

HOW CAN KANT'S CONCEPT OF "UNIVERSAL HOSPITALITY" BE APPROPRIATE FOR SOLVING TODAY'S CONFLICTS CONSIDERING PERPETUAL PEACE?

Güncel ÖNKAL*

Abstract

One of the most crucial achievements of Kant's enlightenment is to have provided a general notion of secular world-view. Since people had described themselves through the concepts of the enlightenment instead of religious ones, the relationship between people (inter-subjective relation) and nature (instrumental relation) have started to change. Before the enlightenment, we had not been able to talk about "individual" who could use his reason to enhance his life through intersubjectivity and secularism. This world-view had given rise to **conflicts among particular-plain members of societies who had different notions such as religious and ideological in Western societies**. These societies were presenting an artificial unity, because the members of such societies were determined by their identities. However, what enlightenment dictates is an ideal humanitarian situation.

I assert that the enlightenment did not succeed in its mission absolutely by staying close to some cultures and believes. The enlightenment's original purpose was to cover all humanity. Although, the rejection of non-Western identities has not been frankly claimed, **exclusive** approach to "**the Other**" is the end of real diversity. We can still see its consequences in international organizations, namely EU.

In this paper I aim to discuss this misunderstanding of hospitality and universal values regarding the possibility of perpetual peace idea in Kant on the eve of 'globalization'. The central idea is the idea that was noted in the Third Definitive Article for A Perpetual Peace: "Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality" by Kant. Nowadays, we unfortunately live a war very near to us. In these days, we always should remember Kant's words inviting us to **peace hugging variety**:

* R.A at Middle East Technical University, Philosophy Department, Ankara, Turkey. (gonkal@metu.edu.tr)

“...the idea of national and international rights, necessary to the public rights of men in general. Only such amendment allows us to flatter ourselves with the thought that we are making continual progress towards perpetual peace.”*

The idea of perpetual peace is necessarily tightened to very critic concepts such as **tolerance** and **humanity**. **The maxims of politics must agree with the rights of this world’s all citizens in behalf of humanity**. Its possibility under the contemporary conditions will be the main discussion in my study.

Key Words

1. Exclusive approach or hospitality
2. West & East
3. Diversity, cosmopolitanism
4. Rights versus duties
5. Humanity

* Kant Immanuel, **Perpetual Peace and Other Essays**, Trans.by.: Ted Humphrey Hackett, Cambridge, 1983, p.119.

200 years after Kant, it is better not to satisfy with re-summarizing or re-narrating Kant's ideas but to attempt to find out new connections of humankind's current situation via using some of his universal, infinite and valid ideas or ideals. As known, what I refer by means of "the new situation" is being after 9/11. **Post 9/11**, the gap between two worlds, two different civilizations is unfortunately getting wider. Being "the Other" for Other attaches a derogatory sense. Necessarily and philosophically, what should be sufficient is to be man for holding equal rights, equal possibilities, etc... If we talk with the terms of Kant, a lawful world originally and naturally must give us same rights. However, there is a misconstruction of being from somewhere against being from a *citizen* of somewhere. What we need in this new situation is not to emphasize 'being from somewhere' but 'being a man', indeed 'being a human' sharing the same values. Fortunately, it is an illusion which denies the conflicts and challenges. The necessary toleration for everyone is a bond requires **recognition**; to recognize them as who they are, to acknowledge as they were and not to deal with shaping or modifying under the name of stumbling terms of modernity. It is time **to replace identity with humanity**.

In this study I aim to indicate some possibilities for such a replacement by two steps: Firstly, it is proper to define today's conflicts between two main cultures, i.e. West and East. Secondly, I try to analyze Kant's concept of "universal hospitality" considering his essay for *Perpetual Peace*. This evaluation may give us the maxims of politics which must agree with the rights of this world's *all* citizens in behalf of humanity.

I. Is There A Peace Hugging Variety: What Has (Not) Changed?

150 years after the death of Kant, John E. Smith noted three most pressing problems confronting Western civilization¹:

- “1. How **to prevent the reduction of man** to the status of a thing or object beside other objects in a mechanized world.
2. How **to preserve a sense of individual moral and social responsibility** at a time when skepticism and relativism control a great deal of ethical thinking.
3. How **to bring the steady advances in scientific knowledge** within the scope and direction of moral and religious purposes.”

