Gresh et al. 2006, 76–77; Hamm 2010, 1012). Accordingly, the output of standard reporting scripts is increasing and the diversification of formats and news is decreasing.

In Western style democracies, a genuine exchange of ideas through the mass media has become less likely. Everyone who takes part in public discourse has to consider a wide sphere of

major interests and 'politically correct' speech. For instance, views about non-toxic ways to treat cancer are seldom discussed because they run counter to the interests of the medical establishment that ignores them (Moss 1996). In the wake of the Fukushima catastrophe many experts underestimated its real dangers (Busby 2011). People who dare to cast doubt on the official 9/11 narrative are systematically marginalised or ridiculed by the established mass media. Similarly, we cannot find any sincere public debate about war victims or the scale of destruction of the wars in which Western powers are currently involved. Instead, the established media are "normalizing the unthinkable" (McNeill 2006) or diverting public attention to the recklessness and indiscretions of individuals. Public opinion about geopolitical issues is also shaped by the scripts of secret services and by planted news in the so-called "quality press" (Ulfkotte 2014). It is deliberately manipulated by fear after catastrophic events (Ganser 2014).

As a consequence, non-mainstream party presidential candidates like Ralph Nader, Dennis Kucinich or Ron Paul will never become president of the United States because they do not get strong public attention. To openly criticise the government of Israel is a taboo in some Western countries. In Germany, people can be put into prison if they publish views about the "Third Reich" that are not in line with the official writing of history. South Koreans who publicly show sympathy and understanding for their compatriots in the North can also be detained due to the "National Security Act". These few examples show that Western style democracies by no means guarantee a free exchange of ideas.

"Manufacturing dissent" is another method to domesticate public opinion. It is less known, however. The global elite also need a critical, yet adaptive science, they need left gatekeepers, people ostensibly blowing the whistle, mass movements and forums where the public can address their discontent with the current state of affairs, but only to a certain degree. Discussions, initiated by these forces, often take the steam out or divert public attention from more important issues. Moreover, if these critical voices consist of conflicting elements, if they only reach a small portion of the public, or if they stay disorganised, they pose no threat to the existing system. On the contrary, the prevailing social and political order may benefit from them (Simmel 1983, 236; Zwicker 2006; Hamm 2010, 1013).

No world peace without mutual tolerance of the great religions

Wether we like it or not, religions still play a fundamental role in shaping public opinion worldwide. The influence of religions in some modern societies, in particular the faiths which belong to the Christian belief system, seem to be fading away;[15] whereas Islam and certain Asian and global religions are gaining momentum.[16] In the Middle East, we can observe revolutions in the so called "Arab spring" being carried out, backed or at least influenced by religious groups.

Parties aggravate ongoing existing conflicts when praising their own religion and denouncing the religion of the other party. No rational dialogue is possible if a group or a society takes refuge behind the concept of a god. Under conditions of worldwide modernisation, the use of higher religious values and the instrumentalisation of the concept of "god" as an ally helps to mobilise support - in the case of Islam see Platteau (2011) - and this strategy often guarantees success in the short run, whereas stable conflict-solutions are jeopardised. What helps to rationalise existing conflicts? We can identify various strategies: focusing on interests and not on positions, inventing options for mutual gain and refraining from religious terminology in conflicts with different thinking adversaries (compare Fisher and Ury 1992).

IV. Respect for living beings

Taming the beast with law – working on a judicial order for a global society

Human beings are fallible. Even enlightened beings usually do not enter this world with mindfulness and wisdom from birth. It takes a certain period of training and learning to be able to act in accordance with human needs and the universal law. Therefore, it is not wise to establish institutions for world peace only until every individual has accomplished full humanity. Moreover, the idea of a community which consists of individuals who have changed their lives does not take into account the fact that societies are more than the mere accumulation of individuals.

Aristotle's idea of the whole being more than the sum of the parts is a commonplace in the social sciences.[17] Social and economic theory following the 18th century Scottish Enlightenment shed light on the question of how the synthesis of personal actions can result in a spontaneous order that was not designed by individuals (Cronk 1988).

On the contrary, referring to Immanuel Kant, we may assume that humans are developing their full potential only as parts of a society. Therefore, in order to establish peace, we should start by instituting binding rules. "The best order is one in which the power stems not from men but from laws", says Karl Jaspers, paraphrasing Kant´s theory of the republican order (Jaspers 1962, I:111). Those with threatening inclinations are bound by the state to abide by the same set of laws. A "perfect civil union" prevents the mentally ill or war criminals from remaining in office. It deters rulers who are deaf and blind to the concerns of their citizens from occupying leading positions. Therefore, states have to become republics, a power has to safeguard the system of law and, moreover, this power has also to be subject to control.

Human beings and animals living together peacefully

For Immanuel Kant, like most other Western philosophers, animals and humans belong to essentially different classes of living beings. Men use animals as a means to certain ends.

