16

The Way to World Peace via an Integrated Kantian and Buddhist Perspective

Kim Them Do (*)

Abstract

The age of the global war on terror requires a new route to world peace. Immanuel Kant points out that the gradual evolution of human institutions is the key to world peace and that the principles of laws, morality and politics could be holistically established and systematically promoting the right to self-determination of individuals, peoples and the whole of mankind as a motivating

(*) Dr. Kim Them Do, L.L.M; M. A. is currently served as Associate Researcher on international competition law and policy at the UNCTAD, Geneva. He has published numerous essays and articles on international competition law and policy, rule of law, Buddhism and country report on Viet Nam. His latest article on legal theory is "Idee der Gerechtigkeit und Öffentlicher Vernunftgebrauch in einer Demokratischer Gesellschaft in: *Rechtstheorie* 42 (2012) 241-249. He is the author of *The Buddhist Viewpoint on the Contemporary Issues* (Hong Duc Viet Nam, 2013).

force. An international league for peace, the national republican constitution and the law of world citizenship are the legal tools need to be implemented.

Moreover, Buddhism values peace both intrinsically and instrumentally. It identifies the human nature and the structural cause of violence. It has the cultural power to motivate and to hold people morally responsible for achieving peaceful ideals: common basis of values, virtues, rights and responsibilities, culture of non-violence, solidarity and tolerance. By associating with the Buddhists, people around the world may feel powerful enough to deal with the contemporary world issues.

Therefore, the Buddhist ethics has been called a conceptual skill for a peace education project and the Kantian ethics has been called a technical skill for a rule of law development movement. Both are the ultimate guarantors for peace, thus becoming the new paradigm for peace governance. Such local collaboration can contribute to the peace-building and peacekeeping processes worldwide. The time is now ripe for such an integrated approach to be introduced.

Policy implication:

Based on this strategic realism the United Nations must work together and in a supportive role vis-à-vis International Buddhist Confederation and International Association of Buddhist Universities in order to facilitate the shared governance of peace. State governments, civil societies, businesses, religions, families and individuals must assume an important and direct role at the domestic level. By helping to identify the skills most needed at the various level of responsibility, global actors, institutions, and regulatory networks may prove useful in terms of selection, training and promotion.

The world is experiencing numerous global challenges, including climate change, resource depletion, financial crises, insufficient education, widespread poverty, food insecurity; and most importantly, the war on terror. Faced with the ever-present threat and the reality of war, there is a growing consensus that we do not have the vision needed for building and keeping the peace because the past pacific

pledges and reconciliatory rhetoric are not longer effective tools and there is something fundamentally wrong with the world´s politics, philosophy, religion and law.

The questions on everybody's minds are clear: Where are we today in addressing these problems? What can we expect? How best can we prevent violence and realize peace? And why are efforts to make peace morally justified?

It is time to rethink the academic discourse on world peace under the changed conditions of the global public sphere because the duties of global and national actors, the prescriptions of institutions, the human nature and the structural causes of violence need to be better understood; more importantly, new tools and techniques are required.

Generally an ethical analysis of global peace can advance our understanding of these questions and the range of opinions about these issues is vast. Critics claim that ethical scholarship fails to consider the complex issues involved world politics, particularly in the cooperation in conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict peace-building process. International lawyers often oversimplify the ethical ramifications of the norms prescriptions. The imposition of legal regulations will not by itself erase deep-seated resentments, hatreds and power struggles. Most distressingly, embedded in the contemporary international political confusion and economic uncertainty, the governance of the United Nations (UN) has become increasingly muddled, impeding progress in areas of cultivating peace.

To find a way out, various efforts have been made to deal with the culture of global peace; philosophers are seeking to ground responsibility in individuals and firms and institutions to improve the world order; lawyers is tracking and adapting through changes in the rules of warfare; and the UN has launched comprehensive reforms in the hope of attaining greater competence and the means to achieve its mission of peace.

As UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali

argued:"Peacemaking and peacekeeping operations, to be successful, must come to include a comprehensive effort to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people."[1] This is indeed a goal worth pursuing.

How can Buddhists accomplish all of this? Clearly, a new approach is necessary. While the legal pursuit of institutional cooperation is still advantageous in the future, the Buddhist understanding of human nature is imperative in certain contexts. Achieving such an understanding requires an interdisciplinary approach.

This article seeks to transform the dialogue between Buddhist scholars and legal theorists researching world peace into a meaningful collaboration. It examines the Kantian and the Buddhist ideals in the light of peace studies. Based on an integrative discourse of Buddhist and Kantian ethics, this discussion informs and provides a path on the moral philosophy of international law, and it can be treated as an integrated approach for future research.

For this analytical purpose, this piece proceeds as follows: it begins by illustrating the meaning of world peace, and then explores the potentials of Kantian contribution in *"Toward to the Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch"* to the peacemaking effort in today´s world. Arguing that such a project needs to be supported by those who promote the Buddhist orientation, this paper goes on to explore the Buddhist culture of peace, the causes of violence and ways that peace can be realised. The article ends with a discussion of how an integrated Kantian and Buddhist ethics can bridge gaps in global law, politics and ethics to shape an approach to new paradigm for peace making.

Collaboration between these fields and the formulation of responses to this global challenge would bring a new culture of peace and the concrete measure in offering a variety of the most fitting means for the non violent resolution of disputes, whether between individuals, groups in society or governments.

---

1. Boutros Boutrous-Ghali 1992, 32.

The Meanings of Peace

The traditional meaning[2]

Peace is not a modern concept: its meaning is rooted in various traditional cultural systems, especially in the ancient Chinese philosophy. One of the most prominent Chinese philosophers is *Lao Tzu* (6th BCE), the author of the *Tao Te Ching*. In his writings, he insists on the peaceful effects of water and wind. Although these things are too soft; but they are more effective means than rock and iron. For this reason, he argues that intelligent leadership should consider them as a useful military strategy. In contrast, *Mo Tzu* (468-391 BCE), argues from anti-war perspective that love is a universal human virtue and that peace is the most respectable human goal of and is within reach. Put simply, he said: "Do good to others, and others will do good to you, if you hurt them and they will hurt to you". Most importantly, *Kung Fu Tzu* (551- 479 BCE), the author of *The Analects*, contends that the peace is a state of social harmony and the ultimate human goal. To realise this, he suggests that one should treat one´s subordinates as one would like to be treated by one´s superiors.

Peaceful ideals are also rooted in the Judeo- Christian philosophy. It is generally agreed that Jewish, Christian and Islamic traditions all have elements of bellicosity in their early history. The God of Abraham, Moses, and David is portrayed as a bellicose figure in the Old Testament and the Israelites were merciless warriors. Over time, this tradition has been changed from the Christianity. Based on the message of peace, love and nonviolence the New Statement prescribes the best example Jesus: "My peace I give unto you" as he declared in his message.[3]

Unlike the religious tradition, the peace was not a prominent concept in the Hellenic poleis. In antiquity, there were no systematic concepts of peace or war. *Thucydides*, the author of *Melian Dialogue*, suggests that the structural balance of power must be maintained to establish peace in Hellas. In his *History of the Peloponnesian*

2. Barash David P., Webel Charles P., 5.

3. Barash David P., Webel Charles P.,7

War, he states that agreement among nations is important and that politicians must to their utmost to avoid breaching it. Even on the battlefield, the generals should keep treating the adversary with respect and fairness. Thucydides focuses here on peace between Athens and Sparta, rather on a global scale. In this light *Aristotle´s Nichomachean Ethics* promotes the role of trade and co-operation in reaching peace, although in reality many ruthless wars were fought in ancient Greece.[4]

The modern meaning[5]

Today, there is much discussion in the peace studies literature of the diverse meaning of peace. In the broad sense, peace may be perceived as happiness, harmony, justice and freedom and there is a growing consensus about its two sides: positive peace and negative peace. Positive peace is the desired state of mind and society. A peaceful state of mind is based on the individual´s inner peace and a peaceful state of society denotes harmony among its people. Negative peace is the absence of war or other forms of conflict and is more supportive than positive peace during negotiations because a lasting suspension of rivalry is urgently needed.

In fact, negative peace is not always the best alternative because it is a political will of the stronger over the weaker. *Pax Romana* maintains its negative peace through repression by ruthless dictators under Roman law. Although this negative peace was long-lasting, it relied on slavery and a despotic regime and was not true peace in any sense.

