


Between ‘citizen of the world’ and ‘patriot’: Kant’s Pragmatic Cosmopolitanism vs. John S. Mill’s Political Utilitarianism

Alexey Salikov

Goethe-Universität Frankfurt. ✉ 

<https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/kant.99191>

Received: 01-12-2024 • Accepted: 06-02-2025

ENG Abstract: Kant is considered one of the main theorists of Enlightenment cosmopolitanism; it reaches its apotheosis in his formulation of cosmopolitan law, bringing together practically the entire complex of ideas associated with cosmopolitanism of the 18th century. However, even if cosmopolitanism was one of the mainstream ideas in political thought of the Enlightenment, already in the early 19th century the cosmopolitan idea faced the idea of a nation-state and local patriotism; the Enlightenment idea of world unity and world citizenship lost much of its appeal to the political thinkers of that time and their contemporaries. Nevertheless, despite the significant rise of the national idea after 1789, there was no decisive break with cosmopolitan views in the political thought in the following period of time. On the contrary, cosmopolitanism remained one of the most important political ideas throughout the 19th century. My paper’s primary goal is to respond to the topic of how Kant’s cosmopolitanism influenced the evolution of political thought in the 19th century using John S. Mill’s political utilitarianism as an example. In my paper, I will show that, despite Mill’s criticism of Kantian ethics, his political philosophy shares with Kant the common pathos of Enlightenment humanism and has some important parallels with the Kantian theory of cosmopolitanism. This suggests that Kant’s pragmatic anthropology, his thoughts on the civil and political development of mankind, in particular his concept of citizen of the world, could serve as one of the sources of political ideas of utilitarianism.

Key words: Kant, John S. Mill, cosmopolitanism, utilitarianism, pragmatic anthropology, citizen of the world, pragmatic cosmopolitanism, patriotic cosmopolitanism, political utilitarianism.

Summary: 1. Introduction. 2. John Stuart Mill’s ‘Patriotic Cosmopolitanism’. 3. Kant’s pragmatic cosmopolitanism and John S. Mill’s patriotic cosmopolitanism. 4. The emergence and development of Kant’s pragmatic cosmopolitanism: ‘citizen of the world’ vs. ‘man of the world’. 5. Conclusion. 6. References.

How to cite: Salikov, A. (2025) Between ‘citizen of the world’ and ‘patriot’: Kant’s Pragmatic Cosmopolitanism vs. John S. Mill’s Political Utilitarianism. *Con-Textos Kantianos. International Journal of Philosophy*, 21, pp.93-99.

1. Introduction

The concept of ‘citizen of the world’ has been for long associated with the idea “that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, are (or can and should be) citizens in a single community” (Kleingeld, Brown, 2019). In recent years, cosmopolitanism has become an increasingly important theoretical stance in the social sciences, especially influential within normative political theory, “in the context of issues relating to globalization and transnational movements of all kinds” (Delanty 2008, p. 218). Its significance is so great that some authors speak of a cosmopolitan turn in the social sciences¹. However, this cosmopolitan turn, in a certain sense, is far from being the first in the history of social thought. Its roots go back to the Enlightenment of the 18th century, which was essentially the heyday of the ideas of cosmopolitanism in Europe with Kant’s concept of cosmopolitanism at its apex, uniting the entire complex of ideas associated with the era of enlightened cosmopolitanism.

Though cosmopolitanism was one of the mainstream ideas in political thought of the Enlightenment, it did not last long after Kant’s death, just “until the intellectual climate grew increasingly nationalist in the early nineteenth century” (Kleingeld 1999, p. 506). The French Revolution and the subsequent Napoleonic Wars

¹ See, for example, the special issue of the British Journal of Sociology. Vol. 57. No. 1 (2006) on Cosmopolitan Sociology, edited by U. Beck and N. Szaider and the Special issue of the European Journal of Social Theory. Vol. 10. No. 1 (2007) on cosmopolitanism.

engulfed a significant part of the European continent and became an important catalyst for national awakening in Europe and beyond (for instance, in Latin America). The idea that each folk or nation, like an individual, has its own special identity and national character, and, for this reason, has the right to self-determination and the exercise of their rights and freedoms in an independent political state, turned out to be more attractive to many of the divided nations of Europe than the abstract cosmopolitanism of the Enlightenment. Therefore, already in the early 19th century, the cosmopolitan idea had face up to the idea of a nation state and local patriotism². The Enlightenment idea of world unity and world citizenship lost much of its appeal to the political thinkers of that time and their contemporaries (cf. Meinecke 1970, pp. 45–6, 55, 61–2).