According to Kant, human beings use the flesh, the fur, the strength and the perseverance of animals. Finally, animals are "instruments of war" (PP, p.108). It is up to humans alone to establish the conditions for peace. So animals do not have to be considered when it comes to caring for peace. On the contrary, in some regions of the world, Kant states, people like the Eskimos lead "a war against animals" and after this war has ended [with the destruction or use of the animals], they then try to establish peace among themselves.[18]

In contrast to this assumption, one could ask how it is possible to treat human beings with compassion and respect and to be violent against animals at the same time? How can we stand up to genocide or apartheid when we put animals into extermination camps?

Morals, law, publicity and universalisation

According to Kant, human beings act out of impulses, inclinations and specific aims. On the basis of this motivation they form maxims, i.e. subjective principles. To check if a maxim corresponds with ethical, judicial (MoM, p.56) or political necessities, we can apply different formulas. The formal principle for checking the morality of a maxim "is expressed as follows: 'Act so that thou canst will that thy maxim shall become a universal law whatever may be its end'" (PP, p.130; MoM 1991, p.56). Kant provides several rules to check the political appropriateness of a maxim among which we can find a negative and a positive formula: 'All actions relating to the rights of other men are wrong, if their maxim is not compatible with publicity' (PP, pp.138-139). And 'all maxims which require publicity in order that they may not fail of their end, are in accordance with both right and politics united with each other' (PP, p.147).

Can the following maxims among equals[19] become universal laws or legitimate political maxims?

1. We seek to prevent others from building nuclear weapons and exporting nuclear material, but we do it ourselves anyway.
2. Force other states to comply with international treaties, but exempt yourself from these treaties.
3. It is right to threaten other states with war on false reasons referring to universal law.
4. State A is entitled to go to war with state B even if the military of B didn't pose a threat to A or to world peace.
5. Intervene in any country you deem as undemocratic.

We can easily see that all these maxims cannot be generalised consistently as universal laws. The first three maxims are often used by Western politicians. For instance, the United States, the European Union and Israel all allege that Iran is trying to build nuclear weapons. They claim that a strict sanctions regime on Iran, which is in effect a method of economic strangulation and a possible cause for a catastrophic war,[20] can prevent Iran from achieving this goal. They constantly threaten to attack Iran, even though Iran insists that her nuclear facilities are for peaceful use (Herbermann 2007; Mousavian 2012; Naseri 2005). At the same time, Western powers who have signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons do not comply with it. They export nuclear material to India and evade a tangible reduction in their nuclear weapon stockpiles.

All these maxims mentioned previously are either inconsistent or they conflict with widely accepted beliefs and institutions: The world is more secure without nuclear weapons.[21] Treaties should be respected by all parties equally. The UN Charter forbids "the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state" (Article 2). Peoples and nations have the right to choose their own destinies. Going to war can only be the *ultima ratio* in a case of self defence, a non-fictitious danger to world peace or a proven genocide. Due to their military might and the assistance provided by the established media, politicians feel no shame in adopting one or more of these five maxims. For this reason, these principles seem to be politically appropriate. Certainly, they would be much harder to adopt if a mindful public openly discussed them with the help of the formulas which were laid down by Immanuel Kant.

V. Conclusion

According to Kant, eternal peace is the "ultimate goal of the whole law of nations" (MoM, §61, pp.156, 161). In order to achieve eternal peace at the present stage of global evolution two steps are necessary. First, we have to examine the human condition and the structures of a globalised modern world. Second, the knowledge, gained in this way, and a realistic but also teleological rational concept helps to change existing structures and institutions.

The corporate mass media are a central part of these structures. They often act as a mouthpiece for global elites and provide a distorted picture of reality. They create friends and foes. Most humanitarian interventions are just camouflage for the protection of economic and geopolitical interests of powerful Western states.

The watchful actions of well-meaning or enlightened individuals do not suffice to achieve world peace. They need to go along with universal ideas and strong institutions. A realistic rational concept, on the other hand, which takes into account the "unsocial sociability" (ungesellige Geselligkeit) of human nature (IUHC, Fourth Proposition, p.9) and the in-

tractable political conditions in the international global system, can help to establish world peace. Such a concept can be derived from the political philosophy of Immanuel Kant.

By questioning and further extending Kant´s political philosophy, we can investigate how far existing states, associations of states and global institutions contribute to the realisation of world peace. We should not expect too much from the moral development of individuals. Rather it is necessary to establish a framework which enables a rational, un-fabricated dialogue, a universal reasoning where "everybody has a vote" (Kant 1921, 604). Such a framework is guaranteed by republics which have established deliberative democracies and by authorized national and legitimate worldwide institutions. Frequently UN institutions implement the right of the strong, but world peace requires the enforcement of international law.

In the last few years, it has become obvious that powerful states cannot act unilaterally without over-exerting their capabilities. They not only rely on political cooperation with other states, but they also cannot last in the long run without an economic policy which is coordinated with much less powerful states. As a result, they will have to learn to cede more of their sovereignty to international institutions and to a "federation of free states". This federation of free states, which would hardly resemble the current UN, should pursue war prevention as its essential goal, and not the economic liberalisation of the world.

Bibliography

Adler, Max. 1924. “Kant und der ewige Friede.” *Die Friedenswarte* 24 (4): 138–46.

Adriaensens, Dirk. 2005. “White Phosphorous, Daisy Cutters, Depleted Uranium, Thermobaric Bombs, Clusterbombs, Napalm... The US Uses WMD against Civilians.” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization*, November 13. http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=ADR20051113&articleId=1239.