¹ Hendel Charles W. (ed.), **The Philosophy of Kant and Our Modern World**, The Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1957, p.6.

We cannot claim Western idea has come off those three for 50 years. On the other hand Eastern civilization has not succeeded to rectify its wrongly constructed image since Eastern civilization could not achieve to bring the steady advances in scientific knowledge within the scope and direction of moral and religious purposes. In addition to Smith, Arkoun also states that:

“In the nineteenth century, Muslim countries encountered only fragments of the philosophical values of the Enlightenment. A very small number of intellectuals, scholars, journalists, politicians, and travelers had access to the schools, universities, and literatures of the West.”²

The scientific rationalism of Western thought made possible the establishment of radical points of departure which aided the secularization of thought in the early years of the twentieth century. Its basic assumptions, even though not fully elaborated, contributed to the progressive disintegration of the foundations of traditional and specifically, religious, convictions. It became fashionable among the educated to ridicule the backwardness and superstition of traditional arguments. Inevitably, such a trend gave way to the idea of conflict:

“Absolute principles of order and justice were irrelevant to the concrete situation of social existence. Power and cunning, not values and principles, decided the fate of individuals and groups. The same law determined relations among nations. Nations face one another in enmity and hatred...and fight one another more mercilessly than wolves. The decisive factor in political existence is not the common bond of humanity but the will of the strong and their ability to impose it.”³

With the ideas of conflict, Sharabi asks “Was the West really civilized? Should we expect peace and security at the hands of Europe?”⁴. I would also ask here if the notion of ‘just distribution’ of material and non-material advantages realized or has the balance shifted. The term “civilization” replaced with the notion of “globalization”. Moreover, globalization means the increasing dominance of some languages, nations, and business-classes. We globe some technologies, inventions; but do we globe rights? While we globe the interconnectedness, we are not able to globe mutual-recognition of identities as a primary condition of eternal peace.⁵ Under the light of Sharabi’s and Appiah’s arguments, the preventing reduction of men –as Smith declared above- can be made possible by

² Arkoun Muhammad, “The State, The Individual, and Human Rights: A Contemporary View of Muslims in a Global Context”, **The Muslim Almanac: The Reference Work on History, Faith and Culture, and Peoples of Islam**, Detroit, Gale Inc., 1995, p.456.

³ Sharabi Hisham, **Arab Intellectuals and The West**, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London, 1970,” p.77. Here, Sharabi exploits some of Antun’s thoughts from **Muqtafatat**.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.99.

⁵ Appiah Anthony K., “Citizens of the World”, **Globalizing Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1999**, Ed. Matthew J.Gibney, Oxford Uni.Press, Oxford, 2003, p.195-197.

disregarding absolutism of ideas and technology politics that were collected in one hand.

In relation to this idea, a fundamental linkage between the use of knowledge and ethics can be directly seen. The senses of moral and social responsibility are no longer valid in West different from Eastern societies where these exist. Pragmatism and individualism are becoming the dominant social principle day by day. It may be an unexpected and unwelcome consequence of Kant's Enlightenment. At this point we should not disregard the **local cultures**. I believe in remembering our moral traditions can be an rescue. If we manage to give a positive response to the values that are served by traditions, humanitarian situations will be realized.

There is also a cross-cultural disagreement highlighting local cultures, even on what rights are to be considered human rights. However we should not allow traditions to become particular absolutisms. If all localities take the way of being particular truths, we will not be able to reach colourful fruits of humanity. So that, we come close to an ideal situation of agreement between politics and morals that Kant described in *Perpetual Peace*. An **ethically and juridically agreement of cultures** is the ground of peace. From this perspective, just the ideas cannot be sufficient. Ignoring or doing little about conditions that promote disease, hunger and high mortality rats are being understood as human rights violations of greater consequence than violations of more abstract legal and political rights concerning liberty or property.⁶

II. What is wrong with “The Third Definitive Article for A Perpetual Peace”:

Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality

Perpetual Peace was published in Konigsberg, East Prussia, late in 1795. It has usually been taken to be a call for immediate political action and to provide a recipe for the immediate achievement of a lasting European peace. We should remember that *Ideas for a Universal History* published ten years before *Perpetual Peace*. There he had made the claim that the problem of establishing a perfect civil constitution is dependent upon the problem of a law-governed relationship between states.⁷

⁶ Viotti Paul R., Kauppi Mark V. *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1997, p.313.

