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Until relatively recently, cosmopolitanism was considered to be totally out of date. It began to reappear around the time of the collapse of the Soviet empire and the end of the Cold War, and has become a fairly common concept within several scholarly disciplines. The complicated political processes of internationalism have contributed to the increasing interest in cosmopolitan ideals amongst not only historians and intellectual historians, but also political scientists, philosophers and sociologists. Some plausible causes for this shift in interest are, of course, the above-mentioned end of the Cold War, but also the increasing intensity of globalization in a broad sense. I use globalization here in a manner similar to Ulrich Beck, who instead calls it globalism, referring to economic globalization and the belief in a world market.¹ This fact demands a cosmopolitan world order, as national states are not capable of handling many of the global problems on their own. So cosmopolitanism is a part of our experience, which is a fact we need to accept, consciously or unconsciously.²

Much of this newfound interest in cosmopolitanism has come out of the social sciences even if well-known philosophers like Martha Nussbaum have been greatly involved in the topic as well. But it is a concept which has to be discussed within the human sciences, whose perspective then allows for an awareness of hermeneutical understanding as well as the impact of time, and is very

¹ Beck, Ulrich *Was ist Globalisierung?* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997).
² Beck, Ulrich *Der kosmopolitische Blick oder: Krieg ist Frieden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004).
illuminating in the case of cosmopolitanism. Placing cosmopolitanism in this temporal and spatial perspective allows for the approach of some aspects of cosmopolitanism that might not otherwise be considered.

In dealing with cosmopolitanism, it becomes apparent that there is a discrepancy between the different ways in which the concept is being used.\(^3\) It has been held that this discrepancy implies that cosmopolitanism has no true ideology – there is no centre of cosmopolitanism. It is frequently treated more as an ideal than as a doctrine. Cosmopolitanism is, in some respects, universal but, on the other hand, there are apparent problems with this universalism, as the parts do not seem to have an actual centre. This idea, originally formulated some two thousand years ago, has apparently not been discarded, as it still receives attention from many different perspectives and quarters. It is certainly a topic, or perhaps even a field, which addresses quite a few scholarly disciplines. But even if the idea of *kosmopolis* does not appear to have been discarded, this has not always been the case. During certain periods, cosmopolitanism has been seen as old-fashioned, or as just unrealistic or naïve.

Cosmopolitanism today might actually mean quite a few different things, and sometimes it seems as if certain theorists do not necessarily notice that different trains of thought are being confused. I consider cosmopolitanism today to be dependent, consciously or unconsciously, on the intellectual history of the concept. Depending on history does not mean that the concept has its own life outside of how it is being used. A concept acquires the meaning from its user.\(^4\) But as human activity is of such disparate
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character, it is difficult to describe all of its expressions. In the case of cosmopolitanism, there seems to be a certain connection between how the concept is being used today and how it was used during the Enlightenment. When the discussion of cosmopolitanism was recently reborn, as explained above, many discussants referred to Enlightenment thinkers such as Kant, Voltaire and others, and to the Ancient Stoics. A key to understanding cosmopolitanism today might be found in analyzing the periods when cosmopolitanism was at its pinnacle, not in order to correct today’s discussion, but instead to broaden it and to illuminate some of its confusing circumstances.

Roughly speaking, there are two main understandings of the concept of cosmopolitanism today. The same pattern can be noticed in the 18th century. One can be traced to the Stoic idea of Kosmopolis, while the other has its background in the Cynics. There is a clear development from a more popular and unreflective use of the term to a growth of a more sophisticated type, without a theoretical attitude. But one has to be cautious, as there also are many similarities between the two. Sometimes it is hard to distinguish one meaning from the other. This development of cosmopolitanism from an apolitical to a political concept occurs in the early 18th century, not surprisingly in close connection with the ideas that were to influence the outbreak of the French Revolution. It is also sometimes said that cosmopolitanism characterizes the Enlightenment in such a way that it can be called a key concept of the period, but this is often said without characterizing cosmopolitanism. Accor-ding to Schlereth, the cosmopolitan is characterized by eclecticism, but also by the willingness and even the desire to expose oneself to the unknown. Some people might consider the cosmopolitan to be naive and selfish, while others would not. However, the point is not whether cosmopolitanism in the 18th century has a true ideology, because that was neither the aim nor the purpose of this use of cosmopolitanism. Rather, Schlereth’s point illustrates that more discussion is needed in the case of cosmopolitanism.

