

Rethinking Kant

Volume 7

Rethinking Kant

Volume 7

Edited by

Edgar Valdez

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Rethinking Kant Volume 7

Series: Kantian Questions

Edited by Edgar Valdez

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2024 by Edgar Valdez and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5624-7

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5624-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations	viii
Introduction	1
<i>Edgar Valdez</i>	
Part I: Critical Philosophy	
Kant on the Transparency of Experience.....	20
<i>Tim Jankowiak</i>	
Kant on Aesthetic Normativity.....	41
<i>Ted Kinnaman</i>	
Kant's Postulate that God Exists	51
<i>Ian Blecher</i>	
Part II: Moral Judgment	
Kant on Moral Feeling and Practical Judgment.....	72
<i>Nicholas Dunn</i>	
Affects, Choice, and Kant's Incorporation Thesis.....	97
<i>Martina Favaretto</i>	
The Self-Binding Self: Phenomena and Noumena in Kant's Practical Philosophy	122
<i>Nataliya Palatnik</i>	
Part III: Kant and the History of Philosophy	
Kant on Friendship	140
<i>Allen Wood</i>	

Kant's Teleology as the True Apology to Leibniz's Pre-Established Harmony	159
<i>Noam Hoffer</i>	
Kant's Pietism: Religiously Vague Yet Philosophically Profound?.....	184
<i>Fr. Bonaventure Chapman, O.P.</i>	
Nietzsche Versus Kant on the Possibility of Rational Self-Critique.....	214
<i>Markus Kohl</i>	
Contributors.....	249

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When the early stages of the pandemic disrupted every facet of our daily lives, academic conferences were put on hold and cancelled. The academy responded with resolve and ingenuity in developing different models and formats for conferences. The hosts and organizers of the study groups of the North American Kant Society are no exception and they should be commended for maintaining an essential component of the academic engine. As this volume will indicate, Kant scholarship remains robust and in conversation with all areas of intellectual pursuit. I am grateful to the community of Kant scholars for its willingness to engage with all areas and examine its place among them. I am thankful to everyone who participated in these study groups and I am especially grateful to all the contributors to this volume. Pablo Muchnik's vision for this series has become a cornerstone of North American Kant scholarship. He remains a steadfast mentor for whom I am continually grateful.

—Edgar Valdez

ABBREVIATIONS

All references to Kant's works are in accordance with the *Akademie-Edition* Vol. 1-29 of *Kant's Gesammelte Schriften*, Berlin, 1900–. References to the *Critique of Pure Reason* follow the customary pagination of the first (A) and second (B) edition. Unless otherwise indicated, the English translations are from the *Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992–). The following abbreviations are used throughout the book:

- AA *Immanuel Kants Schriften*. Ausgabe der Königlich Preussischen (Deutschen) Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin: W. De Gruyter, 1900–)
- Anth *Anthropologie in Pragmatischer Hinsicht* (1798), AA 7
Anthropology from a Pragmatic Standpoint
- BGSE *Bemerkungen in den Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen* (1764), AA 20
Notes inserted in the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime
- BM *Bestimmung des Begriffs einer Menschenrace* (1785), AA 8
Determination of the Concept of a Human Race
- Br *Briefe*, AA 10-13 *Correspondence*
- EEKU *Erste Einleitung in die Kritik der Urteilkraft*, AA 20
First Introduction to the Critique of the Power of Judgment
- FM *Welches sind die wirklichen Fortschritte, die die Metaphysik seit Leibnizens und Wolf's Zeiten in Deutschland gemacht hat?* (written 1793-1794, published 1804), AA 20
What Real Progress Has Metaphysics Made in Germany since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff?
- GMS *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* (1785), AA 4
Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals

- GSE *Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen* (1764), AA 2
Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime
- GUGR *Von dem ersten Grunde des Unterschiedes der Gegenden im Raume* (1768), AA 2
Concerning the Ultimate Ground of the Differentiation of Directions in Space
- IaG *Idee zu einer allgemeinen Geschichte in weltbürgerlicher Absicht* (1784), AA 8
Idea toward a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim
- KpV *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* (1788), AA 5
Critique of Practical Reason
- KrV *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1781, 1787). Cited by A/B pagination.
Critique of Pure Reason
- KU *Kritik der Urteilskraft* (1790), AA 5
Critique of the Power of Judgment
- LK *Gedanken von der wahren Schätzung der lebendigen Kräfte und Beurtheilung der Beweise, deren sich Herr von Leibniz und andere Mechaniker in dieser Streitsache bedient haben, nebst einigen vorhergehenden Betrachtungen, welche die Kraft der Körper überhaupt betreffen* (1747), AA 1
Thoughts on the True Estimation of Living Forces
- Log *Jäsche Logik*, AA 9
The Jäsche Logic
- MAM *Muthmasslicher Anfang der Menschengeschichte* (1786), AA 8
Conjectural Beginning of Human History
- MAN *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft* (1786), AA 4
Metaphysical Foundations of Natural Science
MpVT *Über das Mißlingen aller philosophischen Versuche in der Theodicee* (1791), AA 8
On the Failure of all Philosophic Attempts in Theodicy