Aristotle. 1980. *In Twenty-Three Volumes. XVII. The Metaphysics. Books I-IX*. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. Cambridge - London: Harvard University Press - William Heinemann LTD.

Asghar, Rizwan. 2014. “Obama’s Nuclear Weapons Policy.” *Daily Times*. April 22. http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/opinion/22-Apr-2014/obama-s-nuclear-weapons-policy.

Bahá’í World News Service. 2013. “Media Information - Statistics.” Accessed April 30. http://news.bahai.org/media-information/statistics.

Baker, Peter. 2010a. “Twists and Turns on Way to Arms Pact With Russia.” *New York Times*, March 26. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/27/world/europe/27start.html?_r=0.

———. 2010b. “Senate Passes Arms Control Treaty With Russia, 71-26.” *New York Times*, December 22. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/23/world/europe/23treaty.html.

Bartlett, Eva. 2014. “International Observers Endorse Syrian Elections.” *OrientalReview.org Open Dialogue Research Journal*. June 3. http://orientalreview.org/2014/06/03/international-observers-endorse-syrian-elections/.

BDEAI, ed. 1998. *Buddha Dharma Education Association Inc: The Seeker’s Glossary of Buddhism*. 2nd ed. New York, San Francisco, Niagara Falls, Toronto: Sutra Translation Committee of the United States and Canada.

Bentham, Jeremy. 1843. “A Plan for an Universal and Perpetual Peace.” In *The Works of Jeremy Bentham, Volume 2*, edited by Bowring, John. London: W. Trait. http://www.laits.utexas.edu/poltheory/bentham/pil/pil.e04.html.

BIC. 1986. “The Baha’i International Community and World Peace. Oral Statement to the NGO Committee for the University of Peace New York, U.S.A. 17 April 1986.”

Blum, William. 2013. *America’s Deadliest Export: Democracy – the Truth about US Foreign Policy and Everything Else*. London - New York: Zed Books.

Busby, Chris. 2011. “The Dangers of Radiation: Deconstructing Nuclear Experts. What These People Have in Common Is Ignorance.” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization / Rense Com*, March 21. http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-dangers-of-radiation-deconstructing-nuclear-experts/24060.

Bush, George. 1990. “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Persian Gulf Crisis and the Federal Budget Deficit.” *George Bush. Presidential Library and Museum. Public Papers - 1990 - September*. September 11. http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2217&year=1990&month=9.

———. 1991. “Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the Cessation of the Persian Gulf Conflict.” *Presidential Library and Museum*. March 6. http://bushlibrary.tamu.edu/research/public_papers.php?id=2767&year=1991&month=3.

Cartalucci, Tony. 2012. “Muslim Brotherhood Are Western Proxies. Egypt’s Muslim Brotherhood Joins US-Euro-Israeli Chorus for War in Syria.” *Information Clearing House*, May 30. http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article31458.htm.

CEU. 2014. “Council of the Euopean Union - COUNCIL DECISION 2014/145/CFSP.” *EurLex - Official Journal of the European Union* 57 (L78): 16–21.

Chossudovsky, Michel. 2003. *The Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order*. 2nd ed. Global Research.

———. 2005. *America’s “War on Terrorism.”* 2. ed. Pincourt / Québec: Global Research.

———. 2011. “Syria: Who Is Behind The Protest Movement? Fabricating a Pretext for a US-NATO ‘Humanitarian Intervention.’” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization*, May 3. http://www.globalresearch.ca/syria-who-is-behind-the-protest-movement-fabricating-a-pretext-for-a-us-nato-humanitarian-intervention/24591.

Clewis, Robert R. 2008. “What One Can Learn from Kant on Regime Change.” In *Recht und Frieden in der Philosophie Kants. Akten des X. internationalen Kant-Kongresses. Band 4: Sektionen V-VII*, edited by Valerio Rohden, Ricardo R. Terra, Guido A. de Almeida, and Margit Ruffing, 243–49. Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Cronk, Lee. 1988. “Spontaneous Order Analysis and Anthropology.” *Cultural Dynamics* 1 (3): 282–308.

Dews, Fred. 2014. “NATO Secretary-General: Russia’s Annexation of Crimea Is Illegal and Illegitimate.” *Brookings*. Accessed April 16. http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/brookings-now/posts/2014/03/nato-secretary-general-

russia-annexation-crimea-illegal-illegitimate.

Dhammanada, K. Sri. 2002. *What Buddhists Believe*. expanded 4th edition. Kuala Lumpur: Buddha Dharma Education Association Inc.

Dickinson, Elizabeth. 2014. "Wealthy Qatar, a Backer of Syria's Armed Rebels, Makes Room for Displaced Students." *The Christian Science Monitor*. April 13. http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2014/0413/Wealthy-Qatar-a-backer-of-Syria-s-armed-rebels-makes-room-for-displaced-students.

