

KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF POLITICS

RETHINKING THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

Edited by
Luigi Caranti and Alessandro Pinzani



KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF POLITICS

This book examines the significance of Kant's political philosophy in the context of contemporary philosophical and political debates. In the last few decades, Kantian specialists have increasingly manifested a purely exegetic and philological interest in Kant's oeuvre, while contemporary philosophers and scientists tend to use Kant with scant hermeneutical care, thus misrepresenting or misunderstanding his positions. This volume countervails these tendencies by focusing more on specific themes of contemporary relevance in Kant's writings. It looks to Kant's political thought for insight on tackling issues such as freedom of speech, democracy and populism, intergenerational justice, economic inequality, money, poverty, international justice and gender/feminism.

Featuring readings by well-known Kant specialists and emerging scholars with unorthodox approaches to Kant's philosophy, the volume fills a significant gap in the existing scholarship on the philosopher and his works. It will be of great interest to scholars and researchers of philosophy, politics and ethics.

Luigi Caranti is Professor of Political Philosophy at the Università di Catania. He focuses on Kant, human rights, peace studies and distributive justice. Principal investigator of numerous EU-funded research projects, he is currently coordinating the Marie Curie Rise project "Kant in South America". Among his recent publications are *The Kantian Federation* (2022), (ed. with D. Celentano) *Paradigms of Justice: Redistribution, Recognition and Beyond* (2021) and *Kant's Political Legacy: Human Rights, Peace, Progress* (2017).

Alessandro Pinzani is Professor of Ethics and Political Philosophy at the Federal University of Santa Catarina, Florianópolis (Brazil), and, since 2006, a fellow researcher of CNPq (Brazilian Research Council). His publications include *Jürgen Habermas* (2007), *An den Wurzeln moderner Demokratie* (2009) and *Money, Autonomy, and Citizenship* (with W. Leão Rego, 2018).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

KANT AND THE PROBLEM OF POLITICS

Rethinking the Contemporary World

*Edited by Luigi Caranti and
Alessandro Pinzani*

First published 2023
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2023 selection and editorial matter, Luigi Caranti and Alessandro Pinzani; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Luigi Caranti and Alessandro Pinzani to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-0-367-47157-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-28940-3 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-03383-7 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003033837

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

CONTENTS

<i>List of contributors</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
<i>List of sigla</i>	xi
Introduction	1
LUIGI CARANTI AND ALESSANDRO PINZANI	
1 The practice of sovereignty: Kant on the duties of national and international citizenship	9
PAUL GUYER	
2 Kant <i>via</i> Rousseau against democracy	36
LUIGI CARANTI	
3 A Kantian idea of intergenerational justice	64
JOEL T. KLEIN	
4 Taking economic inequality seriously: Kantian views	87
NUNZIO ALÌ AND ALESSANDRO PINZANI	
5 “Money, money, money . . .”: some reflections on Kant and money	111
THOMAS MERTENS	
6 Kant on social suffering: vulnerability as moral and legal value	122
NURIA SÁNCHEZ MADRID	

CONTENTS

7	Transnationalism and popular sovereignty	137
	MACARENA MAREY	
8	Autonomy and practical reason in Kant and the feminist criticisms by Benhabib and Allen	155
	MONIQUE HULSHOF	
	<i>Index</i>	175

CONTRIBUTORS

Nunzio Ali is a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Political Science at the University of Catania, Italy. A former postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Political Science at the University of São Paulo, Brazil, he has a PhD in philosophy from Federal University of Santa Catarina, Brazil (2018). Ali is working on the book *How Rich Should the 1% Be? Proportional Justice and Economic Inequality* (forthcoming 2022).

Paul Guyer is the Jonathan Nelson Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at Brown University. He is the author of numerous works on Kant. His recent books include *Kant on the Rationality of Morality* (2019), *Reason and Experience in Mendelssohn and Kant* (2020) and *A Philosopher Looks at Architecture* (2021). He is also working on a book on the legacy of Kant's moral philosophy.

Monique Hulshof is Professor of Ethics at the University of Campinas (UNICAMP). She received her PhD from the University of São Paulo (USP) in 2011. She published the translation of the *Critique of Practical Reason* into Portuguese in 2016. She is a member of the Brazilian Kant Society's directive board and Editor of the journal *Studia Kantiana*. Her research interests are Kant's moral and political philosophy and feminist theory.

Joel T. Klein is Professor of Moral and Political Philosophy at the Federal University of Paraná, Brazil. He held a visiting scholarship at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin and a visiting professorship at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (2019–2020, with a grant from Alexander von Humboldt Foundation). His highlighted publications include: “Die Weltgeschichte im Kontext der Kritik der Urteils kraft” (Kant-Studien, 2013), “Kant on Legal Positivism and the Juridical State” (Kant Yearbook, 2021) and “On Serpents and Doves: The Systematic Relationship Between Prudence and Morality in Kant's Political Philosophy” (Kant-Studien, 2021).

Macarena Marey (Argentina) is Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Buenos Aires, Researcher at CONICET and Director of the

CONTRIBUTORS

Centre for Critical Studies and Philosophy of the Present (Institute of Philosophy, UBA). She specializes in social contract theories and contemporary theories of democracy. Her current research interests include political participation, secularism and neoconservatism. She has published in *Constellations*, *Kant-Studien*, *Isegoría*, *Problemas* and *Critical Horizons*, among other journals. Her latest books are *Teorías de la república y prácticas republicanas* (Herder, 2021) and *Voluntad omnilateral y finitud de la tierra* (Buenos Aires, 2021).

Thomas Mertens is Emeritus Professor of Legal Philosophy at Radboud University, The Netherlands. He published extensively on human rights, Kant's moral and legal philosophy (including several edited translations into Dutch) and law and morality during Nazism (with special attention to Gustav Radbruch).

Nuria Sánchez Madrid has a BA in philosophy (1996) and classical philology (2012) and PhD in philosophy (2000) and sciences of religion (2018) from the University Complutense of Madrid. Since 2000, she has been teaching at the Faculty of Philosophy (UCM) (since April 2019 as Associate Professor). From 2017, she coordinated the Complutense Research Group 970798 "Normativity, Emotions, Discourse and Society" (GINE-DIS). She is President of the Academic Society of Philosophy (Spain) from 2019 and Coordinator of the Latin-American, Portuguese and Spanish Network RIKEPS, supported by the AUIP from 2018. She is Associate Member of the Complutense Institute of Gender Studies and External Member of the CFUL of Lisbon, the Institute of Philosophy of Oporto, the PhD Philosophy Programme of the Univ. Roma Tre/Tor Vergata and the Group of Ethics and Political Philosophy of the UFRN (Brazil). Her key lines of research are history of philosophy and legal, political and social philosophy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Does Kant still have something to say to us after more than 200 years from the publication of his major works (the three *Critiques*, the *Groundwork*, the *Metaphysics of Morals*, the political writings and those on the philosophy of history)? Can his thinking still serve as a guide to navigate the turbulence of a globalized world, of an imprescriptible social reality in which moral values and ethical life models have lost their stability, while sciences – even the most exact ones – are painfully aware of the precarity of their foundations, and the borders between domestic and international issues are increasingly blurred?

The editors of these volumes are convinced that these questions are to be answered positively and that Kant remains a source of inspiration for dealing with the latest developments in areas that include ethics, politics and the theory of knowledge. Guided by this belief, we have invited Kant specialists from different backgrounds to discuss contemporary epistemological, moral and political issues from a Kantian perspective. Some have chosen to stay close to Kant's texts, and others have used his work merely as a source of inspiration; all of them, we believe, have shown how his critical philosophy retains a capacity for interpreting reality in salient ways and for offering solutions to our problems – be they new ones, which Kant himself could not foresee, or old ones, which have haunted humankind from its beginning.

Editing these volumes was a journey that began organically some years ago, first through personal conversations between us, then through common projects. The decisive pivot occurred during the 8th Multilateral Kant Congress, held in Catania October 11–13, 2018, which was in turn made possible by a grant from the European Commission that enabled a four-year-long structured cooperation between Kant scholars from Europe and South America (Marie Curie RISE n.777786 “Kant in South America”). The present book constitutes the main scientific output of that project. Its articulation in three volumes, devoted separately to knowledge, ethics and politics, reflects the three scientific work packages into which that

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

project was divided. Many of the authors who participated in this publication presented a first draft of their contributions in Catania, while others joined the project later. Our gratitude goes to all of them. Special thanks to Routledge and to our editor there, Aakash Chakrabarty, for believing in the validity of our idea and for being willing to publish the book despite its dimensions.