Nevertheless, despite the significant rise of the national idea after 1789, there was no decisive break with cosmopolitan views in political thought in the period following *The French Revolution*. On the contrary, both nationalism and cosmopolitanism remained the most important political ideas throughout the 19th century with “a marked tendency to conflate irreconcilable elements within the two ideas (Kaufmann 2003, p. 14). Still, there are striking examples of a conflation of these seemingly irreconcilable ideas within the same political theory. One of them can be found in the theory of political utilitarianism, with its so-called ‘cosmopolitan patriotism’ (Varouxakis 2008, p. 295). Classic utilitarians are primarily known for their moral philosophy, which is based on the understanding of utility or happiness as the highest good. But they also made significant contributions to political theory, “the largest contribution by the English to political theory” (Plamenatz 1949, p. 2) profoundly influencing the shape of nineteenth century political thought and discourse. For this reason, it seems important to identify meeting points and possible alignments between Kant’s cosmopolitan theory and the cosmopolitan concept of John S. Mill, one of the most prominent and influential representatives of utilitarianism.

My paper’s major goal is to respond to the topic of how Kant’s cosmopolitanism influenced the evolution of political thought in the 19th century using John S. Mill’s political utilitarianism as an example. In my paper, I will show that despite Mill’s criticism of Kantian ethics, his political philosophy shares with Kant the pathos of Enlightenment humanism and has some significant parallels with Kant’s theory of cosmopolitanism. I will begin by providing an overview of Kant’s concept of ‘citizen of the world’ as a part of the system of Kant’s pragmatic anthropology. In this part of my paper, I will try to define the place of the concept of ‘citizen of the world’ in Kant’s pragmatic anthropology and describe a special kind of Kantian cosmopolitanism, based on Kant’s anthropological views. Next, in the second part, I’ll focus on John Stuart Mill’s ‘political cosmopolitanism’. And then, in the third part, I’ll compare Kant’s pragmatic cosmopolitanism and John S. Mill’s political (or patriotic) cosmopolitanism. Finally, in the last part of my paper, I will summarize the results obtained in the previous parts and draw a general conclusion.

1. The emergence and development of Kant’s pragmatic cosmopolitanism: ‘citizen of the world’ vs. ‘man of the world’

Kant’s theory of cosmopolitanism, especially in his later version of the 1790s, is multifaceted and can be differentiated in a variety of forms or aspects: epistemological, economic or commercial, moral, ethico-theological, political, cultural, juridical or legal etc. (see more on this topic, for instance: Kleingeld 1999; Cavallar 2012). However, among all these aspects, one more can be distinguished, based on Kant’s understanding of the social nature of human beings, that is, their skill at using their knowledge and ability to use other people for common aims – that means, it is about the pragmatic aspect in a special Kantian sense. In other words, pragmatic cosmopolitanism is another kind of cosmopolitanism that may be discussed within the framework of Kant’s theory of cosmopolitanism.

This kind of cosmopolitanism is historically probably the earliest in Kant. Its roots go back to the time of the appearance of Kant’s pragmatic problematics – i.e. at least to the beginning of the 1770s, when Kant began to lecture on anthropology, and perhaps to even earlier times, to the years of ‘the elegant magister’ if we take into account Kant’s interest to social life in form of kind of ‘world knowledge’ and collecting of various information on other countries inspiring him to start his lectures on physical geography (1755), his thoughts on ‘urbanity’³ this means about socially acceptable behavior, what it should be for effective communication and socialization in society. Pragmatic cosmopolitanism was largely formed in the process of a kind of competition between two concepts – ‘citizen of the world’ and ‘man of the world’ (see also on this topic Salikov, Sturm, Zhavoronkov 2025, pp. 20–24). Both terms – ‘citizen of the world’ and ‘man of the world’ – relevant for Kant’s pragmatic cosmopolitanism, are connected in a certain way by their constituent first part – Welt- (‘world’) denoting belonging to the world in the social sense, to humanity in all its diversity on the planet, being a part or member of a global community, and in this way, making them cosmopolitan.

The process of rivalry between the two concepts – ‘man of the world’ and ‘citizen of the world’ begins in the first half of the 1770s, when Kant comes to cosmopolitan (and pragmatic) issues. From this point on, they are used in parallel by Kant in a social and pragmatic aspect, with ‘citizen of the world’ appearing regularly

² See, for instance, Fichte’s Addresses to the German Nation (1806), and also Hegel’s criticism of Kant’s cosmopolitanism in *Philosophy of Right* (1820).

