

The Necessity of Recreating Peace with Emphasis on the Charter of the United Nations

Mohammad Ali Savadkahi mougouei¹, Ahmad Bakhshayesh Ardestani^{2*}, Seyyed Moustafa Abtahi¹

¹ Department of Political Science, SR.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Department of Political Science, CT.C., Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: ahm.bakhshayeshiardestani@iau.ac.ir

Received: 2025-07-14	Revised: 2025-10-14	Accepted: 2025-10-21	Published: 2026-04-01
EDITOR: Cavid Qasimov ^{id} Prof, Faculty of Letters Department of History, Van Yuzuncu Yıl University, Van, Türkiye. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr			
REVIEWER 1: Mohammadbagher. Jafari ^{id} Department of Sociology of Culture, Istanbul, Türkiye. Email: mbjafari@kmanresce.ca			
REVIEWER 2: Jeremiah Thuku Thuku ^{id} Department of Literary and Communication Studies, Laikipia University, Nyahururu, Kenya. Email: jerethukuthuku@gmail.com			

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the sentence “To achieve a deep understanding of the research topic, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international organizations, laws, and treaties were carefully examined...,” this list reads like a methodological note rather than an introduction. It would improve clarity if the paragraph instead contextualized why peace recreation is an urgent issue in contemporary international relations.

The authors state, “It seems that the necessity of peace is not clearly understood by public opinion...” This is an important observation but should be substantiated with empirical or secondary data, such as public opinion surveys or scholarly statistics on peace perception, to move beyond conjecture.

The metaphor “Peace, like light, is intangible yet recognizable” is eloquent but somewhat literary for a scientific article. The reviewer recommends moderating poetic expressions and integrating analytic exposition to maintain academic tone.

The authors assert, “Peace is a doctrine that enlightens the human being, fills them with positive energy...” This phrasing anthropomorphizes peace and reduces analytical rigor. Replace such metaphorical language with conceptual definitions rooted in social sciences or international law.

The paper provides a detailed exposition of Kant’s perpetual peace but largely paraphrases secondary literature. To improve originality, the authors should connect Kant’s moral framework directly to the modern UN system—for example, how Kant’s federation of republics prefigures today’s collective security model.

The discussion of Rawls’s difference principle is accurate but verbose. The paragraph beginning “More specifically, Rawls distinguishes between two forms of liberalism...” could be condensed while emphasizing the connection between Rawls’s political liberalism and international distributive justice as mechanisms for peace.

The phrase “Enhancing consensus and inner peace within a society will erect a barrier against those who would trespass upon that society’s integrity” needs clarification. The authors should operationalize what is meant by “inner peace”—psychological, cultural, or institutional stability—and how it can be empirically assessed.

The authors list multiple global issues—climate change, pandemics, hunger, migration—but do not explain how each connects causally to the concept of peace recreation. A tabular or conceptual model illustrating these interrelations could enhance analytical clarity.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The claim that “any attempt toward material and spiritual progress is impossible without the recreation of peace” is a strong normative assertion. The authors should support this statement with citations from empirical peace studies literature or qualify it as a philosophical position.

The statement that “the interpretations and political systems derived from those schools have failed to convince people or to establish peace” is sweeping. The authors should identify which schools of thought are meant (e.g., realism, liberal institutionalism) and briefly show how each has failed according to the cited sources.

When referring to “Peace and conflict studies represent a normative field aimed at reducing or eradicating violence,” this is accurate but could benefit from citing foundational theorists (e.g., Galtung’s theory of positive peace) earlier to anchor the discussion theoretically.

The authors write, “The establishment of world peace does not require the abolition of national identities...” This is an insightful observation; however, the argument would be stronger if the authors engaged with cosmopolitan theorists such as Habermas or Appiah to situate their claims within existing global citizenship literature.

The narrative is largely historical. The reviewer suggests adding critical evaluation—for example, to what extent the UN Charter’s peacekeeping mechanisms have succeeded or failed, using recent cases (e.g., Syria, Ukraine, or Yemen) to demonstrate practical implications.

These bullet-like statements (“(a) The theoretical approaches... (b) Peace has broad dimensions...” are valuable but read as notes. The section would benefit from analytical synthesis—grouping these into thematic clusters such as institutional, moral, and educational prerequisites for peace.

The sentence “Peace, as a cultural and epistemic foundation, sustains literature, art, religion, institutions, and generations...” is important but underdeveloped. The authors should include empirical examples, such as UNESCO cultural programs, to ground this assertion.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor’s decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief’s decision: Accepted.