

PHILOSOPHICAL EXPERIMENT

Rudolf Brajičić

UDK 165

1. In *Preface to the Second Edition of The Critique of Pure Reason*, in his note (cf. KrV B XIX–XXI), Kant writes: This method (Kant’s method), which we have borrowed from the natural philosopher, consists in seeking for the elements of pure reason in that *which admits of confirmation or refutation by experiment*. Now the propositions of pure reason, especially when they transcend the limits of possible experience, do not admit of our making any experiment with their objects (as in natural science). Hence, with regard to those *conceptions* and *principles* which we assume a priori, our only course will be to view them from two different sides. We must regard one and the same conception, on one hand, in relation to experience as an object of the senses and of the understanding, on the other hand, in relation to reason, isolated and transcending the limits of experience, as an object of mere thought. Now if we find that, when we regard things from this double point of view, the result is in harmony with the principle of pure reason, but that, when we regard them from a single point of view, reason is involved in self-contradiction, then the experiment will establish the correctness of this distinction. One such experiment was conducted by Kant and then taken as the basis of his philosophical system. I too will attempt to conduct one such experiment briefly here, which Kant claims it is impossible to execute.

2. God is the greatest conceivable being.

The greatest conceivable being is that which must be conceived as being infinitely perfect.

Why?

For if it did not have to be conceived as being infinitely perfect, it would have to be conceived as being of limited finite perfection, because from every finite being, no matter how great, even greater being can be conceived just like an ever greater number can always be added to a natural number.

3. The conceivable being of infinite perfection furthermore *must* be conceived as having all potential beings of limited finite perfection absolutely entirely dependent upon it.

Why?

For if the infinitely perfect being did not *have to* be conceived as having all potential beings of limited perfection absolutely entirely dependent upon it, then it would a priori *have to* be conceived that the conceivable being of infinite perfection lacks the perfections of the beings of finite perfection, which is in contradiction with the conceivable being of infinite perfection.

4. Therefore, if there *exist* the beings of limited perfection in reality, then I know a priori that they cannot be but in a complete dependence upon the conceivable being of infinite perfection *in reality*.

Why?

For if a conceivable being of infinite perfection did not exist in reality, then the beings of finite perfection could not exist in reality either, for which beings I know a priori that they absolutely entirely depend upon the infinitely perfect being.

5. However, *experience* teaches us (having first established the existence of an outer world, which Kant has done indeed and which we do in noetics) that the beings of finite perfection, among which I am the first, *exist*.

6. Therefore, after such an “empirical verification”, it is no longer possible merely to *conceive* that God is *the greatest being in reality*, but we must *think* that He truly is in reality, we must believe that He is the entire Reality, that He simply Is. That is our experiment.

7. In this experiment of ours, that which Kant expects from an experiment, has come to pass. What does he expect? According to the above presented text no. 1, Kant expects an experiment to be possible “only in conceptions and principles that we assume a priori, our only course will be to view them from two different sides. We must regard one and the same conception, on the one hand, in relation to experience as an object of the senses and of the understanding, on the other hand, in relation to reason, isolated and transcending the limits of experience, as an object of mere thought.” See No. 1. In our experiment as well, the same objects (the greatest being and the limited beings), prior to their empirical verification, are assumed a priori as real objects, but merely of thought.

8. Kant furthermore expects from the potentiality of an experiment the occurrence of antinomies (perceptions) of pure reason in a philosophical system established without experiment. We too expect in his philosophical system the occurrence of antinomies (perceptions) in a purely empirical area, for instance, the perception that an oar submerged in the water is broken or that

the rising full Moon is bigger than the Sun. Naturally, the antinomies of reason and the antinomies of the eye are of two different kinds, but so are the areas in which Kant's and our own experiment are conducted. But these antinomies are not insoluble in either of those areas.

9. That we have conducted a true philosophical experiment in the true sense of Kant's notion of experiment is evident from a stunning fact that we have both reached the same result, each in our own area:

Kant:

The conditions of potentiality of experience in general = the conditions of the potentiality of the objects of experience.

We:

The conditions of the potentiality of supraempirical cognition in general = the conditions of the potentiality of the objects of supraempirical cognition.

Therein lies our right to the supraworld. But therein also lie two *seemingly logically* equivalent philosophical systems.

However, the scholastic system does not have to be, and is not, realismus exaggeratus. Kant's system, on the other hand, is subjectivus exaggeratus.

The scholastic system gives us a reliable cognition of universal beings (universitas rerum). Kant's system narrows down the reliability of cognition to empirical world and introduces agnosticism into the supraempirical world.

The scholastic system is "vulnerable" because it cannot empirically demonstrate supraempirical objects. Kant is vulnerable in that the conception of space is not the first conception about the empirical world. The first empirical conception demonstrates things that are external to us, that implore for deployment of those things in space, so that to this very purpose, by relying on demonstrated things external to us, our internal sense (imagination) spontaneously creates a subjective perception of space simply as "ens rationis cum fundamento in re". That is why we can easily say that the space external to us, as we represent it to ourselves, does not exist, but that there exists a real foundation external to us, which is why we represent it the way it appears to us. One should also think in similar terms about the conception of time and about noumena.

10. And let us now confirm the conclusion of our experiment that God exists firstly by an a posteriori evidence and then by certain kind of a poetic a posteriori chant.

1. A posteriori evidence.

I am a contingent being. I could have not been.

But where am I from?
To that question I cannot answer "from a contingent being" because
with such an answer I do not, and indeed cannot, move at all.
Therefore, I am from a necessary being.
But how am I from it?
By its free movement.
Why free?
If I had come to exist by its necessary movement, I would have been
a necessary being, which I am not.
What is the face of my necessary Free Begetter like?
He is a personal spiritual being.
Why? Because only that kind of being is free.

2. Poet's a posteriori evidence.

*The time that my journey takes is long and the way of it long.
I came out on the chariot of the first gleam of light, and pursued
my voyage through the wildernesses of worlds leaving my track on many
a star and planet.*

*It is the most distant course that comes nearest to thyself
and that training is the most intricate which leads to the utter simplicity
of a tune.*

*The traveller has to knock at every alien door to come to his own,
and one has to wander through all the outer worlds to reach the
innermost shrine at the end.*

*My eyes strayed far and wide before I shut them and said 'Here art
thou!'*

*The question and the cry 'Oh, where?' melt into tears of a thousand
streams and deluge the world with the flood of the assurance 'I am!'*