³ See, for example, an episode that happened in 1758 and is described by Ludwig Borowski in his Kant biography, when Kant, in one of his ‘Disputatorio’, explains to his students the difference between ‘urbanity’, i.e. essentially the skill of effective social communication between free and equal citizens, and ‘courtesy’ (Höflichkeit), as the skill of effective social communication in conditions of inequality and hierarchical relations within the court environment (Borowski 1804/1993, pp. 53–54).

in his printed works, while 'man of the world' appears mainly in lecture notes or in marginal notes⁴. Both concepts had undergone a significant evolution since their first appearance in Kant by the 1790s, which can be characterized as a gradual 'socialization' and 'pragmatization' of the term 'citizen of the world'. From the very broad universal understanding of the 1760s, through to its narrower human and social subtypes in the 1770s and socio-historical cosmopolitanism in the first half to mid-1780s. It continues on to the complex cosmopolitanism of the late 1780s–1790s, with explicit 'social' (and 'pragmatic') overtones to characterize a person who not only considers himself a part of the world (human) community and doesn't simply follow the existing legal, moral, religious and other norms of society, but plays an active role in it. In other words, able to participate in its formation and development (i.e. *mitspielen* in Kant's words): „the expressions “to know the world” and “to have the world” are rather far from each other in their meaning, since one only understands the play that one has watched, while the other has participated in it“ (AA VII, 120; Kant 2007, p. 232). From a pragmatic point of view 'citizen of the world' means in this late period a person obtaining 'citizen of the world' (*Weltkenntnis*) and prudence (in the form of 'world prudence', *Weltklugheit*), using them for common goals and benefits. As for the term 'man of the world', it becomes almost or completely identical in meaning to 'citizen of the world' (AA VIII: 277; Kant, 1991, p. 63). It practically merges with 'citizen of the world' in the last period, giving the latter a pragmatic overtone: Kant's 'citizen of the world' not only has a sense of belonging to the world society, but he knows how to use other members of the human community for the benefit of all mankind. Taking into account the context of use of 'citizen of the world' in Kant's late writings, it becomes clear why the main notion of his pragmatic anthropology is not the egoistic 'man of the world', but the socially active 'citizen of the world': this type of world person does not only know people, social norms and how to use them for his own purposes, but he has also obtained a developed social consciousness and uses his social knowledge and skills for the benefit of the whole society. This is particularly clear in *Anthropology*, when Kant notes that the ubiquitous (logical, practical, and aesthetic) "egoism" of human beings can only be superseded by the "pluralism" of the 'citizen of the world': "The opposite of egoism can only be pluralism, that is, the way of thinking in which one is not concerned with oneself as the whole world, but rather regards and conducts oneself as a mere citizen of the world" (AA VII, 120; Kant 2007, p. 232).

But why is it reasonable to single out this type of cosmopolitanism in Kant, and how does it differ from other forms of Kantian cosmopolitanism? First, pragmatic cosmopolitanism differs from its other varieties in Kant in that it emphasizes the social nature of a human being, who, precisely by its very nature, is aware of the commonality of its interests with other people. This awareness promotes active interaction with other members of their species, wherever they live on the planet, and the desire to form a community with them and actively participate in its development. Second, pragmatic cosmopolitanism differs from other types of Kantian cosmopolitanism in its aim, which is the most effective social structure that would allow humanity to achieve the greatest development of its abilities (both on the social and on the individual level). Thirdly, a feature of pragmatic cosmopolitanism is the instrumentalization of other members of the community, which is necessary to achieve set goals. The pragmatic point here is that the more each person understands others and the traits of their social behavior (*Weltkenntnis*), the more successful they will be in interacting with others to achieve a common goal—the happiness or common good of all mankind (*Weltklugheit*).

Obviously, pragmatic cosmopolitanism is closely related to other varieties of Kant's cosmopolitanism, each of which is not a separate cosmopolitan theory, but only a separate aspect, a separate part "of a greater system and are compatible with each other" (Cavallar 2012, p. 97). It intersects especially closely with Kant's political cosmopolitanism, since social interaction takes place within a certain socio-political structure and humans ultimately tend to unite within the framework of a single global confederation or world republic); with economic or commercial cosmopolitanism, for the focus of both types is effective interaction with other people to achieve certain goals (individual or social); with the juridical type, because the participation of members of the world community in social interaction can be most effective only in the case, when all these members have equal rights in it and that these rights are steadily observed.

