

Describe Kant's Argument on the Right to Rebel and Why is it Wrong

Posted on September 19, 2019

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/describe-kant-s-argument-on-the-right-to-rebel-and-why-is-it-wrong/>

Introduction

Immanuel Kant's rejection of a legal right to rebellion is one of the most disputed parts of his political philosophy because it sits beside his strong commitments to freedom, republican government, and public reason. Kant argues that citizens must leave the state of nature and enter a civil condition governed by public law, since private individuals cannot secure rights while each person remains judge in his or her own case. From this starting point, rebellion appears contradictory: if subjects can legally overthrow the highest public authority whenever they judge it unjust, then no final legal authority exists. Yet Kant also admired the moral enthusiasm inspired by the French Revolution of 1789 and regarded public criticism as essential to political progress. His position is therefore not simple authoritarian obedience. It is an attempt to protect the stability of law while allowing intellectual opposition and gradual reform. The difficulty is explaining what citizens should do when a government itself destroys the legal and moral conditions that supposedly justify obedience.

Why Kant Denies a Juridical Right to Revolt

Kant defines right as the conditions under which each person's freedom can coexist with everyone else's freedom under universal law. The state is necessary because property, contract, punishment, and coercion require public rules rather than competing private judgments. Rebellion therefore cannot function like an ordinary legal entitlement. A right must be recognized within a legal order, but a claimed right to overthrow the sovereign asks the existing legal system to authorize the destruction of its own highest authority. Kant fears that once factions can decide unilaterally that government is illegitimate, political disputes return to force and each side claims to embody the people. His argument has genuine force as a theory of constitutional order: no stable legal system can treat violent overthrow as a routine remedy equivalent to appeal or judicial review. It also explains why Kant prefers representative institutions, publicity, and lawful reform to revolutionary action, even when he believes existing governments fall short of republican ideals.

Public Reason, Reform, and the French Revolution

Kant does not require citizens to approve silently of government. In his essay on Enlightenment, he defends the public use of reason and argues that scholars should be free to criticize laws and institutions. Political progress should occur through open argument, legislation, and constitutional improvement rather than through insurrection. His response to the French Revolution illustrates this distinction. Kant condemned rebellion and regicide as unlawful, yet he described the enthusiasm of distant observers for the Revolution as evidence of a moral disposition toward freedom and republicanism. He also held that once a successful revolution establishes a new civil order, citizens should obey the new government rather than attempt a counterrevolution. This position separates the legality of revolutionary action from the moral meaning people may attach to its goals. The relevant historical event is the French Revolution of 1789, not a revolution in 1968, and Kant's reaction reveals a persistent tension between his admiration for freedom and his insistence on legal continuity.

The Problem of Tyranny

The strongest criticism of Kant arises when government is not merely flawed but systematically destroys the institutions of public right. A regime may abolish courts, imprison critics, persecute minorities, censor all opposition, or use legal forms to organize terror. Kant's theory still seems to deny subjects a right to overthrow it because rebellion would replace public authority with private judgment. This reasoning can become circular: the state is owed obedience because it represents public law, yet it may continue claiming obedience after eliminating the conditions that make law reciprocal rather than coercive. Critics therefore argue that a distinction is needed between an imperfect but reformable legal order and a regime that has ceased to protect basic rights altogether. Without such a distinction, Kant's theory risks protecting the existence of authority more strongly than the freedom authority exists to secure. Moral responsibility also complicates unconditional obedience because individuals cannot justify participation in grave wrongdoing simply by saying that officials commanded it.

Why Kant's Warning Still Matters

Rejecting Kant's absolute prohibition does not make revolution automatically desirable. Revolutions can produce civil war, revenge, economic collapse, foreign intervention, and new authoritarian rule, and movements that begin in the language of liberation can reproduce coercion after gaining power. Kant is therefore persuasive when he warns against romanticizing political violence or assuming that one faction's private certainty is sufficient to dissolve the legal order. Modern constitutional systems respond to this problem by institutionalizing resistance within law through elections, independent courts, impeachment, protected speech, opposition parties, judicial review, and professional civil services. These mechanisms reduce the need to choose between passive obedience and violent

overthrow. Where they remain available, revolutionary action becomes harder to justify because lawful remedies exist. Where a regime systematically destroys those channels, however, Kant's absolute conclusion becomes less convincing. His philosophy is strongest as a defense of constitutional procedures and weakest when it offers no adequate response to a state that makes those procedures impossible.

Conclusion

Kant rejects a juridical right to rebellion because public rights require a final authority and because a constitution that authorizes its own violent overthrow would undermine the unity of law. He prefers criticism, public reason, representative institutions, and gradual reform to revolution, and his caution about civil war and factional violence remains important. His admiration for the French Revolution concerned the spectators' commitment to freedom, not a legal endorsement of revolutionary action. The central weakness in his theory is its treatment of extreme tyranny. A state that destroys courts, suppresses public reason, and systematically violates reciprocal freedom may no longer resemble the civil condition Kant seeks to protect. A more defensible position therefore preserves his insistence that revolution should never become ordinary constitutional politics while recognizing a moral distinction between resisting a defective government and resisting organized domination that has eliminated effective legal remedies. Kant explains why rebellion is legally paradoxical, but not why obedience must remain morally unlimited.

References

Kant, I. (1784). *An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?*

Kant, I. (1797). *The Metaphysics of Morals*.

Ripstein, A. (2009). *Force and Freedom*. Harvard University Press.