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***The text readin----***

8:343 P1

Q1: What the text addresses either to the first ,to the second, or the third group?

A: Silent.

E: To human beings in general.

Q2: On what condition that we could say it's applicable to human beings in general?

A: Silent.

E: There should be two conditions. On one hand, human beings should be able to understand this; on the other hand, they should be responsible for what is going on to drive the state of war, or to end the state of war.

Q3: What is the task of philosophers in this essay?

A: To produce the principles of perpetual peace.

8:344 p2

Q4: What does it mean by "perpetual", in this context?

A1: Not in the state of war.

E1: It is the definition of the peace. But what qualifies peace to be a perpetual one?

A2: The "perpetual" means that it is without the limitation of space and time.

8:344 p2

Q5: Under what condition, peace is not a real perpetual peace but something else? What is the opposite concept here?

A: Peace signifies the end to all hostilities.

8:345 P3

Q6: Why these standing armies should be abolished entirely? The standing armies is some persons being armed and be willing to fight, what is the problem with "standing armies"?

A1: Standing armies are only treated as a tool to fight.

E1: That's one of the problems, there are some other problems. Kant gives more than one argument.

A2: The standing armies will be treated as a threaten to other , so that hostility will not be dissolved.

E2: Start with the beginning, what is the first argument Kant has given, then what is the second one, and the third is mere machine or tool. The first argument is the continually threaten of the standing army. what is the second argument?

A3: It causes a lot of cost, namely financial cost.

Q7: what is the different situation for Kant?

A: Only for the situation to protect themselves.

E: The more important qualification is citizens of the state do it voluntarily and periodically.

Q8: why no contract debts? To make debts is a very important proper for actual politics. Kant wouldn't oppose it in principle. There is no problem to have financial assistance for what subjects?

A1: As an instrument in the struggle of state power with one another.

E1: My question is now, for what sort of tasks Kant would except the debts? You wouldn't do that for standing armies, but for what other things?

A2: If you keep debts you give others causes to offend you; and if you want to defend yourself, you will have to keep more debts.

E2: That's a general question of debts. But Kant make difference with debts which are allowed and which are not allowed. Not allowed debts are in connection with it's foreign affairs, but the allowed for what?

A3: Perhaps the attach come from the outside.

E: Only for "the domestic economy" is allowed.

8:348 P4

Q9: What is the significance of the first paragraph? What is the object of this paragraph?

A: Silent

Q10: Is "the state of war" a concept from Kant or other philosophers?

A: Hobbes.

8:349 P5

Q11: What is the consequence of "the state of war", what follows our philosopher?

A: In the state of war, they may want to make a contract to keep peace with each other.

E: What is decisive in Kant is that "the state of peace must be established".

Q12: Do you know the philosopher which has become famous for using this dictum that says "the enemy of my enemy is my friends"?

A: Silent

E: It's the German philosopher or German jewelry of the 20th century, Carl Schmitt.

8:354 P6

Q13: What is the starting point for Kant? Why do we need to talk about something like the international right?

A1: Otherwise we will fall back to the state of nature.

E1: That is one answer. But what is a Kantian answer?

.A2: They bring harm to each other.

E2: We should start with the very beginning. It says "people, as state, can be judged as individual human beings".

Q14: As we have different individuals who form a state, we have different peoples. And what would be the next answer if really the people are compared with the individuals? what would be necessary if you look at the relation of the states of peoples to each other?

A1: It's our security.

E1: These are the problems, the same problem of the United Nations. But to secure the rights of the state , we need what?

A2: We need constitute a federation of peoples.

Q15: If we take the analogy of the state to individual, the relation of individuals to each other in which relation the security's guarantee is called what?

A1: Law.

E1: It's called a state. Now if the states are taken as individuals ,what would be the answer to guarantee the security of these peoples to each other?

A2: Rights and obligation.

E2: We need a state of second order.

Q16: What is the problem which seems against the state of peoples? What is the argument here?

.A: Every state involves the relation between a superior and a subject.

E: You should learn "contradiction" as the central word.

Q17: Why there is a state of peoples a contradictory concept? What is the argument?

A: Silent.

Q18: What is typical for individual state?

A: Every state involves the relation between a superior and a subject.

Q19: What is the conduct argument to have a global legislator and a global people who have to obeys the legislation? What is the most important argument, Kant says?

A: Because people make up one different state.

E: If we would have this state of peoples, then the different states are fused together into one state. That is the argument.

Q20: Is it necessary, if we have a federation of peoples that they all fused together?

A: They are still quit difference states in the federation.

E: Just like the United Nations.

8:355 P7

Q21: Where can the maliciousness of human nature can be observed?

A: In the free relations between the peoples.

Q22: In what way?

A: Openly.

E: The state of nature is the state of war.

8:356 P8

Q23: What is the question which is discussed in this paragraph? There would be no problem when a people says "there shall be no war among us", but how about a state which says "there shall be no war between myself and other states"?

A: Silent.

E: There should be a guarantee of rights, then we need something comparable to a state, which Kant call it "surrogate".

Q24: Why do we need the surrogate of a free federalism?

A: Because it is necessarily connected with the concept of international right.

8:357 P9

Q25: What are the two opposite concepts?

A: The positive idea of a world republic and the negative surrogate.

Q26: Why is this positive idea not possible?

A: Silent.

Q27: What is the expanding federation?

A: Bigger and bigger.

E: That means some states begin to establish a federation with each other, and then there comes more and more members.

Fin.