The pragmatic aspect of Kant's cosmopolitanism is also connected with the issue of the practical and most effective ways of the implementation of the political and legal unity of the whole of mankind, since it is obvious that the achievement of a global civil law state on the planet will require a number of intermediate steps, including at the local level, i.e. through the achievement of a high level of civil law status within some certain states and nations, which, then, through regional associations, could eventually unite later into one single global whole (AA VIII, 356; Kant 1991, p. 104). From here it quite logically follows that at least until the moment when humanity is completely and finally united into a single political and legal whole, people will have to deal with the arrangement of their local political entities, of which they are citizens. At this point, Kant's political thought comes very close to the ideas of political utilitarianism of John S. Mill, to his so-called 'patriotic cosmopolitanism', which will be in the focus of discussion in the next part of my paper.

2. John Stuart Mill's 'Patriotic Cosmopolitanism'

John S. Mill's political philosophy certainly belongs to the cosmopolitan tradition. This is mainly because of the egalitarian and liberal character of utilitarian moral philosophy which recognizes a human being as part of a global moral community whose members obtain the equal moral dignity and freedom to choose the

⁴ This undoubtedly indicates that 'man of the world' was a rather significant concept for Kant, which he thought about quite a lot, taking into account that Kant's lectures on anthropology can be considered a kind of sounding laboratory of his socio-political thought (Salikov, 2018: 15; Salikov, 2020: 121), but which he did not find a place in his 'official' philosophy, in his published writings.

means to achieve their own individual happiness, as long as it does not harm the happiness of other persons and «the collective interests of mankind» (CW X, p. 218). The utilitarians consider utility or happiness as the directive rule of human conduct, happiness is for them the highest aim of man. But since for utilitarians we, humans, are social beings, endowed with a sense of sociability and having “the desire to unite with our neighbors”, the highest goal of a person “is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether” (CW X, p. 213), and ultimately the happiness of the whole of mankind. This means that all individual happiness is inextricably linked with the happiness of other people, ultimately with the happiness of all mankind. This makes achieving the general happiness of all mankind a condition for achieving the greatest happiness for certain individuals and motivates them to contribute to the happiness of other people, to some kind of ‘pragmatic’ relationships and cooperation with other people in society.

Three factors, according to Mill, impede human happiness: people's selfishness, lack of intelligence, and bad state laws. On an individual level, this means, first of all, the need to reject selfishness and realize oneself as a social being, so that “one of his natural wants that there should be harmony between his feelings and aims and those of his fellow creatures” (CW X, p. 233). For Mill, secondly, the lack of intelligence among the members of the human community can be overcome through the improvement of individual abilities and this means, that social progress needs, in order to achieve its main aim – happiness of all mankind – a full realization of the potential of all individuals, and not only the improvement of one's individual abilities, but also personal contribution to their development in other members of society (Cf. Robson 1968, p. 186). Human's superior intelligence combined with their superior social sensibilities enables a person “to attach himself to the collective idea of his tribe, his country, or mankind in such a manner that any act hurtful to them raises his instinct of sympathy and urges him to resistance.” (CW X, p. 248). This developed sense of sociability, which is inherent to human nature, is what propels human progress to the point where people's interests and well-being become “a thing naturally and necessarily to be attended to” in the same way as their own interests and well-being do (CW X, p. 232).

