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**Section 1: questions for the lecture**

Q1: In your last section, you said moral does not include(?)，Could you explain what the “more” means in your last section (last third paragraph)

A: The “more” means you cannot remain at the level of accepting this or that reason, but you must bring it into your own reason and accepted as you own reason, and then follow up these reasons. These reasons should be more than only technically questions and pragmatic questions, much more important is that you should go beyond the way of being happy. Because in order to get to be well-being, some person may make some lies and throw away another person, this is not right from the view of morals.

Q2: You mentioned about well-being, do you think your well-being ultimately is about how you look insight to find out what’s your reasons?

A: You may think well-being is social public goods, social public goods is fundamental goods you need, they will not define your personal well-being. It is good question, but the question we are here dealing is that happiness is last point by which you can define what the morality is. It is quite another subject.

Q3: According to my outstanding, is reason a reflective fact, which means you can only realize the freedom by reflecting some other things?

A: This reflecting on something which is primarily a theoretical question, the other one if something which is within your own actions, your actions, you live with sort of reflections in saying I have certain desires, but they are not last reason for my actions. I mean this more subjective ways and more practical way of reflecting is not the objecting one from an objecting observer.

Q4: In the second question of Kant, he made a claim of the freedom of facts (fact of the reason). In the first critique, he mentioned facts a lot. I want to know what is concept of facts in the second critique.

A: You might deal with this question in the next lecture. In any case, fact means not something only given, but you must do that, you must produce it to a certain degree. So you don’t find it in the world, but only by doing something to a certain degree by producing yourself as moral subject, you bring into the world this moral reason.

Q5: I notice that some American philosophers interpreted Kant’ s theory, they claim that Kant’s whole theory (like transcendental theory) is based on facts of mathematics and physics. It might be Michael Friedman

A: I think his argument is wrong. He thinks the first critique, the critique of pure reason is based, related, connected to the Newton’s physics. This sense is wrong. The Kant’s transcendental idea of space and time is different from Newton’s one. In well opinion, we have to distinguish three levels, the first level is transcendental level, which is done by Kant, that is means what is the conditional possibility to have any experience, there you need space and time. The second level is how can you construct space and time; this is the question of mathematics. The third level is within the mathematically possible theory of space and time, you have to look by the experience of physics, what is concept of space and time which is governed our world. Then we can say, in normal words, there is another concept where is different from astronomy. Michael Friedman doesn’t see the different between the first step of transcendental *(B?),* which is independent of Newtonian relativistic and so on concept, and that was going on. He is not wrong, that Kant discusses Newtonian concept, but he puts it way, he discusses all the concept of Leibniz, he discusses all the concept of Descartes and so on, so he knows the intellectual debate concerning the things, he sees all the problem of all these concepts, then he says to a certain degree. In any case, we are philosophers, we are neither mathematician nor physics, we have to see the transcendental ideas. He always good, he has certain knowledge of Kant, he didn’t grasp the point. Sorry.

Q6: what is difference between the freedom of the will and the will of the freedom?

A: Both are very closely linked. The will is possibility to follow your own reasons. We have three levels of following reasons, technical, pragmatic, and moral level. As long as we have the ability to follow up one’s reasons, who have freedom. But once more, in these three levels, we have technical level if we follow up technical reasons, we have pragmatic level, if we follow up pragmatic reasons, and behave moral freedom, your freedom of will, your autonomy, if we are not only able but willing to follow moral imperatives, that means these maxims which can be universalized.

Q7: I could feel the freedom by reason is worthy of our pursuit and even fighting for. But when I use my own reason to decide my own life, I can’t deny that there are enormous choices shall be decided, deep loneliness shall be overcome, feelings of guilty shall be withstand. These are quite different with the state of immaturity. Do you think these are also part of the freedom? How could the light of freedom or enlightenment scatter all these interruptions, so that human being can dare to think and dare to be themselves?

A: If I intend your question well, that means how can you bring about these situations in which individuals, groups, collective entities are able to follow up these different levels of freedom. That is a question of education. Primarily, an education has different aspect of education of individual and education of group, and last point of humanity. I think it is possible, as we discussed yesterday in the theory of education of Kant, there are somethings to do, we have these different levels of first disciplining overcome wildness, then cultivating, bring about certain skills, third level is a civilizing become a good fellow, and forth level is moralizing to follow only those goals which are committable from standpoint of morals. This is only you could say the frame work on the duty of education. How to do it in the concrete sense? That is quite different question. For this primarily, philosophy is not responsible, philosophy can only say what are the necessary steps, what are the possible hindrances and possible barriers, and why is necessary to overcome all these barriers. But then you have to experience what this situation of this state of this university of your personality is a barrier to enlightenment. You have to reflect it, and then how can you overcome these barriers. And it is not (?) philosophy, but to gain philosophy to know what are philosopher able to do, and where is the limit and other people have their own responsibilities. You are not quite content! Go ahead!

Q7a: How could the light of freedom or enlightenment scatter all these interruptions?

A: The questions is what do you mean with “how can” these possibilities. The first possibility of philosophy is thinking giving some intellectual advice and these advises on different levels. The second question concerning social and individual context to make your idea on this. And third question, perhaps, for educational system of stage of all of the world to establish these things. And that thing you would not really maintain that philosophy will responsible to all these questions. Philosophy gives only answer to the very basic questions, what is enlightenment? What are the problems in thinking freedom? There are a lot of misunderstanding of what freedom is, especially of misunderstanding what is the main target this autonomy? And if this is enlightenment, we have clear idea on that, then philosophy is right, people should think and act for themselves. It would be authoritarian; it would be pragmatic contradiction. If philosophy says on one end, we should think for ourselves and lead our own life. But me as a philosopher, I know what is best for you.

