

Hülya Yaldir / Güncel Önkal (eds.)

New Horizons in Philosophy and Sociology

What is our responsibility as scholars in the Humanities and Social Sciences in the face of global issues threatening humanity today? This book provides a platform for an interdisciplinary, cross-cultural dialogue among philosophers and sociologists on the most pressing global issues facing humanity today. Combining the critical thinking of philosophy with sociological methods and researches, this volume offers fresh and stimulating perspectives with regard to various issues including environmental degradation, democracy, gender and economic inequalities, religion, war and peace.

The Editors

Hülya Yaldir is Professor of Philosophy at Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey. She received her MA and PhD degrees in Philosophy from the University of Reading, UK. Her main areas of interest are philosophy of mind, metaphysics, early modern philosophy, logic, philosophy of culture and comparative philosophy.

Güncel Önkal is Associate Professor at Maltepe University, Istanbul, Turkey. He has specialised in cultural philosophy, social epistemology, philosophy of art, sociology of punishment and sociology of knowledge by means of practical issues. He is currently delivering courses on daily-life sociology, modernity and postmodernity, sociology of knowledge and urban studies.

Hülya Yaldir / Güncel Önkal (eds.)

New Horizons in Philosophy and Sociology



Hülya Yaldir / Güncel Önkal (eds.)

New Horizons in Philosophy and Sociology

ISBN 978-3-631-74207-5



9 783631 742075

www.peterlang.com



PETER LANG

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

New Horizons in Philosophy and Sociology

This is a personal reading copy for the author of this published work and limited to personal use only. It is imperative to respect the publisher`s repository policy and copyright restrictions (www.peterlang.com/howtoshare). Any use outside this policy and especially any commercial use is a violation of law.

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Hülya Yaldır / Güncel Önkal (eds.)

New Horizons in Philosophy and Sociology


PETER LANG

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Yaldir, Hulya, 1965- editor. | Onkal, Guncel, 1978- editor.

Title: New horizons in philosophy and sociology / Hulya Yaldir, Guncel Onkal (eds.).

Description: New York : Peter Lang, [2018] | Includes bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017060874 | ISBN 9783631742075

Subjects: LCSH: Social sciences--Philosophy.

Classification: LCC H61 .N489 2018 | DDC 300--dc23 LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2017060874>

Cover photo: © Chinnapong / Fotolia.com

Printed by CPI books GmbH, Leck

ISBN 978-3-631-74207-5 (Print)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-74705-6 (E-PDF)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-74706-3 (EPUB)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-74707-0 (MOBI)
DOI 10.3726/b13330

© Peter Lang GmbH
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
Frankfurt am Main 2017
All rights reserved.

Peter Lang – Frankfurt am Main · Bern · Bruxelles · New York ·
Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Acknowledgments

In bringing this project to fruition, we have incurred a tremendous debt of gratitude to many people. First and foremost, our deepest thanks to all our contributors, whose invaluable input, dedication and collegiality made the project a pleasure and worthwhile. Special thanks is due to Gönül İçli and Keziban Der who have been a great source of encouragement, guidance and friendship from the project's conception. We are immensely grateful to Mehmet Meder, Rıza Sam, Neslihan Sam, Özgür Sarı, Türkan Erdoğan and Gül Aktaş for their unstinting help and continuing support during this process. Their innumerable and insightful suggestions have greatly improved this project. Our thanks extend to our students who have inspired and encouraged us through this project. We also would like to thank Peter Lang Publishing for supporting our project and providing us with the opportunity to publish it. Last, but by no means least, our earnest and heartfelt thanks to those closer to home. We owe a lot to our families and friends for their endless support and encouragement along the way.

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Contents

<i>Hülya Yaldır and Güncel Önkal</i> Introduction: The Alliance of Understanding	11
Part I: Concepts and Methodology for New Horizons	
<i>Güncel Önkal and Ahu Tunçel</i> Social Knowledge: Inclusions and Exclusions for the Sake of the Future Democracy	15
<i>Ayşe Gül Çıvgın and Seda Özsoy</i> Human's Tragedy in the Global World	25
<i>Elif Çırakman</i> On Finitude and the Ground of Hope: A Kantian Horizon Radicalized by Meillassoux	39
<i>Mirza Iqbal Ashraf</i> The Quest for Peace	55
<i>Mustafa Kaya</i> About the Opportunity of a Permanent Peace in Today's World: Kantian Perpetual Peace	69
<i>Qodratullah Qorbani</i> Rationality in Religion and Religious Beliefs	85
<i>Zouhir Gabsi</i> Islamic Perspective on Islamophobia: From Misconceptions to Reason	103
<i>M^a Ángeles Corpas Aguirre</i> The West and Islam: Consequences in the Marginalization of the Religion by the Post-National State	119
<i>Özgül Ekinçi and Hülya Yaldır</i> Unravelling the Dark Face of the Enlightenment: Theodor Adorno	131