However, despite the obvious moral tone of utilitarian cosmopolitanism with its priority of the common human good over the individual, the recognition of equal moral dignity of all people on Earth, regardless of race and gender, utilitarian cosmopolitanism was not only moral, one-dimensional and abstract, but implied different levels of social organization, a kind of hierarchy of human communities, beginning from very small local groups in some areas to nations and populations of entire countries, with the whole of mankind at the top of this hierarchy. As Varouxakis rightly remarks, Mill obviously did not see a contradiction between a person's feelings of belonging to a particular nation or region and feelings of being a citizen of the world at the same time (Varouxakis 2002, pp. 118- 119). Moreover, love for one's own local community, for one's own country, in Mill's view, not only did not contradict the feeling of belonging to global humanity, but also contributed to the good of the larger country and the world, since patriotism, in Mill's opinion, consists in a feeling of pride for your country, for the contribution to the common well-being and happiness of all mankind, to its improvement, which your nation, country or local community can make (see, for instance: CW XXI, 115; Cf. Varouxakis 2002, pp. 122-123). At the same time, Mill believes that the contribution of different nations to the well-being and happiness of all mankind is not the same among various nations, and nations like individuals can or cannot think regarding „for the good of other nations”, that their own good and the good of others compatible or not, be more or less selfish (CW XXI, p. 115 f.). This stems from the uneven development of mankind in its different parts, from the fact that certain communities or even entire nations can be at different stages of evolution, be more progressive or ‘civilized’, to be more open to the world and doing more than others for the benefit of the whole of humanity, like, for example, most European nations. Or they can be backward, barbaric and egoistic, like, for example, many nations in the other parts of the world. These nations are, according to Mill, not yet ready for complete independence and need control from more developed nations (CW XXI, pp. 118-119). Mill considered his native Britain to be the most civilized of the contemporary European countries that made the greatest contribution to the development of mankind, and he described the British (obviously highly idealised) in his article *A Few Words on Non-Intervention* (CW X, p.111 f.) like “the quintessential cosmopolitan nation.” (Varouxakis 2008, p. 293). In Mill's opinion, Britain, unlike other countries, never enters the outside world for imperialist purposes (CW X, p. 113 f.). And when Britain decides to act outside its borders at all, it does so in order to improve the world, for instance ending conflicts, bringing civilization, etc. Unlike other nations, writes Mill, “There is no such base feeling in the British people. They are accustomed to see their advantage in forwarding, not in keeping back the growth in the wealth and civilization of the world.” (CW X, p. 117). So, as we can see, Mill himself was not only a citizen of the world in his views but also a great patriot of his homeland, even if he was obviously inclined to a clear overestimation of Britain's merits to humanity.

This combination of love for the fatherland with the awareness of belonging to the whole of humanity gives grounds to characterize Mill's position as patriotic cosmopolitanism, or, in the words of Georgios Varouxakis, as cosmopolitan patriotism (Varouxakis 2002, pp. 122-123). According to Varouxakis, Mill's cosmopolitanism does not consist in abandoning one's nation or homeland, but in striving to influence the behavior of one's own nation in such a way that it contributes as much as possible to the progress and the good of the whole of mankind, so that one could be proud of this contribution. In fact, for Mill, patriotism is a necessary practical step on the path to cosmopolitanism, since in the 19th century (and, perhaps, even today), pride in the contribution of one's nation to the development of mankind could have a greater influence on human behavior than the love for the whole of humanity, since the latter may seem to many only an abstract idea, while the love of your country and to your fellow-countryman could seem much more concrete and tangible. In Mill's cosmopolitan conception, patriotism plays an important role because it contributes to the stability of the political system promoting “cohesion among the members of the same community or state” (CW VIII,

p. 923). Moreover, this local patriotism can be improved with the intellectual development of individuals, with their introduction to education and culture, and finally replaced by global patriotism, by a sense of belonging to a bigger country and to a bigger group of people – the sense of being a citizen of the world (CW X, p. 232). In this essentially pragmatic and cosmopolitan interpretation of the idea of human progress through the intellectual and moral improvement of individuals, the movement to global cosmopolitan unity (be it a world union of republics or a world republic) through the development of local communities, countries and nations, Mill is so close to the ideas of Kant's pragmatic anthropology, to his idea of the moral and socio-political progress of mankind, that the question of whether this rapprochement is the result of the direct or indirect influence of the German philosopher suggests itself. In the next paragraph, I will outline my idea on how this question can be answered.

3. Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and John S. Mill's patriotic cosmopolitanism

John S. Mill rarely explicitly refers to Kant – at least in his main works – there are very few of them. On the whole, Mill's interest in Kant is limited to ethics and when he turns to Kant, as, for example, in the one of his main writings – in *Utilitarianism*, he usually criticizes Kant's moral philosophy, his categorical imperative, while at the same time being willing to accept the latter in a kind of utilitarian and cosmopolitan interpretation: “we ought to shape our conduct by a rule which all rational beings might adopt with benefit to their collective interest” (CW X, p. 249).

Mill was obviously quite familiar with Kant's main works, at least the ethical one. As for the rest of Kant's writings, there is no clear indication that Mill was acquainted with them or that he was generally interested in other parts of Kant's philosophy – for example, whether Mill was acquainted with Kant's political writings or with *Anthropology from a pragmatic point of view*. However, there are a number of significant points of agreement between the social and political ideas of Kant and Mill, which are especially well traced in their cosmopolitan views on human nature.