⁷ Gallie W.B., ***Philosophers of Peace and War***, Cambridge Uni.Press, Cambridge, 1978, p.13.

Peace is *now* regarded as the normal condition of society. The problem arises, how men shall live together, each free to work out his own development, without at the same time interfering with a like liberty on the part of his neighbour. The solution of this problem is an *ideal state*. Here the liberty of each member is guaranteed and its limits strictly defined. A perfectly just civil constitution, administered according to the principles of right, would be that under which the greatest possible amount of liberty was left to each citizen within these limits. This is the ideal of Kant and here lies the greatest practical problem which has presented itself to humanity. This is to say that we have to start with our reformation at home, look first to the culture and education and morals of our citizens, then to foreign relations. This is a question of self-interest as well as of ethics. Kant saw the nations of Europe were so closely bound together by commercial interests. On the civil and religious liberty of a state depends its commercial success. The state which does not look to the enlightenment and liberty of its subjects must fail in the race. He clearly realized that the spirit of commerce was the strongest force in the service of the maintenance of peace, and that in it lay a guarantee of future union.⁸ Kant notes that in his *The Metaphysics of Morals*;

“This rational idea of a peaceful, even if not friendly, thoroughgoing community of all nations on the earth that can come into relations affecting one another is not an ethical principle but a principle having to do with rights.”⁹

The result of Kant’s attempt is the view of reality as a system of reason;

- a) which is imperfectly and incompletely known by man,
- b) imposes duties upon him
- c) demands from him an inner worthiness of will
- d) ignoring his rational nature giving up all claim to being a member of the human species.¹⁰

The third definitive article for a Perpetual Peace; “Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality”¹¹, which through will be analyzed existing conflicts. In

⁸ The introductory notes of M.Campbell Smith from Kant Immanuel, **Perpetual Peace**, Trans by: M.Campbell Smith, Thoemmes Press, Bristol, 1992, pp. 46-60,

⁹ Kant Immanuel, **The Metaphysics of Morals**, Trans.by: Mary Gregor, Cambridge Uni.Press, Cambridge, 1991, p.352.

¹⁰ Hendel, Ibid., p.8.

¹¹ in Kant, Immanuel., **Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History and Morals**, Trans.by.: Ted Humphrey, Hackett, Indianapolis and Cambridge, 1983, pp.118-120. and in Kant, Immanuel., **Ebedi Barış Üzerine Deneme**, Çev: Yavuz Abadan, Seha L. Meray, Ankara Üni. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, Ajans Türk Matbaası, Ankara, 1960.

his essay Kant stressed on the view of the **state as a moral person; communal ownership of the earth** and its resources by all persons and **the demand to strive for perpetual peace.**¹²

In other words, what problematic for today is the term “cosmopolitan right” which naturally should require “hospitality”. Is a universal hospitality possible? For Kant, whose concern in the essay (Perpetual Peace) is not with philanthropy, but with *right*. And in such a context, hospitality (hospitableness) means the right of an alien not to be treated as an enemy upon his arrival in another’s country. As he noted, the state of peace among men living in close proximity is not the natural state (*status naturalis*); instead, the natural state is a one of war, which does not just consist in open hostilities, but also in the constant and enduring threat of them. Here Kant’s conception of the state of nature is –perhaps- influenced by, Hobbes. The state of peace must therefore be established only on the state of *lawfulness*. In such a position since the earth is globe people cannot scatter themselves infinitely, but must, finally tolerate living in close proximity, because originally no one had a greater right to any region of the earth than anyone else. A transgressing of rights in one place in the world is felt everywhere; consequently the idea of cosmopolitan rights is not fantastic and exaggerated, but rather an amendment to the unwritten code of national and irrational rights, necessary to the public rights of men in general. Only such amendment allows us to flatter ourselves with the thought that we are making continual progress towards perpetual peace. Human beings, in Kant’s view are capable of genuine commitment to principles of justice. We can apply to standardizing a justice our own past, present, and future actions, interpret and augment them, and evaluate others success in applying them to concrete circumstances. More importantly, a citizen counts herself responsible for the justice mentioned above.¹³

