

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4284-6747>

*Popkov V. V., Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University*

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0728-3635>

*Fouad Hamid, Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University*

## THE "ETERNAL PEACE" CONCEPT AS A SUBJECT OF WORLD-SYSTEM ANALYSIS AND CHINESE VIEWPOINT

*The article starts from the well-known I. Kant's treatise about "eternal peace". Such close attention to this issue is quite understandable. The Russian-Ukrainian war that flared up in the center of Europe finally destroyed the hope of mankind for the possibility of a lasting peace maintaining. The authors critically analyze Kant's argument about the "natural" world history advancement towards "eternal peace" and draw attention to the fact that in different eras there were various attempts to establish peace in fairly large geopolitical spaces. This happened by establishing certain world orders. World orders could be established in the form of empires, or other systemic associations, but with the obligatory presence of an intrasystemic core, a political hegemon.*

*In this regard, the historical experience of world orders is analyzed, starting from Alexander the Great and ending with current events. In this context, the Chinese doctrine of the "world community of a common destiny" is considered. The article suggests that the most appropriate basis for sustainable peace is:*

- the political hegemony of a state that is capable of bearing full responsibility for the it controlled territories and peoples and is ready to use its influence rightly and effectively in order to prevent wars;*
- the presence of appropriate political, legal and cultural content that can motivate ethnic groups for interaction and mutual understanding (like in particular, an ancient Roman general imperial law, citizenship and a single language for all ethnic groups inhabiting the empire);*
- the complete inadmissibility of the world dividing into "civilized" and "the rest." In the battle for world hegemony, the leader who can realize this and build his dominance on a multicivilizational and multicultural basis, can win;*
- the transition from one world-system to another, which is taking place before our eyes, can be defined as a transition from one type of inclusiveness (based on the principle of "vertical projection" of the hegemon's rules and values to the rest part of the world) to another type of inclusiveness (based on the "patronage" principle, without diktat while ensuring equal "horizontal" cooperation of all the political process subjects without exception). This type of inclusiveness and this world order can become the basis of the very peace that Kant once spoke about.*

**Key words:** *Kant, peace, world-system, world order, empire, hegemon, political process, political system, culture, civilization.*

**Introduction.** The subject of "Eternal Peace" has its own deep roots. At least, already Alexander the Great saw the historical meaning of his boundless empire in establishing a lasting peace between the peoples inhabiting it. It is possible that a similar meaning was invested in some pre-Hellenistic empires. However, thanks to ancient Greek writing and the achievements of Hellenistic historical science, we know for sure that the ideas of the "eternal" world already existed at the time of the "furious Iskandar".

A similar idea of establishing an imperial world order "without wars" dominated the minds of another great ancient commander and reformer, Julius Caesar. And this idea was radically improved by him. If Alexander resorted to methods that preceded the emergence of eugenics and genetic engineering (he sought, through mass marriages of his warriors with native beauties, to bring out a homogeneous breed of a single hybrid "people of the ecumene"), then Julius went the other way. He emphasized the political and legal system of Rome and applied it throughout the empire. Not the unity of blood, not the unity of the deity (polytheism flourished in the empire), but the unity of law, the unity of citizenship, the unity of the imperial language and imperial values – this, according to Caesar, ensured the internal stability of Pax Romanorum.

**Statement of the problem.** So, we see at least two foundations for a lasting peace in the experience of ancient civilization: a) empire + “unity of blood”, and b) empire + political and legal unity together with the unity of the state language.

In more recent times, we see new features of the "appeasement strategy." This is, first of all, the empire of Genghisides, which, with the help of “shock therapy” of extermination wars and well-thought-out logistics, achieved unquestioning obedience from the numerous peoples of boundless Eurasia.

Less successful attempts to achieve "order and peace" were exemplified by the European medieval empires, like the empire of Charlemagne, or the Great Roman Empire of the German nation. This can be explained by the fact that two models of the imperial world order collided in Western European history: the Caesarian (the Emperor controls everything) and theocratic (the Head of the Church controls everything). The political and religious motivations for an empire building, clashed. The Pope built his ecumene on the basis of feudal rulers loyalty to the Holy Throne. The Emperor, on the contrary, sought to subjugate all political life participants, including the Vatican.

