

**RADICAL ENLIGHTENMENT: EXISTENTIAL KANTIAN  
COSMOPOLITAN ANARCHISM, WITH A CONCLUDING QUASI-  
FEDERALIST POSTSCRIPT**

**Entendimento radical: anarquismo cosmopolita existencial kantiano, com  
uma conclusão pós-escrita quase-federalista**

**Robert Hanna**  
**Univ. of Colorado at Boulder, USA**  
**Univ. of Luxembourg, Luxembourg**  
**robert.hanna@colorado.edu**

**Resumo:** O artigo foi apresentado como conferência no I Simpósio do Núcleo de Filosofia Kantiana Contemporânea "Zeljko Loparic", realizado na Universidade Estadual de Londrina, nos dias 17 e 18 de outubro de 2013. Trata-se de uma contribuição original e instigante para a filosofia política de inspiração kantiana, que se baseia, sobretudo, em textos da filosofia moral de Kant que não versam diretamente sobre política.

**Palavras-chave:** política; anarquismo cosmopolita; quase-federalista; moral.

**Abstract:** The paper was presented as conference at the I Symposium of the Center for Contemporary Kantian Philosophy "Zeljko Loparic", held at the State University of Londrina, on October 17 and 18 in 2013. It is an original and thought-provoking contribution to the policy philosophy of kantian inspiration, which relies mainly on texts of Kant's moral philosophy that do not cover directly policy.

**Keywords:** policy; cosmopolitan anarchism; quasi-federalist; moral.

Our age is the genuine age of **criticism**, to which everything must submit. **Religion** through its holiness, and **legislation** through its **majesty** commonly seek to exempt themselves from it. But in this way they excite a just suspicion against themselves, and cannot lay claim that unfeigned respect that reason grants only to that which has been able to withstand its free and public examination. (*CPR* Axi n.)<sup>1</sup>

*Enlightenment is the human being's emergence from his own self-incurred immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to make use of one's own understanding without direction from another. This immaturity is self-incurred when its cause lies not in lack of understanding but in lack of resolution and courage to use it without direction from another. Sapere aude! Have the courage to use your own understanding! is thus the motto of Enlightenment. (WE 8: 35)*

That kings should philosophize or philosophers become kings is not to be expected, but is also not to be wished for, since possession of power unavoidably corrupts the free judgment of reason. (*PP* 8: 369)

“Is there a special group of people with the right to use threats of violence to force everyone else to obey their commands, even when their commands are wrong?” .... The modern state claims a kind of authority that obliges all other agents to obey the state's commands and entitles the state to deploy violence and threats of violence to enforce those commands, independently of whether the commands are just, reasonable, or beneficial. [T]hat sort of authority, “political authority,” is an illusion. No state is legitimate, and no individual has political obligations. This leads to the conclusion that at a minimum, the vast majority of government activities are unjust. Government agents should refuse to enforce unjust laws, and individuals should feel free to break such laws whenever they can safely do so.

--M. Huemer<sup>2</sup>

## **I. Introduction**

By *political authority* I mean:

the existence of a special group of people (a.k.a. *government*), with the power to coerce, and the right to command other people and to coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, no matter what the content of these commands might be, and in particular, even if these commands and/or the coercion are morally impermissible.

By *coercion* I mean:

---

<sup>1</sup> For details about citations of Kant's writings, see **A Note on References to Kant's Works** at the end of this essay.

<sup>2</sup> M. Huemer, *The Problem of Political Authority* (London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 332-334.

either (i) using violence (e.g. injuring, torturing, or killing) or the threat of violence, in order to manipulate people according to certain purposes of the coercer (primary coercion), or (ii) inflicting appreciable, salient harm (e.g. imprisonment, termination of employment, large monetary penalties) or deploying the threat of appreciable, salient harm, even if these are not in themselves violent, in order to manipulate people according to certain purposes of the coercer (secondary coercion).

Therefore, as I am understanding it, *the problem of political authority* is this:

Is there an adequate rational justification for the existence of any special group of people (a.k.a. *government*) with the power to coerce, and the right to command other people and to coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, no matter what the content of these commands might be, and in particular, even if these commands and/or the coercion are morally impermissible?

Now by *the State* I mean:

any social organization that not only claims political authority, but also actually possesses the power to coerce, in order to secure and sustain this authority.

Therefore, by *the problem of political authority* I also mean:

Is there an adequate rational justification for the existence of the State or any other State-like institution?

What then, if anything, adequately rationally justifies political authority, the State, or any other State-like institution? Is it the divine right of kings? Is it the actual social contract, as per Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and the enlightened despots of Europe in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries? Is it the hypothetical social contract, as per Rawls? Is it actual democracy, or the democratic process? Is it rule consequentialism? In sharp contrast to the justificatory strategies of divine right, the actual or hypothetical social contract, actual or process-based

democracy, or consequentialism, the thesis of *philosophical anarchism* says that there is *no* adequate rational justification for political authority, the State, or any other State-like institution; and, correspondingly, the thesis of *political anarchism* says that we *should* construct a world in which there are no States or other State-like institutions.

Ironically, although perhaps altogether understandably, in view of the very real risks of political and religious dissent and unorthodoxy in 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe, Kant's political theory, as formulated in the *Metaphysics of Morals*, part 1, the *Rechtslehre*, in my opinion, is sharply out of step with the central ideas of his own moral philosophy, as formulated in *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, the *Critique of Practical Reason*, and the *Lectures on Ethics*, his own philosophy of religion, as formulated in *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* and "What Does it Mean to Orient Oneself in Thinking?," and his most famous political-anthropological essays, "Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim," "Toward Perpetual Peace," and "What is Enlightenment?" The *Rechtslehre*, in my opinion, presents a fairly run-of-the-mill and explicitly anti-revolutionary, hence politically mainstream and safe, version of classical individualist liberalism, plus constitutional monarchy and/or parliamentarianism, plus—when we add to it "Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim" and "Toward Perpetual Peace—a peace-securing internationalism, in the social-contract tradition of Hobbes, Locke, Grotius, and Rousseau.