<i>Nurten Kiriş Yılmaz and Hülya Yaldır</i> Environmental Destruction as a Philosophical Problem	147
<i>Mehmet Ali Sarı</i> The Relation between Theory and Observation in Science as Seen by N. R. Hanson	163
<i>Viviana Yaccuzzi Polisenà</i> Quantum Theory is the Paradigm of Contemporary Science: The Role of Philosophy in the New Paradigm	173
<i>Mirza Iqbal Ashraf</i> Wisdom and Artificial Intelligence	189
Part II: Researches for New Horizons	
<i>Türkan Erdoğan</i> A Qualitative Research with Healthcare Employees regarding Violence against Healthcare Workers	205
<i>Gönül İçli</i> Feminist Economics and Unpaid Labour	219
<i>Gönül İçli</i> Macroeconomic Growth Policies and Female Labour	237
<i>Gül Aktaş, Mehmet Meder and Zuhâl Çiçek</i> Women Entrepreneurs in Rural Areas: From Awareness to Difference: Denizli Case	251
<i>Mehmet Meder, Zuhâl Çiçek and Gül Aktaş</i> Sociological Analysis of the Effects of Divorce on Children: Example of Denizli in Turkey	267
<i>Büke Koyuncu</i> Rendezvous of Turkish Secularists with Yoga: Self-Inquiry Attempts in the Midst of Spirituality, Religion and Politics	277

Personal Copy _ Please respect www.peterlang.com/howtoshare

Contents

9

Özgür Sarı

The HIV/AIDS in Turkey as a Social Phenomenon 293

Rıza Sam and Neslihan Sam

Life Support Units and Rings of Sustainable Cities: Ecological Villages 303

Notes on Contributors 313

Hülya Yıldır and Güncel Önkal

Introduction: The Alliance of Understanding

Philosophy and sociology, two siblings—from the same family yet with distinct attributes and personalities—constantly argue and fight yet complement each other perfectly. Likewise, these two disciplines spring from and are fed by the same sources, namely, society and human beings. Though they are all principally concerned with the nature, life and activities of men and social structure, they yield different analyses and interpretations of the given subjects. This difference stems from techniques and tools each discipline uses in examining and explaining a particular subject. Having located within the scientific paradigm, sociology heavily relies on empirical methods and seeks to provide a deeper insight into a social phenomenon and the cause-effect relationships embedded in it. Philosophy does not premise on providing definite answers to any questions. As Russell remarks, “as soon as definite knowledge concerning any subject becomes possible, this subject ceases to be called philosophy, and becomes a separate science”. Thus, philosophical inquiry is a never-ending critical inquiry into any given problem. Although these divergent modes of approaches may lead to fragmentation among disciplines and draw a sharp line among them, the affinity and alliance among them cannot be denied. They all nurture and influence each other. For instance, Max Weber is often regarded as a “Nietzschean sociologist”, which reveals the influence of Nietzsche’s philosophy on Weber’s sociology. Philosophical and sociological works not only supply materials and new ideas to each other, but also play a pivotal role in teaching and learning process of the prominent views and problems in each field. The emergence of sociology as a positivist social science cannot be considered apart from its philosophical roots and history of ideas through ages. The philosophers who regard sociological relations are more efficient in their conclusions as the sociologists who take philosophical core concepts into consideration while obtaining their methodology in understanding society and human reality.

Thinkers in our era prefer to label several concepts such as *post-truth*, *-post age*, *the end of postmodernism*, *the transhumanism age*, *the end*, etc. It is appropriate to say that all concepts are “incomplete”, all definitions about human and society are “partial” and “blurred”. The nature of humanitarian sciences has been under question for ages, since the reality of humanities is so complex and open to transitions in personal, social and institutional respects. Thus this book begins

with the tragic roots of our global world. If we follow the motto “to define is to understand”, the philosophical concepts require a tool for evaluating humanity in current, global conditions.

This book starts to define new horizons in philosophy and sociology with the debate of social knowledge for the sake of future democracy, in which the possible social conditions of the concepts of democracy is discussed by Ranciere.

“Human’s Tragedy in the Global World” underlines the unfavourable consequences of global developments and the transformed modes of production and consumption, commodification, alienation, exploitation, new forms of slavery, virtual relationships and tyranny. The fragile, interrupted, partial life of human is surrounded by sovereignty relations of the time.

In such a world, it is not easy to provide a continuous hope for future. The following two chapters are quite relevant to evaluate the idea of hope between conceptual–philosophical and sociological levels.

New horizons in philosophy and sociology cannot ignore the religious approach and outsider point of view. Thus, three more chapters are dedicated to discuss this topic under conceptual, sociological and political perspectives.

Since the first part is dedicated to concepts and methodology, culture industry, philosophizing social events, the paradigm shifts in social sciences and the features of observation are all included in this part.

Second part includes researches for the reader and those researches cover varied social phenomena such as female health workers, female labour, the effects of divorcement on children, yoga, HIV and environmental issues.

This book kindly invites its readers to the alliance of philosophy and sociology by providing an interdisciplinary platform where scholars present and share their views with regard to contemporary world problems.

