

**TANGAZA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
PONTIFICAL URBANIAN UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

**EMPIRICISM AND RATIONALISM: KANT'S RECONCILIATORY
PROJECT AND ITS HERITAGE**

ATWEBEMBEIRE STEPHEN, OFM CAP

20/00719

**A LONG ESSAY WRITTEN IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENTS OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE
IN PHILOSOPHY**

NAIROBI-KENYA 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	vi
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE.....	3
THESIS DESIGN	3
Introduction.....	3
1.1 Background of the Study	3
1.2 The Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 Thesis Statement	5
1.4 Literature Review	5
1.5 Relevance of the Study	9
1.6 Justification of the Study	9
1.7 Objectives of the Study	10
1.8 Methodology	10
1.9 Limitations of the Study and Scope	10
Conclusion	11
CHAPTER TWO.....	12
RATTIONALISM AND EMPIRICISM.....	12
Introduction.....	12
2.1 Rationalism	13
2.2 Empiricism.....	14
2.3 The Ultimate Source of Knowledge; Empiricists and Rationalist	15
2.4 Mechanisms of Acquisitions.....	16
2.5 Characteristic of the Initial State.....	17
Conclusion	19
CHAPTER THREE	21
KANT RECONCILES EMPIRICISM AND RATIONALISM.....	21
Introduction.....	21
3.1 Critique of Pure Reason.....	21
3.2 Critique of Practical Reason	23
3.3 Critique of Judgment	23

3.4	Phenomena and Noumena	24
3.5	A posterior and a priori.....	26
3.6	Synthetic and Analytic Statements.....	27
3.7	Kant’s Critique of Rationalism and Empiricism.....	28
3.8	Kant’s Copernican Revolution.....	31
3.9	Synthetic a priori Judgment	33
	Conclusion	34
	CHAPTER FOUR.....	35
	HERITAGE OF KANTIAN RECONCILIATORY PROJECT.....	35
	Introduction.....	35
4.1	Kantian Metaphysics	36
4.2	Kantian Epistemology	36
4.3	Kant’s Transcendental Idealism.....	38
4.4	Kantian Ethics	39
4.4.1	Reason and Freedom	39
4.4.2	The Duty and Good Will	41
4.4.3	Categorical Imperative and Hypothetical Imperative	43
4.4.4	Kant on Moral Worth	45
4.5	Aesthetics in Modern Turning Point Kant.....	48
4.5.1	Judgement of Agreeable, Good and Beautiful.....	49
4.5.2	First Moment is Disinterested.....	50
4.5.3	Second Moment is Universal.....	50
4.5.4	Third Moment is Relation	51
4.5.5	Fourth Moment is Modality.....	51
	Conclusion	52
	GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	53
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

DECLARATION

This thesis is my unique work, as evidenced by my own reading, scientific study, and critical thinking. It has never been submitted for academic credit to any other college or university. Each and every source has been duly acknowledged and credited.

Name: ATWEBEMBEIRE STEPHEN CAP.

Signed:Date:

Supervisor: DR. FR. MUNGUCI D. ENTIRIGA AJ.

Signed:Date:

Head of department:

Signed:Date.....

DEDICATION

This project is in honour of my beloved Uncle Rev Fr. Robert Tumwekwase, all my family members and the people of good will.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge and extend my gratitude, first to God for his protection and guidance during the formulization and finalization of this paper. It is also important and honestly fitting to acknowledge my moderator, Rev. Dr. Fr. Munguci D. Entriga, for his great support to ward this work. I really appreciate his support from the beginning of this work up to its completion. I also would like to extend my grateful appreciation to Br. Donald Ojobo Ofm Cap, Br. Kisuna Ofm Cap and Br Banda Ofm Cap for their concern, generous and their tremendous efforts which led to the completion of this project, especially their effort to edit this work. I want to express my sincere gratitude to my Uncle as well, Rv. Robert Tumwekwase for his financial and spiritual support. Lastly I thank my parent Mr Atwebembeire Celestine and Miss Natukunda Deudela. My grandparents, Mr Bagumira Lawrence, Miss Karahudia Nyamagambo, and the formation Langata friary may the Almighty God bless you abundantly.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The problem of empiricism and rationalism in the field of philosophy has a long history, since it is crucial in the explanation of our source of knowledge. The most important epistemological debate began in the 17th century. The rationalists were primarily French, including Rene Descartes, Baruch Spinoza, and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, whereas the empiricists were primarily British and Irish, including John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume. All human beings constantly think about a variety of things, including beliefs, desires, hopes, dreams, imaginary characters, knowledge, love, and hatred, to name a few. Have you ever thought about where all of this came from? How did they become part of our way of thinking? How do they get into our heads as concepts?

Empiricism believes that our ideas come from our senses. They contend that each of us is born with a mind that is like a *tabula rasa*, or blank page, to which we add contents as we are exposed to the outside world. An after-experience discovery of knowledge is a posterior knowledge.

Rationalism, which contends that reason is the main source of our knowledge, is opposed to empiricism. Rationalists encourage knowledge of logic and mathematics as paradigm examples. They contend that such knowledge can only be acquired rationally, devoid of the use of the senses. These rationalists contend that the knowledge that reason can access is eternal, existing unchanged in the past, present, and future.

Rationalists favor innatism, the idea that some concepts are preprogrammed in our minds from birth, which is known as a priori knowledge. However, Kant had an answer that bridged the difference between rationalism and empiricism as schools of thought. Kant's theory of knowledge restructures how humans know things.

Kant was distinct from all of his forebears, including the empiricists and rationalists. In contrast to the empiricist, he insisted that the mind is not a blank canvas on which the empirical world can write. He also disagreed with the rationalists' claim that a priori, pure knowledge of the universe devoid of the use of sense influences was possible. Therefore, in this essay we will examine what separates rationality from empiricism, the role of Kant in bringing the two schools of thought together, and what Kant has left behind. We shall explain how we were able to conduct this research study in chapter one.

In chapter two, we will explicate the meaning of rationalism and the empiricism and their background. This chapter will introduce some empiricists and the rationalist and their concepts about the ultimate source of knowledge. This will lay a deep foundation for the understanding of the importance of rationalism and empiricism in the field of philosophy. In chapter three, we will expose how the work of Kant toward the reconciliation between rationalism and the empiricism has contributed greatly in our understanding of epistemology in the field of philosophy. In his reconciliation between rationalism and empiricism, we will be able to encounter priori, a posteriori analytic, synthetic and synthetic a priori. In chapter four, we shall give the heritage of Kant's reconciliatory project and how his work has become so influential among the contemporary philosophers. In this chapter, we shall also come to understand the importance of the contributions of Kant in the field of philosophy especially his epistemology, reason, ethics and freedom.

CHAPTER ONE

THESIS DESIGN

Introduction

This thesis attempts to explain how rationalists and empiricists acquire knowledge, as well as their differences in philosophy, and how Kant identified the problem with these two schools of thought in their approach to knowledge. Epistemology, a subfield of philosophy focused on the character, nature, limits, origins, and boundaries of knowledge, is where the conflict between rationalism and empirical evidence is most prominent. Understanding of the external world, knowledge of the internal world or self-knowledge, and knowledge of moral and or aesthetic values are the three main categories of knowledge, which can cover a wide range of topics. We might find that there are category-specific conditions that must be satisfied for knowledge to exist and that it is easier or more challenging to shape certain inquiries and answers if we choose to focus on the outside world or on values.

1.1 Background of the Study

The characteristic feature of philosophy at the dawn of the modern era was the intellectual debate between empiricist and rationalist. On one hand, empiricism as the intellectual tradition adopted the scientific approach of understanding of the outside world, while rationalism on the other hand adopted the rational mathematical method to knowledge developed during renaissance interlude. Rene Descartes, Benedict Spinoza, and Gottfried Wilhelm represented the continental rationalist ideology, whilst John

Locke together with George Berkeley, and David Hume advocated empiricism. Both appear to hold radical views with regard to the source of knowledge.¹

Immanuel Kant outlines his response to these two philosophical movements. While Kant adopts rationalism's a priori understanding of important truths, he refuses a priori philosophical understanding of the nature of natural phenomena such as God or the soul. The notion that knowledge is inherently experience-based knowledge is something that Kant borrows from the empiricists. However, he refuses the idea that there is no necessary truth that can be learned from experience, and in doing so, he refuses Hume's scepticism.² Despite their differences on the importance or certainty of knowledge gained through experience, rationalists and empiricists both saw the brain as an impartial receptor. The report of the senses was that all knowledge comes from the senses. According to Kant, knowledge of experience extends beyond what the senses can report. Sensations can be reported by our senses, but they cannot be organized by cause and effect or in space and time.³

1.2 The Statement of the Problem

A key issue of the human person is their thirst for knowledge. The main issue with the conflict between rationalism and empirical evidence is where our thoughts and knowledge come from. In certain instances, divergent opinions on this subject result in contradictory answers to subsequent queries. The sort of warrant or the limits of our knowledge and thought may likewise be in disagreement. The conflicting rationalist and empiricist answers to the question, as well as Kant's response to each, will be

¹ Eugene Kelley, *The Basics of Western Philosophy*, (London: Green Wood Press, 2004), 84.

² Bernard, J. K, Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, (New York: Dover Publications, 2012), 36.

³ Bernard, J. K, Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 36.

brought to our notice. How can we gain knowledge? What is the foundation of our knowledge?

1.3 Thesis Statement

This paper has objectively focused on Kant's reconciliatory project between rationalism and empiricism. Rationalism and empiricism are both sources of knowledge. The study in this paper provides measures that aim at solving the problem of the gap between the rationalism and the empiricism. Kant claims that the mind requires a set of additional organizing principles in order to possess any knowledge. The faculty of knowing contains these principles. Knowledge is the outcome of the interaction of material and understanding, just as a Cooke is the product of certain content being processed by a form.

1.4 Literature Review

According to French philosopher Rene Descartes, there are various ways that we can learn new things. Some concepts are innate and cognizable through reason, while others come from outside sources or are created by us. Such ideas reveal a universal, necessary, and eternal truth. The example René Descartes provides illustrates how we all have an innate belief in God and our own existence.⁴ Descartes claimed that the stored information in the book has been compared to the innate ideas. Though they are not always conscious to the mind, ideas are always present in us. The book's contents become clear to us once we start reading it, just as reason makes our innate beliefs clear to us.⁵ According to Rene Descartes, knowledge must be

⁴ Rene Descartes, *Meditation on the First Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 67.

⁵ Rene Descartes, *Meditation on the First Philosophy*, 67.

unquestionable and certain. All knowledge is certain and evident cognition, according to his norms for the guidance of the mind, and this knowledge cannot be questioned.⁶

Gottfried Leibniz maintains that innate concepts are accessed by reason and refers to them as principles, much like René Descartes. In his view, reason is the faculty that derives universal truths from specific instances and that the senses do not reveal the universal nature of mathematical truths. A collection of sense-based examples, according to Leibniz, cannot guide us to necessary truths. At the same time, it is obvious that we can understand a lot of fundamental truths, like mathematics. As a result, those truths are innate because the source is the mind. A truth of reason is a necessary truth, according to Leibniz, because to deny it is to engage in contradiction.⁷

According to Baruch Spinoza, he gives us three kinds of knowledge, which are identified with methods by which they are obtained; the first knowledge is from imagination, and the second is from reason and the third is from intuition. For him, the third kind of knowledge is the superior to the two. These kinds of knowledge have to work together in order to give us the true complete picture of reality according to him⁸. Relying on only one of these kinds of knowledge would be an incomplete and inferior way of obtaining our knowledge. When we use these methods in an orderly way, we develop an opinion, and then we can apply both reason and intuition. According to Spinoza, The only source of falsity is knowledge of the first kind, and then the second and the third types of knowledge assist us in determining what is necessarily true⁹.