But emphatically on the contrary, I think that a highly original, politically radical, and if not revolutionary, then at least robustly State-resistant, State-subversive, and even outright civilly-disobedient *cosmopolitan, existentialist* version of *anarchism* that I call *existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchism*, a.k.a. EKCA, very naturally flows from Kant's moral philosophy, his philosophy of religion, and his political anthropology. Roughly, the idea is that if we take Kant's famous injunction *to have the courage to use your own understanding*, and apply this morally courageous act not merely to "the public use of reason" (that is, to intellectual activity, writing, and speech or self-expression in the broad sense of "free speech"), but also to our individual choices, our individual agency, our shared social life, and especially to what Kant quite misleadingly calls "the private use of reason" (that is, to our social lives as functional role-players, or functionaries, within the State, including, e.g., citizenship or public office), then the result is ECKA. Then and only then, in my opinion, can

we understand the last sentence of “What is Enlightenment?” as it truly ought to be understood, namely as formulating a vision of *radical* enlightenment.<sup>3</sup>

When nature has unwrapped, from under this hard shell [of the “crooked timber of humanity” (*IUH* 8: 23)], the seed for which she cares most tenderly, namely the propensity and calling to *think* freely, the latter gradually works back upon the mentality of the people (which thereby gradually becomes capable of *freedom* in acting) and eventually even upon the principles of *government*, which finds it profitable to itself to treat the human being, *who is now more than a machine*, in keeping with his dignity. (*WE* 8: 41-42)

To be sure, neither the term ‘existentialism’ nor the term ‘anarchism’ existed until the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. But insofar as existentialism was substantially anticipated by certain lines of thought in Pascal’s 17<sup>th</sup> century writings,<sup>4</sup> and insofar as the very idea of cosmopolitanism was already a well-established notion in political philosophy by the time Kant came to write about it,<sup>5</sup> and insofar as philosophical anarchism was substantially anticipated by certain lines of thought in William Godwin’s 18<sup>th</sup> century writings,<sup>6</sup> it seems clear that Kant belongs to an emergent existential cosmopolitan anarchist tradition in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century philosophy. In any case, insofar as it at once existentialist, Kantian, cosmopolitanist, and anarchist, this essay therefore constitutes a project in radical *Kantian* enlightenment.<sup>7</sup>

## II. EKCA Defined

---

<sup>3</sup> In his excellent but also highly controversial *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001), and its two sequel volumes, Jonathan Israel plausibly traces the origins of the very idea of a radical enlightenment project back to Spinoza, pantheism, and metaphysical monism. Kant’s own contribution to the controversy about Spinozism is presented in “What Does it Mean to Orient Oneself in Thinking?”

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., D. Clarke, “Blaise Pascal,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2012 Edition), ed. E.N. Zalta (ed.), available online at URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/pascal/>>, esp. section 6.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., P. Kleingeld and E. Brown, “Cosmopolitanism,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition), ed. E. N. Zalta, available online at URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/cosmopolitanism/>>, esp. section 1.

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., M. Philp, “William Godwin,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2013 Edition), ed. E.N. Zalta, available online at URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/godwin/>>, esp. section 3.

<sup>7</sup> My radical Kantian enlightenment project is thus a new-&-improved version of what Samuel Fleischacker aptly calls “the maximalist strand of Kantian enlightenment”; see his *What is Enlightenment?* (London: Routledge, 2013), p. 7. By contrast, Fleischacker himself defends a version of “minimalist [Kantian] enlightenment,” pp. 169-193.

I fully realize that even when it has been helpfully reduced to an acronym, EKCA is still rather a mouthful. So what, more precisely, do I mean by “existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchism”?

1. By *existential*,<sup>8</sup> I mean the primitive motivational, or “internalist,” normative ground of the philosophical and political doctrine I want to defend, which is the fundamental, innate need we have for a wholehearted, freely-willed life *not essentially based* on egoistic, hedonistic, or consequentialist (e.g., utilitarian) interests, a.k.a. *the desire for self-transcendence*, while at the same time fully assuming the natural presence—a.k.a. the *facticity*—of all such instrumental interests in our “human, all too human” lives. In a word, the existential ideal of a rational human wholehearted autonomous life is the ideal of *authenticity*.

2. By *Kantian*, I mean the primitive objective, or “externalist,” normative ground of the philosophical and political doctrine I want to defend, which is the recognition that the fundamental, innate need we have for a wholehearted, freely-willed, non-egoistic, non-hedonistic, non-consequentialist life, which I call *the desire for self-transcendence*, can be sufficiently rationally justified only in so far as it is also a life of *principled authenticity*, by which I mean *principled wholehearted autonomy*, or having *a good will* in Kant’s sense, guided by respect for the dignity of all real persons,<sup>9</sup> under the Categorical Imperative.

3. By *cosmopolitan*,<sup>10</sup> I mean that this philosophical and political doctrine recognizes States (e.g., nation-States) as actual brute past and contemporary facts, but also requires our choosing and acting in such a way that we reject in thought, and perhaps also reject and resist in words and/or actions, any immoral commands, limitations, restrictions, and prejudices present in any contemporary States, especially including the one (or ones, in my case, Canada and the USA) we happen to be citizens or members of, and regard ourselves instead as

---

<sup>8</sup> See also, e.g., S. Crowell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Existentialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012). In order to address the classical “formalism,” “rigorism,” and “universalism” worries about Kant’s ethics, I work out a broadly existential approach to Kantian ethics in *Kantian Ethics and Human Existence* (Unpublished MS, Spring 2014 version).

<sup>9</sup> By “real person,” I mean *an essentially embodied person*, or a rational minded animal, as opposed to either disembodied persons (e.g., souls) or collective persons (e.g., business corporations). On essential embodiment, see R. Hanna and M. Maiese, *Embodied Minds in Action* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009). I work out a general theory of real personhood in *Deep Freedom and Real Persons* (Unpublished MS, Spring 2014 version), chs. 6-8.

<sup>10</sup> See also, e.g., Kleingeld and Brown, “Cosmopolitanism,” esp. section 2.

citizens or members of a single moral world-community of real persons, The Real Realm of Ends.

It is particularly to be noted that the conjunction of 1., 2., and 3. is only accidentally consistent with, and very frequently sharply at odds with, both the theory and also the practices of contemporary *large-scale capitalism*, especially in its *globalizing* manifestations.

4. Finally, by *anarchism*,<sup>11</sup> I mean that this philosophical and political doctrine fully recognizes that there is no adequate rational justification for political authority, and correspondingly also no adequate rational justification for the existence of States or any other State-like institutions, and that the sole adequate rational justification for the continued existence of any aspects or proper parts of *actual contemporary* States or other State-like institutions, is that they fully satisfy the moral requirements under 1., 2., and 3. Otherwise, resistance, subversion, or even outright civil disobedience is at the very least permissible, and possibly also required.