MS	<i>Metaphysik der Sitten</i> (1797-1798), AA 6 <i>Metaphysics of Morals</i>
MSI	<i>De mundi sensibilis atque intelligibilis forma et principiis</i> (1770), AA 2 <i>On the Form and Principles of the Sensible and the Intelligible World</i>
NG	<i>Versuch den Begriff der negativen Größen in die Weltweisheit einzuführen</i> (1763), AA 2 <i>Attempt to Introduce the Concept of Negative Magnitudes into Philosophy</i>
NL	<i>Neuer Lehrbegriff der Bewegung und Ruhe und der damit verknüpften Folgerungen in den ersten Gründen der Naturwissenschaft</i> (1758), AA 2 <i>New Theory of Motion and Rest, and the Connected Consequences in the First Principles of the Natural Sciences</i>
NTH	<i>Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels oder Versuch von der Verfassung und dem mechanischen Ursprunge des ganzen Weltgebäudes, nach Newtonischen Grundsätzen abgehandelt</i> (1755), AA 1 <i>Universal Natural History and Theory of the Heavens, or Essay on the Constitution and Mechanical Origin of the Entire Universe, Treated in Accordance with Newtonian Principles</i>
Op	<i>Opus postumum</i> , AA 21, 22 <i>Opus postumum</i>
Päd	<i>Pädagogik</i> , AA 9 <i>Pedagogy</i>
PG	<i>Physische Geographie</i> , AA 9 <i>Physical Geography</i>
PM	<i>Metaphysicae cum geometria iunctae usus in philosophia naturali, cuius specimen I. continet monadologiam physicam</i> (1756), AA 1

The Employment in Natural Philosophy of Metaphysics Combined with Geometry, of which Sample I Contains the Physical Monadology

- PND *Principiorum primorum cognitionis metaphysicae nova dilucidatio* (1755), AA 1
A New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition
- Prol *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können* (1783), AA 4
Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics
- Refl *Reflexion*, AA 14-19
Reflection
- RGV *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft* (1793-1794), AA 6
Religion Within the Boundaries of Mere Reason
- SF *Streit der Fakultäten* (1798), AA 7
Conflict of the Faculties
- TG *Träume eines Geistersehers, erläutert durch Träume der Metaphysik* (1766), AA 2
Dreams of a Spirit-Seer Elucidated by Dreams of Metaphysics
- TP *Über den Gemeinspruch: Das mag in der Theorie richtig sein, taugt aber nicht für die Praxis* (1793), AA 8
On the Common Saying: That May Be Correct in Theory But It Is of No Use in Practice
- ÜE *Über eine Entdeckung, nach der alle neue Kritik der reinen Vernunft durch eine ältere entbehrlich gemacht werden soll* (1790), AA 8
On a Discovery whereby Any New Critique of Pure Reason Is to Be Made Superfluous by an Older One
- ÜGTP *Über den Gebrauch teleologischer Principien in der Philosophie* (1788), AA 8
On the Use of Teleological Principles in Philosophy

VAMS	<i>Vorarbeiten zur Metaphysik der Sitten</i> , AA 23 <i>Preliminary Works for the Metaphysics of Morals</i>
VAnth	<i>Vorlesungen über Anthropologie</i> , AA 25 <i>Lectures on Anthropology</i>
VE	<i>Vorlesungen über Ethik</i> , AA 27 <i>Lectures on Ethics</i>
VL	<i>Vorlesungen über Logik</i> , AA 24 <i>Lectures on Logic</i>
VM	<i>Vorlesungen über Metaphysik</i> , AA 28, 29 <i>Lectures on Metaphysics</i>
VPE	<i>Vorlesung philosophische Enzyklopädie</i> , AA 29 <i>Lectures on the Philosophical Encyclopaedia</i>
VPG	<i>Vorlesungen über Physische Geographie</i> , AA 26 <i>Lectures on Physical Geography</i>
VRML	<i>Über ein vermeintes Recht, aus Menschenliebe zu lügen</i> (1797), AA 8 <i>On a Supposed Right to Lie from Philanthropy</i>
VRL	<i>Vorlesungen über Religion</i> , AA 28 <i>Lectures on Religion</i>
VvRM	<i>Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen</i> (1775), AA 2 <i>Of the Different Races of Human Beings</i>
WA	<i>Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?</i> (1784), AA 8 <i>An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?</i>
WDO	<i>Was heißt: Sich im Denken orientieren?</i> (1786), AA 8 <i>What does it Mean to Orient Oneself in Thinking?</i>
ZeF	<i>Zum ewigen Frieden: Ein philosophischer Entwurf</i> (1795), AA 8 <i>Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Project</i>

INTRODUCTION

EDGAR VALDEZ

The essays in this series treat a broad range of questions that arise in Kant scholarship and in philosophy more broadly. The rethinking involved calls both for re-examining interpretations of Kant and re-situating Kant in the landscape of philosophy. The contributions in this volume are grouped into three broad themes. The first theme concerns Kant's idea that reason must critique itself. The second theme concerns Kant's understanding of our moral judgment. The third theme concerns how we understand Kant in relationship to other figures in the history of philosophy.

Part I- Critical Philosophy

A distinguishing feature of Kant's contribution to philosophy is that it is what Kant calls a critical philosophy. Importantly, Kant sees himself as directing reason to ask about the capabilities of reason. For Kant there are certain things reason simply cannot do and part of employing reason correctly requires understanding what reason can and cannot do. Here reason is both the subject and object of critique. The hope is certainly that in determining the limits of reason, those things that reason cannot do, and the bounds of reason, those things reason can do, that it would open up the possibility of secure knowledge of the world. Along the way this self-examination also yields knowledge about our own cognitional structure, what we contribute to knowledge and what sorts of things we must hold to be true that are beyond the bounds of reason.

One such product of this self-examination of reason concerns our cognitive contribution to sensory experience. Tim Jankowiak explores this in "Kant on the Transparency of Sensory Experience." In contemporary debates transparency is the idea that we are not aware of our experiential states while experiencing and are only attuned to the content or objects of our experience. So that while we may otherwise examine or situate the mental states that condition our experience, we are not aware of those mental states during experience. Jankowiak argues that Kant must be seen as denying the transparency of experience. While some hold that we cannot

at the same time be aware of our mental states and the content of our experience others argue that since we are sometimes aware of non-object elements we must recognize their constant presence in our experience. Such thinkers Jankowiak calls mental paint theorists. Though there are some distinctions between Kant and contemporary mental paint approaches, for Jankowiak Kant is committed to such a view. In this sense he is using the contemporary transparency debate to explore a tension found in Kant scholarship regarding empirical intuition.

