JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH FOR HUMANITIES
ISSN 2663-192x

HJRS Link: Journal of Academic Research for Humanities (HEC-Recognized for 2023-2024)
Edition Link: Journal of Academic Research for Humanities, 3(3) July-September 2023

Link of the Paper: https://jar.bwo.org.pk/index.php/jarh/article/view/335

THE ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF IMMANUEL KANT'S PHILOSOPHY FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND GLOBAL PEACE

Author:	**SAAD MALOOK**, Department of Philosophy, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan Email: saad.phil@pu.edu.pk

Paper Information

Citation of the paper:
(APA) Malook, S. (2023). The Ethical Implications of Immanuel Kant's Philosophy for Human Development and Global Peace. *Journal of Academic Research for Humanities*, 3(3), 270–282A.

Subject Areas:
1 Humanities
2 Philosophy

Timeline of the Paper:
Received on: 07-09-2023.
Reviews Completed on: 23-09-2023.
Accepted on: 24-09-2023.
Online on: 30-09-2023

Recognized:

HJRS HEC Journal Recognition System

Published by:

BWO RESEARCHES (PVT) LTD PAKISTAN

Abstract

This article explains and examines the ethical implications of Immanuel Kant's philosophy for human development and global peace. The article addresses the problem of whether Kant's philosophy advances human development and global peace. I argue that Kant's philosophy promotes human development and global peace. The argument is based on the following premises: Kant's moral philosophy supports reverence for humanity. Reverence for humanity promotes the cultivation of human potential, such as rationality. Kant considers rationality a property par excellence in human persons, making them superior to other animals; so, rationality is a guiding principle that makes human persons worthy of reverence. Rationality helps resolve conflicts among people in a society. Moreover, Kant's political philosophy promotes cooperation among states, eventually leading to global peace. Peace and human development depend on each other: human development develops positive peace, and negative peace augments human development. Kant's ethics of reverence for humanity promotes positive peace, while his politics of cosmopolitan rights creates negative peace among states. Negative peace is the absence of violence, while positive peace refers to activities affirming life. In general, Kant's moral and political philosophy is characteristically rational and cosmopolitan, which strives to cultivate natural capacities among human persons across the states, which enhances human development and global peace. In the arena of qualitative research, this article uses the method of empirically informed philosophical analysis to examine journal papers, scholarly books, proceedings of conferences, and congresses.

Keywords: Peace, Development, Cosmopolitanism, Ethics, Politics.

Introduction

This article critiques Immanuel Kant's moral and political philosophy and determines its implications for human development and global peace. In his works, notably *Groundworks of the Metaphysics of Morals* and *Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose,* Kant supports positive peace, while *Towards Perpetual Peace* supports negative peace. Peace has two forms: negative and positive. 'Negative peace' refers to the absence of violence (Galtung, 1996). 'Positive peace' means life-affirming activities (Barash, 2018).

Kant's ethics of reverence for humanity strives for human development, which brings about positive peace, and his politics of cosmopolitan right develops cooperation among states, creating negative peace. Peaceand human development depend upon each other (Human Development Report, 1991).

Kant's moral and political philosophy is characteristically rational and cosmopolitan, which strives to cultivate natural capacities among human persons across the states. Kant considers rationality a property *par excellence* in human persons, making them superior to other animals. According to Kant, rationality is a guiding principle that makes human persons worthy of reverence. Thus, I argue that Kant's philosophy leads to human development andglobal peace. In the domain of qualitative research, this article employs the method of empirically informed philosophical analysis to critique journal papers, scholarly books, proceedings of conferences, and congresses.

Contextualizing Kant in the Western Tradition

In the history of the Western tradition, the Enlightenment marks a turning point when it finally became relatively safe to seek new knowledge and challenge traditions. Kant was among many, including Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, Francis Bacon, Rene Descartes, David Hume, and John Locke, who developed the moment. The salient features of the modern Western tradition in general, and the Enlightenment project in particular, include the rational and scientific attitude toward life, independence of politics and religion, and promotion of moral and political values, including freedom, dignity, equality, and particularly respect for persons (Brinton, 1963; Bronowski and Mazlish, 1986). Kant uses the motto, "Sapere Aude" (Have the courage to use your reason)to sum up the idea (Kant, 1996, p. 17).