Mustafa Kaya

About the Opportunity of a Permanent Peace in Today's World: Kantian Perpetual Peace

1 Introduction

During the history of philosophy, philosophers suggested various ideas on "peace" that is an important problem of humanity. Concept of peace indicates an ontological condition or process that describes what and how relationship of man with him, others, nature and God would be. Longing for peace is one of the mostly mentioned demands in our day when wars have never decelerated and become more destructive and boundless by means of new opportunities brought along technology.

On the other hand, human rights violations, terror, wars against terror, civil wars or wars between the countries are usual circumstances today. While a part of the world experiences the wars in all reality, the other part of more people watch them. The demand of people caused by the events experienced or watched is common: a world without war or a permanent peace (Tepe, 2013: 63).

One of the most frequently asked questions of today is "is a world with a permanent peace and without war possible or not?" Immanuel Kant considered this question, demonstrated preconditions of a permanent (perpetual) peace and tried to show that human being inheres opportunity of a world peace as well as eagerness to fight.

Kant intended to make the peace one of the basic subjects of philosophy by his work called *Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* published in 1795. Kant, in his work, carried purpose of traditional politics philosophy a step further through his idea on opportunity of an international peace based on human rights. As is known, it was accepted that basic function of politics is to establish word against violence in the political thinking tradition from the ancient time, and basic duty and responsibility of the philosophers was regarded as thinking on conditions of peace. In accordance with this basic directing idea which modern philosophers shared as well as ancient philosophers, war could be legitimate only for establishing and protecting civil peace against the external threat. However, ideas on not only a possibility of civil peace but also a possibility of establishing a peace between the countries, namely international ground, found a theoretical

ground with Kant for the first time. Thus, Kant tries to found conditions of peace in international relations by turning human rights into “human rights” of the countries (Çörekçioğlu, 2012: 3).

This work discussed by Kant in the late period adopted a critical and synthesizer method related to peace theories prior to it as well as it included its basic philosophical principles such like *general validity* and *universality*. Moreover, ideas suggested by Kant turned into an effective theory as he wanted to create the peace to establish among people at the heart of law. For this reason, his theory of peace inspired great interest not only in philosophy history but also in certain fields like law and political sciences (Yeşilçayır, 2016: 79).

The work of Kant called *Toward Perpetual Peace: A philosophical Sketch* is composed of two main chapters. First chapter is composed of preconditions intended to end war, and these conditions are mostly the preparation phase for second chapter. These preconditions are organized as prohibitory articles and they have no judicial content. As for the second chapter of the book, Kant tries to found peace in the context of philosophy of law. He suggests three articles based on law in this chapter and he indicates that peace could be established between the countries when these articles are applied incrementally. For Kant, it is required to establish a legal order representing right of everybody in order to ensure a peace environment or escape from the natural condition that is a state of war. It is the state that will do that. Thus, at first every state should establish the required environment of freedom in itself in order to make progress that is written as a fate for humanity. This progress that will be in three phases should be primarily at national basis. For this reason, Kant argues the formation of a republican management in the context of state law. As for the second phase, a federative union should be formed between the countries by transmitting the judicial understanding formed in national sense to international ground. As for the third and last phase, peace creates a universal identity in the scope of cosmopolitan right. In this chapter, phases suggested by Kant for establishment of peace will be analysed and it will be examined if it is possible to establish “perpetual peace” in today’s world.

2 Preconditions of perpetual peace

Kant proposes conditions to establish perpetual peace and guarantee it within the struggle to create a structure that can make a lawful judgment in *Perpetual Peace*. He explains formation of an international peace in six preconditions in *Perpetual Peace*. These preconditions are the preconditions of a possibility to

protect legal structure of a state as well as they can be considered as conditions to establish peaceful principles between the states. In that, the aforementioned articles are negative conditions where the possibility of state of war, conflict and pressure would disappear between the countries. According to Kant, these preconditions include possible causes of war in the future and obstacles to perpetual peace. Each condition that would prevent war permanently, not temporarily and for a short time, ensures to protect both condition in which legal integrity and character of a state would be guaranteed indirectly and civil condition between the countries and civil constitution of a state. For this reason, Kant emphasizes that it is required to create peace alliances instead of temporary ceasefires or agreements in order to establish a permanent peace by excluding all kinds of agreement including primarily another reason of war (Kant, 2006: 67–68).

In another precondition, Kant describes the notion of state and he emphasizes that a state cannot pass into other hands through inheritance, commerce or donation. For Kant, “for a state is not a possession (*patrimonium*), as is, for instance, the territory on which it exists. It is, rather, a society of human beings, whom no one but the state itself may command or dispose of” (Kant, 2006: 68). In addition, Kant states that conflicts may arise from the tension, competition caused by the presence of permanent armies between the countries and, more importantly, from use of people as an instrument in permanent armies while he mentions the need of removing permanent armies. For him, “being hired out to kill or be killed seems to constitute a use of human beings as mere machines and tools in the hand of another (the state), a use which is incompatible with the rights of humanity in our own person” (*ibid.*, 69).