Diner, Dan. 2002. "Israel - Nationalstaatsproblem und Nahostkonflikt." In *Fischer Weltgeschichte. Das Zwanzigste Jahrhundert III. Weltprobleme zwischen den Machtblöcken*, edited by Wolfgang Benz and Hermann Graml, 11th ed., 36:165–94. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Engdahl, William. 2014. "ISIS in Iraq Stinks of CIA/NATO 'dirty War' Op." *RT*. June 24. http://rt.com/op-edge/168064-isis-terrorism-usa-cia-war/.

Falk, Richard, Irene Gendzier, and Robert Jay Lifton. 2006. *Crimes of War: Iraq*. New York: Nation Books.

Feigl, Johann. 1993. *Die Mitte der Religionen. Idee und Praxis universalreligiöser Bewegungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

FGR. 2009. "Fastest Growing Religion (FGR) - The Numbers." http://fastestgrowingreligion.com.

Fisher, Roger, and William Ury. 1992. *Getting to Yes. Negotiating an Agreement without Giving in*. Edited by Bruce Patton. 2nd ed. Random House Business Books.

Fuller, Max. 2007. "The Silence of the Lambs? A Cry to Raise Our Voices! Proof of US Orchestration of Death Squads Killings in Iraq." *The Brussels Tribunal*. March 9. http://www.brusselstribunal.org/FullerKillings.htm.

Ganser, Daniele. 2014. "The 'Strategy of Tension' in the Cold War Period." *Journal of 9/11 Studies* 39 (May): 1–19.

Geier, Manfred. 2003. "Revolutionärer Enthusiasmus." In *Kants Welt. Eine Biographie*, by Manfred Geier, 273–86. Reinbeck: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

Gerhardt, Volker. 2011. "Der Thronverzicht der Philosophie. Über das moderne Verhältnis von Philosophie und Politik bei Kant." In *Immanuel Kant. Zum ewigen Frieden*, edited by Otfried Höffe, 3., bearbeitete Auflage, 1:123–38. Klassiker Auslegen. Berlin:

Akademie.

Glasenapp, Helmuth von. 1946. *Die Weisheit des Buddha*. Baden Baden - Wiesbaden: Vollmer.

Greenwald, Glenn. 2012. "Iran Sanctions Now Causing Food Insecurity, Mass Suffering." *Guardian*, October 7. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/oct/07/iran-santions-suffering.

Gresh, Alain, Jean Radvanyi, Philippe Rekacewicz, Catherine Samary, and Dominique Vidal. 2006. *Atlas der Globalisierung.* Edited by Le monde diplomatique. Translated by Lilian-Astrid Geese. 2nd ed. Berlin: "Le monde diplomatique" / taz Verlags- und Vertriebs GmbH.

Griffin, David Ray. 2010. "Did 9/11 Justify the War in Afghanistan? Using the McChrystal Moment to Raise a Forbidden Question," June 25. http://www.globalresearch.ca/did-9-11-justify-the-war-in-afghanistan/19891.

Gsponer, André. 2006. *Depleted Uranium Weapons: The Whys and Wherefores, Independent Scientific Research Institute, Postface to a Book to Be Published by the Bertrand Russell Foundation*. Geneva.

Guillard, Joachim. 2013. "Frisierter Body Count Hintergrund. Zynisches Spiel: Die Bestimmung der Opferzahlen im syrischen Bürgerkrieg dient als Interventionspropaganda des Westens." *Junge Welt*, February 6. http://www.ag-friedensforschung.de/regionen/Syrien/tote7.html.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1997. "Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace, with the Benefit of Two Hundred Years' Hindsight." In *Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, edited by James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann. Cambridge, Massachusetts - London, England: MIT Press.

Hamm, Bernd. 2010. "The Study of Futures, and the Analysis of Power." *Futures* 42 (9): 1007–18.

Hart, Peter. 2013. "John Kerry's Very Precise Death Toll: Where Does It Come From?" *Fair. Fairness & Accuracy in Reporting*, September 3. http://www.fair.org/blog/2013/09/03/john-kerrys-very-precise-death-toll-where-does-it-come-from/.

Hegre, Håvard. 2005. "Development and the Liberal Peace." *Nordic Journal of Political Economy* 31: 17–46.

Herbermann, Marc. 2007. “Americas Deadly Spin on Iran.” *The Korea Times*, September 11. http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinon/2007/11/137_13436.html.

———. 2011. “Cloaked War of Choice.” *The Korea Times*, April 5.

Hersh, Seymour M. 2013. “Whose Sarin?” *London Review of Books*, December 19.

Hirsh, Michael, and John Barry. 2005. “Special Forces May Train Assassins, Kidnappers in Iraq. The Pentagon May Put Special-Forces-Led Assassination or Kidnapping Teams in Iraq.” *Newsweek - MSNBC.com*, January 14. http://www.uni-graz.at/yvonne.schmidt/SpecialForcesMayTrainAssassinsKidnappers_in_Iraq.htm.

Höffe, Otfried, Jean Christoph Merle, Hans Saner, Reinhard Brandt, Pierre Laberge, Volker Gerhardt, Monique Castillo, and Michael W. Doyle. 2011. *Immanuel Kant. Zum ewigen Frieden*. Edited by Otfried Höffe. 3., bearbeitete Auflage. Vol. 1. Klassiker Auslegen. Berlin: Akademie.