SIGLA

References to Kant's works follow the sigla reproduced in the following. The English translation is that of the Cambridge edition unless otherwise indicated by the authors.

Kant, Immanuel: Gesammelte Schriften Hrsg.: Bd. 1–22 Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Bd. 23 Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, ab Bd. 24 Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Berlin 1900ff.

AA	Akademie-Ausgabe
Anth	Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht (AA 07)
AP	Aufsätze, das Philanthropin betreffend (AA 02)
BDG	Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseins Gottes (AA 02)
Br	Briefe (AA 10–13)
DfS	Die falsche Spitzfindigkeit der vier syllogistischen Figuren erwiesen (AA 02)
DI	Meditationum quarundam de igne succincta delineatio (AA 02)
EaD	Das Ende aller Dinge (AA 08)
EACG	Entwurf und Ankündigung eines Collegii der physischen Geographie (AA 02)
EEKU	Erste Einleitung in die Kritik der Urteilskraft (AA 20)
Ethica (1763)	Ethica Philosophia (AA 27)
FBZE	Fortgesetzte Betrachtung der seit einiger Zeit wahrgenommenen Erderschütterungen (AA 01)
FEV	Die Frage, ob die Erde veralte, physikalisch erwogen (AA 01)
FM	Welches sind die wirklichen Fortschritte, die die Metaphysik seit Leibnizens und Wolff's Zeiten in Deutschland gemacht hat? (AA 20)
FM/Beylagen	
FM/Lose	Blätter FM: Beylagen (AA 20)
FM: Lose	Blätter (AA 20)
FRT	Fragment einer späteren Rationaltheologie (AA 28)

GAJFF	Gedanken bei dem frühzeitigen Ableben des Herrn Johann Friedrich von Funk (AA 02)
GMS	Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten (AA 04)
GNVE	Geschichte und Naturbeschreibung der merkwürdigsten Vorfälle des Erdbebens, welches an dem Ende des 1755ten Jahres einen großen Theil der Erde erschüttert hat (AA 01)
GSE	Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen (AA 02)
GSK	Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte (AA 01)
GUGR	Von dem ersten Grunde des Unterschiedes der Gegenden im Raume (AA 02)
HN	Handschriftlicher Nachlass (AA 14–23)
IaG	Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht (AA 08)
KpV	Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (AA 05)
KrV	Kritik der reinen Vernunft
KU	Kritik der Urteilskraft (AA 05)
Log	Logik (AA 09)
MAM	Mutmaßlicher Anfang der Menschheitsgeschichte (AA 08)
MAN	Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft (AA 04)
MoPh	Metaphysicae cum geometria iunctae usus in philosophia naturali, cuius specimen I. continet monadologiam physicam (AA 01)
MpVT	Über das Mißlingen aller philosophischen Versuche in der Theodicee (AA 08)
MS	Die Metaphysik der Sitten (AA 06)
RL	Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre (AA 06)
TL	Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Tugendlehre (AA 06)
MSI	De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principii (AA 02)
NEV	Nachricht von der Einrichtung seiner Vorlesungen in dem Winterhalbenjahre von 1765–1766 (AA 02)
NG	Versuch, den Begriff der negativen Größen in die Weltweisheit einzuführen (AA 02)
NLBR	Neuer Lehrbegriff der Bewegung und Ruhe und der damit verknüpften Folgerungen in den ersten Gründen der Naturwissenschaft (AA 02)
NTH	Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels (AA 01)
OP	Opus Postumum (AA 21 und 22)
Päd	Pädagogik (AA 09)
PG	Physische Geographie (AA 09)
PhilEnz	Philosophische Enzyklopädie (AA 29)
PND	Principiorum primorum cognitionis metaphysicae nova dilucidatio (AA 01)
Prol	Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik (AA 04)
Refl	Reflexion (AA 14–19)

RezHerder	Recensionen von J. G. Herders Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit (AA 08)
RezHufeland	Recension von Gottlieb Hufeland's Versuch über den Grundsatz des Naturrechts (AA 08)
RezMoscatis	Recension von Moscatis Schrift: Von dem körperlichen wesentlichen Unterschiede zwischen der Structur der Thiere und Menschen (AA 02)
RezSchulz	Recension von Schulz's Versuch einer Anleitung zur Sittenlehre für alle Menschen (AA 08)
RezUlrich	Kraus' Recension von Ulrich's Eleutheriologie (AA 08)
RGV	Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft (AA 06)
SF	Der Streit der Fakultäten (AA 07)
TG	Träume eines Geistersehers, erläutert durch die Träume der Metaphysik (AA 02)
TP	Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis (AA 08)
TW	Neue Anmerkungen zur Erläuterung der Theorie der Winde (AA 01)
UD	Untersuchung über die Deutlichkeit der Grundsätze der natürlichen Theologie und der Moral (AA 02)
ÜE	Über eine Entdeckung, nach der alle neue Kritik der reinen Vernunft durch eine ältere entbehrlich gemacht werden soll (AA 08)
ÜGTP	Über den Gebrauch teleologischer Principien in der Philosophie (AA 08)
UFE	Untersuchung der Frage, ob die Erde in ihrer Umdrehung um die Achse, wodurch sie die Abwechselung des Tages und der Nacht hervorbringt, einige Veränderung seit den ersten Zeiten ihres Ursprungs erlitten habe (AA 01)
VAEaD	Vorarbeit zu Das Ende aller Dinge (AA 23)
VAKpV	Vorarbeit zur Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (AA 23)
VAMS	Vorarbeit zur Metaphysik der Sitten (AA 23)
VAProl	Vorarbeit zu den Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik (AA 23)
VARGV	Vorarbeit zur Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft (AA 23)
VARL	Vorarbeit zur Rechtslehre (AA 23)
VASF	Vorarbeit zum Streit der Fakultäten (AA 23)
VATL	Vorarbeit zur Tugendlehre (AA 23)
VATP	Vorarbeit zu Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis (AA 23)
VAÜGTP	Vorarbeit zu Über den Gebrauch teleologischer Principien in der Philosophie (AA 23)

VAVT	Vorarbeit zu Von einem neuerdings erhobenen vornehmen Ton in der Philosophie (AA 23)
VAZeF	Vorarbeiten zu Zum ewigen Frieden (AA 23)
VBO	Versuch einiger Betrachtungen über den Optimismus (AA 02)
VKK	Versuch über die Krankheiten des Kopfes (AA 02)
VNAEF	Verkündigung des nahen Abschlusses eines Tractats zum ewigen Frieden in der Philosophie (AA 08)
V-Anth/Busolt	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1788/1789 Busolt (AA 25)
V-Anth/Collins	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1772/1773 Collins (AA 25)
V-Anth/Fried	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1775/1776 Friedländer (AA 25)
V-Anth/Mensch	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1781/1782 Menschenkunde, Petersburg (AA 25)
V-Anth/Mron	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1784/1785 Mrongovius (AA 25)
V-Anth/Parow	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1772/1773 Parow (AA 25)
V-Anth/Pillau	Vorlesungen Wintersemester 1777/1778 Pillau (AA 25)
V-Eth/Baumgarten	Baumgarten Ethica Philosophica (AA 27)
V-Lo/Blomberg	Logik Blomberg (AA 24)
V-Lo/Busolt	Logik Busolt (AA 24)
V-Lo/Dohna	Logik Dohna-Wundlacken (AA 24)
V-Lo/Herder	Logik Herder (AA 24)
V-Lo/Philippi	Logik Philippi (AA 24)
V-Lo/Pölitz	Logik Pölitz (AA 24)
V-Lo/Wiener	Wiener Logik (AA 24)
V-Mo/Collins	Moralphilosophie Collins (AA 27)
V- Mo/Kaehler(Stark)	Vorlesungen zur Moralphilosophie (hrsg. von Werner Stark, Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2004)
V-Mo/Mron	Moral Mrongovius (AA 27)
V-Mo/Mron II	Moral Mrongovius II (AA 29)
V-Met/Arnoldt	Metaphysik Arnoldt (K 3) (AA 29)
V-Met/Dohna	Metaphysik Dohna (AA 28)
V-Met/Heinze	Metaphysik L1 (Heinze) (AA 28)
V-Met/Herder	Metaphysik Herder (AA 28)
V-Met-K2/Heinze	Metaphysik K2 (Heinze, Schlapp) (AA 28)
V-Met-K3/Arnoldt	Metaphysik K3 (Arnoldt, Schlapp) (AA 28)
V-Met-K3E/Arnoldt	Ergänzungen Kant Metaphysik K3 (Arnoldt) (AA 29)
V-Met-L1/Pölitz	Metaphysik L1 (Pölitz) (AA 28)
V-Met-L2/Pölitz	Metaphysik L2 (Pölitz, Original) (AA 28)
V-Met/Mron	Metaphysik Mrongovius (AA 29)