In this context, Kant indicates both moral and legal *a priori* principles criticizing the ideal of humanity for the use of people as an instrument in someone else's hands whom he defines as having the freedom inherently as the only original right in his critical philosophy. In the moral context, Kant considers keeping permanent armies as an action conflict with the command of categorical imperative which says “behave regarding human, and also you, as an objective but a means”. As for legal context, Kant considers principle of intrinsic objective and freedom of human being as a *a priori* principle of the public legal order (Satıcı, 2012: 228).

In case of preconditions to establish a perpetual peace is not performed, possibility of conflict and war between the countries would be kept alive continuously. In that, rich and strong states would use the states weaker than them as a means for their objectives by carrying out attacks against independencies of

these weaker countries. Therefore, Kant emphasizes that the states should know liberties and autonomies of each other and that they should consider each other as an objective but a means. Thus, Kant presents these preconditions as articles to follow for perpetual peace, however perpetual peace will not be guaranteed when only these preconditions take place. For this reason, Kant describes the necessity to determine regulatory principles that can establish perpetual peace and that are mental and valid for everybody and every situation as in the whole system:

For the possibility of such a formulation (one similar to a mathematical formula) is the only genuine touchstone of a kind of legislation that remains consistent, without which the so-called *ius certum* will always remain a mere pious wish. Otherwise one will have nothing but *general* laws (which are valid *for the most part* [*imAllgemeinen*]), and no universal laws (which are valid *in all cases* [*allgemein*]), as the concept of law seems to require (Kant, 2006: 73).

3 Sense of republican state

Kant starts to explain positive conditions to establish perpetual peace in three articles after he states negative conditions in which possibility of state of war, conflict and pressure between the countries would be removed. In other words, Kant starts to present a priori, universal, de facto, public and legal principles for establishment of perpetual peace.

According to Kant, natural state of human being (*status naturalis*) is not a state of peace; it is a state of war and seems as if it would explode at any time even though it was not announced all the time (Kant, 2006: 72). For Kant, who thinks that state of nature is always a state of war among the people belonging to a community in which interrelations are not determined by the laws, liberties and equalities of the citizens composing a society should be guaranteed by a legal agreement state in order to provide a state of peace (Recki, 2005: 210).

According to Kant, people who can affect each other should be members of a civilian organization and legal organizations should be at the hands of laws so that freedom could be ensured and possible wars could be prevented. Yet any juridical constitution, with regard to the persons that are subject to it,

one based on the right of *citizens of a state* governing the individuals of a peoples (*ius civitatis*), one based on *international right* governing the relations of states among one another (*ius gentium*), one based on cosmopolitan right, to the extent that individuals and states, who are related externally by the mutual exertion of influence on each other, are to be regarded as citizens of a universal state of humankind (*ius cosmopoliticum*) (ibid., 73).

State of law indicated by Kant for the first time is a republican constitution that arises from the agreement and that is the first phase of path to peace. In his

words, “civil constitution of every state should be republican” (ibid., 74). For Kant, this constitution should be based on three principles:

First, according to principles of the *freedom* of the members of a society (as human beings), second, according to principles of the *dependence* of all on a single, common legislation (as subjects), and third, according to the law of the *equality* of the latter (as *citizens of the state*) (ibid.).

According to Kant, only enlightened people or nations can create a republican constitution including freedom and dependency principles based on equality law. According to Kant, for enlightenment, all that is needed is freedom. The freedom in question is the most innocuous form of all – freedom to make public use of one’s reason in all matters (Kant, 1993: 54–55; Der & Yaldir, 2016: 194).

For Kant, republic is a regime that prefers decisions of citizens not rules of kings. For him, only the republican state, having sprung from the pure source of the concept of right, guarantees the rights of individual (Kant, 2006: 75). In such an understanding, citizens create constitution and state’s management with their free wills, and they stay loyal to the order they create.

It is definitely possible to establish a republican order as a result of an agreement formed by the common united wills of people. It is seen that ideas of Rousseau had effects on adoption of republican regime. Rousseau believed that a legal regime depends on formation of a common will from the will of each individual (Rousseau, 2007: 47; Yaldir & Der, 2016: 276). Concept of common will suggested by him appears as united wills in Kant. He indicates that the state meaning the union formed by communities under the legitimate laws in *Morals Metaphysics* reflects the common will in terms of resting on the agreement, and he emphasizes importance of legal liberty, equal citizenship and united will of the people (Kant, 1991: 124).

From this aspect, Kant demonstrates the necessity of a juridical and legal regulation through agreement in order to overcome the absence of law and remove the potential of war in the state of nature. Thus, a republican state moving from state of nature bearing war potential to legality state through an agreement ensured a juridical and legal state of peace within itself among the citizens. Kant indicates that citizens of states shaped by such a republican constitution can prevent war. In case of every state structure being republican, states of law acting with will to peace would definitely play important roles in establishment of legal and lawful order for perpetual peace. While Kant emphasizes the transition from state of nature to state of law, namely unity of the common united wills of individuals, he also emphasizes the

possibility to establish perpetual peace from the level of individuals to the level of states. This emphasis makes civil republic the precondition of an international peace, as well.