One reason to distinguish between the two meanings of the concept, as done here, is that the two understandings of cosmopolitan-
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ism are still quite important and that, from such a historical perspective, the contemporary discussion will appear clearer. Of course there are good reasons to view cosmopolitanism as one of the key concepts of the Enlightenment. But during this period it was also used for different purposes, and it is possible to see how the concept eventually becomes a part of a theory formulated during the later part of the Enlightenment by Immanuel Kant. From being quite uncritically used, the idea of *kosmopolis* develops into a (at least partly) political theory by the end of the 18th century. This theory has an impact on discussions of globalization and world citizenship even today. I am thus looking at the history of thinking in order to illuminate meanings of the concept that might still influence our understanding of it. History is about actions, performed within a certain time and space. The history of ideas, or intellectual history, is different, as many ideas seem to live on as they continue to be used, while others just vanish, sometimes to be reborn later, perhaps in disguise, but always held by a person. Occasionally, however, a concept like *kosmopolis* can be presupposed to mean the same thing as it always has, just because it sounds nearly the same. But that is not the always case. Ideas change as their context changes, and this fact can also be illuminated by using Hans-Georg Gadamer’s idea of *Wirkungsgeschichte*. This is not the same thing as reception history, which, in general, sees the object of a study as more static. The idea of *Wirkungsgeschichte* implies that a concept brings experiences with it. It is tailed by all of its meanings and understandings, and changes over time. According to Gadamer, this change occurs more or less continuously. Reinhart Koselleck believes that concepts underwent more severe changes during the transformation from pre-modern to modern societies around 1750–1850. This interesting theory is sometimes developed further to claim a second such transformation, one caused by the complicated patterns containing the elements of the fall of the Soviet empire, economic globalization, and the intensified situation of communication. More recently, Koselleck has presented the concept of time layers (*Zeitschichten*) as a complementary idea of how changes appear differently depending on the time perspective from which
they are being considered. Gadamer’s as well as Koselleck’s models are very illuminating in the case of cosmopolitanism. Let me state that the Koselleck view explains why cosmopolitanism is currently gaining popularity and changing its definitions, and why it changed during the Enlightenment.

One attempt to examine cosmopolitanism has been made by Pauline Kleingeld who, by exploring the German theory of cosmopolitanism in the last decade of the 18th century, has distinguished six different expressions of the idea of cosmopolitanism. Of course, such distinctions and taxonomies can always be discussed and arranged differently. The categories that she distinguishes include, aside from market cosmopolitanism, the moral cosmopolitans, based on the common value that all human beings belong to the same moral world, even if this does not always imply that all human beings are sage enough to be citizens. Further, she distinguishes two types of political cosmopolitanism. One is defined as ‘International Federative cosmopolitanism’, that is, cosmopolitanism focused on the world, even if it, in some way, begins with Europe, and the other is defined as cosmopolitan law, referring to the relationship between individuals and states. The fifth type is cultural cosmopolitanism, a variety of moral cosmopolitanism, but concentrating on collectives and cultures rather than on individuals, without being either relativist or ethnocentric. The sixth is romantic cosmopolitanism, referring to the early German romantics and their criticism of individualism and rootlessness. Her example of romantic cosmopolitanism involves Novalis and the type of cosmopolitanism he presents in ‘Christenheit oder Europa’.

The cultural cosmopolitan, as defined by Kleingeld, is a person who sees that mankind differs from one another, and also acknowledges that different expressions of humanity are of equal value. A cultural cosmopolitan is neither relativist nor ethnocentric, as she puts it. Kleingeld uses Georg Forster (1754–1794) as a representative of this attitude. Forster described different cultures using un-
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7 Kleingeld, ‘Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany’, pp. 505–524.
prejudiced terms, and was interested in systematic investigations rather than in curiosities. His descriptions of other cultures are neither relativist nor ethnocentric. Common humanity is the origin and root of his cosmopolitanism. It is connected to universal moral cosmopolitanism, but focuses on cultures and collectives rather than on individuals.