V-Met-N/Herder	Nachträge Metaphysik Herder (AA 28)
V-Met/Schön	Metaphysik von Schön, Ontologie (AA 28)
V-Met/Volckmann	Metaphysik Volckmann (AA 28)
V-MS/Vigil	Die Metaphysik der Sitten Vigilantius (AA 27)
V-NR/Feyerabend	Naturrecht Feyerabend (AA 27)
V-PG	Vorlesungen über Physische Geographie (AA 26)
V-Phil-Th/Pölitz	Philosophische Religionslehre nach Pölitz (AA 28)
V-PP/Herder	Praktische Philosophie Herder (AA 27)
V-PP/Powalski	Praktische Philosophie Powalski (AA 27)
V-Th/Baumbach	Danziger Rationaltheologie nach Baumbach (AA 28)
V-Th/Pölitz	Religionslehre Pölitz (AA 28)
V-Th/Volckmann	Natürliche Theologie Volckmann nach Baumbach (AA 28)
VRML	Über ein vermeintes Recht, aus Menschenliebe zu lügen (AA08)
VT	Von einem neuerdings erhobenen vornehmen Ton in der Philosophie (AA 08)
VUB	Von der Unrechtmäßigkeit des Büchernachdrucks (AA 08)
VUE	Von den Ursachen der Erderschütterungen bei Gelegenheit des Unglücks, welches die westliche Länder von Europa gegen das Ende des vorigen Jahres betroffen hat (AA 01)
VvRM	Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen (AA 02)
WA	Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? (AA 08)
WDO	Was heißt sich im Denken orientiren? (AA 08)
ZeF	Zum ewigen Frieden (AA 08)



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

INTRODUCTION

Luigi Caranti and Alessandro Pinzani

Among all classical philosophers, Kant has arguably had the most impact on the political studies of the last fifty years. While the relevance of Kant's political thought has been firmly assessed only in the last decades, particularly in coincidence with the end of the Cold War, two major intellectual events paved the way for that conclusion. On the one hand, exactly fifty years ago John Rawls published *A Theory of Justice*, a largely Kant-inspired book that shaped the contents and methodology of the subsequent political philosophy. Targeting the aggregate approach typical of utilitarianism through a renewed contractarian methodology, the justice of fairness raised the question of how political authority should treat citizens taken as free and equal (and separate) individuals. In 1983, Michael Doyle used some ideas advanced by Kant in *Towards Perpetual Peace* to define and defend what has been called the theory of democratic peace, that is, the theory according to which democracies tend not to enter into armed conflicts with other democracies (Doyle 1983). After the fall of the Soviet bloc, liberal constitutional democracy, perhaps too quickly identified with the Kantian republic (Caranti 2016, 2017), was considered to have triumphed both over fascism (in World War II) and over state socialism (in the Cold War), and it did appear to represent the only viable political regime. It was furthermore claimed that all countries were fated to become liberal democracies sooner or later. Francis Fukuyama's notion of "the end of history" (1992) was vulgarized into the idea that the end of the Cold War would usher a new era in which an irresistible process of global democratization would lead to establishing a lasting period of peace and prosperity, fostered by increasing economic globalization. This hope would reveal itself illusory some years later (at latest after 9/11), but, in connection with the theory of democratic peace, it led to a renewed interest in Kant's project of perpetual peace, which was even considered to offer a blueprint for a democratic reform of the United Nations (Archibugi and Held 1995). In 1995, on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the publication of Kant's *Toward Perpetual Peace*, a number of publications dedicated to this work appeared in many countries and languages (Gerhardt 1995; Höffe 1995; Mori 1995; Marini 1995; Merkel and

Wittmann 1996; Bohman and Lutz-Bachman 1997). Most of them were not purely exegetic but stressed the opportunity to look at the Kantian project as a source of inspiration for concrete political action and reform.

One way to appreciate the centrality of Kant's thought is to say a bit more about his influence on the two major figures of contemporary political philosophy, John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas. Adding to what we said about *A Theory of Justice* (1971), one should not forget that *The Law of Peoples* (1999) is explicitly presented as a renewal of the Kantian project, which the American philosopher interpreted in light of two major hermeneutical orientations: 1) Kant remains well within an internationalist approach, with scant concession to cosmopolitanism, and 2) his (con)Federation of States is to be understood as a sort of club of republics/democracies potentially expanding in time to embrace all nation states (for a critical assessment of both claims, see Caranti 2018). Rawls took himself to be innovating over Kant in that the criteria for accessing "the club" are relaxed to make room for the good-enough, "decent" states. At the same time, "rogue states" – contrary to Kant's indication in the fifth preliminary article but perhaps in accordance with his account of the unjust enemy from §60 of *Metaphysics of Morals* – became legitimate targets of punitive intervention by the international community. Finally, intersecting the other major intellectual "Kantian" research plan of our times, Rawls contributed to have a "more precise idea of the democratic peace" (1999, pp. 48–51). Rawls listed five conditions of socio-economic justice that strengthen the mechanism underlying the first definitive article (republican citizens empowered to stop possible warlike tendencies by their leaders). Going over and above the mainstream interpretation of the democratic peace and, to a certain extent, innovating over Kant himself, Rawls introduced the all-important point that without important welfare devices such as public health care, public financing of campaigns and job assurance, liberal democratic people may very well fail to exercise the expected peace-promoting function.

The other leading figure of contemporary political philosophy, Jürgen Habermas, offered two important writings with compelling and interesting readings of Kant's model of peace. With insights from sociology and a keen awareness of the condition of world affairs post-1989, Habermas entered the debate among interpreters on the reasons Kant ultimately favors the "negative surrogate" of the league of nations over the more ambitious and apparently logically required solution of a world republic (Habermas 1998, 2006). Habermas argued that Kant and many of his interpreters start from a false alternative. Between the world "republic" defended in the 1793 "Theory and Practice" essay and the weak league of nations without coercive powers Kant comes to support from 1795 onwards, there is a neglected middle term that would accommodate Kant's cosmopolitan ambition without any risk of degeneration towards a global autarchy (the famous "soulless despotism"). Suggested by the experience we have "at two hundred

years remove” from Kant, this is “a politically constituted global society that reserves institutions and procedures of global governance for states at both the supra- and transnational levels” (Habermas 2006, p. 135). Major international organizations (UN, WTO, EU) exhibit a tendency, still in fieri, towards taming state power not through the monopoly of force of a supranational entity but through the progressive absorption of competencies previously reserved to the state. In other words, as Habermas puts it, the

democratic federal state writ large – the global state of nations or world republic – is the wrong model. No structural analogy exists between the constitution of a sovereign state that can determine what political competences it claims for itself (and hence possesses supreme constitutional authority), on the one hand, and the constitution of an inclusive world organization that is nevertheless restricted to a few, carefully circumscribed functions, on the other.
(2006, p. 134)

Needless to say, Habermas’s “third way” is itself problematic in a way that the German philosopher does not seem to realize with sufficient clarity. A world organization that reserves for itself certain competencies is constantly at risk of being denied by parties no longer willing to be members. With just over a decade’s vantage point from Habermas’s proposal (2006), we can now say that things like Brexit or Trump’s decision to withdraw from the global warming Paris Agreement expose the intrinsic weakness of Habermas’s idea of a “global domestic politics” without a world government. Still, Habermas’s reinterpretation of Kant’s league of states without coercive powers as something capable of evolving *functionally* towards stronger and more solid peace-promoting supranational institutions proves the point we are suggesting. Kant led Habermas to conceive of this interesting solution in which the binding factor for member states is not a coercive power but interdependencies at the economic, political and cultural levels that make abandoning the organization too costly.