The first and most obvious similarity between the cosmopolitan views of Kant and Mill can be found in the moral aspect of their cosmopolitanism, since both share liberal ideals of equality, “that all persons have unique and equal worth as human beings” (Fitzpatrick 2006, p. 15), “that all human beings are members of a single moral community, and that they have moral obligations to others regardless of their nationality, language, religion, customs, and so on” (Kleingeld 2003, p. 301). Though Kant's and Mill's moral cosmopolitanism are based on completely different, rather even largely opposite, moral doctrines: in Kant's ethics, morality is based on the special nature of the motivation of human actions, on the a priori principle of duty, while in Mill's ethics, morality is based on the empirical principle of utility.

However, a much deeper similarity between the cosmopolitan views of Kant and Mill is revealed when comparing the anthropological foundations that underlie Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and Mill's patriotic cosmopolitanism. At the heart of Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism is the concept of “unsocial sociability” (*ungesellige Geselligkeit*), that humans are meant by nature to provide, by their own efforts, whatever they enjoy of happiness and perfection (AA VIII, 20–22; Kant 1991, pp. 44–45), but at the same time, as a social being, they are able to achieve it only through interaction with other people, being members of society. Therefore, it is in the interests of each person not only to have knowledge and the skill in using other people to achieve their own goals, but to do this to achieve the common goals of mankind, to promote the development not only of their own abilities, but also the abilities and inclinations of other people, the progress of social institutions and, ultimately, the development of all mankind. This pragmatic picture, on the whole, is quite consistent with the utilitarian idea of the social nature of man (with the possible exception of Kant's ‘unsociableness’, for Mill does not have this dialectic). Mill's human being also strives for interaction with other people in order to achieve common happiness, since it is an important prerequisite for individual happiness, for individual happiness is impossible if it contradicts the common happiness. And for this, according to Mill, it is necessary to promote the intellectual development of other people, to raise the level of culture and civilization of society, and, ultimately, to promote the progress of all mankind (CW X, p. 232). At the same time, as in Kant's pragmatic anthropology, the public good and general happiness in Mill take priority over personal interests and individual happiness.

Based on these points in understanding the social nature of humans, in which Kant's pragmatism approaches the position of utilitarians, we can trace some further parallels in the socio-political views of Kant and Mill. In contrast to the more abstract moral cosmopolitanism, Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and Mill's political cosmopolitanism are more focused on practical day-to-day activities in real life rather than abstract human communities. And here the question arises of how a person can contribute to the progress and the common good of all mankind, still rather abstract, while being a member of a local community, one of the many people living on the planet. Is it possible to simultaneously be a member of a local community, be a patriot of your local homeland, nation, country, and at the same time perceive oneself as a ‘citizen of the world’ and a part of the whole of humanity? For Mill, the answer to this question is obvious: love for one's global homeland, for all of humanity, can and should be realized at the current stage of development through love for the fatherland, for one's country and people. Contributing to the development of their cultural, civilizing influence and the progress of other countries and peoples, can at the same time contribute to the development of all mankind (CW X, p. 232). However, Mill is far from the nationalism so popular in the 19th century, at least from the vulgar nationalism that implies a sense of superiority or even hatred towards other nations, and which he openly rejects. Instead he advocates in essence an ‘enlightened’ nationalism or patriotism, which is essentially a kind of ‘local cosmopolitanism’ preceding global ‘world’ cosmopolitanism.

It might seem that for Kant, who is considered being the classic of 18th century enlightened cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitanism ought to be incompatible with patriotism. But in fact this is not the case, and Kant succeeds quite well in combining both positions. First, Kant, like Mill, is opposed to vulgar nationalism, opposed to a 'national delusion' (*Nationalwahn*), as evidenced by his notes in *Reflexionen on Anthropology* (AA XV, Refl. 1353, p. 591). Secondly, in the *Metaphysics of Morals Vigilantus* (lecture notes to lectures he most likely gave in 1793-94) Kant essentially calls patriotism and cosmopolitanism just different varieties of love "for the entire human race", while the former is local and aimed at the national community and the latter is global and "directed to our common world ancestry". And, he says, "both are required of the cosmopolitan" (AA XXVII.2.1, p. 673-4). Thus, exactly as for Mill, patriotism and cosmopolitanism for Kant are essentially two sides of the same coin, a local and global form of love for all of humanity. At the same time, for both philosophers it is quite obvious that awareness of oneself as a 'citizen of the world', one's duties to all of humanity represents a higher level of development of the human mind (primarily social) in comparison with awareness of oneself as only a part of a local community. That is why Kant and Mill consider those enlightened peoples (almost exclusively European peoples) who are aware of their belonging to global humanity and strive to do something for its good as more developed peoples. Both philosophers are patriots and consider their own nations the most cosmopolitan in the world: Kant - the Germans, Mill - the British. These cosmopolitan nations should contribute to the development of other peoples and countries. They should introduce them to culture and civilization, involve them in their political influence - so that in the end all the peoples of the world can unite into a single political entity - a world confederation - members of which will be all the inhabitants of the planet.