There are no doubt different types of cosmopolitanism. The question of whether the concept has a centre or not seems to be less relevant. Cosmopolitanism is not an ideology or a certain kind of belief system, as might easily be presumed if one accepts the word form ending with -ism. The question is whether the different types have what Wittgenstein called a family similarity, or if there is a difference in type between them. The assumed similarity might not be as clear as could be expected.

The background of cosmopolitanism

The idea of *kosmopolis* is not new. The term is a compound of the Greek words *kosmos* and *polis*, both expressing some type of order. *Kosmos* is the type of order that can be found in nature, such as the changing seasons or tides, that is, the type of order that people need to be familiar with in order to be successful in agriculture and navigation. *Polis* is the order of society found in administration and irrigation. Originally, *kosmopolis* means the combination of these two, the ability to combine the order of society with the order of nature. This idea also influenced, or perhaps should even be seen as a part of, the natural right theory.

The first known use of the concept seems to be a well-known quotation, where the Cynic Diogenes of Sinope is asked where he is from, and he answers, ‘I am a cosmopolitan’, that is, he feels at home everywhere. In any case, this expression is a bit problematic, as its source is found in Diogenes Laertius, who lived long after Diogenes of Sinope (AD 200) and who for obvious reasons never met him. Nonetheless, the expression is a part of the history of the concept, as it is so well known. The meaning of the quotation is
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8 Diogenes Laertus, Vol II.
difficult to determine, as the phrase can be understood negatively as well as positively. There seems to be no further theory of cosmopolitanism in Cynic thinking apart from this quotation. The idea of kosmopolis was further expanded by the Greek and Roman Stoics, who developed it into more of an ethical idea, and included some universalistic claims.9 Stoic thinking contains an idea of universal equality beyond any borders, even if the people who actually had the opportunity to live in accordance with Stoic ideals were the elites of society. In addition to the Cynics, Aristotle also had an impact on Stoic thinking, with his view of man as a social being. Within the actual historical and political situation in which he lived, it was not too daring to see not only one’s own city-state but also all of humanity as included in kosmopolis. Logos was within reach for everyone, at least in theory.

The concept of cosmopolitanism was introduced into the modern languages during the Enlightenment, including the terms ‘cosmopolitan’, ‘world citizen’, ‘Weltbürger’, ‘Citoyen du monde’ and ‘världsmedborgare’. The intellectuals of the Enlightenment were in general quite familiar with Greek thought, and even more so with the Roman Stoics. The introduction of the classic term into modern languages also shows how the idea became rooted in a Western tradition. An excellent way to determine how a concept is viewed during a certain period is to look at its formal definitions in encyclopedias. In the great French Encyclopédie, cosmopolite is defined as:

un homme, qui n’a point de demeure fixe, ou bien un homme qui n’est étranger nulle part. Il vient de grand monde & grande ville. Comme on demandoit à un ancien philosophe d’où il étoit, il répondit: Je suis Cosmopolite, c’est-à-dire citoyen de l’univers. Je préfére, disoit un autre, ma famille à moi, ma patrie à ma famille, & le genre humain à ma patrie.10

In this description, it appears as if the cosmopolitan is quite naïve, a person flying above all, unwilling to place his feet on the ground. Such a view also appears in the first use of the concept in printed Swedish: it is in a translation of August Kotzebue’s *The Orthenborger Family and its Sufferings*. At the end of the novel, the young romantic Wilhelm explains to his uncle that he will join the Army in order to forget his broken heart. He might join any army, even the ‘Tartars’. His uncle reminds him that his blood belongs to his fatherland, whereupon Wilhelm answers: ‘My father’s land? The world is my father’s land; I am a cosmopolitan’. The uncle counters: ‘You are a fool!’ Here the cosmopolitan is described as a naïve person, a fool, worth nothing more than to be spat at. The cosmopolitan is also a coward, as he uses cosmopolitanism in order to escape from practical problems and unhappiness. He does not care about the people who are close to him, nor about the place where he was brought up. This kind of cosmopolitanism is close to a Cynic view, but one which involves a rather common understanding of the Cynic thinking, leaving out any political and anarchistic criticism.

