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In the Deduction, Kant aims to justify that human understanding has certain basic necessary concepts that he calls categories. They allow our mind to connect the manifolds of representations given to us by experience. This essay will provide Kant’s attempt to justify his claim, and for the purpose, this essay will be dived into five main sections. The first will provide the aim of the Critique of the Pure Reason. The second part will focus on the metaphysical deduction and the definition of categories and their respective derivation. The third part will discuss the Transcendental deduction to prove that those specific categories correctly apply to objects in our experience. The fourth section will analyze the critique that Kant does on the regard of empiricist and rationalist. It will also include Kant’s solution for the causality problem arise by empiricist. Finally, the last part will summarize all the critical point in a conclusion.

The publication of The Critique of Pure Reason coincides with the end of the Enlightenment, an era of revolutions and new ideas. The Enlightenment's main characteristic was confidence and optimism about human reason to control nature and improve human life. However, new confidence in human reason and new sciences resulted in an increasing doubt towards traditional beliefs. Furthermore, Modern science led to the rise of mechanistic theories. If mechanistic laws govern nature, then it seems that there is no space for freedom or anything but matter in motion. The threat to freedom was a threat to the traditional view of morality. (Gardner, S., 1999) Kant’s goal is to create “the inventory of all we possess (knowledge) through pure reason, ordered systematically” (Kant,1998). Kant wants to show that a critique of reason by reason itself establishes a secure and consistent basis for both modern science and traditional morality.

The crucial point of the Critique of Pure Reason is the possibility of metaphysics. Kant starts his investigation by analysing the main character of what it is considered science. Kant argues that the main character of science is the presence of synthetic a priori proposition. (Fisher, M., & Watkins, E. 1998) According to Kant, in synthetic a priori proposition the subject is not logically contained in the predicate and the truth of which is verifiable independently of experience. According to Kant, mathematics and science are made by synthetic priori propositions. For example, 2+2 equals 4; it is a synthetic proposition because the concept of 2+2 is not necessarily contained in that on the concept of 4. (Moore, G. E., 1899) Synthetic a priori propositions are crucial because, for Kant, a synthetic a priori knowledge is possible. It is possible because all knowledge is made only by appearances. Consequently, if we analyse how they are possible, we will learn how and if mathematics, physics and metaphysical knowledge can be possible (Grier, M., 2004)

Transcendental idealism is the most revolutionary idea that Kant uses to answer how and if knowledge can be possible. (Allison, H. E., 2004) Transcendental idealism consisted of taking an external perspective, transcendentally, and understanding that the mind directly comprehends only phenomena or ideas. (Allais, L., 2004) According to Kant, Transcendental idealism implies that the conscious subject acquires the objects from experience not as things in themselves, but only in how they appear to us under the conditions of our sensibility. (Guyer, P., 1987) Further, Kant distinguishes among the distinct realms of phenomena and noumena. Phenomena are the appearances, which constitute our experience; noumena are the things themselves, which constitute reality. All of our synthetic a priori judgments apply only to the phenomenal realm, not the noumenal. Furthermore, by definition, the thing in itself would be entirely independent of our experience, and therefore independent by the conditions of our sensibility or perception. Furthermore, the conditions of our sensibility are constrained by specific categories. (Walker, R. C., 2010)

In the Transcendental Analytic, a section of the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant seeks to demonstrate the essential role played by these categories in grounding the possibility of knowledge and experience. According to Kant, a category is a characteristic of the appearance of any object before it has been experienced. Furthermore, for Kant, the categories are the ruler of our understanding, allowing us to synthesize all the appearance. (Paton, H. J., 2011) In the metaphysical deduction is a section of the Critique, in which Kant individuates and derivate 12 categories that enable our experience of objects possible. (Longuenesse, B., 2006) Kant starts his investigation by trying to find the necessary form of our conceptual faculty. The human mind has two basic cognitive faculties: the sensibility that enables the faculty of sense-perception and mental imager, and the understanding that enables the faculty of concepts, thought, and discursivity. (Pillow, K. 2003) Furthermore, understanding is the capability to represents the world through general concepts. We use the concepts to make judgments, such as a proposition. According to Kant if there must be some categories, they will be contained in the kind of proposition we make. (Hanna, R. 2004)