⁶ Stanly Tweyman, Rene Descartes, *Meditations on the First Philosophy*, (London: Caravan Books, 2002, 43.

⁷ Janice Thomas, *The Minds of The Moderns, Empiricism, Rationalism and Philosophy of Mind*, (London: Rutledge, 2014), 90.

⁸ Janice Thomas, *The Minds of The Moderns Rationalism, Empiricism and Philosophy of Mind*, 71.

⁹ Janice Thomas, *The Minds of The Moderns, Empiricism, Rationalism and Philosophy of Mind*, 90.

Spinoza further describes how we use our imagination to think about dependent phenomena like the contingent past and contingent future. He didn't perceive this as true knowledge but he thought it was an opinion of what true knowledge can be. Here means that we imagine things that might be, based on our experience of what already is or has been.¹⁰ For example, if a child saw Peter in the morning, Paul at noon, and Simon in the evening, this child will assume that he will see Peter again in the morning again today. The second example is that since the sun has risen this morning, and every other morning and that I have been also alive. I might imagine the sun rising tomorrow. Though these two assumptions about the sunrise and the child may be reasonable things to imagine, they may not be necessary true based on this kind of knowledge alone.¹¹

Spinoza also says that we employ reason to describe things that are eternal and necessary, as opposed to contingent things. He clarifies that it is in the essence of reason to hold such views things as necessary rather than contingent. Ideas just about anyone or things are necessary the same manner that it is true that God exists necessary true. We must first put our imagined notions through the filter of reason. For example, I can use reason in order to explain that the sun rises in the morning due to the rotation of the earth and this is the example of the second kind of knowledge. Ideas like the laws of physics and mathematics are born of this kind of knowledge.¹²

Spinoza adds that, there cannot be real knowledge without the consideration of God who is infinite and this infinite God exists within everything. He explains that we use our intuition to comprehend the essences of things which are essentially parts of God that exist within all things. He claims that knowledge of God's eternal and infinite

¹⁰ Janice Thomas, *The Minds of The moderns, Rationalism, Empiricism and Philosophy of Mind*, 98.

¹¹ Janice Thomas, *The Minds of The Moderns, Rationalism, Empiricism and Philosophy of Mind*, 100.

¹² Andrea Sagiacomo, *Spinoza on Reason, Passion, and the Supreme Good*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 113.

essence, which the concept entails, is adequate and perfect. When you imagine the sun rising tomorrow because of my experience, know that it will rise because of the reasoned explanation of the earth that rotates; my understanding of how beautiful the sun rises is an example of the third kind of knowledge. Therefore, I can only know through intuition that the sunrise this morning was beautiful.¹³

According to David Hume, Ideas are imitations of impression. Impressions come from direct sensory experience and are vivid and lively. The absence of impressions, Hume contends there are no ideas. Hume says that the blind man cannot have notion of color.¹⁴ Ideas that are not derived from any impression cannot be possessed at birth. Hume holds that there are no inherent ideals. Even the concept of God, which Descartes also claims to be innate, according to Hume, is subject to a posteriori, or experience.¹⁵

Hume believed that since God has never been seen or experienced, there is no impression of him. However, Hume argues that by lavishly extending our perception of the positive traits possessed by those around us, our imagination creates this concept of God. Given that even the concept of God can be derived from sensory impressions, this lends additional credence to the idea that all of our ideas are a posteriori, as claimed by empiricists. Therefore, Hume contends that those who assert there are innate ideas are mistaken.¹⁶

Empiricism, according to English philosopher John Locke, emphasizes the importance of sensory experience in order to learn instead of intuition or deduction. Locke rejected theories of innate conceptions and intuition, viewing the mind as a

¹³ Andrea Sagiaco, *Spinoza on Reason, Passion, and the supreme Good*, 113.

¹⁴ Madsen Pirie, *101 Great Philosophers: Makers of Modern Thought*, (London: Continuum, 2009), 95.

¹⁵ Madsen Pirie, *101 Great Philosophers: Makers of Modern Thought*, 97.

¹⁶ Madsen Pirie, *101 Great Philosophers: Makers of Modern Thought*, 100.

tabula rasa at birth, a blank slate upon which experience imprinted the knowledge. In his interest to come to understand the origin of our knowledge, Locke argues that there are no innate ideas at birth as the rationalists have mentioned in the above¹⁷. This means that all materials of knowledge must come or originate from experience. Locke says that the idea cannot be said to be in the mind of somebody, until one is conscious of it. After having criticized the innate ideas theory, Locke wants to show us how the mind can acquire or comes along with the ideas. So, if the ideal are not innate, then where do they come from? Since according to him all our knowledge originates from experience, it means Ideas that precede experience and are ingrained in us cannot exist.¹⁸

1.5 Relevance of the Study

This work is very relevant because it exposes the various dimensions of empiricism and rationalism, clarifies their concepts, their visions and how they interrelate in philosophy. Finally, this work is very important because exposes how Kant comes in to reconcile these two schools of thought and the heritage of this reconciliation.

1.6 Justification of the Study

The theory of knowledge is the focus of the philosophical subfield known as epistemology. It examines the nature of understanding, the validity of belief, and the basis for each. There are two epistemological schools of thought: rationalism and empiricism. Both schools of thinking are interested in justification and the origin of knowledge. Empiricism and rationalism differ primarily in that rationalism emphasizes

¹⁷ Richard John Koscijew, *The Tread Mills of Time*, (Bloomington: Author House, 2014), 173.

¹⁸ Robert G Meyers, *The Understanding of The Empiricism*, (New York: Routledge, 2014), 2.

reason over experience. Empiricism is not considered to be the source of knowledge according to rationalism; rather, reason is thought to be the source of knowledge. Empiricism and rationalism are at odds with one another in a problem that each seems to view itself as a source of knowledge.

1.7 Objectives of the Study

1. To find out how we gain knowledge.
2. To examine, the acquisitions of knowledge according to rationalists and empiricists, and their differences.
3. To analyse measures taken by the Kant to bridge the gap between rationalism and empiricism.
4. To examine the epistemology of Kant and what he has left behind.

1.8 Methodology

The study shall use analytical method of philosophy to analyse the conflicts between rationalism and empiricism and their reconciliation by Immanuel Kant. This investigation will mostly rely on relevant sources, such as books, library sources as well as the internet source. The footnotes in the reference will list the sources that were used in this study. The four chapters have presented the findings in an orderly way showing the reconciliation of Kant between rationalism and empiricism and also his heritage.

1.9 Limitations of the Study and Scope

The limitations in this paper are that we are unable to go to the field for the first-hand data for the time was insufficient. Therefore, the content of this study is based on a pure analytical research. This study is also limited in the sense that the topic is so wide and I am not able to tackle everything. It is also limited in a way that there are so many books that talk about this topic and so I was not able to read all of them.

Conclusion

Man is innately curious, and sources of knowledge are the ways in which one acquires knowledge. Knowledge is any ability, information, or fact that a person has gained by learning, experience, or reason. When someone is curious, they will seek out knowledge sources to help them understand the situation. Likewise, when someone is uncertain about something, they will look for clarification in a variety of methods. For this reason, in 17th century rationalists and empiricists set a very big debate in order to find out which between them was the best source of knowledge and this caused a serious disagreement among them causing what we have called epistemological debate. Therefore, it is needed surely to clarify this biggest problem as reality that confronts us every day in our search for knowledge.

CHAPTER TWO

RATIONALISM AND EMPIRICISM

Introduction

Many warring, opposing camps have engaged in conflict throughout the history of philosophy over important issues. Over the source of all of our knowledge has been one of the fundamental historical conflicts. What is the most fundamental belief in any human society? What are the fundamental beginnings of any worldview? Where does knowledge come from? Sense experience, empiricists have always claimed, is the ultimate origin of everything we know. They argue that our senses provide us with raw information about the globe, and that without these raw materials, there wouldn't be any knowledge. However, rationalists have also consistently asserted that reason not sense, is the greatest repository of knowledge for everyone. They claim that without the prior categories and principles offered by reason, humans are unable to organize and interpret our sensory experience in any way. As a result, the conflict between rationalism and empiricism is most prevalent in the area of epistemology, the branch of philosophy concerned with the study of nature, sources and constraints of knowledge. In this section, we shall meet several views resulting from schools of thought, empiricism and rationalism. We will get a sense of the conflict that has prevailed between the proponents of these two theories on how to acquire knowledge of the world.

2.1 Rationalism

The rationalist philosophical perspective maintains that all of our knowledge is acquired independently of the senses through reason alone. The best example to this is mathematical knowledge, in which we can deepen the numerical relationships, develop arguments and derive ever-more-complex mathematical ideas using only logical mind.¹⁹ Rationalism in western philosophy considers reason to be the primary source of human knowledge. Rationalists claim that truth exists and can be immediately understood by intellect.²⁰ According to rationalists, there are certain rational principles especially in logic and mathematics, but also in ethics and metaphysics, which are so fundamental that to deny them is to fall into contradiction.²¹

Rationalism also has different connotations in various fields depending on the type of theory it rejects. For example, Rationalists believe that reason, not sentiment, tradition, or authority, should be the final arbiter of what is good and harmful in ethics, right bad wrong.²² Kant one of the major thinkers is the representative of rational ethics, and he says that to judge an act is to examine its coherence with what is grasped by the intellect²³. Rationalism in religion means commonly that without assistance of supper natural revelation, all human knowledge is derived by the application of abilities. Therefore, as opposed to solely natural grace or faith, reason is used in a more general sense alluding to human cognitive abilities.²⁴ This means that many world

¹⁹Alan Nelson; *Companion to Rationalism*, (West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2012), 89.

²⁰A. A Gadwall; *Social Research Concepts, Methods and Process*, (Raviwar Peth: Laxmi Book Publication, 2008), 15.

²¹John R Shook, *The Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers*, (England: Thoemmes Continuum 2005), 244.

²² Andreas Sofroniou, *Wisdom Accumulation of Knowledge*, (London: Lulu Com, 2017), 54.

²³ Snippet View, *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia: Knowledge in Depth*, (Michigan: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2003), 641.