Hussein, Louay, Heike Hänsel, and Birgit Bock-Luna. 2013. “ ‘Der Westen hat den Konflikt geschürt’. Die Mehrheit der Syrer ist gegen Einsatz von Gewalt. Ein Gespräch mit Louay Hussein.” *Junge Welt*, October 16. http://www.ag-friedensforschung.de/regionen/Syrien/hussein3.html.

Hyongak. 2012. *Ideas of Peace: Ideas about World Peace Are Not World Peace*. http://enlightenmentward.wordpress.com/2012/02/.

IIFFMCG. 2009. *Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Conflict in Georgia (IIFFMCG)*. I. http://www.ceiig.ch/pdf/IIFFMCG_Volume_I.pdf.

Jaspers, Karl. 1962. *Kant*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. Translated by Ralph Manheim. Vol. I. The Great Philosophers. New York, London: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.

———. 2012. *Die großen Philosophen*. München - Zürich: Piper.

Kahn, Gabe. 2011. “Syria: Seven Police Killed, Buildings Torched in Protests.” *Arutz Sheva 7. Israel National News*, March 21. http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/143026#.URyaot19L3w.

Kant, Immanuel. 1891a. “The Natural Principle of the Political Order Considered in Connection with the Idea of a Universal Cosmopolitical History (‘Idee Zu Einer Allgemeinen Geschichte in Weltbürgerlicher Absicht’, Also Translated as ‘Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose’, IUHCP).” In *Kant’s Principles of Politics, Including His Essay on Perpetual Peace. A Contribution to Political Science [1784]*, translated by William Hastie, 3–29. Edingburgh: Clark.

———. 1891b. “Perpetual Peace.” In *Kant’s Principles of Politics, Including His Essay on Perpetual Peace. A Contribution to Political Science [1784]*, translated by William Hastie, 77–148. Edingburgh: Clark.

———. 1891c. *Kant’s Principles of Politics, Including His Essay on Perpetual Peace. A Contribution to Political Science [1784]*. Translated by William Hastie. Edingburgh: Clark.

———. 1921. *Critique of Pure Reason [1881]*. Translated by Friedrich Max Müller. 1st ed. New York London: MacMillan.

———. 1983. “Der Streit Der Fakultäten.” In *Immanuel Kant - Werke in Zehn Bänden - Band 9*, edited by Wilhelm Weischedel, 265–393. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

———. 1991. *The Metaphysics of Morals. Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Mary Gregor (MoM)*. Cambridge - New York - Port Chester - Melbourne - Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, Kieran. 2013. “The Guardian’s Death Squad Documentary May Shock and Disturb, But the Truth Is Far Worse.” *The Brussels Tribunal*, March 18. http://www.brussellstribunal.org/article_view.asp?id=841#.

Khoury, Elias. 2012. “Rethinking the Nakba.” *Critical Inquiry* 38 (2): 250–66.

Kleingeld, Pauline. 2006. “Kant’s Theory of Peace.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*, edited by Paul Guyer, 477–504. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Krautkrämer, Elmar. 2003. *Krieg ohne Ende? Israel und die Palästinenser - Geschichte eines Konflikts*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Kuperman, Alan J. 2011. “False Pretense For War In Libya?” *The Boston Globe*, April 14. http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2011/04/14/false_pretense_for_war_in_libya/?p1=Well_MostPop_Emailed4&utm_medium=twitter&utm_source=twitterfeed.

Lobe, Jim. 2012. “US Senate Passes New Sanctions on Iran.” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization*, December 2. http://original.antiwar.com/lobe/2012/12/01/us-senate-passes-new-sanctions-on-iran/.

Marshall, Andrew Gavin. 2009. “Global Power and Global Government.” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization*. http://www.globalresearch.ca/global-power-

and-global-government-evolution-and-revolution-of-the-central-banking-system/14464.

McNeill, Sophie. 2006. "Normalizing the Unthinkable. John Pilger, Robert Fisk, Charlie Glass, and Seymour Hersh on the Failure of the World's Press," June 3. http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article13492.htm.

Meyer, Günter, and Klaus Thomas Heck. 2013. "Wer steckt hinter dem Giftgas-Einsatz in Syrien? Interview." *Echo*, August 30.

Meyssan, Thierry. 2011. "The Plan to Destabilize Syria." *Voltaire Network*. June 19. http://www.voltairenet.org/The-plan-to-destabilize-Syria.

Moss, Ralph W. 1996. *The Cancer Industry: The Classic Expose on the Cancer Establishment*. Equinox.

Mousavian, Seyed Hossein. 2012. "Ten Reasons Iran Doesn't Want the Bomb." *The National Interest*. December 4. http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/ten-reasons-iran-doesnt-want-the-bomb-7802.

Naseri, Sirus. 2005. "Federation of American Scientists. Iran's Statement at IAEA Emergency Meeting." Edited by FAS. http://fas.org/nuke/guide/iran/nuke/mehr080905.html.

Naureckas, Jim. 2013. "Which Syrian Chemical Attack Account Is More Credible? By Jim Naureckas." *Fair. Fairness & Accuracy in Reporting*, September 1. http://www.fair.org/blog/2013/09/01/which-syrian-chemical-attack-account-is-more-credible/.