It is clear that the process of self-realization in the name of distributing justice -in the Kantian philosophy- is not so much a psychological phenomenon belonging to the realm of nature as it is a moral phenomenon belonging to the realm of freedom. The concept of the individual citizen emerged in Europe after along historical process that involved economic, social, intellectual, scientific, cultural and technological forces. And yet there must be somewhere a connection between the two realms. For Kant, the resource is the mind which relates values or norms, the realm of freedom, of *noumena*, to the realm of sensory

¹² Donaldson Thomas, “Kant’s Global Rationalism”, **Traditions of International Ethics**, (Ed) Terry Nardin, David R. Mapel, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge Uni. Press, 1992, p.145.

¹³ Holtman Sarah Williams, “Revolution, Contradiction and Kantian Citizenship”, **Kant’s Metaphysics of Morals: Interpretative Essays**, (Ed.) Mark Timmons, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford-New York, 2002, pp.230-231.

experience, the realm of the observation, of phenomena. His history of philosophy supports the possibility and the probability of universal peace. Such a demonstration is decidedly relevant to the moral problem of peace as duty, as an emanation and manifestation of the categorical imperative. “There shall be no war” is a moral law which would be invalid if the possibility of its realization could be demonstrated. There always have been wars constituting no rational proof of their continuing necessity. Freedom and moral laws depend on the *free man* (also the natural man), whose duty is to realize the potentials of his self. Thus “freedom becomes the one and only inborn and imperishable human right”.¹⁴ Here we have the core of the idea of freedom and self-realization as the essence of a philosophy of peace according to critical rationalism¹⁵. But even today the world is far from a realization of the full significance of this doctrine of universal freedom under law.

The assumption that human rights are essentially a Western concept can lead to different practical consequences. To divide the idea of human rights into “Western” or “Islamic” and other culturally defined conceptions, however, would be the end of universal human rights. The modern awareness of freedom has its ethical core in the profession of human dignity. Understanding human dignity in Kantian terms as moral autonomy and connecting this autonomy to universal rights of freedom and participation certainly is a specifically modern achievement.¹⁶

In addition to these, the basis for international morality must remain for Kant what it is for domestic morality: the moral demand of reason. Morality justifies cooperation; not the reverse. While international cooperation may, as an empirical matter, make it more possible to create a league of nations, the reasons why we want a league or, for that matter, any form of international cooperation, derive from our a priori concepts of morality:

“Kantian internationalism -Kant’s categorical imperative- is a ‘cosmopolitan’ doctrine that treats all humans, by virtue of their shared rationality, as citizens of a single moral order... Whether or not globalism, moral consensus, or global cooperation actually emerges, Kant would defend the existence of global obligations, and their corollaries, global human rights. Even if the world were, and appeared destined to be, a barbarous Hobbesian free-for-all, with each nation insisting upon its own peculiar morality, Kant

¹⁴ Friedrich Carl Joachim, **Inevitable Peace**, Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948, p.90.

¹⁵ According to Kant’s critical philosophy, the moral law given us by reason tells us that all rational beings are of the same absolute worth as ends in themselves. This law directs us not to seek to dominate others or resist their ends.

¹⁶ Heiner Bielefeldt, “ ‘Western’ versus ‘Islamic’ Human Rights Conceptions?: A Critique of Cultural Essentialism in the Discussion on Human Rights”, **Political Theory**, Sage Pub., Vol.28, No:1, Feb 2000, 90-121.

would argue that practical reason forbids indiscriminate killing, intentional lying, and other acts violating our hypothetical postulated citizenship. This is because even if there were no possibility of realizing the outcomes prescribed by the categorical imperative, practical reason demands that we must act as if there were.”¹⁷

CONSEQUENCE

It is not so difficult to believe that Kant is standing on a static point. His ideas on “cosmopolitan rights” are static since he keeps them in the transcendental form of duty. Until today, we are approaching new formats of human rights problem. Our concept of human rights was definitely changed after 9/11 by the fundamentalist attacks. Much more common in various countries, however, are racial, national, and ethnic prejudices that result in oppression of minority populations. These are not just Third-World issues. Europe, Japan, and North America also offer considerable evidence of discriminatory practices on racial or ethnic lines. Human rights as a Western concept ignores the differences, cosmopolitanism and local cultures of “the Other” and is based on a Eurocentric world-view.

