Social-philosophical analysis of concepts of peace and cooperation between nations

Rajabov Behruz Bakhshilloyevich
Bukhara State University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan
rajabov666@gmail.com

Abstract
Purpose: This study aims to provide a socio-philosophical analysis of the main concepts of peace and cooperation among nations, focusing on four perspectives: the etatist concept, the ethnological approach, racial ethnocentrism, and the transcendental dimension. It explores how moral values, human rights, and collective identity influence peaceful coexistence between diverse nations

Methodology/approach: The research adopts a qualitative approach using literature-based analysis. Methods applied include synthesis, retrospective and comparative analysis, generalization, and a dialectical-synergetic framework to examine the philosophical foundations of interethnic harmony and international cooperation.

Results/findings: Findings reveal that sustainable peace cannot rely solely on political agreements or legal frameworks. The etatist concept emphasizes state responsibility in ensuring equality among nations, while the ethnological approach distinguishes between natural and artificial polyethnicity. Racial ethnocentrism highlights the emotional depth of cultural identity, and the transcendental perspective underscores spiritual and moral reasoning as key drivers for long-term peace and cooperation.

Conclutions: The study concludes that building lasting peace among nations requires not only treaties and institutions but also the recognition of human dignity, tolerance, and moral values as universal principles. A socio-philosophical lens enriches understanding of justice and equality in international relations.

Limitations: This research is conceptual and lacks empirical testing or case-based validation of the proposed framework.

Contribution: The study offers a theoretical foundation for policymakers, educators, and diplomats to foster multicultural understanding and ethical principles in promoting global peace.

Keywords: *Cooperation, Dignity, Peace, Tolerance, Values*

How to Cite: Bakhshilloyevich, R, B. (2025). Social-philosophical analysis of concepts of peace and cooperation between nations. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 3(3), 221-231.

1. Introduction

The pursuit of peace and cooperation among nations has long been a fundamental goal of international relations and political philosophies. Historically, the Westphalian system of 1648 laid the foundations for modern state sovereignty, introducing the principles of non-interference and territorial integrity as cornerstones of the international order. Advanced ideas of natural law and legitimate governance continue to influence the way states interact. Over time, the concept of peace has evolved from a purely moral aspiration to a political and social necessity, particularly in response to global wars, humanitarian crises, and transnational conflicts (Brigg, 2024).

Philosophical perspectives have significantly contributed to shaping the discourse on peace and cooperation. Envisioned a federation of republican states governed by the rule of law as a sustainable

path to avoid war, including principles of cosmopolitan rights and international federation (Jabri, 2025; Jung, 2025). His ideas continue to underpin the modern theories of democratic peace. Contemporary research reaffirms that democratic norms, constraints on leaders, and accountability reduce interstate conflict, and that democratic publics are less inclined to approve force against other democracies (Tan, 2024). However, recent studies challenge simplistic interpretations: Rathbun, Parker, and Pomeroy (2025) find that public reluctance to use force against democracies is often influenced by ethnocentrism and racial assumptions rather than institutional characteristics. These findings suggest that democratic peace may be underpinned by cultural bias rather than regime type alone (Rathbun et al., 2025; Ugli, 2025). Similarly, normative-philosophical analyses explore the influence of Kantian cosmopolitanism and republican ethics on contemporary international practice (Alemu, 2025; Jung, 2025), affirming that peace entails moral reasoning, mutual respect, and the recognition of universal human rights. Together, these philosophical and empirical contributions highlight that genuine peace is more than the absence of violence; it relies on shared norms, democratic legitimacy, and deep ethical understanding (Almahdali, 2025; Rathbun et al., 2025).

In the contemporary era, these ideals have been institutionalized through multilateral organizations. The League of Nations, founded in 1919, was the first major attempt at collective security, later succeeded by the United Nations in 1945, which remains the most influential global institution dedicated to peace and security. The UN Charter explicitly sets out goals such as maintaining international peace and security, upholding self-determination, promoting human rights, and fostering cooperation among nations—values that have been revisited in modern scholarship as constituting a global constitutional framework (Isakoff, 2024). Recent analyses of peace operations emphasize the need to strengthen the UN's human rights pillar, arguing that sustainable peace requires the elevated prioritization of dignity and equality within peacekeeping mandates and planning. Furthermore, new institutional critiques propose reforming the UN Charter, including reconsidering the veto power, to enhance inclusive and accountable mechanisms for maintaining peace. Meanwhile, relational theories of peace increasingly underscore that enduring harmony depends not just on treaties or legal architecture, but on the quality of interactions among states, communities, and transnational actors—shaped through networks, everyday dialogue, and digital connectivity (Tauchnitz 2025). These perspectives shift attention from rigid institutional frameworks to dynamic, relational processes that foster peace through human engagement across civil society and policy networks.