New York Times / Reuters. 2001. "The Investigation. U.S. to Release Evidence Linking Bin Laden to Attacks," September 23. http://www.nytimes.com/2001/09/23/international/23WIRE-DIPL.html.

Pappé, Ilan. 2008. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: One World.

Parry, Robert. 2014. "Who's Telling the 'Big Lie' on Ukraine?." *Information Clearing House*. September 3. http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article39572.htm.

Perlo-Freeman, Sam, Elisabeth Sköns, Carmina Solmirano, and Helén Wilandt. 2013. *Trends in World Military Expenditure 2012*. SIPRI Fact Sheet.

Pilger, John. 2007a. "The Last Taboo." In *Freedom Next Time: Resisting the Empire*, by John Pilger, 62–162. New York: Nation Books.

———. 2007b. “Liberating Afghanistan.” In *Freedom Next Time: Resisting the Empire*, by John Pilger, 264–313. New York: Nation Books.

Platteau, Jean-Philippe. 2011. “Political Instrumentalization of Islam and the Risk of Obscurantist Deadlock World Development.” *World Development* 39 (2): 243–60.

Rampton, Sheldon, and John Stauber. 2006. *The Best War Ever. Lies, Damned Lies, and the Mess in Iraq*. New York: Tarcher / Penguin.

Rich, Frank. 2006. *The Greatest Story Ever Sold. The Decline and Fall of Truth in Bush's America*. London: Penguin Books.

Salami, Ismail. 2012. “Economic Sanctions on Iran: A Declaration of War.” *Global Research. Centre for Research and Globalization*, August 6. http://www.globalresearch.ca/economic-sanctions-on-iran-a-declaration-of-war/32222.

Seung Sahn. 1997. *The Compass of Zen. Foreword by Stephen Mitchell*. Edited by Hyongak Sunim. Boston & London: Shambala.

Simmel, Georg. 1983. “Der Streit.” In *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*, 6th ed., 2:186–255. Georg Simmel - Gesammelte Werke. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Simons, Geoff. 2008a. *They Destroyed Iraq and Called It Freedom*. Richmond: Legacy.

———. 2008b. *Iraq Endgame? Surge, Suffering and the Politics of Denial*. London: Politico's.

———. 2009. *Nuclear Nightmares*. Richmond: Legacy.

SIPRI. 2012. *SIPRI Yearbook 2012. Armaments, Disarmaments and International Security. Summary*. Solna. http://milexdata.sipri.org/result.php4.

———. 2013a. *The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Military Expenditure Database. Military Expenditure of USA In Local Currency. Start of Financial Year: October*. Solna. http://milexdata.sipri.org/result.php4.

———. 2013b. *SIPRI Yearbook 2013. Armaments, Disarmaments and International Security. Summary*. Solna. http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2013.

———. 2015. “The SIPRI Military Expenditure Database. Excel File with the Data of Military Expenditures of 172 Countries between 1988 and 2013.” http://milexdata.sipri.org/files/?file=SIPRI+milex+data+1988-2012+v2.xlsx.

Siracusa, Joseph M. 2008. *Nuclear Weapons. A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sköns, Elisabeth. 2013. "US Military Expenditure." In *SIPRI Yearbook 2013. Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, 135–41. Solna.

Soka Gakkai International. 2012. "About US - What Is SGI?" Accessed December 12. http://www.sgi.org/about-us/what-is-sgi.html.

Steiner, Jürg. 2012. *The Foundations of Deliberative Democracy: Empirical Research and Normative Implications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stieglitz, Joseph E., and Linda J. Bilmes. 2008. *The Three Trillion Dollar War. The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict*. New York, London: W.W. Norton & Company.

Symonds, Peter. 2015. "US Intensifies Pressure on Iran at Nuclear Talks." *World Socialist Web Site*. March 16. http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2015/03/16/iran-m16.html.

Tarpley, Webster Griffin. 2004. *George Bush - The Unauthorized Biography*. Progressive Press.

Ulfkotte, Udo. 2014. *Gekaufte Journalisten*. 5th ed. Rottenburg am Neckar: Kopp.

USDoT. 2015a. "United States Department of the Treasury / Bureau of Public Debt: The Debt to the Penny and Who Holds It." *Treasury Direct*. February 5. http://www.treasurydirect.gov/NP/BPDLogin?application=np.

———. 2015b. "United States Department of the Treasury / Federal Reserve Board: Major Foreign Holders of Treasury Securities (in Billions of Dollars)." *Treasury Resource Center*. February 5. http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/data-chart-center/tic/Documents/mfh.txt.

Walgrave, Stefaan, and Dieter Rucht, eds. 2010. *The World Says No to War. Demonstrations Against the War on Iraq*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Watson, Roland. 2005. "El Salvador-Style 'Death Squads' to Be Deployed by US against Iraq Militants." *The Times*, January 10.

Wittmer, Donald. 2013. "Public Debt And America's Wars." *Catholic Journal. US American Reflections on Faith and Culture*. September 2. http://www.catholicjournal.us/2013/09/02/public-debt-americas-wars/.

Zuesse, Eric. 2015. "Ukrainian Government: 'No Russian Troops Are Fighting Against Us.'"

