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Kant and the Constitution

**Introduction**

In order to champion enlightenment in general and highlighting the idea of freedom specifically, Kant focused on writing his social and political philosophy. His work contained both natural law and traditions involving a social contract. According to him every human being that is rational in nature has the choice and the freedom of entering into a civil condition. This can also be governed by a contract of the social nature so that the freedom of the individual is preserved and realized. Going further into his work, Kant has worked tirelessly to differentiate between the different forms of constitution currently applicable. Out of all the others he chose to say in his “First Definitive Article for Perpetual Peace” that all republican constitutions should be put into place as the Civil Constitution of every state. This essay, keeping in light of this, will look at why the distinction made by Kant was important for his thesis and is there any resonation in this distinction. Finally, how important is this distinction in order to understand the nature of democracy in the twenty-first century.

**Discussion**

The political philosophy of Kant lies within the domains of practical philosophy. This is considered as one-half of the broadest divisions of the thoughts of Kant between theoretical and practical philosophy. Furthermore, political philosophy is also to be considered as a part of practical philosophy on the basis of both empirical elements and the virtue proper. In light of the empirical elements, it is worth noting that practical philosophy contains a collection of rules. These rules govern the free behavior of rational beings and also cover all the actions of humanity in both aspects related to applying and pure politics. (Rauscher, 2007). Practical philosophy and its rational elements with the absence of empirical evidence were known by Kant as the metaphysics of morals. Kant emphasized heavily and also made the pure aspect of philosophy a priority in his work, this was visible from the part of his essay titled, “On the common saying: that may be correct in theory but it is of no use in practice" (Williams, et al. pp. 263-273). However, this essay was also written in essence to show his contradictory view towards Hobbes on the fact that it was more important for a politician to focus on governance of the pragmatic sense and not with the abstract right (Williams, et al. pp. 263-273).

Political philosophy, in general, is not only a derivative of Kant and his practical philosophy but the truth is that it depends strongly upon the practical philosophy of Kant in order to form its basis. The intention regarding the practical philosophy and the categorical imperative that seems to govern Kant's philosophy was originally thought of to be the basis for not only what is thought ethically proper in this day and age but for a broader spectrum of things that related directly and indirectly with the human behavior and its deliberations. In his work, he defined practical philosophy as something related to the behavioral rules regarding free choice (Rauscher, 2007). On the other hand, theoretical philosophy dealt with the knowledge and its rules. In this manner, practical philosophy laid the rules that govern the deliberative actions of humans. Kant’s main arguments towards the relationship between categorical imperative and human deliberative action arise from the groundwork for the metaphysics of morals. On its first page, he denotes that the groundwork is supposed to be a book that prepares for metaphysics of morals and its future. After twelve years he published two books as part of the metaphysics of morals, the doctrine of right and doctrine of virtue. Both of these parts have categorical imperative as its highest principle and thus making them equally as a part of the practical philosophy of Kant (Tampio, et al. Pp.258-266).

There are two distinct parts of the book metaphysics of morals namely the doctrine of right and doctrine of virtue. Kant's work focused on separating the political rights from what common man would call morals in the narrowest of sense. He put three conditions in order to limit right and only something can be enforceable as a right if it fulfills these three conditions. Firstly, a right is something that has an influence on other people as well. This influence can be either directly or indirectly, which means that any duties to one’s own self are excluded from this. Secondly, right just not merely a concern they wish but also the choice of others (Rauscher, 2007). This means that mere desires have not to be placed in being considered as right in fact only those decisions that bring about actions are at stake. The third condition doesn't necessarily relate to the matter of the acts of others but only the form. This shows that there is no particular desire or even ends that are presumed on the agent's part. However, Kant is considered to include as a part of right to be beneficent, however, there is no conclusion on his part that states that beneficent actions are important for a right. The only thing that he does conclude is that most beneficent actions are permitted by right but there are some who also violate right.

In the perspective proposed by Kant, the concept of a constitution is not one of positive law but one of reason, which is not in any shape or form subject to written law. In Kant’s terms, the experience is related to empirical and positive law which in the overall sense makes it an issue that does not pertain to the faculty of law. Furthermore, there is no implementation of the constitution in normal terms by Kant. This could be accredited to the fact that during that era and after that for a long time the constitution was considered only as a political concept which was normative in nature rather than a legal document (Bragyova, 2011). By the end of the eighteenth century, the constitution was started to be considered as empirical legislation, which Kant refers to as positive law. Constitutions such as the 1791 French constitution was considered as a legal document but was more a product of political philosophy that in turn led to the formation of the political principles. These were then finally written down in a solemn charter. This was majorly present on the legal concept that was considered rational during that time and age. What today is considered constitutional in the period of enlightenment were not valid at that time. This occurred not on the basis of positive law but mostly due to practical reasons (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128).