In every proposition, we can distinguish two components, matter and form. The matter is the particular content of the proposition. The form is the type of relationship we ascribe to the content. For example, in the following two judgments: all painters are poor, and all presidents are rich contain a different matter, the subject and the predicate are different. On the contrast, the form (a type of relationship we ascribe to the content) is the same. In these two cases, both judgments have the same formal structure: S is P. According to Kant, the form, type of relationship we ascribe to the content, is the element that contributes a priori for the understanding. (Watkins, E., & Willaschek, M., 2017) Kant claims that if we can identify all possible logical forms of judgment, this will serve as a "clue" to discovering the most basic and general concepts. Furthermore, the general concepts that are employed in making such judgments are employed in all thought. (Thomasson, A., 2004)

Further, each time we find a form of judgment, there must be a category underlies it. Logicians before Kant like Aristotle had concerned themselves to classify the various possible logical forms of judgment. It is important to stress one crucial difference in the application of the categories between Kant and Aristotle. According to Aristotle, the categories were all the features that an object can present in reality. However, according to Kant, categories are defined as the ruler that guides the synthesise operated by our mind. The synthesise results in the representation of how things appear to us and not how they are in themself. Further, with only minor modifications to Aristotle categories, accepts and adopts his work as correct and complete, and lays out all the logical forms of judgment: they are Unity, Plurality, and Totality for the Categories of Quantity; Reality, Negation, and Limitation for the Categories of Quality; Inherence and Subsistence, Causality and Dependence, and Community for the Categories of Relation, and Possibility-Impossibility, Existence-Nonexistence, Necessity-Contingency for the Categories of Modality. (Sgarbi, M., 2016)

The Transcendental Deduction is Kant's attempt to prove that in order for us to have any experience the data given to us in our forms of sensible intuition must obey these categories. Furthermore, since it is a deduction argument, it aims to justify using the categories by demonstrating that the categories correctly apply to objects of our experience. (Henrich, D., 1969) The Transcendental Deduction of the Categories starts with a premise on the human experience. According to Kant, human experience is always experiencing all the 12 categories mentioned, which are never given directly to us in sense perception. (Ameriks, K., 1978) For example, Human experiences unity. Experiencing unity means that we perceive the unification of some elements as a whole. For example, when perceiving a car, we experience all bits of it. Only at the end, we perceive the car as a unity. According to Kant, our mind needs to engage in a synthesis that it is a process that "gathers the elements for cognition and unites them to form a certain content" (Kant, A78/B103). A synthesis is a process the requires our ability to retain the elements for cognition even when they are no longer directly perceived. The categories are the ruler that guides the synthesise operated by our mind. (Brook, A., 1997)

Further, according to Kant, some criteria must decide which of momentary fragments of our experience to reproduce in our imagination in any process of synthesis. Thus, no matter how we perceive the momentary fragments, we always put them together in the same order. (Merleau-Ponty, M. 1996) For example, when we perceive a person's face, we may first assimilate the right eye and after the nose and so on. No matter if we perceived first the nose or the eye, our mind would always synthesise them by ordering them in a face that we recognise as such. Thus, if human experience can have an awareness of unity, we have to actively reproduce in our imaginations all the momentary fragments of our experience in such a way that gets us a unity. Thus, for Kant, our mind must possess the concept of unity. (Paton, H. J., 2011)