However, in medieval history there were also monolithic theocratic empires. This is, first of all, a gigantic Islamic theocratic empire that survived the change of three imperial hegemonies: a) the Umayyad Caliphate (661 – 750); b) the Abbasid Caliphate with the transition to the Mamluk Sultanate (750 – 1516); c) Ottoman Empire (1517 – 1924).

Order and peace were achieved here through the total Islamization of all aspects of public life (politics, legislation, socialization, culture, the language of the Koran (Arabic). Globally, the world was divided into Dar al Islam (the inner blessed world of Islam) and Dar al Gharb (outer, "fallen" world, the world of Iblis, the world of War).

The Age of Enlightenment brings its own project of "eternal peace", based on the belief in the triumph of reason and progress, to the progressive development of history in the direction of ever greater humanity and universal civilization.

I. Kant belongs to this influential trend, he developed a detailed theory of "eternal peace." Following a number of the 17th and 18th centuries philosophers, he was sure that sooner or later the wars would stop. In his “Towards Perpetual Peace”, he argues that the action of nature, like the "invisible hand" of the market, will lead to peace. “This guarantee,” writes Kant, “is given by nature (great in its art), in the mechanical process of which the expediency is clearly revealed, which consists in realizing the agreement of people through disagreement, even against their will; and therefore, being, as it were, a coercive cause, the laws of action of which are unknown to us, it is called fate, and when considering its expediency in the ordinary course of things, it is, as the deeply hidden wisdom of the highest cause, which predetermines this ordinary course of things and is aimed at the objective final goal of the human race. is called Providence” [7]

The predestination of nature consists in the following: 1) she made sure that people have the opportunity to live in all corners of the earth; 2) through war, she scattered people everywhere, throwing them into even the most inhospitable lands in order to populate them; 3) by war, she forced people to enter into relationships more or less based on law. ” A rationalist and educator, Kant believed that people would eventually come to a rational world order by the power of logic and laws based on law.

Even in his worst nightmare, the author of "Eternal Peace" could not imagine that his homeland, Prussian Königsberg, would become Russian Kaliningrad, and his grave, which had miraculously survived after carpet bombing, would become a landmark of a foreign empire. And after he writes a treatise on eternal peace, there will be two more catastrophic world wars and dozens of various formats wars in different parts of the world [12, p. 345–55 ].

A contemporary of I. Kant, "political practitioner" Napoleon looked at the "eternal peace" prospects in a different way. He associated these prospects with the creation of an imperial nucleus centered in Paris, the capital of the Enlightenment. Bonaparte hoped to achieve what Caesar did not achieve: to combine the legal and civil model of the Roman Empire with the scientific achievements of the Enlightenment. He relied on Modernity, initiated by the French Encyclopedists. At the same time, the emperor resolutely rejected ideology in any of its manifestations. However, it was the ideologized empires that went through the phase of modernization that began to shape the appearance of future centuries.

However, the Napoleonic project of a modernized "Empire of Reason" failed. The pragmatic British won the race. Their rise to the top was driven by the success of an expanding world-economy with the City of London at its core. The driver of profit and unbridled economic growth pushed the Anglo-Saxons to seize more and more new frontiers. It was what Alexander Haig (State’s Secretary during the Reagan administration) described a couple of centuries later: “there are things more important than the peace” [9, p. 45]. Apparently, it is no coincidence that the idea of "eternal peace" was not born in the minds of the British

Enlightenment figures. And this can be understood: the Anglo-Saxon world considered war as a necessary and natural factor in the British-centric world-economy growth. So as the world-system that formed on its basis. As a result, the largest world empire arose, and English turned into the language of global interethnic communication.

The essence of the internal stimulator of this unrestrainedly expanding capitalist world-economy was quite accurately described by K. Marx back in the middle of the 19-th century. In his *Capital*, he quotes an economist who says that if capital can get 100 percent profit, it will "trample on all human laws; 300 percent, and there is not a crime at which it will scruple, nor a risk it will not run ...If turbulence and strife will bring a profit, it will freely encourage both" [3].

That is, according to Marx, the very logic of the capitalist world-economy existence, makes war inevitable. We add: among the totality of wars, several of the most powerful in terms of scale and influence on the historical process stand out. These are World Wars. Their role is to change the world order, leading to further modernization of the world-system and even to a change in its core, headed by a new, more effective global hegemon.