In the contemporary debate, direct realists hold experience to involve an immediate presentational “acquaintance” with external objects. Representationalists hold experience to involve representations that are intentionally directed towards objects. Both groups defend or rely on a version of the transparency thesis. Those who deny the transparency of experience hold experience to involve not just representational content aimed at an object, but also some kind of awareness of features of the experience itself. Here Jankowiak is pointing toward mental or cognitive states that constitute the experience and bring a quality to the experience, what he calls mental paint.

The direct realist says that the phenomenal character of experience is constituted by the properties of the objects with which we’re acquainted; the phenomenal redness in my experience *of* the apple is the redness *on* the apple. The representationalist says that the phenomenal character of experience is reducible to intentional representational content; the phenomenal redness in my experience of the apple is a matter of representing, by way of some intentional content, that the apple is a certain way, viz., (this particular shade of) red. And the mental paint theorist says that the phenomenal character of experience is a matter of being aware of the introspectively accessible qualitative character of mental states; the phenomenal redness encountered in my experience is literally a property of my experience. (22)

These three views in the transparency debate correlate to different ways of reading Kant’s take on empirical intuition. The direct realist views concepts and intuitions as radically different from one another with intuition having a direct or immediate relation to external objects. The representationalist views intuitions as representations of external objects. The mental paint interpretation requires that the matter or content of empirical intuition, *Empfindungsmaterial*, be combined with categorial determinations. Jankowiak thinks that while views on Kant that embrace the transparency thesis have spread recently, transcendental idealism requires a mental paint outlook. In the contemporary debate on perception, the fallibility of the senses provides several examples that resist the transparency thesis. “In particular, after-images, the “phosphenes” and roiling tessellations that can

result from pressure on the eyeballs, orgasms, tinnitus, blurry vision, and double vision are often presented as cases where our experiential states themselves are brought to conscious attention.” (24) With regard to Kant, Jankowiak views the a priori spatial ordering of sense perception to be a constitutive part of empirical intuition. Kant’s own discussion of the senses gives us occasion to deny the transparency of experience. Though Kant considers some senses to be more subjective than others, they each have a subjective element, that is, they represent not just objects but how we are affected by objects. Kant’s claims about the subjective senses representing the effects of objects on the senses are his account of the non-transparency of experience.

Another dimension of reason’s self-critique deals with aesthetic judgment. Kant’s critical philosophy is considering what judgments reason has license to make, be they theoretical, practical, or aesthetic. In such an examination there are differing grounds for making such judgments but there is a unity to be found in them all in virtue of which they can be considered judgments. This tension between the differences and similarities of such judgments is explored by Ted Kinnaman in “Kant on Aesthetic Normativity.” Kinnaman’s aim is to identify the basis on which we have grounds to appeal to an aesthetic normativity given that aesthetic feeling is not to be communicated. For Kant only cognitions can be universally communicated so we might worry that we have no such basis in the case of aesthetic judgments. Put another way, such framing might suggest that aesthetic judgments have only a subjective ground. Kinnaman holds that all judgments are under the same imperative “namely the imperative to represent the world accurately.” (43) The challenge then is to hold all judgments under such an imperative of accurate representation while still allowing for the differences between the different kinds of judgments.

Though we may allow for being convinced of a theoretical matter or moral choice, such persuasion appears to have limits in the context of aesthetic judgments, “in judging the beauty of objects, we do not allow anyone to argue us into finding something beautiful, but rather each of us ‘wants to submit the object to his own eyes,’ presumably because it is at least conceivable that we might not feel disinterested pleasure with regard to the same objects as others have.” (KU 216 50) That is two agents may be in the presence of the same stimuli and have different aesthetic reactions or assessments and we would think it odd that one agent could convince the other. As Kinnaman points out, however, Kant’s aim is to establish an entire system of judgment and such systematicity calls for a deep unity. The use of empirical concepts requires a systematic unity in which concepts can be situated. Such a system would also allow for a determination of sciences

and approaches and would be “a rational reconstruction of the structure of natural science, which works to subsume observed phenomena under broader and broader empirical laws. A complete system would entail a complete science, which Kant envisions as a goal that we can approach ‘asymptotically’ but never entirely reach.” (44) This systematic unity of empirical concepts grounds a sense of cognition in a sense robust enough that for aesthetic judgments to be included in ‘cognition in general’ is to imbue it with the normativity of cognition. This is because for Kant to form an empirical concept is not only to synthesize a manifold but also to determine how that concept fits with other concepts. So cognition requires being integrated within this unified system. Kinnaman suggests that the purposiveness we encounter in nature supports this aim of integration.

One way to resolve this tension between the subjective determining grounds of aesthetic judgments and the generality of judgments is to take every aesthetic judgment to also implicitly make a universal judgment. This is the view attributed to Hannah Ginsborg, who holds aesthetic judgments to be making claims about universal validity. That is, a claim about the beauty of an object implicitly holds that it is universally valid that the object is beautiful. For Kinnaman this view encounters the difficulty that objects do not equally give rise to the harmony of the faculties that produces the subjective determining grounds of beauty. This not only accords with our common sense understanding of beauty but seems to be something to which Kant himself is committed when he holds that poetry takes the highest rank of the beautiful arts because it lets the mind “feel its capacity to consider and judge of nature, as appearance, freely, self-actively, and independently of determination by nature” and music the lowest because it merely plays with sensations. (KU 326) Ginsborg’s view is seeking to ground the normativity of aesthetic judgment in the same ground of normativity in general, but “insofar as Ginsborg’s account neglects sensitivity to the object judged, the normativity of aesthetic judgment in fact rests on a different basis than does (for Kant) cognition in general. Empirical judgments, even more obviously than judgments of taste, are supposed to be sensitive to differences in the objects. Indeed, that is the very point of empirical judgment.” (51) When such sensitivity to objects is absent, normativity is compromised.