Most researchers pay more attention to the important role of the positive peace. Arguing that direct violence is more visible and its outcome is more dramatic, they focus on the structural violence in their explanations of the cause of the conflict. In so doing, they look more deeply at the structure of the social, cultural and economic institutions of the countries concerned.

---

4. Terminski Bogumil 2010, 280.

5. Barash David P., Webel Charles P.,7

In fact both dimensions of peace are equally important and complementary to each other. Negative peace highlights the harmony within oneself and with others and the spiritual tranquility which are desirable modes of being while positive peace underscores the structure of violence. Both are fundamental to the creation of peaceful ideals.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary[6] defines many different aspects of the world peace:

- a freedom from civil clamor and confusion
- a state of public quiet, a state of security or order within a community provided for by law, custom or public opinion
- mental or spiritual condition marked by freedom from disquieting or oppressive thought or emotions
- a state of mutual concord between government: absence of hostilities or war.

In summary, we can assume that peace is love, harmony and justice and that peacemaking and peacekeeping are a pressing priority for humankind today.

The Kantian Perspective

Background[7]

Most of the early peace literature focuses on the desirability of attaining a state of peace because the ancient world was a one of perpetual war with peace the exception. At the beginning of the 17th century, international law scholars have begun considering the rightfulness and wrongfulness of war and Grotius war the first to lay the foundations of international law in his code „*The Law of War and Peace* (1625). He suggests some ways of mitigating the warfare but did not make a clear distinction between the law and ethics.[8]

---

6. Webster´s Third International Dictionary 1993, 1660.

7. Höffe Otfried 1999, 257; Höffe Otfried 1995, 31; M. Campbell Smith 2009, 46.

8. Terminski Bogumil 2010, 282.

The Westphalia peace treaty of 1648 was a key turning point in the European political development and a new state system has been emerged.

The 18th century was the Age of Enlightenment and the dream of peace was subject matter of such great thinkers as Puffendorf, Vattel, Hobbes, Montesquieu and Rousseau.[9] Most notably, Abbé de Saint Pierre war the first to introduce the comprehensive problem of perpetual peace into political literature with his works *„Projet pour rendre la paix perpétuelle en Europe"* I-II (1713), and III, (1717).

Faced the rising insecurity in Europe, Saint Pierre suggested planning a European coalition against Ottoman Empire. He argued that a state of perpetual peace must be established among nations because it is in the interests not only of the weaker, but also of the stronger. His proposal of a European Union for peace was criticised by Rousseau, Leibniz and Voltaire who argued that apparently that such an idea is politically unfeasible.[10]

Against this backdrop, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804*)* published his *"Toward a Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch„* (1795) after developing his system of critical reasoning. It was time for him to turn his attention to the applicability of his moral principles to the international political reality.[11]

His Sketch discuses the philosophical question of how peoples and nations around the world can live together in peace in this new age. He was excited by the struggle for American independence and the victorious French revolution. He seemed to see that the European monarchical system was coming to an end and must be replaced by the democracy.

More broadly, he saw that a federation of nations for the highest good should be pursued. If all of the nations would work closely together, then the world could enjoy lasting peace and prosperity. He

---

9. M. Campbell Smith 2009, 24.

10. M. Campbell Smith 2009, 38;Terminski Bogumil 2010, 284.

11. M. Campbell Smith 2009. 38.

conceded that there is no way to guarantee for its sustainability; but the spirit of commerce would maintain the peace. Kant promoted that his vision must be based on the moral grounds of international law. As a realist, he admitted that his dream was objectively unattainable. What concern us most in this context is that we try to understand its importance and to achieve means by which to attain it.[12]

The Meaning of Peace[13]

Kant started from the most meaningful aspect of peace: peace cannot be understood as the normal condition of society and its perpetual state should be established without conditions. We may enjoy a mere truce or suspension of hostilities and a temporary absence of war while peace is negotiated, but not a real and perpetual peace due to the permanent danger of future war and the possibility of an outbreak of hostilities. As long as diplomats have secret thought of future war, the treaty cannot be valid.

The basic question in the quest for peace is how it can be perpetuated. To realize this, a treaty must be concluded stemming from an honest desire for peace and its strategy should be explored from the viewpoint of moral philosophy. Kantian ethics instruct us what to do and what not to do. There are two kinds of moral reasoning: hypothetical and categorical imperatives.

A hypothetical imperative is a commandment of reason that applies only conditionally to achieve a particular goal. Beyond this, morality consists of categorical imperatives. A categorical imperative tells us to do what to do irrespective of our desire. We must do it because it is valid in itself and becomes a universal moral obligation.

This is why the meaning of perpetual peace is not to a simple desire for a temporary tranquility or even a personal survival: it is not the result of a freedom from fear or the pursuit of happiness. The quest for peace is a categorical imperative and a moral duty for all. One must seek peace because peace is good in itself for itself and for everyone.

12. M. Campbell Smith 2009, 62.

13. Höffe Otfried 1999, 243.

From this viewpoint, a temporary settlement is not always satisfactory and a final victory is not permanent. Peace, therefore, is not only the absence of war, but also something that we make it by shaping the world; it has to be of our own making and it is the result of our conscious and collective action. It must be perpetual and free of conditions and must lead to the absolute impossibility of war. It is essential that we strive to set its preparatory conditions.

Conditions for establishing for peace[14]

The state of peace must be established. This is not to say that peace is the natural state, which is rather to be described as a state of the constant threat of latent war, even though there may be no open hostility.

The natural state shapes human nature. Doubtful of the goodness of human nature, Kant saw the variety in human characteristics: love, sacrifice, harmony, contentment, discontent, hatred, apathy, incompatibility, competition, and so on which allow us to decide what is just, and most dramatically, this gives us a strong basis for extreme behavior and an absolute right to make war. The reason for this is obvious: what we do is not in accordance to serve peace as universal law, but by means of maxims applied by force. We are the authors of such deeds; and finally we destroy each other and thus find perpetual peace in the wide grave that covers all of our abominable crimes.

Viewed from this perspective, the natural state is not always peaceful and we need to transform it into a state of peace with the form of a mutual consensus of the people. For this realization this agreement requires some conditions. These are of two kinds: negative and positive which Kant calls them as Preliminary and Definitive Articles respectively. The first six following Preliminary Articles fall into these negative groups.

---

14. Höffe Otfried 1995, 43.

The Preliminary Articles[15]

1. No treaty of peace shall be regarded as valid if it is made with the secret reservation of the material for a future war.

We may enjoy a truce, a temporary halt in hostilities, but it is not an indefinite peace as long as we are not ready to ensure confidence in peacemaking and still plan for a future war. Even though we were exhausted by war but we still have an intention of future conflict, given this situation it may be said that there will be no peace. These tactics are therefore not trustworthy and a treaty drawn up in such circumstance is invalid.

2. No independent existence of the state, whether great or small, shall be acquired by another through inheritance, exchange, purchase or donation.

The reasons for this prohibition are various, but most importantly it refers to the original contract between the people and the state, and society should determine the issue of territorial integrity. The state should not treat its total territory as property; trading it without the public consultation is, therefore, not permissible. This article applies not only to the past but also to future acquisitions.

3. Standing armies shall be abolished in the course of time.

The world becomes a warlike system as states' armies threaten other states. While states fear the outbreak of war, a country´s arms can be used in self-defend but not to destroy the other side. And arms race will inevitably lead to war. At a certain level of armament, a making of short war is more effective than negotiation because it is less costly than peace-building efforts. In contrast, regularly and voluntary military training is necessarily practical for defense. There are three significant state powers: alliance, money and the army, although Kant states that the army foments insecurity abroad and encourages aggression at home.

---

15. M. Campbell Smith 2009, 62.

4. No national debt shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the state.

The sovereign must deal with the national debt with great care. In theory, credit is good, if used for constructive purposes, such as infrastructure development and productive investment. Military aggression should not be funded by foreign credit; increasing debts and repayment claims continuing for an indefinite period of time lead to increased political power on the part of foreign creditors. When tax revenue cannot keep up with interest payments and other economic means could not be helpful to structural rebalancing, there will be inevitable conflict between short-term stabilisation and risks to sustainability of long-term debt. Such financial fragility affects domestic politics and increase the likelihood of interstate war.

5. No state shall violently interfere with the constitution and government of another.

States could not try to create scandal or offense among nations. Interventions of this kind are unjustified. Interventions may be used to serve as a warning to others against internal chaos and lawlessness. However, if a state has split into different states, intervention on the side of one or the other is justified because these are new states.