It would seem that Kant's idea of "Perpetual (Eternal) Peace" was put to shame by pragmatic reality. However, in the twentieth century, we find a new interpretation of this sublime idea. We are talking about the "noosphere concept" of academician Vernadsky. According to V. I. Vernadsky, "in the biosphere there is a great geological, perhaps cosmic, force, the planetary action of which is usually not taken into account in ideas about the cosmos ... This force is the mind of a person, aspiring and organized will ... him as a being of a social» [4].

Will the noospheres' humanity be able to move to the new phase of its development – the "eternal peace"? This question was raised by I. Vernadsky, who, following I. Kant, expected a cardinal transformation of the world with the Reason help.

However, in reality, the concept of "Eternal Peace" took a different path of implementation. In the 20th century, it was radically ideologized, becoming an appendage to the of two competing "transits" ideology. One of them is a transit to a "bright communist future" through socialist "iron" revolutions and mono-party centralism. The other is a transit to a "bright liberal-democratic future" through "velvet" revolutions and multi-party competition. Each of the transits declared that it was his path that was the best path to the final and "eternal" world.

The Communists argued that after the complete final and global victory of socialism, the very economic basis for waging aggressive wars would disappear and a strong "family of fraternal peoples" would be formed on the basis of internationalism. In his work *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin emphasized that after the victory of the world socialist revolution and the collapse of world imperialism, peace for all peoples is guaranteed. [10].

Seven years after the end of the Second World War, Stalin, in his speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU, emphasized that it was the USSR that was the spokesman of all peoples aspirations of for peace. [11].

The USSR was assigned an avant-garde revolutionary role in world history, a special, messianic mission. The existence of the old, capitalist formation was associated with the inevitability of new wars; consequently, the prevention of wars was considered possible only through the elimination of imperialism. The relevance of the International remained line: "This is our last and decisive battle!"

In his last work, "The Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR" (1952), Stalin, substantiating the thesis of the historical conditionality and inevitability of a general crisis and the collapse of the world capitalist system/ He emphasized that as long as imperialism persists, the inevitability of a world war remains. Hence the conclusion: "to eliminate wars from history, it is necessary to destroy imperialism."

However, at the 20th Congress of the CPSU (February 1956) and at the 21st Party Congress (January-February 1959), N. Khrushchev revised the Stalinist theoretical scheme, according to which world war is inevitable as long as capitalism exists. He declared the emergence of a real opportunity to prevent a world war by excluding it from the life of society on the basis of the growing predominance of the socialist forces over the forces of imperialism, the peace forces over the forces of militarism. This meant the rejection of the thesis about the fatal inevitability of world war.

After the N. Khrushchev overthrow, L. Brezhnev demonstrated a different approach: at the forefront he set the task of uniting the socialist countries, supporting the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and only then – detente and peaceful coexistence. Detente in no way abolishes and cannot abolish the laws of the class struggle. Detente is only a favorable condition for peaceful socialist and communist construction.

M. Gorbachev in his “new thinking” left only “detente” from the Brezhnev’s era and crossed out the thesis about the inevitability of the class struggle and the communism achievement as the global goal of all mankind. Thus, the installation of the socialist world-system for a radical change in the world-order and the establishment of an “eternal peace without wars” ended with the complete USSR and its “socialist alternative” capitulation and adaptation to the existing capitalist world-system as a peripheral “defective” link. As a result, neither *détente*, nor “new thinking,” much less “eternal peace” came about. From 1991 to 2023, a whole cascade of wars fell upon humanity. The most bloody is the Russian-Ukrainian war.

Unlike supporters of the socialist alternative, the liberals argued that only after the final breakdown of all non-democratic structures and the global triumph of democratic values, the idyll of a democratic states community, that carefully observe the rules of conduct in relations with each other, will reign in the world.

In this regard, one reads Z. Brzezinski’s version [1] about the need to create an American-centric, global, (“balancing”) world order. The version of F. Fukuyama is close to it [6] about the onset of the American-centric finale of world history. A. Toffler’s model [13] talk about a rationalized global “informational civilization” with the United States playing a central role. The model of S. Huntington [8], which called on the West to abandon the mentoring tone and move towards equal relations with all civilizations of the world, looks somewhat apart of western theories.