Kant is known to be a philosopher who brought about a 'Copernican revolution' in Western philosophy in the form of a new way of understanding the world and our relation to it. Kant was a man of the Enlightenment. Bearing a critical mind, Kant challenged the foundations of traditionalism, religious dogmatism, and other superstitions. He defended rationality as a tool for enlightenment in Western civilization. In his classic essay, "What is Enlightenment?", Kant argued that an enlightened mind comprehends the world without the help of external guidance (Kant, 1996). An enlightened mind uses its cognitive capabilities to uncover knowledge. Indeed, the autonomy of reason (or mind) was cardinal in Kant's enlightenment project.

John Peter Eckermann once asked the great German intellectual, poet, and scientist Johan Wolfgang von Goethe, who was the foremost among German philosophers. Goethe named Kant without any doubt. Goethe added, "He [Kant] is the one whose doctrines continue to work and have penetrated most deeply into our German civilization" (Eckermann, 1946, p. 191). Goethe was quite right that Kant's influence on German civilization was unsurpassed, and indeed, with hiscontributions to the fields of epistemology, metaphysics, ethics, aesthetics, law, and politics, his influence on Western philosophy remains profound.

Kant's Categorical Imperative

Kant discovered a set of formulations known as the 'categorical imperative,' considered one of the foundational ideas of modern Western ethics. In Kant's ethics, categorical imperative means commands without any exceptions. Having a categorical imperative implies that an objective end must be unconditionally good. Accordingly, Kant holds that only rationality can discover this unconditional objective end. He explains the difference between two kinds of imperatives: the hypothetical imperative and the categorical imperative. According to Kant, the hypothetical imperative refers to "the practical necessity of a possible action as a means to attain something else which one will, while the categorical imperative would be the one which represents an action as is objectively necessary for itself, without any reference to another end" (Kant, 2002, p. 31). Kant develops three formulations to explain his categorical imperative.

This categorical imperative is based on freedom and rationality because only free and rational persons can create moral judgments. At the beginning of his *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), Kant juxtaposes physics and ethics. Kant argues that physics explains the laws of nature while ethics explains the laws of freedom (Kant, 1993). The foundation of Kant's ethics is freedom of the will. As knowledge has both empirical and metaphysical underpinnings, Kant makes a convincing distinction between anthropology and moral philosophy; anthropology deals with empirical moral experience – what is the case – while moral philosophy deals with metaphysical moral experience – what ought to be the case (Kant, 1993). According to Kant, the universal law, the formula of humanity, and the kingdom of ends are the key formulations of the categorical imperative. I argue that these formulations of the categorical imperative are consistent with cosmopolitanism and reverence for human persons. Notably, Kant's first formulation of the categorical imperative, the formula of universal law, and the idea of cosmopolitan right (Kant, 2006) reveal his cosmopolitan approach. Kant's second formulation of the categorical imperative, the formula of humanity, particularly explains the idea of reverence for human persons.

Formula of Law: From Personal Maxims to Universal Laws

In this formulation, Kant investigates the question how people's maxims, that is, the personal principles that motivate their actions, can be universal laws. Based on rational faculty, Kant suggests that one ought to act in such a way, that it would become a universal law. For Kant, moral law is the greatest strength of human persons. Kant articulates: "Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and reverence, the more frequently and persistently one's meditation deals with them: *the starry sky above me and the moral law within me"* (Kant, 2015, p. 130). The starry sky refers to the unlimited natural world as a macrocosm while the moral law refers to the power of the inner human world.

This formulation of the categorical imperativeis called 'universal' because Kant claims that it expresses a "universal law", that is, a command that applies to all agents across cultures. I hold that Kant's formula of universal law is consistent with what I call a cosmopolitanism. The key claim isthat Kant's universal law challenges the notion of discriminating against people onthe grounds of racial, cultural, color, or linguistic identities. Instead, it fosters universal consistency in the world. Kant's first formulation of the categorical imperative has two versions. The first version of this formulation states, "So act as if the maxim of your action were to become through your will

a universal law of nature" (Kant, 2002, p. 38). The second version of the first formulation of categorical imperative asserts, "Act only by that maxim through which you can, at the same time, will that it become a universal law" (Kant 2002, p. 37). So, the significant implication of Kant's formula of universal law holds that every judgment ought to be applied to all without any discrimination of racial, color, or national disparities. This imperative of universal moral law supports cosmopolitan ethics.

When explaining his first formulation, Kant uses four examples: committing suicide, false promises, cultivation of one's talents, and the act of beneficence. In the case of committing suicide, Kant investigates whether taking one's life can become a universal law. In the Kantian tradition, let us say, that Freed is a human person who has a series of misadventures in his life, and because of such unfortunate happenings, he has become a pessimist. Yet, Freed is still rational enough to question whether taking his own life may not be contrary to his duty to save his life. To know what to do Freed can apply the test: can his action become a universal law? Freed's maxim of committing suicide cannot be universal law because it obstructs the progression of life which is contrary to the law of nature. Thus, committing suicide cannot become a universal law because it will end the human race while saving people's lives can be a universal law that will cause the continuity of the human race.