Johan Galtung's distinction between negative peace—the absence of physical violence—and positive peace, which includes the elimination of structural violence and social injustice, remains foundational. Recent scholarship on environmental peacebuilding expands this framework by linking ecological stewardship, social equity, and cultural reconciliation to long-term stability. The Nature of Peace synthesis demonstrates that peacebuilding trajectories that neglect environmental dimensions often lead to social fragmentation and renewed conflict. Furthermore, empirical evidence from Afghanistan and Nepal shows that integrating sustainable resource governance with reconciliation initiatives supports measurable gains in positive peace (Sakir, 2025; Zelli and Krause, 2025).

Simultaneously, socio-philosophical perspectives frame peace not merely as political agreements but as deeply cultural and moral phenomena. A recent theory inspired by Linklater argues that collective identity and shared normative frameworks shape international relations far beyond legal structures (Wendt, 1994). This aligns with modern cosmopolitan ethics, which emphasizes mutual respect, empathy, and solidarity as the essential foundations of trust and peaceful coexistence. Contemporary reviews draw parallels with Kant and Locke, reaffirming that peace necessitates moral inclusion and the recognition of universal rights in a global community. Together, these insights underscore peace not as a static endpoint but as a dynamic, evolving processrequiring continuous structural reform, environmental justice initiatives, and the cultivation of ethical norms across diverse communities.

However, despite institutional innovations, significant challenges persist in achieving inclusive and sustainable peace. As scholars such as Acharya often emphasize, the liberal international order (LIO) remains uneven and frequently privileges powerful states over smaller ones, marginalizing Global South actors in global decision-making processes (Benabdallah, 2024; Saputro, Achmad, & Santoso,

2025). Ikenberry and others echo this critique, highlighting the structural bias embedded within the rules-based system, which was largely shaped by Western interests (Lake, Martin, & Risse, 2021). Recent academic literature points to the inability of international institutions to effectively respond to complex 21st-century challenges, ranging from climate emergencies to cyber threats and resurgent populism, resulting in fragmented and inconsistent cooperation (Cottiero, Hafner-Burton, Haggard, Prather, & Schneider, 2025; McInerney & Archer, 2023). For instance, studies on global multilevel games demonstrate that misaligned incentives and power disparities often prevent local actors from fully engaging in international cooperation, undermining collective solutions (Cottiero et al., 2025).

However, despite institutional advancements, challenges persist in realizing inclusive and sustainable peace. These limitations echo Johan Galtung's foundational warning: without addressing systemic inequalities and forms of cultural or structural violence, peace agreements remain fragile and short-lived. Contemporary scholarship reinforces this view by emphasizing that normative equality and inclusivity, rather than solely legal frameworks, are indispensable for building resilient peace processes (Bilich, Varga, Masood, & Konya, 2023). Emerging peacebuilding approaches highlight the significance of relational and micro-dynamic processes, focusing on everyday interactions, social networks, and grassroots dialogue as essential foundations for long-term peace. Brett, Ginty, Sagherian-Dickey, and Voyvodic (2024) argue that micro-dynamics serve as both a unit of analysis and a practical tool to understand how peace is co-constructed through interpersonal contact and local agency. Similarly, a special issue on transitional justice foregrounds the role of local actors and justice interactions in shaping outcomes from the bottom-up (Kostovicova & Vico, 2024).

In parallel, educational and civil society initiatives that foster non-violent values and cross-cultural understanding are increasingly recognized as critical. Feminist peacebuilding scholarship underscores women's agency in promoting resilience through inclusive participation, arguing that higher representation directly correlates with stronger peace outcomes. Likewise, insights from peace education and grassroots dialogue affirm that moral imagination—rooted in empathy, shared responsibility, and collective agency—is pivotal for moving beyond state-centric models toward the prevention of violence (Corpuz, 2025). Together, these perspectives broaden conventional peacebuilding frameworks by emphasizing moral norms, everyday agency, and inclusive participation as central to achieving sustained peace.