6. No state at war with another shall countenance such modes of hostility as would make mutual confidence impossible in a subsequent state of peace: such are the employment of assassins or of poisoners, breaches of capitulations, the instigating and making use of treachery in the hostile states.

The pacific rhetoric of diplomats is not trustworthy if they use the above dishonorable practices as negotiation tactics. Even during the wartime the diplomats should ensure the trust of the adversary to honor the commitment to the end of hostilities. Without these confidence-building measures they simply force the other side to enter into the natural state and lawlessness and used another method of continuing the war. Because of the equality among nations and the lack of global judiciary system, no party can declare that war is justified as a form of punishment. War-making of this sort should be prohibited.

In short, these articles stipulate that obstacles and threatens to future peace should be abolished irrespective of whether the countries concerned are at war, at the negotiation table or living in a state of peace. These prohibitive conditions are aimed ruling out of mistrust between nations and bringing about trustworthy measures. If relations among nations could be stabilised, then they would assure the right of sovereignty (Articles 2 & 5), to remove threats to the sovereignty of other nations (Articles 3 & 4), and build confidence in the conciliatory practice (Articles 1 & 6).

The Definitive Articles[16]

1. The civil constitution of each state shall be republican.[17]

To Kant, the constitution is republican, if the citizens may enjoy the freedom and equality and answer to a common legislation.

With regard to all kind of human and material costs (fighting, supplying and peace-building), Kant argues all of citizens must examine how they meet such costs before deciding to engage in war. By contrast, without being personally involved in combat, a despotic ruler declares the war on behalf of the people. Of course, he has nothing left with a sense of impunity and accountability.

Kant distinguished between the republican and the democratic constitution. The former refers to the form of government and the latter to the form of sovereignty. The basic question about a constitutional rule is who rules (autocracy, aristocracy, or democracy) and how society is ruled (republican or despotic).

Democracy means the government of the majority of the people, rather than the election of a sovereign group from amongst the class of politicians. The democratic will of the majority is despotic and it is of necessity despotism, because it establishes an executive power.

Republicanism entails separating the executive power of the

---

16. M. Campbell Smith. 2009. 117.

17. Höffe Otfried 1995, 87; Schwan Alexander 1991, 242.

government from the legislature. If the majority makes the law, they should not have the right to execute it as this is not compatible with republican principles. Put simply, a separation of powers is required. The spirit of a representative system, which is by definition impossible under a democratic government, as the whole people in this system is only a majority, so here the universal will stands in contradiction of itself and of the principle of freedom.

Kant saw that the smaller the staff of the executive – the number of rulers – and the more real their representation of the people, the better the republican government. The republican principles entrust the legislative and executive power to the majority. Monarchies and aristocracies are reluctant to launch comprehensives reform the republic whereas democracies can do this through violent revolt.

2. The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states[18]

War is a state of lawlessness and a brutish degradation of humanity. The well-being, development and security of a country are dependent to that of another one. Therefore, peaceful relations among nations must be based on their mutual interests. Each nation has the right to request others to engage in a legal federation of peace. Due to their equal basis there are neither superior nor inferior positions among peoples and nations.

In reality, many stronger nations use legal rhetoric to justify their aggressive action and ignore the claims of weaker nations. This results in the depravity of nature of relationships. Because there is no judiciary system over all nations, it is easy for powerful states to enforce their assumed rights and if necessary they do so by making war.

The objective of establishing a pacific federation is to prevent war. War-making should be prohibited and peacemaking established by law; the formal calling for peace making is not helpful; the international league for peace does not pursue bringing a particular war to the end but bringing an end to all of wars in all time. If these principles could spread via alliances and the consensus among state

18. Höffe Otfried, 1995, 109.

members were to grow over time, then the legal federalism of global peace would be feasible.

3. The rights of men, as citizens of the world, shall be limited to the condition of universal hospitality.19

In theory, the essence of legal protection for foreigners is not a subject for philanthropy but a matter of universal human rights: no one has more rights than another to any part of the earth. The earth belongs to human beings and the seas and the deserts divide the world community but fortunately the ship and the camel can bring people together. People begin communicating and understanding each other by using a common language and establishing a legal system on the earth. People are coming together in their working and reaching a common basis of values and responsibilities; a new attitude to the world and people has emerged. For example, the violation of human rights in a distant part of the earth is protested by the others in elsewhere, or more broadly by the world community, because the heart is enlarged and the mind is developed in this interdependent world. These universal ideals and criteria lead to the possibility of the introduction of a law of world citizenship.

In practice, a stranger must not to be treated as an enemy. Such discrimination should be prohibited by law. Hospitality may be offered and limited on the condition that a foreigner lives in accordance with local regulations. If an outsider has a legally correct way of life, he may enjoy the right to become a fellow inhabitant for a certain length of time, but this residence does not stem from the beneficiary agreement because his stay is temporary.

In short, war is the natural state and peace should be established to overcome it in using legal tools and techniques to determine our moral obligations and practical rights. The barrier to reach peace is not that we are unable to restraint the warlike tendencies of mankind as such, but to find out when the prospect of war arises.

After all, what we need to establish peace is the republican

---

19. Höffe Otfried 1995, 133.

constitution, the international federation for peace and the law of world citizenship. The reasoning behind these conditions must be based on the principles of equality, freedom, and transparency among nations and peoples. Kant saw that people are rarely reasonable, because the critical thinking system for this is lacking and more helps are needed.[20]

In his supplement and appendix he suggests complementary conditions that would guarantee peace: the role of nature, the secret articles and the role of philosophers, the harmony between morality and politics and the principles of the publicity of public law. All of these are the contributory conditions for peace.

Supplement I: On the Guarantee of Perpetual Peace[21]

What part does nature play in the designing of peace? How does it guarantee peace? And how may we exercise the right of freedom in this context?

We don't know enough about how the mechanism of nature operates and assume the omnipotence of God in determining its course. We call His will Divine Providence and but cannot test it empirically, so were we try to understand it through analogy with the human actions. As a great artist, nature plays a creative role in producing a harmony among people, even against their will and in guaranteeing peace. Although the relationships between the will of Providence and the ultimate goal of morality are problematic, Kant argues that both scopes can be used as a practical concept of peace.

In this light, the quest for peace we have to deal in this context is a moral duty and a theory of peace, not religion. We observe the change of nature and explain the relations between causes and effect as long as we can experience it. Whatever we may test the outcome or not, it is not measured by the original will of Providence.

Nature arranges for people to live in accordance with its law

---

20. Schwan Alexander 1991, 243.

21. Höffe Otfried 1995, 149; M. Campbell Smith 2009, 143.

in three ways: in every part of the world, nature offers sufficient conditions for existence. An outbreak of war drives people to different places and to live together; the social relationships among people should be protected not by nature, but by the contractual law. These relationships have developed in two forms: the emergence of the state and the exchange of goods through trade. The caring behavior of nature for people to live together is the wonder as early man´s development of language and the arts of agriculture have shown.

Kant argues that there are three fields to which people should attend in order to fulfill the will of nature: public law, international law and the law of world citizenship. First, people express solidarity to defend themselves against the war and go to the common life by submitting to the public laws of authority. The republican constitution is the best framework for preserving the rights of the people. In fact the state has difficulty setting this up and maintaining it due to the various conditions of development of society. The good organisation of the state is one thing, and good citizenship is another. People´s moral improvement is important for social welfare, but the function of a good constitution is to establish a good moral condition in its people, not the reserve. As a result, each states needs is a good constitution and good citizenship and what society needs is a strong basis for morality.

Second, people have reason living separately from one another in their communities: they have different languages and religions; both distinctive features and causes of social and political division. But the international law would be an instrument to reunite these differences if every independent state had a peaceful relationship with its neighbors. More importantly, a league for peace is the best strategy for preventing war because of the supremacy of its international law. Peace made by law is not the same as peace imposed by a strong power. The effect of law and order is not the same as that of a despotic ruler.

Third, the application of a law of world citizenship would unite the world community through mutual interest. As a result, over time, not only the self-interest, the local interests and the national interests, but also the spirits of commerce would promote and maintain a lasting global peace.

Supplement II: On the Secret Articles of a Perpetual Peace[22]

Secret arrangements are contradictory to the principle of transparency in international law. In fact, backstage deals can occasionally be made for various reasons; perhaps most importantly, when diplomats seek to hide their authorships. Unofficial compromises in peace negotiation are understandable and therefore permissible.