Information Clearing House. January 31. http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article40860.htm.

Zwicker, Barrie. 2006. “The Shame of Noam Chomsky and the Gatekeepers of the Left.” In *Towers of Deception: The Media Cover-up of 9-11*, 179–224. Gabriola Island, BC, Canada: New Society Publishers.

[1] Not to mention the analysis of the conditions which must be met for the existence of a peaceful world society. A growing number of political scientists and philosophers, however, explicitly examine these conditions. To name a few essential works: Czempiel, Ernst-Otto. 2002. *Weltpolitik im Umbruch: Die Pax Americana, der Terrorismus und die Zukunft der internationalen Beziehungen,* München: C.H. Beck. Galtung, Johan. 1996. *Peace By Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization.* Oslo: Sage. Russell, Bertrand. 2009. "Methods of Settling Disputes in the Nuclear Age" in Egner, Robert E. and Denonn, Lester E. eds., *The Basic Writings of Bertrand Russell.* London & New York: Routledge, 718-721. Senghaas, Dieter. 1997. *Frieden machen.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp. von Weizsäcker, Carl Friedrich. 1994. *Der bedrohte Friede – heute.* München: Hanser.

[2] A profound interpretation is edited by Höffe (2011).

[3] This appears as a more fitting translation of the title "Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht" than the versions by Lewis White Beck, William Hastie or John Richardsen. Nevertheless, the essay refers to Hastie's translation of 1891 (Kant 1891b, 3–29) as IUHCP, whereas "Perpetual Peace" (Kant 1891b, 77–148) is abbreviated as PP. This essay also mentions Kant`s writing "Metaphysics of Morals" as "MoM" (Kant 1991).

[4] PP, 9. In the following quotations, I leave out capital letters that appear in Hastie's translation [author's addition]. The theorem of „ungesellige Geselligkeit" is certainly one of the ideas which led to dialectic thinking in German idealism and to Marx' concept of history (Adler 1924). We cannot go into details here wether Kant´s admiration of the French revolution is in accordance with his rejection of constitutional changes by revolution. See for instance: Clewis (2008) and Geier (2003).

[5] The German Philosopher Karl Jaspers listed the main sources of Kant´s political philosophy. "Quellen: Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht, 1784. - Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? 1784. - Kritiken gegen Herder, 1785. - Mutmaßlicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte, 1786. - Was heißt sich im Denken orientieren? 1786. - Kritik der Urteilskraft § 65, § 82-84, 1790. - Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht in der Praxis, 1793. - Das Ende aller Dinge, 1794. - Zum ewigen Frieden, 1795. - Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre, 1797. - Der Streit der Fakultäten (darin der zweite Abschnitt). 1798. Ferner: Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht... 1784. - Aus dem Nachlass (15, 2. Hälfte): Zur Anthropologie" (Jaspers 2012, 532).

[6] MoM, § 57, PP, third preliminary article, compare that statement to Article 51 of the UN Charter.

[7] See Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, Third Chapter.

[8] In the wake of 9/11, for example, constitutional rights have been abandoned without considerable opposition by the Democrats. The Patriot Act, which took effect on February 1 2002, reduced restrictions for gathering intelligence and authorised indefinite detention of immigrants.

Moreover, it entitled law enforcement officers to search a home or business without the owner's or the occupant's permission or knowledge. In October 2002, in both parties a clear majority of the members of the American Congress opted for a mechanism which finally led to the catastrophic war in Iraq.

[9] Barack Obama raised more than 700 hundred million dollars in 2008 and in 2012 (Federal Election Commission, http://www.fec.gov/disclosurep/pnational.do).

[10] To name just a few cases of violation of constitutional duties which happened under George W. Bush's tenure with his direct and indirect involvement: The calculated deception of the public before the Iraq war, the conduct of the Iraq war (including the creation of a secret task force and torture), the obstruction of post 9/11 investigations, attempts to overthrow the Iranian government and the outing of a CIA officer. George W. Bush enacted many supplementary budgets without being stopped by the congress. Moreover, under his tenure, military expenditure rose from 313 billion dollars in 2001 to 621 billion dollars in 2008 (SIPRI 2013a).

[11] Chossudovsky (2003) and Tarpley (2004). According to Tapley, "The leitmotiv of modern American presidential politics is unquestionably an imperial theme, most blatantly expressed by Bush in his slogan for 1990, "The New World Order," and for 1991, the "pax universalis." The central project of the Bush presidency is the creation and consolidation of a single, universal Anglo-American (or Anglo-Saxon) empire very directly modelled on the various phases of the Roman Empire" (Introduction: American Caligula, p 9).

[12] In the second part of his writing "The saying: that a thing may be right in theory, but may not hold for practice", Kant speaks of a paternal state that seeks to make everyone happy as the "greatest conceivable Despotism" (Kant 1891c, 36), and in the third part he states that "the most terrible despotism" (Ibid, 72) arises when "oversized states" force other states to make peace on their terms. "This is so because the laws lose always something of their definiteness as the range of a government becomes enlarged; and soulless despotism when it has choked the seeds of good, at length lapses into anarchy. Nevertheless there is a desire on the part of every State, or of its Sovereign, to attain to a lasting condition of Peace by subjecting the whole world, were it possible, to its sway" (PP, 114).

