

## **-- (DRAFT: 26 AUGUST 2018): 2 - THE INDISPENSABILITY OF A PURE MORAL PHILOSOPHY**

(c) 2018 Dolf Leendert Boek, Revision: 26 August, 2018

Immanuel Kant (22 April 1724 to 12 February 1804) whom was initially educated within theology as ostensibly the Pythagorean binomial perennialist (Latin) school of thought and note worthy are his second (1756) and third (1755) dissertations:

The Employment in Natural Philosophy of Metaphysics Combined with Geometry—also known as the *Monodologia Physica* which contrasted the Newtonian methods of thinking with those employed in the philosophy then prevailing in German universities;

In a third dissertation, "New Elucidation of the First Principles of Metaphysical Cognition", Kant analyzed especially the principle of sufficient reason, which in Wolff's formulation asserts that for everything there is a sufficient reason why it should be rather than not be. Although critical, Kant was cautious and still a long way from challenging the assumptions of Leibnizian metaphysics.

And of his criticism of Leibnizian rationalism Kant's principal work of this period was published by 1764 as "An Inquiry into the Distinctness of the Fundamental Principles of Natural Theology and Morals". Within this work he attacked the claim of Leibnizian philosophy that philosophy should model itself on mathematics and aim at constructing a chain of demonstrated truths based on self-evident premises. Kant argued that mathematics proceeds from definitions that are arbitrary, by means of operations that are clearly and sharply defined, upon concepts that can be exhibited in concrete form. In contrast with this method, he argued that philosophy must begin with concepts that are already given, "though confusedly or insufficiently determined," so that philosophers cannot begin with definitions without thereby shutting themselves up within a circle of words. Philosophy cannot, like mathematics, proceed synthetically; it must analyze and clarify. The importance of the moral order, which he had learned from Rousseau, reinforced the conviction received from his study of Newton that a synthetic philosophy is empty and false.

Within 1770 he became a full professor at the University of Konigsberg, teaching metaphysics and logic. The Inaugural Dissertation of 1770 that he delivered on **\*ASSUMING\* \*HIS\* \*NEW\* \*POSITION\* \*ALREADY\* \*CONTAINED\* \*MANY\* \*OF\* \*THE\* \*IMPORTANT\* \*ELEMENTS\* \*OF\***

**\*HIS\* \*MATURE\* \*PHILOSOPHY\***. As indicated in its title, *De Mundi Sensibilis atque Intelligibilis Forma et Principiis: Dissertatio* ("On the Form and Principles of the Sensible and Intelligible Worlds"), the implicit dualism of the *Träume* is made explicit, and it is made so on the basis of a wholly un-Leibnizian interpretation of the distinction between sense and understanding. Sense is not, as Leibniz had supposed, a confused form of thinking but a source of knowledge in its own right, although the objects so known are still only "appearances"—the term that Leibniz also used. They are appearances because all sensing is conditioned by the presence, in sensibility, of the forms of time and space, which are not objective characteristics or frameworks of things but "pure intuitions." But though all knowledge of things sensible is thus of phenomena, it does not follow that nothing is known of things as they are in themselves. Certainly, humans have no intuition, or direct insight, into an intelligible world, but the presence in them of certain "pure intellectual concepts"—such as those of possibility, existence, necessity, substance, and cause—enables them to have some descriptive knowledge of it. By means of these concepts they can arrive at an exemplar that provides them with "the common measure of all other things as far as real." This exemplar gives them an idea of perfection for both the theoretical and practical orders: in the first, it is that of the Supreme Being, God; in the latter, that of moral perfection. [cf: *Britannia Encyclopaedia*]

After the *Dissertation*, Kant published virtually nothing for 11 years until 1781, Immanuel Kant disseminated the first edition to *Critique of Pure Reason* with the second in 1787, as an enormous work and one of the most important on Western thought. Although the adolescent Kant loathed his Pietist as Lutheran schooling, he had deep respect and admiration for his parents, especially his mother, whose "genuine religiosity" he described as "not at all enthusiastic." According to his biographer, Manfred Kuehn, Kant's parents probably influenced him much less through their Pietism than through their artisan values of "hard work, honesty, cleanliness, and independence," which they taught him by example. [cf: Kuehn 2001, 38, 44. See also 54]