The debate around Kant’s model of peace was just the beginning of a renewed interest in Kant’s political and legal thought as a whole. While in the second half of the 20th century, the *Doctrine of Right* had been the object only of a major work in English (Gregor 1963) and of some specialized monographs in German, mostly focused on Kant’s concept of private property (Saage 1973; Kühl 1984), after 1997 (the 200th anniversary of the publication of this work), a growing number of commentaries and monographs were dedicated to Kant’s legal theory, starting from the pioneering Höffe (1999), followed by the comprehensive essay by Ripstein, “Force and Freedom” (2009), and the commentary by Byrd and Hruschka (2010). Nowadays, after a very long period of oblivion (caused by the uncritically widespread perception that they represented minor works whose coherence

had been severely doubted given Kant's old age), both the *Doctrine of Right* and the *Doctrine of Virtue* have become two standard works in academic syllabi and a frequent object of study for scholars (not only for Kantian specialists but also for law theorists and ethicists at large). At the same time, this renaissance of Kant's legal and political thought has provoked interest in other works, like *Theory and Praxis* and his writings on the philosophy of history, which have come to be read within the wider context of Kant's political philosophy.

Discussions focused on the metaphysical principles underlying Kant's conception, on the relation between the political and the ethical and on the architectonic of the system in general have not been carried out at the expenses of analyses more geared towards specific issues of great relevance for contemporary politics. Examples of this more practical orientation are Lucy Allais's essay on giving to beggars, Konstantin Pollok's recent work on Kant and climate ethics and Sarah Holtman on Kant and the welfare state. The chapters collected in this volume square more with this second orientation. Our contributors' different readings often reflect their interest in specific issues. This generates what – we believe – makes our volume of special importance. The focus is on political topics that are of current relevance. To give a list that follows the order of contributions, we have: freedom of speech, democracy and populism, intergenerational justice, economic inequality, money, poverty, international justice and gender/feminism. All of these works are based on a thorough analysis of Kant's text from which scholars elaborate originally either on topics and themes that the German philosopher did not treat specifically or that he did cover but to arrive at considerably different conclusions.

In his chapter, Paul Guyer discusses two different meanings of the concept of sovereignty in Kant's political thought. The first one refers to popular sovereignty as it is exerted through representatives in a republic; the second one refers to national sovereignty as exposed in the pages on the *ius gentium* (the law of peoples) and in the project for perpetual peace. Guyer insists on the central role that free speech plays in both kinds of sovereignty. On the domestic level, individuals must have the right to petition in order to move their government to revise their decisions (correspondingly, governments have a duty to respond and to address the people's grievance). Free speech serves here as an instrument for concretely exerting sovereignty, that is, for creating laws in the name of the people. On the international level, free speech becomes the basis for grounding the necessity of a right of diplomatic representation. Diplomatic representatives play a role not only within the context of the *ius gentium* but also when it comes to the application of what Kant understands as cosmopolitan right, that is, the right that regulates the relation between individuals and foreign governments. Guyer aims not only to reconstruct Kant's position with regard to these issues but also to make a more general exegetic point regarding the fact that, despite its metaphysical

character, “Kant’s political philosophy rests on incontrovertible but empirical assumptions as well as *a priori* principles”, as other authors in the volume also defend.

Luigi Caranti’s chapter focuses on Kant’s criticism of democracy, which, Kant warns, is not to be conflated with the republic. While interpreters usually settle on the appeasing view that Kant could not be an enemy of democracy but only of its controversial direct version, Caranti argues that this view conceals the great value of Kant’s analysis. In this new reading, the problem Kant identifies has to do with the tendency, peculiar to democratic systems, to legitimize an opportunistic approach to political life in which citizens are not only allowed but encouraged to voice and protect their individual or group interests through the exercise of their share of political power. In contrast, the republican attitude presupposes that whoever rules takes up what Caranti calls “the burden of representation”, that is, the responsibility to make decisions from the perspective of the general will. Interpreted in this way, Kant’s criticism appears to convey an important lesson for contemporary democratic theory and reveals where one should intervene to prevent the degeneration of democratic systems towards the populist forms of despotism that we have been experiencing in this historical phase.

Joel T. Klein’s chapter represents a direct attempt at looking in Kant’s writings for arguments that might help us to tackle contemporary problems, in this case, questions of intergenerational justice and of duties towards future generations, particularly – but not exclusively – with regard to environmental issues. In doing so, Klein identifies “two different, yet complementary perspectives”. The first one is genuinely Kantian insofar as it has metaphysical character. Klein insists on the advantage of such a perspective when it comes to discussing the normative claims of rightsholders who do not yet exist, as in the case of future generations, and whose “physical, biological and cultural characteristics” as well as preferences, interests and desires are totally unknown to us. The second perspective, too, is genuinely Kantian insofar as it recurs to Kant’s philosophy of history in the attempt to find “a single and coherent practical and historical meaning” in the history of humankind from a cosmopolitan perspective. It is this philosophy of history that, according to Klein, offers the normative context within which it is possible to develop a conception of intergenerational justice based on a metaphysical concept of right.

A similar attempt at looking for normative arguments in Kant’s metaphysical philosophy of right can be found in the chapter by Alessandro Pinzani and Nunzio Alì. They discuss the relation between economic and political inequality both in Kant’s writings and in general terms. According to many interpreters (and to both authors), Kant’s treatment of this issue is unsatisfactory, since it leads to creating a two-tiered society through the notorious distinction between active and passive citizens; for this reason, it has been proposed to either consider this distinction incoherent with the republican

view defended by Kant or to give a more charitable reading of the notion of independence on which it is based. Pinzani and Alì follow both suggestions and elaborate on four resulting strategies that, taking Kant as their starting point, lead to formulating four different ways of thinking about the relation between economic inequality and political participation in general. The first strategy coincides with the position of both libertarianism and classical liberalism: it claims that one should not tie political representation to economic independence while at the same time defending that economic inequality is politically irrelevant; the second one tries to keep economy and politics apart but, nonetheless, differently from the first strategy, aims to establish some form of economic equality. These two strategies simply reject Kant's position on the relation between economic independence and political participation. The last two ones, on the contrary, take Kant's argument seriously but interpret it as a claim for granting every individual the possibility to become economically independent (and so an active citizen). The third one, which they call "neoclassical liberalism", is not interested in economic equality, though, while the fourth one, which aims for a "structural dispersion of private ownership", claims that political equality presupposes a certain degree of economic equality. The authors' sympathy clearly goes to the last strategy.

Thomas Mertens explores a theme that is not very much present in Kant and, consequently, has been quite neglected by Kantian interpreters: money. Mertens collects Kant's remarks on money that are scattered through his oeuvre, particularly in his moral and legal philosophy and in his writings on anthropology. He then refers to Aristotle's distinction between "natural" and "unnatural" forms of economic activities and, based on Aristotle's ethical negative judgment on the latter form (which is called chrematistics), he tries to come to a better understanding of Kant's condemnation of greed that, nonetheless, leaves space for great economic inequality (as we have seen in Pinzani and Alì's chapter). Mertens is well aware of the limits of Kant's position with regard to money; nevertheless, he is convinced that we can learn something from it when it comes to reflecting on the meaning and the final goal of a modern economy, in which money (as well as the desire for it) plays a crucial role.

In her chapter, Nuria Sánchez Madrid critically discusses Kant's views on poverty and on social vulnerability. Do poor people have a legal claim to receive public support? Do they have a moral right to private charity? Is a basic income for needy citizens justifiable from a Kantian perspective? First and foremost, however, how can "the little and cold attention that Kant devotes to the poor of the earth" be reconciled with the value that he attributes to human dignity? Sanchez Madrid finds Kant's answers to these questions unsatisfactory in the context of the section on public right in the *Doctrine of Right* and in the section on beneficence in the *Doctrine of Virtue*. Therefore, she looks elsewhere in his legal and political theory for mechanisms aimed at relieving social suffering, and she finds them in the

context of Kant's cosmopolitan philosophy. Accordingly, individuals have as *Erdbewohner*, as inhabitants of Earth, an equal social right.

Macarena Marey defends that Kant's conception of popular sovereignty can be a useful tool in the attempt to build what she calls a "transnational" system of Right as opposed to an international one. She chooses this term to refer to the way in which Kant thinks of state right, law of peoples and cosmopolitan right as forming a complex system of interrelated forms of right. Focusing exclusively on the domestic level would mean missing the systematic character of Kant's theory of law. By taking into account the interaction of the different layers of right, a new political subject arises: a complex community formed by different communities across borders. Correspondingly, new forms of collective praxis are conceivable, ones that might counteract the existing asymmetries of power among states and which manifest themselves primarily in imperialism and colonialism.