Foreign policy is not only the service of diplomats and the agenda of lawmakers, but also the concern of philosophers and the state would be well-advised to ask them for confidential advice. Academia input is important and the state should allow the philosophers freedom to share their expertise because in general they have no desire to dominate position or lobby in domestic politics.

Appendix I: On the Opposition between Morality and Politics[23]

In theory, there is no conflict between politics and ethics because both disciplines are based on the doctrine of rights, the former focused on practical and the latter on theoretical matter. With regard to perpetual peace both areas may be conjoined.

In practice, conflicts of interest are not easy to resolve because the moral politician and the political moralist each has his own objective. The former is concerned with to choose the political principles that work in accordance with the moral thinking system while the latter is interested how he can serve the interests of politicians. While the despotizing moralist violates rules of political prudence and the moralizing politician is incapable of launching reforms, leading to an undesirable outcome: all bad decisions in politics and morals get worse; they would not make a better course for improvement.

Kant suggests that we begin from the formal principle of pure reasons: „so act that you can will that your maxim could become a

---

22. M. Campbell Smith 2009, 158.

23. Höffe Otfried 1995, 195; Schwan Alexander 1991, 243; M. Campbell Smith 2009, 161.

universal law, regardless of the end". We would strive toward it as a moral duty regardless of its outcome and there are two ways of doing this.

First, the political moralists consider the international law and the law of world citizenship as a problem of technique and the political prudence is as an instrumental value. Second, the moral politicians value the peace making as a duty and moral wisdom as an intrinsic one. Both could go and work closely together because honest politics work well with paying attention to the morality.

Appendix II: On the Harmony between Morality and Politics[24]

The principle of transparency requires the publicity of public law. It is not only an ethical but also juridical character; and principally, it is easy to be applicable. A claimant cannot be successful in court without referring to the principle of publicity which can be applied in two fields: the domestic and international law.

The question when dealing with domestic law is whether people have the right to throw off the yoke of a tyrant in a rebellion. The principle of publicity resolves this problem. People would ask themselves whether they dare to publish its intention of this kind in the constitution, if stipulated, then people have a legitimate power to do so.

The principle of publicity may be applied in the field of international law. It is a public announcement of the general will of every state and can be seen as a juridical condition. Without it, its effects have the characteristics of private law character and conflicts among nations cannot be resolved. The emergence of international law is important; without it, the effects of international public law are still missing.

Finally, possible harmony between politics and morals should be measured on the basis of the juridical condition. All maxims need to be observed the principle of publicity.

---

24. Höffe Otfried 1995, 195; M. Campbell Smith 2009, 184.

Remarks

Kant wrote his essay in 1795 and surprisingly the profound implications of this academic discourse have remained far-reaching until today.

Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke and Rousseau extensively explored the dream of peace in the light of social contract theory but unlike Kant they don't pay any particular attention to the contributory role of international law.

Kant was the first to introduce the comprehensive problematic of peace studies in the light of politics, morality, and a priori theory of international law. His integrative effort led to a new paradigm: a combination of an internationalised social contract model and an ethical theory of international law.

Kant points out that the principles of laws, morality and politics could be holistically established, systematically promoting the right to self-determination of individuals, peoples and the whole of mankind as a motivating force. An international league for peace and the national republican constitution and the law of world citizenship are the best tools to implement this. The principles of sovereign equality among nations and non-intervention were recognized by the UN Charter.

Critics charged that Kant´s view is impossible because he produced a forward-looking strategy without considering that peace-building in the national context is still fragile and needs more concrete measure. There are numerous different reasons for his utopia.

Firstly, Kant presupposes that the cultures around the world come to fight one another, and over time they mature together in peace, however, these expectations are out of line with reality. The current world politics tells us that the thesis of the clash of civilization and the real global war on terror is not the case.

Secondly, Kant argues that peace can be maintained through the development of trade. At present, measures taken to counter the

global recession insist on the trade protectionism and the needs to maintain advantages. A further concern is that the wealthy countries are not entirely motivated to do more for the poorer countries and that most of the world´s economic aid programs have been proven to be ineffective. We are on path of increasing risk and instability and the idea peace through trade seems implausible.

Thirdly, Kant calls for the establishment of a republican constitution and suggests prohibition of the intervention of other states. By contrast, the democratic government can be emerged from a war situation. To have this ability requires transplanting the rule of law. These attempts are often unsuccessful because there is no basic structure of governance and leadership doesn't want to give up its power to gain democracy. Furthermore, the violence or the threat of violence still exists.[25]

Fourthly, Kant states that living conditions in the state of nature are similar to those of war conditions. Living in a society and according to the law requires motivation. But there is no similar way to generalise this with the willingness of all peoples around the world to live in accordance with the protection of international law. There are two different backgrounds for two different undertakings. It is much more difficult to sustain the normative power of international law than the national law.

Fifthly, the Second World War did not end in a peace treaty and the international military tribunals prosecuting war crimes at Nuremberg and Tokyo were not as effective as legal instruments as Kant expected.

Finally, Kant points out that the gradual evolution of human institutions is the key to world peace and the principles of laws, morality and politics could be holistically established. However, a peaceful future cannot be reasonably expected because the failure of cooperation has so many reasons and the two most important are: first, a sketch of the duties of international and national actors and institutions could not definitively concluded and second, these

25. Weingast Barry R. 2010

actors cannot deal with peace by virtues only of its effect on their self-interest and national interests.

Kant provides a guideline for moral, legal and political systems that he believes will succeed where existing arrangements have failed. But now we have not realised his dream, his version is not entirely flawed, but it needs to be complemented. Solving today´s problems requires one fundamental change.

To address the problem, perhaps most importantly, we need to identify the human nature and the structural cause of violence. This alternative may be found in the light of a Buddhist approach to peace studies. The question of whether Buddhism is conducive to overcoming the most pressing issues today is briefly discussed below.

The Buddhist Perspective

Background[26]

Siddhartha Gautama (563-483 BCE) was a prince of the Sakya clan in the southern regions of modern-day Nepal. After giving up his throne and meditating on the vicissitudes of life and death he attained a state of Enlightenment. From then on, he began to teach the Buddhist doctrine in India.

Broadly speaking, Buddhism is not only a religion but is also a practical philosophy and a universal ethical guide because it is concerned not only spiritual faith but also with the cultivation of universal virtues such as peace, compassion and joy. People from different cultures, backgrounds and religions can find for themselves the most suitable way of practicing it in order to attain better lives for themselves.

Basics of Buddhism[27]

The Buddhist teaching (*dharma*) is based on the laws of the

26. Willis Janice

27. Thich Minh-Chau Bhikkhu 1995; Galtung Johan 1993; Der-Ian Yeh Theresa 2006.

universe and of action (*karma*). These operate eternally and in tandem helping us to grasp the real nature of life. To approach these laws, we need to explore two things: namely sufferings and a means of bringing about the end of suffering. In order to explain these laws, the Buddha provides us with two theories: the Four Noble Truths and the Dependent Origination.

The Four Noble Truths

These Truths have four parts and each of them is a step to follow, namely:

1. Suffering is a fact of life.

Humans suffer birth, aging, sickness and death. Other forms of sufferings include sorrow, lamentation, pain, grief and despair.

There are three basic kinds of sufferings. The first deals with the physical and mental pain and may simply be perceived as distress and uneasiness. The second is connected to the suffering that is produced by change: for example, a happy state may suddenly change into a sorrowful one. The most distinctive feature of the Buddha´s teaching is the third *samsara*, meaning "he flows into himself" or "the realm of continuous going". Buddhists believe that one continues to be born and reborn in various realms in human, animal or other form. The form depends entirely on causal karma.

2. Our delusions of self are the cause of our suffering.

Each human being consists of several selves that play various roles. The basic conflict in the self-concept may reveal itself via behaviour and our attachment to what we desire or hate is of primary importance. The root cause of suffering is, therefore, all types of desire and hatred. Due to the fundamental darkness, we come to believe that the self is permanent, and that self- concern and the conceit of „I" are the most valuable things.

Moreover, we assume that we are best at deciding everything. Because of our attached identities and our limited faculties, we fail

to see the world as it really is and to perceive the true nature of life: instead, we merely see it as we wish it were. As the result, these delusional tendencies, we are not always truly happy because the reality often contradicts our expectation of it; thus ego fixation is at the heart of conflict.