In Kant's understanding, concepts such as state and constitution are more related to the course of action. This is because the constitution determines the government, its form and how it manages the relationship between the different state powers. In actuality, the idea of social contract is not the creation of Kant but the implementation of his thought as a regulative idea that might stem from him. Kant was an exceptional anthropologist, which allowed him the notion that no contract that ever has constituted a society has ever been obtained (Bragyova, 2011). This way he relates the notion of a constitution with a social contract. This entails the idea that Kant explicitly considered the constitution to be a social contract. So, by understanding the constitution in the form of an idea, Kant considers the people that are constituted within the constitution as the ideal people. Since these people cannot exist before and separate from a social contract, they cannot discuss about the origination of the supreme one.

Furthermore, the constitution and its conception as a form of social contract help in developing an understanding of the link between the sovereignty of the people and the constitution. The conceiving of the constitution by Kant is not only as of the basis of social life establishment under the rule of law but more of his focus is on the people who united on the basis of this contract as he identifies with them (Bragyova, 2011). The sovereignty of people is the most important criteria but there should be no manifestation of it in the practical life of individuals. The republican constitution and the representation of the constitution as a social contract are basically the same things. Kant considers representational and more importantly constitutional democracy as a necessary element that is needed for the formation of a lawful constitution. These thoughts of his have proved widely successful in the constitutional theory of the modern age and more importantly the neo-classical school of thought. It was also appreciated in the modern political philosophy, which is considered by Rawl as the theory of constitutional democracy (Bragyova, 2011). In the light of constitutional law, it is an accepted theory that the conception of the constitution to be judged as a social contract. This is interpretable in legal forms and also has applicability in legal reasoning related to constitutional law. Furthermore, it helps in the interpretation of sovereignty of people under the law of the constitution. Lastly, in modern legal systems, the constitution provides two services. It maintains the legality of the legal system and helps in the legal determinations of the content of the law. This is present in both modern and neo-constitutionalist legal systems.

Taking into account the central idea of the perpetual peace and the notion that was proposed by the central ideology of International Law, it is highlighted that Kant is hundreds of years ahead of the ideology that is presented by Hobbes. For Kant, law and constitution is all what is parallel to the actual and moral good. Also, it is termed as an ethical dimension that can be a representative of the activities carried out by human beings and the ethical dimensions that directly or indirectly affect human activities and human relationships. For Kant, a constitution should be a reflection of the public good because all those actions that are performed by the leaders and the ones who are elected when made not acceptable for the public is the real cause of religious and state issues and stress that can bring unrest in the action of the states (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). Also, it is highlighted that constitution is a contract, but it is never ever a fact, in fact, it is an idea of reason that is required of a human being so that something that can be born out of the collective and the united will of the state. Within society and a state, every normal human being is termed as a contractor because a contract has the potential to decide and then categorize what is being served is required or not. Also, it determines if the propositions are in favor of humans or not. An analysis of the constitutional views by Kant highlighted that any constitution should be a republic. It means that only the constitution that is the result of some social pact must be based on the goodwill of the people. It is also highlighted that there are two major principles that can make the constitution well-performing and applicable. One of the principles is of representation and the other is the principles of the separation of power. The principle of representation highlights that every human being within a state is the representative of the affairs of the state. Also, a state can only work if it is the union of all the citizens as well as it is careful of the rights of the citizens that are gained through the mediation of the delegates. The other principles, also called the principle of the separation of power highlights that if a state has any of the representative characters, then it should think like the report of the sovereign and the multitude of the subjects (Tampio, et al. pp.258-266). Kant finds the separation of power not as a division but as a unity that resides in the different authorities of the state. The reason for such beliefs can be traced from the fact that Kant has its prime focus on the lawful government as well as the civil right that connects him to the natural right thoughts. These justifications of the state given by Kant are not just limited to the visions that are proposed by the other people, but it also highlights the fact that an individual only enters the state when it is found that the rules and regulation of the states are best fulfilling the needs of an individual. In order to promote the welfare of society, those laws should be proposed that can address human thoughts and are compatible with the thinking paradigm of those who are living in a society or that state.