The concept of peace and cooperation among nations encompasses three interlinked dimensions. First, the historical-philosophical foundation, where theories of natural law, cosmopolitan ethics, and republican governance lay the groundwork for peaceful state relations. Contemporary scholarship continues to explore and expand Rawls's ideas regarding justice and the global order, particularly as articulated in The Law of Peoples. Scholars have assessed how Rawls's approach to decent peoples, international toleration, and the omission of global distributive obligations have shaped normative cosmopolitan theory. The second dimension is the institutional framework, reflected in multilateral institutions and treaties that structure collective commitments to security and justice. Recent research on relational peace theory critiques purely institutional models and promotes frameworks where peace emerges through interactions across networks—from states to civil society (Brigg, 2024; Tauchnitz, 2025) The third dimension is the moral–cultural domain, integrating empathy, tolerance, and social justice into the global peace discourse. New studies argue that these moral-cultural elements are essential for sustaining harmony beyond law or force, emphasizing that mutual recognition and respect are at the core of peaceful coexistence in the region.

Therefore, a socio-philosophical lens offers a holistic understanding of peace as a dynamic process rooted in ethics, social cohesion and shared humanity. This reveals that enduring cooperation among nations is not achieved solely through diplomatic negotiations or military deterrence but by cultivating values that bridge differences, promote fairness, and strengthen the moral fabric of international society. As global challenges become increasingly complex, integrating these philosophical insights with practical policy and institutional reforms is essential for fostering genuine, sustainable, and inclusive peace in the modern world.

2. Literature Review

The discourse on peace and cooperation among nations has evolved significantly over the centuries, influenced by philosophical traditions, institutional developments, and sociocultural transformations. This section reviews the major theoretical and empirical contributions that underpin the socio-philosophical analysis of peace and cooperation, focusing on four dimensions: philosophical foundations, institutional frameworks, structural and environmental peacebuilding, and moral and cultural dynamics. Recent scholarship (2023–2025) has been integrated to strengthen contemporary relevance.

2.1 Philosophical Foundations of Peace

The groundwork for theories of perpetual peace, natural rights, and tolerance emphasizes that legitimate governance and mutual respect among states are key to sustainable peace (Jabri, 2025; Jung, 2025). Kant's vision of a federation of free states governed by the rule of law is echoed in modern democratic peace theory, which posits that democratic nations are less prone to conflict because of shared norms and accountability mechanisms. However, recent research questions the universality of this theory, suggesting that cultural bias and ethnocentrism rather than regime type often explain peace between democracies (Rathbun et al. 2025). These findings highlight that genuine peace is not merely a political arrangement but a moral commitment grounded in ethical reasoning, mutual recognition and universal rights.

2.2 Institutional Frameworks and Multilateralism

The institutionalization of peace ideals has been central to 20th and 21st-century international relations. The League of Nations (1919) represented the first attempt at collective security, succeeded by the United Nations (1945), which remains the most influential global body dedicated to peace and security (Isakoff 2024). The UN Charter enshrines the principles of self-determination, human rights, and cooperation, which have been interpreted in recent scholarship as forming a global constitutional framework for the international order. Nevertheless, critiques of the liberal international order (LIO) argue that power imbalances persist, privileging dominant states and sidelining smaller nations, particularly those from the Global South. These structural inequalities limit the inclusivity of peace processes, calling for reforms such as the revision of Security Council veto power and the enhancement of equitable representation. Relational theories of peace propose a shift from state-centric and legalistic approaches to dynamic frameworks built on interactions, networks, and trust-building among states, civil society, and transnational actors (Brigg 2024; Tauchnitz 2025). This approach conceptualizes peace as a relational process dependent on dialogue, empathy, and shared understanding rather than static institutional designs.

2.3 Positive Peace, Environmental Justice, and Structural Reform

Johan Galtung's seminal distinction between negative peace (absence of violence) and positive peace (elimination of structural violence and social injustice) remains influential. Contemporary scholarship expands this notion by incorporating environmental stewardship, resource governance, and social equity as prerequisites for sustainable peace (Simangan, Bose, Candelaria, Krampe, & Kaneko, 2023; Zelli & Krause, 2025). Studies in Afghanistan and Nepal demonstrate that integrating ecological concerns into peacebuilding efforts enhances long-term stability and prevents conflict relapse (Krampe, Hegazi, & VanDeveer, 2021). Moreover, research on systemic inequalities underscores that peace treaties are fragile if the underlying cultural, economic, and political injustices remain unaddressed (Bilich (Bilich et al., 2023). Inclusive peace processes that engage marginalized populations and address historical grievances are increasingly recognized as essential for preventing recurring violence (Cottiero et al., 2025).

