

Report on the International Workshop for Philosophy of Peace “Philosophy of Peace in History: Kant in Hiroshima 2024”

2024 marks the 300th anniversary of the birth of Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher known for his book *Perpetual Peace* (1795). To commemorate this, a workshop was held on October 19th at the SENDA LAB on the Higashi-Senda Campus of Hiroshima University in Hiroshima City. The event was organized by the Hiroshima University Project Research Center for Applied Ethics, implemented by Professor Kirihara of the Social Cognitive Education Area, with assistance from Ms. Gao Yiyang and Mr. Kohei Noro, both of whom are graduate students in this area. (Reporter: Takahiro Kirihara)

The participants for the lectures and presentations are as follows:

[Special Lectures]

Matthias Lutz-Bachmann (Goethe University Frankfurt): “Peace through law? On the strengths and limits of Immanuel Kant’s Political Philosophy”

Soraya Nour Sckell (NOVA School of Law): “Peace through Kant’s Cosmopolitanism”
(online via Zoom)

[Presentations and Discussions]

Toshiro Terada (Sophia University): “Morals and Politics toward Perpetual Peace: Thinking together with Kant in Hiroshima in 2024”

Tomoki Hazama (Hiroshima University): “Reconciliation with Reality: Significance of Telling a Truth”

Junya Hamai (National Institute of Technology, Niihama College): “On the Linkage between Just War Theory and the Theory of Civil Resistance”

Takahiro Kirihara (Hiroshima University): “Reconstructing Kant’s Political Theory as a Philosophy of Peace: Historical Contexts and the Moral Philosophical Foundation”

The event began with a speech from Professor Hiroshi Goto, Director of the Hiroshima University Project Research Center for Applied Ethics, who spoke about the significance of

conducting research on peace in Hiroshima from the perspectives of philosophy and ethics, in light of this year's Nobel Peace Prize being awarded to the Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Victims Organizations (HIDANKYO), and on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of the birth of Kant.

[Special Lectures]

The first special lecturer, Professor Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, a researcher of medieval philosophy, practical philosophy, and Kantian philosophy at the University of Frankfurt, spoke about the significance and potential of Kantian legal and political philosophy, based on an analysis of the current world situation in which conflicts and wars are becoming more serious. Based on the idea of the transition from the state of nature to the state of law and the realization of freedom under the law, he stated that a binding system of the rule of law, that is, a public law system or republic (= *res publica*; public thing), must be implemented not only in constitutional law, but also in international law and Kant's new legal category, world citizen law. In this regard, the biggest difference between private law and public law, the difference between a "provisional" legal order and a "peremptory" one, holds the important key. Kant emphasizes that republicanism as constitutional law is a legitimate public law order, distinguishing it from dictatorship. On the other hand, both the peace federation between nations and the world citizen law as an individual right of visiting/hospitality in foreign countries are included in the framework of "public law," but at the same time have a provisional character of private law (lacking legal force on the parties). Here, the issue of "institutionalization" of the international peace order arises. How to establish a system that gives legal force to the maintenance of peace in each country through a federal system that transcends the nation-state, as is typically seen in the EU, and how to utilize the knowledge of the texts of philosophers such as Kant for this purpose are points that Lutz-Bachmann has long been researching. In this lecture, he reiterated the need to propose an international public law system based on Kant's philosophy to realize world peace, and further pointed out that Kant's concept of a global ethical community (*Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*) is also an essential element for establishing peace. In particular, he emphasized the motif of prohibiting all violence between subjects. It was strongly asserted that peace, as coexistence with others, is an unconditional imperative that must be maintained in all situations, between individuals, between nations, and between

individuals and nations.