3. The way to cease our suffering is to extinguish our attachment

To move away from delusional ideas, we have to grasp the true nature of things as well as the nature of ourselves. Buddhists consider this to be the ultimate human goal and refer to it as an attaining of a state of liberation or awakening, which is often called *Nirvana*, a concept of paradise or lasting peace. Some Western scholars have mistakenly translated as state of extinction; it should rather be seen as a state of constant happiness after becoming a fully awakened Buddha.

4.   There is a path that leads to the cessation of suffering.

It is necessary to cultivate an enlightened attitude. The last step towards overcoming human sufferings is practicing various methods of meditation; and more particularly, following the Eightfold Path. This path consists of having the correct understanding, the correct intentions, the correct speech, performing the correct action, pursuing the correct livelihood, making the correct effort, mindfulness and right concentration. Finally, only a fully awakened Buddha has the capacity to be free from suffering.

Dependent Origination[28]

This term is an English translation of the Sanskrit word *pratiya-samutpada*. It refers to a situation in which the emergence and existence of certain phenomena depends on other phenomena. It is an on-going story of the various causes and conditions of all phenomena. This evolving process explains why a new phenomenon completes the rise of a given phenomenon.

The logic behind the theory of complementarity is that the reality of

28. Tatsushi Arai 2012.

the world is characterised by an interdependent timeless universe of interrelated causes and effects. Buddhists believe that there are four realms: human beings, animals, nature and cosmic space. They also believe that we are reciprocally interwoven with the existence of everything else. In other words, everything (including sentient and insentient beings) exists in relation to others and nothing can exist on its own.

   The process of Buddhist analysis is used to look more deeply into ways of reuniting all of the interrelated spaces. As human being, we do not divide the world in which we live equally; rather we extend our human realm to include everybody in the human space, then downward to non-human nature, backwards and forwards in the time and through the principle of karma and rebirth. The *anatta* doctrine (no-self) is a means of perceiving this wisdom. Metaphorically, this means there is that of me in everybody else and that of everybody else in me. I am a process that is continuous with others. This is a way of cultivating our virtues in order to reunite this cosmic relationship.

The Meanings of Peace[29]

To achieve perfect enlightenment, it is necessary to practice the Four Noble Truths and the Dependent Origination. The heart of this practice is to generate loving kindness, compassion, joy and equanimity as our moral faculties. Finally, a practitioner overcomes mental defilement and reaches a state of inner peace. Buddha described this as the final destination of this spiritual journey. In early Buddhist texts his teaching is often quoted as follows:

> "All composite things are impermanent
> All defiled things are unsatisfactory
> All phenomena are empty of inherent existence
> Nirvara is peace."

   The *Nirvara* (paradise) illustrated here is a metaphor for the inner peace of a awakened practitioner. In fact, Buddhism highlights peace theory rather than the state of individual enlightenment.

---

29. Harvey Peter 2000; Galtung Johan 2011.

The original concept of Buddhist peace may be found in Sanskrit texts. The words *samnipata, samgri* and *samgama* refer to this peace. The root of these words is *samvii*, meaning that people do things together in the form a collective action. This means that peace is not only a sense of individual concern and responsibility for one´s own future, but is also an altruistic concern for the wellbeing of others.

Thus, there is no differentiation between the concepts of negative and positive peace, because both notions of peace serve the same ultimate goal. Put simply, peacemaking efforts involve not only the diplomatic services, but should also be a universal daily preoccupation for everybody. Most significantly, each human being and each level of the system has to cultivate moral virtues for this undertaking.

At this point, the Buddhists perspective explores the causes of violence at the level of human structures via the theories of conflict and peaceful resolution.

Theory of Conflict[30]

Buddhist teachings distinguish internal and external domains of conflict. The former refers to the state of mind of a human individual. Thus a decisional dilemma, which reflects the deeper conflict of the self-concept, exists. The latter is tied to the contradictory situation of people in social relationships for which a solution is also necessary.

Whenever an individual or social field of conflict becomes problematic, a practitioner is required to first ask the question:"Is it something wrong with me?" and "What is going on?". The practitioner begins with a degree of self-examination identifying the cause and the possible interplay of these variables before determining the consequences.

Prior to exploring the structural cause of a conflict, the practitioner

---

30. Der-Ian Yeh Theresa 2006, 94; Harvey Peter 2000, 239; Tatsushi Arai 2012, 13.

uncovers the elements that emerge at personal and social level.

Firstly, at the personal level, the key issues include prejudice, subjective views and preferences. These are inescapably associated with our human characteristics. It is often impossible to explain why people prefer certain foods, music and colours, and or become extremely annoyed by criticism. Without self-examination, people tend to base most of their everyday choices on them not being significantly harmful to anyone else. This is just an individual decision in the preference-making process.

Secondly, the longing for home, affection, trust, wealth and peace is understandable, as is the need for increased material comfort (food, fashion, furniture and housing) and for better living (health, distinguished performance and social prestige) is rightly so. People are bound to deal with the varieties of need and desire all their lives as change in behaviour is a constant.

Due to the changing living conditions, needs and desires do not remain the same over time. However, it is difficult for people to rationally determine their desires and easy for them to go beyond the limitation of satisfying a need.

More substantively, people cannot see that the deeper layer of cause lies elsewhere; the difficulties with values come from fear, dislike, resentment, anger and hate. A perception could possibly be unclear and biased because an event today is not the same as it was yesterday. They are symptoms of misperceptions. As long as we do not have the power to see ourselves, a decisional dilemma exists. In order to overcome this, we need to reconsider our desires, cravings, greed, and attachments with critical care. This raises the following questions: How does one alter one´s demands and acquire new expectations? How does one discover that one´s existing self-concept is inadequate?

At the social level, the consequences are not different, although the individual state of being that is entangled with social tension cannot be accurately predefined; society is filled with conflict and the causes thereof are varied: pleasure, property, economic dominance and political superiority. However, the nature of its external contradictions

stems from our internal desires, as illustrated above.

In other words, the sense of having more possession is the most significant; what concerns us is doing the utmost to fulfill our desires without balancing the interests of others, although the tension doesn't allow us to do so. The key source of external conflict is that we can no longer control the inner contradictions and therefore externalise them. The result is harm to others, both physically and verbally. It is inevitable that a conflict takes places and that violence is used to defend conflicting interests. Therefore, what is required in order to reduce conflict?

The Way to a Peaceful Solution[31]

The way forward requires inner reflection because the Buddhists begin to make peace within by themselves first. The primary aim for the practice is to guard the mind carefully in order to develop wisdom and increase mindfulness. This is a prerequisite for a more compassionate world.

Looking back on his contemplative practice, the Buddha tells us that he has also difficulty when faced with conflicting views and a variety of opinions. As a first step, people often argue around an issue, then focus on a particular concern before finally coming to conclusion that their interests must be protected at all costs. This is a question of "I" that thinks, dreams, talks, feels and believes, but the "I" that no one knows fully. Thus, how we see ourselves determines what we do, how we react and how we behave. This ego centric preoccupation is the reason that we are incapable of choosing a course of action more accurately than an outsider may reasonably expect.

As discussed above, the conceptual basics of Buddhist teachings facilitate the cultivation of the moral faculties required for peace. Among its central values are those known as the *Four Noble Truths* and *Dependent Origination* and the *Noble Eightfold Path*; they are the guidelines for inner reflection.

---

31. Der-Ian Yeh Theresa 2006, 97; Harvey Peter 2000, 241; Tatsushi Arai 2012, 20.

Of course, a practitioner does not only work on intellectual concepts. He needs more for his daily practices than contemplation. For this purpose, the Buddha suggested a guideline and called it *the Five Precepts*. These precepts are a list of things that we ought not to do, such as taking life, stealing, adultery, lying and consuming intoxicating drinks.

Moreover, the Buddha prescribes a list of actions that are moral obligations. It consists of five deeds: we should develop compassion, not to sell weapons or liquor, control our sexual desires, tell the truth, and reduce carelessness and increase the mindfulness.

Both the negative and the positive list outline preliminary practices for beginners. However, a self-direction is not a helpful method to solving social conflict because the nature such conflict is more complex: thus a practitioner has to reach an understanding of and cooperation with others. In Buddhist terminology, a practitioner should approach others in a spirit of social cordiality.