²⁴ John Blackburn, *The Popular Biblical Educator*, (London: Palala Press, 2016), 301.

religions, including Christianity, which holds that the Divine has risen as a result of some inspired individuals or publications that have occasionally demanded that their statements be believed even when they contradict conventional wisdom, are in opposition to reason.²⁵

In epistemology, rationalism holds that A priori knowledge is used to gain some human knowledge or rational. As opposed to sensory experience, which frequently only offers a muddled and uncertain perspective?²⁶ In the disagreement between rationality and realism, empiricism asserts that all knowledge of facts comes from perception.²⁷ Rationalism on the contrary holds that knowledge can be reached by only reason and that this knowledge is eternal and unchanged²⁸. What the mental faculties understand is objects that transcend sense experience. We also need to be aware of the rationalists' admiration for the certainty and clarity of knowledge it offers. They also strive to advance global knowledge. ²⁹

2.2 Empiricism

Empiricism is the theory that tells us that all our knowledge comes primarily only from a sensory perspective. Empiricism highlights the significance of the five senses' role in obtaining knowledge about a specific chair, the chair I am currently

²⁵ Andreas Sofroniou, *Wisdom Accumulation of Knowledge*, 55.

²⁶ Michael S K Toh, *One Layman's Contemporary, Theology*, (Wichita Kansas: Library Congress, 2014, 144.

²⁷ Emilian Mangone, *Beyond the Dichotomy Between Altruism and Egoism: Society, Relationship and Responsibility*, (United States of America: Information Age Publishing, 2020, 4.

²⁸ Wiep Van Bunge, *The Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic*, (Brill Leiden-Boston: Juan Pablo Dominguez, 2003), 65.

²⁹ Franco Trabattoni, *Essay's On Plato's Epistemology*, (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 20016), 78.

looking at or touching, or these specific chairs, but not about chairs in general.³⁰ This is so that we can only experience specific concrete objects through our sense organs. Through the process of sense perception, the senses put us in touch with the real world. Do the qualities we perceive in things actually exist there or are they the result of our minds, is a possible question we might ask ourselves. If I see a red object, for instance, is the redness actually inherited by the object or by my sense of sight? Democritus and Berkeley assert that while things may appear to have the qualities we perceive in them, in reality, these qualities are a result of our senses.³¹

2.3 The Ultimate Source of Knowledge; Empiricists and Rationalist

The rationalists acknowledge the ultimate source of our knowledge as the mind, rather than outside input, because they claim that mental grammar applies to and influences linguistic knowledge to some extent. This indicates that rationalists firmly believe that already knowledge resides in the mind and is independent of outside knowledge. So, in accordance with rationalists, everyone is born with linguistic ability.³²

On the other hand, empiricists hold that the baby is born as a *tubularasa*, as we have already witnessed with John Locke. The Latin word *tubularasa* means that there are no preconceived notions or predetermined objectives. Therefore, according to the empiricist, there are no inherent ideas in humans. Our entire creative process relies on outside input. They use the example of two identical twins that would experience

³⁰ Merilee H. Salmon Clark Glamour, *Introduction to Philosophy of Science*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 109.

³¹ Merilee H. Salmon Clark Glymour, *Introduction to Philosophy of Science*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 100.

³² Paul Cobley, *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, (New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2005), 114.

various external input processes over time if they were separated at birth and raised in two different environments.³³

In other words, if the separation of the two twins we've discussed above is such that one is exposed to a setting where English is the native tongue, that child is likely to pick up this language more easily, according to empiricists. If their other twin child were to settle in a situation where English is spoken as a second or even third language, the child would be forced to learn the linguistic characteristics of the type of English used in that context over time. Therefore, linguistic knowledge is triggered by the internal structure of the mind, as opposed to empiricists' belief that the most trustworthy source of information is external and must be activated by environmental information.³⁴

2.4 Mechanisms of Acquisitions

Additionally, there are differences between rationalism and empiricism in terms of how knowledge is acquired. Rationalists contend that the mind's capacity to produce what is perceived as input and to derive knowledge is the fundamental mechanism of knowledge acquisition. Therefore, rationalists have a great deal of faith in their theory, which holds that knowledge is gained or derived from the way the human mind is organized. This means that anything that we can understand must be created using mental rules.³⁵ Consider a child who has knowledge; this child has knowledge that comes from within, from the mind, and not from outside the mind, in other words the ideas that the child possesses are not acquired from outside. Most adherents of this theory of rationalism contend that there is a strong tendency for the offspring of

³³ Paul Cobley, *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, 114.

³⁴ Daniel Garber Michael Ayers, *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 979.

³⁵ James Russel, *What is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 82

someone who is knowledgeable in one field of study to also be knowledgeable in that same field of study.³⁶

In this sense therefore, the rationalists are trying to tell us that if James plays a musical instrument, his children too are most likely to perform the same or similar musical instruments because the skills are innate in the children's genes. This means that for rationalists, the external matters do not matter at all³⁷. However, the empiricists on the other hand, keep on strongly rejecting this theory by arguing time and again that ideas can only be acquired from sense experience, not anything else like innate ideas. They argue that if infants have these inborn concepts, why do they not show them as soon as they are born? Why are they unable to talk, speak, walk, or play immediately after birth? According to them, babies pick up all these simple tasks after experiencing the world for themselves. According to empiricists, just because James plays a musical instrument does not necessarily mean that his kids will as well.³⁸ To be proficient in that musical instrument, James' children must first master it, be exposed to this particular instrument, by learning the theories of it before they can be expert or competent to it. Therefore, for empiricists, the environment matters much in acquisition of knowledge³⁹.

2.5 Characteristic of the Initial State

In terms of the characteristics of the initial state, rationalists propose some innate competence. According to them, the pre-experience condition is biologically programmed so as to provide for the possibility of linguistic experience but limited in its forms. Chomsky proposed and researched a traditional theory for the origin of

³⁶ James Russel, *What is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*, 82.

³⁷ James Russel, *What is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*, 82.

³⁸ James Russel, *What is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*, 82.

³⁹ James Russel, *What is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*, 82.

language as a faculty of the human species. He claims that language use and acquisition are the result of a distinct faculty of the mind that differs from other faculties of the species in important ways.⁴⁰

Two fundamental purposes of rationalist theory are served by the initial state, or the language faculty. It offers a sensory mechanism for the preliminary evaluation of language data. According to rationalists, the two characteristics of the initial state are the faculty of languages, which offers a system for the initial evaluation of languages, and the faculty that establishes a narrowly specific type of grammars. This means that rationalism makes the assumption that the mind can accommodate a variety of grammatical structures. For instance, In case you are person who is fluent in two languages and has equal proficiency in two others, and you happen to settle in a different speech community, your offspring's minds are capable of accommodating a third language.⁴¹

The innateness hypothesis, which holds that the mind offers a means, to determine and take out the pertinent information through some type of mechanism that are part of its biologically determined resources, supports the rationalists' position. In fact, rationalism holds that the mind is biologically endowed with a faculty for using language and supporting the processing of both knowledge and language.⁴² The initial state characteristics have been used by empiricists to attempt to explain language learning without attributing abstract linguistic knowledge to children. For them, they assert that the acquisition of language is based on item by item imitation of learning. Empiricists contend that a child can learn language by mimicking sounds in their

⁴⁰ Barbara C Lust, *Child Language Acquisition, and Growth*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2006), 49.

⁴¹ Barbara C. Lust, *Child Language Acquisition and Growth*, 52.

⁴² Barbara C. Lust, *Child Language Acquisition and Growth*, 52.

environment. In light of the fact that learning is crucial to a child's acquisition of language, society and the environment also have a significant impact on how well a learner does.⁴³ Empiricists contend that one must invest time and effort into learning syntax, phonetics, morphology, and semantics if one is sincere about learning them. Language faculty may not always contain linguistic expertise. The cognitive linguistic school of thought holds that language knowledge develops through language usage, in accordance with the empiricists' theory of the beginning state. For instance, one's ability to speak English increases as he utilizes it more. As a result, it denied that the mind contains an independent linguistic capacity.⁴⁴

Conclusion

The study of human knowledge, including what is knowable, how it is knowable, and what is not knowable, is known as epistemology. This is one manner in which the study of epistemology and metaphysics complement one another. The method of approaching knowledge of how the world actually is is epistemology. While empiricists contend that since humans lack any innate ideas at birth and that experience is the most trustworthy source of knowledge, rationalists who believe in innateness contend that the mind is the ultimate source of knowledge. Empiricism and rationalism both struggle with how to see past outward appearances to the reality hidden beneath them. The rationalists attempt to do this by relying on one's intuition and a few precepts from which one can infer the nature of reality. The empiricist, on the other hand, draws on her personal experiences when looking for proof of the nature of reality. The danger with both points of view is that their approaches don't always seem to produce as much as they would like. The starting premise and the intuition to believe in are topics of disagreement among rationalists. Empiricists discover that their own methods of

⁴³ Kirsten Malmkaer, *The Routledge Linguistic Encyclopaedia*, (London: Routledge 2009), 290.

⁴⁴ Kirsten Malmkaer, *The Routledge Linguistic Encyclopaedia*, 290.

experiencing make it impossible to say anything about what lies beyond experience. Therefore, this makes it impossible find out who is smack in the middle of rationalism and empiricism in the final source of our knowledge. However, we must continue to view knowledge as the justifiable basis for the truth and use it to reevaluate analysis' core premises in terms of the conditions that are required and sufficient.

CHAPTER THREE

KANT RECONCILES EMPIRICISM AND RATIONALISM

Introduction

Kant's solution to the famous debate between rationalism and empiricism bridged the gap between these two philosophical traditions. Kant's theory of knowledge reconstructs how humans learn. Kant is remembered as a giant in the history of thought. He asserted that knowledge could not exist apart from the acceptance of both empiricist and rationalist facts. In this chapter, we will discuss Emmanuel Kant's perspective on the sources of knowledge, including his concepts and ideas for reconciling the two schools of thought. We shall begin briefly by looking at his Objections to pure reason, criticism of judgment, practical reason, and his project of reconciliation. Here we shall expose and explain all his ideas in this project. Therefore, we shall look at nominal and phenomenal, posterior and a priori, synthetic and analytic statements, Kant's Copernican revolution, and the synthetic prior judgment. It is from these matters that Kant will register success in this project.

3.1 Critique of Pure Reason

Philosophers before Kant held that there are two approaches to gain knowledge: rationally or empirically. The goal of pure reason critique is to ponder and assess what is ultimately true as well as to discover the limitations and scope of pure reason. The examination of the criticism of pure reason is origins of human knowledge, in addition to a look at the relationship between presumptive and posterior knowledge, synthetic

and analytic statements, and nominal and phenomenal knowledge.⁴⁵ The critique of pure reason explains how transcendental unity of reason and experience provides knowledge and how pure reason provides a priori knowledge. Kant does not support either the rationalists' or empiricists' view that all knowledge is produced by experience or that all knowledge originates from reason.⁴⁶ He accepts the position of empiricists that all knowledge is derived from experience the absence of any innate ideas in the mind before experience, however, he disagrees that this is the case proves that experience must be the sole source of knowledge. Instead, he explains why it takes a combination of reason and experience to produce reliable knowledge.⁴⁷

The idea of Kant about the nominal plays a key role when understanding notions within the critique as we shall look at it. Pure reason must be restrained, in Kant's view, because when it is applied outside of its purview, it results in confused arguments. However, according to Kant, experience does not determine our understanding of ideas like space, time, logic, and mathematics; rather, it can change it.⁴⁸ The synthetic a priori proposition, which Kant coined, held that there is knowledge that we are born with and cannot learn through our own experience or reasoning. According to Kant, neither the existence of God nor freedom can be proven or disproven through the application of reason or the scientific method. God and freedom,

⁴⁵ Thomas Kingsmill, Abbot, *Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason*, (New York: Dover Publications, 2012), 38.

