INTRODUCTION:
PEACE, INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE, AND GLOBAL JUSTICE

Xunwu Chen *

This special volume of The Journal of East-West Thought, entitled *PEACE IN TRUTH AND JUSTICE BETWEEN UKRAINE AND RUSSIA* in nine languages by Josef Seifert, the most outstanding European phenomenologist philosopher today, is the shortened version of Seifert's original book of the same title in twenty-six languages, published by the International Academy of Philosophy. It is Seifert's philosophical treaty of war, peace, and justice in the Russia-Ukraine War, and his proposal for the establishment of permanent peace between these two nations, as well as within Ukraine itself, and among European countries, in terms of international justice and historical truth. As Seifert himself claims: "Because of the extremely urgent and dramatic importance of the topic (each day without peace means many deaths and misery) it seemed the right thing for a philosopher who should live fully in the real world and not in an ivory tower, to propose a philosophically deeply reflected peace plan, a peace convention not based on deals or mere compromises but on truth and justice." (Seifert, 2025, 1). In the treaty, Seifert insists on his friend Pope John Paul II's famous motto: There can be no peace without justice. This is also the motto that Socrates famously claimed in the Republic. Moreover, Seifert claims that a just peace between Ukraine and Russia is not only just for Ukraine and Russia, but also for the entire world. He echoes Martin Luther King's claim: injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.

Seifert's treaty should first remind readers of Immanuel Kant's (1972)"Perpetual Peace and Other Essays." Both Seifert's treaty and Kant's treaty search for a kind of legal framework for permanent peace, not a temporary truce, grounded in justice. Kant, permanent world peace grounded in global/cosmopolitan justice; Seifert, permanent Russia-Ukraine peace, as well as permanent European peace, grounded in international justice, and also in global justice. Both treaties ground permanent peace in justice, not in humanitarian morality. Both treaties want a framework of permanent peace under the rules of international and global laws, not a framework of peace under the rule of morality, and Seifert also insists on listening to the voice of truth and history. But as a philosophical treaty more than two hundred years after Kant's treaty, Seifert's philosophical treaty of peace, justice, and truth has touched on a wider range of parenthetical questions and subject matters including international justice, global justice, the relationship among peace, justice and truth, national sovereignty, national security, people's sovereignty, and just war theory. Kant's treaty advocates a cosmopolitan order on earth under the rule of a cosmopolitan constitution, evolving from international laws and consisting of basic global laws. Seifert's treaty proposes a cosmopolitan order between Russia and Ukraine and in Europe under the rules of international laws and treaties wherein there will be permanent peace within Ukraine, between Ukraine and Russia, and among European nations, and protection of national rights (national sovereignty), people's rights, and individual rights.
Justice, like air, is indispensable to human existence. As Seifert insists in his treaty, justice is the air and a necessary condition to resolve the Russia-Ukraine conflict and resolve the problems of security in Europe. Equally crucial, what must be established are two families

* Dr. Xunwu Chen is a professor of philosophy at The Department of Philosophy & Classics, The University of Texas at San Antonio. Email: xun.chen@utsa.edu

of public justice: international justice and global justice. International justice refers to justice in international relations or the relations between nation-states. International justice delineates a distinctive family of public duties, obligations, and norms of action that differ from and are also complementary to obligations and norms of action that universal justice and global justice delineate. Global justice refers to cosmopolitan justice that promotes world peace, protects basic human rights, and safeguards humanity's security. It delineates a distinctive family of public obligations and norms of action that differ from but also are complementary to obligations and norms of action that universal justice and international justice. Thus, to appreciate fully Seifert's treaty of peace—that is, permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine and in Europe—based on justice and truth, distinctions among international justice, universal justice, global justice, and international humanitarian morality are in order.

As one of three families of public justice, international justice differs from universal justice, that is moral, not juridical. International justice has a legally compulsory force and validity between nations. Universal justice is universally valid from the moral point of view but does not have lawfully compulsory force unless it is entrenched in public laws—global, international, and/or municipal. International justice defines what is particularly obligatory between nations. Universal justice defines what is universally obligatory and dutiful for all human beings. Further distinctions between international and universal justice are as follows.

First, the concept "international" is a spatial concept, while the concept "universal" is both spatial and temporal. The concept "international" connotes the space between nation-states, while the concept "universal" connotes both everywhere on the earth and at all times. International justice has the binding force only in a given space—that is, the space between nations. The qualifier "international" emphasizes the contractual nature of a claim and the spatial limit of the application, validity, and authority of international justice governing actions within a designated space. In comparison, universal justice has binding force in all spaces and all times. Its binding force is not limited to and confined in space, at least a given space.

Second, the relationship between international justice and universal justice is one between the particular and the universal, wherein universal justice lives in international justice and international justice embodies universal justice. The qualifier "international" emphasizes that international justice is a particular family of justice that has its particular nature, content, objects of concern, and scope of application and designates international justice as a particular family of public. The particular and the universal are not separable. There is no particular that does not embody the universal. There is no universal that is not embodied in particulars, and that exists independently in itself as a Platonic form. Thus, neo-Confucian philosophers, including Zhu Xi, insisted that the principle is One, and its embodiments are multiple. In Parmenides, facing Parmenides's challenge and criticism, Socrates could not defend his claim that the form as the universal exists in its own, independent of those particulars that embody it.