Q8: In the practical life, we cannot usually be a moral being, and be directed by desires, I want to know the relationship between conciseness and practical will.

A: Once more it is either empirical question, or it is philosophical rather foundational and principle question. The principle question you have say, you have certain conciseness of yourself. This conciseness of yourself is quite something given, it is especially something which is very complex. The conciseness has theoretical and practical sides, and practical side has technical, pragmatic, and moral sides, then you have special personal interests. Once more you have to put in the three questions. Starting, if you have any goals, how to obtain them, should be part of your conciseness. How can obtain this is the question of your skill, whether you are able to obtain any goals or not. The second one is much more important. It is not so important to follow up any goals, but those goals which has a network make you able to follow up your well-being and your happiness. But with certain question, you are not allowed to follow up your happiness with all means, but only those means which accept maxims and are universalblized. This rather complex frame work is more or less already part of your conciseness, sometime it is silent, sometime it is explicit. Then all these three levels you can try to enlighten your own conciseness from the standpoint of morals which you should enlighten it (?)way. We are naturally interest in happiness. More happiness, we are required to follow up the happiness only in the framework of universalble maxims

**Section 2: Seminar reading**

Q1: What are the most important words in this explication?

A1: General.

A2: Principal and laws.

A3: Maxims.

A4: Subjective and objective.

E: Subjective and objective, this are the most important words.

Q2: What does the first sentence of the explication’s meaning?

A: Silence.

Q3: What steps do we get to actions？

A1: The will determines the choice?

A2: First we should know the reason.

A3: General communication.

A4: Rules.

E: There are two steps. From the principle to the rules; and from the rules to actions. On the other way, we start with the action, the different actions are follow the same rule, than the different rules are follow the same principle.

Q4: Make a distinction between the two types of principles.

A1: Subjective and objective.

Q5: What’s the name of objective principles?

A1: The maxims.

Q6: Principles are maxims or subjective rules, what’s the meaning of the “subjective”?

A1: It’s only follow himself, not follow everyone.

Q7: What is the other type of objective principles?

A1: These are laws.

Q8: If we have these two types of principles—the maxims and the laws—do they exclude each other?

A1: No

E: There is another question that whether subjective maxims have the character of the objective laws.

Q9：Kant is looking for pure reason, the necessarily is to qualify the pure reason.

A1: The moral reason.

Q10-1: With your own word to reformulate the sentence of “… sufficient to determine the will, then there are practical laws; but if not, than all practical principles will be mere maxims.”

A1: Which the subjective maxims are confront with the conflict is the practical of the maxim, the subjective maxim, which you look for to purify themselves to generalize, then it becomes a practical law.

Q10-2: This is the second steps. Kant put a question and what is the first step in your own word?

A2: What is different between principles and laws? Maxims and laws?

A3: What’s the nature of the practical principles?

A4: Is the pure reason sufficient to itself to determine the will?

E: It is the possible that the pure reason can sufficiently determine the will?

Q11: What condition you could say there is the pure reason?

A1: What they’re based sufficient to determine the pure reason.

E: If pure reason sufficient to determine the will, then the practical laws are possible; if not, they are only maxims.

Q12-1: What is the qualification of the will? There is a special word introduces it, and what is?

A1: Pathologically affected will.

Q12-2: What does it means in this sentence?

A2: Conflict with itself.

A3: Affected by some cause of sensitive.

E: Affected by some sensuous drives.

Q13: To what other concept, “patient” would be contrasted? What is the opposite of the patient?

A1: With healthy reason.

Q14: If mam only with pathological reason, what it will cause? The consequence?

A1: Conflict.

E: The conflict with the practical laws.

Q15: What is the example?

A1: No affront unavenged.

Q16: Why would be conflict between practical law and its maxims?

A: Silence.

Q17: Kant makes here a distinction between nature and practice, what does the decisive distinction?

A1: Nature is decided by the object, and practice is determined by one’s own will.

Q18: What is the principle of the nature?

A1: Nature identify with laws.

E: Nature is govern by laws, there is no possibility opposing the laws.

Q19: What about the action?

A1: Law must be suit for multifarious.

E: In actions, we have the sphere: on the one hand, the power of desire; on the other hand, the power of reason, they may be a conflict.

Q20: What in your own words is the imperative what is an “ought”?

A1: You look always follow the rules so you have to be commend to follow it.

E: Laws we should be obey but which unnecessarily obey.

Q21-1: Why are maxims are principles but not laws?

A1: Because different people have different maxims.

Q21-2: First, why are they principles?

A2: Silence.

E: They are principles because they are this type of second “ought” rules.

Q21-3: Why Kant says “no” when you expect that the second “ought” rules have the character of imperative?

A3: Imperatives are not conditional.

A4: Once they are conditional, they are hypothetical imperative, not categorical.

E: Ja, they are only hypothetical imperative, what he says they are practical principles but not laws.

Q22-1: What does it say in page 32, line 2 to 5?

A1: He is talking about reason’s legislation must be based on itself.

Q22-2: And what does word “legislation” remind us?

A2: Law-giving.

Q22-3: For what concept we know that law-giving?

A3: It’s belong experience.

E: Experience, categorical and so on.

Q23: What is the example for a reason’s legislation he gives?

A1: Lying promise.

E: Never to make lying promise.

Q24: What does Kant maintain (in the page 34 )?

A: Silence.

Q25: What is the relation of this words to the concept “own happiness”?

A1: The receptivity toward the object.

E: Happiness is the sum of feeling pleasure.