It is also particularly to be noted that the conjunction of 1. through 4. rules out the possibility that “the single moral world-community of real persons, The Real Realm of Ends,” mentioned under 3., could ever permissibly take the form of either a *league* of States or a *world-State*, assuming that these also claim political authority and actually possess the power to coerce.

On the other hand, however, my idea is *not* the non-revolutionary Marxist idea that States and other State-like institutions will somehow *wither away* in the face of the gradual actualization or realization of The Real Realm of Ends, *nor* is it the revolutionary Marxist idea that States and State-like institutions must be destroyed in a single all-encompassing campaign of violent social change. On the contrary, my idea is instead the very different thought that existing or real-world States and other State-like institutions will be gradually *detoxified* and *devolved* by us into something less and less State-like. Or in other words, ECKA is *devolutionary* anarchism, not *revolutionary* anarchism.

In effectively detoxifying and devolving States and other State-like institutions, we will gradually deconstruct, purge, and neutralize all their immoral political and social toxins,

---

<sup>11</sup> See also, e.g., P. Kropotkin, “Anarchism,” first published in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1910, available online at URL = <<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/kropotkin-peter/1910/britannica.htm>>; and M. Bookchin, *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism*, available online at URL = <[http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist\\_Archives/bookchin/soclife.html](http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/bookchin/soclife.html)>.

including, in my opinion: protected State-borders and State-boundaries; State-centralized or more locally institutionalized identity-politics and xenophobia; State-centralized or more locally institutionalized patriotism; wars of aggression or pre-emption; the military development and/or use of doomsday weaponry; police-statism and totalitarianism, including State-centralized or more locally institutionalized mechanisms of thought-control, censorship, and witch-hunting; State-driven terrorism; State-driven espionage; Constitutional idolatry, permitting such moral abominations as the private possession of firearms and other lethal weapons, capital punishment, the denial of universal healthcare, and the destruction or degradation of the environment; and above all, State-centralized or more locally institutionalized racial, religious, sexual, or age-based forms of discrimination, persecution, or—the nadir of all State-driven evil—genocide.

What would remain after such a gradual detoxification and devolution of all existing or real-world States and other State-like institutions is a living, organismic, fundamentally healthy, garden-like, world-encompassing, complex dynamic structure of *post-States*, both instantiating multiple overlapping non-coercive, non-compulsive<sup>12</sup> social institutions or structures for *bottom-up* mutual aid, care, empowerment, and support (e.g., intimate partnerships and families), and also incorporating multiple overlapping non-coercive, non-compulsive social institutions or structures for *top-down* communal aid, care, empowerment, and support (e.g., hospitals and universal health-care systems), that is neither a league-of-nations nor a world-State—nor any sort of global capitalist system, whether Statist or anti-Statist. Just to give it a name, I will call this world-encompassing, complex dynamic vital structure of post-States *The Kosmopolis*, with a capital ‘K’ to distinguish it sharply from league-of-nations-oriented and/or world-State-oriented conceptions of cosmopolitanism, and also from global capitalist conceptions of cosmopolitanism—and, equally importantly, to remind us of the ancient Greek term *Kosmos* and ‘Kantian’ alike.

### **III. EKCA Further Explicated**

---

<sup>12</sup> By *non-compulsive* I mean “that which avoids, or constitutes the opposite of, the malign psychological effects of living within and under the control of States and other State-like institutions.” The Existentialist analysis of *inauthenticity*, and the Marxist analysis of *alienation*, can then be brought under the general critical analysis of the *compulsiveness* of States and State-like institutions. The fact of the compulsiveness of States and other State-like institutions also verifies, in the special case of those who directly belong to governments, or are officers of governments, the truth of Kant’s observation that “possession of power unavoidably corrupts the free judgment of reason” (*PP* 8: 369).



Let me now spell out the basic ideas of EKCA again somewhat more fully.

According to existential Kantian ethics, a.k.a. EKE,<sup>13</sup> the highest or supreme good is a *good will* in Kant's sense (*GMM* 4:393) (*CPrR* 5: 110); and a good will in Kant's sense is the self-consciously experienced realization, at least partially and to some degree, of our innate capacity for autonomy, i.e., our innate capacity for free moral self-legislation, insofar as it is also inherently combined with an innate capacity for wholeheartedness, in this fully natural and thoroughly nonideal actual world. Otherwise put, self-consciously-experienced-autonomy-with-wholeheartedness-in-this-fully-natural-and-thoroughly-nonideal-actual-world is nothing more and nothing less than a rational human minded animal or real human person who is choosing and acting freely, on principle, and with a passionate and yet Stoic commitment, for the sake of the Categorical Imperative, a.k.a. the moral law. The self-conscious experience of our own at-least-partially-realized capacity for autonomy carries with it a *deep* happiness, or "self-fulfillment" (*Selbstzufriedenheit*) (*CPrR* 5: 117), aptly characterized by Kant—who clearly has the Stoic notion of *ataraxia* in mind—as a *negative satisfaction in one's own existence*, which also strongly anticipates what the existentialists later called *authenticity*, and consists, in the ideal case, of the self-conscious experience of the perfect coherence and self-sufficiency of all one's own desires, beliefs, cognitions, inferences, intentions, motivating reasons, and choices in the act of autonomous willing. To choose and act in this way to any extent is, to that extent, to have thereby achieved *principled authenticity* (i.e., principled wholehearted autonomy, or a "good will" in Kant's sense), at least partially and to some degree. Or otherwise put, to choose and act in this way is to have reached or exceeded the highest possible bar, standard, or ideal of rational normativity for rational human minded animals, and indeed for any other actual or possible creatures essentially like us, whether or not they are human.

This fundamental axiological thesis about the good will can be directly compared and contrasted with that of *ethical egoism*, which says that the highest good is individual self-interest (whether this self-interest is specifically narcissistic/self-loving, selfish/self-inflating, or hedonistic/pleasure-seeking, or not), and also with that of *act consequentialism*, which says that the highest good is choosing and acting with good results. Now ethical egoism (including

---

<sup>13</sup> See Hanna, *Kantian Ethics and Human Existence*.

but not restricted to hedonism) and act consequentialism can both be consistently combined with classical *eudaimonism*, which says that the highest good is human happiness—fundamentally self-interested and therefore *individual shallow happiness* for the ethical egoist, or, for the act consequentialist, good results that increase *overall shallow happiness for as many people or other shallow-happiness-capable creatures as possible*. Deep happiness, however, is not only *irrelevant* to ethical egoism (including hedonism) and act consequentialism, but even *inimical* to them, since the achievement of deep happiness generally runs contrary to the pursuit of shallow happiness. So EKE is sharply distinct from ethical egoism, hedonism, act consequentialism, and classical eudaimonism alike.