Third, the objects of concern of international justice are also necessarily objects of concern of universal justice. But the objects of concern of universal justice are not necessarily objects of concern of international justice. For example, sovereignty which Seifert examines in his treaty is an object of concern of both international justice and universal justice. In comparison, individual murder or rape is an object of concern of universal justice, but not an object of concern of international justice. Racial conflict in a given society is not an object of concern for international justice, but rather an object of concern for universal justice. In content and focus, international justice is centered on

international relations, the rights of nation-states, and national sovereignty. Universal justice is focused on the general fairness of distributions of resources, opportunities, freedom, duty, rights, obligations, benefits, and fairness in the correction of the wrong, reward, and punishment. Correspondingly, global justice focuses on defining the sovereignty, rights, and obligations of nations within an international community. Universal justice focuses on defining moral righteousness and acceptability in individual, institutional, and social conduct. It focuses on regulating human beings' relations to one another.

Fourth, international justice is public or civil justice, while universal justice is moral justice. International justice, global justice, and municipal justice constitute three families of public justice. Universal justice and particular justice constitute two families of moral justice. International justice is juridical, positive, and contractual. In comparison, universal is moral. International justice expresses the mandated will of a collective community of nation-states that are parties, establishing international laws that define such public justice. Universal justice is moral justice and natural. International justice expresses the collective will of a particular human community. Universal justice redeems the claim of humankind as a universal moral community or as the kingdom of ends, in Kant's idiom. Thus, international justice and universal justice differ in force. The force of international justice is obligatory and sanctioned, and backed by coercive institutions, while the force of universal justice is not backed by coercive institutions, yet it is also obligatory.

Fifth, international justice allows no institutional or organizational deficit, while universal justice allows institutional or organizational deficit. Organizations and institutions are the necessary enacting conditions of international. In comparison, the norms of universal justice allow organizational deficit, for example, eliminating world property is a norm of universal justice, even though our world today still does not have the necessary institutional resources to eliminate world poverty. Where there is international justice, there exists its enacting conditions and institutional resources, such as the government. Where those enacting conditions and institutional resources for justice do not exist, there is no, and there can be no, international justice. In comparison, universal justice exists even if its enacting conditions and institutional resources do not exist.

Sixth, international justice is contractual justice between nations whose legality is binding only on concerned nations under contract in a given space and given times, and whose juridical prudence is international in a given space and given times. Universal justice is binding on all nation-states, and all human beings in all spaces and all times. It is natural in the sense that it is grounded in human nature and recognized by human reason. International justice is contractually articulated in international laws. Universal justice is naturally given to human reason.

Seventh, international justice is defined by international laws, and its legitimate authority is from international contracts and treaties and enacted by an international networked realm of public authority. In comparison, universal justice is defined by universally accepted principles and norms. Its legitimate authority comes from universal human reason. The process in which specific norms become international and the process in which given norms become universal are not identical. The meaning, scope, and limit of international justice are defined by international laws and therefore definite, specific, and explicit. The norms of international justice are cognitively determinate and specific, while the norms of universal justice are cognitively indeterminate and non-specific.

Therefore, international justice and universal justice are not separable but also not identical. No wonder, subject matters such as just war theory are not only objects of concern of international justice but also objects of concern of global justice and objects of

concern of universal justice. By this token, means and end are objects of concern for both international justice and universal justice. Thus, Seifert rightly insists that "Justice and injustice of a war do not only depend on the war's end but equally on observing or violating an ethics of warfare. Therefore, a war might have the best purposes, but if it uses means of the 'total war', kills civilians, destroys hospitals and schools, uses rapes as means of humiliating the enemy, such a war is utterly unjust." (Ibid., 22). It is claimed in traditional just war theory that a just war consists of two aspects: (1) its purpose and objectives must be righteous and just; and (2) its means and execution must be just, e.g., not use force disproportionally, etc. Seifert claims here that if the Russia-Ukraine war were just, then both its end and its means would be just.

Noteworthy, in the treaty, Seifert defends the priority of the people's rights for independence over national unity from the point of view of universal justice. For Seifert, the matter of people's rights to independence is a matter of international justice, and also a matter of universal justice. He claims:

> A. In accordance with the positive, man-made law of the text of the Ukrainian constitution, which does not provide for independence and certainly not for secession of its oblasts, this goal of war is just.
>
> B. However, there is a basic human and natural right to independence, preceding and independent of positive law, of every individual person, as well as of individual provinces, smaller population units, and culturally, linguistically, and politically distinct areas. This right of a distinctive majority to independence is not solely a natural law but is also clearly and unreservedly recognized in international law and by the UN, not so the right to secession (Ibid., 20).

Seifert insists: "Against attempts to separate the right to independence from that to secession, however, we see: the right to independence is inseparable from the right to secession. How could the British colonies in North America have become independent in 1776 and form the USA without separating from Great Britain? How can any province or colony achieve independence and statehood without separating from its homeland or colonial power?" (Ibid.).

Distinctions exist between international justice and global justice too. They are two particular families of public justice that are importantly associated, but not identical. Some concerns of global justice may take the form of concerns of international justice. For example, war crimes, genocide, crimes of aggression, and crimes against humanity are often understood as the objects of concern of the international community and thus categorized as international crimes, although they are global crimes and objects of concern of global justice. justice. Some concerns of international justice and global justice are intertwined. For example, national sovereignty and people's sovereignty, which Seifert explores in his treaty, are objects of concern for international justice and global justice. Seifert's idea of unconditional people's sovereignty can be subject to debate, and so is his insistence on the majority of a people's rights to unconditional independence and secession. For example, Seifert claims: "from the point of view of international law, and even more so of pure natural law, the Ukrainian government's war against the secession of Donetsk and Luhansk and against their exercising their right to independence is unjust." (Ibid.). But the subject matter of people's rights to independence and secession is a subject matter of both international justice and global justice.