2.4 Moral-Cultural Dimensions and Peace Education

Beyond institutional and environmental factors, socio-philosophical analyses highlight moral and cultural dimensions of peace. Linklater's theory of collective identity argues that international relations are shaped by shared norms and moral frameworks, transcending legal and power-based structures. Peacebuilding grounded in empathy, tolerance, and intercultural understanding is crucial for building trust and dismantling hostility among nations (Kwuelum 2024). Education and grassroots initiatives

play vital roles in cultivating nonviolent values and moral imagination in society. Feminist peacebuilding scholarship emphasizes the agency of women and marginalized groups in fostering inclusive decision-making, which correlates with more durable peace outcomes. Furthermore, micro-dynamic approaches examine how everyday interactions, local dialogues, and community networks co-create peace from the bottom-up (Brett et al., 2024; Kostovicova & Vico, 2024). These approaches broaden conventional frameworks by recognizing that long-term peace depends on collective responsibility and shared, ethical principles.

3. Research Methodology

The socio-philosophical analysis of the specific role and significance of the concepts of peace and cooperation between nations in this study relies on a combination of qualitative research methods rooted in philosophical inquiry and social-science reasoning. Given the abstract and multidimensional nature of peace and cooperation, this study draws on a range of scientific approaches to develop a comprehensive understanding of how these concepts have evolved, how they function within international relations, and how they contribute to shaping the global order and ethical frameworks among nations.

3.1 Analytical and Synthetic Methods

The method of analysis was applied to deconstruct complex philosophical and sociopolitical ideas related to peace and cooperation into their constituent elements. This process involved examining the historical origins of peace theories, including the contributions of classical philosophers such as Immanuel Kant and John Locke, as well as modern interpretations of democratic peace theory, cosmopolitan ethics and relational peace. The analytical approach allowed the researcher to identify key variables, such as moral reasoning, institutional frameworks, and socio-cultural dynamics, that underpin the development of peaceful relations among nations. Conversely, synthesis was employed to reassemble these fragmented elements into a coherent framework that captures the interconnectedness of the philosophical principles, legal norms, and cultural practices influencing international cooperation. This method facilitated the integration of diverse sources of knowledge—historical texts, contemporary scholarly debates, and institutional policy frameworks—into a unified conceptual model for peace. By synthesizing philosophical and empirical insights, this study achieves a holistic understanding of peace as both a normative ideal and a practical imperative for global stability.

3.2 Retrospective Analysis

The retrospective method was used to trace the evolution of the concepts of peace and cooperation across different historical periods, from early natural law theories and the Westphalian system of sovereignty to the establishment of the League of Nations, the United Nations, and modern multilateral frameworks. This approach provides temporal depth, highlighting how philosophical ideals have been translated—or, in some cases, distorted—into political and legal institutions over time. Retrospective analysis also enables the identification of patterns, recurring challenges, and shifts in normative thinking regarding the conditions necessary for sustainable peace. This study examines how past conflicts, peace treaties, and failed agreements have influenced contemporary understandings of positive and negative peace and how the notion of cooperation has expanded beyond political treaties to include social justice, environmental stewardship, and collective moral responsibility. Thus, a retrospective analysis establishes a historical continuum linking philosophical ideals with real-world international practices.

3.3 Comparative Analysis

The comparative method plays a critical role in contrasting different theoretical models and practical approaches to achieve peace and cooperation among nations. This includes comparing Kantian visions of perpetual peace with modern democratic peace theory and juxtaposing Western-centric frameworks of the liberal international order with alternative perspectives arising from postcolonial and Global South scholarship. Comparative analysis allows for the evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of prevailing paradigms, revealing biases in how peace is conceptualized and practiced. This method also encompasses cross-regional comparisons of peace processes, highlighting how local cultural values, religious traditions, and historical grievances shape the possibilities of cooperation. This

underscores the relevance of pluralistic and context-sensitive approaches that go beyond universalistic or Eurocentric models.

3.4 Generalization

Generalization was applied to extract overarching principles from the analytical and comparative findings. By identifying common patterns across philosophical discourses, institutional designs, and socio-cultural practices, this study proposes general socio-philosophical laws governing the development of peace and cooperation. This step was essential to move beyond fragmented case-specific insights toward theoretical propositions that are applicable to broader international relations contexts. Generalization also facilitated the formulation of recommendations for fostering peaceful coexistence globally, emphasizing moral norms, inclusive governance, and relational networks as the essential foundations for sustainable peace.