Thus in the consideration given to Kantian appeal for a pure moral philosophy as beginning with a reference to the usefulness of the division of labor. Here Kant raises the question whether philosophy would not also benefit from such a division. Ultimately, he is not concerned with whether the burden of elaborating philosophical theories should be distributed among the shoulders of a multitude of persons.[Page 6]

We would however contend against this notion as being an impotent chimeric {ie. a thing which is hoped for but is illusory or impossible to

achieve} of idealism {ie. the unrealistic belief in or pursuit of perfection} such that one may declare "the economic sovereignty you claim to defend is a chimera".

And thusly, it is in and of itself an oblique contradiction of Kant's own characteristic position development where he emphasizes that an adequate form of moral philosophy has to be 'pure', ie. both free from all empirical elements of interest, self-love, and natural feelings as well as free from rational concepts of perfection:

"And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

**HETEROS PROTOTYPE: (DAY #6 as #342)@{**

@1: Sup: 6 (**#6**); Ego: 6 (**#6**),  
@2: Sup: 20 (**#26**); Ego: 14 (**#20**),  
@3: Sup: 42 (**#68**); Ego: 22 (**#42**),  
@4: Sup: 72 (**#140** - I DEAL NOT FRAUDULENTLY (%14); I AM NOT AN EAVES-DROPPER (%16)); Ego: 30 (**#72**),  
@5: Sup: 29 (**#169** - I TROUBLE MYSELF ONLY WITH MY OWN AFFAIRS (%18)); Ego: 38 (**#110**),  
@6: Sup: 75 (**#244**); Ego: 46 (**#156** - I DO NOT CAUSE TERRORS (%21)),  
@7: Sup: 48 (**#292**); Ego: 54 (**#210** - I AM NOT OF AGGRESSIVE HAND (%30)),  
@8: Sup: 29 (**#321**); Ego: 62 (**#272**),  
@9: Sup: 18 (**#339**); Ego: 70 (**#342**),  
Male: #339; Feme: #342  
} // #342

**TORAH PROTOTYPE: (DAY #6 as #369)@{**

@1: Sup: 16 (**#16**); Ego: 16 (**#16**),  
@2: Sup: 33 (**#49**); Ego: 17 (**#33**),  
@3: Sup: 51 (**#100**); Ego: 18 (**#51**),  
@4: Sup: 10 (**#110**); Ego: 40 (**#91**),  
@5: Sup: 51 (**#161** - I AM NOT A TELLER OF LIES (%9)); Ego: 41 (**#132**),  
@6: Sup: 12 (**#173** - I AM NOT GIVEN TO UNNATURAL LUST (%27)); Ego: 42 (**#174**),  
@7: Sup: 76 (**#249**); Ego: 64 (**#238**),  
@8: Sup: 60 (**#309**); Ego: 65 (**#303**),  
@9: Sup: 45 (**#354**); Ego: 66 (**#369**),  
Male: #354; Feme: #369  
} // #369

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." [Genesis 1:31-2:3 (KJV)]

Thusly if the Sabbath as a sacred principle of nature which is the ultimate good as perfection: "And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath." [Mark 2:27 (KJV)]

It's meritorious purpose as a benefit to humankind is found firstly within the ACT TO WILL by VOLUNTĀTIS {ie. MENTALISM {#41}: #1 - WILL, FREE WILL, CHOICE as to engage within actions that endeavour to #1 - BE SOCIALLY BENEFICIAL (the Artificial Intelligence equivalent of 'DO NO EVIL?'); {\*FORMULA\* \*FOR\* \*UNIVERSAL\* \*LAW\*}} by it's remembrance and then the voluntary avoidance of **\*LABOURING\*** as the absence of any WILL TO ACT.