Both international justice and global justice are public justice beyond the borders of nation-states. Since a system of norms of justice cannot be incompatible with each other or

in conflict with one another, norms of international justice and norms of global justice are necessarily compatible. The three families of public justice—municipal justice, international justice, and global justice—are necessarily compatible. Still, international justice and global justice are two families of public justice and differ in objects of concern, content, scope, focus, and substance. Their differences can be summarized as follows.

First, international justice focuses on and regulates the relations between nation-states, while global justice focuses on and regulates the relations between governments and citizens, as well as between citizens and other citizens. International justice focuses on how nation-states ought to interact with one another as neighbors and equal members of a large human community. In comparison, global justice delineates a set of norms and principles that define how an individual government of a nation-state ought to treat its citizens and foreign citizens. With regard to how a government ought to treat different ethnic groups of people in a country, global justice focuses not so much on the rights of a culture or an ethnic group but on the rights of individual citizens who belong to different ethnic groups.

In the Russia-Ukraine war context, international justice demands that the rights of a nation-state should be given their due. In comparison, global justice demands that the rights of Ukrainian citizens and foreigners as human beings should be given their due by the Ukrainian government, and the rights of Russian citizens and foreigners as human beings should be given their due by the Russian government. Thus, in Seifert's treaty, the issue of how the Ukrainian government ought to interact with Ukrainian citizens, including those who aspire for independence and secession, is a matter of global justice, while the issue of how Ukraine and Russia ought to interact with one another is a matter of international justice. In internation justice, nation-states are the most basic units of social-political consideration. In global justice, individual citizens are the most basic units of social-political consideration.

Second, correspondingly, international justice defines a nation's sovereignty and rights and its duty and obligation to neighboring nation-states as well as the human community at large on the earth. International justice demands respect for sovereignty, equality, and the rights of nation-states. In comparison, global justice focuses on and defines each person as a global citizen's liberties, rights, duties, and obligations, while international justice focuses on and affirms each nation's sovereignty, rights, and international obligations to peace and coexistence with others. In the context of the Russia-Ukraine war, global justice emphasizes each person's basic human rights as cosmopolitan rights and correspondingly each person as a global citizen's duty and obligation, including the duty and obligation to humanity. In comparison, international justice is concerned with Ukraine's and Russia's national sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national security, as well as the relationship between Russia and Ukraine. No wonder international justice focuses on peace, co-existence, cooperation, and co-development between nations and peoples. Global justice focuses on defending basic human rights, world peace, and the security of humanity.

Third, the objects of concern of international justice—for example, the relationship between two nation-states—do not necessarily have global bearings. The objects of concern of global justice, such as crimes against humanity, genocide, aggression, and war crimes, have global bearings. Also, As Larry May indicates, crimes such as piracy, hijacking, trafficking (in drugs, women, and slaves) and money laundering "do not fit into the Standard of Nuremburg or Rome categories but have been, or might be, prosecuted because they are crimes that cross State borders in their execution, or occur outside the confines of State borders altogether (such as on high sea) and have been thought to be best

dealt with as international crimes." (May, 2005, 70). International justice does not concern about how governments ought to interact with citizens whom it governs. Global justice concerns such. International justice does not concern about the possible conflict between global human rights politics and national sovereignty. Global justice concerns such.

Fourth, the legal validity of norms and jurisprudence of international justice are international, while the concept of global justice indicates that the legal and jurisprudence of norms and principles of global justice is global. International justice and global justice are distinguished from each other by the scope of each's legal validity. The concept of global justice adds a third category of justice to change the current two levels of public justice—international and municipal justice—into three levels of justice: global justice, international justice, and domestic justice in terms of scope of validity and authority.

Fifth, the legal authority-entity that fouls specific acts and practices as crimes and to which contracted nations must be answerable for their acts in international justice is the collective legal subjectivity of nations under contracts. The legal authority-entity that fouls acts and practices as crimes and to which all nations, governments, non-government organizations and institutions, and individual persons must be answerable for their acts is humankind as a legal community and humanity as a legal substance and subjectivity.

Seifert's treaty deals with both the relationship between the Ukrainian government and

Ukrainian citizens, on the one hand, and with the relationship between Ukraine and Russia, on the other hand. It examines two wars: "Firstly, the civil war that has been raging in Ukraine for 11 years (2014-), secondly and primarily, the war between Russia and Ukraine (2022-)." (Seifert, 2025, 19). It thus concerns both international justice and global justice. Its subject-matters such as national sovereignty, and people's sovereignty, as well as their relationship are objects of concern of both international justice and global justice. To spell it out differently, in his treaty, Seifert proposes the establishment of peace and security between Russia and Ukraine, as well as in the entire Europe, based on a two-track justice: international justice that regulates the interaction between Russia and Ukraine in a way that the two nations respect each other's national sovereignty and territorial integrity, and global justice that dictates how both nations ought to restrain from committing genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and crimes of aggression, etc.