As indicated in the *Stanford Dictionary* (2006), very few cosmopolitans in the Enlightenment defined themselves in the way they were described within the French encyclopedic definition. On the contrary, such a definition turned out to be the critical definition of a cosmopolitan by the non-cosmopolitans. This double meaning of the concept of cosmopolitanism still exists in our own time, for instance, when one type of cosmopolitanism is considered to be an expression of extreme individualism, while the other is a theoretical system with important links to human rights and contemporary political problems.

The concept of cosmopolitanism is apparently of considerable importance within Enlightenment thought. It acquired its impact from the Stoics, and from the Romans in particular. The Stoic cos-
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11 August Kotzebue, *Orthenbergska famillens lidande* (Stockholm 1794).
12 This is one of the distinctions made in Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown, ‘Cosmopolitanism’, in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/. However, one person here is only briefly mentioned.
mopolitanism might be understood as focusing on unity, which implies that humanity is seen as one entire unit. The Cynic type of cosmopolitanism is instead characterized by focusing on differences and discrepancies, and implies an elite perspective. Cynic stoicism includes elements of escaping rather than reflecting on the consequences of a cosmopolitan perspective. The Enlightenment cosmopolitan with certain Cynic characteristics is represented in this chapter by Fougeret de Monbron, while the cosmopolitan with Stoic characteristics is represented by Immanuel Kant.

Fougeret de Monbron

Anyone who is interested in cosmopolitanism sooner or later runs into Fougeret de Monbron and his quite unsystematic travel memories, *Le Cosmopolite*. He has been referred to by scholars interested in the idea of cosmopolitanism in the 18th century. Fougeret actually acts in a manner which makes him a good target for anyone wanting to criticize cosmopolitan attitude. His view of cosmopolitanism gives the impression of being unreflective, and it might be exaggerating to term it cosmopolitanism, as he does not present a coherent theory. But because he calls himself a cosmopolitan and because his writing is of interest to scholars, there are reasons to examine the type of ideas he has and associates with being a cosmopolitan. What he represents will be called cosmopolitanism here, even if it might be more appropriate to call it a cosmopolitan attitude. His position is quite self-centered, and he has an unsophisticated, liberal, and sometimes anarchistic pose to his surroundings. His actions demonstrate that calling oneself a cosmopolitan is apparently not the same as believing in cosmopolitanism as a universal ethical position. His cosmopolitan attitude might be called an aesthetic approach, and does not have much of a conscious moral basis.

Fougeret’s little book is quite unsystematic, consisting of some scattered travel impressions from the world from his point of view.
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He tries to place it in a broader context in the beginning by referring to: ‘L’univers est une espéce dont on n’a lu que la première page, quand on n’a vu que son pays’. The author tells us about how he dislikes the narrow-mindedness and stupidity in his homeland, and explains his love for England. Fougeret keeps referring to himself not as a travel writer or journalist, but as a travelling person jotting down his reflections on paper, letting random coincidences govern his journeys. His aim is explicitly not to evaluate or describe manners and culture. Still, that is exactly what he does. His personal boundaries shape what he sees and what he does not see. In addition, when he mentions where he might go, he refers to places that are well known, but that are also considered to be a bit exotic. These places could be Moscow, St Petersburg, Isfahan, or Beijing.

Fougeret thus refers to himself as a cosmopolitan, or a world citizen, as the title of the book says. In what way is he such a person? He serves as a good example of the kind of cosmopolitan who sets the norms for cosmopolitanism according to his own taste. The boundaries are very clear, and coincide with the boundaries of Christianity and Europe. This becomes apparent in his description of ‘Turks and Mohammedans’. It is the differences that are constantly focused on. Turks are harsher on themselves than Europeans are, which is shown in religious traditions like Ramadan. Turks are also brutal fatalists with a cruel system of rights. They have a nice method of disposing of building dimensions, but not when it comes to clothing and music. The way the Turks dress is, according to Fougeret, characterized as against nature, in the respect that it hides the beautiful proportions nature has given to humanity. Fougeret sees it as unnatural to place a short and chubby ideal before one which is tall and slim. With regards to music, there is an admission that tastes might be different; the Turkish music is melancholic and nasal. In his comparison of music, the images are carefully chosen. Some might prefer mustard, others sweets, Fougeret explains. That is also his view on how Turkish music is to be considered in comparison to sweet European music. There are simply different tastes
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14 Ibid.
15 Ibid., p. 41.
in music, and it is not hard to see how Fougeret uses his images: the coarseness of mustard, or the softness of a sweet? Which is to be preferred? When Fougeret catches a fever some weeks after leaving Turkey, he believes that he caught it in Oriental Turkey rather than in any of the other places he mentions.

