

A11

Classificazione Decimale Dewey:
801 (23.) LETTERATURA. FILOSOFIA E TEORIA

Leonardo Dini

The Philosophy of Peace

Essay of Philosophy of Law





Aracne editrice

www.aracne-editrice.it

Copyright © MMXXV

ISBN 978-88-255-4209-7

*I diritti di traduzione, memorizzazione elettronica,
di riproduzione e di adattamento anche parziale,
con qualsiasi mezzo, sono riservati per tutti i Paesi.*

*Non sono assolutamente consentite le fotocopie
senza il permesso scritto dell'Editore.*

I edizione: dicembre 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7	<i>Introduction</i>
9	CHAPTER I From Peace as Utopia to Peace as Reality
13	CHAPTER II The Concept of Philosophy of Peace Through the Analyses of Philosophers and Mystics. Now and in the History of Thinking Through the Millennia
87	CHAPTER III Conclusions
89	<i>List of Theories of Peace</i>
81	<i>Essential Bibliography</i>

INTRODUCTION

The theme of the philosophy of peace is a very important theme, but it acquires an even more important role, in an age like ours, in which war seems to be dominant, both in the world, both in the continents and between peoples.

So proposing a new philosophy of peace and a new method for a philosophy of peace also means updating what have been the *prolegomena* for a perpetual peace by Immanuel Kant in 1700 and also to update the pacifist thought that has crossed the history of the 20th century, both in Europe and in the world: this book intends to propose a method and a possible way to resume the dialogue on peace, to develop the concept and idea of peace in the twentieth one century and to propose the reflection of a theoretical philosopher on what can be actualized today, the concept and the *nomos* of peace and at the same time what could be a possible way to resolve the current crises taking place in the world, which see the development and more and more wars, fewer and fewer context of international pacification, given that, even today, history is seen

as a history built through wars, while in the future and according to the evolution of science, the evolution of civilization and the evolution of dialogue between civilization, therefore a history built through the evolution of peace.

Eric Remarque wrote a book: Nothing new from the western front, during the First World War, Altiero Spinali wrote his project of a united Europe during the Second World War, we write this book probably during the Third World War, *si parva licet*.

March 31 2025
Sambir, Lviv Oblast, Ukraine

LEONARDO DINI
DACIA DINI

CHAPTER I

FROM PEACE AS UTOPIA TO PEACE AS REALITY

Strangely, the concept of peace, to use an expression dear to Marx, is a ghost in the universal critical consciousness of philosophy, both, western and eastern and of the other continents of the planet.

From Plato⁽¹⁾ to Kant, the path is very complex, because the nomos of peace is a viable resource, it was born only in the contemporary age and indeed presents itself as an evolving ideal, that can only be true in the future of the human species.

Plato, Kant and Bertrand Russell indicate three stages of the species path, from war to peace. In the philosophy of science, Russell is essential, for his contribution to the progress of the ideal of peace, just as in the philosophy of law is the contribution of the Italian Sergio Cotta, of whom I was student in the '80s. If Russell proposes constant peace activism, Cotta proposes a palingenesis of anthropological categories of the relationship between beings

(1) Compare: Plato's Laws and on the concept of peace as interval between wars, seen as an ordinary condition of History. In Plato we find this definition: "What most men call peace is by the name".

and being—there in the world and peace. In Russell, science must distance itself from war. It is necessary to replace history based on wars, with history based on the evolution of science. In Cotta the human openness is philosophical to otherness and even among peoples it is opposed to war, an instinct that deteriorates human coexistence in the world.

Kant, in turn, prefigures the League of Nations, today the UN, and indicates stable and perennial peace, as a potential horizon for beings.

However, the P factor as peace seems utopian, not only to Plato and Aristotle, but also to Kant, who places it as an ideal perspective, writing his essay at the time of the Napoleonic war campaigns, that crossed and devastated Europe. Cotta and Fukuyama, in parallel after the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Berlin Wall, in 1989, instead imagine: from two distant visions of the world, one American and one European, a possible path to peace, but starting from an error of perspective, ignoring the wars of the future, of the 21st century and subsequent ones.

Einstein, on the other way, in his reflections, despite being a philosopher and scientist, aspires to peace, but pushes it away, by participating in the Manhattan atomic bomb project. Future peace should, in fact, arise not as a post-nuclear or post-world peace, after nuclear or world wars, but a choice for peace that interrupts the seemingly inevitable cycle of history built through wars. If we share the idealist and neo-existentialist position of Cotta⁽²⁾, however, we need to go further, more than thirty years later, from his essay on the topic. Certainly, however, we see a parallel, not secondary, in the affinity between resurgent selfishness

(2) Expressed in *From war to peace, a philosophical itinerary*, Rusconi, Milan 1989.

and nationalism and the threat of world wars. The *nomos*, as opposed to that of peace, that of violence, still appears difficult to eradicate, despite.

Even in contemporary history peace is indicated as an interval between two wars, while it is the exact opposite and the war is an interval between two phases of peace.

The First World War followed the *Belle Époque* and preceded the difficult 1920s and 1930s.

The Second World War followed the development period of the 1930s and preceded the post-war social and economic expansion.

So, today, the tensions of the first years of the new century preceded the winds of war and times of war.

However, in the times of Plato and Kant there were no world wars, like contemporary wars, at most there was ripercussions in the non-european colonies, of the wars, or repercussions in other continents if the wars in Asia or Africa.