**H2257@{**

**@1:** Sup: 8 (**#8**); Ego: 8 (**#8**),  
**@2:** Sup: 10 (**#18**); Ego: 2 (**#10**),  
**@3:** Sup: 40 (**#58**); Ego: 30 (**#40**),  
**@4:** Sup: 41 (**#99**); Ego: 1 (**#41**),  
**Male: #99; Feme: #41**

**} // #41**

**T'AI HSÜAN CHING {POLAR OPPOSITIONS / INTERPLAY OF OPPOSITES} [4 BCE]:**

**UMBRA: #40 % #41 = #40** - Reversal, Avoiding Activity; I-Ching: **H36** - Suppression of the Light, Sinking/Darkening Light, Brilliance injured, Intelligence hidden; Tetra: **68** - Dimming;

**THOTH MEASURE: #40** - Oh Neheb-kau, who makest thy appearance at thy cavern; **\*I\* \*HAVE\* \*NO\* \*UNJUST\* \*PREFERENCES\***.

**#VIRTUE:** Law (no. #40) means to facilitate union with All-under-Heaven.

**#TOOLS: \*LABOURING\*** (no. #80) means to lack achievement despite strenuous efforts.

**#POSITION:** With **\*DUTIES\*** (no. #27), to exhaust oneself.

**#TIME:** With Fostering (no. #81), to increase oneself.

**#CANON: #228**

**ONTIC\_OBLIGANS\_228@{**

**@1:** Sup: 40 (**#40**); Ego: 40 (**#40**),

**@2:** Sup: 39 (**#79**); Ego: 80 (**#120**),

**@3:** Sup: 66 (**#145**); Ego: 27 (**#147**),

**@4:** Sup: 66 (**#211**); Ego: 81 (**#228 - I HAVE NO UNJUST**

**PREFERENCES {#40}**),

**Male: #211; Feme: #228**

**} // #228**

**#41 as [#8, #2, #30, #1] = chabal (Aramaic) (H2257): {UMBRA: #6 as #40 % #41 = #40} 1) \*HURT\*, \*DAMAGE\*, \*INJURY\*;**

"Take heed now that ye fail not to do this: why should damage {**#41 as [#8, #2, #30, #1] = chabal (Aramaic) (H2257): hurt**} grow to the hurt of the kings?" [Ezra 4:22]

Rather Kant, with this rhetorical consideration, introduces an explicitly methodological train of thought. He asks "whether the nature of the science {ie. 'OTH CYCLE of 6D x #364 = #2184 days x 49J (based seven number) = #294 x #364 = 107,016 days / 293 as TROPICAL YEARS = 365.242321 days} does not require the empirical part always to be carefully separated from the rational [of the INTELLECTUS AS GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS (ie. voluntary will)]:

"And God said, Let us make {ie.

**\*APOINT\*** AS HAVING INCEPTION OF 22 / 7 WITH A GENESIS {DAO OF NATURE (CHINESE: ZIRAN) / COURSE (GREEK: TROCHOS) OF NATURE (GREEK: GENESIS)} REPRISE UPON EQUINOX OF WEDNESDAY 20 MARCH 1996 / #0 - NEW MOON OF THURSDAY 21 MARCH 1996

} man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." [Genesis 1:26-27 (KJV)]

And he confines this question to the sub-question "Whether one is not of the opinion that it: is of the utmost necessity to work out once a pure

moral philosophy which is fully cleansed of everything that might be in any way empirical and belong to anthropology"

The passage that is introduced by this question contains, at the same time, a positive response — the thesis that there must be a "pure moral philosophy" is "self evident." And indeed for Kant this evidence arises "out of the common idea of **\*DUTY\*** and the moral law" (ibid.). Kant's cursory argumentation for this thesis is difficult to grasp. Undoubtedly, it constitutes one of the key argumentative passages of the Groundwork. [Page 6]

It is perhaps presumptuous of us at only page #6 of #323 to already be taking issue with the robustness of Kant's otherwise cogent thesis that there must be a "pure moral philosophy" which is "self evident" given that there are seven day designates within our understanding of the cosmology which is understood universally as an implicit law of nature.

**GOVERNMENT SHILL #2 (GOV.SHILL@GMAIL.COM) @ 1633 HOURS ON 25 AUGUST 2018:** "The Kantian appeal for a pure moral philosophy begins with a reference to the usefulness of the division of labor. Kant raises ... a glass and...

