



The Philosophy of Migration by I. Kant and Frankfurt School: Ideas of Freedom and Hospitality

Shachina A¹ and Shachin S^{2,*}

¹Associated Professor of Department of Pedagogic, Murmansk Arctic State University, Russia

²Associated Professor of Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Murmansk Arctic State University, Russia

*Corresponding author: Shachin S, PhD, Associated Professor of Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Murmansk Arctic State University, Murmansk, Russia; E-mail: s_shachin@mail.ru

Received date: 23 November 2023; Accepted date: 02 December 2023; Published date: 09 December 2023

Citation: Shachina A, Shachin S (2023). The Philosophy of Migration by I. Kant and Frankfurt School: Ideas of Freedom and Hospitality. SunText Rev Arts Social Sci 4(3): 166.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51737/2766-4600.2023.066>

Copyright: © 2023 Shachina A, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract

Article is devoted to consideration of a problem of migration on the basis of I. Kant and A. Honneth's ideas. Migration is considered as realization of freedom of the person, but also the state as the set of institutes is also a condition of a possibility of collective freedom. The problem consists in how to coordinate individual and collective freedom. For this purpose, to the real migrants it is necessary either to remain guests, or to be integrated into new society. The last assumes rendering to them the help in sense of development of ability of judgment in them, their ability to dialogue with the purpose of formation of norms with which all citizens of the state will be able to agree. Therefore, tolerance as a condition of ability to integrate migrants into the new state insufficiently. It is necessary that between communities of migrants and the society accepting them the relations which are based on mutual recognition would be established.

Keywords: Migration; Freedom; Integration; Tolerance; Mutual recognition; Globalization

Introduction

Not acceptable the cult of values as such, representatives of the famous philosophical current known as the Frankfurt School proceed from the concept of freedom as a basic value. The authors of this report consider convincing the proposal of Axel Honneth which he formulates in his book "Right of Freedom: Essay on Democratic Morals" to understand freedom in the unity of its three components. The modern leader of the Frankfurt School schematically represents this construction as a triangle with vertices NF (negative freedom (T. Hobbes)) – RF (reflexive freedom (J. G. Herder, I. Kant)) – SF (social freedom (G.W.F. Hegel)). Neglect of one of the components of freedom does not even lead to injustice but to the pathologies of the individual and society. These components with proper reflection don't contradict, but harmoniously complement each other. So, from the point of view of A. Honneth, the full individual freedom (from something and for something) is possible not in spite of, but only on condition of solidarity (social freedom). To achieve this aim it is necessary that of all social freedoms interact in accordance with their

functions: "Only if every member of society can satisfy with every other shared need for physical and emotional intimacy, for economic independence and for political self-determination, that he/she would be able to rely on the sympathy and help of its interaction partners, our society would have become social in the full sense of the word" [1]. In German: „Nur wenn jedes Gesellschaftsmitglied sein mit jedem anderen geteiltes Bedürfnis nach körperlicher und emotionaler Intimität, nach ökonomischer Unabhängigkeit und nach politischer Selbstbestimmung derart befriedigen kann, dass es sich dabei auf die Anteilnahme und Mithilfe seiner Interaktionspartner zu verlassen vermag, wäre unsere Gesellschaft im vollen Sinne des Wortes sozial geworden“. The state, therefore, is seen as the guarantor of human freedom in the service of self-determination and self-realization of its citizens.

Ideas of freedom and hospitality in I. Kant's work "Toward Perpetual Peace"

The authors will refer to I. Kant's work "Toward Perpetual Peace". This work is chosen because it raises the problems not only of



morality, but also of the transcendental justification of law and citizenship (external freedom), that today is more important than ever, because we live not just in the era of globalization, but in the era of mass migration of some peoples, which is caused by wars in their states. And, this is not a temporary evacuation, and for many - a conscious choice to emigrate in the search for prospects, a better life, integrate into a new society. According to modern scientists, “the world will never be the same as it was ten years ago, the world will change, and people will change (from appearance to culture), climate change in the future can cause new migrations” [2]. This Kant could not even imagine (otherwise he would express himself on this subject in his works), although he foresaw globalization, but imagined it differently: “... a violation of right on one place of the earth is felt in all, the idea of a cosmopolitan right is ... a supplement to the unwritten code of the right of a state and the right of nations necessary for the sake of any public rights of human beings”. Migrants have no illusions about the future (after the end of hostilities in their country) unification of their country with the host country, they are often ready to accept another citizenship (of the host country). Kant also understood this, and history confirmed: people resolutely don’t want to form a state of nations (*civitas gentium*), “thus rejecting in hypothesis what is correct in thesis” but realize, that in order to achieve peace, it is necessary not only to stop hostilities and wars, but a union of peoples is desirable, so Kant: “This would be a league of nations, which, however, need not be a state of nations”. Coming to a permanent residence in a state, according to Kant, it is reasonable to accept the citizenship of a given state (if the authorities, of course, do not mind). Otherwise we should expect a relation to ourselves or as a guest (hospitality in the representation of Kant goes back to the ancient tradition) or as a visitor (speaking in modern language, as a tourist). For a long time to be only a guest and be only a visitor (and, according to Kant's conviction, everyone has the right not to automatically become a guest, that would impose certain obligations on the receiving side, but only the right to visit another state: “originally no one had more right than another to be on a place on the earth” means to occupy a passive life position and deny yourself the right to freedom. Thus, real migrants remain either to remain guests, or integrate into a new society. Of course, migrants are not tourists, and they claim the right not to visit, but to hospitality and help in integrating into a new culture for them. At the same time, Europeans are trying to remain faithful to the ideals of the Enlightenment. According to this, assistance in integration means not making migrants conform to certain patterns of behavior or uncritically join the existing opinions and attitudes, this would be contrary to their right to self-determination, the right of freedom (according to Kant, the right innate to man): and “The right of human beings must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice this may cost the ruling power”. Help should consist in the development of their ability to judge, of their ability to dialogue,