However, even in this variant, the goal of “eternal peace” turned out to be unattainable. In his final work “The Strategic Vision” [2] Z. Brzezinski was forced to state the United States loss of its role as an indisputable hegemon and guardian of world order. F. Fukuyama admitted that instead of the American-centric “Final of History”, an endless performance of the global “theater of the absurd” is being played out. A. Toffler came to the conclusion that even in the conditions of an information civilization, wars will retain their historical force, only they will acquire an even more advanced and “intellectual” character. The closest to the truth was S. Huntington, who at the end of the last century stated: “Avoidance of a global war of civilizations depends on world leaders accepting and cooperating to maintain the multicivilizational character of global politics.” [8, p. 22]

In addition to the two universal transit models, considered here, there were models related to the type of “social egocentrism”. This is Hitler’s model of the world as a resource for German racial domination, with the projects of Italian fascism and Japanese imperialism adjoining it. Other models were closed on the principle of exclusivity (confessional, ethnic or positional). We can refer to the first type, for example, pan-Islamism, to the second – pan-Turkism, to the third – the model of the “third world” as a special historical entity.

The Chinese factor.

True, now a new paradigm has appeared. At the same time, it is an application for another global transit. We are talking about the Chinese idea of a “common destiny community”, where each nation retains its right to independently choose its own way of life and type of political system without the didactic imposition of “mandatory for execution” someone’s rules. For all community members there is one obligatory rule here: full and strict observance of the international community norms and linking the personal prosperity of each ethnic group with the entire community prosperity.

In fact, the emergence of such a phenomenon in the era of the “the liberalism dying” [Wallerstein, I 1995], was predicted by the authors of world-system analysis. Then, in particular, it was about the spontaneously emerging the “new left” model of social organization, initiated on the one hand by the Red May 1968 in Paris, and, on the other hand, by the “Prague’s Spring”. I. Wallerstein generally regarded this phenomenon as a new “World Revolution”, critically overcoming previous mistakes in attempts to create alternative systems to capitalism. These are the miscalculations of the 1-st and 2-nd Internationals, and the difficult experience of creating and dissolving the Com-Intern, and the problems of the Stalin’s “socialist camp”, and the contradictions of the Brezhnev’s system of “peace and socialism”, and the Maoist “campaign of the world village” against the “world city”.

All of these phenomena were eventually assimilated into the existing 500 year old capitalist world-system. And although I. Wallerstein predicted the inevitable breakdown and departure from the foreground of this system, however, he could not guess exactly how this would happen.

Today, the discussion is more and more actively “flaring up” that it is the Sino-centric “Community of a Common Destiny”, founded on the geo-economics of the “Belt and Road”, that can become the very sign of the one world-system end, and the beginning of another. Moreover, on the one hand, this system acts as a continuer of the socialist transit traditions, and, on the other hand, it modifies the liberal market transit/ China is forming its own Tao, its original “transition path” to the future. A kind of postmodern manifesto. In this aspect deserves attention, the position of the PRC leadership, voiced by the Xinhua news agency:

“According to the report to the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, building a human community with a shared future is the way forward for all the world’s peoples. Only when all countries pursue the cause of common good, live in harmony, and engage in cooperation for mutual benefit will there be sustained prosperity and guaranteed security” [14].

Is the current Russian-Ukrainian war a monstrous harbinger of a new world order and a new world-system? Is this war the end of the entire history of wars, or the beginning of a chain of new, even more monstrous wars? Is the realization of the Kantian “Eternal Peace” formula possible at all, or will everything end (as Kant warned about it) in a global catastrophe? The questions remain opened.

**Conclusions.** However, we will try to extract the “dry residue” from the whole complex of our reasoning.

Firstly, the very fact of the monstrous war that broke out in the very center of Europe called into question the viability and effectiveness of the Yalta and Potsdam mechanisms for maintaining peace – the UN, the Security Council, NATO, etc. The psychological resonance from this war was very strong. Not only the generation born after 1945, but all subsequent generations became disillusioned with the political sanity of the elites. They became convinced that not only the peripheral zones of the planet, but Europe itself, which survived two world wars, is in no way immune from outbreaks of madness, destruction and bloodshed.