**YOUTUBE:** "The Philosopher's Song (Monty Python)"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=2m51s&v=PtgKkifJ0Pw>>

'IMMANUEL KANT WAS A REAL PISSANT  
WHO WAS VERY RARELY STABLE.  
HEIDEGGER, HEIDEGGER WAS A BOOZY BEGGAR  
WHO COULD THINK YOU UNDER THE TABLE.  
DAVID HUME COULD OUT CONSUME  
SCHOPENHAUER AND HEGEL,  
AND WITTGENSTEIN WAS A BEERY SWINE  
WHO WAS JUST AS SLOSHED AS SCHLEGEL.

THERE'S NOTHING NIETZSCHE COULDN'T TEACH YA  
'BOU THE RAISIN' OF THE WRIST.  
SOCRATES HIMSELF WAS PERMANENTLY PISSED.

JOHN STUART MILL, OF HIS OWN FREE WILL,  
AFTER HALF A PINT OF SHANDY WAS PARTICULARLY ILL.  
PLATO, THEY SAY, COULD STICK IT AWAY,  
'ALF A CRATE OF WHISKEY EVERY DAY!  
ARISTOTLE, ARISTOTLE WAS A BUGGER FOR THE BOTTLE,

AND HOBBS WAS FOND OF HIS DRAM.  
AND RENE DESCARTES WAS A DRUNKEN FART:  
"I DRINK, THEREFORE I AM."

YES, SOCRATES HIMSELF IS PARTICULARLY MISSED;  
A LOVELY LITTLE THINKER, BUT A BUGGER WHEN HE'S PISSED.'

24 beers in a carton. 24 hours in a day. HmMMM....."

**DOLF @ 0812 HOURS ON 26 AUGUST 2018:** "It may have escaped your notice, as is self-evident from your burlesque constipated turd 🍌 haemorrhoidal opinion that the subject we are contending with is a consideration of profound intellectual accomplishments conveyed by a book which articulates the merit as collective mind of no fewer than FOURTEEN {#14} eminent university professors:

THE COUNTRIES MOST ANTICIPATED LEGAL ADVICE HAS ARRIVED

Yes indeed my appraisal by Christoph HORN and Dieter SCHÖNECKER (Eds.) of Immanuel KANT's GROUNDWORK FOR METAPHYSICS OF MORALS (1785) has arrived at my doorstep this morning of 24 August 2108 courtesy of Australia Post.

It will be my task to read it this weekend in the hope that probity and decorum will return to the governance of this Commonwealth given its CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE:

DIEU ET MON DROIT

Whilst it is prudent to establish the starting point of necessity as to any premises for the continuity of enquiry, I recognise as my ignorance with respect to the learned as the educated and the gravitas of the subject matter to say nothing of those whom may have given their lives as something other than marsupial roadkill as RECTUS for the foundational cause—it is best to proceed with caution and in a sturdy and thoughtful manner rather than with the intoxication of self-entitlement which you bestow."

Yet for Kant this anthropological evidence arises "out of the common idea of **\*DUTY\*** and the moral law" which is also certainly self evidently a contradiction of his initial postulate that any adequate form of moral philosophy has to be 'pure', ie. both free from all empirical elements of interest, self-love, and natural feelings in the dutiful display of filial affection by VOLUNTĀTIS {CORRESPONDENCE {#82}: #2 - desire,

inclination as to engaged within actions that #2 - Don't introduce biases; {*\*FORMULA\* \*OF\* \*HUMANITY\**}

 relating to the "honour bestowed upon one's matrimonial or common law parents" which is due from a son or daughter:

**H3513@{**

**@1:** Sup: 6 (**#6**); Ego: 6 (**#6**),  
**@2:** Sup: 56 (**#62**); Ego: 50 (**#56**),  
**@3:** Sup: 76 (**#138**); Ego: 20 (**#76**),  
**@4:** Sup: 78 (**#216**); Ego: 2 (**#78**),  
**@5:** Sup: 1 (**#217**); Ego: 4 (**#82**),  
**Male: #217; Feme: #82**