In the case of false promises, Kant investigates whether borrowing money with an act of false promise can be a maxim of universal law. In the Kantian tradition, suppose, Saud needs to borrow $ 1344 to pay his university fees. Saudasks Raza to borrow the money for 6 months.Saud knows that if he tells Raza that he cannot return the money within 6 months, Raza will not lend him the money. Saud knows that he cannot return it in 6 months. Even then knowing his economic circumstances, Saud makes a promise to Razathat he will return the said money withintime. Saud can now apply for the test: can borrowing money with false promises be a universal law? Saud will lose his trust if he does not return the money in due time. A false promise is a bad act that creates distrust in society. Keeping promises while lendingmoney can be a universal law for governing society.

In the example of the cultivation of human talents, Kant holds that the cultivation of human talents is essential for fulfilling different kinds of tasks. The cultivation of talents needs a certain amount of effort. Idleness is a state of laziness. In the Kantian tradition, let us say Haley is a young girl who has two choices: first she can cultivate her talents with the required efforts. Second, she can live a life of idleness to amuse herself for the time being. Now, the question is whether living a life of idleness can be a universal law. If Haley could not cultivate her talents, she could not achieve certain goals in her life. Like Haley, if all people live a life of idleness and do not cultivate their natural talents, what kind of this social world would be? In this case, there will be no progress in society. Thus, living a life of idleness cannot become a universal law, while cultivating one's natural talents can be a universal law for the progress of humanity. Notably, Kant's example of cultivating human talents supports human development and, eventually, positive peace.

In the case of the example of an act of beneficence, Kant investigates whether assisting can be a universal law. In the Kantian tradition, suppose Arshad has good fortune in her life. Arshad knows that many people around him are not born with good fortune. Arshad also believes that he is not responsible for people's hardships. Arshad is a resourceful person who helps people, and he has a dilemma about whether he should help others. Now, the question is whether selfishness can be a universal law. What would be the nature of this social world if

nobody assists others? Thus, assisting the needy can be a universal law.

Kant's formulation of the universal law shows the possibility of creating maxims that could be applied to all human agents across cultures. In the Kantian tradition, the question is whether contempt for humanity can be a universal law. If people have contempt for others, there would be a world in which all are at war against one another. In this case, there is the possibility of human extinction. In contrast, reverence for one another can be a universal law because it not only makes the cultivation of humanpotential but also peaceful co-existence.

Formula of Humanity: From Self-Reverence to Reverence for Humanity

Kant argues that only 'rational nature' is unconditionally valuable and worthy of reverence. When discussing the second formulation of the categorical imperative in *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant states: "The ground of such a principle is this: rational nature exists as an end in itself. In this way, man necessarily thinks of his existence; thus far, is it a subjective principle of human actions? But in this way also does every other rational being think of his existence on the same rational ground that also holds for me; hence, it is at the same time an objective principle, from which, as a supreme practical ground, all laws of the will must be able to be derived" (Kant, 2002, p. 36). Kant holds that the rational nature of human creatures is the end in itself. To some, the argument supporting this formulation of the categorical imperative is 'obscure' (Paton, 1965, p. 176), 'tedious' (Rawls, 2000, 196), 'mysterious' (Dean, 2006, 119), and 'terse' Wood, 2008, 88). Yet, according to Samuel J. Kerstein, Kant's formula of humanity is "a principle that many of us find especially attractive as a candidate for the supreme principle of morality" (Kerstein, 2002, 15). Kerstein is correct that Kant's formula of humanity is a supreme principle of morality because it leads to the idea that human persons are worthy of reverence. Kant's formula of humanity, in a precise sense, is the formula of reverence for humanity.

Kant's second formulation of the categorical imperative holds, "Act in such a way that youtreat humanity, whether in your person or the person of one another, always at the same time as an end and never simply as a means" (Kant, 1993, p. 36). What does Kant mean by 'humanity'? According to Christine Korsgaard, Kant's formula of humanity follows from two premises. First, humanity, which refers to rational nature, means the capability to set ends (Korsgaard, 1996). Setting ends requires a rational mind, and this capability of setting ends is one of the central characteristics of humanity (Kant, 1991). Kant argues that this ability to set ends entails that persons with the capacity to be rational are to be treated as ends (Korsgaard, 1996). Korsgaard's premise supports the notion of freedom in Kant's ethics. It is freedom that helps decide between two choices. Second, humanity, or rationality, makes the distinction between good and bad values or right and wrong actions (Korsgaard, 1996). So, it is truethat rationality is used for human persons while non-human persons may not fulfill the criterion. I do not discuss these questions here because these are perhaps out of context.