The political philosophy of Kant is more like a junction between the two major realms, on one side there are the overwhelming political principles, while on the other side, there are domain of materials motives of the human behaviors (Molloy, et al.). A critical analysis highlights that if a state draws these two constitutions, it is necessary to meet the set obligations of the society. Also, the moral improvement of men can only be done by making those condition and laws that are equally applicable and they are directly meeting the needs and the requirement of the people who are living in that particular state. One of the examples that are given by Kant is that of a human who commits robbery, he commits robbery, not because of the passion to rob but he robs because he is seeing that there is no way out that he can achieve and fulfill his dreams, of both moral and materialistic desires. Such desires push not only robbery but other crimes as well such as adultery and even attacking the politicians out of anger and disrespect.

A critical insight highlights that there are two major sections of the construction of peace by Kant. According to Kant, peace means that there would be an end to all the form and types of hostilities taking into account that an adjective “perpetual” is attached to it. This understanding of peace is defined and found to nullify all the exciting reasons that can pave the way for future wars. It is also highlighted that there would be a mental reservation by the party that can revive some old pretension to the future (Grovogui, pp. 301-302). Kant held that the "telos" of human history is actually a tribute to the achievement of the constitutional state. There are some strong reasons in the construction of Kant's republican constitution, with a strong reliance on the reason and this logic is very close to the anthology that is proposed by the neo-constitutionalist constitution, taking into account the idea that a republican constitution can never be a political constitution. It is more like a legal construction that is derived from some pure source of the concept of law. Kant has proposed a profound difference between the political and legal construction taking into account the dominance of the natural or the national law. Kant has defined three major principles of a constitution (Molloy, et al.). One of the major principles is freedom, taking into account that man has a single simultaneous and innate right. The concept of freedom is much interesting as it includes some of the fundamental human rights such as freedom of speech, equality and the protection of privacy. In more simple words, the concept of freedom proposed by Kant is more like a universal right that infers that freedom is supposed to be acquired or deserved, much like the other rights that are practiced under legal systems. Another aspect of Kant's constitution is the enforcement of legal norms, also called “met the norms” that can be used to conduct the legal system (Grovogui, pp. 301-302). Here, legal freedom comprises of the lawful freedom that employs an equal subjugation to the law, highlighting that legal freedom is protected by the state coercion. It is also called the nonconstitutional concept of freedom that was incorporated in the 18 century and it was prevalent until the 20 century. In addition, the third element of the republican constitution as proposed by Kant is the equality of the citizens. This equality is also called Unabhängigkeit. The underlying understanding of this equality differentiates between the active and passive citizens where political rights are secured and meant for the citizens who are self-sufficient and they have an economic and social existence (Grovogui, pp. 301-302).

An analysis of the definite article of peace highlights, Kant has proposed some necessary and sufficient conditions that are necessary for the achievement of perpetual peace. According to Kant, it is necessary and possibly formal to institute a state of peace with the same ideology that it is among the men. Perpetual peace as defined by Kant is dependent on the establishment of an international civil constitution, in which Kant highlighted three major principles named as, freedom for all the members of the society, the principle of dependence for everyone who is living in a state on a single and common legislation and then the legal equality for everyone (Acosta, et al.). Kant differentiates between the republican constitution and the democratic constitution which highlights that Kant was not friendly towards democracy, in fact, he found that the stance of democracy has puzzled many commentators and there is some good reason behind this differentiation. It asserts that Kant is not only committed to his ideology of ethics but he had a strong notion of equality among the other human beings. Kant has endorsed Rousseau’s idea that there is none of the law that can be legitimate until and unless it can or at least it enjoys consent from all the consociates. This is also defined as a principle that is found to be more demanding than the current understanding of legitimate democracy. Kant’s philosophy asserts that there should be no obedience to the external law except those which are given consent from all the people who are living in a state. Kant’s differentiation of republican and democratic consultation is necessary to understand How Kat sees democracy as a despotism in to the realms of perpetual peace (Acosta, et al.).