Now *real persons* exist in the fully natural and thoroughly nonideal actual world, alongside non-living material things, forces, and processes, other living organisms, and non-rational minded animals; and various sorts of structured intersubjective and social relationships *between real persons* also exist in this world. But it is what Gilbert Ryle aptly called a *category mistake* to infer from the existence of real persons and structured, intersubjective, mutual and communal social relationships between them, to the thesis that The State-in-itself, i.e., *the supposed Really Real ground of human social existence and political authority*, either exists or does not exist, or has a knowable essence or nature of some sort.

More precisely, The State-in-itself, the supposed Really Real ground and source of human social existence and political authority, with the power and the right to command and to coerce people to obey its commands as a duty, even if these commands and/or the coercion are impermissible according to basic existential Kantian moral principles—just like God, the supposed Really Real ground of worldly, creaturely existence and morality, namely a super-human entity with the power and the right to command and to coerce people to obey its commands as a duty, even if these commands and/or the coercion are impermissible according to basic existential Kantian moral principles—is nothing but a *noumenal or transcendental abstraction* in the Kantian sense, a mere “thought-entity” or *Verstandeswesen*. If Kant’s radical agnosticism about things-in-themselves or noumena is correct, then it follows that the existence or non-existence of The State-in-itself, like God, is knowably unknowable, and its nature, were it to exist, is also knowably unknowable.

Now the non-existence of the mythical State-in-itself is the mythical Hobbesian *state-of-nature*, and it is just as philosophically fallacious to think that if God were to fail to exist (the dark night of atheism), then everything would be permitted in a *moral* sense (the chaos of nihilism), as it is to think that if the State-in-itself were to fail to exist (the dark night of the Hobbesian state-of-nature), then everything would be permitted in a *political* sense (the chaos of “the war of all against all”). Correspondingly, it is just as philosophically fallacious to use the mythical bogeyman of “the war of all against all” as a sufficient reason for believing in the necessity of a State-in-itself, as it is to use the mythical bogeyman of nihilism as a sufficient reason for believing in the necessity of God’s existence. Theism is to statism, as atheism is to the belief in a Hobbesian state-of-nature lurking behind the paper-thin façade of civil society. All are *equally* rationally unsupported and illusory.

Therefore, since there is no knowable Really Real ground or *source* of human social existence and political authority, or of States, then there is no such thing as a *sufficient rational justification* of either political authority or States. Or as Michael Huemer crisply puts it, “that sort of authority, ‘political authority’, is an illusion.” —Not merely a psychological illusion, however, but more fundamentally a *philosophical* illusion, and more specifically, a *noumenal or transcendental* illusion.

That is one Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism. Later, in section **IV**, I will present another Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism, this time specifically from Kantian ethics, that I call *the core Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism*.

In any case, according to EKCA, *The Realm of Ends* is the total *ideal* moral community of rational minded animals or real persons, each of whom respects one another and themselves as creatures with dignity (absolute objective intrinsic non-denumerable moral value), and also considers all the others and themselves equally in relation to the Categorical Imperative/moral law, and, finally, each possesses a good will. The *complete* good, i.e., the best life for any rational human minded animal or real human person, is a life of deep individual happiness and also deep communal or social happiness that is intrinsically controlled and structured by a good will in the Kantian sense. Now *The Realm of Ends* and the complete good are only *regulative ideals*, never real-world facts. What I call, by sharp contrast, *The Real Realm of Ends* is what is *really* possible for *us* in this fully natural and thoroughly nonideal actual world. Otherwise put, *The Real Realm of Ends* is the “human, all

too human” actualization or realization of The Realm of Ends, to whatever degree or extent this is really possible, by means of our wholehearted autonomous constructive activity. Every time an agent truly chooses or acts for the sake of the Categorical Imperative/moral law, she thereby actualizes or realizes moral worth, and she thereby experiences autonomous self-fulfillment, at least partially or to some degree. But if she also thereby achieves some individual and also communal or social happiness, then she also realizes a proper part of the complete good, and partially actualizes or realizes The Realm of Ends in this “human, all too human” world, at least partially or to some degree. Given “the crooked timber of humanity” in this thoroughly nonideal world, which is a timber that “can never be made straight” (*IUH* 8: 23) and which is a world in which, it seems, as they say, no good deed ever goes unpunished, however, then the complete good is not humanly possible to *any* degree or *any* extent unless

(i) we satisfy the moral constraints of existential Kantian moral theology, a.k.a. EKMT,<sup>14</sup>

and unless

(ii) we recognize that proofs of The State-in-itself’s existence or non-existence (the Hobbesian state-of-nature), and knowledge of The State-in-itself’s nature as a supposed Really Real ground of human social existence and source of political authority, and therefore any rational justification of its political authority, are all *knowably unknowable* (Kant’s radical agnosticism), and unless

(iii) we prove ourselves to be morally worthy of happiness, by collectively constructing realizing The Real Realm of Ends on this earth and in this fully natural and thoroughly nonideal world, in the form of a world-wide complex of post-states, The Kosmopolis, as if we were *already* liberated from the morally impermissible and rationally unjustifiable commands, limitations, prejudices, and restrictions of actual States and other State-like institutions (existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchism), hence

---

<sup>14</sup> See R. Hanna, “If God’s Existence is Unprovable, Then is Everything Permitted? Kant, Radical Agnosticism, and Morality,” *DIAMETROS* 39 (2014): 26-69. Also available online at URL = [https://www.academia.edu/6351404/If\\_Gods\\_Existence\\_is\\_Unprovable\\_Then\\_is\\_Everything\\_Permitted\\_Kant\\_Radical\\_Agnosticism\\_and\\_Morality](https://www.academia.edu/6351404/If_Gods_Existence_is_Unprovable_Then_is_Everything_Permitted_Kant_Radical_Agnosticism_and_Morality).

(iv) it is at the very least always *permissible*, and, other things being equal, sometimes also *obligatory*, that we refuse to accept, and are also prepared to resist, subvert, or even overtly civilly disobey any actual State or State-like institution, precisely insofar as it is not morally consistent and coherent with collectively constructing The Real Realm of Ends on this earth and in this fully natural and thoroughly nonideal actual world, as The Kosmopolis (“the arts of resistance”<sup>15</sup>).