Monique Hulshof uses criticism that feminist thinkers have advanced against Kant's concepts of practical reason and autonomy as the starting point of her text. In particular, she focuses on Seyla Benhabib and Amy Allen. According to Hulshof, the former suggests modifying these concepts in order to make them more inclusive, although they remain Kantian in spirit, even in this reformulation. Allen is more radical in her critique, particularly with regard to the notion of autonomy. Both authors agree, however, in claiming that Kant excludes women from his conception of practical reason and autonomy. Hulshof proposes that we go back to the Kantian text to verify whether this is really the case. She suggests that the two concepts are not so formal, abstract and insensitive to gender as claimed by Benhabib and Allen. Kant's supreme principle of morality itself is not as formal as it might appear on a first reading, as it demands that subjects assume a connection to a context in which the others play an essential role. There is therefore a collective and intersubjective dimension of the will that critics do not consider satisfactorily. Furthermore, Hulshof claims that both our practical reason and our capacity to judge moral actions must be developed and exercised "under historical and empirical circumstances", principally through interaction with other agents. Kant's practical reason has therefore a dialogical dimension that many critics (among them Habermas, whom Allen follows in her criticism) have not perceived. This dialogical aspect becomes particularly evident in Kant's writings on politics, right and history, in which he describes practical reason as a faculty that goes through a historical development involving not only individuals but different generations. In the second part of her chapter, Hulshof discusses Kant's sexist claims concerning women's incapacity to fully use reason. She first observes that these claims are connected to the use of reason under historical and empirical circumstances. Second, she suggests that Kant's position represents more a concession to common views on male domination than a necessary element of his conception of practical reason.

From this short summary, it can be evinced that Kant's practical thought still has much to say when it comes to discussing contemporary issues. We are convinced that the chapters collected in this volume give evidence of this.

References

- Archibugi, D. and Held, D. (eds.). 1995. *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. New York: Polity
- Bohman J. and Lutz-Bachman, M. (eds.). 1997. *Perpetual Peace. Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT University Press.
- Byrd, B. S. and Hruschka, J. 2010. *Kant's Doctrine of Right. A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Caranti, L. 2016. "Kantian Peace and Liberal Peace: Three Concerns." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 24 (4): 446–469.
- Caranti, L. 2017. *Kant's Politics Today. Human Rights, Peace, Progress*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Caranti, L. 2018. "The Kantian Federation: Two Hermeneutical Problems." In H. Klemme and A. Falduto (eds.), *Kant und seine Kritiker*. New York: Olms Weidemann, Hildesheim Zuerich, pp. 347–362.
- Doyle, M. W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12/I: 205–235 and 12/II: 323–353.
- Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Gerhardt, V. 1995. *Immanuel Kants Entwurf "Zum ewigen Frieden". Eine Theorie der Politik*. Darmstadt: WBG.
- Gregor, M. J. 1963. *Laws of Freedom: A Study of Kant's Method of Applying the Categorical Imperative in the Metaphysik der Sitten*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Habermas, J. 1998. *The Inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. 2006. *The Divided West*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Höffe, O. (Hg.) 1995. *Immanuel Kant. Zum ewigen Frieden*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag
- Höffe, O. (Hg.) 1999. *Immanuel Kant: Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre*. Berlin: Akademie
- Kühl, K. 1984. *Eigentumsordnung als Freiheitsordnung. Zur Aktualität der Kantischen Rechts- und Eigentumslehre*. Freiburg: Alber.
- Marini, G. 1995. "Il diritto cosmopolitico nel progetto kantiano per la pace perpetua con particolare riferimento al secondo articolo definitivo." *Studi Kantiani*, 8: 87–112.
- Merkel, R. and Wittmann, R. (eds.). 1996. *Zum Ewiger Frieden. Grundlagen, Aktualität und Aussichten einer Idee von Immanuel Kant*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Mori, M. 1995. "Pace perpetua e pluralità degli stati in Kant." *Studi Kantiani*, 8: 113–137.
- Saage, R. 1973. *Eigentum, Staat und Gesellschaft bei Immanuel Kant*. Stuttgart Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ripstein, A. 2009. *Force and Freedom*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Introduction

- Archibugi, D. and Held, D. (eds.). 1995. *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. New York: Polity.
- Bohman J. and Lutz-Bachman, M. (eds.). 1997. *Perpetual Peace. Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT University Press.
- Byrd, B. S. and Hruschka, J. 2010. *Kant's Doctrine of Right. A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caranti, L. 2016. "Kantian Peace and Liberal Peace: Three Concerns." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 24 (4): 446–469.
- Caranti, L. 2017. *Kant's Politics Today. Human Rights, Peace, Progress*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Caranti, L. 2018. "The Kantian Federation: Two Hermeneutical Problems." In H. Klemme and A. Falduto (eds.), *Kant und seine Kritiker*. New York: Olms Weidemann, Hildesheim Zuerich, pp. 347–362.
- Doyle, M. W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12/I: 205–235 and 12/II: 323–353.
- Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Gerhardt, V. 1995. *Immanuel Kants Entwurf "Zum ewigen Frieden". Eine Theorie der Politik*. Darmstadt: WBG.
- Gregor, M. J. 1963. *Laws of Freedom: A Study of Kant's Method of Applying the Categorical Imperative in the Metaphysik der Sitten*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Habermas, J. 1998. *The Inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. 2006. *The Divided West*. Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Höffe, O. (Hg.) 1995. *Immanuel Kant. Zum ewigen Frieden*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Höffe, O. (Hg.) 1999. *Immanuel Kant: Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Rechtslehre*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Kühl, K. 1984. *Eigentumsordnung als Freiheitsordnung. Zur Aktualität der Kantischen Rechts- und Eigentumslehre*. Freiburg: Alber.
- Marini, G. 1995. "Il diritto cosmopolitico nel progetto kantiano per la pace perpetua con particolare riferimento al secondo articolo definitivo." *Studi Kantiani*, 8: 87–112.
- Merkel, R. and Wittmann, R. (eds.). 1996. *Zum Ewiger Frieden. Grundlagen, Aktualität und Aussichten einer Idee von Immanuel Kant*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.
- Mori, M. 1995. "Pace perpetua e pluralità degli stati in Kant." *Studi Kantiani*, 8: 113–137.
- Saage, R. 1973. *Eigentum, Staat und Gesellschaft bei Immanuel Kant*. Stuttgart Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ripstein, A. 2009. *Force and Freedom*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

The practice of sovereignty

- Anderson-Gold, S. 2001. *Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Brandt, R. 1982. "Das Erlaubnisgesetz, oder: Vernunft und Geschichte in Kants Rechtslehre." In Reinhard Brandt (ed.), *Rechtsphilosophie der Aufklärung*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 233–285.
- Byrd, B. S. and Hruschka, J. 2010. *Kant's Doctrine of Right: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caranti, L. 2017a. *Kant's Political Legacy: Human Rights, Peace, Progress*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Caranti, L. 2017b. "How Cosmopolitanism Reduces Conflict. Narrow and Broad Readings of Kant's Third Ingredient for Peace." *Journal of International Political Theory*, 14 (1): 1–18.