Kant states that republicans are less inclined to the war compared to other regimes (Kant, 2006: 75). For him, while many kings considered wars as an entertainment party at the beginning and decided to war easily, republicans did not consider war as an adventure. For Kant, republican regimes would ask their citizens the question “is it required to declare war or not?” before they enter into a serious event like war. For Kant, if citizens are conferred on, then they will not want to fight due to the results of war (ibid., 75). Therefore, as consent of the people is required to decide war in republican regimes, citizens would normally make decisions against the war due to deaths and poverty caused by the war. Otherwise, people would bear the negative consequences caused by the war. It is seen that Kant proposes an empirical argument and argues that citizens in the republican societies would come up against the war due to physical and moral damages caused by the war (Yeşilçayır, 2016: 81).

Second, Kant states that any possible external attack and intervention is less in republican countries than the countries governed by other regimes. For example, it is easier to intervene in internal affairs of a country governed by monarchy compared to a country governed by republican regime. In that, intervention from other countries might be possible as riots of people and violence against the citizens will be most likely seen in the countries that are not governed by republic. As for republican regimes representing the will of citizens, they are more dependable against the possible attacks. In that, any intervention would be regarded as being against the will of people. As it is seen, Kant offers some arguments and argues that republican regime is more peaceful. When his thesis is considered in today’s conditions, we encounter striking results. Although countries that reflect will of their citizens on the regime are peaceful between each other, they might exhibit an aggressive attitude against other anti-democratic countries (Büyükbaş & Atıcı, 2012: 6). One of the most remarkable examples in this regard is intervention and attacks from the United States of America governed by democracy under the effort of democratization towards the countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Argument of Kant suggesting that countries governed by republic are more peaceful is a more consistent understanding for that period compared to our period. In the later centuries, ideas such as powerful nationalism in the political field appeared in the countries reflecting wills of the people. It was seen that countries sometimes became a threat for other countries due to these ideas intended to make their domestic structure stronger.

4 A federation of peoples

According to Kant, the second phase required for perpetual peace is formation of a federation. In other words, Kant intends to carry the republican understanding that is the first phase to an international field at the second phase. Kant emphasizes that majority of the countries only consisting of republican, constitutional and liberal countries could create a federation for perpetual peace. According to that, international right shall be based on the federalism of free states (Kant, 2006: 78). Kant combines the article expressing that every country is required to be formed by a republican constitution with the idea of a federation on establishing a state of peace between the countries.

Peoples, as states, can be judged as individual human beings who, when in the state of nature (that is, when they are independent from external laws), bring harm to each other already through their proximity to one another, and each of whom, for the sake of his own security, can and ought to demand of others that they enter with him into a constitution, similar to that of a civil one, under which each is guaranteed his rights. This would constitute a *federation of peoples*... (ibid.).

Kant, by analogy between individual and the state in order to found an understanding of federation, argues that it is required to consider countries as individuals one by one. For this reason, a legal assurance is required in relationships between the countries. In the international arena, fundamental rights of the countries should be protected by international law (ibid.). In this context, Kant argues against the thesis of Locke that natural rights of the human are unalterable and he argues that natural rights should pass into law (Flikschuh, 2008: 149). He argues that countries should create a legal community such like individuals by moving away from the state of nature as he assesses the countries as if they are individuals (Kant, 2006: 78).

Thus, Kant thinks that international peace can occur only in the frame of a *union of nations* (Völkerbund) based on the international law. In his book called *On the Common Saying: This May Be True in Theory, But It Does Not Hold in Practice*, he wrote almost two years before *Perpetual Peace*, he tells about desperation and difficulty caused by the ongoing violence and wars in the history of humanity and in fact he emphasizes that human mind indicates an international (universal) constitution. In the same book, he points out the desperation experienced by societies and he argues that it became compulsory to establish a federation based on international law (Kant, 2010: 51). Then, in *Perpetual Peace*, he expresses these ideas in a more stressed manner. While proposing this theory, Kant indicates that countries would not create a single country when they entered into the federation of peoples and they would protect their identities

same as before. For him, this structure is a federation of peoples where they would not dominate each other or would not act with the intent of holding down each other. In the federation, each government and citizen would be acknowledged by their own autonomous and liberal characters, and the current rights would be mutual rights of the nations that would not disappear into a single government (Kant, 2006: 78). Mutual right is the basic principle of international law. Concepts like assurance of the rights, being warless, perpetual peace, border security, protection for weak countries are the basic principles observed by this law. In other words, assurance of the identities and independencies of the nations is the international law that is the assurance of peace. For this reason, federation of peoples is a legal structure that prevents possible destructive tendencies of the countries. This structure protects both security of the territory borders of the countries and cultural and political pre-determination rights of the countries (Höffe, 2010: 230).

For Kant, governments should have a law of peace, not law of war, as wars brought along cruelty on humanity and therefore mankind is required to aim at ending cruelties to the last. In this context, Kant criticizes the philosophers who wanted to create a law of war in the previous periods because war can be never presented as a legitimate instrument. For this reason, the union to establish between the countries is a federation that would ensure the state of perpetual peace (Kant, 1991: 151).