Judging from his actions and deeds, Fougeret seems to despise people rather than cherish them. He seems to keep his distance. This is quite clear in his descriptions of the Turks, but also when he meets others, such as Italian women. His view is that Italian is by far the most beautiful language, and Italian opera and churches are also beautiful, especially the Saint Peter’s church in Rome. The Spaniards, on the other hand, are portrayed as half savage, which is exemplified not least by their treatment of the colonies.\(^\text{16}\) Even more savage, according to Fougeret, are the Portuguese, depicted as ‘a blend of blacks or mulattos, almost all Jews in their hearts and Christian on the surface!’\(^\text{17}\)

In any case, Fougeret does seem to possess some kind of political awareness. This becomes clear when he speaks about the English. He sees them not only as loving, but also as living in an egalitarian society, which apparently is one of his ideals. All citizens in England have the same privileges, and have the same protection under the law. From this point of view, the English are free.

One important aspect, in his view, involves his initial quote, which says that those who have only seen their paternal country have only read the very first page of a book. This implies that he is interested in seeing more of the world. His view on cosmopolitanism is that it is an attitude. And that attitude is very individualistic. Some would perhaps not call him a cosmopolitan at all, because he permanently uses his own subject as the norm, and notes what is different from his habits without reflecting on himself. He seems to lack an interest in searching for the reasons behind these differences. He does not really care. When it comes to ethics, he seems to have an unreflective view, saying that his own values are the right ones, or at least not to be questioned.

\(^\text{16}\) Ibid., p. 146.
\(^\text{17}\) Ibid., p. 148. ‘Les Portugais sont un mélange de Nègres ou de Mulâtes, presque tous Juifs de coeur & Chrétiens pour la forme!’
Fougeret de Monbron has been discussed here to serve as a good, although somewhat extreme, example of what a person calling himself a cosmopolite during the Enlightenment might mean by that. In the case of Fougeret, it is clear that he does not embrace the ideal of universalism. Rather than seeing what unifies humanity, and what is human in a person, he focuses on the differences, and does so quite uncritically. He does not see that treating someone badly is a threat to humanity as a whole. It is also easy to see that he is a representative of Orientalism and a colonial attitude.\textsuperscript{18} At the same time, he does not like being French but instead prefers the freedom on the other side of the Channel. In a way his cosmopolitanism implies escape, from the French, from his roots, and from his origins. His attitude shows that he might have been one of those who was referred to in the French encyclopaedia. He is an example of a person living a way of life that was not uncommon during the Enlightenment and still exists: that which could be termed cosmopolitan. The manner in which he refers to himself as a cosmopolitan is similar to the way the term is used today. A cosmopolitan can still be an unreflective person travelling around the world, using others as a means rather than as an end in themselves.

Kant as a cosmopolitan

For some, calling the Königsberg philosopher Kant a cosmopolitan might appear to be contradictory, as it is widely known that Kant hardly left his native city of Königsberg during his lifetime. In the biographies he is generally considered to be almost a patriot, unwilling to leave the place where he once upon a time, by chance, was born. But if cosmopolitanism in one of its meanings implies physical travel, as in the case of Fougeret, the concept also has a different meaning, in that it can refer to intellectual experiences as well as attitudes. Perhaps Kant’s cosmopolitanism is not a developed theory, but it is at least the outline of such a thing. Kant acquired his experience of the physical world and the world outside of Königsberg and Prussia through different media. Of course he

read an immense number of journals and books. But he also heard
stories and the experiences of travelling friends and visitors from
the at-that-time metropolitan old Hanseatic city of Königsberg,
strategically placed between East and West, and famous for its uni-
versity as well as for its commerce.