One of the most important results of reason’s inquiry into its own limits is the conclusion that there are some objects we cannot cognize. God, freedom, and immortality—what Kant calls the traditional objects of metaphysics—are not objects of possible experience and so we cannot set them as objects of theoretical investigation. In setting these objects beyond our reach Kant famously claims to “deny knowledge in order to make room for faith.” (Bxxx) This is because these objects for Kant are of practical

necessity and so he claims that we postulate them as a foundation of a moral point of view. And yet, the practical necessity of believing that God exists in order to be moral is quite different from the practical necessity of extending a line to construct a geometrical object, another instance of a postulate. Kant also goes to great lengths to deny the possibility of proofs for God's existence so the notion that we must postulate God's existence requires further elaboration. In "Kant's Postulate that God Exists," Ian Blecher explores the particularities of this claim.

One distinction that is often recognized in the secondary literature is that between different forms of holding true, *Fürwahrhalten*. Kant distinguishes between opinion, belief, and knowledge. Here the distinction draws not on the conviction with which we hold something to be true but rather on what grounds. If the subjective grounds of a conviction are insufficient to be sustained indefinitely then the conviction is one that Kant calls opinion. If its subjective grounds are sufficient the conviction is either belief or knowledge. Belief lacks objective sufficiency while knowledge can be objectively sustained. That is, the truth of the conviction can be established. For Blecher, it is misleading to read the lack of objective sufficiency as always owed to the strength or quality of the grounds of conviction, "In this passage, [Kant] is speaking of the distinction between belief and opinion rather than belief and knowledge. But the point generalizes. When belief 'is considered as restricted to a special kind of object,' it is a 'complete holding-as-true', and so no less certain than knowledge (Log 9:72)." (61)

When restricted to this special kind of object, this belief is the foundation of the moral point of view, the faith for which Kant has made room, "Kant really seems to have thought that a belief in the existence of God can motivate us to virtue -- if only by enabling us to maintain our respect for the moral law against the evidence of its uselessness on Earth." (59) In this sense, our lack of objective sufficiency better reflects the moral point of view. Our belief in the existence of God is not forced or constrained by objective conditions. Instead, it springs forth from our subjective condition. The faith for which Kant has made room is

the special possession of the *righteous* (those he calls "*der Rechtschaffene*"). It is they who will see the divine in things on the infinite strength of moral feeling. For everyone else (and here I would include myself) there remains the possibility -- sometimes the danger -- of a theistical *persuasion*, and maybe in the best cases, a pious *hope* that could be called the true religion. But it is not to them that the divine shows itself. 68

Genuine objects of faith are those for which holding-as-true is necessarily *free*, rather than determined by objective grounds. In this sense the postulate

of God's existence is available to those who have freely chosen the moral point of view not those who have simply come upon the difficulty of theoretical cognition of God.

Part II Moral Judgment

In his moral philosophy, Kant is famously committed to acts done from a sense of duty. The categorical imperative can generate such duties for us while feeling and inclination can yield only hypothetical imperatives. And so even an action consistent with what duty requires but done from inclination is not an act with moral worth. This broad view is well known in Kant scholarship. Kant does also say that inclination and feeling are part of our phenomenal experience and so the susceptibility to the draw of inclination is there for all of us. So much is to be determined about what role feeling and affect play in our moral decision making and how we subject ourselves to the moral law.

One view of the role that moral feeling and affect play is found in Nicholas Dunn's "Kant on Moral Feeling and Practical Judgment." Dunn argues that practical judgment fundamentally involves a kind of feeling. The role for feeling, according to Dunn, is broader than moral motivation, "Far from entering only at the point at which we are trying to muster the strength of will to carry out what we know we ought to do, feeling is present the moment we begin to deliberate about what it is that we ought to do." (74) For Dunn, all judgment involves reflection and feeling plays an important role in reflection.

Kant defines judgment as the power to subsume under rules. Subsuming under rules cannot be guided by rules since such guidance would require an infinite regress. Thus, the activity of judgment involves "the faculty for thinking of the particular as contained under the universal" (*KU* 5:179). For Dunn, this means that while reason may be able to generate maxims for us, we need the faculty of judgment to determine that a particular action falls under the general rule that our maxims call for. For Kant we need the power of judgment to apply the moral law to specific circumstances. Reason may determine the moral law for us, but judgment is required to apply it.

What sets the power of judgment apart from reason (as well as the understanding, which provides its own kinds of universals in the case of theoretical judgment) is its ability to bring general representations to bear on particular ones. Just as there can be no rules for the application of rules *ad infinitum*, there can be no principles for the applications of principles. This being the case, we can think of determining judgment as a matter of

the reflecting power of judgment assisting, or cooperating with, another faculty (in this case, reason) in applying its laws or principles. 79

To help make this point Dunn distinguishes between act-types and act-tokens. The former are types of actions generated by maxims or rules while the latter are individual actions that meet the criteria of these act-types, that is act-tokens are subsumed under act-types. While we can use reason to generate act-types, we must use judgment to subsume act-tokens under those act-types. These are different activities and good practical reason does not imply or require good practical judgment. For Dunn, a central difference between these activities is that while reasoning to produce an act-type can be without feeling or affect, judging an act token to be of a particular type requires a kind of affect or feeling. This of course is not the same feeling involved in an agent's respect for the moral law. It is rather an intellectual kind of feeling that one can cultivate. Such cultivation would not be a matter of better understanding the moral law or deepening our commitment to it. Rather it would involve improving our ability to determine which actions instantiate the moral law. This reconstruction of the role of feeling helps unite determining and reflective judgment and introduces moral feeling much earlier in Kant's ethics.

