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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

1.1 Preamble statement of the research:

There are many alternative interpretations and reconstructions in the nature of philosophical research. One of the important dimensions is to make a currently relevant reconstruction from the history of philosophy. So historicity of a philosophical theme partly becomes a central focus of a research work just like the history of ideas. Historicity may advance in many ways and directions. So far as the history of western philosophy is concern it often takes a form, as Hilary Putnam says, oscillation with reference to a certain focal point, this stands true for the philosophy of Kant. If we look at the history of Kantian philosophical interpretation, we find that in every age the philosophy of Kant is interpreted with reference to the existing schools and trends of philosophising. In 19th century, for example there was an idealistic interpretation of Kant’s critique of philosophy.¹ Even in analytic school of thought, although it remains critical to Kant, the later philosophy of Bertrand Russell has much impact from Kant.² At the same time in the school of ordinary language philosophy P. F. Strowsan writes a book on Kant regarding the limitations of sensibility.³ If we look at the recent interpretation of Kant, then there is an effective revival in the understanding of the relationship between Kant and logical positivism in the side of semantics on the one hand, and the position of Kant with reference to the possibility of scientific theory on the other. The example may be cited in the form of the classical works of Coffa and Friedman.⁴ Moreover almost every first rank philosopher of analytic tradition has remarked something on Kant. But I as a researcher feel that there is a portion of Kant’s ‘critique of pure reason’ which is comparatively less cultivated and requires a re-investigatory research. This becomes the starting point of the present research work and after due consideration it take the form of research problem.

1.2 Statement of the problem:

Kant’s most important work is his ‘critique of pure reason’. This is an examination of the scope, nature, possibility and limitations of human knowledge. In this work Kant examines three basic metaphysical questions and finds their answers in negative. That portion is the portion of transcendental dialectic where Kant makes a
critical inquiry into the nature of self, universe and ultimate reality. An important result in ‘critique of pure reason’ is this that this inquiry results in a completely negative way. For Kant these three concepts are examples of transcendental illusions. Here what is of importance is this that there is nothing which can be called ordinarily fallacious in the formation of these concepts. Yet in the sections of paralogism, antinomy and ideal of pure reason, Kant finds that corresponding to these three concepts, there is nothing in the field of possible experience which can be given as an object of knowledge before knower. I first take this point on a common philosophical discourse and then shall try to investigate in the particular reference of ‘critique of pure reason’.

1. First we take the example of paralogism of pure reason. Here the subject which is under consideration, is the self as a conscious substance. Now at a common philosophical understanding it is quite clear that normally there is no possibility of any knower to put itself as a known object before it. So any self whether material or transcendental, cannot become an object of knowledge before itself. Therefore matter seems quite straightforward if one demands the epistemological objectivity of self.

2. Antinomies of pure reason deal in part with cosmological ideas cosmology, or more correctly rational cosmology, in the language of Kant deals, somehow, with the universe as a whole. Here by the very nature of the definition, universe is that which contains everything or, all-that-there-is. Again with this definition of the universe there is no possibility of its epistemological objectivity. No knower or observer can know or observe the universe as a whole because it itself is the part of the universe. So it also seems quite straightforward that there is no possibility of epistemological objectivity of the universe as a whole. In the same way it becomes still further apparent that the ultimate being or absolute reality is not a subject of epistemological objectification. So in a nutshell it can be said that neither self as a substance nor world as a cosmos nor ultimate reality is generally supposed as being put before an epistemological knower as the object of its knowledge.

The point of this research work is this that what is the particular Kantian mechanism in the dealing with this three topics and why Kant sees that these are transcendental illusions parallel to three types of classical syllogisms that is categorical syllogisms, hypothetical syllogism and disjunctive syllogism. In Kantian
ontic commitment everything is either phenomena or noumena. That is, epistemologically, either it is subject of possible experience of agnostically it is beyond any reach of human experience that is noumena. Now Kant does not believe that either self or universe or God or ultimate reality is to be considered as noumena. So the central problem of this research work becomes a thorough investigation in the Kantian thought regarding the epistemological and ontological status of the mechanism of transcendental dialectic. It appears that there is some fundamental inconsistency which is currently being seen by me between transcendental dialectic and transcendental aesthetics and transcendental analytic. To bring out these inconsistencies and to suggest a possible remedy is a possible outcome of the statement of this problem.

1.3 Relevance of research work:

About Kant it has been said that one can go either with Kant or against Kant but not without Kant. This stands true in other disciplines and branches of philosophy but it is still more correct in the field of epistemology and logic. Looking this, the main relevance of the present research work can be summarized as follow.