Kant is a transcendental idealist, and he argues that objects in space and time do not exist independently of us. We cannot have any concept of space and time from any experience of objects. We cannot say anything about the space of being 'near to' or ' far from' each other. An analogous argument can be applied to time. We cannot have any concept of time from appearances. We can only experience appearances as existing at the same time or at different times by presupposing time as underlying them. Further, we cannot think about any experience that is not located in space and time. In contrast, we can think about space and time as empty of any object, for example, while engaged in a mathematics operation. Therefore, space and time must be a priori, or pure and not dependent on experience (Kant, A23/B38). It follows that every appearance must be capable of being thought in one spatial and/or temporal intuition. Thus, if space and time are necessary, and if they require and presuppose certain concepts' operation, then those concepts must be necessary. (Stroud, B., 1968) Since we cannot get necessity from experience because the experience is contingent, the concepts must be contributed by the mind's structure, a category. Kant then argues that it is only by means of the categories that we are able to conceive of any manifold of representations as existing. Hence, the categories must apply to any manifold that can be thought of as an appearance. The categories, therefore, make our experience of objects possible. (Chipman, L. 1972)

Kant's contribution is often represented as a synthesis of the "rationalist" such as Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz and "empiricist" such as Locke, Berkeley, and Hume. Kant argues that this synthesis is necessary because either approach if taken separately, does not properly provide what is possible and impossible to know. Kant moves a critique towards the rationalists because they assert the reason only can provide fundamental metaphysical truths such as the existence or non-existence of free will. In contrast, Kant criticizes the empiricists for the lack of contribution that our intellectual faculties have on acquiring knowledge of the world. The empiricists believed that we knowledge using sensations or sensory impressions alone. (Vanzo, A., 2013)

For example, the deduction is, for Kant, the answer to Hume's induction problem. According to Hume, the relation of cause and effect (one of the twelve categories) is derived entirely from experience. (Howson, C. 2000) All our conclusions move upon the supposition that the future will be conformable to the past. Therefore, the evidence of this last proposition by probable arguments, or arguments regarding existence, must be taken for granted. Furthermore, the idea of a necessary connexion among events arises from several similar cases. However, there is nothing in several cases, different from every single instance. According to Hume, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe that it will exist. Therefore, this connexion, which we feel in mind, is the impression, from which we form the idea of necessary connexion. An impression is perceptions that the mind experience. Hume's position on the deductibility of causality is Kant's quarry in the transcendental deduction. (Guyer, P. 2013)

Kant agrees with Hume that neither the relation of cause and effect and the idea of necessary connexion is given from experience. According to Kant, both are contributed by our mind. For Kant, the concepts of both causality and necessity arise from precisely the operations of our understanding. (Howson, C. 2000) Kant thinks that he has an answer to Hume's induction problem. For Kant, there is a fundamental difference between a mere "empirical rule" (a lightning bolt always follow a thunder) and a genuine objective law (the speed of the light is faster than the speed of the sound) arrived at by adding the a priori concept of cause to the merely set of observations. Kant maintains that, when one event follows another in virtue of a causal relation, it must always follow "in accordance with a rule" (Kant, A193/B238). Moreover, the "rule" to which Kant is referring is not the general causal principle, but rather a particular law connecting a given cause to a given effect that is itself strictly universal and necessary that arises from the operations of our understanding. Furthermore, our mind uses the categories that are the ruler of our understanding that synthesise thought them all the manifold of representation given to us. (Kant, A193/B238–239)

In conclusion, the deduction aims to justify the argument that human understanding has certain basic necessary concepts that he calls categories. In order to reach this goal, Kant introduced the concept of transcendental idealism. Transcendental idealism states that the mind directly comprehends only phenomena or ideas. According to Kant, the mind needs to use specific categories or pure form of understanding to comprehends phenomena and ideas. A category is a characteristic of any object's appearance before it has been experienced. In the metaphysical deduction, Kant aims to individuate the 12 categories that enable our experience to be possible. In this section of the Critique, Kant states that specific categories must be present in the forms of judgment that we make. Further, in the Transcendental deduction, Kant argues that human experience is always experiencing all the 12 categories that are never given directly to us in sense perception. Thus, if human experience can have an awareness of the 12 categories, we have to actively reproduce in our imaginations all the momentary fragments of our experience in such a way that gets us the 12 categories. Thus, for Kant, our mind must possess them, and they are necessary to experience the external object. Kant's transcendentalism can be considered as a synthesis between empiricist and rationalist. Further, for Kant, the transcendental deduction is the solution for the induction problem arises by Hume.
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