HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH TO THE RIGHT TO PEACE

Abstract. The article is devoted to the historical and philosophical context of the category "peace" and human rights to it. The views of the most prominent representatives of philosophical thought (Plato, Aristotle, A. Aurelius, T. Hobbes, I. Kant and others) on the issue of war and peace, which differed in different historical eras and depended on political activity, are analyzed. Statistical data on the duration of armed conflicts are presented and it is argued that peace is an immanent property of human society.

It is noted that due to the dominance of the informational component in the development of society and active processes of globalization, the nature of war in the modern world has changed. This circumstance makes it necessary to change approaches to security components and find ways to ensure a strong and lasting peace. Ukraine, which suffered aggression from the Russian Federation, is currently actively promoting its peace formula, which can become global, since any other country will be able to use the Ukrainian experience, similar means and methods in ensuring peace. The next stage of the implementation of the formula should be a global peace summit, the purpose of which is to create conditions favorable to achieving lasting peace in Ukraine.

In the light of modern social and political transformations, "peace" should be considered as a necessary condition for stable life, mutual understanding, commonwealth, as well as a basis that guarantees the observance of fundamental human rights and freedoms. Such peace can be achieved by observing the regulated order and rules of interaction. It is noted that today the modern system of
international relations has reached the qualitative and quantitative limits of development, but due to the challenges that have arisen before it, its low efficiency is observed. At the same time, it is emphasized that peace policy is determined at the international level by diplomatic relations, the consistency of demands and positions based on the formation of a reasonable balance of interests, mutually beneficial agreements.
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**Statement of the problem.** The current state of relations in the world is characterized by dramatic changes in the political and social system and an extreme aggravation, which is especially evident in the context of the war started by the Russian Federation in Ukraine. As a consequence of this aggravation, the level of threats to international and national security and the observance of fundamental human rights and freedoms is rapidly increasing.

The beginning of the 21st century marked a significant revision of the hierarchy of values, where the information component, including the communication factor, is dominant in the structure of civilization. The speed and globalism of modern transformations affect traditional human existence and world of life through transformations not only in the production spheres, but also in social, political, moral and ethical relations. It is terrifying to realize that alongside the characteristics of modern society, along with scientific and technological progress, development of international law, and democratization of social relations, there are such associations as revolutions, wars, nuclear threat, etc. There is breakdown of old forms of life, revaluation of values and ideals, habitual beliefs, and search for new life attitudes and behavior patterns. All this prompts the search for ways of peace, which acquired a new "sound" and value under the conditions of global challenges; peace that should be based primarily on the moral and intellectual solidarity of humanity, because it is quite clear that governmental political agreements are not enough to end military conflicts today. The current situation places greater emphasis on the issues related to human right to peace, in particular its diverse content, including historical and philosophical research.

**Purpose of the article** is to analyze the philosophical component of the category "peace" in the context of historical genesis of human right to peace and to substantiate the need to consolidate it taking into account current social and political realities.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The issues related to peace have been and remain a relevant subject of research for scientists around the world. This issue has been addressed by both representatives of philosophical thought (Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Cicero, T. More, I. Kant, J. Bentham, H. Grotius), and
scientists representing the modern segment of legal science (N. Onishchenko, O. Bohinych, I. Ivankiv, S. Suniehin). At the same time, understanding the importance of historical genesis of the general philosophical category of "peace" and human right to it for the development of social and political processes associated with institutionalization of this right today, prompts the research of the said issue and constitutes a relevant direction.

**Material presentation.** Peace, as a category, has been relevant in all historical eras and has been one of the central issues of research in philosophical and political treatises by the most prominent representatives of humanity who have understood its complexity and multidimensionality since ancient times. In particular, one of the most prominent representatives of ancient Greek philosophy, Plato, defined peace as a break between wars and called for building a state in such a way that it would win in wars that are constantly waging between states.

The philosopher considered war itself to be a natural state of society, legal and just way to acquire slaves and seize foreign lands. He considered man as a being subject to the laws of nature. Therefore, he believed that the laws that apply in the animal world also apply to human society. Because of this, he believed that the natural right of the strong over the weak prevails in human society, and therefore war, as a social phenomenon, is eternal and cannot be eliminated. Therefore, what people call peace is an abstraction, because there is naturally an eternal irreconcilable war between states. Plato emphasized that ignorance of most people lies in the failure to understand that throughout their lives everyone is at war with everyone else in public and private life, and each with himself. People and states do not recognize any moral norms [1, p. 15]. Aristotle shared similar views, but he argued that not only war, but also peace is a necessary condition for the life of a slave state: it is necessary that citizens have the opportunity (if necessary) to wage war, but, most preferably, to enjoy peace [2, p. 38].