**} // #82**

**T'AI HSÜAN CHING {POLAR OPPOSITIONS / INTERPLAY OF OPPOSITES} [4 BCE]:**

**UMBRA: #82 % #41 = #41** - Playing with Reversal, Sameness in Difference; I-Ching: **H26** - Great Domestication, Restraining Force, Great Accumulating, The taming power of the great, Great storage, Potential energy; Tetra: **60** - Accumulation;

**THOTH MEASURE: #41** - Oh thou of raised head, who makest thine appearance at thy cavern; **\*I\* \*HAVE\* \*NO\* \*STRONG\* \*DESIRE\* \*EXCEPT\* \*FOR\* \*MY\* \*OWN\* \*PROPERTY\***.

**#VIRTUE:**

**#TOOLS:** Fostering (no. #81) receives all the rest.

**#POSITION:** As to Resistance (no. #22), it is contradiction, but

**#TIME:** As to Unity (no. #54), it is conforming.

**#CANON: #157**

**ONTIC\_OBLIGANS\_157@{**

**@1:** Sup: 81 (**#81**); Ego: 81 (**#81**),  
**@2:** Sup: 22 (**#103**); Ego: 22 (**#103**),  
**@3:** Sup: 76 (**#179**); Ego: 54 (**#157 - I AM NOT ONE OF PRATING TONGUE {#17} / I HAVE NO STRONG DESIRE EXCEPT FOR MY OWN PROPERTY {#41}**),  
**Male: #179; Feme: #157**

**} // #157**

**#82 as [#6, #50, #20, #2, #4] = kabad (H3513): {UMBRA: #37 as #82 % #41 = #41} 1)** to be heavy, be weighty, be grievous, be hard, be rich, be honourable, be glorious, be burdensome, be honoured; **1a)**



(Qal); **1a1**) to be heavy; **1a2**) to be heavy, be insensible, be dull; **1a3**) **\*TO\* \*BE\* \*HONOURED\***; **1b**) (Niphal); **1b1**) to be made heavy, be honoured, enjoy honour, be made abundant; **1b2**) to get oneself glory or honour, gain glory; **1c**) (Piel); **1c1**) to make heavy, make dull, make insensible; **1c2**) to make honourable, honour, glorify; **1d**) (Pual) to be made honourable, be honoured; **1e**) (Hiphil); **1e1**) to make heavy; **1e2**) to make heavy, make dull, make unresponsive; **1e3**) to cause to be honoured; **1f**) (Hithpael); **1f1**) to make oneself heavy, make oneself dense, make oneself numerous; **1f2**) to honour oneself;

"And the LORD said, Because the cry of Sodom {their secret; their cement} and Gomorrah {rebellious people} is great, and because their sin is very grievous {**#82 as [#6, #50, #20, #2, #4] = kabad (H3513): honour**};" [**Genesis 18:20**]

5. (MOTHER) FORMULA OF HUMANITY AS HEAD OF STATE / \*HONOUR\*  
\*PARENTS\*

PYTHAGOREAN TETRAD: #1 + #2 = #3 as #MIND WHETHER AS  
FORMULA OF HETEROS PROGRESSION / THESIS ON IT'S HOMOIOS  
BASIS

MONAD - #1 - NATURE CONTAINS NATURE: {ALEPH (\*MOTHER\* -  
SCALES OF MERIT) / SERAPHIM {Heb. Saraph Gk. Ophis - burning, that  
is, (figuratively) poisonous (serpent); specifically a fiery (serpent) or  
symbolical creature (from their copper color)}} {ARCH KAI TELOS OIDA  
{1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10}}

TETRAD - #2 - NATURE REJOICES IN ITS NATURE: {BETH (DOUBLE - #1  
- NATURE CONTAINS NATURE {#4 - NATURE AMENDED IN ITS  
NATURE}) / CHERUBIM (Gk. Cheroubim - a cherub or imaginary figures  
which covered the mercy seat to the Ark of the Covenant [Exodus  
25:17-22] and from where God communed with Israel)}

PENTAD - #3 - NATURE SURMOUNTS NATURE: {GIMEL (DOUBLE - #2 -  
NATURE REJOICES IN ITS NATURE {#5 - ACT OF NATURE}) / THRONES  
(Gk. Thronos - a stately seat; by implication power or (concretely) a  
potentate:—seat, throne)}

