

A SAMPLE PAPER: A TEMPLATE

Boris Veytsman, A. U. Thør, and C. O. Rëspondent

Abstract: The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements.

1 Introduction

The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly, our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental aesthetic. (Gregorio, 2011)

As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for our understanding. The paralogisms of practical reason are what first give rise to the architectonic of practical reason. As will easily be shown in the next section, reason would thereby be made to contradict, in view of these considerations, the Ideal of practical reason, yet the manifold depends on the phenomena. Necessity depends on, when thus treated as the practical employment of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, time. Human reason depends on our sense perceptions, by means of analytic unity. There can be no doubt that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to human reason.

Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological

manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So, it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general.

To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, in respect of the intelligible character, the transcendental aesthetic depends on the objects in space and time, yet the manifold is the clue to the discovery of the Transcendental Deduction. Therefore, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of our understanding, our ideas. There can be no doubt that the things in themselves prove the validity of the objects in space and time, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. By means of analysis, there can be no doubt that, inasmuch as the discipline of pure reason relies on the Categories, the transcendental unity of apperception would thereby be made to contradict the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions. In the case of space, the Categories exist in time. Our faculties can be treated like our concepts. As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the transcendental unity of apperception stands in need of, in the case of necessity, our speculative judgements.

Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the whole content

for a priori principles; for these reasons, our experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close examination.¹

2 Discussion

2.1 Negative Arguments

We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even as this relates to our knowledge, is a representation of the discipline of human reason. The things in themselves are just as necessary as our understanding.² The noumena prove the validity of the manifold. As will easily be shown in the next section, natural causes occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge concerning the existence of the Antinomies in general.³

Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like

¹As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. See also (Hoff, 2010) and (Knuth, 1994).

²As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason.

³The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can be treated like the objects in space and time. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict the Transcendental Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason has nothing to do with our ideas; however, time can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends on hypothetical principles. Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.

the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close examination.

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory, and the thing in itself would thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On the other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the Antinomies, as will easily be shown in the next section. Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our ideas, but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of necessity. But the proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved.

2.1.1 *An Aside on Numbers*

Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it is not at all certain that, for example, the thing in itself (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is true) can not take account of our experience, and our concepts, in all theoretical sciences, are a representation of the phenomena. Since some of the phenomena are problematic, Hume tells us that metaphysics has lying before it, however, natural causes. By virtue of natural reason, Aristotle tells us that the things in themselves, therefore, should only be used as a canon for our a posteriori judgements. Our understanding can be treated like the transcendental unity of apperception. The Categories can be treated like space.

2.2 Positive Arguments

By virtue of natural reason, what we have alone been able to show is that, in so far as this expounds the universal rules of our a posteriori concepts, the architectonic of natural reason can be treated like the architectonic of practical reason. Thus, our speculative judgements can not take account of the Ideal, since none of the Categories are speculative. With the sole exception of the Ideal, it is not at all certain that the transcendental objects in space and time prove the validity of, for example, the noumena, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. As we have already seen, our experience is the clue to the discovery of the Antinomies; in the study of pure logic, our knowledge is just as necessary as, thus, space. By virtue of practical reason, the noumena, still, stand in need to the pure employment of the things in themselves.

The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly, our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties abstract from all content of knowledge; for these reasons, the discipline of human reason stands in need of the transcendental aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, inasmuch as the Ideal relies on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as the things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena. Philosophy (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, as will easily be shown in the next section. Still, is it true that the transcendental aesthetic can not take account of the objects in space and time, or is the real question whether the phenomena should only be used as a canon for the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the Transcendental Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul, but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human reason, in other words,

is what first gives rise to the transcendental aesthetic, yet our faculties have lying before them the architectonic of human reason.

However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be supposed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already seen. On the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a representation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo. As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible character, exist in the objects in space and time.

3 Conclusions

Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of, however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason. This is what chiefly concerns us.

Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts, but the Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions, depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case) constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements. In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our faculties have nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we can deduce that this is true) would thereby be made to contradict the phenomena. As we have

already seen, let us suppose that the transcendental aesthetic can thereby determine in its totality the objects in space and time. We can deduce that, that is to say, our experience is a representation of the paralogsms, and our hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts. However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do with natural causes.

By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to, indeed, the empirical objects in space and time. The objects in space and time, for these reasons, have nothing to do with our understanding. There can be no doubt that the noumena can not take account of the objects in space and time; consequently, the Ideal of natural reason has lying before it the noumena. By means of analysis, the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, therefore, space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical reason.

The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know, our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts have nothing to do with the paralogsms of pure reason. As we have already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so regarded, exist in our judgements.⁴

Boris Veytsman
Computational Materials Science Center, MS 6A2
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA 22030
USA
E-mail : borisv@lk.net
<http://borisv.lk.net>

A. U. Thør
C. O. R spondent
Kant-Forschungsstelle Universit t Mainz
Colonel-Kleinmann-Weg 2
55128 Mainz
Germany

References:

Gregorio, Enrico. 2011. *The kantlipsum Package. Dummy text in Kantian Style*. <http://mirrors.ctan.org/macros/latex/contrib/kantlipsum>.

⁴As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a mystery why our judgements exclude the possibility of the transcendental aesthetic.

Acknowledgements The work on this package was supported by Sant Lois University.

- Hoff, Karla. 2010. “Fairness in Modern Society.” *Science* 327 (5972): 1467–1468. URL <http://www.sciencemag.org>.
- Knuth, Donald Ervin. 1994. *The T_EXbook*. Computers & Typesetting A. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.