The Middle Ages were characterized, in addition to the existence of ideology of "just", holy war, including religious war (the Crusades), by the emergence of a new take on peace and right of peoples to peace. This was initially the concept of the Peace and Truce of God, which was called for by church representatives, offering a truce between the warring parties during certain periods associated with certain religious holidays. Although some authors argued that peace, especially in its hypostasis as eternal peace, is possible only in the City of God (Augustine's doctrine), later theologians tried to formulate a doctrine of peace aimed at establishing peace among Christian states and peoples [3, p. 184]. It should be added that *The City of God* doctrine emphasizes that despite the fact that human nature is corrupted by the fall, peace is the most valuable thing for people. Saint Augustine was the first to emphasize that when taking part in a war, either side has future peace in mind and seeks it, but no one, when making peace, seeks war.
Another representative of the medieval period, T. Aquinas, also emphasized the sinfulness of people and power, which he saw as the cause of wars. At the same time, he considered it possible to achieve and maintain peace through a combination of human and divine order. It should be noted that despite the ideology of the "holy war", representatives of this era disapproved the war of conquest and even military service, because they saw the deprivation of human life as the gravest sin.

The ideas of peace have been further developed in the Modern era. Thus, according to T. Hobbes, who persistently defended peace, it is not just valuable to man as a universal potential or "gift of God", but comes down to "the first and fundamental natural law". This law is the dictates of reason and higher justice. It is unchanging, and eternal. All other laws are derived from this law, determined by it, and show the way to peace or protection. He considered it necessary to conclude a social contract on the creation of "general power – state" to ensure peace [4]. The specific feature of his philosophy is that, due to human selfishness, he considered war to be a natural state, and peace, due to the instinct of self-preservation, to be a natural law. Accordingly, peace can be ensured under the condition of self-overcoming and limiting the natural right of an individual to everything, which is possible only by establishing a government that will be entrusted with a number of functions, including ensuring peace. T. More also spoke out in the context of ensuring peace as a function of the state.

One of the founders of modern international law, H. Grotius, tried to study the issues of war and peace through the lens of moral principles that determine the relations between states. Believing that war disrupts the normal state of international relations (although it is a natural process) and is a temporary phenomenon, as they always return to peaceful coexistence between states, he defended the point of view that universal moral principles should be applied to resolve armed conflicts, and the governments of all states should adhere to these principles. He debated with those who argue that in international relations everything is decided by force and that during war all laws cease to be valid. He noted that to establish just international order, it is necessary to form a system of law that should derive from the idea of God's justice by mutual consent of states for reasons of benefit. The solution to the problems of war and peace is to conclude treaties by states that cannot be violated.

A wide range of measures to maintain peace was developed and proposed by W. Penn, after whom one of the US states, Pennsylvania, is named. In 1693, he published a work whose title reflects his view of the peaceful future of Europe through creation of appropriate institutions – An Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe by the Establishment of a European Dyet, Parliament or Estates. He saw the task of these authorities as maintaining peace among states of the European continent and actively preventing threats of war [3, p. 172]. English philosopher and jurist J. Bentham in his work Plan for a Universal and Perpetual
Peace proposed his own project of European unity. In this essay he put forward the idea of "limitation of force" in international relations, which, in his opinion, would make impossible armed conflicts and wars of conquest caused by religious disputes, interstate strife, and tyranny of one nation against another.

The concept of peacebuilding is also presented in the works of I. Kant, in particular in his work Toward Eternal Peace, which at the time of its publication was reformist in nature. In this work, the philosopher suggested plan to eliminate war and ensure peace between nations. In general, Kant's doctrine of law and state was permeated with peacemaking ideas. The relations between states can be permanently peaceful provided that the most important principles are observed, including non-interference in the internal affairs of another state.

He writes "There shall be no war. Standing armies are eventually to be abolished. The prerequisite for eternal peace is the dictates of a categorical imperative, requirements of moral worth, and social and political prerequisite is a republican state system in which the executive power is separated from the legislative power, and the right to declare war is transferred to the people. The way to eternal peace is that the states should conclude first preliminary articles and then definitive articles, to create a federation of states, a union of nations. At the same time, the state sovereignty of each member of the federation is preserved [1, p. 22]. I. Kant believed that the main means of overcoming war and establishing eternal peace was the education and moral improvement of people, carrying out reforms, and establishing relations between states under the law. The scientist wrote: "The idea of eternal peace, if only it is tested and implemented not in a revolutionary way, by a leap, that is, by the violent overthrow of the existing wrong state system, but by gradual reforms according to sound principles, can, with continuous approach, lead to the highest political triumph – to eternal peace" [5].