1. There is a continuously growing scholarship of Kant at international level. The entire work of Kant together with his classroom notes is continuously being re-edited in English by Cambridge university. International team of scholars cultivates different areas of Kantian scholarship. In this way it is also necessary to make a firsthand research through original sources in India to join this international enterprise.

2. In current interpretations of Kant there are two areas in which I am particularly interested. They are,

i.) Kant’s position on semantics and

ii.) Kant’s view regarding philosophy of science

Particularly the later view is emerged in the last two decades of 20th century. It is felt that a comprehensive study an interpretation of ‘critique of pure reason’ together with Kant’s metaphysical foundations of natural sciences can make some important light in the global understanding of Kantian scholarship.

3. There are certain issues which are discussed by Kant and which lie in the sections of transcendental dialectic which are currently relevant and important in contemporary physics and cosmology. One of them can be illustrated as the question of the origin or creation of the universe. Kant was the first philosopher who took this
question seriously. Its relevance has been recognized by Stephen Hawking in his popular as well as technical work. So, as I have some background of science, it is relevant for me to inquire the original arguments of Kant, step by step in his antinomies of pure reason, with reference to modern scientific concept of space and time either in the theory of relativity or quantum mechanics or quantum cosmology.

4. The title of ‘critique of pure reason’ is empathetically justified in the section of transcendental dialectic. The epistemological status of reason and its supposed demarcation with understanding or intellect is very much important whether with reference to Kant or in a general epistemological reference. This research work will focus its attention on this issue and which type of epistemological activity is responsible for the generation of these transcendental illusions. It seems that it will be very much relevant to make a comprehensive study of transcendental aesthetics, analytic and dialectic.

1.4 Methodology of research work:

The research methodology in philosophy is generally descriptive, narrative, reconstructive, evaluative and critical. The first step of the research methodology is the complete and thorough study of Kant’s ‘critique of pure reason’. The aim of this thorough study is to bring out the connective parts and themes of the central point of this research work. That is, in which way the other components of ‘critique of pure reason’ are connected with transcendental dialectic. Moreover Kant’s original view about cosmology, physics and astronomy are also taken into account. The methodological aspect is this that there can be a possibility of the formulation of Kant’s view as exact sciences.

The interpretative, evaluative and critical part of this research work is generally taken by the methodology of within system evaluation. It means that within the boundary of Kant’s critical philosophy there may be some re-constructive consistent interpretations which are to be critically estimated. But there is also a possibility that there are some interpretations and evaluations from extra systematic reference. Though these references are not to be avoided altogether but main emphasis will be on criticism within the system.

Any research work contains some elements of comparative interpretation and more correctly, inter-disciplinay comparative interpretations. This particularly applies in the context of present research work. It is methodologically necessary that
Kant’s view’s of space, time and matter as well as his questions regarding causality are to be compared and evaluated with reference to the, the then contemporary physics and cosmology. It is also true that for getting a comprehensive interpretation, and obtaining a contemporarily relevant evaluation, these views are to be compared with the contemporary status of relativity theory and quantum mechanics. The methodology of this comparison will be non-technical so far as it is possible. On the other hand, there are some views of Kant which may be compared with contemporary philosophizing. In this the same methodological standards are to be followed.

1.5 Review of literature:

Any research work does not start in vacuum. The research work on Kant has a vast implementive literature and almost in each topic of Kant’s ‘critique of pure reason’ either a book or research article has been written. So we must have to be selective in assessing Kant’s existing literature. So far as the research literature on Kant in this region is concerned, the scope is very much limited. There are only two cases which come in our knowledge in which the philosophy of Kant is evaluated. First is Doctor Madhusudan M Baxi’s work on Kant which is published by university book production board, Ahmedabad.

Second, Doctoral dissertation of Dr. S. S. Sharma’s ‘A critique of antimetaphysical trends and a confirmation of metaphysics’ degree is awarded by Saurashtra University. The content of both of these works is given as follow.

Dr. M. V.Baxi’s work is the only publication which is in Gujarati language. It is published by University book production Board, second edition in 2010. Its content is given below.

```
INDEX
Chapter 1 – Kant ane temani samasya
Chapter2–Samvedanshakti ni mulagami mimansa transcendental aesthetic
Chapter 3 – Samanya ane mulagami tarkashatra
Chapter 4 – Vichararuponu tattvika ane mulagmi pramanya
Chapter 5 – Samajanashakti na adhara siddhanto
Chapter 6–Anubhavgamyavastuonu jagat ane anubhavatita vastuonu jagat
Chapter 7 – Shuddh tarkbuddhina vicharo (Transcendental dialectic)
Chapter 8 – Tarkbuddhinishtha manovignan
```
Chapter 9 – Tarkbuddhinishtha srushtivignan
Chapter 10 – Tarkbuddhinishtha Iswarvichar
Chapter 11 – Saiddhantik a ne vyavharik tarkbuddhi”

The work provides an exposition of Kant’s philosophy with the current status of Kantian interpretation chapter 7, 8 and 9 deals with Kant’s theory of transcendental illusion.