When explaining the second formulation of the categorical imperative, Kant uses a German expression, *Achtung,* which means 'esteem' or 'respect'. Kant writes that "rational beings... ought always to be esteemed... as ends" (Kant, 2002, p. 48). Michael Rosen states: "Kantian term *Achtung* is usually translated as "respect" but it would be better perhaps to render it as "reverence" (Rosen, 2012, p. 156). I hold that 'esteem' and 'reverence' are overlapping concepts. Like

Rosen, H. J. Paton also translated Kant's *Achtung* as 'reverence' rather than 'respect' (Paton, 1965, 63). However, Paton talks about Kant using *Achtung* to refer to having 'reverence for the law' (Paton, 1965, 63-4) rather than 'respect for the law'. By 'law', Kant means an objective principle. Following Paton, I translate Kant's *Achtung* with 'reverence for humanity' because if 'reverence for the law', as Paton states, is correct, the law is an objective principle for all human persons. I hold that when Kant refers to reverence for law, this is, reverence for humanity. It also occurs to me that when Kant is writing on the second formulation and states, "the ends of any subject which is an end in himself, ought as far as possible to be my ends also", the claim arguably requires more than just respect and reverence might be a better term for Kant's position. Thus, Kant's principle is known as 'the formula of humanity', but I use the expression, *reverence for humanity* in the Kantian sense. Sometimes, Kant's formula is subject to criticism that it is too general (Schneewind, 2010). If humanity, which embodies rational nature, is valuable, it ought to have reverence rather than be belittled or treated with contempt (Nelson, 2008). Wood holds, that "what FH [formula of humanity] fundamentally demands of our actions is that they express proper respect or reverence for the worth of humanity" (Wood, 1999, 147). Respect and self-respect are identical.

Self-respect is the central element of reverence; I interpret the imperative: 'You shall have reverence for humanity': honor your self-respect yourself and the self-respect of your fellow human persons. So, self-respect helps enhance human potential. In this context, human persons deserve self-respect irrespective of their affiliations with different religions, cultures, races, or nationalities. This imperative also holds that 'you shall not exploit humanity' means that human persons ought not to be exploited by any means because all human persons deserve dignity. Likewise, 'you shall not humiliate humanity' means that human persons ought not to be humiliated by any means because all human persons deserve self-respect. 'You shall not discriminate humanity' means that human persons ought not to be discriminated against by any means because all human persons deserve equality. 'You shall not coerce humanity' means that human persons ought not to be coerced by any means because all human persons deserve freedom. Accordingly, 'you shall not exclude humanity' means that human persons ought not to be excluded by any means because all human persons deserve fraternity as members of humanity.

Kant infers that whatever thing contains a rational nature deserves reverence. Humans manifest the existence of rationality at its highest level among animals. So, the imperative holds that 'you shall have reverence for humanity'. I argue that Kant's meaning of treating humanity as an end is to have reverence for yourself and others because all human persons have intrinsic worth due to their rationality. This imperative not only implies self-reverence but also reverence for others. Thus, Kant's formula of humanity can be paraphrased: 'So act as to treat humanity with reverence, whether in your person or any other, as an end and not merely as means.

Formula of Autonomy: From Personal Ends to the Kingdom of Ends

Kant's two interrelated formulations of the categorical imperative, known as the formula of autonomy and the kingdom of ends, significantly imply the idea of human dignity. The formula of autonomy is derived from the formula of universal law and the formula of humanity. The formula of universal law particularly insists on the idea of universalizability, that is, a maxim is only true if it is universalizable. The formula of humanity asserts that unconditional value is rational nature. Now the formula of

autonomy explains the ground of unconditional worth of a rational nature. According to Kant, the ground of unconditional worth of rational nature is the autonomy of will. Kant states that "the will of every rational being" is "a universally legislating will" (Kant, 2002, p. 56). In Kant's perspective, only rational people can create moral laws. He further writes, "Act following maxims of a universally legislative member for a merely possible realm of ends" (Kant, 2002, p. 56). Thus, the autonomy of will is the essence of human persons.

