## 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 can come across as opaque, it is grasping. Much philosophy needs to be read with notebook in hand, to pepper each page with pencil. Hegel is hard. Heidegger is hard. Satre is unexpectedly erudite, but appears to be the exception. Do not get me started on Pierce, he is hard. As a general rule, philosophers write poorly, but then again, the subject matter is difficult. But Kant appears as a blinding and guiding light, as if almost drunkard, shaking you, telling you at every turn, no this is what he really meant. And further, there is something about the way this is written, that forces to take opinion, to become an evangelical. It is like Every sentence. It seems chaotic, but perhaps it is not at all. It is how language should be written. He sets out to make metaphysics a science and in doing that sets fire to language, giving a glance of what it all means. The whole experience is something like stumbling out of a smoke hazed dorm room, trying to make sense of it all. And before assuming that these are ramblings of a madman, this is touch on tru meaning, the vital work.

So does this mean that mean you should avoid Kant? Absolutely not. If you are into philosophy, you need to put in the time to understand the Critique of Pure Reason, first appearing in 1779, 1787. Sentence by sentence, word by word. As general advice, I would also advise, if you think Kant is complicated, have a read of Peter Strawson on Kant. important the not to hide behind – Peter Strawson? Karl Ameriks? These are mostly postscripts. Some of them are exciting (think Daniel Robinson wonderful text). But the take away here is one is ever coming to help. Maybe just pop into Wikipedia to get a bit of an orientation, and then get into it line by line. Its just you and Kant in the room dancing around madness, but if

The goal of this essay I am going take a small bight out of it. I have this plan for a bunch, to go over each of the sections, so I will limit myself to having a look at the structure, but Time and Space capture the burning question, then get s sense of the architecture and components. Part of this purpose is also to start grasping at the language. The terminology of what can I know. One of the things that makes Kant so difficult is that the assault of language. You need to build up a glossary.

I am also going to be modest in setting my sights: the focus will just to get tot eh bottom of time and space. This introduction

2. Setting the scene

Now the problem with providing context is that it always gets out of hand. It is hard to know context i. Three is something, think about anything else than to face the work head on, Where to start? I guess it is clear that there are a cast of characters that have a lot to say. They cluster around the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries like so:

Fig 1. Bacon? Locke? Gallieleo or Newton? Liebniz? Descartes? Hume.

To understand Kant past a certain point it is important to read these people as well. But how much time does one have. For me, all of this comes down to three ideas. First, that humans world brings some kind utility comes from explanatin is some thing kind of sel. Bacon puts it all so elequtently, role of human is to uncovert he world. But what is this human that uncovers? Well, its seems be some kind some kind of I-am situation, some kind of out-there situation going on. Inner and outer. What is real. How can anything be known. Maybe there is doubt. Maybe there is cause. It is all a bit murky.

This sets the stage for metaphysics, and this really needs to be defined, a way to understand metaphysics. But what even is metaphysics. Robinson breaks it down nicely epistemology ontology interplay. Its impossible to grasp but as more of the world is uncovered. I do not want to set too much of the scene in all this. So obvervation is important. Novum Organum, new method. Evidence, hypothesis. Scientific method, but Locke important to Newton at the dates. Kant tring to get to the heart of the matter. Before any further utility can happen, any benefit. One wonders about the state of the world now, the environment, Kant project

In terms of the work itself. After twelve years of deep thought, it came to Kant. Write, there were other key works also.

3. Everything is just so…transcendental

Kant as a toddler transcendental. So its important to take a position on this, to have an opion with it.

This all leads nicely The two questions, what can I know, how should I think. The price of entry is nature of metaphysics and transcendental. Everything in the critique is transcendental.

3. Breaking down the table contents

My first foray into the labyrinth of Kant was to try and see it as a numbers game was to treat it like a numbers game. 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

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