The Buddha tells us that the reasons for discord and strife in the social life are varied and that there are six typical features of disputes, as follows: people are often angry and resentful contemptuous and insolent envious and miserly deceitful and fraudulent; have evil wishes and wrong views and finally they adhere to their own views. The list is not completed but it is widely believed that these are the main factors leading to social conflict.

The Buddhist emphasis is on the *Six Principles of Cordiality* as a self-training method for social life. The wise thing to do is to put it into practice in order to avoid harming others.

In the practice of the Six Principles of Cordiality one generate love, respect, cohesion, non-dispute, concord, and unity. More specifically, person engages in caring behaviour, rather than only seeking achievement, power, and status. One should maintain bodily acts of loving-kindness toward one´s companions, maintain verbal acts of loving-kindness, maintains mental acts of loving-kindness, enjoys things in common without reservation, have unbroken virtues and finally possesses a Right and Noble View in accordance with that of one´s companions.

These principles are aimed at boosting pro-social motivation and at enhancing affective faculties like attention, compassion, empathy, understanding and cooperation. In so doing, a participant in the social conflict can be motivated by contributing to the development of a more peaceful society.

Remarks

1. Buddhists ´contributions to the social peace have not always been successful. Buddhism will still have difficulty thinking and acting in terms of world peace because it does not cover a wide range of modern economic and political issues. World politics does not interest the monks; instead they pay more time to charity work and to going on retreat. Behind the closed doors of the temples the monks and nuns care more about the monastic rule of self-contemplation than they do to the techniques of the newly emerging field of global challenges. They have been often criticised for being pessimistic regarding for peace activism. Most peace researchers have drawn these negative lessons from Buddhists societies in Sri Lanka, Myanmar and Thailand.[32] Consequently, it is impossible to develop a vision of world peace from a Buddhists perspective.

2. By contrast, some argue that the positive impact of Buddhist ethics is far reaching because the Buddhist notion of peace aims to protect living beings from harm and to stop them from harming each other. This begins with the individual battle for mind and heart. This type of thinking is a reasoning process that involves looking more deeply into self-examination, the concept of conflict management and communication within a small group. As the personal and social levels interact more symbiotically with each other, individual tranquility and social harmony could be attained. Some Western scholars have described this as "small is beautiful".[33] Face to face cordiality has often been referred as to the distinctive feature of traditional Asian society.

Evidently, the community life of *Sangha* (ordained monks and nuns) was a harmonious and exemplary setting for this kind of conflict

32. Harvey Peter 2000; Galtung Johan 2011

33. Galtung Johan 2011, 283.

resolution. After the Buddha passed away, the Buddhist Congregations tended to codify his teaching discourses systematically. In three consecutive conferences in *Rajagriha, Vaisali* and *Patna* in India their efforts were unsuccessful because of the diversity and a lack of a common approach to interpretation. Although some respectable scholars insisted on their own ways of teaching, others showed their openness and tolerance in the spirit of cordiality.[34]

3. There were some Buddhist justifications of, and involvement in violence. In the early Buddhist texts, the Buddha was once said to have been engaged in politics. He became involved in conflict resolution between the *Sakiya* and the *Koliya*. The dispute concerned the use of water resources between two territories. With his mediating power, the Buddha's way of resolution was well respected. As a result, both conflicting parties agreed to desist from the misuse of water and the war came to an end.

In addition, there were so many historical examples of monks serving as top advisers to the king when negotiating the end to a war. In Viet Nam the involvement of *Van Hanh Zen Master* of political matters in the Ly dynasty (1009-1225) is a well-known example of the patriotism of Vietnamese Buddhists.

Another example of the legal effect of Buddhist teaching has been found in Japan. In the year 604 CE, the Buddhist Prince *Shotoku* adopted the principles of Buddhist cordiality in the Japanese constitution. Most of Japanese legal scholars contend that it was the first Japanese constitution that incorporated Buddhist democratic thinking and procedures.[35]

4. In 20th century Sri Lanka, the Sinhalese Buddhists played not only the main role in protecting Buddhism during the civil war but also rebuilding the country in post- conflict. Over 600 monks engaged in the post-conflict mediation among the war-torn villages. By so doing, all the participants shared the Buddhist perceptions regarding

---

34. Do Kim Them 2012, 248.

35. Do Kim Them 2012, 248.

the war and peace from the Buddhists perspective.[36]

The same case was seen in the post-war reconstruction of Japan. The *Soka Gakkai* was one of the most successful Buddhist mass movements in peace education. Its objective was to motivate people to learn to work in the Buddhist harmony, not to repeat the mistake of the past and to ensure the re-building the country and the world as an interdependent network.[37]

5. Today, the ethnic conflicts, disputes over self-determination and violent power struggles between the domestic groups have increased around the world. Most dramatically, terrorist activities are expanding to the four corners of the earth. Given this, most peace researchers come to believe that the Buddhist perspective is a rich resource for global peace studies and practices. Five typical reasons are given as follows

Firstly, Buddhism has the cultural power to motivate and to hold people morally responsible for achieving peaceful ideals. Buddhism creates a common basis of values, virtues, rights and responsibilities for everyone in society by promoting a culture of non- violence, respect for others, solidarity and tolerance. Whatever path one might take, individually or socially, people can develop the skillful means of Buddhist in awakening in achieving this insight as a new paradigm for peace. Therefore, peace can be seen as the fruit of the individual efforts as well as of collective actions.[38]

Secondly, the next stage of this do-it-yourself thinking is that people will live in the same world space. This means that we will all have the same ethical budget and the same *Buddhahood*: the Buddha´s nature is in each of us and in every living thing. This principle is not only to be used in monasticism but for everyone on the global scale. As we value this quality, we will do our utmost to practice it. This symbiotic thinking could easily be applied to the question of environmental protection and disarmament. The interconnectedness of the world

---

36. Harvey Peter 2000, 254.

37. Harvey Peter 2000, 264.

38. Galtung Joan 2011, 280.

is a common reason that self-examination, self- realisation and self-improvement are necessary as they endorses the more robust concept of desiring to live in a world where all people wish for peace and prosperity.[39]

Thirdly, the theory of harmonious coexistence leads to an approach towards the holistic framework of peace. All of the four realms of life, as discussed above, are globally interrelated. People need to connect to all the boundaries of these areas. In fact, a holistic orientation concerning peace research could not be as easily applied to the wide range of the global scope as expected. The difficulty of dealing with empirical reality requires various adjustments.

Fourthly, it is not easy to guarantee that the design of the fundamental model of peace studies will succeed. According to Buddhism thought, the four spheres interact and change over time. Such an effort is as difficult to achieve as it is desirable because human behaviour changes constantly. Thus, self-examination is merely a preparation for an insight into peace. People must see themselves in relation to the environment, and must develop his concern in response to what they see around them. An individual must broaden his or her perception of peace and of him- or herself. That is to say individual effort is relative and is in relation to certain local conditions. It is important to realise that this is not enough because a mutual consensus is needed. The desire for peace must be dynamic. Therefore, individual striving must be continuous and a final state of peace is not to be expected.[40]

Fifthly and finally, Buddhist teaching gives us a strong basis for peace education as it concerns ultimate goals and peaceful means. The self-concept of examination, of expectation, the culture of non- violence, respect for others, solidarity and tolerance are necessary for this performance. Working towards peace means that two basic things are required: peace education and the realisation of peaceful methods.

After all, the Buddhist vision values peace both intrinsically and instrumentally. By associating with the Buddhists, people around the

---

39. Galtung Joan 2011, 282.

40. Galtung Johan 2011, 282

world may feel powerful enough to deal with the contemporary world issues like interpersonal relations, animal welfare, human rights and the environmental protections, as well as with strategy of dialogue among religions and nations.[41]

The Need for an Integrated Approach

Both Kantian and Buddhist ethics have common ideals that aim at finding a way to achieve world peace. They are competent in terms of advancing the understanding of means of achieving it. They contended that peace-building and peacekeeping are processes, dynamic ways of problem solving and pose question regarding the responsibilities and practices necessary for cultivating peace. Thus, the concepts are similar, although their instruments are different.

Peacemaking is not just a matter of global cooperation of human institutions as Kant suggested. Its effective strategy must, therefore, be comprehensive. The deepest scepticism here concerns the dark side of human nature. This is one of the most significant contributions of Buddhist ethics that could be incorporated into the Kantian perspective.