The question of affect is also at issue when considering our moral choices. Because for Kant a moral choice involves choosing to incorporate a certain motivation into our maxim, affect and moral choice appear incompatible. Referred to as the incorporation thesis, Kant holds, "freedom of the power of choice has the characteristic, entirely peculiar to it, that it cannot be determined to action through any incentive *except so far as the human being has incorporated it into his maxim* (has made it into a universal rule for himself, according to which he wills to conduct himself)" (RGV 6:23–4). On this view, we can either act from a reasoned maxim or we can act from affect or inclination, but we cannot choose to act from affect. In "Affects, Choice and Kant's Incorporation Thesis," Martina Favaretto challenges this view and works to make room for a kind of unreflective choice in Kant's ethics.

Kant holds that affect and passion are obstacles to reflection, "[i]t is not the intensity of a certain feeling that constitutes the affected state, but the lack of reflection in comparing this feeling with the sum of all feelings (of pleasure or displeasure)" (Anth 7:254). With our reflection incomplete we may respond to lower desires like stimuli or impulses rather than to higher desires like motives or motive grounds. The distinguishing feature of the rational agent is that she is always capable of resisting the lower desires,

while human beings' acts of the power of choice can either stem from the sensitive or intellectual power of choice – i.e., either from the lower or the higher faculty of desire – all these acts of the power of choice always presuppose the agent's capacity to refrain from being compelled to action, even though the extent according to which one is successful in exercising this capacity may vary. 108

It is in this way that the freedom of choice is viewed as so fundamentally at odds with acting from affect. To have responded to the lower stimuli is to have failed to do the characteristically rational thing. Favaretto's point is that we must understand this failure in normative terms rather than modal terms.

when one is subject to an affect and chooses to act in a certain way, affects get in the way of meeting some normative standards of rationality, where these standards could be either prudential, or moral. What the text establishes is that one in a state of affect cannot carry out either a morally sound choice or a prudentially sound choice. But while the agent in a state of affects cannot make a sound choice, it is clear that she could still be able to make a choice that is neither morally nor prudentially sound. 114

Only by recognizing this distinction is there room for an agent to make a bad choice. Otherwise, the agent would be limited to making a good choice, or not making a choice at all.

This bad or deficient choice can occur in two ways. One can either act on an explicitly bad reason or one can act on an implicit reason. In the former case, the failure of comparison is that we have done so incorrectly. In the latter case, the failure is that we have not completed the comparison. Both cases can be the result of affect impeding such comparison. In order to consider an unreflective choice that responds to affect as incorporated into one's maxim, Favaretto says it is necessary to clarify the sometimes varied use of the term maxim in Kant. Kant sometimes refers to a maxim as a higher order principle or "life rule" and these notions of maxim are understood in such a way as to require the kind of deliberation and rationality that is lacking in unreflective choice. But Kant also uses a notion of maxim in a thin sense where he is thinking merely of the subjective principle for action. In these cases, Favaretto thinks that we can incorporate an unreflective choice to act from affect.

Affect and moral freedom are also in tension in that they seem to be on opposite sides of the phenomenal-noumenal divide. This is often understood by situating affect in the noumenal world and free moral agency in the phenomenal world. The phenomenal self seems bound by the laws of nature and behaves deterministically in accordance with causal laws while the

noumenal self turns to reason to set moral ends. This framing would seem to set one self as bound by the law and the other as lawgiver. And yet it would be difficult for a moral law to bind the phenomenal self given its causal determinism. In “Self-Binding Self: Phenomena and Noumena in Kant’s Practical Philosophy,” Nataliya Palatnik makes the case that the distinction between the phenomenal self and noumenal self does not correspond neatly to a separation between a self that is bound by the law and a self that gives the moral law.

One reason to resist this dichotomy is that it conflates ontological and normative considerations. Put another way, the ontological view describes the kinds of laws one is subject to while the normative view derives or determines those laws. It would be odd to think of the addressee of the law as being strictly in the world of sense or phenomena because that would compromise her ability to respond to the law or see herself as bound by it. And it would be likewise odd for a morally free agent to attempt to give moral legislation to a being whose actions are mechanistically determined by nature. To clear up this confusion, Palatnik distinguishes between two senses of the phenomenal.

On the one hand, *homo phaenomenon* is a concept of the self as a natural rational being who “has reason” (*MS*, 6:418); a being who acts (and regards herself as acting) on incentives she takes to be reasons. Taken in this sense, the concept of a *homo phaenomenon* is morally *undetermined*, since it leaves open the possibility that the agent’s actions are fully determined by natural causes. On the other hand, from the practical standpoint, from which the agent is able to cognize herself as a freely acting intelligence, the concept of *homo phaenomenon* acquires new content. An agent is now regarded not merely as a natural being with reason, but *also* as receptive to unconditional moral requirements; as possessing the kind of sensibility that makes her capable of moral feeling and of acting for genuinely moral reasons. That is, from the practical point of view, the concept of *homo phaenomenon* becomes morally determined. 130

Thus, we can think of *homo phaenomenon* as the object of phenomenal inquiry and investigation. Such a being would seem to take reasons as incentives, but it would be an open question as to whether such incentives would be moral ones. We can also think of *homo phaenomenon* as the subject of phenomenal experience. This agent would consider herself free to act on moral reasons. This morally determined sense of *homo phaenomenon* is receptive to requirements of the moral law.