Secondly, the experience of the largest wars in the history of mankind suggests that the most suitable “backbone” for ensuring sustainable peace is the political hegemony of a state that is able to bear full responsibility for the territories it controls and is ready to effectively resort to sanctions (for example, Pax Romanorum).

Thirdly, the presence of one “backbone” in the form of an empire or a supranational “voluntary” association (under the obligatory chairmanship of the hegemon) is not enough. An appropriate political, legal and communicative content is needed that motivates ethnic groups for interaction and mutual understanding (like ancient Roman general imperial law, citizenship and language for all ethnic groups inhabiting the empire).

Fourth (and this is the reality of our time), the implementation of this model is possible only if the division of the world into “civilized” and “other” would be rejected as unacceptable. In the battle for world hegemony, the leader who realizes this and builds his dominance on a multicivilizational and multicultural foundation, – will win. At the same time, the language of interethnic communication throughout the world may not be the language of the hegemon at all. For example, after the collapse of the Roman Empire and in the presence of new hegemons (Franks, Germans, Portuguese, Spaniards, etc.), Europe continued to use Latin for a long time in the practice of interethnic communication (religious life, medicine, university education, etc.).

Fifth, the transition from one world-system to another, which is taking place before our eyes, is characterized by a transition from one type of inclusiveness (based on the principle of direct dictate and the imposition of rules and values of the hegemon to the rest part of the world) to another type of inclusiveness (based on the principle of common patronage and provision hegemon of equal “horizontal” cooperation of all subjects of the world political process without exception). In this direction, the action of the laws of world-economic development is guessed, a global conflict, in the epicenter of which Ukraine is at the epicenter, can lead to such a result. All this requires deep and creative developments that are adequate to the challenges of this time.

#### References:

1. Brzezinski Zbigniew. *The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*, New York: Basic books, 1998. – 240 p.
2. Brzezinski Zbigniew. *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*, Grover Gardner. Basic Books, 2012 – 224 p.
3. D’Amato Paul. A SYSTEM OF ORGANIZED VIOLENCE. <https://socialistworker.org/2012/01/27/a-system-of-organized-violence>
4. Encyclopedia of Modern Ukraine, v. 23. NOOSFERA. <https://esu.com.ua/article-74036>
5. *Evoluciya doktrinnih zasad zarubizhnoyi politiki SRSR*, <http://kimo.univ.kiev.ua/MVZP/10.htm/>.
6. Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*, Penguin, 2012, 448 p.
7. Guyer Paul. *Introduction to Kant’s essay in Political Philosophy y: The Essential Texts*, Oxford University Press, 2005 available at <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~freeman/courses/phil320/21.%20Perpetual%20Peace.pdf> /
8. Huntington Samuel P. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*, SIMON & SCHUSTER Rockefeller Center, 1993 410 p.
9. Jones Howard. *Crucible of Power: A History of U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1897*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2008, 621 p/

10. Lenin V. (2022). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Source: Lenin's Selected Works, Progress Publishers, 1963, Volume 1, Transcription/Markup: Tim Delaney & Kevin Goins (2008) Proofed: and corrected Alvaro Miranda (2022) <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/imperialism.pdf>
11. Ober Razum. Video recording of I. Stalin's speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6EfhXy6Hv0>
12. Panafidin I. O. *Filosofska ideya miru: stanovlennya ta evolyuciya*, Aktualni problemi duhovnosti: zb. nauk. prac / Red.: Ya.V.Shramko, Vip. 12, Krivij Rig, 2011, p. 345–355.
13. Toffler, Alvin. *The Third Wave: The Classic Study of Tomorrow* / Random House Publishing Group, 1981 – 537 p
14. *Understanding Xi's quotes on building a community with a shared future for mankind*. <https://english.news.cn/20230323/6d411c2465664137a7ad8e45ac0de8da/c.htm/>
15. Wallerstein (1995), *After Liberalism*, Publisher New Press, NY