The second special lecturer, Professor Soraya Nour Sckell, a researcher of international law, cosmopolitanism, and Kantian philosophy at Nova School of Law, focused on cosmopolitan citizenship and cosmopolitan law from her own long-standing theory of systematic cosmopolitanism (cosmopolitan self, cosmopolitan democracy, cosmopolitan citizenship, cosmopolitan law, cosmocentrism). With regard to cosmopolitan citizenship, she spoke about the importance of the principle of “publicity” (freedom of speech, decision-making in the “public sphere” rather than in a closed room) in the second appendix of *Perpetual Peace*, in contrast to peacebuilding based on rational egoism in the first supplement to the book, “Guarantee of Perpetual Peace.” Her argument is that Kant’s procedural public law order plays a more decisive role in peacebuilding than Kant’s philosophy of history, which is based on the keyword “development of natural dispositions through unsociable sociability.” Behind this lies Kant’s belief that a “reform of ways of thinking” (which, unlike sudden political revolutions, takes time) must be the pillar of a peaceful order. Professor Soraya Nour interpreted Kant’s main point as being that social progress must be achieved through the voluntary involvement of the public, not (only) through economic interests based on rational egoism or the exercise of authoritarian power, and from that perspective, she also touched on Kant’s reference in the chapter “The Conflict between the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Philosophy” in *Conflict of Faculties* about the role of the people to sympathetically observe and become involved (*Teilnehmung*) in the process of reform (or revolution in a distant place). Regarding international law, it was pointed out that the International Criminal Court (ICC) has a system in place whereby individual rulers are held accountable, and that this differs in principle from the collective responsibility of sovereign states in traditional international law. Furthermore, by positioning individuals as subjects of international law (in Kant’s case, cosmopolitan law), it corrects state-centrism and opens the way for the international community to directly protect the rights of individuals, without going through state sovereignty.

[Presentations and discussions]

The first research presenter, a researcher of Kantian philosophy and ethics Toshiro Terada

(Sophia University), focused on the issue of “Politics and Morality” in the appendix of *Toward Perpetual Peace*, systematically placing it within the overall picture of Kant’s philosophy, and clarifying its significance as a theory of peace. The central issue is Kant’s interpretation that “morality” as the “theoretical doctrine of law” and “politics” as the “practical doctrine of law” work together to build a “cosmopolitan constitution,” and that the natural qualities of humanity will develop under the peace that this makes possible. Kant draws a blueprint for the development of this natural quality in *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose*, and in the sixth proposition of the same essay, he warns leaders against “misuse of freedom” (attempting to see themselves as exceptions to the law) and points out the difficulty of educating politicians on their moral qualities, since leaders need leaders (and the latter themselves need leaders etc. ...). Regarding this point, as mentioned in the presentation, the relationship between philosophy and politics in the second supplement to *Toward Perpetual Peace* (philosophers do not exercise power themselves, but seek the truth from an independent standpoint, and politicians listen to the opinions of philosophers and use them as a reference for policymaking) holds an important key to resolving the above-mentioned “politics and morality” problem. Based on his own practice of philosophy education, Mr. Terada emphasized that philosophy in the original sense is not only about specialized philosophers, but also about “(1) Think for oneself, (2) Think into the place of the other [person] (in communication with human beings), (3) Always think consistently with oneself” (*Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*). In other words, philosophy as an “activity” as people’s daily communication practice is philosophy in the true sense. The main focus of this presentation was the difference between practical knowledge (Klugheit; expediency/prudence) and morality. This characterizes the difference between what Kant calls “political moralists” and “moral politicians.” While “political moralists,” who are only concerned with obtaining and maintaining power, utilize practical empirical knowledge centered on human self-interest, “moral politicians” are required to always maintain morality, such as fairness and truthfulness, while appropriately utilizing knowledge of humanity, including practical knowledge, as a means of peacebuilding. The principle of publicity is also essential to guarantee this institutionally. In this sense, the main focus of this presentation is that in order to build the peaceful society, it is essential to cultivate moral politicians, or in a broader sense, to cultivate people’s political and moral qualities through a wide range of philosophical education and philosophical practice, as an essential means of peace.

The second presenter, Hegel scholar Tomoki Hazama (Hiroshima University), considered “reconciliation,” which is essential for the reconstruction of peace between the parties involved after a conflict, in line with Hannah Arendt’s argument, based on the objective of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa, which was to seek the truth and rebuild peaceful relationships between the victims and perpetrators of apartheid. When an event destroys peaceful relationships, the truth of the event (what happened and why it happened) is questioned. If a story or narrative of the event is given, the meaning of the event can be understood and “reconciliation with reality” becomes possible. In response to the view that justice (punishment) is necessary for reconciliation, Arendt takes the view that truth is necessary for it, and furthermore, accepting from Hegel the view that reconciliation with reality is a rational insight into reality, she criticizes the lack of plurality in the latter. The presentation also introduced Arendt’s important argument regarding the difference between forgiveness and reconciliation, that the former brings about an unequal relationship, while the latter creates an equal relationship of solidarity. In addition, regarding the issue of who should tell the truth about an event, the presentation expressed agreement with Arendt’s emphasis on the perspective of an impartial observer in order to clarify the truth, while keeping in mind the perspective of a sympathetic third party as described by Kant.