3.5 Dialectical Method

The dialectical method was used to explore the contradictions inherent in peace and cooperation discourses. This allowed the research to examine opposing forces—such as power politics versus ethical norms, sovereignty versus cosmopolitanism, and conflict versus reconciliation—that shape the dynamics of international relations. This approach treats peace not as a static condition but as a dynamic, contested process that emerges through negotiation, struggle, and moral evolution among states and societies. Dialectical reasoning reveals that sustainable peace often arises from transformative processes that reconcile antagonistic interests and bridge moral divides. This aligns with contemporary scholarship on peacebuilding, which views conflict resolution as an ongoing, iterative effort rather than a single agreement or treaty that resolves the issue.

3.6 Synergetic Method

Finally, a synergetic approach was employed to understand how multiple factors—philosophical, institutional, cultural, and environmental—interact to produce stable conditions for peace. Synergetics emphasizes non-linear dynamics, where small changes in moral values, educational initiatives, or grassroots dialogue can have large-scale effects on international cooperation. This method highlights the interconnectedness of micro-level interactions, such as local peace initiatives, and macro-level structures, such as multilateral organizations and global norms. Synergetics also underpins the relational perspective of this study, demonstrating that peace emerges from complex adaptive systems shaped by networks of states, civil society actors, and transnational institutions. It provides a framework for understanding peace as a co-created, evolving phenomenon that is dependent on shared responsibility and ethical interdependence.

4. Results and Discussions

The philosopher Immanuel Kant advocated for peace based on moral autonomy and republican rule—a federation of free states bound by law and mutual respect. Philosophers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Hobbes have disagreed on the nature of human beings. Hobbes believed that humans were inherently conflicted and needed a strong state to ensure peace, whereas Rousseau saw peace as more natural and conflict as a product of inequality and social structures. In modern times, peace is increasingly viewed as the result of shared values, cultural dialogue, and institutional trust. In his 1689 work "A Letter of Concern's Toleration", the famous English scholar John Locke "argues that not only Christians, but also followers of other religions, particularly Islam, are morally superior" (Grigoryeva & Grigoryeva, 2020).

Locke's suggestion that Muslims can have high moral character reflects his broader epistemological and ethical position. Locke argued that reason, conscience, and natural law govern moral conduct, principles that are present in all major religious systems. Locke argues that civil government has no authority over the soul; its proper role is to protect life, liberty, and property. Religious belief, being a matter of individual conscience, should not be enforced by the state. Locke's philosophy is based on the idea that all people are endowed with natural rights by virtue of their rational nature. This humanistic foundation allows him to argue that religious diversity should be respected because it flows from the free exercise of reason—a universal human quality not limited to any one religious group. Locke's inclusion of

Muslims in his argument for tolerance was not merely rhetorical. This was a radical philosophical position based on his belief in human reason, moral equality, and the limits of state power. His work laid the foundations for modern secularism, religious pluralism, and liberal democracy. The Preamble to the UN Charter calls upon the peoples of the United Nations to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and in the equal rights of nations large and small, and to this end, living together in peace and harmony as good neighbors, exercising tolerance.'

The reference to wars that have brought "uncountable sorrow to mankind" shows that tolerance is not a theoretical ideal but a moral imperative born of history. The suffering caused by intolerance, aggression, and humanism is forcing the international community to adopt a new moral framework. Tolerance is inseparable from the recognition of human rights and the inherent dignity of individuals. To be tolerant is to accept others as equals, regardless of race, sex, religion, or nationality, and to support systems that universally protect these rights. The Preamble explicitly affirms the equal rights of peoples, large and small, which reflects the political dimension of tolerance. Living together in peace and harmony evokes the concept of tolerance as an attitude and behavior—not just passive non-interference, but also active cooperation, empathy, and solidarity. It sees tolerance as the basis of peaceful coexistence, requiring patience, dialogue, and mutual understanding.

The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations offers more than legal or diplomatic language—it presents a philosophical and moral declaration that elevates tolerance to a universal moral principle. Incorporating historical awareness, respect for the dignity of the individual, and a commitment to peaceful coexistence, it defines tolerance not only as tolerance of differences but also as a path to justice, peace, and human prosperity. Proponents of the ethnological concept argue that national policy cannot be implemented without considering the adaptation of each nation and ethnic group to society. Proponents of the ethnological concept divide the nation into natural and artificial polyethnic communities. Natural polyethnicity refers to nations that have emerged on the basis of a unity of culture, traditions, and mentality, and have lived in harmony and cooperation. We can cite the Tajik, Turkmen, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz nationalities that have lived in our country for centuries as an example.