+ 0, H9, H18 {ie. System's Cosmology as Earth - Formula of Humanity}

Thusly in summation, as to the problem of discernment and knowledge  
assimilation into a coherent syncretism, at this juncture in our ingestion  
of Kant's acumen as thesis, we ought to prudently reserve our further

conjectures upon any rhetorical artifices which he may of necessity deploy until we have fully considered what are the nominative descriptions applied as their grounding in explanations and the explicit nature of the underlying dialectic as its capacity and means by which Kant conveys any such postulates.

For instance, Karl Marx (5 May 1818 – 14 March 1883) and Friedrich Engels (28 November 1820 – 5 August 1895) proposed that Georg Hegel's (27 August 1770 – 14 November 1831) subsequent dialectic was too abstract. The dialect which HEGEL proposes is:

- #1 - THESIS
- #2 - ANTI-THESIS
- #3 - SYNTHESIS
- #4 - PROGRESSION

This concept of dialectics was given new life by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel as a proponent of German Idealism has been seen in the 20th century as the originator but as an explicit phrase it originated with Johann Gottlieb Fichte (28 November 1820 – 5 August 1895), whose dialectically synthetic model of nature and of history made it, as it were, a fundamental aspect of the nature of reality instead of regarding the contradictions into which dialectics leads as a sign of the sterility of the dialectical method, as Immanuel Kant was considered by many to have tended to do within his Critique of Pure Reason. [Nicholson, J. A. (1950). Philosophy of religion. New York: Ronald Press Co. Page 108]

As Walter Kaufmann (1 July 1921 – 4 September 1980) astutely affirms of Hegel's criticism of the triad model commonly misattributed to him, adding that "the only place where Hegel uses the three terms together occurs in his lectures on the history of philosophy, on the last page but one of the section on Kant—where Hegel roundly reproaches Kant for having 'EVERYWHERE POSITED THESIS, ANTITHESIS, SYNTHESIS'"

In contradiction to this Hegelian idealism, Marx presented his own dialectic method as an anthropological consideration and **SENSIBILITY** of the world, which he claims to be "direct opposite" of Hegel's method: 'My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite.' To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, ie. the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos {ie.

Substance of thing (materia, substantia: #15CE ... #34CE ... #65CE ... #111CE ... #175CE ... #260CE ... 369CE), is the means to purvey the

binary distillation so as to derive the notion of gender and spermatic attributions as bifurcated elements, so then convey the proof of its SCIENTIFIC essence of a thing (essentia, ousia: #260 ... #175 ... #65 ... #34 ... #369 ... #111 ... #15)

} of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, the idea is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind {#260}, and translated into forms of thought {#15}. [Marx, Karl. "Afterword (Second German Ed.)". Capital. 1: 14. Retrieved 28 December 2014]

That it not only shares an organisational / institutional orbital association to other regimes which are constituted by Pythagorean Perennialist / A-U-M belief systems, furthermore it has a connection to a vassal perspective {ie. **\*AS\* \*PRINCIPLE\* \*OF\* \*#AIDING\*, \*#WILLINGLY\* \*OR\* \*#UNWILLINGLY\* \*THE\* \*DISSOLUTION\* \*OF\* \*THE\* \*STATE\***} as subjugation to the mechanised autonomic transformative gnostic process of extrusion as the "different substance or hypostasis" impetus for Roman Imperial / Religious Empire Governance which pervaded throughout Europe as the world created and ruled by a lesser divinity, the demiurge as oligarch. That the oligarchy ("the rule of the few") or the ecclesiastical hierarchy adopted by Islam, the Vatican City / State and German Fascism, have often become instruments of transformation, by insisting upon monarchs ("the rule of the one") or dictators share power or giving credibility and impetus to that process of change, such as occurred by the 20 July 1933 signing of the Concordat with the German Reich, thereby opening the door to governance by other 'party' elements of society.