In addition to many common conceptual features, Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and Mill's political cosmopolitanism share a number of separate prejudices with each other, which is especially evident in their assessment of other peoples⁵, that is in the combination of patriotism and cosmopolitanism inherent in both philosophers. However, this can hardly be considered the result of Mill's borrowing this combination of cosmopolitanism and patriotism from Kant or Kant's direct influence. In fact, the combination of patriotism, nationalism (and in the 18th century they were practically indistinguishable) and cosmopolitanism was quite common in the 18th century. As Pauline Kleingeld rightly points out in her article *Kant's Cosmopolitan Patriotism* (Kleingeld 2003, p. 305): "this patriotic cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitan patriotism was defended by a number of Kant's contemporaries": "by Wilhelm von Humboldt, Schiller, Novalis, and the Schlegel brothers", until pride in one's country turned into aggressive, or, in Mill's words, "vulgar" nationalism in the 19th century. In this sense, Mill, with his enlightened nationalism or patriotism, just followed Kant's and other cosmopolitan's steps, developing his patriotic concept of 'citizen of the world'.

4. Conclusion

Finally, the following brief conclusions should be noted. First of all, despite significant differences in their moral philosophies, Kant and Mill have many points of agreement in their socio-political thought. This is especially noticeable when comparing Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and Mill's patriotic cosmopolitanism. Pragmatic cosmopolitanism is one of the earliest varieties of Kant's cosmopolitanism, which appeared in Kant along with pragmatic problems at least from the beginning of the 1770s and developed through the rivalry between the concepts of 'man of the world' and 'citizen of the world' until the late period, with the disappearance of the former concept and gradual pragmatization and socialization of the later one. Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism shares with Mill's political cosmopolitanism the focus on achieving practical goals, benefits, and individual happiness, however, in both concepts of 'citizen of the world', the priority is not individual happiness, but public happiness, over and above which stands the happiness of all mankind. This means that in some sense Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism is somewhat utilitarian, and Mill's political cosmopolitanism is to some extent pragmatic.

Kant was not among those thinkers who directly influenced Mill's political philosophy. Unlike Kant's moral writings, we have no clear certainty that Mill was familiar with Kant's anthropological and political writings. However, conceptually, Kant's pragmatic cosmopolitanism and Mill's political cosmopolitanism are quite close and seem to rely on similar anthropological ideas, liberal and egalitarian in their nature. Therefore, we can assume at least an indirect influence of Kant on Mill, through the general set of ideas of the late Enlightenment, which were established in European socio-political thought under Kant's influence. The similarity of their socio-political views, liberal and cosmopolitan in essence, clearly demonstrates that the cosmopolitan tradition of the Enlightenment, most prominently expressed in the philosophy of Kant, continued to exist in the 19th century, although it was undergoing some transformations under the influence of the ideas of nationalism.

⁵ So, Kant, for example, sometimes mentioned colonial practices and slavery without a share of any criticism, as something quite natural and acceptable (see AA II, 438; AA VIII, 174; AA XXV, 362-5), and Mill justified imperialism and the colonial policy of the British Empire. Though it must be admitted that Mill's ideas were more modern from our point of view, he even actively supported the North American States in their war against the slave-owning south, while there is no record of whether Kant, for example, supported the revolution in Haiti (Cf. Salikov 2024, p. 66; Huseynzadegan 2024, p. 9; Zhavoronkov, Salikov 2018, p. 288; Kleingeld 2014, pp. 64-65).