For Palatnik, this leads to a kind of dual self-conception in which we place ourselves under moral obligations. This self-binding is necessary because duties to oneself are in a sense original. Reason yields all duties but

if we could not bind ourselves to duties to ourselves we could not bind ourselves to duties to others. When we bind ourselves to duties to ourselves we recognize the humanity in ourselves.

Now the human being as a *natural being* that has reason (*homo phaenomenon*) can be determined by his reason, as a *cause*, to actions in the sensible world, and so far the concept of obligation does not come into consideration. But the same human being thought in terms of his *personality*, that is, as a being endowed with *inner freedom* (*homo noumenon*), is regarded as a being that can be put under obligation and, indeed, under obligation to himself (to the humanity in his own person). So the human being (taken in these two different senses) can acknowledge a duty to himself without falling into contradiction (because the concept of a human being is not thought in one and the same sense). *MS*, 6:418

So in this dual self-conception we must regard ourselves as sensibly affected rational beings who can be motivated by moral concerns. For Palatnik, this bridges the seeming divide between the noumenal and phenomenal self because “the same act of reason that allows her to think of herself as a *homo noumenon* confers further content on her self-conception as a rational natural being.” (132) The tension is only there if we take the morally determined sense of noumenal self to be prescribing moral incentives for the morally undetermined sense of phenomenal self. Palatnik’s point is that the moral agent can no longer think of her phenomenal self as subject only to the laws of nature. Rather the moral agent must think of her phenomenal self as morally determined and thus receptive to moral incentives in the world of sense.

Part III- Kant and the History of Philosophy

Kant’s importance in the Western canon cannot be overstated. Even for many contemporary debates, one can identify a defensible category of Kantian perspectives or solutions. Thus a field or problem could be understood by how Kant might respond and stand in relation to other prevailing approaches. Another way to understand how we might rethink Kant is to revisit how he stands in relation to other important thinkers or movements in the history of philosophy. In “Kant on Friendship,” Allen Wood does just that by examining Kant’s views on friendship and its importance for the moral project. Wood argues for an underappreciated discussion of friendship in Kant. While friendship serves as an important element of a good life in the Ancient view, few modern thinkers give friendship the consideration it merits. Given his many significant contributions to ethics, Kant’s discussion of friendship can go overlooked,

though it plays an important role in the path to the moral life. Kant draws heavily on Montaigne's treatment of friendship. Importantly though, unlike Montaigne, Kant emphasizes the inadequacy of actual friendship, highlighting its importance as a moral idea. In his moral theory, Kant divides the duties we owe to others into duties of respect and duties of love and these kinds of duties can even seem at odds with one another when considering what moves us to recognize them. "The principle of **mutual love** admonishes them constantly to *come closer* to one another; that of the **respect** they owe one another, to keep themselves *at a distance* from one another;" yet both are necessary, for 'should one of these great moral forces fail, "then nothingness (immorality), with gaping throat, would drink up the whole kingdom of '(moral) beings like a drop of water'"'. (MS 6:449) (149) In friendship, mutual love and respect are in balance. Love and respect are of course not opposites, but the tension rests in how we view ourselves in relation to the object of love or respect. According to Wood, "we tend to love that to which we feel superior, which does not threaten our self-esteem.... Respect, however, is a feeling that combines positive valuation with infringement of our self-love, and humiliation of our self-conceit" (150) The importance of friendship is that Kant believes we need both dispositions, toward positive and negative self-evaluation, for our moral relationships toward others. It is not only that morality calls for both respect and love, but that respect and love are each diminished if they are not in balance with the other. This requires a harmony or balance that is dynamic. That makes friendship the ideal model for the balance of respect for the law and the internalizing of the realm of ends "In the realm of ends, as in friendship, there is a union of rational beings, and there is also the combination of love (mutual sharing of ends) with respect (for each member as an end in itself)." (151) In this sense, friendship serves as a model for the ideal ethical community.

The question of comparison that quickly arises is how Kant's discussion of the moral idea of friendship stands in relation to that of Aristotle. Kant has a tripartite division of friendship analogous to that of Aristotle dividing friendship along the lines of needs, tastes, and moral friendships. There are, however, two key differences. The first difference concerns the ranking or relative value of the lesser forms of friendship. For Aristotle it is utility that is not really friendship and pleasure that starts to look like friendship while for Kant need can form the basis of friendship, but taste cannot. Each thinker's imperfect version of friendship hints at the second difference between them, namely the key features of their perfect version of friendship. "For Kant, however, the basic thing in true or complete friendship is not mutual admiration and shared excellence, but rather mutual benevolence

and shared thoughts and feelings.” (154) Morality is needed for friendship in order to sustain the trust that makes intimate communication possible, and the good will toward each other that constitutes their shared ends and feelings: “Each participating and sharing sympathetically in the other’s well-being through the morally good will that unites them” (MS 6: 469). With Aristotle, moral virtue enters into friendship first through the fact that you must be virtuous in order for me to have a reason to wish you well. For Kant, however, it is just the opposite: the need for virtue is fundamentally my need to be virtuous and to act virtuously in relation to you in order to be *worthy* of the trust and benevolence I hope you will show me as my friend (MS 6:469, VE Collins 27:429). True friendship then has five features in Kant: wellwishing love, equality, reciprocal possession of one another, intimate communication and love toward reciprocal well-liking. Though only the last is enough to make friendship an ethical duty. While friendship does not on its own produce complete happiness, adopting the ideal of friendship is a moral duty because it makes one deserving of happiness.