The rational nature is an end (Kant, 2002). The rational nature has autonomy. 'Autonomy' in Kant's view, refers to something which has freedom, while if something is determined, it is 'heteronomy' (Kant, 2002, 75). According to Kant, only rational nature can create law. A rational will is autonomous because it has universalizability and necessity. If all rational natures have their ends, subject to the categorical imperative, there is a realm or kingdom of ends. Rational people are the creators of moral laws. The formula of humanity claims that treat humanity in your person and other persons never merely as means but always at the same time as ends. Kant envisages a world which is a realm or kingdom in which rational persons are ends. 'Realm', in Kant's view, is a "systematic combination of various rational beings through communal laws" (Kant, 2002, 51). Christine Korsgaard uses the expression Kingdom of ends (1996) for the 'realm of ends. Kant juxtaposes the kingdom of ends with the kingdom of nature. In the kingdom of nature, everything is subject to natural laws. In this kingdom of nature, external forces govern the objects. In contrast, in the kingdom of ends, rational beings create the governing laws themselves (Kant, 2002, p.56).

In the kingdom of ends, rational persons are the members and the sovereign at the same time. Kant writes, 'Act by maxims of a universally legislative member for a merely possible realm of ends' (Kant, 2002, p. 56). Sovereign persons not only create laws but also obey them by goodwill. Jeremy Waldron argues that Kant's idea of the kingdom ofends refers to a political model in which each individual possesses moral capacities, especially the relational dimension: "Possession of these capacities means that allof us can belong as legislators to a kingdom of ends: an imagined political community in which people reason together to set down the terms, requirements, and constraints that are necessary for a common life together" (Waldron, 2017, p. 140). Waldron's claim of moral capacities among human persons as a relational dimension is significant in the kingdom of ends.

Autonomy of will implies dignity. Kant states, "Autonomy is thus the ground of the dignity of the human and every rational nature" (Kant, 2002, p. 54). Kant writes, "In the realm of ends everything has either a price or a dignity. What has a price issuch that something else can also be put in itsplace as its equivalent; by contrast, that which is elevated above all price, and admits of no equivalent, has a dignity" (Kant, 2002, p. 52). Thus, due to autonomy, humanpersons have dignity.

Kant's Ethics, Human Development, and Global Peace

I argue that the *summum bonum* of Kant's idea of reverence for humanity is to bring about human development and global peace. For Kant, rationality is an essential human potential, and he defends it for human development in a broader sense, such as cognitive, moral, and cultural development. Many scholars agree with Kant that rationality is essential for such development. For instance, Robert Briffault and Ernest H. Gombrich argue that the cause of moral and cultural progress is rationality. In *The Making of Humanity*, Briffault identifies moral progress, not with the development of feeling but with rational thought which causes moral evolution (Briffault, 1919, p. 300). Briffault

agrees with Kant on the role of rationality in moral progress. Similarly, Gombrich argues that the evolution of civilization and culture, that is, the progress of humankind from a primitive state of nature to a civilized polity, depends upon the development of arts, normative values, and "unrestrained use of rationality" (Gombrich, 1969, p. 4). Although Gombrich holds that arts and normative values play a significant role, the unrestrained use of rationality is the key factor for the moral development of humanity. So, Gombrich and Kant converge on the role of rationality for moral progress and human development, in general.

According to Kant, there are two kinds of goods, the natural good and the political good. The highest natural good is the cultivation of natural capacities, that is, human development. Thomas McCarthy states Kant's claim that"nature's purpose in history is not human happiness but human development"(McCarthy, 2009, 61). Human development, in Kant's moral and political thought, enhances positive peace. The highest politicalgood is peace. In *Metaphysics of Morals*, Kantholds that the highest political good is perpetual peace (Kant, 1991, 149). By 'perpetual peace', Kant means endurable peace. In general, Kant's moral and political philosophy explains how society as rational persons and the state as an institution ought to contribute their roles for cultivating their human capacities and perpetual peace. According to Kant, an enlightened human person is a developed person. Kant'sresponse to the question of what enlightenment is – states that 'enlightenment' refers to the autonomy of mental capabilities to understand the world without external guidance (Kant, 1996).So, the cultivation of capacities (potentials) among human persons is something that we call human development. In the later part of this section, I will discuss two questions: first,how does the cultivation of natural capacities (human development) take place? Second,how global peace can be attained?