5. References

- Borowski, L. (1804/1993). Darstellung des Lebens und Charakters Immanuel Kant's. Von Kant selbst genau revidirt und berichtigt (Königsberg: Nicolovius), in: Immanuel Kant: Sein Leben in Darstellungen von Zeitgenossen. Die Biographien von L. E. Borowski, R. B. Jachmann und E. A. Ch. Wasianski / Hrsg. von F. Gross, mit einer neuen Einleitung von R. Malter. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993 (1. Ausg. 1912).
- Cavallar, G. (2012). Cosmopolitanisms in Kant's philosophy. *Ethics & Global Politics*, 5(2), pp. 95-118.
- Delanty, G. (2008). The Cosmopolitan Imagination. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 82/83, pp. 217-230. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40586351>
- Fitzpatrick, J. R. (2006). *John Stuart Mill's political philosophy: balancing freedom and the collective good*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Huseinzadegan, D. (2024). Conjectures on Kant and the Haitian Revolution. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 62, pp. 72-81.
- Kant, I. (1900– [referred to as: AA]). *Gesammelte Schriften*. Academy edition. 29 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kant, I. (1991). *Kant's Political Writings*. Translated by. H.B. Nisbet, edited by Hans Reiss [second, enlarged edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (2007). *Anthropology, History, and Education*. Transl. and ed. by M. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufmann, E. (2003). The Rise of Cosmopolitanism in the 20th-century West: A Comparative-historical Perspective on the United States and European Union. *Global Society*, 17 (4), pp. 359-383.
- Kleingeld, P. (1999). Six varieties of cosmopolitanism in late eighteenth-century Germany. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 60(3), pp. 505-524.
- Kleingeld, P. (2003). Kant's Cosmopolitan Patriotism. *Kant-Studien*, 94, pp. 299-316.
- Kleingeld, P. (2014), "Kant's second thoughts on colonialism", in: K. Flikschuh, L. Ypi (eds.), *Kant and Colonialism: Historical and Critical Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. pp. 43-67.
- Kleingeld, Pauline and Eric Brown, "Cosmopolitanism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/cosmopolitanism/>>.
- Meinecke, F. (1970). *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*, trans. Robert B. Kimber. Princeton: Princeton University Press [orig. German ed. 1907].
- Mill, John Stuart (1963–1991) [referred to as: CW]. *The Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, general editor F.E.L. Priestley and subsequently John M. Robson, University of Toronto Press: Toronto and London, 33 vols. (Vol. I: Autobiography and Literary Essays (1981); II, III: Principles of Political Economy (1965); VI: Essays on England, Ireland and the Empire (1982); VII, VIII: A System of Logic: Ratiocinative and Inductive (1973); X: Essays on Ethics, Religion and Society (1969); XII, XIII: Earlier Letters, 1812–1848 (1962); XIV, XV, XVI, XVII: Later Letters, 1848–1873 (1972); XVIII, XIX: Essays on Politics and Society (1977); XX: Essays on French History and Historians (1985); XXI: Essays on Equality, Law and Education (1984); XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV: Newspaper Writings (1986); XXVIII, XXIX: Public and Parliamentary Speeches (1988); XXX: Writings on India (1990); XXXI: Miscellaneous Writings (1989); XXXII: Additional Letters (1991); XXXIII: Indexes to the Collected Works of John Stuart Mill (1991)).
- Plamenatz, J. P. (1949). *The English Utilitarians*. Oxford, 1949 [2nd edition, 1958], p.2.
- Robson, John M. (1968). *The Improvement of Mankind: the social and political thought of John Stuart Mill*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Salikov, A. (2020). Die politische Dimension der Anthropologie-Vorlesungen Kants. *Studies in the History of Philosophy*, 11(2), pp. 109-122.
- Salikov A. (2024). Kant's conception of race and contemporary political thought. *Con-Textos Kantianos* 20, pp. 63-71. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5209/kant.95658>
- Salikov, A. (2018). Some political aspects of Kant's Lectures on Anthropology. *Studia Philosophica Kantiana*, 1, pp. 3-17.
- Salikov, A., Sturm, T. & Zhavoronkov, A. (2025). World-Concepts in Kant's Anthropology: Their Meaning, Relations, and Roles. *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/agph-2024-0037>
- Varouxakis, G. (2008). Cosmopolitan patriotism in J.S. Mill's political thought and activism. In: Urbinati, N., & Zakaras, A. (Eds.). (2007). *J.S. Mill's political thought: a bicentennial reassessment*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 277-297.
- Varouxakis, G. (2002). *Mill on Nationality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Varouxakis, G. (2006). 'Patriotism', 'cosmopolitanism' and 'humanity' in Victorian political thought. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 5(1), pp. 100-118.
- Zhavoronkov, A., & Salikov, A. (2018). „The concept of race in Kant's Lectures on Anthropology”, *Con-Textos Kantianos: International Journal of Philosophy*, (7), pp. 275-292.