Kant wants to take preventive measures against a number of misunderstandings as well as add a universal dimension to the peace with the idea of a federation of peoples. In that, peace required to be established between the nations is not the project on a country of world, it is a federative idea called union of the nations (Yeşilçayır, 2016: 84). For Kant, a possible country of world is not a formation suitable for peace of law, and the idea of international peace can be practiced only in a federation (Kant, 1991: 151). Furthermore, it is not possible to establish peace on the grounds of law as supranationalist despotic power would be formed in a possible country of world. Therefore, it is possible to establish and ensure the peace within a structure in the form of a federation of peoples in which participant countries protect their independencies (Kant, 2006: 80).

Idea of Kant on an international federation represents the legal form on which necessary international political relations should be based so that governments established their constitutional order will protect both their liberal entities and perpetual peace. For this reason, terms of republican regime and international federation summarize the political philosophy of Kant (Strauss & Cropsey, 1987: 581).

Importance of the federation design in terms of political and moral philosophy of Kant is combination of political and ethical designs. Combination of political

design and moral design of Kant can take place with the idea of federation. In that, an international federation founded by many governments turning into one government is possible by approaching ethics and politics closer together. Such union and association are a priori and compulsory in terms of principles of law (Kant, 2006: 107–108). Therefore, Kant ceases the citizenship of only one government with the idea of federation and brings people to the level of being a member of the world or citizen of the world.

5 Cosmopolitan right

Kant's principle of cosmopolitan right has a supplementary content which regulates relations between the countries and people and concludes the disagreements. For Kant, legal status of the individuals in other countries should be limited one by one by the conditions of universal hospitality (Kant, 2006: 82). Hospitality is not the right of an unlimited hospitality; on the contrary, it is the right of a limited hospitality. In addition, Kant argues that preferring right of visit to right of hospitality should be a valid principle for all countries. Moreover, he suggests that hospitality should substitute for hostility prevailing between the countries. When people go other countries, they should obey the rules of visit and they should not be treated like an enemy. However, individuals do not have the right to take up permanent residence anywhere they wish on the globe but only the right of "temporary sojourn" in foreign lands (ibid., 82).

It is possible to bring the foundations of Kant's idea of cosmopolitan right to the Stoics who lived in Hellenistic period. *Logos* (universal wisdom) and *kosmopolis* (university) fiction of Stoa affects Kant's idea deeply. Kant argues that university could appear in *Perpetual Peace* but it could take place as a requirement of universal wisdom, not by individual will of people. In other words, for Kant, universal wisdom (*logos*) would provide university (*kosmopolis*). It is comprehended that as long as every particular mind is a part of total mind or universal wisdom, university would appear as logos (*universal wisdom*) (Bağcı, 2003: 108). Kant involved idea of Stoics cosmopolitan in the thinking system of the modern ages and demonstrated it in context of philosophy of law. For this reason, world citizenship is not a moral principle, it is a legal principle.

Principle of the cosmopolitan right is closely associated with the liberty sense of Kant included in the philosophy of law. He involved this statement in the *Metaphysics of Morals*: "Law includes agreement conditions of arbitrariness of someone with arbitrariness of another one according to general law of freedom" (Kant, 1991: 63). Accordingly, universal legal laws will specify limits of freedom and arbitrariness of individuals. It is required to create general principles of law

and law of freedom because people cannot spread in the universe at their wills as earth is limited (Kant, 2006: 82). Cosmopolitanism requires that liberties of people are organized by a particular principle, and occurrence of peace in universal sense is closely associated with the establishment of general law of freedom. When freedom is considered as a personal right, it is seen that Kant tried to formulate philosophical foundations of an understanding in which rights would be secured mutually. If a universal principle of law takes place throughout the earth and relations between the countries start to take place within the scope of fairness, then it opens the door of world peace slightly for humankind. In this context, it would be useful to review reasons why Kant developed an idea of cosmopolitan right.

There are a few reasons why Kant developed an idea of cosmopolitan right. First of them is associated with colonization and colonialism activities which reached excessive dimensions in the period Kant lived. Although Kant thinks that European civilizations are more sophisticated than other regions in the world, he considers that authorities of Europeans to civilize others, which they granted themselves and have no basis, do not mesh with the civilization. For him, civilization is the process in which a nation enhances itself to an upper level of power with its own efforts in the light of its own provisions and objectives. Kant considers the higher civilization as the development of competences of the mankind and as possessing the power to direct people actually to higher conditions of living in terms of both rights and morals. However, indicators of the civilization are tyranny, ambition, enthusiasm, etc., in the world we live in. These indicators not only brought along sedition and inequality in the European society but also caused people in this society to regard these places as abandoned and therefore occupy those places as they became arrogant and set people living in other regions of the world at naught (Wood, 2009: 222). Kant speaks of the “horrible lengths” to which European traders have gone in “visiting” foreign lands, which with them is tantamount to conquering them (Kant, 2006: 82). He addresses to the good causes promised by the colonists and he expresses that it is not difficult to make out how they could hide their violations of law through the cruelty (Kant, 1991: 266). We wish we could at least hope these ideas of Kant would have been known in the past two hundred years. Once, Europeans stated they brought “civilization” to the places they conquered, today they have stated they brought “freedom” and “democracy” to the countries such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