Kant develops his account of human development in his essay, "Idea of a Universal History within a Cosmopolitan Purpose" (1784). The title of the essay reveals that Kant's account bears two aspects, historical and cosmopolitan. Kant's overarching argument of human development asserts that the "ultimate end is the full development of the natural capacities of the human being" (McCarthy, 2009, p. 53). From a broader perspective, Kant states, "all the natural capacities of a creature are destined sooner or later to be developed completely" (Kant, 2010, p. 18). Her expression, 'creature' does not make a distinction between humans and animals. Particularly for a human creature, Kant states, "In man (as the only rational creature on earth), those natural capacities which are directed toward the use of reason are such that they could be developed only in the species, but not in the individual" (Kant, 2010, p. 18). This proposition demonstrates the role of reason in cultivating natural capacities in the human creature as a species. Kant insists on the historical role of reason in advancing humanity. According to Kant, reason "requires trial, practice, and instruction to enable it to progress gradually from one stage of insight to the next" and "then it will require a long, perhaps incalculable series of generations, each passing on its enlightenment to the next before the germs implanted by nature in our species can be developed to the degree which corresponds to nature's original intention" (Kant, 2010, p. 18). Thus, Kant holds the cultivation of natural capacities advances gradually in species. Kant is correct because such changes do not occur abruptly.

Kant is asocial holist philosopher because he argues that society is essential for the development of natural capacities. Kant states "The highestpurpose of nature – i.e., the development of all-natural capacities - can be fulfilled … only in society, and nature intends that man should accomplish this, by

his efforts" (Kant, 2010, p. 20). This claim shows that the cultivation of natural capacities does not onlyrequire society but also active individuals. McCarthy makes a distinction between two aspects of the cultivation of natural capacitiesof the species in Kant's theory: The first is the negative aspect which liberates them from the despotism of desire. The second is the positive aspect of skill which promotes the arts, sciences, taste, refinement, and the ruleof law in nation-states (McCarthy, 2009). The second aspect is consistent with Kant's formula of humanity in the Categorical Imperative presents a best case for human development. The formula states "Act in such as way that you treat humanity, whether in your person or the person of one another, always at the same time as an end and neversimply as a means" (Kant, 1993, p. 36). I interpret Kant's claim that humanity should be treated as an end in itself in the context of self-respect, dignity, equality, freedom, and fraternity. I hold that when people aretreated as ends, that means their self-respect, dignity, equality, freedom, and fraternity are revered, and people's human capacities are developed. The first part of theformula of humanity is related to positive peace. Kant's categorical imperative is significant for fostering the prospects of human development.

The second question is related to peace. The second part of the formula of humanity implies negative peace. If one is treated simply as a means, one is humiliated, exploited, discriminated against, coerced, or alienated by other people or state institutions. I argue that avoiding treating people simply as a means helps resolve conflicts and negative peace. No one should be treated merely as a means. Treating someone merely as a means can involve, or result in, conflicts, hostilities, and eventually violence. Kant's categorical imperative is significant for eradicating the possibilities of violence and human decadence.

In his short treatise, *Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795), Kant develops his argument for negative peace in the world. Kant assumes that human persons do not want war (Kant, 2006). Yet rulerscan want wars. To end the possibility of war, Kant proposes a republican society because civil society does not desire wars while rulersdo it. Kant's argument creates a cosmopolitanright that seeks hospitality for all human persons across the cultures on the planet Earth (Kant, 2006). In general, 'cosmopolitanism' explains that all human persons, despite their divergent races,genders, cultures, languages, or political affiliations, belong to one humanity. Cosmopolitanism holds three principles: individualism, egalitarianism, and universalism. John Dewey states, "Kant was enough of a child of the eighteenth century to be cosmopolitan, not nationalistic, in his feelings. Kant upheld the ideal of an ultimate republican federation of states; he was one of the first to proclaim the possibility of enduring peace among nations based on such a federated union of mankind" (Dewey, 1915, p. 67-8). Dewey highlights Kant's version of cosmopolitanism and international peace. Kant's cosmopolitanism does not support a single republican state. He supports the federation of free states. A federation of free states creates peace through the rule of universal law.

According to Kant, social injustice causes wars. Instead, global peace is linked with social justice. In *Towards Perpetual Peace,* Kant delineates the necessary conditions for global justice. Kant'srule of the universal law does not protect thefreedom and equality of particular people in particular states but all people in all states. Kant's argument asserts that perpetual peace depends upon the creation and implementation of just laws within the states,among states, and people of all states. In *Towards Perpetual Peace*, Kant develops six preliminary articles for

perpetual peace:

i. ‘‘No peace settlement which secretly reserves issues for a future war shall be considered valid’’ (Kant, 2006, p. 67)
ii. “No independently existing state (irrespective of whether it is large or small) shall be able to be acquired by anotherstate through inheritance, exchange, purchase, or gift’’ (Kant, 2006, p. 68).
iii. ‘‘Standing armies shall gradually be abolished entirely’’(Kant, 2006, p. 69).
iv. ‘‘The state shall not contract debts in connection with its foreign affairs’’(Kant, 2006, p. 69).
v. ‘‘No state shall forcibly interfere in the constitution and government of another state’’(Kant, 2006, p. 70).
vi. “No state shall allow itself such hostilities in wartime as would make mutual trust in a future period of peace impossible. Such acts would include the employment of assassins (percussions), poisoners (benefice), breach of surrender, incitement of treason (perduellio) within the enemy state, etc.’’(Kant, 2006, p. 70).

