

## **ABOUT THE ARGUMENT “THE WORLD IS TIRED OF PEACE” – THE OPTIMISTIC POINT OF VIEW**

“The world is tired of peace” is the statement by Professor V.D. Zorkin, reminding us of the title of the great novel by Leo Tolstoy, who, by the way, met Proudhon in 1861 and published his book *War and Peace* in 1864. The French thinker’s paradoxical ideas served as an impetus for Tolstoy’s historiosophic reflections. And if war in case of Proudhon is an antinomy, Tolstoy’s peace is not the state opposite to war, but the World<sup>1</sup> with a capital letter, which means the most important ontological category. And a very modest soldier Platon Karataev lives in this World, according to Tolstoy, Karatsev’s greatness consists of his perception of himself as exclusively a part of the whole, the nation, without the tiniest claims to autonomy and individualization. Surely, this is an archetype in Jung’s style, a characteristic of the nation in the person of one representative, from whom it is required to learn aesthetics, truth. And these are already not the conclusions to which Pierre Bezukhov comes.

Coming back to Proudhon: the phenomenon of war is explained by him as two functions of the mankind, which alternate in history as vigil and sleep alternate in individual’s life. And when war is something common and even productive! Proudhon’s idea of war is, first of all, the idea of power, which is one of the principles of movement and life. Power gives birth to antagonism, and this is already one of the universal laws of the World (understood not as the state opposite to war, but as an ontological category). Antagonism, struggle of opposites is one of 12 Kant’s categories. Justice also appears in this straightening spiral of discourse about power as manifestation of practical mind and the highest ability of the soul; the balance existing in nature demonstrates itself in justice. So, war is antagonism, but it exactly helps origination of the international law and the idea of European balance in foreign policy that appeared a little bit later. Carl Schmitt wrote that the idea of balancing was the achievement of absolute rationalism of the Age of

---

<sup>1</sup> The words 'peace' and 'world' are homophones in the Russian language – *translator's note*.

Enlightenment that generated numerous isomorphic images. Starting from the 16<sup>th</sup> century, various kinds of balances have been ruling in all fields of the mankind's spiritual life: trade balance in national economy, attraction of balance and repulsion in space, and even Malebranche's balance of passions and J. Moser's balanced diet. War is a continuation of antagonism, its culmination. However, cessation of antagonism may lead to "universal hierarchy", which will mean "universal enslavement". Because of that Proudhon comes to the conclusion that the political system of the mankind "is in the general balance of states, mutually limiting each other". This balance is peace.

It seems that the feeling that the World is tired of peace reflects a pessimistic point of view. What is the optimistic point of view in this case?

Joseph Brodsky presented the Declaration of Optimism in his famous speech in December, 1988 addressed to the graduates of the University of Michigan. He suggested in the Declaration to "try to respect life not only for its amenities but for its hardships, too. They are a part of the game, and what's good about a hardship is that it is not a deception. Whenever you are in trouble, in some scrape, on the verge of despair or in despair, remember: that's life speaking to you in the only language it knows well".

You only have to know how to understand the language of life, which is very metaphoric. The metaphor of deep paradigmatic changes in scientific ideas is a part of a mountain collapsing and baring the structure of a part of the Earth crust! The state of affairs when "the world is tired of peace" bares the illusiveness of many scientific reflections. Actually, scientific knowledge has a feature of permanence as well, and this is the permanence of illusiveness. For example, the happy for the mankind thirty years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century after the end of World War II generated such a scientific illusion as the welfare state. Thomas Piketty proved in his book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* that there is much more injustice and inequality in owning capital now than in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. People in Russia feel the injustice of property stratification after decades of relative property equality. And this creates a strong demand for a certain model of politics.

The idea of universal human rights turned out to be one of the most dangerous for the world illusions. At the time of George Walker Bush's Presidency a conviction appeared that "our", i.e. American values, ideas of universal human rights are the only right ones, because of that they should be accepted by all other nations of the world. Jurgen Habermas rightly noticed that the way the American government acts leads up to the thought that the international law as the environment to solve inter-state conflicts, realize human right is already of no importance for the United States. This world power already openly declares these goals as the contents of its own policy, which no longer appeals to the international law but addresses its own aesthetic values, to a big extent founded on an individual's autonomy and individualization.

I did not remind about the archetype of Platon Karataev's image accidentally, it helps to understand that the amount of piety to individualization existing in the West is not the same in all cultures. Together with the phrases about morals in international relations, the Bush's government sent *ad akta* (to the archives) the Kant's project created 220 years ago for regulation of international relations by law, which may only appear on the basis of agreements, on the constitutional basis.