Natural polyethnicity is a sociocultural phenomenon that implies the harmonious coexistence of several ethnic groups within one nation or territory. Unlike artificial or externally imposed multiculturalism, natural polyethnicity arises from a long history of common experience, mutual respect, and closely related destinies among different ethnic communities. It is a product of historical processes in which cultural diversity is not only tolerated but also accepted as a natural part of the national identity. From a philosophical perspective, natural polyethnicity can be examined through communitarianism and cosmopolitanism. Communitarianism emphasizes the role of shared values, traditions, and collective identities in shaping moral and political lives. In this sense, natural polyethnicity reflects a society's ability to integrate different cultures into a coherent social structure without suppressing their individual characteristics. It represents a higher stage of social development, in which unity is achieved not by eliminating differences but by harmonizing them. In addition, natural polyethnicity is consistent with the dialectical approach in philosophy, which sees opposition not as a contradiction but as a driving force for synthesis and progress. The interaction of different ethnic traditions, languages, and mentalities creates a dynamic cultural environment in which innovation and tolerance thrive. This synthesis contributes to a stronger and more resilient society in the future.

As for artificial polyethnicity, we can cite as an example those nations that emerged as a result of the subjugation of other nations by peoples belonging to different nationalities with different languages, religions, cultures, and customs. An example of this is the resettlement of Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians, and other nationalities here after Tsarist Russia's conquest of Central Asia. Artificial polyethnicity refers to the forced or externally engineered coexistence of several ethnic groups within a political unit. Unlike natural polyethnicity, which develops organically over time through interaction and shared cultural values, artificial polyethnicity often results from colonialism and conquest. From a philosophical perspective, artificial polyethnicity raises several ethical and political issues. Drawing on

postcolonial and critical theory, it can be argued that such diversity is often accompanied by structural inequalities, cultural domination, and marginalization of Indigenous populations. In many cases, the incorporation of ethnic groups leads not to harmony but to tension, distrust, and a crisis of identity. In artificial polyethnic societies, the dominant group often imposes its norms and values, resulting in cultural assimilation and the erosion of indigenous identities. In addition, artificial polyethnicity raises questions regarding identity, agency, and justice. It challenges individuals to define their place in societies that do not recognize their historical or cultural legitimacy. This can lead to alienation, resistance, and even conflict, especially when there is a lack of fair representation and inclusion in the decision-making process. Unlike natural polyethnicity, in which diversity is combined with national identity, artificial polyethnicity often leads to societal fragmentation. Unless deliberate efforts are made to promote inclusion, intercultural dialogue, and historical reconciliation, it becomes a source of division, rather than unity.

According to the etatist concept, the state is the main subject of interethnic relations. The founder of this concept is the Italian scientist Pasquale Mancini, who, in his work "The Nation as the Foundation of the Rights of Peoples" emphasized that a state can be built only when the rights and freedoms of each nation are ensured. The etatist concept views the state as the central subject of governance and regulation of interethnic relations. This approach emphasizes the primacy of state sovereignty, national unity, and legal equality in maintaining peace among different ethnic groups within a country. Mancini saw not only territory but also the nation as the legitimate basis of international law and political organization. This made the recognition of national identities within the state a legal obligation. For a multinational state to survive and flourish, the rights and freedoms of all ethnic groups must be ensured. Thus, the state serves as a guarantor of interethnic balance and a defender of minority rights. The etatist concept introduced by Pasquale Mancini places the state at the center of interethnic harmony, advocating for a single legal order that ensures the equal treatment of all nationalities. Its success depends on the state's ability to fairly recognize and protect cultural diversity while maintaining national unity.

The concept of racial ethnocentrism emphasizes that representatives of one nation are distinguished from others by their beliefs, customs, and values. According to D. Noel, there must be strong competition for the formation of racial-ethnocentric groups. Racial ethnocentrism refers to the belief that one's own ethnic or racial group is superior to others, often expressed through cultural pride, group identity, and exclusive attitudes. It emphasizes the perceived uniqueness of the group's beliefs, customs, and values, which are seen as defining characteristics that distinguish them from outsiders. Ethnocentrism is not purely biological or genetic; rather, it is socially constructed and culturally reinforced. It stems from the ways in which groups define themselves as "other"–usually through language, religion, clothing, traditions, or historical memory.

One of the scholars who studied racial ethnocentrism, G. Le Bon, also emphasized that to change the language, beliefs, and culture of a given nation, it is necessary, first of all, to change the hearts of the representatives of the nation, but this is impossible. He argued that even millennia are not enough for this(Le Bon, 1898). Lebon argues that national identity is not simply a product of language, institutions, or formal education but is deeply rooted in the collective psyche of a people. This directly relates to the concept of racial ethnocentrism, where cultural values and beliefs are perceived as being inherently tied to one's ethnic or national group. Lebon's concept of the "spirit of a people" suggests that cultural change is slow, non-linear, and deeply resistant to external manipulation. Even when a group is colonized, taught a new language, or forced to convert to a new religion, its core identity often persists for generations.