The central idea of these articles is to remove actual or potential factors that cause hostility between states. Significantly, the preliminary articles show that Kant rejectsthe convergence of states into a world state while he supports a federation of states. Kantmakes a distinction between preliminary and definitive articles: the former helps implement the latter. I explain below Kant’s definitive three articles: creating republican states, creating a federation of free states, and creating cosmopolitan hospitality.

The first definitive article in *Towards Perpetual Peace* asserts: “The civil constitution of every state shall be republican” (Kant, 2006, p. 74). Kant supports the republican constitution of a state for three reasons: first, republican constitutions give freedom to all members of a society as human persons. Second, it is legislated by people as subjects themselves. Third, it supports the equality of all citizens of the state (Kant, 2006, p. 74). Kant argues that world peace can only be acquired through republican constitutions because in a republican state, citizens do not support wars and these citizens can influence their decision-makers on whether the state ought to wage war. In contrast, citizens of adespotic state cannot influence their state to stop a war, because they are merely subjectsand do not have any role in decision-making. Kant states, “The head of [a despotic] state can decide to wage war for insignificant reasons as a kind of game for amusement andcan, for the sake of decency, indifferently leave its justification up to his diplomatic corps, which always stands ready for such tasks” (Kant, 2006, p. 75). In principle, Kant’s argument is persuasive. In a republic state, people play a significant role in deciding whether the state will go to war, but citizens may support wars in some circumstances, and such wars may be legitimate or illegitimate. For instance, most republican states promote nationalism. If citizens of a republican state decide whether to wage warbased on emotions, they could be instruments for waging war instead of avoiding it. So, although a republican state has more chances of avoiding war than a despotic state, having a republican constitution is not sufficient to guarantee that a state will not go to war.

The second definitive article asserts, “International right shall be based on the federalism of free states” (Kant, 2006, p. 78). To establish and sustain peace in the world, Kant defends a federation of free states rather than the creation of a world state. Kant’s concern here is how to prevent world states from existing in a “state of nature”. In the Western tradition, Thomas Hobbes supports a social contract between members to form a Leviathan, a state with absolute power. The Hobbesian state is despotic because the sovereign, whether that is one person or a group of people, holds absolute

power. Kant deviates from the Hobbesian Leviathan world state because it could cause different kinds of conflicts among them. Instead, Kant's federation of free states is a solution to prevent the state of nature using international relations among states. He writes, "Peace can be neither brought about nor secured without a treaty among peoples and for this reason, a special sort of federation must be created, which one mightcall a pacific federation" (Kant, 2006, p. 80). So, the rationale for a federation of free states, in Kant's context, is to promote mutual relationships among states to establish perpetual peace. In contrast, a world state would be administratively inefficient.

The third definitive article asserts, "Cosmopolitan right shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality" (Kant, 2006, p. 82). To establish and sustain peace, Kant proposes a solution he calls 'cosmopolitan right'. According to Kant, 'Cosmopolitan right' is a "right to visit, to which all human beings have a claim, to present oneself to society by the right of common possession of the surface of the earth" (Kant, 2006, p. 82). The cosmopolitan right supports and develops human relationships across borders because it requires that visitors to a foreign land not be victimized for being foreigners. Jeremy Waldron infers the central thesis of Kant's cosmopolitan right, that is, "to live in the world and to regard nothing human as alien" (Waldron, 2000, p. 243). Thus, cosmopolitan right requires (a sort of) universal hospitality. According to Kant, the cosmopolitan right is a "necessary supplement to the unwritten code of constitutional and international right, for public human right in general, and hence for perpetual peace" (Kant, 2006, 85). Thus, cosmopolitan right brings about world peace.