⁴⁶ Richard, Falckenberg, *History of Modern Philosophy*, (London: Verlag Publications, 2020), 251.

⁴⁷ Paul Casus, Immanuel Kant, *Kant's Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics*, (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company), 1912, 123.

⁴⁸ Anele Mngad, *The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant. Kant's Contribution to The Enlightenment Period*, (London: German National Library Publications, 2018), 4.

in his view, are rational because they enable us to establish order and morality in the world.⁴⁹

3.2 Critique of Practical Reason

For Kant in the second critique and other writings on ethics, such as ground works of metaphysics of morals, this involves awareness of the moral law and the motive of acting according to that moral law. In the critique of practical reason Kant argued that humans are free when their actions are governed by reason and this reason, he sometimes called noumenal self. This critique of practical reason is molded on the first critique. First the analytic will investigate the operations. Next, the dialectic will investigate how it can go astray. Finally the doctrine of method follows, which will only be loosely analogous to its corresponding first critique section, discussing how to bring about psychological influence of pure practical reason.

3.3 Critique of Judgment

The third critique, or critique of judgment, does not have a focus that is as distinct as the other two critiques. The critique of judgment discusses scientific and teleological issues; it must be recalled for what Kant has to say about aesthetics. Though they are founded on people's particular feelings, aesthetic judgments are also said to be universally legitimate, according to Kant. In contrast to our feelings toward pleasure and moral excellence, our feelings toward beauty are disinterested. We strive for moral excellence and the possession of pleasant things, but we merely appreciate beauty without feeling compelled to use it.

⁴⁹ Anele Mngad, *The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant. Kant's Contribution to The Enlightenment Period*, 4.

3.4 Phenomena and Noumena

Kant asks the big question namely; is it possible to understand what is fundamentally true? Is metaphysics a possibility? For our purposes, metaphysics here is the field of study that seeks to comprehend the nature of being, that is, it tries to know what is real and what is ultimately real. This question is not actually new, but Kant's phrasing of the question is the one that turns out to be more significant. Are synthetic, a priori judgments about the nominal possible, questions Kant? To fully comprehend this inquiry, we must examine some of the terminologies that Kant uses in his project as we already mentioned in the previous section, some of the terminology that Kant uses in his project is crucial to understanding this question. As we already mentioned in them in the introduction and his critique of pure reason.⁵⁰ According to Kant, the only universe we are capable of knowing is the one made up of the visible objects to us throughout the experience. He uses the word phenomena to describe things in the world as they appear to us. Therefore, the phenomenal is what appears to us when we perceive it.⁵¹ The physicists tell us, for example that Even though the chair seems solid and impenetrable, it is actually made of molecules and atoms, which are largely composed of empty space. This means that the way things appear to us through our senses, according to physics may not be the same as the way things really actually is.⁵² However according to Kant, it is possible to know the phenomenal, because it is the aspects of things that appear to us when we actually perceive them.⁵³

⁵⁰ Theodor W. Adorno, Rolf Tredeman, *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, (California: Stanford University Press, 1955), 39.

⁵¹ Helen Buss Mitchel, *Roots of Wisdom, A Tapestry of Philosophical Traditions*, (Singapore: Cengage Publishing 2018), 239.

⁵² Lars Goran Johansson, *Empiricism and Philosophy of physics*, (Switzerland: Springer, 2021), 57.

⁵³ Helen Buss Mitchel, *Roots of Wisdom, A Tapestry of Philosophical Traditions*, 239.

On the other hand, *noumena* are something about which we are unable to have knowledge. It follows that *noumena* are a component of what is actually, truly real. Therefore, the first world is known as the *noumena* world. The world outside of us, the world of what actually is, the world of realistic trees, dogs, cars, houses, and fluffy things. Kant argues that because of the way our minds are built, we are unable to understand reality as it is. Kant continues to wonder if it is possible to know something's noumenal aspect, or in other words, if it is possible to know what is truly real.⁵⁴ Hume held that everything we experience is merely a perception and that what we believe to be our self or identity is not at all real. Berkeley held that the only things that were truly real were perceptions and minds.⁵⁵

Kant argues that it is crucial to consistently make a distinction between the different worlds of phenomena and noumena.⁵⁶ Thus, noumena are the things in themselves that make up what is truly real, but phenomena are the appearances that make up experience. All of our synthetic a priori conclusions only hold true for the realm of phenomena, not the noumena. The structure of our conceptions can therefore be justifiably imposed on the objects of our knowledge at the level of phenomena in light of what we can really experience. Because the item in and of itself is, by definition, completely independent of our experience of it, we are absolutely ignorant of the noumena realm. The crucial thing to remember in this situation is that our

⁵⁴ Georges Dicker, *Kant's Theory of Knowledge: Analytical introduction*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 34.

⁵⁵ Samuel C. Rickless, *Berkeley's Argument for Idealism*, (Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 2013), 68.

⁵⁶ Andrea Diema lane, *Spooky Physics the Illustrated Edition*, (London: Lulu.com second edition, 2016), 19.

perceptions of the world are influenced by the outside environment, so while we are witnessing an actual reality, our impressions of it may not be entirely accurate.⁵⁷

3.5 A posterior and a priori

A priori understanding is understood as knowledge that is justified without reference to experience, i.e., knowledge that is unrelant on empirical data.⁵⁸ Contrarily, a posteriori knowledge is that which is supported by experience, and therefore it depends on experiential evidence.⁵⁹ It is possible to think of the difference between non-empirical and empirical knowledge as analogous to the difference between a priori and a posteriori knowledge. Since our experiences only reflect how things appear to us, experiential knowledge can only provide us with knowledge of appearances. Therefore, A posteriori knowledge can only provide information on the phenomenal side of things; it cannot provide information about the noumena.⁶⁰ As a result, if we are to possess noumenal knowledge that is, knowledge of what actually is and it must be based on some type of non-empirical knowledge. Because a posteriori knowledge only provides us with information about phenomena that are phenomenally perceptible to our senses, if we are to have knowledge of the noumena, it must come from some type of a priori knowledge.⁶¹

A priori knowledge, or information that is not logically based according to experience today, such knowledge is possible, in Kant's view. For instance, square

⁵⁷ Andrea Diema Lane, *Spooky Physics the Illustrated Edition*, 19.

⁵⁸ Nicholas Bunnin Jiyan Yu, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, (Singapore: Wiley Blackwell, 2009), 43.

⁵⁹ Nicholas Bunnin Jiyan Yu, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*, 43.

⁶⁰ Henry E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*, (London: Yale University Press, 2004), 94.

⁶¹ Jaekwon Kim, Ernest, Gary S. *Rosencrant A companion to Metaphysics*, (Singapore: Wiley Blackwell Publication, 2009), 454.

roots and decimals are not taught to us in mathematics. According to Kant, such things are not present in the world because knowledge of them is not according to firsthand understanding of the world but rather is based on non-experience. The question of whether it's possible to know something about the noumena beforehand still stands. Regardless of whether Kant is correct about mathematics, his question still demands that in order to know what is truly real, we must develop a grounded understanding of noumena.⁶²

3.6 Synthetic and Analytic Statements

Analytical sentences reveal information about language use and reasoning. They don't provide accurate knowledge about the outside world.⁶³ Conversely, synthetic claims are supported by our sensory data and experiences.⁶⁴ Synthetic statements have a truth-value that cannot be determined solely by logic. According to Kant, by definition, analytical statements are true because the subject contains the predicate concept. For instance, triangles have three sides, salmon are fish, and bachelors are unmarried men, and in this case about the statements above, we learn absolutely nothing new⁶⁵ On the other hand, synthetic statements are descriptions of the universe that cannot be considered as givens. Synthetic sentences are those that may or may not be true. Children, for example, wear cottages, the kitchen table is round, and

⁶² Georges Dicker, *Kant's Theory of Knowledge: Analytical Introduction*, 64.

⁶³ Diogenes Allen, Eric O. Springsted, *philosophy of Understanding Theology*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1958), 214.

⁶⁴ Diogenes Allen, Eric O. Springsted, *Philosophy of Understanding Theology*, 214.

⁶⁵ Nikolay Milkov, Volker Peckhaus, *The Berlin Group the Philosophy of Logical Empiricism*, (New York: Springer shop, 2013), 207.

my computer is turned on. Thus, the only ways to assess the veracity of a synthetic assertion are through observation and personal experience.⁶⁶

After examining the analytical and synthetic assertions above, we can now construct an analytic claim regarding noumena reality in the same manner since analytic does not rely on observation. However, the analytic proposition contains two notions that are identical but are presented in two distinct ways. This means that the analytic assertion is essentially meaningless as a proposition because it does not precisely describe what noumena reality is. On the other hand, since it is based on observation and experience, a synthetic statement could be able to inform us about the phenomenon. However, Kant's query is still open. Is it possible to possess true knowledge that is not reliant on experience because experience just serves to amplify our perceptions of what is really real?⁶⁷

3.7 Kant's Critique of Rationalism and Empiricism

Who is correct in the epistemological argument: the empiricists, who place a strong emphasis on the senses as our only source of knowledge of the world, or the rationalists, who maintain that only reason can ultimately determine what is true?⁶⁸ Although Kant was familiar with the works of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, he was more directly influenced by the German philosopher Leibniz despite having a foundation in Descartes' rationalistic philosophy.⁶⁹ In contrast to Locke, who maintained that the mind is a blank slate, or *tabula rasa*, and that it becomes populated with ideas through its interactions with the outside world, Kant claims that the blank

⁶⁶ Nikolay. Milkov, Volker Peckhaus, *The Berlin Group the Philosophy of Logical Empiricism*, 209.

⁶⁷ Helen Buss Mitchel, *Roots of Wisdom: A Tapestry of Philosophical Traditions*, 239.

⁶⁸ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1992), 228.

⁶⁹ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 200.

slate model of the mind is insufficient to explain our beliefs about objects and that some components of our beliefs must be brought to experience by the mind.⁷⁰ While arguing against material idealism, Berkeley also claims that our assessments of objects are really assessments of just these representations and not the materials that give rise to them. Kant contends that Berkeley's stance that we are able of forming judgments in a way that our experience is really incompatible with material idealism.⁷¹

Kant's epistemology is also a direct and explicit response to Hume's skepticism, an attempt to provide both a foundation for empirical scientific knowledge and to demonstrate the limitations of such knowledge.⁷² Kant freely acknowledges that the stimulus that awoke him from his dogmatic slumber was reading David Hume's works.⁷³ If allowed to stand, Hume's attack on the idea that the law of cause and effect is not grounded in reason but rather in customs or habit would undermine the credibility of natural science for starters and eventually undermine faith in reason's ability to accomplish anything.⁷⁴ According to Kant, Hume is completely unable to lay a foundation for our knowledge of the world outside of our existing worldviews. Empiricism by Hume falls short of providing the kind of evidence that Kant believes is necessary to support the knowledge that serves as the foundation for our daily actions. Most importantly, Hume does not demonstrate the necessary link between cause and effect. His research unequivocally shows that inductive reasoning is unable to produce these results. The main goal of this is to shake Kant out of his dogmatic slumber, and it

⁷⁰ Alloy S. Ihuah, *Philosophy, Religion and Politics*, (Hillsborough: Lulu publishing company, 2012), 277.