As a secular system of ethics, Buddhism sees individuals as the central moral unit of the peace making process. Through the practice of inner reflection and social cordiality individuals can internalise these ethical commitments and can enhance their faculties of compassion and altruistic behaviour. Thus, individual ethics become social ethics. As a result, an integrated approach could be applied to future governance in order to achieve peace.

By contrast, some have argued that this redirection is illusory because the two models are seen as being unacceptably demanding; achieving such integration requires a methodology that moves beyond the regular scope of peace studies. Thus, finding a way of advocating it or making major changes to it seems highly implausible.

Alternatively, one could simply find it possible to convince oneself

---

41. Terminski Bogumil, 2010; Der-Ian Yeh Theresa. 2006.

that such duties exist, whether for reasons of conception or of feasibility. Similar to the global strategy of environmental protection, a new way of resolving the problem of global conflict in terms of personal duties and local consequences is essential. In this light, the aim is to think of peace in all aspects of the practice on the global scale, while acting on the local scale. Advocacy of the peace making is a morally correct view, but adjustment on the basis of the difference between the global objectives and local duties is pragmatic one. There are many reasons to pursue this path.

Firstly, all human have a duty towards peacemaking as this matter affects everyone on earth. The principles of peace-building and peacekeeping are uniform, but the realisations thereof vary from one country to another and from one conflict situation to another. On the one hand, caring and acting in response to the suffering in Sudan is not done at the same way as in Tibet or in Syria. Arguably most importantly, duties can only arise in the local context and the duty towards global peace is less extensive than that of domestic peace. On the other hand, the collapse of Afghanistan or the Chinese regional dominance in Vietnamese domestic politics will inevitably have implications for the entire world. At the most fundamental level, we also have the global duties of charity and of humanity. All kind of duties may be occasionally merged in practice.

Secondly, a new concept for world peace is required because of the altered natures of modern warfare. The global war on terror is evident. However, peace researchers tell us that most of the wars are intranational rather than international and that 93 percent of the armed conflicts are ethnic, religious and local in nature. Wars between two democratic countries are an exception.[42] In response to this, one should generate a global public understanding of the local methods and domestic duties of managing conflict.

It is widely believed that the most urgent solution to Darfur relies on peacekeepers and sanctions, but this is not enough to solve the problem of keeping people alive. What is equally problematic is that

42. Krity Neil J. 2001, 802.

Darfur needs a basic economic infrastructure and the rule of law development. Both of these areas need to be addressed.

Vietnam should not do the same, although Vietnam is now less peaceable internally and more vulnerable externally than ever before because elites are placing the Chinese interests and their own interests above the political will of people. The most part of the problem can be only solved by public understanding, political consensus, redirection and determination. Only by stabilizing the Sino-Vietnamese relationship can a regional diplomacy that supports peace and shared prosperity be achieved. But such cooperation will be impossible unless the China recognizes Vietnam as an equal partner - and not just rhetorically.[43] And what can engaged Buddhist do? That is for now at least unknown, but what Buddhist can do is help Vietnamese people to find their voice, to start a more robust public discourse and to facilitate a peaceful transition.[44]

Thirdly, it is essential to distinguish between the theoretical structure suggested by Kant and the more practical proposal made by the Buddha. Although the essential value of peace of both is practically unimpaired, we must go beyond Kant's ideals because we are clearly not on the path towards problem solving, as Kant suggested. We would prefer to understand the significance of Kant's proposal in connection with that of Buddhist cordiality and in the light of the contemporary scholarship. It seems highly plausible to consider the integration of Kantian and Buddhist philosophies as the minimal condition for interaction today.

Whatever view we take of the applicability or inapplicability of either vision to our present situation, it seems that genuine peace cannot be established by the sum of many approaches. Moreover, the convergent approach requires a justification. The question, therefore, is whether such an integrated view can create a coherent paradigm for new responsibilities.

---

43. Do, Kim Them, 2013 (1)

44. Do, Kim Them, 2012 (2)

A New Paradigm for Peace Governance

Peaceful Means

The way to peace is aiming at preventing, managing, limiting and overcoming violence (direct attack and massacre), structural violence (indirect violence caused by an unjust structure) and cultural violence (dominant positions in ideology). Most importantly, a new mind set for a realistic and achievable strategy is imperative. The Buddhist concept of peace reveals that is human behaviour is motivating force for peace. Based on the ethical commitment of inner revolution, nonviolence, compassion and altruism, people seek to avoid war and conflict via peaceful means. Non-violence and social cordiality can be cultivated.[45] Ethical education that can serve the ends peace in the light of Buddhist teaching is compatible with Kantian ideals.

Rule of Law

Buddhist social cordiality governs our relationships with all other people, animals, nature and the world. This does not mean that the entire theory assumes that there moral agents exists before society. Buddhism did not create society: on the contrary, society created Buddhists. Our compassion, empathy and altruistic behaviour are the response to the world´s miseries. Although harmonious thoughts are the source of peace, their realisations depend entirely on the existence of the social institution concerned and this connection is relative and relational to the local background.

The ethical commitment is easily applicable within the face-to-face Buddhist community. More broadly, the King could show his kindness and build a consensus around a small-scale model for peace and the sharing of burdens needed to implement it successfully. This is not the same scope of tasks within a modern society.

The principle at issue here is that the normative power of Buddhist harmony is not entirely reduced to moral motives. It is closely related to the pressing practical question regarding the legal path towards

---

45. Galtung Johan, 2011.

peaceful governance. People, including Buddhists, should be bound by the law. Thus what Buddha seems to be proposing in this context is that the mutual advantage for the members is the result of the interpretation of contractual obligation, shaped by the Kantian ideal of a social pact: all humans have to be bound by societal rules in order to create the conditions for peace and a legal order.

In this light, the operative notion of Buddhist harmony is more legal, rather than socio- economic or religious. In short, instead of promoting the Buddhist harmony within the community life as do the *Sangha*, what is needed to rectify the existing paradigm is to be able to call for the rule of law. This may be thought of as a corrective strategy for „small is beautiful". It is indeed worth advocating.

However, seen in its entirety, the risk of incoherence becomes evident. Most of the great challenges for peace in our time are the end of poverty, the protection of environment and the control of nuclear weapons. Most of governmental global cooperation is crumbling. The devastating consequences lead to the self-destruction of humankind, because some of economies are failing to eliminate poverty and to improve the delivery of better education and health care; some of societies are more or more fragmented and some of existing governmental structures are incapable of launching comprehensive reforms. The major threat facing the world today is the absence proper global governance for peace, which is a situation that may continue indefinitely.

In fact, given the likely trade-off between the strategy and the tactics of local governance with regard to peace, no complete blueprint for global cooperation is available in the 21st century, nor could there be. However, in order to discover all of its transformative potential its realization is essential. The heart of the practice is to accomplish the comprehensive objectives to the limited extent of the background to ethical education for the peace and the rule of law development movement.

The tasks for peace set by Kant and Buddha fit nearly within the current educational and legal reform agendas today. Hence, both peaceful means and the rule of law are the ultimate guarantors for

peace, thus becoming the new paradigm for peaceful governance.

Suggestions for Future Research

The integrated approach may enrich the fields of peace studies and of peace activism. Therefore, the potential merits would benefit from further investigation, both theoretical and practical. It is clear that the benefits are mutual. Can we reach this level of awareness? Who is responsible for promoting this paradigm?

Even if the new paradigm for peace appears to be promising, social institutions that enable us to fulfill our duties are required. The primary duty falls to institutions as well as to national and local organisations, communities, businesses, families and individuals.

However, the required steps, if pursued seriously, needs more help, especially through the medium of international entities. The secondary role of international actors and institutions is also important. During the past few decades, there have been a vast number of assistance programmes to facilitate the implementation of the rule of law in terms of techniques, especially in terms of providing a road map for peace making. Global actors and institutions have a supportive and facilitative role in providing technical assistance, training for expert consultations on the drafting of legislative and regulatory reforms.[46] How can Buddhist activists for peace accomplish all of this?

Simply put, it is not to be expected that monks could teach international law or serve as diplomats. An integrated approach requires that Buddhist scholars understand the relevance of the legal field because they cannot avoid issues of the legitimacy of the Buddhist solution by focusing on morality. They focus on the individual and social ethics and are aware of the spillover effects of compassion and of loving kindness in terms of peace, but their educational work needs to be largely supplanted by the use of legal effects. They should look beyond the interpretative methods for a Buddhist solution to conflict. It seems plausible that such collective effects have a function that will be continuous. This can emerge under conditions of interaction,

---

46. Krity Neil J. 2001, 802.

either generally or in more specific contexts.