The analysis of both, “To perpetual peace and The Doctrine of Right”, it is highlighted that the aim of perpetual peace is to look for the most explicit and the strongest reservations that can be found against the government. According to Kant, forms of state can only be classified by using two different criteria, whether it reflects the number of rules, or it is all about the way in which a sovereign power to be exercised. Kant views democratic government and constitution as demos that can act either like a monarch or an oligarchy (Acosta, et al.). Kant has affirmed that direct democracy is something that is void of any human interpretation. Also, it is highlighted that Kant departs from Rousseau because Kant is not explicit about it. This philosophy also highlights that there is a dire need to have a government that can be called "universal government”. This philosophy automatically pushes people towards republican democracy (Grovogui, pp. 301-302). In the spirit of republicanism, it is highlighted that the minds of the citizens and rulers should be the representative of the public that is living within the state. Also, it is highlighted that if the burden of representation is shared by the electors as well as the elected then there is no reason that is left behind to justify that democracy should be void of despotism. In a simplified form, it is highlighted that if the power of general good is embedded in the political authorities, then democracy can face a clear advantage over the others also called “formae imperii.” (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). Kant is not an appreciator of the popular which is also called democratic control over the other delegates. It would not be wrong to say that Kantian republic is more like an ideal type that cannot be satisfied only with the help of election and a critical analysis of the constitutional limits. It is important to note that the Kantian republic is more like an idea that should have been followed by the concrete republicans. A simple understanding of constitution near Kant is more like a despotic regime. Kant’s republican ideology is more like an ideology of today that can entail the ability of an individual to distance oneself from the other’s interest or the political interest. In terms of Kantian constitution, there would be a state in which all the citizens would be free, there would be a deliberative and an autonomous citizenship that can accept all the issues and burdens of the upholder policy and other representations that either support public good or there is a real chance to express goodwill (de Ville, et al. pp. 335-357).

As per Kant’s philosophy, it is justified that if there is a state in which all the votes can be either exchanged or controlled so that the powerful can dispose of a number of votes in proportion to the number of those dependent, then there is a very less or rare chance of expressing goodwill. Kant is found to be quitting explicit, along with the reason for excluding the servants, women, apprentices and the minors from the right to vote. The ignorance and negligence reflect the stance of passive citizenship which infers that all the people are obliged to depend on the officers and other higher authorities to get their life necessities fulfilled. This exclusion is much similar to the elitism style which is also defined in terms of the preoccupation highlighting that the powerful citizens do not increase in their say of political decisions if they exploit their dependency on the other dependents, which ranges from moral sustenance to the act of blackmailing someone. It would not be wrong to say that for the angle of constitutional theory, it is highlighted that the relationship between public justification and rationality is significant. In terms of politics, it is highlighted that the use of reason both public as well as collective is justified because it is a combination of both, participation rights as well as election, and legislation along with other communicational rights that can act as a strong tool to safeguard public reasoning and debate. It is highlighted that the democratically of the legitimate formation of both will and constitution is impossible without the inclusion of constitutional rights and it is based on the constructional rule or procedure. Ultimately, it is asserted that rational procedural constitutional democracy is also in a dire need of judicial protection that would be granted by the constitution. As per Kant’s thought, the constitution is more like a social contract, which defines as well as highlights the underlying concept of constitutional democracy, which is also called equality (Molloy, et al.). Under this stance, constitution is meant for the equality of those who are living in the constitutional state. This idea is similar to that of popular sovereignty highlighting the empirical social fact. The constitutional people also called the sovereigns exist only in the constitution, taking into account the idea of the titular state. The collective decision making power that binds people is more like the manifestation of the decision-making procedure. In other words, the constitutional freedoms that are the major part of an adequate constitution reflect fundamental rights these rights are legally necessary and they are the actual content of any of the legal system. Under the impact of modern constitutional reviews, legislation is meant to protect the constitutional rights of the people which is in return taken over from the natural law or from the rational law that is preferred by the majority (Tampio, et al. pp.258-266).

In accordance with the constitutional theory of Kant, it is highlighted that the rational states usually establish legal consideration and these considerations are a confusion among the citizens. Legal freedom, one of the basic aspect is also found to be lawful and in freedom along with an equal subjection to the rule of law. This stance of law is much similar to that of constitutional freedom that is granted in the 18 century and it was prevalent until the 20 century. These political dimensions are also counted unfit for the title of constitutional law. It is also a general role that is deemed to be accepted by the people who are adapting to the different representative organs such as parliament. As per the information quoted by Kant, the ultimate identity of the two formulas also called, rationale admissibility, as well as the publicity, is actually derived from the concept of reason. Kant has associated rationality with publicity and this concept is intertwined with reason that is used in a similar way as that of science. Kant has examined the rationality of the arguments (Molloy, et al.).