⁷¹ Daniel Garder, Beatrice Ionuenesse, *Kant and the Early Moderns*, (Oxford: Princeton University Press), 2008, 7.

⁷² Theodor W. Adorno Rolf Tredeman, *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, (California: Stanford university Press, 1955), 39.

⁷³ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 229.

⁷⁴ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 229.

must be accomplished in order to lay the groundwork for the newly emerging empirical science of the eighteenth century.⁷⁵

Kant, who shares Descartes' view in this regard, asserts that the statement that I think, on the one hand, of the concept of God, plays a crucial function in structuring all cognitive use of reason. And in both cases, the declaration of existence is the main focus of Kant's examination of the Cartesian view.⁷⁶ Kant believed that he might deduce the existence of things in space outside of him based on his perception of his own existence and the justification that God exists and is not deceiving him. Kant asserts that one cannot gain knowledge of the object. Instead, the capacity to be aware of one's own existence presupposes the existence of entities in space and time outside of me, according to Descartes' famous cogito argument.⁷⁷ Since existence is not a predicate of a thing or a real predicate, Kant objects to the Cartesian proof of God's existence on the grounds that it cannot be analytically deduced from the fact that God is the most perfect being.⁷⁸ Kant, on the other hand, agrees with Descartes' assertion that the statement "I think" contains the statement "I exist." Descartes asserts that my existence is more readily known than my essence, but Kant disagrees. Descartes is criticized for ignoring the fact that I am aware of the existence of my own mental states, at least to the extent that I am aware of this existence as determined in time.⁷⁹

Kant is profoundly dissatisfied with the idealistic and initially dubious conclusions of the empirical lines of research. Locke, Berkeley, and Home's empiricist positions are shown to be untenable since they logically demand the very claims that

⁷⁵ Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Practical Reason*, (Cambridge: Dover Publication, 2012), 67.

⁷⁶ Daniel Garder, Beatrice Ionuenesse, *Kant and the Early Moderns*, 10.

⁷⁷ Andrew ward, *Kant the three Critiques*, (Main Street Malden: Polity Press, 2006), 83.

⁷⁸ Daniel Garder, Beatrice Ionuenesse, *Kant and the Early Moderns*, 10.

⁷⁹ Daniel Garder, Beatrice Ionuenesse, *Kant and the Early Moderns*, 11.

they claim to be opposed to by Kant, who advances a number of reasons in support of each claim. In fact, according to Kant, these assertions must be made in order for any logical account of how we perform even the most fundamental mental functions, like self-awareness and object assessment, to make sense.⁸⁰ Kant is sympathetic to many aspects of empiricism, but in the end it cannot provide a satisfying explanation for how we see the world. On the other hand, the rationalist endeavor was bound to failure since it ignored how our capacity for reason affects how we perceive objects. Although their a priori study of our thoughts may provide us with information about their substance, it was unable to provide a cogent proof of metaphysical truths like the outside world, the soul, God, and other concepts.⁸¹

3.8 Kant's Copernican Revolution

In the wake of the Copernican revolution, Kant saw a flaw in the empiricist approach to knowledge. In other words, how can we arrive at the necessary and universal knowledge possibility of scientific knowledge or more specifically, the connection between causes and effects that enable the mind to understand scientific truths, if all we learn and gather are particular sensations or particular impressions, as the empiricists claimed? Rationalism and empiricism are two opposing schools of thinking, and Kant provided a solution to this conundrum.⁸² The theory of knowledge of Kant as we already said in the introduction will help us to know how human come

⁸⁰ Paul Gayer, *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern philosophy*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 79.

⁸¹ Alloy S. Ihuah, *Philosophy, Religion and Politics*, 277.

⁸² Snippet view, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, (New York: Abe books, 1988), 104.

know things. Kant thought that people actively seek to understand the world, as opposed to being only passive observers of it.⁸³

Empiricists think that the mind passively receives records then organizes impressions. The external world shapes our perceptions, while knowledge conforms to its objects. Kant rejects this by saying that objects conform to our knowledge, for sense data to be experienced; the mind must impose a rational structure on our experience⁸⁴. According to Kant, all experience is the result of the mind imposing its structure on the external environment through the creation of meaningful objects from raw sensory data within a temporal and spatial matrix. According to Kant, the human mind imposes the categories of space and time on experience in order to make sense of it. He referred to these categories as types of intuition.⁸⁵

As a result, Kant proudly referred to it as the Copernicus revolution. In order to answer the question of how the mind creates knowledge from experience, Kant proposed that the mind imposes principles on experience in a manner similar to how Copernicus rejected the idea that the sun revolved around the earth. According to Kant, the mind needs a further set of organizing principles in order to have knowledge. The ability to understand contains these principles. Thus, both a priori and posteriori components are necessary. Nothing would be observable if there were no sensation. Without comprehension, nothing could conceive. In his critique of pure reason, Kant claims that sense perceptions without conceptions are blind and thoughts without

⁸³ Shawn. P. young, *Jeopardy and Philosophy, what is knowledge in the form of a question?* (Chicago: Open Court, 2012), 161.

⁸⁴ Henry E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*, 60.

⁸⁵ Paul Guyer, *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*, 61.

contents are empty, only understanding can detect the north and only the senses can think nothing. So, knowledge arises only from their united action⁸⁶.

3.9 Synthetic a priori Judgment

Having already seen two types of knowledge, namely knowledge that is entirely empirical and knowledge that is completely independent of the senses, Kant comes in with synthetic a priori judgment. We have concepts and judgments that are both synthetic and a priori, according to Kant. Many of these ideas can be found in mathematics and natural science, according to Kant. He contends that these ideas are the most crucial components of knowledge that empiricists ignored.⁸⁷ The ideal knowledge is synthetic a priori knowledge, which is both certain and informative. We need to understand that Kant is trying to do all this in order to conform to us that we need both reason and experience for us to arrive at the true knowledge. This means that our way of knowing is the combination of rationalism and empiricism but not just one of them alone⁸⁸.

For us to be able to understand clearly, According to Kant, there are only twelve key synthetic a priori concepts involved in the process of acquiring knowledge. He offers these concepts as categories. The principle of causality, which we have already seen in Kant's critique of empiricism, was the most crucial one in light of Hume's attack. In this sense, Hume was correct to believe that causality was not a principle derived from experience, but he was also mistaken to believe that this concept has no validity.⁸⁹ Without categories like cause and effect, substance, and others, according to

⁸⁶ Robert Mark Wenley, *An Outline Introductory to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1904), 52.

⁸⁷ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 211.

⁸⁸ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 199.

⁸⁹ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 199.

Kant, it would be impossible to convert sensual intuition into judgment, which is what is meant by the term knowledge.⁹⁰ To gain knowledge, we must process the information provided by our senses using mental constructs such as cause and effect, which the mind generates on its own. Sensing and thought are useful. Both are necessary for knowledge to exist. Without content, thoughts are meaningless, and without concepts, intuitions are blind.⁹¹

Conclusion

According to Kant, both empiricists and rationalists failed to provide an adequate characterization of human cognitive capacities because they did not appreciate the heterogeneity of sensible and intellectual capacities. Therefore, Kant tried to show them that both rationalists and empiricist needed to come together if one of them was to register success in this field of philosophy. It is generally arguable that Emmanuel Kant in his philosophy did a great work in trying to bring together the two schools of thought. However much some philosophers have argued that Kant failed to reconcile the empiricism and rationalism but he provoked the thinking in philosophy and that is why some philosophers have doubted him to be a metaphysician because of his way of approach to metaphysics. Kant said that knowledge is of both sensibility and understanding; both of them are equally responsible for the formation of knowledge. What made Kant more important is that he wanted to show how two schools of thought could complement each other. Kant remains one of the greatest figures among the modern philosophers because of his effort to bring together both the empiricist and rationalists.

⁹⁰ Bernhard Ritter, *Kant and Post Tractarian, Wittgenstein, Transcendentalism*, (Switzerland: Springer Shop, 2020), 246.

⁹¹ David Stewart, H. Gene Blocker, *Fundamentals of Philosophy*, 233.

CHAPTER FOUR

HERITAGE OF KANTIAN RECONCILIATORY PROJECT

Introduction

A philosopher rarely has a considerable influence on just one area of philosophy. It is uncommon for a philosopher to have such a broad influence, as Kant did. The philosophy of Kant has been so much influential in the field of philosophy. His critique in attempt to reconcile rationalism and empiricism had positive effects in modern philosophy. In the wake of the scientific revolution, Kant understood that our current conception of knowledge required revision. He realized that some very fundamental presumptions, which are not self-evident but cannot be entirely justified by empirical observations, underlie both daily life and scientific knowledge and help to organize them. For instance, we presume that mathematical principles will hold true in the physical world. According to Kant, everything we experience is simply given to us, unadulterated by the way we think. In order to describe reality as it exists independently of our experiences of it and unstructured by our cognitive makeup, Kant introduced the idea of the thing in itself. Additionally, we'll examine freedom and reason, the dual nature of human existence, and obligation and goodwill and Kant on moral worth. Act solely in line with the maxim, with the intention of it becoming a universal rule.

4.1 Kantian Metaphysics

Kant's metaphysical project can be summarized in one sentence: dogmatism must be broken. Kant questions the human reason, its status, and its limitations in order to achieve this goal. The metaphysical question is what can I understand? How can we be sure? To respond to this query, we must provide way to methodology of metaphysics⁹². We must remember that, prior to Kant, metaphysics referred to the knowledge of intelligible objects, as seen in Plato's form theory, without any doubt about their knowledgeability. Kant rejects both the realistic and the idealistic assumptions within the couple subject or object. While idealism believes that the subject causes the object, realism believes that the subject is affected by the object. In order to avoid taking a position on either side of the debate, Kant tries to establish a middle ground between these two viewpoints. The study of purely rational cognition and comprehension of a priori objects is known as metaphysics. These are the understanding's guiding principles that enable the experience. These principles of Kant are limited reason. Human understanding is constrained to things that are sensible to experience. Man can imagine things he doesn't know by thinking about them outside of his sensory experience. Being familiar with the environment is an unmatched experience. Exit the ontology that assumed it could understand phenomenology.⁹³

4.2 Kantian Epistemology

Immanuel Kant makes an effort to meld the epistemological traditions of rationalism and empiricism. In actuality, he did this in response to David Hume's skepticism, which Kant said awakened him from his dogmatic slumber. Conceptions

⁹² Abraham Anderson, *Kant, Hume, and the Interruption of Dogmatic, Slumber*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 37.

⁹³ Harold Arthur Prichard, *Kant's Theory of knowledge*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1909), 28.

without sensations are empty, according to Kant, who also agreed with the empiricist, hence concepts or ideas by themselves cannot be considered knowledge. Knowledge does not simply come from innate notions; it also comes from experience. We need to know also that Kant agreed with the rationalist that that perception without concept is blind. Merely having experience alone and perception alone does not constitute knowledge. This means that there must be some way in which the mind organizes and structures for there to be knowledge.