Dr. S. S. Sharma’s work in a doctoral thesis which is submitted for the degree of Ph.D to Saurashtra University and degree has been awarded. Chapter 2 of this research work deals with Kant's anti-metaphysical stand and particularly regarding the discussion of transcendental apperception in the transcendental deduction of categories and mathematical concepts of infinity and continuity. It covers Kant’s derivations of antinomies of our reason are relevant for the present research work. The analytical content of this doctoral dissertation is given as below.12

“INDEX

Chapter 1 Introduction
1.1 Why the question of the possibility of metaphysics
1.2 Nature of metaphysical possibility
  1.2.1 Denial of pure logical possibility
1.3 Further clarification in the meaning of metaphysics
1.4 Examination of logical denials of metaphysics
1.5 Confirmation of metaphysics with reference to methodology of science as well as cosmology and physics.
  1.5.1 Methodology of science and confirmation of metaphysics
  1.5.2 Einstein’s general theory of relativity, cosmology and confirmation of metaphysics
  1.5.3 Quantum mechanics, quantum cosmology and confirmation of metaphysics
  1.5.4 Superstring theory and confirmation of metaphysics
  1.5.5 Meta logic, Meta mathematics and confirmation of metaphysics

Chapter 2 Exposition and denial of Kant’s anti metaphysics stand.
2.1 A general critique of Kant’s anti metaphysical stand.
2.2 Copernican revaluation and Kant’s metaphysical commitment
2.3 Metaphysical deduction and the metaphysical unity of consciousness
2.4 Transcendental deduction – metaphysical implications:
2.1.1 The premises of the argument of transcendental deduction
2.1.2 Process and components of transcendental deduction
2.1.3 Transcendental deduction implies certainty of knowledge and possibility of exact sciences
2.5 Problematic possibility of ‘noumena’ indicates its metaphysical character
2.6 Kant’s view of ‘idea’ and ‘reason’: no consistent generatio of paralogism and antinomies.
2.7 Kant’s ‘representation’ and quantum ‘observation’ their complementarities in metaphysical counterpart
2.8 Phenomenalism requires an ontological background; not agnosticism
2.9 Critical consideration of Kant’s theory of space and time indicating possibility of metaphysics
2.10 Conclusion

Chapter 3 Examination of Wittgenstein’s position with metaphysical implications
Chapter 4 Russell’s philosophy and its metaphysical implications
Chapter 5 Refutation of logical positivistic denial of metaphysics
Chapter 6 Philosophy of science and metaphysics
Chapter 7 General relativity, cosmology and metaphysics
Chapter 8 Quantum mechanics, Quantum cosmology and metaphysics
Chapter 9 Unification of physics, superstring theory and metaphysics
Chapter 10 Meta logic, mathematics and metaphysics”

In this work there is a particular type of scientific approach and Kant’s position is generally evaluated with reference to Newtonian physics, Euclidean geometry and contemporary physics. In present research work, this line of articulation is to be taken in parts.

Apart from these two regional works, we are bounded to consult internationally recognized research works on Kant. In this field there is a particularly important work on Kant’s doctrine of transcendental illusion by Michelle Grier.13

Contents

“Introduction:
Part one: Kant’s discovery of metaphysical illusion
1.Metaphysical error in the pre-critical works
The early works
The delusion of metaphysical knowledge and the dreams
The transition from the dreams to the dissertation

2. The inaugural dissertation
The distinction between sensuality and the intellect
The theory of the intellect
Illusion and the fallacy of subscription
The principles of harmony
Part two: Fallacies and illusions in the ‘critique of pure reason’

3. The transcendental employment of the understanding and the conflation of appearances and things in themselves
Preliminary remarks
The transcendental employment of the understanding
The distinction between appearances and things in themselves
The pretension of sensibility

4. Transcendental illusion
The sources of dialectical error
Reason as the seat of transcendental illusion
The transcendental concepts of pure reason
Part three: The dialectical inferences of pure reason

5. Rational psychology and true pseudo-rational idea of the soul
The transcendental idea in the paralogism
The fallacy of the first paralogism
The B edition
The second and third paralogism