Cosmopolitanism becomes a risk for the Western and consequently for the Eastern civilizations. At that point, instead of a crash of civilization we need a consensus of civilization under the umbrella of tolerance. This tolerance, as I have tried to justify through the paper, cannot be constructed with transcendental ideas but practical and understandable principles since cosmopolitan recognition is the main pre-condition of cosmopolitan rights and hospitality. Deeply-rooted cultural values or prejudices are, of course, not easily changed.

¹⁷ Donaldson, *Ibid.*, pp.142-144.

REFERENCES

- Appiah Anthony K., “Citizens of the World”, **Globalizing Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 1999**, Ed. Matthew J.Gibney, Oxford Uni.Press, Oxford, 2003.
- Arendt Hannah, **Lectures On Kant’s Political Philosophy**, (ed) Ronald Beiner, The University of Chicago Press, Sussex, 1989.
- Arkoun Muhammad, “The State, The Individual, and Human Rights: A Contemporary View of Muslims in a Global Context”, **The Muslim Almanac: The Reference Work on History, Faith and Culture, and Peoples of Islam**, Detroit, Gale Inc., 1995.
- Cassirer Ernst, **Kant’ın Yaşamı ve Öğretisi**, Çev: Doğan Özlem, İnkılap Yay., İkinci Basım, İstanbul, 1996.
- Donaldson Thomas, “Kant’s Global Rationalism”, **Traditions of International Ethics**, (Ed) Terry Nardin, David R. Mapel, Cambridge Studies in International Relations, Cambridge Uni. Press, 1992.
- Friedrich Carl Joachim, **Inevitable Peace**, Harvard Uni. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1948.
- Gallie W.B., **Philosophers of Peace and War**, Cambridge Uni.Press, Cambridge, 1978.
- Heiner Bielefeldt, “‘Western’ versus ‘Islamic’ Human Rights Conceptions?: A Critique of Cultural Essentialism in the Discussion on Human Rights”, **Political Theory**, Sage Pub., Vol.28, No:1, Feb 2000.
- Hendel Charles W. (ed.), **The Philosophy of Kant and Our Modern World**, The Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1957.

-Holtman Sarah Williams, "Revolution, Contradiction and Kantian Citizenship", **Kant's Metaphysics of Morals: Interpretative Essays**, (Ed.) Mark Timmons, Oxford Uni. Press, Oxford-New York, 2002.

- Jacobs Brian, Kain Patrick, **Essays on Kant's Anthropology**, Cambridge Uni. Press, Cambridge, 2003.

-Kant Immanuel, **Ahlak Metafiziğinin Temellendirilmesi**, Çev: Ioanna Kuçuradi, TFK Yay, İkinci Baskı, Ankara, 1995.

----- **Ebedi Barış Üzerine Deneme**, Çev: Yavuz Abadan, Seha L. Meray, Ankara Üni. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları, Ajans Türk Matbaası, Ankara, 1960.

----- **Perpetual Peace**, Trans by: M.Campell Smith, Thoemmes Press, Bristol, 1992.

----- **Perpetual Peace and Other Essays**, Trans.by.: Ted Humphrey Hackett, Cambridge, 1983.

----- **Philosophia Practica Universalis, Etik Üzerine Dersler I**, Çev:Oğuz Özügül, Yay.Gerd Gerhardt, Kabalcı Yay. İstanbul, 1994.

----- **The Metaphysics of Morals**, Trans.by: Mary Gregor, Cambridge Uni.Press, Cambridge, 1991.

-Sharabi Hisham, **Arab Intellectuals and The West**, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London, 1970.

-Viotti Paul R., Kauppi Mark V. **International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity**, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1997.