According to Kant, experience is the source of all knowledge. Since knowledge cannot exist without experience, experience serves as the catalyst for acquiring knowledge. Once more, he concurs with the empiricist that knowledge comes from experience. According to Kant, it is incorrect that experience is the exclusive source of all knowledge. Knowledge does not only come through experience. He concurs with the empiricists in this regard because knowledge can only exist if there are categories by which experience can be organized and comprehended. According to Kant, the mind actively participates in the process of knowing and contributes to our understanding of the universe. Understanding categories are present in the mind. These are the categories that describe how the active mind constructs or forms experience. Twelve categories, such as causation or cause and effect, were described by Kant. The active mind interprets and links experience in terms of certain events' causes and other events' effects. It follows that if we are unaware of reality as it may exist independently of our mental structures and experiences, reality cannot be known. We don't understand noumenal. Only the way our active mind structures and categorizes our experiences can we accurately describe reality?⁹⁴

⁹⁴ Henry E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*, 46.

4.3 Kant's Transcendental Idealism

According to Kant's thesis of transcendental idealism, reason and experience were both necessary for understanding the universe.⁹⁵ Kant identified two sources of knowledge: sensibility, the mind's receptive ability, and understanding, the mind's conceptual capacity. He believed that no experience could be had with things that are not situated in space and time.⁹⁶ But according to Kant; we are unable to know the nature of things as they are in themselves. These criteria of possibility result from our consciousness' requirement that objects be perceived as occupying a space and lasting for a certain amount of time. Sensitivity by itself, however, does not enable object judgment. Understanding is also necessary since it gives the concepts and guidelines for figuring out what is typical or universal across various representations. According to him, we wouldn't receive any items without sensitivity, and we wouldn't think of any objects without comprehension. Without content, thoughts are hollow, and without conceptions, intuitions are blind, as we've previously seen with his Copernicus Revolution. According to Kant, thinking about some objects requires comprehension, which assigns ideas based on the sensational information received from the object to determine what is common and universal about it.⁹⁷

Despite Kant's assertion that we cannot know the nature of items as they are in themselves, it is possible to know how things look. This suggests that the categories of understanding that frame and frame every aspect of human experience can never be transcended by human knowledge. Humans will never be able to fully comprehend how the cosmos actually appears since they are unable to conceptualize without any

⁹⁵ Henry E. Allison, *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*, 76.

⁹⁶ Harold Arthur Prichard, *Kant's Theory of knowledge*, 28.

⁹⁷ Harold Arthur Prichard, *Kant's Theory of knowledge*, An Introduction To the Critique of Pure Reason (Cambridge, Hackett Publishing Company, 2001), 28.

structure and order of things. Kant's justifications, which are based on the idea of transcendental idealism, are intended to highlight the boundaries of human understanding. According to Kant, the rationalists thought that humans could have metaphysical knowledge about things like God, the soul, matter, and other such concepts, and that this knowledge was transcendently real. However, Kant claims that humans are only capable of having empirical knowledge of the world. He claims that for minds like ours, transcendental knowledge is ideal but not actual.⁹⁸

4.4 Kantian Ethics

Kant's conviction in human freedom was one of his core ethical presuppositions. The moral world functions in accordance with self-imposed laws of freedom, unlike the natural world, which is governed by laws of cause and effect. Without freedom, morality is impossible, according to Kant. Freedom exists because morality does too. Kant concurred that reason was the source of freedom. Without reason, according to Kant, we would be ruled by our appetites, such as avarice, desire, and envy. Without a cause, we wouldn't be free if we were enslaved by our passions, and vice versa. Therefore, without reason, there is no freedom, and without freedom, there is no morality, according to Kant, and without reason there is no morality and so for this case Kant held that our free and rational nature is the source of our moral obligation. The study of our obligation can be found in Kant's ethics. We can choose between activities because we are rational, free beings, and moral behaviors are those that follow reason.

4.4.1 Reason and Freedom

According to Kant, freedom is crucial because moral judgment presumes that we are free in the sense of having the option to act differently. For instance, according

⁹⁸ Daniel Garder, Beatrice Ionuenesse, *Kant and the Early Moderns*, 89.

to Kant, in order for a person's behavior to be morally wrong, it must have been within his control, meaning that at the time it was within his capacity to refrain from committing this act of stealing.⁹⁹ Only free agents who have agency over their actions and the capacity to behave morally are subject to moral right and wrong or wrongly at the same time. This, according to Kant, is just common sense. Because it is necessary for moral judgments to be possible, freedom is central to Kant's ethics. Freedom is a rational concept that serves a practical purpose. Reason cannot act without the assumption of freedom.¹⁰⁰

Any attempt to conceive of a rule that describes the means by which some purpose might be realized is meaningless if we think of ourselves as completely causally determined rather than as uncaused causes ourselves. Because of this, I find it difficult to imagine myself as being subject to causal law and as being able to act in accordance with the idea of a principle that directs my will. We must consider our activities to be the result of a cause that is not caused if at all we are to perform well, use reason to accomplish our objectives, as well as comprehend the cosmos. As a result, reason naturally wants to think that it is free. In other words, theoretical reason cannot prove freedom for the purpose of action but practical reason must assume it. Therefore, being able to judge and use reason separates us from that chain of events with causes and effects.¹⁰¹ This means that reason develops the idea of spontaneity for

⁹⁹ Immanuel Kant, Thomas Kingsmill Abbot, *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*, (Longmans: Alpha Ed, 1909), 48.

¹⁰⁰ Immanuel Kant, Thomas Kingsmill Abbot, *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*, 89.

¹⁰¹ Immanuel Kant, Thomas Kingsmill, Abbot, *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*, 97.

itself, enabling it to act without the necessity for any prior cause. Kant says that reason must think of itself as free¹⁰².

4.4.2 The Duty and Good Will

The faculty of acting in line with legal principles is how Kant defines volition. The morality of our acts is independent of how they turn out because when we act, achieving our objectives is frequently out of our hands. The reason for the action is something we can control. As a result, it is necessary to consider the purpose behind an action while determining its morality. If two people, Stephen and John, carry out the same action in accordance with the same legal theory but Stephen is prevented from succeeding by circumstances beyond his control, Stephen is still deserving of credit. In terms of the motivations behind their behavior, we must evaluate them morally on an equal footing.¹⁰³ The sole thing that is beneficial without qualifications is the spirit of goodwill.¹⁰⁴

Kant defined a good will as one whose decision-making is solely guided by moral standards or moral law. Such laws are obligations that we will address in greater detail later because they inevitably make people feel confined in their basic aspirations. The idea of a good will is believed to be the idea of someone who is committed entirely to acting in ways that they deem morally right and who views moral concerns as sufficient justification for their actions.¹⁰⁵

According to Kant, having good intentions is comparable to having good will. Kant believed that an action cannot be good unless it was carried out with good intent.

¹⁰² Allen W Wood, *Kant's Ethical Thought*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 175.

¹⁰³ Levis White Beck, *A commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 38.

¹⁰⁴ Robert Stem, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), ix.

¹⁰⁵ Robert Stem, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, ix.

For an action to be good, the person's internal motivation must be good. All people have a range of abilities and talents. To put them to good use, we must employ our good will. For instance, the majority of people can write. We must employ our good intentions to guide the writing ability toward useful applications. Without good will, abilities can be misused.¹⁰⁶

All good deeds, according to Kant, must be motivated by good will. He asserts that there is an innate tendency for goodness in humans. Good will signifies that the deed was done with good intent. Kant also held that we must have faith in humanity's rational goodness and that these adages and principles will become moral rules.¹⁰⁷ In fact, good intentions point to a good action not because the results will ultimately be good, but because the intention is good in and of itself. According to Kant, the only intrinsic good exists in good will. All the others, such as pleasure or courage, might be used maliciously, whereas good will, by definition, is always driven by good intentions.¹⁰⁸

The good will is not just any good intentions, for example, it is not utilitarian intention to have the best outcome from one's actions. It is a will to do one's duty without any contradictions. Good will is the only thing that is not subjected to corruption. The good will performs the duty because it is honorable. According to Kant, everyone has a moral obligation. If something is done out of duty, it has moral value. If a maxim can be declared to be a universal law, then the conduct is ethically right. As we have previously shown above regarding the duality of the human

¹⁰⁶ Barbara, Herman, *The practice of Moral Judgement*, (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993), 13.

¹⁰⁷ Roger J. Sullivan, *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 68.

¹⁰⁸ Barbara Mackinnon, *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*, (London: Cengage Learning, 2014), 114.

predicament, this also calls for us to always respect humanity, Never simply as a means to an end, whether in ourselves or others, but always as a goal in and of itself.¹⁰⁹

4.4.3 Categorical Imperative and Hypothetical Imperative

A deontological moral theory is an example of Kant's theory. According to these theories, the rightness or wrongness of an action is determined not by its consequences, as we have seen, but by whether it fulfills the duty.¹¹⁰ According to Kant, there is a fundamental moral principle known as the categorical imperative, and it is this principle that establishes our moral obligations. What does it imply, when the duty of someone is established by way of a categorical imperative? An imperative is what? Paying your taxes is compulsory because a command is an imperative.¹¹¹

A hypothetical imperative is a moral duty that only holds true when pursuing a particular objective. For instance, a student studies to get good grades. Hypothetical imperative is independent of morality. We may also take more two examples of hypothetical imperative; the first one is If you want to go to medical school, you should major in biology in college. This order doesn't apply to you if you choose not to enroll in medical school.¹¹² Another illustration is when your father tells you to eat if you are hungry, but to disregard the order if you are not. According to Kant, categorical imperatives govern our moral duties. No matter what one's individual intentions or restraints may be, the categorical rules are universal and apply to everyone, in every circumstance. Categorical imperatives, for example, command unconditionally, "Do

¹⁰⁹ H. J. Paton, *Moral Law: Groundwork of the Metaphysics, Immanuel Kant*, (Cambridge: Routledge, 2013), 6.

¹¹⁰ John. S. Feinberg Paul, *Ethics for a Brave New World*, (Wheaton Illinois: Crossway, 2010), 35.

¹¹¹ John. S. Feinberg Paul, *Ethics for a Brave New World*, 35.

¹¹² Immanuel Kant, Thomas Kingsmill Abbot, *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*, 23.

not cheat on your taxes." Even though cheating would benefit you, you might decide against it.¹¹³

The connection between categorical imperative and morality is that morality must be founded on categorical imperative as morality imposes itself upon you and you are unable to refuse it or argue that it does not apply to you. How does categorical imperative function is a possible question.¹¹⁴ There are three alternative ways to phrase the categorical imperative. This means that there are three methods to express what it is. All three, according to Kant, actually express the same thing. Although the first formulation is more obviously a categorical imperative, it is also the easiest to understand.¹¹⁵

The first formulation, which asserts that you should only act in accordance with that maxim while simultaneously wishing for it to become a universal law, is sometimes referred to as the law of nature. Simply put, if you do something, then everyone else should be able to do it as well. According to Kant, a really moral deed is one that may be codified as a universal rule. The second one indicates obliquely that you are not permitted to take any action that you would not be ready to take on behalf of everyone else. You cannot exempt yourself from the rules. For instance, you have a responsibility to maintain your promises if you expect others to keep theirs.¹¹⁶ The third mandates that any maxim you adhere to must be such that you are prepared to argue that everyone should do the same in comparable circumstances. For instance, if I deceived to get something, I would be willing to accept that everyone constantly lied in order to obtain what they wanted. However, no one would ever buy into this

¹¹³ H. J. Paton, *Moral Law: Groundwork of the Metaphysics, Immanuel Kant*, 6.