Another figure that looms large in situating Kant is Leibniz. A prevailing view is that Leibniz has too much confidence in what rationalism can say about the world drawing only on a priori principles and Kant’s critical turn seeks to understand the limits and bounds of such principles. Such a view often takes Kant to be generous and even falsely humble when he defers to or credits the wisdom of Leibniz. In “Kant’s Teleology as the ‘True Apology’ to Leibniz’s Pre-Established Harmony,” Noam Hoffer argues that we can take Kant at his word when he claims to be offering a defense of a Leibnizian view. Hoffer shows how Kant’s view of teleology stems from an understanding of Leibniz’s pre-established harmony. Of course, Kant himself tells us that he thinks of his work as a true apology, but he then goes on to break from Leibniz in many significant ways, as well as criticizing the Rationalist philosophy that springs from Leibniz through Wolff.

Kant sees an error in each of what he identifies as the three main elements of Leibniz’s metaphysics: the principle of sufficient reason, the doctrine of monads, and the doctrine of pre-established harmony. Yet each element also possesses a redeeming quality. The idea of reason for instance points to a normative dimension of metaphysics by identifying a standard of perfection. Though such a standard is only a regulative ideal, it identifies an end set by reason. As such it expresses

a need to presuppose a single intelligent ground I am quite convinced that Leibniz, in his pre-established harmony (which he, like Baumgarten after him, made very general), had in mind not the harmony of two different natures, namely, sense and understanding, but that of two faculties belonging to the same nature, in which sensibility and understanding

harmonize to form experiential knowledge. If we wanted to make judgments about their origin - an investigation that of course lies wholly beyond the limits of human reason - we could name nothing beyond our divine creator. Br11:52

While Kant rejects the idea of a kind of harmony between the internal states of substances, this notion of harmony Kant reinterprets as one between different explanatory principles. Though Kant mentions this true apology to Leibniz in the first Critique, Hoffer argues that it is in the Critique of Judgment where Kant offers the true apology because it is there that purposiveness becomes explicit as a regulative principle. As such purposiveness is not a harmony of causal laws. "Instead of harmony between the internal states of distinct substances, e.g., the perception of bodies and their motion, Kant reinterprets pre-established harmony as a harmony between different explanatory principles (or the cognitive faculties governing them)." (171) For Hoffer, this shift is helped along by Kant's reading of Maupertuis. While Leibniz sees a harmony between the kingdoms of causation and wisdom, Maupertuis helps Kant identify the deeper unity

This acute and learned man immediately sensed that, in having thus introduced unity into the infinite manifold of the universe and created order in what was blindly necessary, there must be some single supreme principle to which the totality of things owed its harmony and appropriateness. He rightly believed that such a universal cohesiveness in the simplest natures of things afforded a far more fitting foundation for the indubitable discovery, in some perfect and original being, of the ultimate cause of everything in the world, than any perception of various contingent and variable arrangements. BDG 2:98-9

According to Hoffer, this allows Kant to recognize this unity as regulative for our understanding of nature, "[a]ttributing purposiveness to nature does not mean that we know its divine purpose, but only that for assuming the systematic unity of the laws of nature as 'discernible by us' we assume a supreme intelligent being as the ground for their unity. Thus, we should understand purposiveness here as the way human thought can make the unity of the laws of nature palpable when *applying* it to the system of empirical concepts." (181) Thus in the third Critique Kant arrives at a teleology that does not require a supernatural being interfering or playing dice with the universe but that allows us to use necessary laws to explain specific operations. This harmony extends to sensibility and understanding in aesthetic judgments as well as to mechanism and teleology in organic nature. While the critical project is certainly not a Leibnizian one, Kant has

transformed pre-established harmony into a regulative idea and offered a defense of Leibniz.

Scholars often invoke this assumption of a supremely intelligent being to point to one of Kant's unacknowledged influences, namely, his Pietist upbringing. For many, that Kant's ethics yield prescriptions that resemble Christian imperatives with a worldview that necessitates—while unable to prove—the existence of a supreme being is evidence that Kant was unable to shed the Pietist influence on his thinking. Fr. Bonaventure Chapman argues that Pietism, rather than keep him tied to certain religious or theological commitments that compromise his philosophical thinking, actually brings Kant to a kind of philosophical criticism of Wolff and Leibniz. In “Kant's Pietism: Religiously Vague Yet Philosophically Profound?” he identifies Christian August Crusius as the figure whose influence best exhibits Kant's relationship with Pietism.

Though many suggest that Kant's pietism influenced his thinking, few of the theological or religious commitments of Pietism emerge in Kant. In a general sense he is committed to a kind of theism, but few if any of the features of his theism can be attributed to Pietism. This is not to deny influence entirely. For Chapman the important distinction to be made is between a religious or theological Pietism that calls for certain faith commitments and a philosophical Pietism that offers criticism of Wolffian philosophy. “Metaphysically speaking, the Pietists argued that Wolffianism was deterministic. Morally speaking, the Pietists argued for what is now called “incompatibilism,” where determinism is incompatible with human freedom, moral imputation, morality itself, and the justice of God in his eternal judgment of individuals. These matters served as the core concerns of Pietism.” (197) These concerns brought Pietists like Crusius to shift away from philosophy as a mathematical or strictly logical science to recognize a form of philosophical analysis that was more than strictly deductive. This yields a kind of German modal metaphysics that separates logic and ontology.