The third presenter, Junya Hamai (Niihama National College of Technology), a researcher of modern political philosophy including Charles Taylor, compared the just war theory with the theory of nonviolent civil resistance. In his presentation, he explained the basic points of just war theory (justifiable reasons for the use of force as a last resort, reasonable prospects for success, proportionality, protection of civilians, etc.) centering on the legitimacy of humanitarian intervention based on Michael Walzer, and Walzer’s judgment on recent wars based on that, and then introduced Erica Chenoweth’s theory of civil resistance.

Considering that the success rate of nonviolent resistance movements throughout the 20th century was over 50%, while the success rate of resistance movements using violent means was about 25%, Chenoweth argues that nonviolent resistance movements are effective because they do not involve aggression against others, even if they are “non-institutional actions” that deviate from actions within institutional frameworks such as voting and

lobbying, and therefore can gain the support and participation of more people. In the presentation, the just war theory and civil resistance theory were compared from the utilitarian perspective of their respective political effects. The minimum requirement for civil resistance is that it does not fall within the framework of institutional behavior, but as the hurdles rise from there, such as ignoring politeness, illegal activities, and self-harm, civil resistance also takes on the same “last resort” character as the just war theory, and when it comes to “fringe violence” and “armed uprising,” it goes beyond the framework of civil resistance. The above discussion makes it possible to refine the evaluation axis of their effectiveness and moral legitimacy by analyzing humanitarian intervention and civil resistance in detail from the perspective of action theory.

The fourth research presenter was scheduled to be Takahiro Kiriwara (Hiroshima University), a researcher of Kant’s practical philosophy and Critical Theory, but due to time constraints, the presentation was cut short and instead he asked the participants for their opinions on how to proceed with future research based on the results of this workshop. The proposal to continue peace philosophy research in Hiroshima, using this workshop held on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of Kant’s birth, as a starting point, was supported. The main focus of Kiriwara’s presentation was to examine the perspectives for reconstructing Kant’s practical philosophy as a peace philosophy by repositioning it in historical contexts. Among the definitive articles of *Perpetual Peace* (Republic of state law, Peace Federation of international law, and the right of visiting and hospitality as world citizen law), the discussion of representative government presented in the first republican theory lacked concreteness compared to that of Thomas Paine and did not go beyond the framework of Prussian constitutional monarchy, whereas the second peace federation shows the direction of federalism as a system of mutual constraints of sovereignty that goes beyond the limits of sovereign states, and is argued to have a connection with Leibniz’s federal system with the Holy Roman Empire in mind. In addition, the third cosmopolitan theory is interpreted as aiming to secure the maximum rights of individuals in international society, and in this regard, in order to clarify the specific scope of the universal rights of individuals, the social philosophical interpretation of the purposiveness formula in the categorical imperative (Herman Cohen, Tetsuro Watsuji) is examined while taking into account the criticism of the labor-power commodity theory in modern Marxist studies.

[Comments from participating students]

Before attending the workshop, I had hardly thought about the relationship between philosophy and peace. However, during the two years I lived in Hiroshima, I took a lot of peace education courses at the university, visited the atomic bomb site, and realized the destructiveness of war to mankind and the importance of peace. Among Kant's series of philosophical thoughts, I am very interested in the establishment of public law mentioned by Professor Matthias Lutz-Bachmann. In Professor Hamai's speech, it was also mentioned that there are also unjust wars in our current world. Although the political forms of various countries are different at present, we can resist or reduce such unjust wars by establishing a similar public order to promote the development of peace. (Gao Yiyang, 1st year master's student of this course)

I participated in this workshop as part of Professor Kirihara's graduate class. I belonged to a seminar on Western philosophy as an undergraduate (at another university), but this was the first time for me to participate in a full-scale workshop on philosophy, and I think I was able to learn about a world that I could not have known only by reading literature at university. I asked a question about peace education, especially in Hiroshima, considering the current international situation and Kant's eternal peace theory and world citizenship. In response, I received a proposal for a philosophy education that integrates "knowing the truth" and "thinking for oneself." I am studying social studies education, and although I am not directly studying Kant, I would like to hold on to ideas such as world citizenship in the fundamental part of my research, such as "What is the purpose of my research?" (Kohei Noro, 1st year master's student of this course)