In *Towards Perpetual Peace*, Kant develops an argument for acquiring global peace. Following the Hobbesian tradition, Kant holdsthat people are at war with one another at the state of nature, and he devises a political scheme that could bring about everlasting peace. In this work, Kant delineates the necessary conditions for global justice. The main argument asserts that peace can only be acquired if all states become republican under a universal rule of law for two reasons:first, citizens of a republic do not support the war. Second, politicians in republican states can follow such universal laws. Kant argues that perpetual peace requires a rightful orderat three levels: the national, international, and cosmopolitan. Kant refers to differentkinds of relationships, which are states versus states, and people versus people, and this is on the assumption that states and peopleshare one earth. The rightful order at the national level entails adopting a republican constitution. Cosmopolitan state laws protectthe citizens of the world rather than the citizens of particular states. Cooperation is a key to perpetual peace. Kant aims to determine the essential conditions forabolishing the state of war among states and seeks a pith for perpetual global peace.

Conclusion

This paper investigated how Kant's philosophy advances human development and global peace. Kant's ethics of reverence for humanity promotes positive peace. Kant holds that human persons are capable of using reason, which makes them worthy of reverence. As explained earlier, peace and human development are interdependent: human development enhances positive peace, and negative peace enhances human development. I argued that Kant, in his works, notably including, *Groundworks of the Metaphysics of Morals* and *Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose* supports positive peace through life-affirming activities, such as creative arts. In

Towards Perpetual Peace, Kant's politics of cosmopolitan right brings about negative peace. Kant's philosophy is rational and cosmopolitan, which cultivates natural capacities among human persons across the states, and cosmopolitan laws help create peace among states. So, Kant's moral and political philosophy supports human development and global peace.

Acknowledgments: *This paper is based on the author's PhD research at the Department of Philosophy, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. The author would like to thank Dr Carolyn Mason and Dr Douglas Campbell forreading the original manuscript and making valuable comments and suggestions.*

References

Barash, D. P. (2018). Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies. Fourth edition. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Briffault, R. (1919). The Making of Humanity. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Brinton, C. (1963). The Shaping of Modern Thought, reprint. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bronowski, J. and Mazlish, B. (1986). The Western Intellectual Tradition. USA: Dorset Press.

Dean, R. (2006). The Value of Humanity in Kant's Moral Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dewey, J. (1915). German Philosophy and Politics (New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Eckermann, J. P. (1946) Conversations with Goethe, trans. John Oxenford and ed. J. K. Moorhead. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd, New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. Inc.

Galtung, J. (1996). Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization. London: Sage Publications.

Gombrich, E. H. (1969). In Search of Cultural History. Oxford University Press.

Kant, I (2015). The Critique of Practical Reason. Translated and edited by Mary Gregor. Cambridge, UK.

Kant, I. (1991). The Metaphysics of Morals, trans. and ed. Mary J. Gregor. New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (1991). The Metaphysics of Morals. Translated and edited by Mary J. Gregor. New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (1993). Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals. Translated by James W. Ellington. Third edition. Indianapolis / Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Kant, I. (1996). Practical Philosophy. Translated and edited by Mary J. Gregor. New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2002). The groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, trans. Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kant, I. (2002). Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals. Edited and translated by Allen W. Wood. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kant, I. (2006). Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace and History, ed. Pauline Kleingeld and trans. David L. Colclasure. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kant, I. (2010). "Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose" (17-26). In The Cosmopolitan Reader, ed. Garret Wallace Brown and David Held. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kant, I. (2010). "Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose" (17-26). In The Cosmopolitan Reader. Edited by Garret Wallace Brown and David Held. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kant, I. 1996. Practical Philosophy, trans. and ed. Mary J. Gregor. New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Kerstein, S. J. (2002). Search for the Supreme Principle of Morality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Korsgaard, C. M. (1996). Creating the Kingdom of Ends. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, T. (2009). Race, Empire, and the Idea of Human Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nelson, W. (2008). "Kant's Formula of Humanity", Mind 117, no.1

Paton, H. J. (1965). The Categorical Imperative: A Study in Kant's Moral Philosophy. 5th ed. London: Hutchison and Co. Ltd.

Rawls, J. (2000). Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy, ed. Barbara Herman. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Rosen, M. (2012). Dignity: Its History and Meaning. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press.

Schneewind, J. B. (2010). Essay on the History of Moral Philosophy. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Program, "Human Development Report 1991", project director Mahbub ul Haq. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Waldron, J. (2000). "What is Cosmopolitan?", Journal of Political Philosophy 8, no. 2, (2000): 227–43, 243.

Waldron, J. (2017). One Another's Equals: The Basis of Human Equality. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Wood, A. W. (1999). Kant's Ethical Thought. Cambridge University Press.

Wood, A. W. (2008). Kantian Ethics. Cambridge University Press.