- Caranti, L. 2018. "The Kantian Federation: Two Hermeneutical Problems." In Heiner Klemme and Antonino Falduto (eds.). *Kant und seine Kritiker*. Hildesheim: Olms, pp. 347–362.
- Carson, T. 1988. "Perpetual Peace: What Kant Should Have Said." *Social Theory and Practice*, 14: 173–214.
- Cavallar, G. 2015. *Kant's Embedded Cosmopolitanism: History, Philosophy, and Education for World Citizens*. Kant-Studien Ergänzungsheft 183. Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dodson, K. 1993. "Kant's Perpetual Peace: Universal Civil Society or League of States?" *Southwest Philosophical Studies* 15: 1–9.
- Ferguson, A. 1995. *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*. Edited by Fania Oz-Salzberger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guyer, P. 1997. "Kantian Foundations for Liberalism." *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik/Annual Review of Law and Ethics* 5: 121–140; reprinted in Guyer 2000, 235–261.
- Guyer, P. 1998. "Life, Liberty, and Property: Kant and Rawls." In Dieter Hüning and Burkhard Tuschlings (eds.). *Recht, Staat, und Völkerrecht bei Kant*. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, pp. 273–291. Reprinted in Guyer 2000, 262–286.
- Guyer, P. 2000. *Kant on Freedom, Law, and Happiness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guyer, P. 2002. "Kant's Deductions of the Principles of Right." In Mark Timmons (ed.). *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 23–64. Reprinted in Guyer, *Kant's System of Nature and Freedom*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005, pp. 198–242.
- Guyer, P. 2006. "The Possibility of Perpetual Peace." In Luigi Caranti (ed.). *Kant's Perpetual Peace: New Interpretative Essays*. Rome: LUISS University Press, pp. 161–181.
- Guyer, P. 2016a. "The Twofold Morality of Recht." *Kant-Studien* 107: 34–63.
- Guyer, P. 2016b. "Setting and Pursuing Ends: Internal and External Freedom." In Guyer, *Virtues of Freedom: Selected Essays on Kant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 87–104.
- Guyer, P. 2020. "Achenwall, Kant, and the Division of Governmental Powers." In Margit Ruffing, Annika Schlitte, and Gianluca Sadun Bordoni (eds.). *Kant's Naturrecht Feyerabend*. Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 201–228.
- Kames, H. Home, Lord. 2007. *Sketches of the History of Man*, enlarged edition (London, A. Strahan and T. Cadell, and Edinburgh: William Creech, 1788), edited with an introduction by James A. Harris. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Kant, I. 1996. *Practical Philosophy*. Edited by Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kleingeld, P. 2006. "Kant's Theory of Peace." In Paul Guyer (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 477–504.
- Kleingeld, P. 2012. *Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 2019. *The Cosmopolitan Tradition: A Noble but Flawed Ideal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- O'Neill, O. 2015. "Cosmopolitanism Then and Now." In O. O'Neill (ed.). *Constructing Authorities: Reason, Politics and Interpretation in Kant's Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 199–213.
- Pippin, R. 2006. "Mine and Thine? The Kantian State." In Paul Guyer (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 416–446.
- Ripstein, A. 2009. *Force and Freedom: Kant's Legal and Political Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rossi, P. J. 2019. *The Ethical Commonwealth in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, A. W. 2014. *The Free Development of Each: Studies on Freedom, Right, and Ethics in Classical German Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kant via Rousseau against democracy

- Achen, C. H. and Bartels, L. M. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ackerman, B. 1991. *We, the People*: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bell, D. A. 2015. *The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berlin, I. 1997. "Two Concepts of Liberty." In H. Harder (ed.). *The Proper Study of Mankind*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Bertram, C. 2010. "Jean Jacques Rousseau." In *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. Stanford University. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/>.
- Bessette, J. 1994. *The Mild Voice of Reason: Deliberative Democracy and American National Government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brennan, J. 2016. *Against Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brito Vieira, M. 2017. *Reclaiming Representation. Contemporary Advances in the Theory of Political Representation*. New York London: Routledge.
- Brown, C. 1992. "'Really Existing Liberalism' and International Order." *Millennium*, 21 (3): 313–328.
- Byrd, B. S. and Hruschka, J. 2010. *Kant's Doctrine of Right: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caranti, L. 2012. "Kant's Theory of Human Rights." In T. Cushman (ed.). *Handbook of Human Rights*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, pp. 35–44.
- Cavallar, G. 2001. "Kantian Perspectives on Democratic Peace: Alternatives to Doyle." *Review of International Studies*, 27 (2): 229–248.
- Christiano, T. 2015. "Self-Determination and the Human Right to Democracy." In R. Cruft, M. S. Liao and M. Renzo (eds.). *Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 459–480.
- Colon-Rios, J. I. 2016. "Rousseau, Theorist of Constituent Power." *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 36 (4): 885–908.
- Dagger, R. 1997. *Civic Virtues. Rights, Citizenship and Republican Liberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, R. 1989. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. 1990. *Discursive Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryzek, J. S. 2000. *Deliberative Democracy and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elster, J. 1997. "The Market and the Forum: Three Varieties of Political Theory." In J. Bohman and W. Rehg (eds.). *Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 3–34.
- Estlund, D. 2009. "Debate: On Christiano's The Constitution of Equality." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 17: 241–252.
- Fishkin, J. S. 1991. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fishkin, J. S. 1995. *The Voice of the People: Public Opinion and Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Galston W. 1991. *Liberal Purposes. Goods, Virtues and Diversity in The Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodin, R. E. 2003. *Reflective Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hanisch, C. 2016. "Kant on Democracy." *Kant-Studien*, 107 (1): 64–88.
- Höffe, O. 1983. *Immanuel Kant*. München: Beck..
- Holmes, S. 1993. *The Anatomy of Antiliberalism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kleingeld, P. 1995. *Fortschritt und Vernunft: Zur Geschichtsphilosophie Kants*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann..
- Kleingeld, P. 1999. "Kant, History, and the Idea of Moral Development." *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 16: 59–80.
- Macedo, S. 1990. *Liberal Virtues. Citizenship, Virtue and Community in Liberal Constitutionalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Macedo, S. 1992. "Charting Liberal Virtues". In J. Chapman and W. Galston (eds.). *Virtue*. New York: New York University Press, 204–232.
- Mali, R. 2009. "Acting through Others: Kant and the Exercise View of Representation." *Public Reason*, 1 (1): 9–26.

- Manin, B. 1997. *The Principles of Representative Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, J. 1980. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. New York: Basic.
- Mansbridge, J. (ed.). 1990. *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marini, F. 1967. "Popular Sovereignty but Representative Government: The Other Rousseau." *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, 11 (4): 451–470.
- Maus, I. 1992. *Zur Aufklärung der Demokratietheorie: Rechts- und demokratietheoretische Überlegungen im Anschluß an Kant*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Mill, J. S. 1991. "Considerations on Representative Government." In J. Gray (ed.). *On Liberty and Other Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peter, F. 2015. "A Human Right to Democracy?" In R. Cruft, M. S. Liao and M. Renzo (eds.). *Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 481–490.
- Petit, P. 1999. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pinzani A. 2005. "Repubblicanesimo e democrazia liberale: un binomio inconciliabile?" In: *Annali del Dipartimento di Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze 2003–2004*, Firenze: Firenze University Press, pp. 299–315.
- Pinzani, A. 2008. "Representation in Kant's Political Theory." In J. Joerden, S. Byrd, and J. Hruschka (Hrsgs.), *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik 16*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, pp. 203–226.
- Pinzani, A. and Sanchez Madrid, N. 2016. "The State Looks Down. Some Reassessments of Kant's Appraisal of Citizenship." In: A. Pinzani, A. Faggion and N. Sanchez Madrid (eds.). *Kant and Social Policies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 25–47.
- Pitkin, H. F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rawls, J. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Richardson, Henry S. 2002. *Democratic Autonomy: Public Reasoning About the Ends of Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ripstein, A. 2009. *Force and Freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rousseau, J. J. 1973a. "Discourse on Political Economy." In J. J. Rousseau (ed.). *The Social Contract and the Discourses*. New York: Everyman's Library..
- Rousseau, J. J. 1973b. "On the Social Contract." In J. J. Rousseau (ed.). *The Social Contract and the Discourses*. New York: Everyman's Library..
- Schumpeter, J. A. 1947. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Strauss, D. 1992. "The Liberal Virtues." In J. Chapman and W. Galston (eds.). *Virtue*. New York: New York University Press, 197–203.
- Urbinati, N. 2000. "Representation as Advocacy. A Study of Democratic Deliberation." *Political Theory*, 28 (6): 758–786.
- Viroli, M. 1999. *Repubblicanesimo*. Roma: Laterza.
- Young, I. M. 1997. "Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy." In I. M. Young (ed.). *Intersecting Voices*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 60–74.
- Young, I. M. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A Kantian idea of intergenerational justice