Kant's initial reaction to Crusianism is largely negative. As he takes the critical turn he is drawn more toward Crusius. Chapman identifies three structural elements in Crusian thought that he finds echoed in Kant's critical philosophy. The first structural element is what Chapman calls an epistemologized metaphysics in which metaphysics requires an epistemological ground to justify its claims. The second structural element is a commitment to material first principles of inseparability (What we cannot think without the other is in reality combined) and uncomposability (What we cannot think together is in reality not combined together). (203) These material commitments show the incompleteness of the principles of

non-contradiction and sufficient reason. The third structural element concerns what Chapman calls a metametaphysical commitment, the justification of the first principles of metaphysical cognition, best characterized in the Architectonic of Pure Reason

Now the philosophy of pure reason is either **propaedeutic** (preparation), which investigates the faculty of reason in regard to all pure *a priori* cognition, and is called **critique**, or second, the system of pure reason (science), the whole (true as well as apparent) philosophical cognition from pure reason in systematic interconnection and is called **metaphysics**; this name can also be given to all of pure philosophy including the critique, in order to comprehend the investigation of everything that can ever be cognized *a priori* as well as the presentation of that which constitutes a system of pure philosophical cognitions of this kind but in distinction from all empirical as well as mathematical use of reason (A841/B869).

With respect to this distinction, Kant sees Crusius as making a similar distinction

Crusius indeed contested such a unified effect of the soul on the body, which Leibniz assumed by virtue of the *harmonia praestabilita*, but decreed on the contrary that the criterion of truth is to be sought for only in the ideas which the creator has placed in us, just because he could not trust it to our reason that it would find these ideas itself ; he thus assumed an inner revelation with human beings, and with the necessity of this for bringing one to conviction (VM 29:959).

The difference here is that where Crusius turned to God in his metametaphysics, Kant turns to reason. In this respect, the influence of Pietism in rejecting the Leibnizian or Wolffian tradition is not one that imports theological commitments and obstructs the critical project but is rather an influence consistent with the critical turn that seeks something more than German rationalism can offer.

For many who come after him in the Western canon, Kant is a thinker one must come to terms with and respond to. A defensible position in most contemporary philosophical debates must often situate itself in relation to Kant (or Kantianism of some kind, e.g. O'Neill, Rawls etc.) regardless of whether one is embracing or rejecting him. Nietzsche, of course, is noted for forcefully rejecting Kant and embracing a different “*a priori*.” Nietzsche views himself as diametrically opposed to Kant and the scholarship on this opposition usually focuses on moral imperatives and the concomitant metaphysical commitments like moral responsibility and free will. In “Nietzsche versus Kant on the Possibility of Rational Self-Critique” Markus Kohl centers the question of reason’s examination of its own limits. While

this capacity seems to be the bedrock of Kant's critical philosophy, Nietzsche is suspicious of any attempts of rational agents examining their own rational capacities. That is, for Kant we can engage in such rational assessment whereas for Nietzsche we cannot. Kant is concerned with correcting the misuse of epistemically inadequate principles, "principles, which reason has been using for a long time without first inquiring in what way and by what right it has obtained them", when one follows "the dogmatic procedure of pure reason, without an antecedent critique of its own capacity" (Bxxxv)." For Kohl, it is no surprise that Kant and Nietzsche would come up with different answers to the question, but recognizing their different approaches offers us insights into their conceptions of the task of philosophy.

Kant views his critical philosophy as unique at that point for asking about its own limits and bounds. By turning this critique on itself reason can be sure that it is equipped to take on the questions it asks. Transcendental philosophy is thus one of the "sciences whose nature entails that every question occurring in them must absolutely be answerable from what one knows, because the answer must arise from the same source as the question" (A476/B504). (224) For Nietzsche, to use reason to inquire about reason's capacity is already to take reason's capacity for granted. It is to assume that reason is capable of addressing the question of what reason's capacities are. Kohl terms this the circularity argument in Nietzsche. The risk philosophers run when thinking through what reason or human cognition is like, according to Nietzsche is that they take the particular and idiosyncratic features of their own circumstances and extrapolate them to everyone. This gives a non-cognitive contribution to one's conception. In Kant's case it would be his adherence to the moral and religious system he is trying to justify, "to assert on the whole the existence of things about which we cannot know anything at all, precisely because there is an advantage in not being able to know anything about them, was a naivete of Kant, consequence of a refill (*Nachschlags*) of needs, namely moral-metaphysical ones" (NF 1887, Group 10 §205). This moral commitment led to a kind of metaphysical assumption on his part, "Kant believed in the fact of cognition...The rightfulness of the faith in cognition is always being presupposed: just like the rightfulness in the feeling of the judgment of conscience is being presupposed. Here the moral ontology is the reigning prejudice" (NF 1886, Group 7 §4). For Nietzsche Kant's assumption that reason can answer the question of its own capacity is no less spurious than the assumption that reason can answer questions about the traditional objects of metaphysics.

This impasse may turn out to be a matter of thinkers talking past one another as Kant will see Nietzsche's criticism as requiring some kind of commitment to truth and Nietzsche will see Kant's commitment to truth as evidence of his bias.

Kant argues that anyone who partakes in a truth-oriented thought process must place a robust trust in our purely rational capacities. Thus, for Kant Nietzsche's objections against the project of rational self-critique fail since they incur a commitment to the cognitive authority and standards of pure reason which they purport to deny or doubt. However, Nietzsche emphatically disavows a preoccupation with rationality, truth, and knowledge: in his view, dispositions such as valuing truth over everything else, favoring dialectical procedures of giving and weighing reasons or arguments, and seeking out objective knowledge for its own sake betray a deeply problematic mindset. This mindset results from and manifests an impoverished psycho-physical life form which involves thinned, frigid passions as well as the corresponding loss of any deeper sense of meaning, orientation, and purpose. 247

This fundamental disagreement, Kohl argues, points to a fundamental difference in the conception of philosophy and its task. Kant sees philosophy as tasked with truth and knowledge which rely on the scrutiny and assent of other rational thinkers with universal intersubjective validity as an aim. Nietzsche on the other hand views such commitments as part of the problem of our current descent into nihilism. Philosophy in turn must create the new values reinvigorate human passions.