¹¹⁴ Roger J. Sullivan, *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*, 68.

¹¹⁵ Roger J. Sullivan, *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*, 68.

¹¹⁶ N. T. Potter Mark. Timmons, *Morality and Universality: Essays on Ethical Universality*, 157.

justification, the lie would be exposed, and you would fail to accomplish your objective. Therefore, lying is prohibited according to the categorical imperative because doing so would result in your goal being defeated, if you wanted such a maxim should be made into a worldwide rule.¹¹⁷

4.4.4 Kant on Moral Worth

Kant also offers some thoughts about a person's moral worth. He discusses the qualities of a decent person. We must remember that Kant intended this to be consistent with the all of his theory and that the categorical imperatives would establish what one's duty is. However, one may also somewhat approach this as a separate theory and take another standard into consideration. We must keep in mind that the comments below are about how one views other people, not about their deeds. Whether a person morally deserves or not depends on their behaviors, which also decide whether they are right or wrong. A person's moral worth is determined by their deeds, but this involves more than just judging whether they did something right or wrong.¹¹⁸

According to Kant, a person can only have moral worth, or be a good person, if they are driven by morality. Motivation is what matters. Consider Stephen winning the lottery and pondering what to do with the money. After that, he looks around to see what would be the most enjoyable thing to do with it, then realizes that the most enjoyable thing to do is to donate the money to a good cause and to take pleasure in the special feeling he gets from making other people happy, so he donates all of his lottery winnings. Kant contends that Stephen's actions disqualify him from being a moral person, in a sense that it would be the most enjoyable, because such a self-centered

¹¹⁷ Immanuel Kant. Allen W Wood, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, 18.

¹¹⁸ Monika Betzler, *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, (Californi: Walter Grayte, 2008), 36.

quest is not honorable. It was only fortuitous for those charities that he felt giving away money was enjoyable.¹¹⁹

This means that acting morally only makes sense when you know it is right to do so and would still do it even if you didn't enjoy doing it. According to Kant, actions motivated by desires or self-interest have no moral worth because desire and self-interest can sometimes lead us to do bad or wrong things. In other words, a person cannot have moral worth if their actions are motivated by their feelings or desires. It may seem strange, but there are solid arguments in favor of Kant's position. This implies that the only deeds with moral value are those driven by obligation. According to Kant, a morally upright person acts morally upright and does so despite the influence of want and appetite, which could cause them to act unethically. According to Kant, moral value is the most significant quality a person can possess. It is more admirable than mental skills like intelligence, wit, and judgment, as well as temperamental traits like courage, resolve, and tenacity.¹²⁰

According to Kant, these natural qualities, such as intelligence, courage, and a host of others, can also turn evil and harmful if the will that is intended to use them is not good. It is possible for someone to act with evil intent but for it to have positive effects on society, and it is also possible for someone to act with good intent but for it to have both good and terrible effects. For example, imagine two people went out to the bar to drink together late in the night, and then after they each decide to drive home while intoxicated. They take different routes while driving. Despite driving recklessly, one of them travels alone and arrives at home without incident. The other, who is less fortunate, runs over a pedestrian while they are moving in the late night and then kills

¹¹⁹ Monika Betzler, *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*, 36.

¹²⁰ Immanuel Kant, *Fundamentals of the Metaphysics of Morals*, 53.

them with their vehicle.¹²¹ Here, Kant would argue that based on these behaviors, both drunks are equally awful; the fact that one of them was fortunate does not elevate him above the other. Since none of them had any control over the other's behavior, they both had to make the same decisions. People who act for the right reasons follow the same logic. If both people act for the right reasons, they are both morally worthy, even if one of their actions results in negative consequences due to bad luck.¹²²

We have no control over how a decision will turn out, but we can only control our reasons when we behave morally. Therefore, the moral worth of an action is given by our good will. Let us consider the case that has been mentioned above regarding the lotto winner's charitable contributions. Imagine him giving charity with a good intention to save hundreds of starving children in a remote village, but not fun as we saw above. When the food is delivered to that village, a batch of robbers learns that there is food and they come to steal it, killing both adults and children in the process. The intended effects of feeding hungry children were good, but the actual effects are negative. Kant is not advocating that we base our moral judgments on the intended outcomes. According to Kant, moral worth is correctly determined by considering the reason behind the action, which may be selfish even if the anticipated outcomes are positive.¹²³

When you look in the above example, you may be mistaken to think that Kant is forbidding happiness. But this isn't the case. If you carefully examine the previous example, you will realize that the selfish person's desire to satisfy his own desires is one of his intended consequences. As a result, it may appear that this intended

¹²¹ Steven Scarlet, John Arthur, *Morality and Moral Controversies: A readings in Moral Social and Political Philosophy*, (Cambridge: Routledge, 2016), 81.

¹²² Steven Scarlet, John Arthur, *Morality and moral controversies: A readings in moral social and Political Philosophy*, 81.

¹²³ Barbara Mackinnon, *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*, 114.

consequence is preferable. Another interpretation of Kant's argument is that it is unworthy to act if one of my intentions is to satisfy my own happiness. This is also incorrect. Clearly, Kant believes that happiness is a good thing. Making yourself happy is the intended result of doing something, and there is nothing wrong with that; that is not being selfish. You can gain moral value by engaging in activities you enjoy, but you cannot do them out of a sense of enjoyment; rather, you must do them because they are mandated by law.¹²⁴

There is also a widespread belief that Kant believes that any activity that merely increases your happiness, like as purchasing an ice cream cone, is always bad. That is not the case. Kant believes that you should do what makes you happy as long as it is not unethical or opposed to your commitments, and that you should avoid from doing it if it is. You can go ahead and get ice cream because it is not immoral to do so.¹²⁵ You wouldn't become a morally good person by doing it, but you also wouldn't become a bad person. Many legal but not obligatory actions are viewed as neutral in this perspective. Kant asserts that a good person always fulfills their obligations since they are their obligations. While it is acceptable if they love doing it, it must be for a reason that they would carry it out even if they did not find it enjoyable. The main takeaway is that one to be a good person, one must first be good.¹²⁶

4.5 Aesthetics in Modern Turning Point Kant

The third critique, often known as the critique of judgment, lacks the same sharp focus as the first two critiques. Kant begins by exploring our capacity for judgment in broad strokes. What Kant has to say about aesthetics is what people

¹²⁴ Barbara Mackinnon, *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*, 114.

¹²⁵ Andrew, Bailey, *First philosophy: Fundamental Problems and Readings in Philosophy*, (Canada: Broadview Press, 2011), 644.

¹²⁶ Andrew, Bailey, *First philosophy: Fundamental Problems and Readings in Philosophy*, 644.

remember most for this critique. Thus, this book is separated into two sections: the first is an aesthetic assessment, and the second is an assessment of teleology. In the first part, Kant talks about three judgements the judgement of agreeable, the evaluation of good and the beautiful assessment. However, the second section of the book of critique of judgement, Kant discusses teleology, or the notion that everything has a goal or intention. Kant distinguishes between the beautiful and the sublime in that our perception of the sublime is linked to our capacity or reason, which has the idea of absolute totality and freedom, for beauty you simply appreciate without thinking first. For Kant, when judging the beautiful, we do not depend on our experiences or reason.

127

4.5.1 Judgement of Agreeable, Good and Beautiful

Kant gives us three judgements, the judgement of agreeable which depends on sensation, the judgement of good which depends on our personal goal, and the judgement of beauty which does not depend on our individual interest. Although they are based on the individual's subjective feelings, Kant refers to aesthetic judgments as judgments of taste and notes that they also assert universal applicability. In contrast to our feelings toward pleasure and moral excellence, our feelings toward beauty are disinterested. We make an effort to amass pleasing things and to advance moral excellence, but we merely appreciate beauty without feeling compelled to use it in some way. It's crucial to understand the difference Kant makes between what is agreeable, beautiful, and what is good. The good is that which is respected or approved, that is, that which he assigns an objective worth to. The pleasant is that which satisfies a man; the lovely is that which merely delights him. To put it another way, when something is acceptable, it is connected to some sort of desire, like lust or hunger, and

¹²⁷ Benard, J. K, Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 34.

what is good is related to our moral judgment, i.e., whether something is right or wrong.¹²⁸

4.5.2 First Moment is Disinterested

Beauty judgments are disinterested because they are independent of our personal aspirations and objectives. Then, Kant makes a distinction between the pleasure of beauty and other pleasures. Pleasure in the beautiful is distinct in that it is an unselfish and unrestricted satisfaction, with no regard for reason or common sense. The enjoyment of beauty does not result from an item pleasing our senses, such as the sweetness of a mango, or from using it in some way, or even from an object satisfying moral obligations, like the morally right. Beauty judgments are based on emotions, specifically feelings of pleasure or displeasure. On the other hand, this pleasure is unique in that it is disinterested, which means that it neither depends on the subject's desire for the object nor causes such a desire to exist. According to Kant, it is a judgment of taste because we make a decision without giving it much thought. For instance, when we see something beautiful, we experience a similar internal rush of pleasure right away.¹²⁹

4.5.3 Second Moment is Universal

Because they are disinterested, judgments of taste are accepted worldwide. When it comes to appreciating beauty, our individual needs and desires are irrelevant, so our aesthetic response is universal. The definition of beauty according to Universal Pleasure is that which makes everyone happy without requiring a concept. As a result, because they involve a demand or expectation of other people's agreement, aesthetic judgments behave universally. On the other hand, aesthetic judgments are not just

¹²⁸ Nicholas Walker, *Critique of Judgment Immanuel Kant*, (Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 2007), 75.

¹²⁹ Recherche nice, *Distinction A social Critique of Judgement of Taste*, (New York: Harvard University Press, 1984), 90.

subjective but also universal. I don't consider a painting's price or the artist when I appreciate it on an aesthetic level. Instead, regardless of what I might gain from the painting, I am happy with it as it is. In other words, if I find something within myself to be beautiful, it is because it is.¹³⁰

4.5.4 Third Moment is Relation

In the third, the concepts of end and finality also known as purpose and purposiveness are discussed. The idea that guided an object's design determines what it is intended to be used for. According to Kant, beauty should be viewed as having a purpose but no clear goal. Both the internal purpose, which explains what the object was simply designed to be, and the collection of exterior purposes, which describe what the thing was supposed to do or achieve, would be examples of "specified purposes." According to Kant, beauty is nonetheless purposeful even when it is not identical to utility or perfection. Even if the creation of such works may have been motivated by certain goals, such as the artist's desire to convey a particular feeling or idea, these goals cannot be sufficient for the thing to be beautiful. For instance, a car's aesthetic appeal cannot be determined by how it performs.¹³¹

4.5.5 Fourth Moment is Modality

The object of a necessary satisfaction, the beautiful is that which exists without any concept. We think that when we find something beautiful, everyone should agree with us and call it beautiful. This necessity, which Kant refers to as the necessity exemplary subjective, is based on a common ground and is not theoretical, objective, or practical. History of Modern Philosophy, this is referred to as common sense, a subjective principle with universal applicability that determines what pleases or

¹³⁰ Bernard, J. K, Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 76.