In one track, it is about the family of public justice called "international justice" that provides the ground for the peaceful, co-existing, and co-developing relationship between. Russia and Ukraine. This family of public justice gives due to the social-historical reality of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine, the claims of rights of Russia and Ukraine, the national sovereignty of Ukraine and the national sovereignty of Russia, the Ukrainian people's sovereignty and the Russian people's sovereignty, as well as the claims of peace and cop-existence of Russia and Ukraine. It is the family of public justice whose concern is about the social-historical reality of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine, the claims of rights of Russia and Ukraine, the national sovereignty of Ukraine and the national sovereignty of Russia, Ukrainian people's sovereignty and Russian people's sovereignty, as well as the claims of peace and cop-existence of Russia and Ukraine, whose content is about the social-historical reality of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine, the claims of rights of Russia and Ukraine, the national sovereignty of Ukraine and the national sovereignty of Russia, Ukrainian people's sovereignty and Russian people's sovereignty, the claims of peace and cop-existence of Russia and Ukraine, and whose principles and norms are about the social-historical reality of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine, the claims of rights of Russia and Ukraine, the national sovereignty of Ukraine and the national sovereignty of Russia, Ukrainian people's sovereignty and Russian people's sovereignty, the claims of peace and cop-existence of

Russia and Ukraine, and whose focus is on the social-historical reality of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine, the claims of rights of Russia and Ukraine, national sovereignty of Ukraine and the national sovereignty of Russia, Ukrainian people's sovereignty and Russian people's sovereignty, Russia's security, Ukraine's security, as well as the claims of peace and cop-existence of Russia and Ukraine.

In another track, it is the family of public justice known as "global justice." This family of public justice governs how Ukraine government ought to interact with Ukrainian citizens—in particular, with citizens who are so-called "separatists"—and Russian citizens who are not combatants in the Russia-Ukraine conflict, and how Russian government ought to interact with Russian citizens and foreign citizens—in particular, Ukrainian citizens that are not combatants. It is the family of public justice that prohibits genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and crimes of aggression and whose concern, content, principles and norms are about citizens' universal, basic human rights, fundamental human dignity and status and that sets limits to government authority in terms of citizens' universal, basic human rights, fundamental human dignity and status. Of course, in the context of the Russia-Ukraine War, global justice is concerned with the four categories of global-international crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and crimes of aggression.

A further conceptual introduction is this. Seifert proposes a peace treaty in terms of justice and truth, not a treaty in terms of humanitarian morality—that is, a treaty based on justice and truth, not on love and compassion. Humanitarian morality can butter peace, but cannot be the ground for permanent peace. Like Kant, Seifert wants to ground peace in international justice, not humanitarian morality. The world would be far better off if all human beings were good Samaritans, as Jesus Christ teaches in the Gospel Luke. But the real world in which we live is not an ideal world of good Samaritans, but a world of human beings full of sins. Thus, the real world must have the rule of law, amid the rule of law can be assisted by moral regulation. There is a conceptual distinction between international justice and international humanitarian morality, as well as between global justice and global humanitarian morality. International justice is public justice in terms of public laws, not in terms of morality. So is global justice. Justice gives due to rights. Humanitarian morality acts on love, care, and compassion. Their differences can be summarized as follows.

First, international justice redeems the claim of basic rights of nation-states, the claim of national security, and the claim of regional peace. It rises from the associative relations of nation-states. Humanitarian morality is a call from human love, compassion, and what Mencius dubbed as the mind of commiseration—the mind that cannot bear seeing that others suffer. The foundation of international justice is rights and fairness. The foundation of humanitarian morality is compassion, benevolence, kindness, goodness, and the avoidance of human suffering. International justice imposes contractual duties and obligations on nation-states from the perspective of respecting rights and freedoms. International humanitarianism enkindles love, compassion, and benevolence toward neighbors and other people. The object of concern of international justice is rights. The object of humanitarian morality is happiness and suffering.

Second, international justice obliges nation-states to redeem what they owe to each other as neighbors. Humanitarian morality advises nation-states about the truth that when lips vanish, so will teeth, and that cruelty is a human vice and evil. International justice obliges nation-states to be responsible neighbors. Humanitarian morality advises human beings to practice Christian and Moist universal love, and that having a human heart is a great virtue, and indifference to human suffering is a great vice. International justice is a

claim of the contractual, associative relations of nation-states. International humanitarianism is a rise and claim of the common human heart. International justice imposes duty and obligation. Humanitarian morality teaches virtue and kindness.

Third, correspondingly, international justice is proportional to what nation-states owe to one another and cannot be excessive or insufficient. It is also reciprocal between nation-states. Humanitarian morality is not proportional and reciprocal, and can be either excessive or insufficient. Justice means fairness, and humanitarianism means love and care. Fairness cannot be disproportional, but love and care can be disproportional.

Fourth, international justice is public, or civil, and thus juridical. Humanitarian morality is not juridical. International justice is enacted by public laws and enforced by laws, while humanitarian morality is practiced out of love and care. International justice is coercive, but international humanitarian morality is non-coercive. Thus, international justice does not allow organizational and institutional deficits. But humanitarian morality allows organizational deficit. International justice must be articulated explicitly in international laws and publicly published by a proper authority. Humanitarian morality need not be specifically written and publicly published by a proper authority. The principles of human morality govern relationships among all sentient beings on Earth.

Thus, Seifert's treaty proposes the establishment of permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine in particular, and permanent peace in Europe in general in terms of justice, not in terms of humanitarian morality. Seifert is a Christian thinker, or more exactly, a Catholic philosopher. He wants a world full of love. He wants peace and love between Russia and Ukraine. As a Christian, he believes that love is the greatest transforming force in the world. Still, as a philosopher, like Kant, Seifert knows that real peace can only be established on the basis of justice under the rule of law. Thus, he wants to establish permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine based on justice and truth, not on love and care, as love and care are necessary for human existence, like air.