Now as I see it, the four classical problems with anarchism are

(i) its lack of well-worked-out ethical foundations, (ii) its tendency to collapse into destructive ludic mayhem,<sup>16</sup> revolutionism, and terrorism, (iii) how it handles the all-important issue of the use of physical force and threats of physical force *within* an anarchist social framework, and (iv) its lack of a workable theory of how, once anarchism has been widely accepted, “to make the trains run on time”: that is, the lack of any workable theory of how to sustain all the morally good things in our actual-world political and social existence, while also expunging all the morally reprehensible things in actual-world States and other State-like institutions.

But, at least prospectively, EKCA clearly responds adequately and effectively to problems (i) to (iv).

**First**, ECKA is committed to the basic principles of Kantian ethics and to moral realism about those principles: according to ECKA, such principles really do objectively exist, and they are humanly knowable by means of rational intuition.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., J. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1990); and J. Scott, *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia* (New Haven CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2009).

<sup>16</sup> —Although I also think there’s nothing wrong with a certain measured amount of *constructive, morally-constrained, non-violent* ludic mayhem, if it’s properly aimed at exposing, resisting, or subverting the moral evils of actual-world nation-states or other coercive and compulsive social institutions. See, e.g., Vigo’s 1933 film, *Zéro de Conduite*; Simonsson’s and Nilsson’s 2010 film, *Sound of Noise*; and J. Scott, *Two Cheers for Anarchism* (Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> See Hanna, *Kantian Ethics and Human Existence*, esp. chs. 1-2. Huemer’s *Problem of Political Authority*, by contrast, appeals only to common-sense moral intuitions, and remains officially neutral about moral realism and ethical intuitionism. But in fact, Huemer is elsewhere committed to moral realism and ethical intuitionism; see M. Huemer, *Ethical Intuitionism* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). For my alternative view about the nature

**Second**, according to ECKA, destructive ludic mayhem, revolutionism, and terrorism are all strictly inconsistent with respecting the dignity of real persons, and with choosing and acting for the sake of the Categorical Imperative, and thus are morally impermissible.

**Third**, according to ECKA, the use of physical force or the threat of physical force within an anarchist social framework is morally permissible *only* for the purposes of

- (i) self-defense against primary coercion, especially life-threatening primary coercion,
- (ii) protecting the innocent and the weak from primary coercion, especially life-threatening primary coercion, and
- (iii) preventing direct violations of rational human dignity.

Moreover, only the use of *minimal, last-resort* self-defensive, protective, and preventative physical force is morally permissible.<sup>18</sup>

**Fourth**, EKCA’s “detoxification” and “devolution” model of the deconstruction of actual-world nation-states and other state-like institutions—whereby all and only the morally good-making, environmentally-sound, non-coercive, non-compulsive bottom-up and top-down social institutions or structures are all left in place, and all and only the morally, physically, and psychologically toxic features of actual States and State-like institutions are purged and/or phased-out—also clearly and effectively responds to problem (iv).

Within the scope of “morally good-making, environmentally-sound, non-coercive, non-compulsive bottom-up and top-down social institutions or structures” I mean to include, e.g., flourishing families and intimate adult partnerships of all kinds<sup>19</sup>; hospitals and universal healthcare; schools and colleges; humanistic and scientific communities of free inquiry, a.k.a., *post-universities*; fine arts and everyday arts, and crafts; private and public entertainment; sports and games; small-scale, eco-sensitive agriculture, public forestry, and public park-cultivation; small-scale capitalism with universal social security; and trains that run on time. As such, EKCA is neither *anarcho-capitalist*, insofar as unconstrained large-scale capitalism is immoral, nor *anarcho-socialist*, insofar as authoritarian and/or totalitarian socialism is also

---

of intuitions, *Kantian Intuitionism*, see Hanna, *Cognition, Content, and the A Priori* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, forthcoming), chs. 6-8.

<sup>18</sup> See Hanna, *Kantian Ethics and Human Existence*, chs. 3-5.

<sup>19</sup> I mean: heterosexual or non-heterosexual—including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, or whatever; and monogamous or polyamorous.

immoral. At the same, EKCA is perfectly compatible with any and all morally permissible forms of petit bourgeois capitalism and social welfare.

In any case, it should therefore be obvious by now that the version of political anarchism that I am proposing is thoroughly *devolutionary* and *constructive* (moral-community-growing) and not revolutionary, terrorist, or destructive (bomb-throwing). That the version of political anarchism that I am proposing is *deep*, and not shallow or lifestyle (radical chic). And that the version of political anarchism that I proposing is *realistic*, and not excessively idealistic or utopian (cloud cuckoo-land). Indeed, political anarchism as I am understanding it is the permanent necessary social condition of achieving principled authenticity and constructing the real-world moral community of The Real Realm of Ends on earth, via our detoxifying and devolutionary construction of the Kosmopolis—thereby, in effect, *pruning back* and *weeding out* real-world States and other State-like institutions, until finally they are nothing but *mulch* for the world-wide growth of morally good-making, environmentally-sound, non-coercive, non-compulsive bottom-up and top-down social institutions or structures. In this way, we endlessly create and cultivate the post-state, fundamentally healthy, world-wide *garden* of our deepest individual and collective rational human aspirations. This is *not* the pre-lapsarian, mythical, paradisal, Adam-and-Eve-privately-owned garden of *Eden*: instead, it is nothing more and nothing less than the post-lapsarian, real-world, mixed-use, communal garden of *home-planet earth*.

Bounded in a nutshell, then, here are the five simplified imperatives of this devolutionary, constructive, deep, realistic, existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchism:

- 1. *Think for yourself.***
- 2. *Criticize political and institutional authority.***
- 3. *Recognize and reject political and institutional bullshit.*<sup>20</sup>**
- 4. *Treat everyone else with at least minimal moral respect, but never allow yourself to be tyrannized by the majority.***
- 5. *Take responsibility for constructing The Real Realm of Ends on earth.***

---

<sup>20</sup> Of course, I mean “bullshit” in the strictly philosophical sense of that term. See, e.g., H. Frankfurt, “On Bullshit,” in H. Frankfurt, *On the Importance of What We Care About* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988), pp. 117-133. Also available online at URL = [https://athens.indymedia.org/local/webcast/uploads/frankfurt\\_harry\\_-\\_on\\_bullshit.pdf](https://athens.indymedia.org/local/webcast/uploads/frankfurt_harry_-_on_bullshit.pdf).