¹³¹ Bernard, J. K, Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 26.

displeased through feeling rather than concepts, in Kant's Critique of Judgment. It is an illustration of an ideal or norm that underlies all aesthetic evaluation.

Conclusion

Despite numerous criticisms, Kant's philosophy is still one of the most significant contributions to modern philosophy. Its emphasis on ethics being fundamentally rational and justifiable through reason is shared by many philosophers. The greatest contribution to metaphysics and general philosophy was made by Kant. Of all philosophers, Kant most likely had the greatest influence on modern philosophy. Kant was one of the greatest and most notable philosophers who lived in the 18th century as a result of his contributions to modern philosophy. His views on metaphysics, transcendental idealism, and opposition to skepticism, ethics, epistemology, and his critiques about practical reason, pure reason and judgment gained him a following in the philosophical community. Kant was very interested in academic and learning. Empiricism and rationalism, two significant historical movements in philosophy that occurred in the 18th century, had a significant impact on his work. He identified and filled in all the gaps in the ideas and justifications put forth by empiricists and rationalists. It has also been demonstrated that studying Hume's work led to his philosophical awakening and reasoning.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Though very few people outside of academic philosophers have ever read Immanuel Kant's writings, he is widely regarded as one of the most powerful thinkers in the annals of western civilization. The critique of pure reason is one of Kant's most significant works, and I'm tempted to think that very few people have read it cover to cover. In fact, his reconciliation, metaphysics, and epistemology can all be traced back to this work. Most of the writings of Kant are very difficult to penetrate; however, reading Kant's work is very great, because it heals the rigidness that had conquered both the mind of the empiricists and rationalists in their beliefs of how we come to knowledge. What makes Kant important is that unlike other philosophers he is not saying that his predecessors are wrong he is neither accepting them completely nor rejecting them, instead of finding out contradictory views between these two schools, he simply looked for what could complement each other.

Kant's synthetic prior judgment that appreciates both experiences and reason became so important, in the same way that reason and faith are similar to two wings that allow a person to contemplate the truth, according to Pope John Paul II, in the same way reason and experience are similar to two wings that allow a person to arrive at any knowledge. Kant's concept of the noumena made metaphysics impossible and he also suffered from the problem of reductionism especially when he reduced all our knowledge to the things in space and time. What about God and the soul, which exists outside of space and time. Can we, gain knowledge of them? For Kant, the answer is no. It was incorrect for Kant to assert that we cannot know anything about the world that we don't experience or plan things using our minds, such as God, the soul, and

other metaphysical concepts. He is actually saying that we can only know things that appear to us in space and time when he says that we can never know God, the soul, or all things in themselves but that we can know things as they appear to us. Meaning beyond this no any other knowledge is possible. The way the thing is in itself, is the essence of that particular thing that appears to us and so if you don't know the essence of it, it becomes also difficult to know it as it appears to you as well. In this way Kant is telling us that we can never know anything at all, and this is a contrary to reality and metaphysics.

I also have issues with Kant's theory of aesthetics, particularly when he states that when it comes to beauty, we should be utterly indifferent to our wishes, concepts, thoughts, and emotions. In my opinion, we cannot possible completely detach our thought from an aesthetic experience. For instance, the emotion we experience when we see the sun and the knowledge that it is bringing light and safety to our world cannot be separated from one another as well as warmth to the cold. Does the purity of beauty not permeate these emotions and thoughts? In order to assess whether something is actually beauty, we cannot simply step outside of our emotional and intellectual reality. Fair enough, Kant isn't, in my opinion, advocating that every time we suppress our feelings and thoughts while making any judgment on a beautiful; rather, I think he's stating that there is something particular about the beautiful that is independent of these things. However, we contend that these extra components improve beauty. Furthermore, there are a lot of things in this world that I find to be beautiful that are conceptual in nature. However, Kant, a German philosopher and a key character in the Enlightenment, has become among the most crucial personalities in contemporary Occidental philosophy as a result of his thorough and methodical work in epistemology, metaphysics, Ethics and aesthetics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY BOOKS

- ALLEN, W. Immanuel Kant *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- DESCARTES, R. *Meditation on the First Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- GADWALL, A. *Social Research Concepts: Methods and Process*. Raviwar Peth: Laxmi Book Publication, 2008.
- HENRY E. A. *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- KANT, I. *Critique of Practical Reason*. Cambridge: Dover Publication, 2012.
- NICHOLAS, W. *Critique of Judgment Immanuel Kant*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- ROBERT, M. W. *An Outline Introductory to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. New York: Henry Holt, and Company, 1904.
- ROBERT, S. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- THEODOR W. *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. California: Stanford university press, 1955.
- THOMAS, K. A. *Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason*. New York: Dover Publications. 2012.
- THOMAS, K. *Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics*. Longmans: Alpha Ed, 1909.
- TWEYMAN, T. Rene Descartes, *Meditations on The First Philosophy*. Landon: Caravan Books, 2002.

SECONDARY BOOKS

- ABRAHAM. A. *Kant, Hume, and the Interruption of Dogmatic, Slumber*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- ALLEN, W. *Kant's Ethical Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- ALLOY, S. I. *Philosophy, Religion and Politics*. Hillsborough: Lulu publishing Company, 2012.
- ANDREA, D. L. *Spooky Physics the Illustrated Edition*. Landon: Lulu.com second edition, 2016.

- ANDREA, D. *Spinoza on Reason, Passion, and the supreme Good*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.
- ANDREAS, S. *Wisdom Accumulation of Knowledge*. Landon: Lulu Com, 2017.
- ANDREW, B. *First philosophy: Fundamental problems and readings in Philosophy*. Canada: Broadview press, 2011.
- ANDREW, W. *Kant the three Critiques*. Main Street Malden: Polity Press, 2006.
- ANELE, M. *The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant. Kant's Contribution to The Enlightenment Period*, Landon: German National Library Publications, 2018.
- BARBARA, M. *Ethics: theory and contemporary issues*. Landon: Cengage Learning, 2014.
- BARBARA, C. *Child Language Acquisition, and Growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- BARBARA, H. *The practice of Moral Judgement*. England: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- BENARD, J. K. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Judgement*. New York: Dover Publications, 2012.
- BERNHARD, R. *Kant and Post Tractarian, Wittgenstein, Transcendentalism*. Switzerland: Springer Shop, 2020.
- CHUNG, Y. C. *Contemporary Chinese Philosophy*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2008.
- DANIEL, G. B. *Kant and the Early Moderns*. Oxford: Princeton University press, 2007.
- DANIEL, G. M. *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*. Cambridge: University Press, 2003.
- DAVID S. H. G. *Fundamentals of philosophy*. New York City: Macmillan Publishers, 1992.
- DIOGENES, A. E. *Springested, philosophy of Understanding Theology*. Landon: Westminster John Knox Press, 1958.
- EMILIAN, M. *Beyond the Dichotomy between Altruism and Egoism: Society, Relationship and Responsibility*. United States of America: Information Age Publishing, 2020.
- EVGENE, K. *The Basics of Western Philosophy*. London: Green Wood Press, 2004.
- FRANCO, T. *Essay's On Plato's Epistemology*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 20016.

- GEORGES, D. *Kant's Theory of Knowledge, Analytical introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- PATON, H. J. *moral law: Groundwork of the Metaphysics, Immanuel Kant*, And Cambridge: Routledge, 2013.
- HAROLD, A. P. *Kant's Theory Of knowledge an Introduction to the Critique of Pure Reason*. Cambridge: Hacket publishing Company, 2001.
- HELEN, B. M. *Roots of Wisdom, A tapestry of Philosophical Traditions*, Singapore: Cengage Publishing 2018.
- JAEKWON, K. E. *A Companion to Metaphysics*. Singapore: Wiley Blackwell publication, 2009.
- JOHANSSON, G. *Empiricism and Philosophy of physics*. Switzerland: Springer, 2021.
- JOHN, B. *The Popular Biblical Educator*. London: Palala Press, 2016, 301.
- JOHN, R. S. *The Dictionary of Modern American Philosophers*. England: Thoemmes Continuum 2005.
- JOHN. S. F. *Ethics for a brave new world*. Wheaton Illinois: Crossway, 2010.
- KIRSTEN, M. *The Routledge linguistic Encyclopaedia*. Landon and New York: Routledge 2009.
- LAIN, P. D. *Kant and the Role of Pleasure in Moral Action*. United States of America: Ohio University Press, 2008, 19.
- LEVIS, W. B. *A commentary on Kant's Critique of practical reason*. Chicago: university of Chicago Press, 1963.
- MADSEN, P. *101 Great Philosophers: Makers of Modern Thought*. London: Continuum, 2009.
- MERILEE, H. S. *Introduction to Philosophy of Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1999.
- MICHAEL, S. K. *One Layman's Contemporary, Theology*. Wichita Kansas: Library Congress, 2014.
- MONIKA B. *Kant's Ethics of Virtue*. California: Walter Grayte, 2008.
- NELSON, A. *Companion to Rationalism*. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2012.
- NICHOLAS, B. J. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Western Philosophy*. Singapore: Wiley Blackwell, 2009.
- NIKOLAY, M. *The Berlin Group The Philosophy of Logical Empiricism*. New York: Springer shop, Amazon.com, 2013.

- PAUL, C. Immanuel Kant, *Kant's Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 2013.
- PAUL, C. *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*. Landon and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis group, 2005.
- PAUL, G. *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University press, 2006.
- POTTER, N. T. Timmons, *Morality and Universality: Essays on Ethical Universality*, 157.
- RECHERCHÉ, N. *Distinction Asocial Critique of Judgement of Taste*. New York: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- RICHARD, F. *History of Modern Philosophy*, Outlook Verlag. Gmbh: Verlag Publications, 2020.
- RICHARD, J. K. *The Tread Mills of Time*. Bloomington: Author House, 2014, 173.
- ROBERT, G. M. *The Understanding of The Empiricism*. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- ROGER, J. *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- RUSSEL, J. *what is Language, Development? Rationalist and Empiricist*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- SAMUEL C. R. *Berkeley's Argument for Idealism*. Great Clarendon Street: Oxford University press, 2013.
- SHAWN P. Y. *Jeopardy and Philosophy, what is knowledge in the form of a question?* Chicago: Open Court, 20120.
- SNIPPET, V. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia: Knowledge in Depth*. Michigan: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2003.
- SNIPPET, V. *Journal of The History of philosophy*. New York: Abe books, 1988.
- STEVEN, S. *Morality and moral controversies: A readings in moral social and political philosophy*. Cambridge: Routledge, 2016.
- THOMAS, J. *The Minds of The Moderns Rationalism, Empiricism and Philosophy of Mind*. Landon: Routledge, 2014.
- TMAS, P. *Epistemology and Metaphysics for Qualitative Research*. Landon: Sage Publications, 2016.