6. Rational cosmology and the pseudo-empirical idea of the world
Transcendental illusion and the idea of the world
The mathematical antinomies
The resolution to the mathematical antinomies
The dynamical antinomies

7. Rational theology and pseudo-rational idea of God
Preliminary remarks
The Idea of the Ens Ralissimum
Transcendental Illusion and the Unconditionally Necessary Being
The Ontological Argument

PART FOUR: ILLUSION AND SYSTEMATICITY

8. The Regulative Employment of Reason

Preliminary Remarks
The demand for systematic unity
The unity of reason
Kant’s philosophy of science
The unifying function of ideas

Conclusion

This is an internationally recognized standard research work in which Kant’s doctrine of transcendental illusion is dealt with in greater detail. Particularly part-3 of this work is about transcendental illusion and it appears that the arguments of Michelle Grier is very much appealing and I want to take some lights from it with my own addition and ramifications in the field of scientific interpretation. Basically this work was a Ph.D thesis which was submitted to University of California, San Diego.

With this basic review, I find that there is a need of the expansion of Kant’s theory of transcendental illusion and so in this research work I have taken a stand in which I can neutrally as well as scholarly evaluate Kant’s position of space and time and together with it, his theory of transcendental illusion. So the vast literature of Kant is to be taken into account and will be evaluated as per the need of the context of the present research work.

1.6 Conclusion:

Research is a continuous process and finding of any research is always a subject of further interpretation and modification in future. These do apply for the present research work yet the probable conclusion which at present appears before me is this that the entire framework or Kantian epistemology and the logical methodology which is used by Kant do not warrant consistently his position regarding his theory of transcendental illusion. Particularly this seems to stand current for rational cosmology and I think I have some ideas that consideration as a universe as a whole is a necessary ingredient in current scientific and philosophical studies. Universe is there, and whether it is singularly determined single reality or it is a collection of different many universes, is another question. In either case cosmology remains a meaningful branch of knowledge and the adjective of rationality does not make it illusion. So
together with paralogism and ideal I think that the “antinomy” is a portion of “critique” which demands a general reconsideration and in the present research work, up to an appropriate degree, this reconsideration has been made.
Notes and references


   In the epistemological considerations with reference to probabilistic knowledge, Russell takes a view similar to Kant, when in the beginning of 19th century, Russell writes his first book on the foundation of geometry, his views are almost Kantian. As Allen Wood summarized the entire philosophical journey of Russell, though Russell does not entirely subscribe to it, in a formula ‘Kant to Kant’ cf. Russell Bertrand (1959) ‘My philosophical development’ George Alln and Unwin, London.


   Even in his technical work, ‘Foundations of space-time theories’ Friedman starts that work with the first chapter which deals about the relationship between Kant and logical positivism.

5. Here we are taking the term knower and knowing process in its widest sense. Even in scientific discourse, there is no possibility of self observing observer either in the theory of relativity or quantum mechanics. cf. Dirac P. A. M. (1967) ‘The principles of quantum mechanics’ Oxford University Press, Oxford. And Shach and Hu (1977) ‘General relativity for mathematicians’ Springer Verlag, Berlin. In general relativity the term observer is defined as a future pointing time-like curve or geodesic. In any case, there is no possibility of self observing observation.

6. This is true for scientific discourse also and therefore currently investigated realm of quantum cosmology is a matter of theoretical dispute. Quantum mechanics provides any description of quantum state with reference to an observer and therefore it is impossible to have an observer of the universe as a whole cf. Linde Andri (1993) ‘Particle physics and inflationary cosmology World Scientific, Singapore.
7. These classical syllogisms are taken by Kant as examples of the application of pure reason in his transcendental dialectic. The main emphasis of Kant is this that these syllogisms are functioning as unschematizing agencies of pure reason. There are three types of illusions which are noted in book-2 entitled as ‘The dialectic inferences of pure reason and these three illusions are classified as:
Chapter-1 The paralogism of pure reason,
Chapter-2 The antinomy of pure reason and
Chapter-3 The ideal of pure reason


10. There is always a risk in providing non-technical exposition of physical theories. Simplification and popularization generally do not grasp the core ideas of a scientific theory. Yet in the field of philosophy, particularly in our country it is very much difficult to acquire a completely technical exposition. So in this research work, methodologically, a middle path is taken. Mathematical expressions are to be avoided so far as we can but when they are necessary they must be included. cf. Einstein Albert (2001) ‘Relativity the special and general theory’ Dover publication, London. Here Einstein makes the exposition of relativity with the supposed background of the knowledge of mathematics up to matriculation. In this research work I have attempted to follow the same path.