The difference between the two ideologies. Democratic constitutions in contrast to the republic constitution highlight that a constitution should be made only out of three major perspectives and baselines such as freedom, equality, and independent. Under this impact, it is affirmed that all the laws and regulations should be made under the impact of republicans. Republicanism is more like the political principles that infer the separation of executive power with that of legislative. It is highlighted that the despotism is that of the autonomous authority that is designed by the state of the laws which is decreed by the government itself. Also, it is highlighted that in the despotism, the public must be governed by the rulers, as per the direction of the will of the ruler (Tampio, et al. pp.258-266). However, the democratic model of the government is found to be in contrast with that of the republicans. It is made impossible by the modes of the government to wish for mastery. It is also said that no matter how much smaller is the person of the government, there would be a greater representation and there would be increased stress on the approaches by the constitution, reaching the possibility of the republicans. In the case of democratic authority, the government must have a significant representative form where the government is despotic and it is arbitrary in nature.

Taking into account the political philosophy of Kant, it is highlighted that states are subjected to the unilateral whims of the potential adversaries, also defined as a condition that is formally incompatible with the duty to respect. The Kantian republic is more like an ideal abstraction that each of the concrete republics should always strive for. It is important to note that Kant is so suspicious about democracy taking into account the ideology that it helps to conceive a form of a democratic regime that cannot importantly fall in the category of perversion fears (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). As per Kant’s philosophy, it is brought into insight that the spirit of republicanism has shaped and modified the minds of both citizens and rulers in such a way that the representative uses laws that are not only found to be consistent with the constitution but it was something that is capable of furthering the general grounds. If the ideology of general good is embedded in the polity then democracy can have a clear advantage over the other form of politics and democracy. The overall analysis highlights that Kant was in the favor of majority where majority good can be addressed and all the actions and their consequences are the product of something that is practiced within the state (Molloy, et al.).

It would not be wrong to say that this distinction between democratic and republic law is important to examine what is actually required of a layman who is living in a society and what they are presented with which in return behooved them to resist and act against the set standards. There are a lot of aspects and dimensions that need to be considered while analyzing the criticism of the perpetual peace and the difference between a republic and a democratic constitution. An exegetical analysis of the Kant’s philosophy highlights that the political philosophers tend to analyze their works in terms of the present situation that they have been facing rather than a critical insight of their future and the changing situation. The analysis of the Kant philosophy in the present time, i.e. 21 century attracts man’s attention because the massive shift and empowerment of the Kant’s philosophy was because of the French revolution and 21 century is something that is beyond the impact of any kind of revolution (Williams, et al. pp. 263-273). It is asserted that although Kant was highly in the favor of republican democracy, still some of the philosophers assert that the points are much similar to that of the metaphysics of morals. It is asserted that liberalism and republicanism are not actually the same thing because the limitations of the legislation and constitutional limits are not enough for the standards that are set for a republic. Also, the republic is far more important in the concept of liberal democracy, taking into account that the legislative owner acts in the spirit it is not just a collection of facts and figures. It is also sweeping to admit Kant’s vision because a republic is not just a set of institutions, in fact, it’s a collection of ethos that is meant to be reached through the action of the citizens. If there are shared ethos than it determines the internal political reference and preferences but it is also and most relevantly a choice in the foreign policy (Grovogui, pp. 301-302).

Kant has made a clear thesis that no perfect republic is actually responsible of the relation of one state with the other state, there is no consideration under the common laws. If the concept of moral learning is considered than there is no other ideal state than republican state because a republic state is something that is continuously something that is striven towards. There is no state in the world can be said to reach the ideal positions neither there is a state that has secured once for all in the progress that is made for the achievement of that ideal state (Molloy, et al.). Another notion of the republican government highlights that a republic government doesn’t actually or merely respond to the majority of the electors because if a republic is judged by the conformity of the decisions in terms of constitutional as well as interpretation values. Also, the major notion of the representative government comprises of more than one mechanism that is capable of showing or ensuring the transition of preferences from the citizens to the rulers. Also, a state is found to presuppose the authentic interpretative effort that can be applied to the republican principles that are applicable to all the interpretative efforts (Grovogui, pp. 301-302).