One of the most important works in regards to Kant’s cosmopol-
itanism is *Zum ewigen Frieden* (1795). In this work, Kant outlines
a model for perpetual peace, including a model for stable political
communication. His ideal is a state organized along the lines of
republican ideals, and is very much reminiscent of the ideal of
Rousseau. The states are to join themselves into an international
federation, with the purpose of allowing for both civilized discus-
sions and eventual solutions concerning matters between political
units. This quite formal solution (even if Kant did not develop it
himself) was combined with an idea of cosmopolitanism. Yet when
Kant discusses cosmopolitanism, he immediately limits the cosmo-
politan right to conditions of universal hospitality. Hospitality is the
right of a guest, and the guest cannot be treated like the inhabitant.
The guest has only rights, while the inhabitant has rights as well as
duties. This article is often referred to as a way to protect the colo-
nies from their European colonizers. The most important part of
this article is the last paragraph, where it is stated that:

> The people of the earth have thus entered in varying degrees into a
universal community, and it has developed to the point where a
violation of rights in *one* part of the world is felt *everywhere*. The
idea of a cosmopolitan right is therefore not fantastic and over-
strained; it is a necessary complement to the unwritten code of po-
itical and international right, transforming it into a universal right
of humanity. Only under this condition can we flatter ourselves
that we are continually advancing towards a perpetual peace.¹⁹

This might be developed more thoroughly, but at this point my
main intent is to indicate these two very different uses of the con-
cept of cosmopolitanism as represented by Fougeret de Monbron

¹⁹ Immanuel Kant, ‘Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch’, in Hans Reiss
(ed.), *Kant: Political Writings*, trans. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge Uni-
and Kant. The quotation above implies that Kant’s idea of cosmopolitanism has its centre in the concept of universal human rights, and that its boundaries will be where humanity ends. In this respect, we are all citizens of the world.

Kant’s argument for cosmopolitanism references the shape of the earth as an example. That it is shaped like a globe means that people can spread all over it to finally meet again, after a certain amount of time. Even Nature is involved in this, as Nature has what Kant calls a secret, hidden plan for humanity. In the beginning of history everyone, according to Kant, had the same right to the earth as everyone else. In cosmopolitanism, we can see the consequences of that. Because of this original cosmopolitan right, there is still, in principle, a right to be everywhere, regardless of who you are. But as things developed over history, the right to hospitality is all that is left of this.

According to Kant’s cosmopolitanism, every human being has the same value, on the basis of being a human. He explicitly includes all humans, not only Europeans. He argues that a violation of a person’s right is a violation of humanity in general. But his cosmopolitanism is still quite restricted. It has its greatest value in the case of human rights. When it comes to people’s freedom to remain where they want on Earth, cosmopolitanism is very restricted. It can only be seen as a general hospitality, according to Kant. And even this hospitality is restricted. It means that a person could visit any place without being treated with hostility, and expect to be treated kindly, but it cannot be compared to a guest’s right, but instead to a visitor’s right. While the former might imply that the person would be given almost the same rights as the host, the latter involves only the right to visit for a short time. This is at the same time Kant’s criticism of European colonialism, in which he quite briefly mentions the violations of human rights that regularly occurred. Kant criticizes the way the inhabitants in the colo-
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21 Kant’s criticism of European colonialism was radical, and was based on the theory of human rights. At the same time, he is disparaging of non-Europeans in his anthropology and geography lectures, a fact that was highlighted some years ago by Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze in Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader
nies are treated as a means and not as an end. The reason for claiming human rights is that human beings as such are gifted with reason, which brings with it the ability to choose between good and bad. This is the same for all humans, whether they are Europeans, Indians, or Africans. There are some contradictions in this, however. Kant claims the cosmopolitan right; there is no doubt about that. But, at the same time, he seems to imply that humans could be divided into different races. In the 1990s Kant was considered to be a racist at the same time as he was a cosmopolitan, a circumstance that led to an intense and ongoing discussion.22

The hospitality right aims at creating new and peaceful connections between different parts of the world based on universal rights, a condition that, in the long run, will be a necessary qualification for a world republic. Such a global republic might be Kant’s final goal – it is difficult to grasp what he really means, and it is complicated by the fact that at times he is concerned with the theoretical perspective, and at times with the practical.