- Arendt, H. 1982. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Beckerman, W. 2006. "The Impossibility of a Theory of Intergenerational Justice." In J. C. Tremmel (ed.). *Handbook of Intergenerational Justice*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 53–71.
- Caranti, L. 2017. *Kant's Political Legacy: Human rights, Peace, Progress*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Dierksmeier, C. 2006. "John Rawls and the Rights of Future Generations." In J. C. Tremmel (ed.). *Handbook of Intergenerational Justice*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 72–85.
- Fackenheim, E. L. 1956/57. "Kant's Concept of History." *Kant-Studien*, 48: 381–398.
- Flikschuh, K. 2000. *Kant and Modern Political Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galston, W. A. 1975. *Kant and the Problem of History*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Hill, T. E. 1992. *Dignity and Practical Reason in Kant's Moral Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Höffe, O. 2006. *Kant's Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Hruschka, J. 2004. "The Permissive Law of Practical Reason in Kant's *Metaphysics of Morals*." *Law and Philosophy* 23: 45–72.
- Huxley, A. 2006. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper.
- Kersting, W. 2007. *Wohlgeordnete Freiheit. Immanuel Kants Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie*, 3. erweiterte und durchgesehene Auflage, Paderborn: Mentis.
- Klein, J. T. 2014. "A relação entre ética e direito na filosofia política de Kant." *Manuscrito*, 37: 161–210.
- Klein, J. T. 2015. "Freedom of the Press: a Kantian Approach." *Estudos Kantianos*, 3: 83–92.
- Klein, J. T. 2016. "Kant and Public Education for Enhancing Moral Virtue: The Necessary Conditions for Ensuring Enlightened Patriotism." In A. Faggion, N. Sanchez Madrid, and A. Pinzani (eds.). *Kant and Social Policies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 149–174.
- Klein, J. T. 2017. "Considerações Críticas Acerca do Libertarianismo de Nozick à Luz da Filosofia Moral Kantiana." *Revista Latinoamericana de Filosofia*, 4: 65–104.
- Klein, J. T. 2018. "Kant and Constant: A Reassessment on An Alleged Right to Lie from Philanthropy." In A. Falduto and H. Klemme (eds.). *Kant und seiner Kritiker – Kant and His Critics*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag, pp. 99–112.
- Klein, J. T. 2019a. "Kant e o Valor Moral da Democracia Representativa." *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 75: 667–694.
- Klein, J. T. 2019b. "Kant's Constitution of a Moral Image of the World." *Kriterion*, 60: 103–125.
- Klein, J. T. 2021b. "Kant on Legal Positivism and the Juridical State." *Kant Yearbook*, 13: 73–105.
- Klein, J. T. 2021a. "On Serpents and Doves: The Systematic Relationship between Prudence and Morality in Kant's Political Philosophy." *Kant-Studien* 112 (1): 1–27.
- Klein, J. T. 2022, (preview / forthcoming). "Permissive Laws and Teleology in Kant's Juridical and Political Philosophy." *Kantian Review*, 27: 1–22.
- Kleingeld, P. 2012. *Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louden, R. 2018. "The A Priori in Ethics: Why Does Kant Want It? (And Do We Need It?)" In R. B. Louden, U. Rancan de Azevedo Marques and L. Ribeiro dos Santos (eds.). *Thinking (the) A Priori: Theme and Variations*. Editorial de Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências da UNESP.
- Lumer, Ch. 2006. "Principles of Intergenerational Justice." In J. C. Tremmel (ed.). *Handbook of Intergenerational Justice*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 39–52.
- Maus, I. 1994. *Zur Aufklärung der Demokratietheorie: rechts- und demokratietheoretische Überlegungen im Anschluss an Kant*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Medicus, F. 1902. "Kants Philosophie der Geschichte." *Kant-Studien*, 7: 1–22 and 171–229.
- Mertens, T. 2019. "Bona Fama Defuncti in Kant's Rechtslehre: Some Perspectives." *Kantian-Review*, 24: 513–529.
- Nozick, R. 2008. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Orwell, G. 2003. *Nineteen Eighty-four*. New York: Plume.
- Pinzani, A. 2017. "Beati Possidentes? Kant on Inequality and Poverty." *ethic@*, 16: 475–492.
- Plato. 1963. *The Republic* (Vol. 2). London: Heinemann.
- Rawls, J. 1972. *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ripstein, A. 2009. *Force and Freedom: Kant's Legal and Political Philosophy*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Sanchez Madrid, N. 2013. "Private Property and a Priori General United Will in Kant's Rechtslehre. Some Troubles with Kant's Alleged Foundation of Liberalism." *Studia Kantiana*, 15: 103–120.
- Sensen, O. 2011. *Kant on Human Dignity*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Stern, P. 1986. "The Problem of History and Temporality in Kantian Ethics." *Review of Metaphysics*, 39: 505–545.
- Westphal, K. R. 2002. "A Kantian Justification of Possession." In Mark Timmons (ed.). *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals: Interpretative Essays*. Oxford: University Press, pp. 89–110.

Taking economic inequality seriously

- Ackerman, B. and Alstott, A. 1999. *The Stakeholder Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Alperovitz, G. 2004. *America Beyond Capitalism: Reclaiming Our Wealth, Our Liberty and Our Democracy*. New York: Wiley.
- Atkinson, A. 2015. *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowles, S. 2012. *The New Economics of Inequality and Redistribution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrd, S. ; Hruschka, J. 2010. *Kant's Doctrine of Right. A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edmundson, W. 2017. *John Rawls: Reticent Socialist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edmundson, W. 2019. "What Are 'The Means of Production'?" *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 28 (4): 1–17.
- Faggion, A. and Pavão, A. 2016. "Kant For and Against Human Rights." In A. Faggion , A. Pinzani and N. Sanchez Madrid (eds.). *Kant and Social Policies*. London: Palgrave and Macmillan, pp. 49–64.
- Federici, S. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch. Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn, NY: Autonomedia.
- Freeman, S. 2007. *Rawls*. London: Routledge.
- Freeman, S. 2009. "Consequentialism, Publicity, Stability and Property-Owning Democracy." In S. Freeman (ed.). *Justice and the Social Contract: Essays on Rawlsian Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 75–109.
- Freeman, S. 2011. "Capitalism in the Classical and High Liberal Traditions." *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 28: 19–55.
- Gilens, M. and Page, B. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics*, 12 (3): 564–581.
- Graeber, D. 2012. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. New York: Melville House.
- Hayek, F. A. von . 2001. *The Road to Serfdom*. London: Routledge.
- Hayek, F. A. von . 2012. *Law, Legislation and Liberty: A New Statement of the Liberal Principles of Justice and Political Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Holtman, S. 2018. *Kant on Civil Society and Welfare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. 1996. *Practical Philosophy*. Edited by M. Gregor . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Losurdo, D. 1983. *Autocensura e compromesso nel pensiero politico di Kant*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.
- Marx, K. 1977. *The Capital*. Vol. I. Edited by E. Mandel . Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Maus, I. 1994. *Zur Aufklärung der Demokratietheorie*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- McGilvray, E. 2011. *The Invention of Market Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meade, J. 1964. *Efficiency, Equality and the Ownership of Property*. New York: Routledge.
- Murphy, L. and Nagel, T. 2002. *The Myth of Ownership: Taxes and Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nozick, R. 1974. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- O'Neill, M. 2017. 'Survey Article: Philosophy and Public Policy after Piketty', *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 25 (3): 343–375.
- O'Neill, M. and Williamson, T. (ed.). 2012. *Property-Owning Democracy. Rawls and Beyond*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Paine, T. 2004. *Common Sense [with] Agrarian Justice*. London: Penguin.
- Petroni, L. 2019. "Socialization and Subordination under Rawlsian Socialism." *Ethical Perspectives*, 26 (2): 333–337.
- Piketty, T. 2014. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. 2016. "Capital, Predistribution and Redistribution." In H. Farrell (ed.). *Crooked Timber Seminar on Thomas Piketty's Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, pp. 90–107. Available at: <http://crookedtimber.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/piketty-final.pdf>

- Piketty, T. 2020. *Capital and Ideology*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pinzani, A. 2008. "Representation in Kant's Political Theory." *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 16: 203–226.
- Pinzani, A. 2017a. "Gibt es eine ethische Pflicht, äußerlich frei zu sein?" In B. Dörflinger , D. Hüning , and G. Kruck (eds.). *Das Verhältnis von Recht und Moral in Kants praktischer Philosophie*. Hildesheim: Olms, pp. 171–190.
- Pinzani, A. 2017b. "Beati Possidentes? Kant on Possession and Inequality." *ethic*, 16 (3): 475–492.
- Pinzani, A. 2021 (upcoming). "Wie kann äußere Freiheit ein angeborenes Recht sein?" In C. Freiin von Villiez and J.-C. Merle (eds.). *Kants Metaphysik der Sitten. Der Zusammenhang von Recht- und Tugendlehre*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Polanyi, K. 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. 2nd Edition. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rawls, J. 2001. *Justice as Fairness. A Restatement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roemer, J. 1994. *A Future for Socialism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scanlon, T. 2018. *Why Does Inequality Matter?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, A. 2017. *Republic of Equals. Predistribution and Property-Owning Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomasi, J. 2012. *Free Market Fairness*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tomasi, J. and Brennan, J. 2012. "Classical Liberalism." In D. Estlund (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 115–132.
- Vita, A. 2007. *A justiça igualitária e seus críticos*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes..
- Walzer, M. 1983. *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wood, E. Meiksins . 2002. *The Origins of Capitalism. A Longer View*. London: Verso.