Notwithstanding, Seifert's insistence on peace in terms of justice and truth reveals another concept of justice which he operates with here: justice as truth, and justice as the essence of things. For Seifert, justice and truth cannot be separated. Justice entails truth. And truth entails justice. Where there is justice, there is truth. Where there is truth, there is justice. The concept of justice as truth has a long history in both Western and Eastern philosophies. As recorded in Plato's Apology, in the sense of justice as truth and essence of being, Socrates urged his audience to focus on the justice of what he said, not on anything else. Since Plato, the concept of justice as truth has become an essential vocabulary in Western philosophy. Meanwhile, the concept of justice as truth has a long history in Chinese philosophy as well. The Chinese counterpart of the English word "justice" is Zheng Yi (正義), consisting of the word "Zheng (正)" and the word "Yi (義)". Zheng means setting straight or original/authentic. Yi connotes righteousness or the essence, truth, or substance of being. Thus, the phrase "Zheng Yi" means setting righteousness straight or setting straight the truth and essence of being.

In one sense, the word "Yi" means the profound essence, substance, principle, and truth. According to Ci Yuan (《辞源》The Origin of Chinese Words), justice is defined as "the justified, right, fair principle and truth." (*Ci Yuan*, 1983, 1665). In this sense, for example, we find such book titles as *Zhou Yi Zheng Yi* (《周易正義》, *The Essence of the Book of Change*), *Kong Zi Zheng Yi* (《孔子正義》, *The Essence e of Confucius's Teachings*), *Meng Zi Zheng Yi* (《孟子正義》*The Essence and Substance of the Teachings of Mencius*), Chun Qiu Zheng Yi (《春秋正義》*The Truth of the Spring-Autumn Period*),

U Jing Zheng Yi (《五經正義》*The Essence of the Five Classics*), and *Shi Ji Zheng Yi* (《史記正義》*The Essence in the Records of History*). In the sense of justice as truth, Wang Yang Ming said, "to search for the ultimate good in external things, we are outside the realm of yi, that is, we miss the essence and substance of the ultimate good (於事事物物上求至善, 卻是義外)." Yi (義) here refers to the profound truth or the essence of a thing. According to Wang, when we search for the ultimate good from things external to ourselves, we cannot find the truth of the ultimate good. The ultimate good is within our mind; the essence of the ultimate good is in our mind, as Buddhism insists that Buddha is inside one's mind.

The term "zheng" connotes being rectified, justified, and standing straight, as contrasted to the wrong, the crooked, the unjustified, and the unacceptable, or connotes the original and authentic. Confucius said, "To govern is to Zheng (正)." (Confucius 1996, 12.17). The duty of the government is to rectify the affairs of a normal society and to set things right. The word "zheng" here means setting straight and rectifying. In this sense, Dong Zhong Shu of the Chinese Han Dynasty said: zheng qi yi, bu mou qi li (正其宜, 不謀其利 setting righteousness straight, not seeking profit and personal gain. Confucians talked about "Zheng Ming (正名 rectifying names)", "Zheng Ren (正人 rectifying others)", and "Zheng Ji (正己 rectifying oneself)". Traditional Chinese intellectual, moral, and political discourses are filled with metaphors such as "Gong Zheng (公正 fairness)," and "Zhong Zheng (中正 impartiality)". In another sense, "Zheng (正)" means the authentic, pure, true, original, and legitimate, as contrasted to what is faked, unreal, peripheral, untrue, derivative, superficial, and illegitimate. In this sense, one talks about "Zheng Tong" (正统 the legitimate tradition, the authentic tradition, the original tradition), "Zheng Zong" (正宗 the original, the authentic, the legitimate, or the pure), "Zheng Ben" (正本 the original copy, the main copy), and "Zheng Dao" (正道 the correct path, pure truth).

All the same, the concept of justice as original, authentic truth that is rectified and set straight has a long history and is a core vocabulary of Chinese philosophical discourse. When Seifert connects justice and truth, he insists on justice as truth, as Socrates did. In the treaty, Seifert insists that a permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine, and in Europe, is founded on justice as truth, as the essence of being, and as the authentic, original, and legitimate being of Russia, Ukraine, and Europe. Permanent peace cannot be established on lies, false beliefs, and false values. It can, and must, only be established on authentic, original, and legitimate truth and essence of being. Regarding truth, as a phenomenological realist philosopher, Seifert's concept of truth is Aristotelian, not so much Husserlian. According to Aristotle, "to say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true." (Aristotle 2001, 1011b26-28). If what is said of X—for example, the history of the relationship between Russia and Ukraine—corresponds to what X is, the statement is true. The same can be claimed of thought. If a thought represents X as it is, the thought has truth. If a thought represents X that does not correspond to what X is, the thought does not have truth. By this token, Seifert insists: "A just peace can only be proposed if first the truth about justice and injustice in these two wars is known." In his treaty of peace, Seifert exposes that Putin's claim of Nazification in Ukraine is not a sufficient reason to justify Russia's war of invasion of Ukraine.