[13] "No State is for a moment secure against another in its independence or its possessions. The will to subdue each other or to reduce their power, is always rampant; and the equipment for defence, which often makes peace even more oppressive and more destructive of internal prosperity than war, can never be relaxed" (Kant 1891b. The Principle of Progress, 74-75).

[14] SIPRI provides its military expenditure database in the form of an Excel spreadsheet. The author used the Libreoffice function "slope" [=SLOPE(y-values, x-values)] to calculate the slope (m) of the regression line y=b+m*x, where "y-values" means the array or matrix of Y data (in our case: military spending between 1992 and 2013) and "x-values" is the array or matrix of X data (the years). The analysis is based on the data of military spending of 137 states in SIPRI`s latest

military expenditure database: military expenditures in constant 2011 U.S. dollars (SIPRI 2015). For 35 countries, figures on military spending for five or more years in the period between 1992 and 2013 are not available; these countries are not taken into account: Afghanistan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Central African Republic, Congo, Dem. Republic of the Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Gabon, German DR, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, North Korea, Liberia, Libya, Montenegro, Myanmar, Qatar, Somalia, South Sudan, Tajikistan, Timor Leste, Trinidad & Tobago, Turkmenistan, UAE, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, North Yemen, South Yemen, Yugoslavia (former), Zambia and Zimbabwe.

[15] Since the end of the metaphysical era and the beginning of the modern age, we are witnessing a constant process of secularisation in modern Western societies. Declining numbers of church visitors, rising numbers of people engaged in cohabitation, rising divorce rates, the institutionalisation of gay-marriage, the persecution of Christians in Africa - all these developments confirm the waning importance and influence of the church. Nevertheless, in terms of *absolute* numbers of members, Christianity is still the largest religion and the fastest growing religion. But what can we say about the relative figures? Here the picture looks different. The World Christian Encyclopaedia has compared existing religions in terms of relative growth, i.e. the number of new converts in relation to the existing size of a religion's adherents in the decade 1990-2000. Zoroastrianism is ranked at the top of the list with a relative growth of 2.65%, followed by the Bahá'í religion (2.28%) and Islam (2.13%) (FGR 2009).

[16] For a short introduction to the Bahá'í faith see for instance Feigl 1993, p. 78-84. "There are more than 5 million Bahá'ís in the world. The Bahá'í Faith is established in virtually every country and in many dependent territories and overseas departments of countries. Most nations and a few territories have a National Spiritual Assembly elected by the Bahá'ís of that jurisdiction. Bahá'ís live in some 100,000 localities around the globe" (Bahá'í World News Service 2013) The new Buddhist Religion Sōka Gakkai, which was founded in 1930 and is rooted in the Japanese Nichiren Buddhism – see (Feigl 1993, 66, 67) - claims to have more than 12 Million members around the world (Soka Gakkai International 2012).

[17] "Since that which is compounded out of something so that the whole is one, not like a heap but like a syllable-now the syllable is not its elements, ba is not the same as b and a, nor is flesh fire and earth … ; the syllable, then, is something-not only its elements (the vowel and the consonant) but also something else, and the flesh is not only fire and earth or the hot and the cold, but also something else" (Aristotle 1980, Book VII 10, Book VII 17).

[18] "… wo sie dann mit dem Kriege gegen die Tiere gnug zu tun haben, um unter sich friedlich zu leben", can be read in Kant´s essay. This is the only place in his writing "Perpetual Peace" where he explicitly refers to "animals" in general. In the first supplement that discusses "the mechanism of nature", Kant speaks of several animals: "seals, walruses and whales" (PP, 107). He also mentions the camel and the reindeer (PP, 107).

[19] According to the laws of nations, states have equal rights. Kant asserts, "There is no relation of

subordination between [states], as between Superior and Inferior." PP, 86, compare MoM, § 57, 136.

[20] US sanctions against Iran can be traced back to 1979, the time of the fall of Mohammad Rezā Shāh Pahlavī. The Security Council sanctions regime against Iran started with resolution 1696 adopted in July 2006. Since then, seven further resolutions have been imposed on Iran. Resolution 1737 was unanimously adopted on 23 December 2006 (See Simons 2009, 232). It was not only directed against Iran's nuclear programme but also against Iran's missile programme. According to these resolutions, assets which are allegedly related to Iran's nuclear programme were frozen, ships monitored, an embargo imposed and medical equipment prevented from entering the land. Due to the draconian sanctions, inflation is skyrocketing, official unemployment is at least 13 per cent and the population has to deal with shortages and increased prices of medicine (Greenwald 2012; Lobe 2012; Salami 2012; Symonds 2015). In 2015, nonetheless, these sanctions are likely to be reduced if the United States, Russia, China, France, the United Kingdom, Germany and Iran can reach a comprehensive agreement on the Iranian nuclear program.

[21] In today's world, lasting nuclear supremacy is very difficult to achieve and the MAD (Mutual Assured Destruction) doctrine that helped to maintain huge nuclear weapon stockpiles has become obsolete (Siracusa 2008, 68, 108–121).