#### **Бібліографічний список:**

1. Brzezinski Zbigniew. *The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*, New York: Basic books, 1998. – 240 p.
2. Brzezinski Zbigniew. *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power*, Grover Gardner. Basic Books, 2012 – 224 p.
3. D'Amato Paul. A SYSTEM OF ORGANIZED VIOLENCE. <https://socialistworker.org/2012/01/27/a-system-of-organized-violence>
4. Енциклопедія сучасної України, Т. 23. Ноосфера. <https://esu.com.ua/article-74036>
5. *Еволюція доктринних засад зарубіжної політики СРСР*. <http://kimo.univ.kiev.ua/MVZP/10.htm/>
6. Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*, Penguin, 2012, 448 p.
7. Guyer Paul. *Introduction to Kant's essay in Political Philosophy y: The Essential Texts*, Oxford University Press, 2005 available at <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~freeman/courses/phil320/21.%20Perpetual%20Peace.pdf> /
8. Huntington Samuel P. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*, SIMON & SCHUSTER Rockefeller Center, 1993 410 p.
9. Jones Howard. *Crucible of Power: A History of U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1897*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2008, 621 p.
10. Lenin V. (2022). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Source: Lenin's Selected Works, Progress Publishers, 1963, Volume 1, Transcription/Markup: Tim Delaney & Kevin Goins (2008) Proofed: and corrected Alvaro Miranda (2022) <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/imperialism.pdf>
11. Ober Razum. Video recording of I. Stalin's speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u6EfhXy6Hv0>
12. Панафідін І.О. “Філософська ідея миру: становлення та еволюція”, Зб. наук. праць «Актуальні проблеми духовності», Вип. 12. Кривий Ріг, 2011, С. 345–55
13. Toffler, Alvin. *The Third Wave: The Classic Study of Tomorrow*, Random House Publishing Group, 1981 – 537 p
14. *Understanding Xi's quotes on building a community with a shared future for mankind*. <https://english.news.cn/20230323/6d411c2465664137a7ad8e45ac0de8da/c.htm/>
15. Wallerstein (1995), *After Liberalism*, Publisher New Press, NY

#### **Попков В. В., Фуад Хамід. Концепція "Вічного миру" як предмет світ-системного аналізу та китайська точка зору**

Автори статті відштовхуються від відомого трактату І. Канта про «вічний мир». Така пильна увага до цієї проблематики цілком зрозуміла. Російсько-українська війна, що розгорілася в центрі Європи, остаточно зруйнувала надію людства на можливість збереження міцного миру. Автори критикують кантівську аргументацію про «природне» просування світової історії до «вічного миру» і звертають увагу на те, що в різні епохи були різні спроби встановлення миру на досить великих геополітичних просторах. Це відбувалося шляхом встановлення певних світових порядків. Світові порядки могли бути встановлені у формі імперій або інших системних об'єднань, але з обов'язковою наявністю внутрішньосистемного ядра, політичного гегемона.

У цьому плані аналізується історичний досвід світопорядків, починаючи від Олександра Македонського до поточних подій. У цьому контексті розглядається китайська доктрина «світової спільноти єдиної долі» та глобальні перспективи із цим пов'язані. У статті висловлюється припущення, що найбільш підходящим базисом для сталого миру є:

- політична гегемонія держави, здатної нести всю повноту відповідальності за контрольовані ним території та народи, та готової справедливо та ефективно використовувати свій вплив з метою недопущення воєн;
- наявність відповідного політико-правового та культурного контенту, здатного мотивувати етноси на взаємодію та взаєморозуміння (на зразок єдиного давньоримського загальноімперського права, громадянства та єдиної мови для всіх етносів, що населяють імперію);

– повна неприпустимість поділу світу на «цивілізований» та «інший». У битві за світову гегемонію може перемогти той лідер, який усвідомлює це та побудує своє домінування на поліцивілізаційній та мультикультурній основі;

– перехід від однієї світ-системи до іншої, що відбувається на наших очах, може бути визначений як перехід від одного типу інклюзивності, (заснованої на принципі «вертикальної проєкції» правил і цінностей гегемона на весь інший світ), до іншого типу інклюзивності (заснованої на принципі «патрунування» без диктату при забезпеченні рівноправної «горизонтальної» співпраці всіх без винятку суб'єктів політичного процесу). Такий тип інклюзивності та такий світопорядок можуть стати основою того самого світу, про який колись говорив Кант.

**Ключові слова:** Кант, мир, світ-система, світовий порядок, імперія, гегемон, політичний процес, політична система, культура, цивілізація.