It is also highlighted that the ideas of universal peace that are presented by Kant are more towards the model of an imperial Pax Romans that is based on universal monarchy. Also, this ideology is based on the project that is meant for an international order. Kant has given an account of the human’s innate right of the freedom with that of the others that is also defined as the independence from being constrained by the choice of someone else (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). As per Kant, right is something that is accounted with the authorization of the use of coercion because as long as there is an opposition of the coercion, there would be a hindrance to the freedom that is parallel to the universal laws. Kant’s ideology is more like general within the context of private life. Kant clearly prefers a division that is a republic in nature in terms of the vision of power which is also a single alternative to despotism. So, there are two possibilities both, acceptance and no acceptance of the resonance because at one stage Kant’s philosophy is more like a negation of the private concern while on the other side, it is more like a stance of acceptance because of the possibility of change in the societies that are more closer to the ideology of an ideal state where a prime significance is given to the human rights. Also, Kant is not a categorical pacifist, in fact, he accepted what have played a central role in the development of making in general good. He does not think like the “mechanism of nature” that is similar to that of the natural law. In fact, the ideology promoted by Kant is more like the perfection of the practical reason that is termed as a duty towards eternal peace (Acosta, et al.).

Taking into account an analysis of the 21 century, it is highlighted that Kant’s work is more like an insight into the prophetic view of state on, however, there would be a massive approach to human rights and the will of a common citizen. In the present i.e., the Kant’s philosophy is not applicable because today, morals are more of a practical sense. Politics is defined as the sum of laws that impose unconditional obedience, taking into account that this obedience is in accordance with “Ought” to act phenomena (Grovogui, pp. 301-302). If this philosophy is matched with the current notion of politics then the idea of duty seems to engage in her to the ground by itself because of “ultra-posse more obligations”. Political science also deals with morals and ethics but these morals and ethics are theoretical in nature. This contradictory statement here is the fact that politics infer “be wise as a serpent” in contradiction to the morals infer, “and guileless as doves” (Tampio, et al. pp.258-266). In 21 century, perpetual peace is more like a stance that needs to be resided because the world is not the same, and the situation is not the same. Also, there are two notions in the era of the moral framework that is associated with morality and then its implication in politics. On one side, it is honesty that is the best policy while on the other side it is said that honesty is better than the other policy. It is also important to note that the philosophy of Kant that highlights three basics fundamental of the constitution is something that is nothing more than an abstraction because, in the world of technology where modernism prevails, the branches of government such as resilient and justifications are the law decoders. The considerations of general goodwill never lead political progression, in fact, it will return and tilt politics to the grounds of morality only that is only dependent on the human power to make decisions (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). Also, the values of any of the state changes with the passage of time and even morals as well where Kant’s philosophy is nothing more than an open invitation to everyone to express and come to change what they want to.

It would not be wrong to say that today it is the time of political revolution, where a complex community is removed from the surface of the earth in the name of politics and the harm that community have done to the political structure (Simpson, et al. pp. 109-128). In such a case, the political and moral view of peace promoted by Kant would ultimately lead to the dramatized version where there would be no world politics and there would be no progression of the law-making bodies. Also, the domain power in the present time is that of democracy that is practiced in most of the superpowers, their success infers that they are required to address human needs and to take initiatives that can prove effective in the long run. The promotion of perpetual peace might result in war because if there would be no major contributions to the world and then it would lead to more wars (Grovogui, pp. 301-302).

**Conclusion**

Kant one of the well-known philosophers has proposed the ideology of law in the name of “perpetual peace”, taking into account an emphasis on republic politics rather than democratic peace. Although Kant has justified this phenomenon as per his ideology which was guided by the French revolution, it is highlighted that the stance of republic politics resonates because of the shivering basis that is made on human rights in general overpowered by human rights in private. Although, it seems to be sweeping still it is asserted that Kant’s philosophy cannot withstand 21 century. It is highlighted that in 21 century, Kant’s philosophy is nothing more than philosophy, because, in the current time, there is no significance of "general politics", in fact, there is a prevalence of “political politics”. The shuffle of politics intertwined with morality is something that needs to be promoted and it is also required by the present time because democracy is prevalent only because of the validity of the stance. This stance is enough justification for the fact that Kant’s philosophy cannot be promoted in the present time, because it might lead to world war.
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