It is worth mentioning that in his 2007 article, entitled "Philosophical Reflection on Justice, Humanitarianism, and Other Requirement for a Global Culture of Peace" in the

Journal of Chinese Philosophy, Seifert outlines nine conditions for what he dubs as "authentic peace", including authentic global peace: (1) commitment to truth; (2) acknowledging human dignity and an objective order of goods, justice, and human rights which our mind has to discover; (3) acknowledging various human limits within which alone justice and other values can be realized on this earth; (4) readiness to forgive and to grant pardon as condition of peace; (5) responding to the just order and other goods for the right motives; (6) applying the golden rule; (7) recognizing of the absolute good; (8) never committing intrinsic evil acts against others; and (9) abstaining from the false "absolutization" of peace (Seifert 2007, 359-378). Seifert's view of peace in terms of justice and truth in his present philosophical treaty in this volume is a continuity and development of his view in his 2007 article.

A further point of introduction is this. In his present treaty of peace between Russia and Ukraine, Seifert proposes to develop a Kantian cosmopolitan condition between Russia and Ukraine wherein permanent peace exists, rights are protected, and security is safeguarded between Russia and Ukraine under the rule of international laws and global laws. He calls for the establishment of an international legal framework for a permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine, amid some concrete proposed articles of the treaty should be subject to further discussion. Although he is a phenomenological realist philosopher, not a cosmopolitan thinker, Seifert is more of a Kantian-Hegelian thinker. Still, his philosophical treaty of peace in terms of justice and truth, Seifert envisions a cosmopolitan Europe wherein both Russia and Ukraine can co-exist as two good neighbors. Thus, Seifert's political vision for Russia and Ukraine and for Europe in his treaty can be better and deeper understood when it is read alongside with reading Kant's Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay.

In Kant, a cosmopolitan condition is the condition under the rule of international laws and under the rule of the cosmopolitan constitution, as contrasted to the natural condition. It is a condition wherein there are rules of international laws and global laws, contrasted to the condition which Kant dubbed as "the state of nature," wherein there is no rule of international law. As Otfried Höffe notes, Kant distinguished between two conditions of the human community on the earth: (1) the international state (condition) of nature and (2) the international state (condition) of law-governing. He "describes the counterpart of cosmopolitanism ('world citizenry') as an international state of nature." (Höffe, 2006, 167). That is to say, by the state of nature, Kant referred to "the state of coexistence while lacking legal form." (Ibid.) In contrast, a cosmopolitan condition is the international state (condition) of law or law-governing. It is a condition under the rule of international and world laws. Kant's "seventh proposition calls the international state of law 'cosmopolitan'" (Ibid., 168). Seifert also suggests that the present Russia-Ukraine conflict can be resolved if and only if a kind of international order under the rule of international laws is developed. His treaty is thus not devoted to proposing a kind of moral enlightenment, but a proposal to develop a new legal international order between Russia and Ukraine.

Kant's concept of cosmopolitan condition involves most strikingly two cornerstone ideas: cosmopolitan rights, and cosmopolitan laws, including cosmopolitan constitution as the basis of permanent peace. As Habermas points out, the concept of cosmopolitan law (ius cosmopolitism), including the cosmopolitan constitution, connotes the third category of civil law: the family of civil law. Seifert's treaty thus calls for both Ukrainian government and Russian government to respect and protect civil-political rights, including rights which may not be compatible to their cultural values, and noticeably, advocates cultural tolerance as an epochal value and norm of our time, amid tolerance is an epochal

value and norm enthroned and enshrined in the UN Charter and various international and global covenants that have been established through the leadership of the United Nations. The 1995 Declaration of Principles of Tolerance of the United Nations claims: “Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human.” (See www.un.org). Michael Walzer also indicates, “Toleration makes difference possible; difference makes toleration necessary.” (Walzer, 1997, xii).

Cosmopolitan order or condition purports to promote permanent peace in the world by protecting fundamental rights under the rule of law. It transforms the concept of one’s international duty and obligation from an obligation of humanitarian morality into an obligation of justice. In his treaty, Seifert proposes to establish a cosmopolitan order between Russia and Ukraine. In a cosmopolitan order, friends or enemies, neighboring nations should interact with one another under the rules of international and global laws, and within an international legal framework, instead of footing in history, culture, friendship, enmity, or desires for territories and other objectives.

Returning to Kant’s1795 essay Perpetual Peace. In the essay, Kant put forth a concept of ius cosmopolitism (cosmopolitan law/right) among people. There, Kant claimed that we should expand the right of hospitality "to the earth's surface, which belongs to the human race in common," and such an expansion would "finally bring the human race ever closer to “a cosmopolitan constitution."(Kant 1972, 118). In the essay, in letters, “cosmopolitan right is concerned with the juridical relations between states and foreign individuals (or groups) whom he [Kant] regards as citizens in a single all-encompassing juridical realm.” (Kleingeld, 2012, 7). In spirit, Kant talked about some basic civil-political rights of a human being as a world citizen. In content, our concept of basic human rights is richer than Kant’s concept of cosmopolitan rights. In spirit, our concept of basic human rights and Kant’s concept of cosmopolitan rights are the same: they are the basic rights of each person as a world citizen.