that’s because the development of the ability to judge is carried out in the process of exchanging empirical arguments and in trying to find philosophical grounds. The latter is much more difficult, but more effective, if we take into account the prospect for the future, taking into account the construction of a joint civil society, because “by principles of freedom a state constitution that can continue valid is first possible”. The problem, of course, is the isolation of migrants from the main population that threatens with the fact that they would prefer to live in isolation, guided by their values, and cannot fully integrate. A few years earlier, the idea of building a multicultural society was proclaimed, but this idea did not justify itself, moreover, led to a greater stratification of Western European society. Therefore, today it is necessary to recognize, that if people want to belong together to some society, state, then they must agree on the norms and rights with which they all could agree (the common will of the people, since the time of Rousseau, is the principle of all rights), and Kant anticipates the communicative ethics of Jurgen Habermas: “My external (rightful) freedom is, instead, to be defined as follows: it is the warrant to obey no other external laws than those to which I could have given my consent” [3].

The philosophy of dialogue by I. Kant and Frankfurt School as a methodology for solving problems of migration

Today, European countries, for example, Germany, for their part, are interested in increasing the young population of their country, politicians make calculations about the arriving young people who are to build the future of Germany, and which should multiply, rather than squander the wealth of this country [2]. Fears and worries are clear, and thinkers, whose task now lies in clarity of thought, can again find encouragement in Kant’s philosophy in his demand: “It can therefore be said, ‘Seek you first the kingdom of pure practical reason and its justice, and your end (the blessing of perpetual peace) will come to you of itself’. This happens because it is just the general will give a priori that alone determines what is laid down as right among human beings. ... Thus, it is [...] a principle of moral politics, that people are to unite itself into a state in accordance with freedom and equality (below the right) as the sole concepts of right, and this principle is not based upon prudence but upon duty” (Kant 1996, p. 345). To come to this understanding of the rights and freedoms of citizens and potential citizens is possible only through dialogue. Dialogue implies openness, that is, the ability to decenter and to hear the arguments of the counterpart, willingness to change their point of view, that implies knowledge of unknowledge of the result of dialogue, otherwise the dialogue degenerates to manipulation practices. Kant understands the importance of dialogue for the development of norms of a joint society, he writes about publicity and proposes the formula of the

transcendental principle of public law: “All maxims which need publicity (in order not to fail in their end) harmonize with right and politics combined” [3]. And further: “For if they can attain their end only through publicity, they must conform to the universal end of the public (happiness), and to be in accord with this (to make the public satisfied with its condition) is the proper task of politics”. In right only “is the union of the ends of all possible”. Furthermore: “Without publicity would be no justice (which can be thought only as publicly known) and so too no right, which is conferred only by justice” [3]. Of course, when accepting migrants, the state, in the person of the government and citizens, should be aware of all the risks and responsibilities. Today, we are not just talking about the openness of the dialogue, but also (even in spite of the cosmopolitan worldview) on the closure and inviolability of state borders [4]. The government of the host state must clearly understand: who it is ready to accept and in what quantity without prejudice to those citizens, which live there because of ethnicity or have long lived. And if the states hosting refugees, including many young people, with whom the future prosperity of these states is linked, don’t want to be disappointed, then we must proceed from the fact that, in Kant’s words: “... for it is not a case that a good state constitution is to be expected from inner morality; on the contrary, the good moral education of people is to be expected from a good state constitution” (Kant 1996, p. 335 – 336). For “in a wrong life there cannot be a right life” how written after almost 200 years (be based on personal experience in Nazi Germany and its sociological research in America) the famous philosopher of the Frankfurt School Theodor W. Adorno [5]. (The T. Adorno’s book is devoted to the interpretation of the practical philosophy of I. Kant.)

Conclusions

Thus, philosophical and sociological research leads to the justification of the pedagogy of recognition (which arose, based on the ideas from I. Kant’s book “Toward perpetual peace” and thinkers of the Frankfurt School T. Adorno and A. Honneth) and politic of recognition (which proceed from recognition as a basic human need), and consider tolerance only as fact, but not the goal. At the same time, one must not forget that the non-tolerant is subject to eradication and all kinds of condemnation [6-8].

References

1. Honneth, A. The idea of socialism. Attempting an update. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2015.
2. Blom P. The flow of refugees marks a turning point. 2015.
3. Kant I. Toward perpetual peace. In: Kant, I. Practical Philosophy: The Cambridge edition of works of Immanuel Kant. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996; 311-352.
4. Nida-Rumelin J. Thinking beyond boundaries: Recording from May 16, 2017 in the Korber Forum. 2017.

5. Adorno T. Problems of moral philosophy. Moscow: Republic, 2000.
6. Kuhler M. Two concepts of tolerance. In: Materials of the XXIII. Congress of the German Society for Philosophy. Munster: History – Society – Validity. 2014.
7. Forst R. Tolerance in conflict: History, content and present of a controversial term. Frankfurt. 2003.
8. Honneth A. The right to freedom: outline of a democratic morality. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2011.