According to Kant, it is exactly a lawlessness to make other countries a colony and seize their rights and it is a severe obstacle before the peace (Kant, 2006: 83). Kant withstands colonist policies with the theory of international law. It is never

possible to ensure peace in universal sense through colonist policies in severe dimensions and by ignoring the law. Law of world citizenship includes legal regulations to take the precautions required to end colonization and colonialism.

As for the second reason, it is associated with competence of critical thinking which Kant made it a general character of philosophy. For him, although thinking is regarded as an action which can be performed by human in his own, thinking consistently requires to take thought of other people into consideration. Checking our own ideas with others' ideas and criticisms would relieve us of being dogmatic and prejudiced. However, if communication is over with the mass to which we presented our thoughts, then we cannot learn about their thoughts and we cannot question to what extent we think consistently (Kant, 1991: 55).

Hannah Arendt (2005) argues that there is a close junction between Kant's idea on common and critical thinking and his principle of world citizenship. Accordingly, thinking consistently required to evaluate our ideas with ideas and criticisms of other people. Kant prefers to create his own ideas by taking ideas of other people into consideration because it is required to think with a comprehensive mentality so that idea could evolve into a consistent structure. In other words, ideas and criticisms from other people are important in order that man can use his mind reasonably and accurately. Besides, if human can learn to put himself into others' shoes, then he can establish better relations with them. Consequently, his critical understanding of philosophy has an important effect on formation of the idea on law of world citizenship and universal peace. Enlargement of the mind would allow man to evade the limits added in his judgments in a negative manner. However, it does not mean a state of empathy based on asking everybody for advice separately. As a feature of illumination, thinking on thinking is *Selbstdenken* with words of Kant (ibid., 343).

On the other hand, for Kant, each type of law, namely law of public, state and cosmopolitan right, would contain *principle of publicity* for establishment of a formal mediation between the subjects. *Principle of publicity* is defined as, people reveal clearly, the action principles, which would interact in both moral and legal manners. All rules required to be demonstrated clearly to reach their goals by means of fulfilling the publicity condition are suitable for both law and politics (Kant, 2006: 109). In this context, Kant suggests to consider principles which are away from all kinds of material legality and which would guide towards perpetual peace in terms of only a common form of legality. For Kant, establishment of law and legality is thus based on a world citizenship, federation of nations and morals-politics-law harmony in which actions and ideas could be disclosed clearly and they could not dominate each other (Satıcı, 2014: 139).

Principle of publicity argued by Kant for establishment of perpetual peace allows people to disclose their ideas and actions freely before the public and therefore it is required to spread over a large field. Publicity of statement and action commands people to use their minds as it would provide an opportunity to think, speak and act to a large field instead of limiting their mind with their individual interests. As emphasized by Arendt, “the larger area idea of a person reaches – the larger area enabling enlightened individual to act among different points of view – the larger the individual will think” (Arendt, 2005: 342).

Consequently, Kant demonstrates his theory of peace in the basis of law of world citizenship which brings along the mutual restrictions in the universal platform. It is useful to assess that it is a manifestation by character of his common philosophy that Kant considers theory of peace in universal arena. As a basis, it would not be expected that a philosopher intended to philosophize on universal human mind to develop theory of peace restricting mankind. Therefore, Kant argues that formation of a universal peace would be possible only through law of world citizenship. In addition, his sense of peace suggests carrying national political order to an international platform and it proposes an important example for political institutions of that period. Although globalization tendencies did not occur in that period, it argued a theory of world citizenship and world peace that would take effect in the later ages and could be regarded as significant.

6 Conclusion

Events we experience in the period we live in show us that we stay distant from the establishment of perpetual peace, argues Kant. However, it is obvious that developments in the present day had not taken place by legal instruments, while Kant argued his theory in 1795. Even though Kant intended to be a philosophical example for political formations of that period through theory of legal peace, his theory has become a reference for modern world in order to solve war and violence that are the biggest problems in the present day.

Well, could peace take place if conditions suggested by Kant for perpetual peace were fulfilled? It is not possible to give a straight answer for this question. However, we could make certain estimations. The thing Kant insisted on is the fact that morals and politics are not opposite but real politics cannot take a step further without showing the required respect for morals, and policy should come to heel before morals. In that, for him, morality solves and breaks the nodes that politics can't solve in case morals and politics could not reach an agreement. As long as Western world continues to read biasedly, we cannot think of both an

average law and idea of a universal peace under the pragmatic conditions occupying an average place between morals and interest. In that, universal human rights should be regarded as blessed, at all costs, by owners of the power in terms of management. Especially, basic reference of conceptualization for universal human rights which meet the need of a universal idea in order that previous world wars and the destructions would not reappear is the humanity idea on which Kant founded the legitimacy of law. In this regard, basic element, which contemporary democratic legal systems regard as universal reference or foundation, is the "human as objective" and "humanity" idea. This idea, beyond being only a law of morals, is important in terms of being a universal criterion considering whether each political union, state and legal system is legal or not. Kantian idea of perpetual peace finds the basis to organize relations between people and countries and between the countries in this idea.