Inaugurating cosmopolitan rights as the third category of civil rights, Kant has also inaugurated cosmopolitan laws as the third category of public laws while emphasizing the rule of international laws and advocating a new world order based on a world constitution evolving from international law and covenant. As Habermas notes, “with this Kant introduces a third dimension into his legal theory: cosmopolitan laws (das Recht der Weltbürger).” (Habermas, 1998, 165). Kant is the first philosopher in history to introduce the concept of cosmopolitan constitution as a constellation of international laws. Kant’s cosmopolitan laws differ from international laws here. “Whereas international laws, like all law in the state of nature, are only provisionally valid, cosmopolitan law would resemble state-sanctioned civil law in definitively bringing the state of nature to an end.” (Ibid., 168). That is to say, cosmopolitan law is a form of civil law and has global validity. Also, while international laws define the juridical relationships between nation-states, cosmopolitan laws define the juridical relationships between governments and individual persons, as well as among individual human beings. While international laws focus on the security and sovereignty of nation-states, cosmopolitan laws focus on the protection of individual persons’ rights and the security of humanity in each person and the security of global humanity as a whole. Therefore, in essence, cosmopolitan order is an order of international justice and global justice. Seifert’s argument is that such an order of international justice and global justice, which are made possible by the rule of international laws and global laws, should exist between Russia and Europe, and should exist in Europe, and should be the order that should be established to resolve the Russia-Ukraine conflict. His claim is that it is only with such an international order of

cosmopolitan condition that permanent peace in terms of justice and truth between Russia and Ukraine and permanent peace in Europe becomes possible.

Thus, in Kant, "the legal principles implemented within single states should lead ultimately to a global legal order that unites all peoples and abolishes war: 'all forms of the state are based on the idea of a constitution which is compatible with natural rights of man, so that those who obey the law should also act as a unified body of legislators.'" (Ibid., 155). "A global legal order that unites all peoples"! What a concept! There should be a global order constitutionalized by civil world laws as "a means of ending all wars" and protecting and promoting fundamental human rights (Ibid.). In Seifert, the legal principles of international justice and global justice implemented within democratic states should lead to an international legal order that unites Russia and Ukraine and unites Europe.

The path to a cosmopolitan world society is long and bumpy. So is the path to a cosmopolitan order between Russia and Ukraine and in Europe, in particular in the current situation wherein both Russia and Ukraine seem to lack the will to end the Russia-Ukraine war. Kant claimed, "The greatest problem for the human species … is to achieve a universal civil society administered in accord with the right." (Kant, 1972, 33). In other words, humankind faces a great challenge to develop a global order geared to protect persons' cosmopolitan rights under the rule of law. And humankind's approach to a cosmopolitan constitution can be a two-step journey. The first step is that "distant parts of the world can establish with one another peaceful relations that will eventually become matters of public law." (Ibid., 118) The second step is that "the human race can gradually be brought closer and closer to a cosmopolitan constitution." (Ibid.). What Kant claimed about a cosmopolitan world society is also true of a cosmopolitan order between Russia and Ukraine and of Europe. Such a cosmopolitan order has several salient features. First, in such an order, "the republican constitution is the only one wholly compatible with the rights of men." (Ibid., 124). Second, only a republican constitution can bring about permanent peace and enduring protection of rights. Thus, what we should look for is not a treaty for a temporary truce and temporary protection of rights. Instead, what we should look for is a cosmopolitan condition of permanent peace and permanent protection of rights that "nullifies all existing causes for war" and for crimes violating rights. (Ibid., 107).

Seifert does not mention the European Constitution, nor the UN Charter. Still, he suggests that there should be a constitutional order between Russia and Ukraine and in Europe. Thus, a few remarks on Kant's cosmopolitan constitution are in order. First, Kant's cosmopolitan constitution is public law, not merely moral law. It is the basic law for the global human community, just as a nation's constitution is the basic law for a nation's people. Second, a world constitution evolves from international laws, or in Kant's words, people on the earth are gradually led to it through international laws. (Ibid, 118). Thus, a cosmopolitan constitution is importantly associated with international laws, amid it belongs to the third category of public law: world laws. Third, while a cosmopolitan constitution is developed from functioning international laws, Kant did not say what such a constitution would be. Is it a documentary constitution itself, or a body politic akin to the Constitution of the United Kingdom? Kant himself indeed talked about "a body politic" in the context of discussing a cosmopolitan situation and community of humankind. (Ibid., 37-38). Still, whether it is a single document or a body politic functioning as a cosmopolitan constitution should be the basic laws that constitute the cosmopolitan order on the earth.

Seifert does not revitalize the project of development of the European constitution, formally known as the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe. The project of the European Constitution aimed to create a consolidated legal framework for the European Union, replacing the existing European Union treaties with a single text and giving legal force to the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The project was ultimately rejected by some member states in 2005. In his treaty of peace, Seifert does not propose the concept of a European constitution that will be a particular embodiment of the Kantian cosmopolitan constitution and the UN Charter in Europe, to bring about permanent peace between Russia, Ukraine, and Europe. Still, having constantly referred to the UN Charter and other international laws, Seifert has in mind developing a kind of international legal framework of international justice and global justice to bring permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine and to Europe.

Since the end of World War II, the global human community has marched forwarded greatly toward the Kantian ideal of a cosmopolitan global order in all fronts: the establishment of the United Nations and other organizational developments, publications of the UN Universal declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the Statute of International Criminal Court (1998-2002), the institutional assembling of global legal architecture, the accumulations of legal precedents of prosecuting global crimes such as genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and crimes against aggression have started a new epoch of Kantian cosmopolitanism. Still, the Russia-Ukraine war explores the vulnerability of the existing cosmopolitan order, exposing what a long road we still need to travel to develop a global cosmopolitan order, and what a bumpy road Russia and Ukraine, as well as people in Europe and the world, must travel to develop a cosmopolitan condition between Russia and Ukraine. Seifert's proposal may be a utopia today, but "utopia to-day, flesh and blood to-morrow," to borrow a line from Victor Hugo's Les Misérables. (Hugo, 1992, 561).
Seifert's proposal to develop a cosmopolitan order between Russia and Ukraine indeed calls for the deed of daring and the capacity called "creativity." As Victor Hugo claimed:

> Deeds of daring dazzle history and form one of the guiding lights of man. The dawn dares when it rises. To strive, to brave all risks, to persist, to persevere, to be faithful to yourself, to grapple hand to hand with destiny, to surprise defeat by the little terror it inspires, at one time to confront unrighteous power, at another to defy intoxicated triumph, to hold fast, to hold hard—such is the example which the nations need, and the light that electrifies them (Ibid., 517).

