

Kant's Views On Human Rights

Posted on October 2, 2018

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/kants-views-on-human-rights/>

Introduction

Immanuel Kant's moral and political philosophy remains influential in discussions of dignity, autonomy, duty, rights, and the limits of state power, although contemporary human-rights law cannot be reduced to Kantian theory. Kant asks moral agents to examine the maxim guiding an action and determine whether it could be willed as a universal law. He also argues that humanity must always be treated as an end and never merely as a means. These principles are relevant to rights because they reject the idea that a person's basic moral status depends on wealth, citizenship, popularity, or usefulness to a majority. Kant's language of dignity distinguishes persons from commodities that can simply be replaced by equivalents. Governments may pursue security, prosperity, and public welfare, yet Kantian reasoning asks whether the means respect the agency of those affected. At the same time, Kant did not write the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and some of his own writings on race, gender, and political status conflict with contemporary equality norms. His contribution is therefore philosophical rather than a complete historical blueprint for modern rights.

Universal Law, Good Will, and Equal Moral Standards

Kant begins the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* by describing a good will as good without qualification because talents, courage, wealth, and even happiness can serve harmful purposes when directed by corrupt principles. Moral worth therefore depends primarily on the maxim from which a person acts rather than on luck in the final outcome. The first major formulation of the categorical imperative requires a person to act only on a maxim that could be willed as a universal law. A false promise, for example, relies on a practice of trust that would collapse if everyone used promises deceptively whenever convenient. Universalization is not a test of personal preference; it asks whether an agent is making a private exception while expecting others to respect a rule. Human-rights reasoning contains a related demand for consistency. A legal protection loses moral credibility when institutions apply it only to favored groups. Kantian universalism therefore supports the idea that rights and duties require standards capable of public justification rather than rules adjusted according to social power or political convenience (Kant, 1998; O'Neill, 1989).

Humanity as an End, Autonomy, and Dignity

The humanity formulation gives Kant's ethics its clearest connection with modern rights discourse. People routinely use one another's services: patients rely on clinicians, customers rely on workers, and citizens rely on public officials. The violation occurs when another person's rational agency is bypassed through coercion, deception, exploitation, or deliberate disregard. Treating humanity as an end requires respecting another person as someone capable of purposes rather than merely as an instrument for one's own project. Slavery, torture, trafficking, nonconsensual experimentation, and systematic deception are therefore incompatible with this principle because the affected person is subordinated to another objective. Kantian autonomy does not mean doing whatever one desires. It concerns rational self-government under principles that could apply to all. Modern human-rights law uses dignity more broadly than Kant's own account of rational agency, clearly protecting children and people with significant cognitive disabilities whose decision-making capacity may be developing or impaired. This broader legal development prevents rights from depending on a person's demonstrated intellectual ability while retaining the central Kantian insight that human beings should not be assigned merely instrumental value.

Rights, Consequences, and the Role of Public Law

Kant is frequently contrasted with utilitarianism because utilitarian theories evaluate actions or rules through effects on overall welfare, whereas Kantian ethics places stronger constraints on how individuals may be treated. A simplistic aggregate calculation could appear to justify punishing an innocent person if doing so prevents greater unrest, while Kantian justice rejects using that person as an instrument. The contrast should not be exaggerated. Policymakers need empirical knowledge about consequences, and sophisticated consequentialist theories often defend stable rights because insecurity and coercion reduce welfare. Kant also distinguishes ethics from the "Doctrine of Right," which concerns the lawful coexistence of persons in a civil condition (Kant, 1996). Political institutions are necessary because one person's external freedom can conflict with another's, and public law creates enforceable conditions for equal freedom. Rights are therefore not merely benevolent favors granted by rulers. They structure relations among persons who must share a legal order. Contemporary rights systems often combine deontological constraints with proportional policy reasoning: certain protections limit what authorities may do, while other questions require balancing legitimate interests through law, evidence, due process, and review.

Cosmopolitanism, Historical Influence, and Limitations

Kant's political writings extend beyond domestic law. "Toward Perpetual Peace" discusses republican government, relations among states, and a limited cosmopolitan right of hospitality, contributing to

later traditions of international legal and cosmopolitan thought (Kant, 2006). Modern human-rights documents similarly assert protections that do not depend entirely on nationality. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights grounds equal dignity and articulates civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, but its intellectual history includes many sources beyond Kant: religious traditions, natural-law theories, antislavery struggles, labor movements, feminist activism, anticolonial movements, wartime experience, and negotiations among states and civil-society actors (United Nations, 1948). Kant's own record also requires critical context. Some writings contain racial hierarchies and restrictive assumptions about women and citizenship that conflict with contemporary equality. His hospitality principle is narrower than modern refugee protections. A responsible account therefore avoids presenting him either as the sole founder of human rights or as irrelevant because of historical limitations. His universalism, autonomy, and dignity remain influential conceptual tools that later thinkers have revised and expanded.

Conclusion

Kant's philosophy contributes to human-rights reasoning through universal law, autonomy, dignity, equal moral standing, and the requirement to treat persons as ends rather than mere means. These ideas place limits on arguments that justify coercion or sacrifice solely by appealing to collective benefit. They also connect rights with duties: protection from deception implies obligations of honesty; equal legal status requires institutions to apply rules without arbitrary discrimination; and public freedom depends on a lawful order capable of justifying coercion to those subject to it. Kantian ethics does not settle every modern policy dispute, because consequences, social vulnerability, competing rights, and empirical conditions also matter. Nor did Kant himself anticipate the full content of contemporary human-rights law or consistently embody its modern equality commitments. His continuing importance lies in a demanding question that can be applied to both personal conduct and institutions: can the governing principle be justified universally, and does it respect each affected person as someone with dignity rather than as a disposable instrument? That question remains one important strand within the broader, plural history of human rights.

References

- Kant, I. (1996). *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (1998). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (2006). "Toward Perpetual Peace." In *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings*. Yale University Press.
- O'Neill, O. (1989). *Constructions of Reason*. Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.