"Money, money, money ..."

- Aristotle . 2000. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Edited by R. Crisp . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aristotle . 2013. *Politics*. Edited by C. Lord . 2nd Edition. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Becker, G. and Posner, R. 2009. *Uncommon Sense: Economic Insights, from Marriage to Terrorism*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Chang, H.-J. 2014. *Economics: The User's Guide*. London: Pelican.
- Eich, S. 2015. *Paper Money and German Romanticism*. Available at: www.iwm.at/publications/5-junior-visiting-fellows-conferences/vol-xxxiv/paper-money-and-german-romanticism/, accessed on November 22, 2020.
- Graeber, D. 2011. *Debt. The First 5000 Years*. Brooklyn: Melville House.
- Kant, I. 1996. *Practical Philosophy*. Edited by M. Gregor . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lembke, B. 1933. *Immanuel Kants Geld-Theory*. Danzig: Rosenberg.
- Meikle, S. 1996. "Aristotle on Money." *Phronesis*, 34: 26–44.
- Plato . 2000. *The Republic*. Edited by T. Griffith . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, R. 2014. *How Adam Smith Can Change Your Life: An Unexpected Guide to Human Nature and Happiness*. New York: Portfolio.
- Sandel, M. 2012. *What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Satz, D. 2010. *Why Some Things Should Not Be for Sale. The Moral Limits of Markets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. 1954. *History of Economic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sherman, R. 2017. *Uneasy Street. The Anxieties of Affluence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Walzer, M. 1983. *Spheres of Justice. A Defence of Pluralism & Equality*. Oxford: Basic Books.

Kant on social suffering

- Flikschuh, K. 2010. "Justice without Virtue." In L. Denis (ed.). *Kant's Metaphysics of Morals. A Critical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flikschuh, K. 2017. "A Regime of Equal Private Freedom? Individual Rights and Public Law in Ripstein's Force and Freedom." In S. Kisilevsky and M. J. Stone (eds.). *Freedom and Force. Essays on Kant's Legal Philosophy*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Huber, J. 2013. "What Makes Human Rights Political? A Kantian Critique." *Zeitschrift für Menschenrechte/Journal for Human Rights*, 2: 127–141.
- Kant, I. 1991. *Political Writings*. Edited by Hans Reiss and translated by H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. 1996. *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited by M. Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. 1997. *Lectures on Ethics*. Edited and translated by P. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pinheiro Walla, A. 2019. "A Kantian Foundation for Welfare Rights." *Jurisprudence*, 1: 1–16.
- Pinzani, A. forthcoming. "El misterio de la pobreza." *Con-textos Kantianos* 15 (2022).
- Ripstein, A. 2017. "Embodied Free Beings under Public Law: A Reply." In S. Kisilevsky and M. J. Stone (eds.). *Freedom and Force. Essays on Kant's Legal Philosophy*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Rosen, A. 2018. *Kant's Theory of Justice*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Sánchez Madrid, N. 2019. "Poverty and Civil Recognition in Kant's Juridical Philosophy. Some Critical Remarks." *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 75: 565–582.
- Sensen, O. 2011. *Kant on Human Dignity*. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter.
- Shklar, J. 1990. *Faces of Injustice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Transnationalism and popular sovereignty

- Caranti, L. 2006. "Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace? Reflections on the Realist Critique of Kant's Project." *Journal of Human Rights*, 5: 341–353.
- Caranti, L. 2016. "Kantian Peace and Liberal Peace: Three Concerns." *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 24: 446–469.
- Cavallar, G. 1994. "Kant's Society of Nations: Free Federation or World Republic?" *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 32: 461–482.
- Cavallar, G. 2001. "Kantian Perspectives on Democratic Peace: Alternatives to Doyle." *Review of International Studies*, 27, 2: 229–248.
- Coetzee, E. and Hudson, H. 2012. "Democratic Peace Theory and the Realist-Liberal Dichotomy: The Promise of Neoclassical Realism?" *Politikon*, 39: 257–277.
- Cohen, J. 2006. "Sovereign Equality vs. Imperial Right: The Battle over the New World Order." *Constellations*, 13: 485–505.
- Dorning, C. et al. 2021. "Global Patterns of Ecologically Unequal Exchange: Implications for Sustainability in the 21st Century." *Ecological Economics*, 179: 1–14.
- Ebbinghaus, J. 1929. "Kants Lehre vom ewigen Frieden und die Kriegsschuldfrage." In *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Vorträge und Reden*, Darmstadt: Georg Olms, 1968, pp. 24–57.
- Flikschuh, K. 2010. "Kant's Sovereignty Dilemma: A Contemporary Analysis." *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 18: 469–493.
- Flikschuh, K. and Ypi, L. (eds.). 2014. *Kant and Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geismann, G. 1983. "Kants Rechtslehre vom Weltfrieden." *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, 37: 363–388.
- Kleingeld, P. 2004. "Approaching Perpetual Peace: Kant's Defense of a League of States and his Ideal of a World Federation." *European Journal of Philosophy*, 12: 304–325.

- Marey, M. 2007. "La fuente de normatividad del derecho internacional kantiano y las fronteras nacionales." *Revista Latinoamericana de Filosofía*, 33: 333–360.
- Marey, M. 2012. "¿Era Kant un terrorista moral, defensor de la guerra justa?" *Revista Latinoamericana de Filosofía*, 38: 171–204.
- Marey, M. 2018. "The Ideal Character of the General Will and Popular Sovereignty in Kant." *Kant-Studien*, 109: 557–580. <https://doi.org/10.1515/kant-2018-4001>.
- Marey, M. 2020. "Kant's Popular Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism." *Constellations* 27 (3): 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12453>.
- Maus, I. 1998. "Volkssouveränität und das Prinzip der Nichtintervention in der Friedensphilosophie Immanuel Kants." In H. Brunkhorst (ed.), *Einmischung erwünscht? Menschenrechte in einer Welt der Bürgerkriege*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, pp. 88–116.
- Maus, I. 2002. "From Nation-State to Global State, or the Decline of Democracy." *Constellations*, 13: 465–484.
- McGrew, A. 2002. "Liberal Internationalism: Between Realism and Cosmopolitanism." In D. Held and A. McGrew (eds.), *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pinheiro Walla, A. 2016. "Common Possession of the Earth and Cosmopolitan Right." *Kant-Studien*, 107: 160–178.
- Roseto, S. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *American Political Science Review*, 97: 585–602.
- Roseto, S. 2005. "Explaining the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review*, 99: 467–472.
- Tuck, R. 1999. *The rights of War and Peace. Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vaha, M. E. 2018. "Kantian insights on the moral personality of the state." In L. Krasnoff, N. Sánchez Madrid, and P. Satne (eds.), *Kant's Doctrine of Right in the 21st Century*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 161–180.

Autonomy and practical reason in Kant and the feminist criticisms by Benhabib and Allen

- Allen, A. 2013. *The Politics of Our Selves. Power, Autonomy and Gender in Contemporary Critical Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Benhabib, S. 1992. *Situating the Self. Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- De Gouges, O. 1791. "The Declaration of the Rights of Women." In *Women in Revolutionary Paris, 1789–1795*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp. 87–96.
- Herman, B. 1993. *The Practice of Moral Judgment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kleingeld, P. 1993. "The Problematic Status of Gender-Neutral Language in the History of Philosophy: The Case of Kant." *Philosophical Forum*, 25: 134–150.
- Mikkola, M. 2011. "Kant on Moral Agency and Women's Nature." *Kantian Review*, 16: 89–111.
- O'Neill, O. 1989. *Constructions of Reason. Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Neill, O. 2004. "Autonomy, Plurality and Public Reason." In N. Brender and L. Krasnoff (eds.), *New Essays on the History of Autonomy: A Collection Honoring J. B. Schneewind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 181–194.
- Schott, R. M. 1997. "The Gender of Enlightenment." In R. M. Schott (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 319–337.
- Schröder, H. 1997. "Kant's Patriarchal Order." In R. M. Schott (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 275–296.
- Sedwick, S. 1990. "Can Kant's Ethics Survive the Feminist Critique?" In R. M. Schott (ed.), *Feminist Interpretations of Immanuel Kant*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 77–100.

Wollstonecraft, M. 2014. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.