Le Bon's views are significant for the following reasons. First, cultural differences are not only social but also psychological and necessary for survival. Second, attempts to unify or homogenize ethnic groups under a single state or ideology often end in failure or resistance. Third, true understanding between cultures requires more than politics; it requires the recognition of deep emotional and historical complexities. Le Bon's ideas about racial ethnocentrism suggest that cultural identity is not simply a collection of external characteristics but a deep emotional heritage that cannot be easily changed. His

ideas reinforce the notion that ethnic groups resist assimilation not out of ignorance but out of emotional and historical depth, which even the most powerful political systems struggle to overcome.

According to the transcendental concept, the process of socialization of each nation in society is understood as divine. The philosopher I. Kant explains this process as one related to the faith and soul of each representative of a nation. M.Horkheimer and T.Adorno argue that nation is "not a natural property" [6]. The transcendental concept interprets the socialization of nations not as a mere political or cultural process but as one with spiritual or metaphysical dimensions. According to this view, the identity and development of a nation do not depend on material conditions or biological characteristics, but rather involve the internal moral capacities, beliefs, and spirits of its members. In Kant's transcendental philosophy, people are not simply products of their environment but rational, autonomous beings with a moral law within them. National identity is shaped not only by geography or ethnicity but also by a consciousness based on moral development and faith. Each member of a nation contributes to its moral qualities through their personal duty, reason, and beliefs.

5. Conclusion

In short, peace and cooperation among nations are more than political goals; they represent profound social and philosophical commitments grounded in the shared essence of humanity. These ideals go beyond diplomatic agreements, treaties, and institutions, reflecting a deeper aspiration for harmony and coexistence based on respect, justice, and dignity for all nations and people. True and lasting peace cannot be reduced to the absence of war or the temporary resolution of disputes; it requires a fundamental transformation in the way societies understand one another, interact across borders, and uphold the universal moral principles that guide their actions in the global community. Genuine peace is a multidimensional process. Political frameworks, treaties, and international organizations provide the necessary platforms for negotiation, conflict resolution, and protection of rights. However, these mechanisms alone are insufficient to eliminate the deeper roots of conflict, such as structural inequalities, historical injustices, environmental exploitation, and the suppression of cultural identities. Without addressing these fundamental causes, peace agreements risk being fragile, short-lived, and ineffective in preventing recurring tensions or violence.

A socio-philosophical perspective emphasizes the importance of moral reasoning and imagination in building sustainable peace. Moral reasoning allows nations to look beyond their narrow self-interest and consider fairness, empathy, and shared responsibility for global well-being. It challenges traditional notions of power and sovereignty, urging states to prioritize human welfare over dominance or competition. In contrast, moral imagination empowers societies to envision futures beyond conflict—futures shaped by understanding, compassion, and the willingness to recognize others as equal members of a broader human family. This vision nurtures dialogue over hostility and collaboration over division. The collective will is another vital element in realizing peace. It requires not only the efforts of political leaders and institutions but also the active participation of societies worldwide. Grassroots initiatives, intercultural dialogue, education for non-violence, and the inclusive involvement of women and marginalized communities strengthen the social fabric that supports long-term peace. Everyday interactions between individuals and groups can foster trust, tolerance, and cooperation, gradually shaping norms that reject violence and embrace harmony in the community.

Ultimately, peace and cooperation among nations must be understood as ongoing processes that integrate political actions, ethical reflections, and social engagements. They cannot be achieved or sustained solely through laws and treaties; they must be co-created through shared moral commitment and acknowledgment of a common humanity that unites all peoples. Sustainable peace rests on justice, mutual recognition, empathy, and the unwavering dedication of nations and communities to live together in dignity and solidarity, building a world where harmony is not an exception but the collective norm.

References

Alemu, M. G. (2025). Genocide and political destruction in Tigray: The imperative for systemic transformation. *Journal of Governance and Accountability Studies, 4*(2), 147-164. doi: https://doi.org/10.35912/jgas.v4i2.2323

Almahdali, H. (2025). Tantangan dan Peluang Inovasi Pelayanan Publik di Era Revolusi Industri 4.0. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, 4*(2), 63-73. doi: https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v4i2.4104

Benabdallah, L. (2024). The liberal international order as an imposition: A postcolonial reading. *Ethics & International Affairs, 38*(2), 162-179. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679424000236

Bilich, J., Varga, M., Masood, D., & Kónya, A. (2023). Faster peace via inclusivity: An efficient paradigm to understand populations in conflict zones. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00816*. doi:https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.00816

Brett, R., Ginty, R. M., Sagherian-Dickey, T., & Voyvodic, C. (2024). The micro-dynamics of peace and conflict. *Security Dialogue, 55*(5), 443-461. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/09670106241269753

Brigg, M. (2024). Furthering relational approaches to peace. *Journal of Peace Research* 00223433241267811.