Deeds of daring and creativity are necessary for human civilization in history. They are also necessary to develop a cosmopolitan condition between Russia and Ukraine under the rules of international law and global humanity's laws. Thinking in line with our epochal spirit is called for to develop such a cosmopolitan order to establish permanent peace between Russia and Ukraine, and in Europe. Daring to create a new order in line with our epochal spirit is both a call of destiny and a challenge of destiny.

Justice, like air, is indispensable for human existence. It is essential to develop our epoch as an epoch of humanity, for humanity, and by humanity is at the core of our epochal spirit. It is essential for people in both Russia and Ukraine from the barbaric state wherein they, as human beings, recognize each other no longer, and as neighbors, recognize each other no longer. "It is because of justice that man is a god to man and not a wolf," said Francis Bacon in 1623. (A New Dictionary of Quotations, 626) Indeed, as Daniel Webster said in his Speech at the Funeral of Mr. Justice Story on September 12, 1845, "Justice is…the ligament which holds civilized beings and civilized nations

together."(Ibid.) Simultaneously, it is of humankind that justice is what Cicero called "the crowning glory of the virtues"; in a Latin proverb, "justitia virtutum regima (justice is the queen of virtues)." To the people of Russia and Ukraine, and all human beings on the earth, justice is the sum of all moral duty. Only in justice, humanity of humankind stands straight, and only when humanity of humankind stands straight, good and beauty in the world become possible. As Immanuel Kant claimed, "Out of the crooked timber of humanity no straight thing was ever made (Aus so krummem Holze, als woraus der Mensch gemacht ist, kann nichts ganz gerades gezimmert warden)." (Kant, 1912, v, xi). Justice is the supreme norm, value, and virtue of humankind. The ideal of justice is the supreme human ideal. In The Republic, Socrates famously claimed that without justice, there can be no hope for humankind; without justice, humankind would forever live in conflict and antagonism. Socrates's insight, like costly wine, the older it is, the better it tastes.

Developing a cosmopolitan order of justice on the earth is a global duty and obligation for all human beings. Developing a cosmopolitan order of justice is an international and global duty and obligation for the people of Russia and Ukraine. Thus, Seifert insists that the people of Russia and Ukraine have a task to impose the norms and obligations of international justice and global justice to resolve their conflict and bring about peace between them and in Europe. Friedrich Nietzsche has dubbed nicely our capacity to impose norms and obligations on ourselves as "the artistic cruelty." Nietzsche argued:

> Beware of thinking lightly of this phenomenon [the bad conscience], by reason of its initial painful ugliness. At bottom it is the same active force which is at work on a grandiose scale in those potent artists and organizers, and builds states . . . Only the material, on which this force with all its constructive and tyrannous nature is let loose, is here man himself, his whole ancient animal self . . . This secret self-tyranny, this cruelty of the artist, this delight in giving a form to one's self as a piece of difficult, refractory, and suffering material, in burning in a will . . . This wholly active bad conscience has finally (as one anticipates)—true fountainhead as it is of idealism and imagination—produced an abundance of novel and amazing beauty and affirmation. (Nietzsche, 1927, 705)

In his present treaty of peace in terms of justice and truth, Seifert suggests that what we need today is to use our Nietzschean artistic cruelty to impose norms and obligations of justice on Russia, and Ukraine, as well as on Europe, in order to bring about permanent peace between Russia and Europe and in Europe. It is to dare to create, to invent, and re-invent a new order.

References

1. A New Dictionary of Quotations.
2. Aristotle. 2001. Metaphysics, in The Basic Works of Aristotle, edited by Richard McKeon and Intro. by C.D.C. Reeve. New York: The Modern Library. 1011b26-28.
3. Ci Yuan《辞源》. 1983. Beijing: Commercial Publishing House 商务印书馆. Vol.2.
4. Confucius. 1996. The Essence of the Analects. Beijing: Unity Publishing House. .12.17.
5. Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. The Inclusion of the Other. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
6. Höffe, Otfried. 2006. Kant's Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
7. Hugo, Victor. 1992. Les Misérables. New York: The Modern Library.
8. Kant, Immanuel. 1972. Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Essay, Trans. M. Campbell Smith, Prefaced by Robert Latta. New York: Garland Publishing. P.118.

9. ———. 1912. Gesammelte Schriften. Berlin. Vol. 8. This quote is directly from Isaiah Berlin, The Crooked Timber of Humanity (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).
10. Kleingeld, Pauline. 2012. Kant and Cosmopolitanism. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.
11. May, Larry. 2005. Crimes against Humanity: A Normative Account. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1927. The Genealogy of Morals, in The Philosophy of Nietzsche. New York: Random House.
13. Seifert, Josef. 2007. "Philosophical Reflection on Justice, Humanitarianism, and Other Requirements for a Global Culture of Peace", in the Journal of Chinese Philosophy. 34 (3):359-378.
14. ———. 2025. *Peace in Truth and Justice*, *Journal of East-West Thought, No.*3, Vol. 15, December 2025.
15. Walzer, Michael. 1997. On Toleration. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.