Furthermore, some current superpowers were born from a succession of wars on their territories and those on their borders, furthermore, in every age, wars, geopolitically redefine boundaries, zones of influence and economic regions, and often act according to economic interest, unlike many wars developed in the past, simply to expand territories.

Kant

Until Kant time, peace was considered a utopian or absurd prospects.

Kant himself mistakenly believes in peace as a truce in the world that cannot free itself from the wars, inherent to

human nature, and that of peoples, a concept that is anachronistic today.

But to be Kant or not to be Kant, this is the question: the most disconcerting question for a philosopher is to see that even in 2025 the human species is not able to prefer peace and that there is still no universally valid theory to implement peace or a universal method and yet the cosmos around the planet is a cosmos of peace and nature has its own balance there is no war between animals, among the many species or between plants.

Thousands of years of philosophical, religious, reflection and dialogue between civilizations seem to have been in vain and so it for the existential failure in the way of Jaspers or Kierkegaard or Nietzsche, of the many theories for and on peace.

Indeed it emerges that philosophy perhaps has not questioned itself enough on the subject and that the human species has not found more evolved solutions than the birth of the United Nations, the UN Council and Assembly, the European Union and other continental unions. The conflict between identity and community well described by Derrida and Habermas still prevails over logic and the feeling for peace...

Is peace still a utopia today and in the future? Just as it is impossible to avoid the collisions of meteorites and planets or galaxies among themselves and the explosions of stars, must we resign ourselves to peace as a utopia, of the possible?

No, because it is evident that a planet without wars is better, is in harmony with nature, and respects the essence and nature of the human species and the essence of nature external to humans, fauna, flora, and the planet itself.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT OF PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE THROUGH THE ANALYSES OF PHILOSOPHERS AND MYSTICS NOW AND IN THE HISTORY OF THINKING THROUGH THE MILLENNIA

Kant proposes as a way to peace⁽¹⁾ a league of states, concretely actualized in the United Nations today.

Kant states that «in the League of Peace, states do not submit to coercive binding laws (a great mistake for our opinion) they do not recognize any supreme legislative power», for us instead, there should exist a bonding global hyper-state entity, equipped with a legislative parliament, therefore United Nations, with a parliamentary assembly and world government, instead of the security council, with a rotation between the major and minor states, in the executive, which should also coincide with the G20, at least for global commercial and economic peace, we talked about it in *Politics and Governance*, in the homonymous our essay of year 2020⁽²⁾ States therefore, for Kant, do not lose sovereignty and do not constitute themselves in a state of states, rather

(1) Immanuel Kant, *supra*, *For a perpetual peace*, *ibidem*, by Salvatore Veca, Feltrinelli, Milan 2017 and edition by Norberto Bobbio. Editori Riuniti, Rome, 1985, from: *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*, Friedrich Nicolosius, Königsberg 1795.

(2) Leonardo Dini, *Politica e Governance*, Aracne, Roma 2021.

they constitute themselves in a free federation, as a surrogate of the union in civil society. Almost a social contract à la Rousseau, applied to states and which would produce, if realized, a post–Westphalian world federalism.

In our opinion this is also a viable hypothesis, but it would leave latent the risks of conflicts if it were not a world federalism between democracies, as in the meeting of democracies, organized by Biden in Washington, before the ukrainian war: a mixed system, if it can be effective, between democratic monarchies and democratic republics, would not be and Kant can not even imagine it, between autocracies and democracies and between dictatorial and democratic superpowers.

We do not like the definition of liberalndemocracies, nor that of illiberal democracies, instead the concept of world civil society, of democracy, in a single world state, and of universal and not local or continental peace is valid.

A global world democracy that already exists in commerce, in the scientific community and academical, in that of artists, of writers, in globalized finance and in the economy, in cinema, in theater, in music, in art, could well work as long as it does not translate into Orwelllian big brother or into the evangelical triple six man number or into a global dictatorship or autocracy.

In fact the risk exists but to suggest it is like demonizing téchne and ethical relativism and wokism.

New enemy for peace from off–planet?

AI Artificial Intelligence reveal itself as a technological world dictator against peace ot at its service, or on the contrary, a way to continue and witness the human species,

beyond the end of its time and its history what happens to the Voyager missions in extrasolar space, or to future human bases, on Mars and the Moon, or on other planets.

But at that point, at the point of the political village, as a single global world city.

The enemy of peace, paradoxically, and as in a science fiction, could come from space, from other planets or realities, of the cosmos or simply from the Nature: tsunamis, earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, glaciations and from off-planet meteorites, comets, radiation...

In this way peace among humans would not mean peace with nature and the cosmos.

More on Kant

For the philosopher of Königsberg a state like a citizen, a human, can consider as an enemy that which does not accept guarantees of peace.

Security for Kant comes from the other⁽³⁾, and the security of one lies in the security of the other, the shared common security lies in the security accepted by all, of the law, accepted by all.

From the institution and istituzionalization of peace, in the peace, between states, the civil constitution, like in Locke and Rousseau and Montesquieu view, with which one exits from the state of nature as a state of war, is added to the public law of the citizens, who form a state and to the international law, that regulates the relationships between States, proposing as an end, and as a means, Kantianly speaking, the cosmopolitan law.

(3) See *Politica e Governance*, by Leonardo Dini, chapter 1, *ibidem*.