Corpuz, J. C. G. (2025). Toward Grassroots Interfaith Dialogue: The Role of Faith-Based Movements. *Religions, 16*(3), 345. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16030345

Cottiero, C., Hafner-Burton, E. M., Haggard, S., Prather, L., & Schneider, C. J. (2025). Illiberal regimes and International Organizations. *The Review of International Organizations, 20*(2), 231-259. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-024-09556-1

Grigoryeva, S. G., & Grigoryeva, L. G. (2020). Formation of Tolerance Among Young People Through Multicultural Education as a Preventive Factor in Countering Extremism and Terrorism. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy, 11*(12).

Isakoff, M. (2024). Testing the Constitutional Limits of the UN Charter: Applying a Contemporary Interpretation of the Uniting for Peace Resolution in Syria. *UCLA J. Islamic and Near EL, 21*, 131.

Jabri, V. (2025). 'No Justice, No Peace': the political in two mutually constitutive concepts. *Peacebuilding*, 1-10. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/21647259.2025.2535132

Jung, H. (2025). Kant's Perpetual Peace: The Foundation of the Liberal Worldview. *Kant's Perpetual Peace: The Foundation of the Liberal Worldview (January 02, 2025)*.

Kostovicova, D., & Vico, S. (2024). Interactions for Justice: An Introduction (Vol. 18, pp. 493-511): Taylor & Francis.

Krampe, F., Hegazi, F., & VanDeveer, S. D. (2021). Sustaining peace through better resource governance: Three potential mechanisms for environmental peacebuilding. *World Development, 144*, 105508. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105508

Kwuelum, C. (2024). Navigating the complexities of inter-religious peacebuilding: Implications for theory and practice. *Religions, 15*(10), 1201. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101201

Lake, D. A., Martin, L. L., & Risse, T. (2021). Challenges to the liberal order: Reflections on international organizations. *International organization, 75*(2), 225-257. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000636

Le Bon, G. (1898). Psychology of People. New York: Macmillan Company.

McInerney, W. W., & Archer, D. T. (2023). Men's violence prevention and peace education: Drawing on Galtung to explore the plurality of violence (s), peace (s), and masculinities. *Men and Masculinities, 26*(1), 69-90. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X221149989

Rathbun B. C., Parker C. S., & Pomeroy, C. (2025). Separate but Unequal: Ethnocentrism and Racialization Explain the "Democratic" Peace in Public Opinion. *American Political Science Review, 119*(2), 621-636. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055424000509

Sakir, A. R. (2025). Pengaruh Perilaku Birokrasi terhadap Kinerja Pegawai pada Kantor Kecamatan Salahutu Kabupaten Maluku Tengah. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, 4*(2), 75-84. doi: https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v4i2.4088

Saputro, G. E., Achmad, I., & Santoso, T. I. (2025). Evaluation of the Formation Mechanism and Management of Reserve Components to Improve National Defense Economics *Jurnal Studi Ilmu Sosial dan Politik, 4*(2), 97-103. doi: https://doi.org/10.35912/jasispol.v4i2.3729

Simangan, D., Bose, S., and Candelaria, J. L., Krampe, F., & Kaneko, S. (2023). Positive peace and environmental sustainability: Local evidence from Afghanistan and Nepal. *Environment and Security, 1*(3-4), 142-162. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/27538796231185677

Tan, B. S. (2024). The revenge of 'democratic peace': *International Political Science Review, 45*(2), 149-169. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/01925121231200122

Tauchnitz, E. (2025). "Doing Peace": Conceptualizing relational peace through interactions and networks in a digitalized world. *Data & Policy, 7*, e34. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2025.11

Ugli, B. U. R. (2025). Socio-philosophical analysis of symmetry and asymmetry. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 603-611. doi: https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3167

Wendt, A. (1994). Collective identity formation and the international state. *American Political Science Review, 88*(2), 384-396. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2944711

Zelli, F., & Krause, T. (2025). The nature of peace: trajectories of environmental peacebuilding between dominant narratives and power relations. *Ecology and Society, 30*(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-15971-300205