Is Kant claiming a theory of cosmopolitanism? I would instead term it an outline of a theory. The idea of cosmopolitanism, like Kant’s idea of peace, is firmly rooted as a part of his philosophical system. Therefore it can be said to be at least an outline of a theory. Also it can be said to have its centre in universal human rights that are moral, but also seem to be more political than they had been earlier.

Conclusion

I have assumed that the multifaceted discussion on cosmopolitanism today, as well as some of the misunderstandings in that discussion, can be analyzed by referencing a history of the use of the concept during the Enlightenment. The reason behind this was that many of the discussions today refer to Enlightenment cosmopol-
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itanism. Therefore, that period has a certain relevance. In the same way, many of the Enlightenment philosophers referred to the Roman and Greek Stoics in their theories. And it is there we find the outlines for formal Stoic and Cynic cosmopolitanism. These can be used as outlines for understanding and clarifying the discussion of cosmopolitanism today. The idea is not to claim that there should be some kind of ‘true’ cosmopolitanism, but to instead illuminate some of the ongoing discussions.

Cosmopolitanism is indeed one of the key concepts of the Enlightenment. The mere fact that this is the period when it began to appear in the modern languages clearly shows this. What is less clear is what it actually means. What is 18th century cosmopolitanism? I have tried to give examples of two quite disparate definitions. I also have tried to show that there was a development of these definitions during the Enlightenment. But such a development can only be claimed to be quite slight. Cosmopolitanism was not, and still is not, a well-formulated theory with a clear centre. The more unreflective understanding of cosmopolitanism, as Fougeret indicates, still exists today. Even if that has not been the focus of this chapter, it will not be difficult for any of us to imagine such examples. People in power, or elites, still travel, and now and then consider the unknown, or their opposites, to be inferior, and refuse to reconsider their own values and experiences. This is indeed an uncosmopolitan attitude. But the Kantian cosmopolitanism also exists, a theoretical approach based on a theory of universal human rights. This type of thinking also has a background in Enlightenment thinking, including the problem of hospitality that Kant himself focused upon. But at the same time, the other meanings of the concept lived on. The Cynic cosmopolitanism represented by Fougeret can be found today, for example, in what Zygmund Bauman calls ‘the tourist’. Stoic cosmopolitanism, represented by Kant, can also be seen within many different contexts, such as the ideals of the United Nations and the struggle for human rights. The continuity of these ideas can show us that there are problems with these universalistic Enlightenment ideas when it comes to real dialogues. It can perhaps be claimed that the connec-
tion between Stoic and Cynic cosmopolitanism is such that it is impossible to discard one without the other.

How fair is it to compare Fougeret with Kant? Fougeret is perhaps only using a fashionable word from his time in order to fill it with his own dreams. He had the opportunity to travel and to explore different parts of the physical world. Kant, on the other hand, constructed an entire theory of how cosmopolitanism might be the leading concept of the world, without ever leaving Königsberg. Kant’s experiences of the world outside Königsberg came from his thinking, which was stimulated by talking and reading. His knowledge of other cultures and of the geography in other parts of the world was always mediated. Apparently the physical experience of *kosmopolis* is not necessary in order to understand it. Perhaps it is easier to grasp if you have not in fact travelled around the world. Perhaps humanity has to be seen from the perspective of the sage from Königsberg in order to approach an understanding of a cosmopolitan point of view. As is often the case, ideals are easier to believe in if they are not confronted with too much harsh reality, and with humans made of flesh and blood. That is probably the largest difference between Enlightenment cosmopolitan theory and the theory of today. All of the consequences arising from economic globalization, be they cultural, political or social, make it rather impossible to struggle with cosmopolitan ideals and at the same time ignore the problem of hospitality. Awareness of the history and of the different meanings of the concept might open the way for new insights into our own *kosmos*.
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