Is the Buddhist thinking on legal interpretation is morally imperative? Such collaboration becomes more difficult for lawyers because they are mainly interested in the coercive power of the law and in the functioning of social institutions. For them, the mode of formal prescription is more important than is the attainment of the state of personal peacefulness. Translating the Buddhist concept of peace into the rule of law development movement needs to be fully explored. Being key players in the moral position Buddhist scholars should engage with the Buddhist significance of the field of international law and institutions.

In order to determine the joint programme for the collective responsibility for peace, such collaboration requires the specialised training of scholars in both disciplines. The main issues for advancing scholarship regarding global peace involve the following questions: Who are the relevant stakeholders? How do the Buddhist and the legal scholars share moral duties and legal responsibilities? How does Buddhism and the rule law further global peace with regard to education and intervention? Thus, the relationships of Buddhism and global actors, institutions and political authorities are areas for future research. The challenges to interdisciplinary dialogues are evident and great. Without an awareness of this expectation, the position of advocating these convergent efforts is irrelevant.

Conclusion

The age of the global war on terror requires a new route to world peace. The purpose of this article has been to highlight a new paradigm for peace. It does not include a discussion of visionary idealism, but rather stresses that of strategic realism. It has examined various ethical and legal issues from Kantian and Buddhist perspectives. Debates on these inquiries have reached a point in which both disciplines would benefit from greater collaboration.

The Buddhist paradigm of nonviolence, compassion and altruism has been called a conceptual skill for a peace education development movement; and the Kantian vision of legal

internationalism has been called a technical skill for a rule of law development movement. Both can contribute to the peace-building and peacekeeping processes worldwide.

The difference between the two approaches invites Buddhist scholars to learn from the legal scholars and vice versa. The Buddhist activists for peace are capable of training people to realise their full socio-emotional potential to create the binding effect of legal order. The legal scholars need to propose institutional reforms in order to contribute to the development of a more compassionate society, rather than seeking only competition, achievement, power, and status.

This two-skill approach may be developed through awareness, consensus, determination and redirection. From this perspective, the UN must work together and in a supportive and facilitative role vis-à-vis International Buddhist Confederation and International Association of Buddhist Universities in order to facilitate the shared governance of peace. State governments, civil societies, businesses, religions, families and individuals must assume an important and direct role at the domestic level. By helping to identify the skills most needed at the various level of responsibility, global actors, institutions, and regulatory networks may prove useful in terms of selection, training and promotion.

The conceptual skills advanced by Buddhism and the technical skills outlined by Kant have become the most important determinants for future governance in terms of the peace process. The time is now ripe for such an integrated approach to be introduced. In so doing, we hope to become closer to attaining this goal. However, this option does not have a promising outcome, because there is no pressure to bring together leading thinkers and practitioners from both sides to consider this possibility. It is hoped that a new discourse regarding the age of convergence will begin, although greater systematic attention is needed.

REFERENCES

Barash David P., Webel Charles P., 2014. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, Los Angeles SAGE.

Benn, James A., Jinhua Chen. Eds.2007. *Buddhism and Peace: Issues of Violence, Wars and Self-Sacrifice*, Hualien, Taiwan, Tzu Chi University.

Boutros Boutrous-Ghali. 1992. *Agenda for Peace*, New York: United Nations, 32-34.

Chaiwat Satha-Anand 2008 "Finding a Language to Speak about the Global War on Terror: A Buddhist Alternative from a Muslim Perspective" in: Hans Kochler Ed. *The Global War on Terror and the Question of World Order,* Vienna: International Progress Organisation.

Der-Ian Yeh Theresa. 2006. "The Way to Peace: A Buddhist Perspective", in: *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Vol.11, N. 1, Spring Summer 2006, 91-112.

Dietrich Wolfgang et al. eds. 2011. *The Palgrave International Handbook of Peace Studies: A Cultural Perspective*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Do, Kim Them. 2012. „Idee der Gerechtigkeit und Öffentlicher Vernunftgebrauch in einer Demokratischer Gesellschaft" in: *Rechtstheorie* 42 (2012) 241-249.

Do, Kim Them, 2013 (1). *Vietnam and the US: Need for Each Other*, available at>

http://www.asiasentinel.com/econ-business/vietnam-and-the-us-need-for-each-other/

Do, Kim Them, 2013. (2) *Vietnam´s Disappointing New Constitution*, available at: http://thediplomat.com/2013/11/vietnams-disappointing-new-constitution/

Jayatilleke K. N. 1962. *Buddhism and Peace*, Buddhist Publication Society, Ceylon, The Wheel Publication.

Jayatilleke K. N. 1967. „The Principles of International Law in Buddhist Doctrines", in: *Académie de Droit International*: Receuil des Cours 120. I, 441-567.

Galtung Johan. 1985. „Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Responses", *Journal of Peace Research*, 22, 141-158.

Galtung Johan. 1993. *Buddhism: A Quest for Unity and Peace*, Da Won Sa Buddhist Temple of Hawaii, Sarvodaya Books Publication Services.

Galtung Johan, Jacobsen Carl G, Brand Jacobsen Kai-Frithjof. 2002, *Searching for Peace: The Road to Transcend*. London: Pluto Press.

Galtung Johan, Webel Charles. Eds. 2007. *The Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.

Galtung Johan. 2011. "Buddhism and the World Peace", in: Dietrich Wolfgang et al. Eds, *The Palgrave International Handbook of Peace Studies: A Cultural Perspective*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 278-290.

Harvey Peter. 2000. *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics, Foundations, Values and Issues*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Höffe Otfried. 1995. *Zum Ewigen Frieden Immanuel Kant,* Klassiker Auslegen, Bd. 1 Berlin, Akademie Verlag.

Höffe Otfried. 1999. *Demokratie im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, München, C. H. Beck.

Kant Immanuel, 1795 „*Zum Ewigen Frieden, Ein Philosophischer Entwurf",* Königberg, bey Friederich Nicovius, in: Die Kritiken, 2008, Zweitausendeins, Frankfurt am Main. 1091-1124.

Kant Immanuel, 2009, *Perpetual Peace – A Philosophical Essay*, translated with introduction and notes by M. Campbell Smith, W L C.

Krity Neil J., 2001, "The Rule of Law in the Postconflict Phase – Building a State Peace" in: Chester Croker et al. Eds. *Turbulent Peace – The Challenge of Managing International Conflict*, U. S Institute of Peace 801-820.

Küng Hans, 2002, Global Politics and Global Ethic – Status Quo and Perspectives, in: *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Winter-Spring 2002, 8-20.

Küng Hans, Senghaas Dieter. (Hg.) *Friedenspolitik - Ethische Grundlagen Internationaler Beziehungen*, München, Piper.

Niesen Peter, Eberl Oliver. 2011. *Zum Ewigen Frieden und Auszüge aus der Rechtslehre*, Studienbuch, Suhrkamp.

Sen Arnartya. 2010. *The Idea of Justice*, London: Penguin Books.

Sisk, Timothy D. Ed. 2011. *Between Terror and Tolerance: Religious Leaders*, *Conflict, and Peacemaking*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schwan Alexander. 1991. Freiheitsgesetz und Republikanische Regierungsart, in: Lieber, Hans-Joachim, *Politische Theorien von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Bonn, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Schriftenreihe Bd. 299. 242-257.

Tatsushi Arai. 2012. Toward a Buddhist Paradigm of Peace Studies Dependent Origination and Conflict Transformation, SIT Graduate Institute.

Terminski Bogumil. 2010. "The Evolution of the Concept of Perpetual Peace in the History of Political-Legal Thought" in: *Perspectivas Internationales* . Cali, Colombia, Vol 6 No. 1 Diciembre 2101, 277-290

Thich Minh-Chau Bhikkhu. 1995. *Some Teachings of Lord Buddha on Peace and Human Dignit*y, Vietnamese Buddhist Research Institute, Saigon, Vietnam.

Webster´s Third International Dictionary 1993, Springfeld, MA: Merriam-Webster 1660.

Willis Janice. *Buddhism and Peace*, available at: http://www.urbandharma.org/udharma6/peace.html

Weingast Barry R. 2010. "Why developing countries prove so resistant to the rule of law?" in: James J. Heckman et al. Eds. Global Perspectives on the Rule of Law, London and New York: Routledge Cavendisch, 29-51.