#### IV. The Core Kantian Argument for Philosophical Anarchism, and Beyond

As I mentioned in section I, by *political authority* I mean:

the existence of a special group of people (a.k.a. *government*), with the power to coerce, and the right to command other people and to coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, no matter what the content of these commands might be, and in particular, even if these commands and/or the coercion are morally impermissible.

And again, by *coercion* I mean:

either (i) using violence (e.g. injuring, torturing, or killing) or the threat of violence, in order to manipulate people according to certain purposes of the coercer (primary coercion), or (ii) inflicting appreciable, salient harm (e.g. imprisonment, termination of employment, large monetary penalties) or deploying the threat of appreciable, salient harm, even if these are not in themselves violent, in order to manipulate people according to certain purposes of the coercer (secondary coercion).

Therefore, again, as I am understanding it, *the problem of political authority* is this:

Is there an adequate rational justification for the existence of any special group of people (a.k.a. *government*) with the power to coerce, and the right to command other people and to coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, no matter what the content of these commands might be, and in particular, even if these commands and/or the coercion are morally impermissible?

And again, by *the State* I mean:

any social organization that not only claims political authority, but also actually possesses the power to coerce, in order to secure and sustain this authority.



Therefore, as before, by *the problem of political authority* I also mean:

Is there an adequate rational justification for the existence of the State or any other State-like institution?

This problem applies directly to *all* kinds of political authority, States, and State-like institutions, from pharaohs, kings, and popes, to constitutional monarchies, communist States, capitalist liberal democracies, provincial or city governments, military organizations, business corporations, and universities—basically, any institution with its own army or police-force. But of course the problem is not just philosophical, it is all too horribly real. Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, States, especially nation-States, and other State-like institutions have explicitly claimed to possess political authority, and then have proceeded to use the power to coerce, especially the power of primary coercion, frequently of the most awful, cruel, and monstrous kinds, thereby repressing, detaining, imprisoning, enslaving, torturing, starving, maiming, or killing literally hundreds of millions of people, in order to secure their acceptance of these authoritarian claims. Even allowing for all the other moral and natural evils that afflict humankind, it seems very likely that there has never been a single greater cause of evil, misery, suffering, and death in the history of the world than the coercive force of States and other State-like institutions.

As I also noted in section I, the thesis of *philosophical anarchism* says that there is no adequate rational justification for political authority, States, or any other State-like institutions, and the thesis of *political anarchism* says that we should construct a world in which there are no States or other State-like institutions. On the one hand, it is rationally coherent and permissible to defend philosophical anarchism without also defending political anarchism. But on the other hand, it is hard to see how one could rationally justify political anarchism except by way of philosophical anarchism. So philosophical anarchism is the rational key to anarchism more generally, although of course political anarchism is ultimately where all the real-world action is.

Although I want to defend *both* philosophical anarchism *and also* political anarchism, from an existential Kantian cosmopolitan point of view, this is not the place to take on the

strenuous task of fully justifying political anarchism. Instead, here is what I take to be a self-evidently sound five-step argument for *philosophical* anarchism, which I will call *the core Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism*:

- (1) We adopt, as basic moral principles, by means of which we can judge the permissibility or impermissibility of any human choice, action, practical policy, or other practical principle, the set of basic *Kantian* moral principles.
  
- (2) Precisely insofar as it is morally impermissible for *individual real persons or groups of real persons* to command other people and coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, then by the same token, it must also be morally impermissible for *special groups of people inside States or other State-like institutions*, a.k.a. *governments*, to command other people and coerce them to obey those commands as a duty.
  
- (3) Therefore, precisely insofar as it is morally impermissible for individual real persons or groups of real persons to command other people and coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, even if governments have *the power* to command other people and coerce them to obey those commands, nevertheless governments do not have *the right* to command other people and coerce them to obey those commands as a duty.
  
- (4) But all governments claim political authority in precisely this sense.
  
- (5) Therefore, there is no adequate rational justification for political authority, States, or other State-like institutions, and philosophical anarchism is true.

Or in other and fewer words, because there is no adequate rational justification, according to the set of basic Kantian moral principles, for an individual real person's, or any group of real persons', immorally commanding other people and coercing them to obey those commands as a duty, yet the very idea of political authority entails that special groups of people within States or State-like institutions, namely governments, have not only the power to coerce, but also the right to command other people and to coerce them to obey those commands as a duty, even when the commands and/or coercion are immoral, then it follows that there is no

adequate rational justification for political authority, States, or any other State-like institutions—therefore, philosophical anarchism is true. Or in still other and even fewer words, human *governments* have no moral right to do to other people what *real human persons* have no moral right to do to other people, according to the set of basic Kantian moral principles; yet *all* human governments falsely claim this supposed moral right; hence philosophical anarchism is true. **QED**

If only it were so simple! Another fundamental task of the existential Kantian cosmopolitan philosophical anarchist is to explain how, paradoxically, *there is almost universal belief in the political authority of governments, States, and other State-like institutions, even in the face of (what I take to be) the rationally self-evident soundness of the core Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism.*

One possible explanation for the almost universal failure to recognize the truth of philosophical anarchism is that most people, including most political philosophers, are subject to a complex and powerful *psychological* illusion—the illusion of political authority—that interferes with and undermines the proper employment of their rational capacities, and thus makes it extremely difficult for them to recognize what is otherwise rationally self-evident. And I do think that this is indeed the case. One everyday example of this complex and powerful psychological illusion is the more or less spine-chilling spectatorial horror we feel when we watch post-apocalyptic movies, directed to the mythic Hobbesian “war of all against all” (often reminiscent of Hollywood depictions of the Wild West, only even more chaotic and gory) that is depicted as following from the breakdown of State-order, yet feel no disgust or horror *whatsoever* about the horrendous State-system that must have led to the fictional apocalypse.

But I also think that there is a deeper *Kantian* explanation, namely, that most people, especially including most political philosophers, are subject to a complex and powerful *philosophical* illusion—the noumenal or transcendental illusion of The State-in-itself and its equally illusory dialectical contrary, the Hobbesian state-of-nature—that makes it extremely difficult for them to see the self-evident truth of philosophical anarchism.