As a result, it is seen that ideas argued by Kant took place partially, and we see there are difficulties in reaching an idea of perpetual peace when considering them in today's conditions. Just as personal interests are brought under control only to certain aspects, interests of the governments could be brought under control only to a certain aspect. However, big countries do not take a step towards perpetual peace both for themselves and humanity as they give particular importance to their interests. Whenever self-seeker relations are abandoned and a sense of federation based on mutual agreements could be performed and practiced properly, as indicated by Kant, then an expectation of peace will rise. However, history has shown us that such an event has not taken place so far. As long as technological developments increase across the world, raw material and market seeking will continue. Some conditions like climatic changes would be likely experienced in the next years, decrease in the sources of pure water could bring along new wars but the peace. When we consider today's conditions, perpetual peace will unlikely take place. However, as Kant said "the perpetual peace [...] is not an empty idea, but rather a task which, carried out gradually, steadily moves toward its goal (since the periods in which equal advances are made will hopefully grow shorter and shorter)" (Kant, 2006: 109).

References

- Arendt, H. (2005). Kant'ın Siyaset Felsefesi Üzerine Notlar. (trans.) Y. Tezgiden, *Cogito Dergisi*, Sayı 41-42, 340-380.
- Bağce, H. E. (2003). Küresel Savaşların Eşiğinde Kant ve Hegel'i Yeniden Okumak. *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, Sayı 24, 105-121.

- Büyükbaş, H. & Atıcı, N. (2012). Liberal Demokratik Barış Kuramı: Eleştirel Bir Değerlendirme. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Sayı 40, 1–19.
- Çörekçioğlu, H. (2012). Kant ve Benjamin'de Şiddetin Tarihi ve Hatırlama. *FLSF (Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi)*, Sayı 13, 1–9.
- Der, K. & Yaldır, H. (2016). Kant's Enlightenment: Egalitarian or Not? In Hülya Yaldır, Recep Efe, Elzbieta Zuzanska-Zysk, Mehmet Arslan (eds.), *Current Topics in Social Sciences* (pp. 194–202). Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.
- Flikschuh, K. (2008). *Kant and Modern Political Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Höffe, O. (2010). Uluslararası Hukuk Topluluğunun Teorisyonu Olarak Kant. In H. Çörekçioğlu (ed.), *Kant Felsefesinin Politik Evreni* (pp. 225–241). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Kant, I. (1991). *The Metaphysics of Morals*, (trans.) Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (1993). An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment? In H. Reiss (ed.), *Political Writings* (pp. 54–60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (2006). Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch. In P. Kleingeld (ed.), *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History* (pp. 67–109). New Heaven and London: Yale University Press.
- Kant, I. (2010). Yaygın Bir Söz Üstüne: Teoride Doğru Olabilir Ama Pratikte İşe Yaramaz. In H. Çörekçioğlu (ed.), *Kant Felsefesinin Politik Evreni* (pp. 17–57). İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Recki, B. (2005). Kant ve Aydınlanma. *Cogito Dergisi*, Sayı 41–42, 192–213.
- Rousseau, J. J. (2007). *Toplum Sözleşmesi*, (trans.) A. Erenuluğ. İstanbul: Öteki Yayınevi.
- Satıcı, M. (2012). *Kant'ın Hukuk Felsefesi ve Çağdaş Hukuk Felsefesine Etkisi*, Doctoral Thesis. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Satıcı, M. (2014). Modernitenin Mirası ve Krizi Olarak Demokrasi ve Ötesi. *FLSF (Felsefe ve Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi)*, Sayı 18, 133–152.
- Strauss, L. & Cropsey, J. (1987). *History of Political Philosophy*. London: Chicago University Press.
- Tepe, H. (2013). Kant Etiği ve Barış Düşüncesi: Etik Savaşları Önleyebilir mi? In I. Kuçuradi (ed.), *Barışın Felsefesi, 200. Ölüm Yıldönümünde Kant* (pp. 63–73). Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.
- Wood, Allen W. (2009). *Kant*, (trans.) A. Kovanlıkaya. İstanbul: Dost Yayınevi.

Yaldır, H. & Der, K. (2016). Hobbes and Rousseau on Human Nature. In Hülya Yaldır, Recep Efe, Elzbieta Zuzanska-Zysk & Mehmet Arslan (eds.), *Current Topics in Social Sciences* (pp. 267–277). Sofia: St. Kliment Ohridski University Press.

Yeşilçayır, C. (2016). Kant'ta Barışın Hukuki Zeminde Kurgulanması. *Artvin Çoruh Üniversitesi Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Sayı 3, 78–93.