Another representative of German classical philosophy, G. Hegel, rejected the Kantian idea of eternal peace as an ideal to which people should strive. He claimed that eternal peace is an empty dream. At the same time, Hegel did not consider war to be a fatal inevitability turning history into a massacre where the happiness of nations, state wisdom, and individual virtues are sacrificed. He noted the dialectically contradictory nature of war and tried to find the reasons for its denial in itself. The scientist wrote that war is defined as something that should be a thing of the past. Therefore, it contains an international legal definition establishing that it preserves the possibility of peace. At the same time, Hegel advocated the observance of international agreements against the violation of international legal norms during hostilities [1, p. 23].

It is clear that when studying issues related to peace, one cannot ignore the category of war, and thus the military classic of all time, the "unsurpassed philosopher of war" of the 19th century, C. Clausewitz, who considered war as a
political tool, and approached its essence from a philosophical perspective. According to C. Clausewitz, the influence of politics on war is manifested in the fact that the first gives rise to the second, and determines its goals. Politics is crucial for determining the war scale, and for choosing the methods of warfare. The war has its own grammar, but it does not have its own logic; it uses the logic of politics. Politics influence the intensity of the armed struggle and the means of achieving victory. The conduct of war, in its great outlines, is therefore policy itself, which takes up the sword in place of the pen, but does not on that account cease to think according to its own laws [1, p. 25-26]. Clausewitz considered war and peace as two opposite spheres of one social phenomenon – state policy. If war is a policy that is carried out by violent means, then peace is a policy that excludes violent means and hostilities. The dividing line between them is determined by violent means, and their use or non-use.

We share the opinion of D. Frye, who proves in his works that peace is an immanent property of human society, and war is not common in all societies [6]. As I. Ivankiv notes, an attempt to talk about the right to peace usually leads to criticism of the unreality of ensuring this right. It is also often argued that war is a normal (albeit undesirable) process regulated by international humanitarian law. Waging war, provided that the mandatory norms are observed, cannot be considered a violation of human rights. However, it is advisable to pay attention to Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that any propaganda for war shall be prohibited by law. In this context, it is also worth mentioning that aggression is recognized as an international crime under the Rome Statute. Since July 17, 2018, this crime has been covered by the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. The researchers call this step one of the main contributions of humanity to the maintenance of peace. Therefore, it is not necessary to unequivocally state that war is a normal state of affairs and an objective reality that must be accepted [7, p. 58]. Given the full-scale war unleashed by the Russian federation, we can state, without exaggeration, that the Geneva and Hague Conventions, which form the basis of modern international humanitarian law, are ineffective, and there is nothing normal about war, because in any case, it is a human loss. How many mothers did not wait for their sons from the front, how many children are forced to grow up without a father, how many women are widows. And, unfortunately, these losses are getting bigger with every day of the war.

Since the conclusion of the Amphictyonic Agreement (1496 BC) between the communities of Middle Greece and Thessaly on the rules of warfare, humanity has lived in peace and harmony for no more than 300 years. Therefore, it can rightly be called “warring”. Thus, in the 20th century, world wars, almost 500 small wars, and revolutions involving troops, have claimed the lives of 100 million people. This is 12 times more than in the 19th century. In the 21st century in fact, nothing has
changed. In 2023, the annual budget of NATO alone reached almost 1.3 trillion dollars, and the most expensive conflict of the 20th century remains World War II – 13 trillion dollars [1, p. 14]. Indeed, in fact, the entire history of our civilization can be called the history of wars – in the last century alone, humanity had to survive two world wars, and local armed conflicts in different parts of the world occur constantly. According to sources, since 3500 BC, humanity has lived on Earth only 292 years without wars, and 15,513 large and small wars have claimed 3 billion 640 million human lives [8].

Modern war is distinguished by the fact that it is waged in a globalized world, when the world space is narrowed by intensive communications, and the denser nature of interactions between nations contributes to the growth of contradictions between them. Today, Ukraine is experiencing another national revival, which consists in the struggle for its independence, and in this war it is giving up its most valuable resource – human resources. For the Ukrainian society, the phrase "peaceful sky" has long ceased to be a metaphor and has become the most cherished desire and the greatest value.

It is safe to say that peace is the result of political activity, which is determined at the international level by diplomatic relations, coherence of demands and positions based on a reasonable balance of interests and mutually beneficial agreements. In fact, the Russian-Ukrainian war was only the result of the failure of the world's elites to prevent this crisis and a tool that unleashed actions that would have been impossible in the inter-crisis period. Therefore, this war is not defined solely by the national dimension, but is much deeper.

The presumption against the use of force, as well as the established "rules of the game" that were the basis of the world order after World War II, are no longer in effect. According to the analysis of world experts, the world is on the verge of World War III, which could be more destructive than World War I and World War II due to the possession of nuclear weapons. In the context of such threats, questions arise about the activities of world security organizations. First of all, we are talking about the UN, which has failed to demonstrate proper efficiency. In this context, the main document on which the UN's activities are based is the Charter, Article 1 of which proclaims the purpose of the Organization – to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace [9].