Here, then, is where Kant’s radical agnosticism can be smoothly extended and added to the five-step core Kantian argument for philosophical anarchism, as follows:

(6) Nevertheless, there is almost universal belief in the political authority of governments, States, and other State-like institutions.

(7) Part of the explanation for the almost universal failure to recognize that there is no adequate rational justification for political authority is that most people, including most political philosophers, are subject to a complex and powerful psychological illusion—the illusion of political authority—that makes it extremely difficult for them to recognize the self-evident truth of philosophical anarchism.

(8) The psychological illusion of political authority can, to a significant extent, be dismantled by a careful critical diagnosis of its basic elements,<sup>21</sup> together with a bracing regimen of what Scott very aptly calls “anarchist calisthenics,”<sup>22</sup> i.e., frequent rehearsals, under non-dangerous physical and social conditions, of the art of avoiding and undermining mindless, pointless obedience to the commands of States or other State-like institutions.

(9) But the deeper Kantian explanation is that most people, including most political philosophers, are subject to the philosophical, and more specifically noumenal and transcendental illusion *that it is possible to know the existence or non-existence and nature of The State-in-itself*, the supposed ultimate ground or source of the right to command people and to coerce them to accept its commands as a duty, even if these commands and/or the coercion are impermissible according to basic Kantian moral principles.

(10) Kant’s radical agnosticism undermines this philosophical illusion, and makes it possible to see the rationally self-evident truth of philosophical anarchism.

This argument-strategy, in turn, has a special advantage over other existing arguments for philosophical anarchism that proceed by, **first**, enumerating, criticizing, and rejecting a finite number of candidates (say, divine right of kings, social contract theory, democracy, and rule consequentialism) for providing sufficient rational justification for political authority, then, **second**, critically attacking the psychological illusion of political authority, and then, **third**, concluding that philosophical anarchism is true.<sup>23</sup> Such an argument cannot, in

---

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Huemer, *The Problem of Political Authority*, ch. 6.

<sup>22</sup> Scott, *Two Cheers for Anarchism*.

<sup>23</sup> This is the argument-strategy of, e.g., Huemer’s *Problem of Political Authority*.

principle, rule out the possibility that there is some *other* candidate, *as yet unexamined*, that will provide sufficient rational justification for political authority. So, apparently, there is always room for a reasonable doubt that political authority can be sufficiently rationally justified, and the argument for philosophical anarchism falls short of decisive proof. Let us call this *the objection from arguments-by-cases*.

But if, as Kant's radical agnosticism shows, it is *impossible to know the existence or non-existence and nature of The State-in-itself*, the supposed ultimate ground or source of the right of a government to command and to coerce people to accept its commands as a duty, even if these commands and/or the coercion are impermissible according to basic Kantian moral principles, then unless the philosophical defender of political authority can actually *specify* another minimally plausible candidate for providing a rational justification for it, there is no reason whatsoever to believe in the possibility of there being such a thing. So the objection from arguments-by-cases fails, and there is *decisive* proof for philosophical anarchism.

\* \* \*

It is perhaps needless to say that the radical Kantian enlightenment project which emerges from the philosophical, moral, and political convergence of *Kant*, *Kierkegaard*,<sup>24</sup> and *Kropotkin*<sup>25</sup> that I have spelled out in this essay might come as somewhat of a surprise to you. But it gets worse. Not only do I *believe-that* EKCA is true, I also *believe-in* it.

## **V. Concluding Quasi-Federalist Postscript**

Finally, here is another closely-related line of thought, by way of a concluding postscript. In his "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim," Kant develops an explicitly *teleological* reading of the history of humanity, i.e., rational humanity, that

---

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., S. Kierkegaard, *The Essential Kierkegaard*, trans. H. Hong and E. Hong (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2000).

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid* (New York: NYU Press, 1972), available online at URL = [http://www.complementarycurrency.org/ccLibrary/Mutual\\_Aid-A\\_Factor\\_of\\_Evolution-Peter\\_Kropotkin.pdf](http://www.complementarycurrency.org/ccLibrary/Mutual_Aid-A_Factor_of_Evolution-Peter_Kropotkin.pdf).

postulates the modern State as a necessary developmental stage on the way to individual and social enlightenment for rational humankind as a not-merely-biologically-defined species.

Although the very idea of teleology is of course controversial, I do think that Kant is *deeply right* about the the possibility of a teleological history of rational humanity, but also *deeply wrong* about the teleological necessity of the State. At the same time, however, thinking about Kant's essay prompted me to think about the role of Federalism in such a teleological moral history of rational humanity, which in turn led me to what I will call *an idea for a universal history with an existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchist aim*. It goes like this.

(1) The “original sin of political authority” is that the natural rational human need for mutual aid, and also for the protection of the innocent and weak, in a pre-State condition, plus *fear*, whether justified fear or irrational fear, pushes us into the very idea of the State and its supposed political authority.

(2) But although *we do indeed all need* mutual aid, and also *we do indeed all need* to protect the innocent and weak, *because of our fear we go too far*, and this is a fundamental, tragic error that we have been paying for ever since.

(3) In effect, we traded our basic moral principles, our autonomous freedom, and our respect for rational human dignity, for the social-contractual promise that governments, States, and State-like institutions will (i) provide effective protection against mortal threats, and (ii) guarantee our mutual freedom of action (as opposed to freedom of the will, or autonomy in the Kantian sense), especially freedom of economic action.

(4) In other words, in a tragic way, because of our fear, we have traded our own *rational humanity* for the Mephistophelian (and so often, as a matter of actual political-historical fact, false) promise of living like *well-serviced machinery*.

(5) Nevertheless, insofar as there actually have been various active attempts to *challenge, constrain, deconstruct, and detoxify* the political authority of the State, or other State-like institutions, by appealing to moral principles with a broadly Kantian justification—e.g., universal human rights, based on the notion of rational human

dignity—then there has been a morally healthy *devolutionary* trend towards Kantian ethical anarchism.

