## Lost in Space and Time

###### 

1. Introduction

Whenever I find myself reading Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason, the overwhelming thought I always have, without fail, is that one of us is stoned. Of course, most philosophy is opaque, it is grasping. Kant is a special category (btw hilarious phislophy joke) Som philoslopy, read with a notebook in hand. Hegel is hard. Pierce is hard. text is technology, it might require note taking, and diagramming, the text is ontological, meaning, there is Bordieu, there is derrida. Satre is fun. But Kant appears, almost drunk. is philoslophy that is opaque, there is No one quite. But Kant makes almost no sense. He is the master saying something every four hundred sentences or so, giving breathing room and then it bounds and

Do not take my word for it, no one will admit this, myself included. But check out the opening paragraph of the A the ection (that’s right, there are two editions). Read the first Five sentences.

There is us, there is someone talking, the narrator. He is a human being. He has cognition which is an activity of human beings, it is used to relate to objects. It is an activity of thinking, and it is an intuition. I direct attention to a coffee cup. I think about the coffee cup. So the coffee cup is out there, a representation, it comes in here via sensibility, definted as intuition. It has some kind of connection to to the concept, to my thinking an intuition, I am thiknig about it. And its not just a coffee cup, it’s a concept, but there is a detour. I put it in a group. How on earth did this work make it a second edition?

Let me know really clear: This work is vitally important, for what it intends to to do.The problem he is grappling with is big. It lays down a problem. Kant is suppOne canot just do science. And so sets out to make this scientific. Pull out of the smake hazed dorm room and put this to bed, frustrion. Kant starts the work that we actually need to hand in

So in this essay, I want to a series of essays. I am goin to bold, space and time. I want to talk reinterpretation, structure. What he really means is.

A possible way forward might be look at commentary. But overwhelmingly, it is a reflection or this complexity. There is some nice stuff. Strawson is fun, but so dense. Gomborowice is joyously brief so deserves a mention. Daniel Robinson, Gombrowicz and Kant himself – band members, just as stoned as the lead singer, support group.

An ongoing metaphor. What is the architecture, the components, why are some

But really, the critique is a numbers game, an architecture, an operating system. Before I start, want to look at the transcendental, metaphysical. What do these mean

2. Breaking down the table contents

So I will start with the structure. What the reader is dealing with, is a kind of convoluted manual for a video the eighties style, but for the human being.And this manual. There Are two sections,

1. Doctrine of Elements,
2. the structure, all the components. And the second part is the Doctrine of Method,

really how you are doing to use it So to extend the VHS metaphor, explains the play buttons, the timer, the components. The second section, the doctrine of method, how do you use this thing. How does it make sense. It is great for popping in a video, not so good if you try and use it as a toaster. So part is hook up and troubleshoot. Part 2 is how best to watch the video.

In this essay I will deal with Transcendental Aesthetic, in the next I will deal with Transcendental logic. And the transcendental is maybe kind of the simplest. It just deals with space and time. So I want to talk about it.

But first to the punch line. Kant is wrong. Big time. I love my drunk frat buddy, but its wrong. And like, everybody I will Descartes