Today we see the division of states into several clusters. The Russian-Ukrainian war has divided the world according to the attitude towards the actions of the Russian federation. However, this is only the first manifestation of the
restructuring of international relations into a multipolar system based on a new combination of interests and resources of states. It is difficult to determine the exact number of clusters formed as a result of the crisis processes, but we can already assume that some clusters will be: Russian Federation surrounded by the post-Soviet states; group of Western states with Japan united by common civilizational values; China; India. A group of neutral states will remain separately, unwilling to join any of the clusters or their behavior will be situational [1, p. 100].

We share the point of view of Sytnyk, who notes that today modern system of international relations as a whole has reached the qualitative and quantitative limits of development and is being destroyed (fragmented). At the same time, the leaders of the leading countries and their elites (primarily the United States, the United Kingdom, and the EU member states) have failed to prepare for the transformation of this system, to make it more balanced and fairer. Instead, they focused their efforts on obtaining their own preferences, accusations, and imposing various global governance projects that would ensure the dominance of the unipolar system. The time that followed the collapse of the socialist system, including the USSR, has been lost. Today, it has become clear that the end of the past and the beginning of a new future will be realized through a global comprehensive crisis and, unfortunately, wars [1, p. 100].

Due to the full-scale invasion of Russian Federation, Ukraine has developed its own 10-point peace formula, which includes not only issues directly related to the war in Ukraine (restoration of territorial integrity, withdrawal of Russian troops and cessation of hostilities), but also other issues making up the architecture of global security (radiation, nuclear, energy, food security), and which together can ensure peace. The implementation of each of these points requires the involvement of all allies and the support of partners. The goal of the peace formula is to become global, meaning that any other country will be able to use Ukraine's experience, similar means and methods, and even ready-made solutions.

One of the key points contained in the peace formula, on the implementation of which Ukraine is actively working, is to prevent the escalation of war and recurrence of aggression. To discuss this point, a working group consisting of representatives of the allied governments has been convened several times. The representatives of groups of experts from a number of countries were also involved. We emphasize this point right now because of frequent media reports on a new stage in the war due to the offensive planned by the occupiers to expand their offensive actions and stretch the front line. However, we emphasize that all the points contained in the formula are crucial for building a stable and lasting peace.

The work on the "Ukrainian peace formula" should culminate in a global peace summit to be held in early summer in Switzerland. Its goal is to create conditions favorable to achieving lasting peace in Ukraine, i.e. to give political
impetus to specific diplomatic efforts. As V. Zelenskyy said, commenting on the upcoming event, the world majority "must force russia into peace and can do it" [10]. According to Ukraine's plan, at this summit, the leaders of the countries should discuss the "Ukrainian formula" together and, based on it, create a clear plan for achieving peace, which is to be presented to the russian federation in the future.

Not only Ukrainians, but the whole of society is waiting for the time when, finally, in the history of the world, the period when states were formed by force of arms will be a thing of the past, and it (society) will develop, educate and learn in the spirit of peace and mutual respect.

Speaking about the very concept of "peace", it should be noted that the world-famous Norwegian scientist and researcher J. Galtung defined two types of peace. "Negative peace" means the absence of war, the absence of armed conflicts between states or within states. "Positive peace" means not only the absence of war or armed conflict, but also the creation of conditions for equality, justice and development [11].

Analyzing the complexity of modern social and political existence, we can say that the concept of "peace" should be considered as light, basis for stable life, mutual understanding, commonwealth, cooperation between people, communities, associations, peoples, nations, states, and as a necessary condition that guarantees the observance of fundamental human rights and freedoms. In this sense, peace means the absence of armed aggression and the existence of an agreement to minimize contradictions, prevent and resolve conflicts without the use of violence, which leads to war, through the established order and rules of interaction. The higher the level of interaction, the more developed the rules and regulation of the behavior of subjects. After all, peace is not just the absence of war, it is also the result of conventions or peace treaty that will truly ensure the balance of interests and non-confrontational development of countries with different civilizational, political, economic, etc. foundations.

Thus, the following conclusions can be drawn. The war has left a deep mark on social development, as well as the possibility of establishing peace and finding optimal ways to it, and has always been in the center of attention of philosophers. Most philosophers considered war as a natural state (Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, and others), while some considered maintenance of peace to be one of the main functions of the state power (T. More, T. Hobbes, and others). Today, despite the development of international law and democratization of social relations, peace is still a priority in the system of social values, as it was in ancient times.

Since the beginning of the full-scale invasion of russian federation, Ukraine has been searching for a universal way to establish a lasting peace under international law. For this purpose, "peace formula" has been developed, and its points are being actively worked out with partners and allies. The next step is to hold a global peace summit, which should give impetus to specific actions to ensure peace.
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