(6) Now, as well-described by Andreas Føllesdal, here is the basic idea behind Federalism:

Federalism is the theory or advocacy of [basic Kantian moral] principles for dividing powers between member units and common institutions. Unlike in a unitary state, sovereignty in federal political orders is non-centralized, often constitutionally, between at least two levels so that units at each level have final authority and can be self governing in some issue area. Citizens thus have political obligations to, or have their rights secured by, two authorities. The division of power between the member unit and center may vary, typically the center has powers regarding defense and foreign policy, but member units may also have international roles. The decision-making bodies of member units may also participate in central decision-making bodies. Much recent philosophical attention is spurred by renewed political interest in federalism, coupled with empirical findings concerning the requisite and legitimate basis for stability and trust among citizens in federal political orders. Philosophical contributions have addressed the dilemmas and opportunities facing Canada, Australia, Europe, Russia, Iraq, Nepal and Nigeria, to mention just a few areas where federal arrangements are seen as interesting solutions to accommodate differences among populations divided by ethnic or cultural cleavages yet seeking a common, often democratic, political order.<sup>26</sup>

(7) In this quotation, taken from the Introduction to Føllesdal's excellent *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on "Federalism," I have made only one editorial change, which is to insert 'basic Kantian moral' for 'federal' in the original text. Of course, this controversial emendation might not be what Føllesdal actually had in mind.<sup>27</sup> But it does set up the final step in my Kantian anarchist teleological history of rational humanity.

(8) Looked at teleologically, the real-world fact of Federalism seems to me to be, precisely insofar as it is "the theory or advocacy of [basic Kantian moral] principles for dividing powers between member units and common institutions," *a practically necessary and morally healthy devolutionary step in actual human political history* between, on the one hand, our fundamental tragic error of believing the myth of political authority and our corresponding creation of States and other State-like

---

<sup>26</sup> A. Føllesdal, "Federalism," *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), available online at URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/federalism/>>.

<sup>27</sup> In conversation, Føllesdal has said to me that "we're probably on the same team." Of course, I wouldn't want to saddle him with a commitment to EKCA. I think he meant only that, at the end of the day, we have similar views about the moral and rational justification of Federalism.

institutions, by means of which we voluntarily turn ourselves into more or less well-serviced machines, and on the other hand, the guiding moral ideal of an existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchist post-State world.

(9) In this way, then, *Kantian ethical anarchists* can also be *quasi-Federalists*.

(10) And now, with one other editorial addition, we can also re-quote Kant's vision of radical enlightenment:

When [after a long devolutionary Federalist process] nature has unwrapped, from under this hard shell [of the "crooked timber of humanity" (*IUH* 8: 23)], the seed for which she cares most tenderly, namely the propensity and calling to *think* freely, the latter gradually works back upon the mentality of the people (which thereby gradually becomes capable of *freedom* in acting) and eventually even upon the principles of *government*, which finds it profitable to itself to treat the human being, *who is now more than a machine*, in keeping with his dignity. (*WE* 8: 41-42)<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> I am very grateful to the participants in the workshop "Philosophical Foundations of Federalism," at the University of Luxembourg, LU, in May 2014, and especially Andreas Føllesdal, for extremely helpful critical comments on an earlier version of this essay, and equally helpful conversations on or around its central topics.



### **A Note on References to Kant's Works**

For convenience, I cite Kant's works infratextually in parentheses. The citations include both an abbreviation of the English title and the corresponding volume and page numbers in the standard "Akademie" edition of Kant's works: *Kants gesammelte Schriften*, edited by the Königlich Preussischen (now Deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: G. Reimer [now de Gruyter], 1902-). For references to the first *Critique*, I follow the common practice of giving page numbers from the A (1781) and B (1787) German editions only. Because the Akademie edition contains only the B edition of the first *Critique*, I have also consulted the following German composite edition: *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, ed. W. Weischedel, Immanuel Kant Werkausgabe III (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1968). I generally follow the standard English translations of Kant's works, but have occasionally modified them where appropriate. Here is a list of the abbreviations and English translations of works directly relevant to this essay:

- CPR* *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. P. Guyer and A. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997.
- CPrR* *Critique of Practical Reason*. Trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996, pp. 139-272.
- GMM* *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, pp. 43-108.
- IUH* "Idea of a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim." Trans. A. Wood. In G. Zöllner and R. Loudon (eds) *Immanuel Kant: Anthropology, History, and Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007, pp. 107-120.
- LE* *Immanuel Kant: Lectures on Ethics*. Trans. P. Heath and J. Schneewind. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- MM* *Metaphysics of Morals*. Trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*. Pp. 365-604.
- OT* "What Does it Mean to Orient Oneself in Thinking?" Trans. A. Wood and G. di Giovanni. In *Immanuel Kant: Religion and Rational Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996, pp. 7-18.
- PP* "Toward Perpetual Peace." Trans. M. Gregor. In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, pp. 317-351.
- Rel* *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason*. Trans. A. Wood and G. di Giovanni. In *Immanuel Kant: Religion and Rational Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996, pp. 57-215.
- WE* "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?" In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, pp. 17-22.

- Clarke, D. *Blaise Pascal*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Fall 2012 Edition ed. E.N. Zalta (ed.), available online at URL <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2012/entries/pascal/>, esp. section 6.
- Crowell, S (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Existentialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012.
- FRANKFURT, H. *On the Importance of What We Care About*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988.
- FØLLESDAL, A. *Federalism*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Spring 2014 Edition. E. N. Zalta (ed.), available online at URL =<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/federalism/>.
- HANNA, R and MAIESE, M. *Embodied Minds in Action*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.
- HANNA, R. *Kantian Ethics and Human Existence*. s\n
- HANNA, If God's Existence is Unprovable, Then is Everything Permitted? Kant, Radical Agnosticism, and Morality. [https://www.academia.edu/6351404/If\\_Gods\\_Existence\\_is\\_Unprovable\\_Then\\_is\\_Everything\\_Permitted\\_Kant\\_Radical\\_Agnosticism\\_and\\_Morality](https://www.academia.edu/6351404/If_Gods_Existence_is_Unprovable_Then_is_Everything_Permitted_Kant_Radical_Agnosticism_and_Morality).
- HUEMER, M. *The problem of political Authority: An examination of the Right to coerce and duty to obey*. London & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ethical Intuitionism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- ISRAEL, J. *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001.
- KIERKEGAARD, S. *The Essential Kierkegaard*. trans. H. Hong and E. Hong. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2000.
- KLEINGELD, P. and BROWN, E. *Cosmopolitanism*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Fall 2013 Edition, ed. E. N. Zalta, available online at URL =<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/cosmopolitanism/>, esp. section 1.
- KROPOTKIN, P. *Mutual Aid*. New York: NYU Press, 1972.
- PHILP, M. *William Godwin*. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Summer 2013 Edition, ed. E.N. Zalta, available online at URL =<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/godwin/>, esp. section 3.
- SCOTT, J. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Two Cheers for Anarchism*. Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2012.