Where the dialectical method is itself an anthropological construct, which is at base an OPINE {ie. *hold and state as one's opinion; origin late Middle English: from Latin opinari think, believe*} as existentialism purveying a characteristic mode of quantitative expression in being essentially idiomatic:

'I THINK THEREFORE I AM'

But when, as occurs in the distillation of vodka which at a high proof is devoid of **SENSIBILITY** where all taste and odour has been eliminated making vodka a neutral spirit begging for self-entitlement, it is then sublimated into its superlative form as substantially an epitaph of merit in valedictory acceptability by an occasion of agreeability as an opportune expression of a truism, where it is formerly inducted into a Hall of Fame as a maxim life. As OSTENSIBLY being a discourse between two or more

people holding different points of view about a subject but wishing to establish the truth through reasoned arguments as its imperative:

#1 - PROGRESS

#2 - SYNTHESIS

#3 - ANTI-THESIS

#4 - THESIS

YOUTUBE: "The Script - Hall of Fame (Official Video)"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mk48xRzuNvA>>

Dialectical materialism accepts the evolution of the natural world and the emergence of new qualities of being at new stages of evolution. As Zbigniew Antoni Jordan (11 August 1911 - 6 October 1977), notes, "Engels made constant use of the metaphysical insight that the higher level of existence emerges from and has its roots in the lower; that the higher level constitutes a new order of being with its irreducible laws; and that this process of evolutionary advance is governed by laws of development which reflect basic properties of 'matter in motion as a whole'." [The Evolution of Dialectical Materialism: A Philosophical and Sociological Analysis (London: Macmillan, 1967), p 167]

Marx criticized classical materialism as another idealist philosophy—idealist because of its transhistorical understanding of material contexts. The Young Hegelian Ludwig Feuerbach had rejected Hegel's idealistic philosophy and advocated materialism. Despite being strongly influenced by Feuerbach, Marx rejected Feuerbach's version of materialism as inconsistent. The writings of Engels, especially *Anti-Dühring* (1878) and *Dialectics of Nature* (1875–82), were the source of the main doctrines of dialectical materialism.

Marx's own writings are almost exclusively concerned with understanding human history in terms of systemic processes, based on modes of production (broadly speaking, the ways in which societies are organized to employ their technological powers to interact with their material surroundings). This is called **historical materialism**. More narrowly, within the framework of this general theory of history, most of Marx's writing is devoted to an analysis of the specific structure and development of the capitalist economy.

Other scholars have argued that despite Marx's insistence that humans are natural beings in an evolving, mutual relationship with the rest of nature, Marx's own writings pay inadequate attention to the ways in

which human agency is constrained by such factors as biology, geography, and ecology.

Dialectical materialism adapts the Hegelian dialectic for traditional materialism, which examines the subjects of the world in relation to each other within a dynamic, evolutionary environment, in contrast to metaphysical materialism, which examines parts of the world within a static, isolated environment.

For his part, Engels applies a "dialectical" approach to the natural world in general, arguing that contemporary science is increasingly recognizing the necessity of viewing natural processes in terms of interconnectedness, development, and transformation. Some scholars have doubted that Engels's "dialectics of nature" is a legitimate extension of Marx's approach to social processes.

Engels exemplifies this quintessential characteristic of Pythagorean methodology of sophistry by postulating three laws of dialectics from his reading of Hegel's Science of Logic. Engels elucidated these laws as the materialist dialectic in his work Dialectics of Nature:

**THE LAW OF THE UNITY AND CONFLICT OF OPPOSITES** {MIND: #1 + #2 = #3 (PENTAD) - NATURE SURMOUNTS NATURE: {GIMEL (DOUBLE - #2 - NATURE REJOICES IN ITS NATURE {#5 - ACT OF NATURE}) / THRONES (Gk. Thronos - a stately seat; by implication power or (concretely) a potentate:—seat, throne)}}}

**THE LAW OF THE PASSAGE OF QUANTITATIVE** {ie. measure by having magnitude or spatial extent} **CHANGES INTO QUALITATIVE** {ie. determine comparative size, appearance, value and superlative forms} **CHANGES** {SCIENCE: #3 + #4 = #7 - ENGENDERING NATURE / #4 - NATURE AMENDED IN ITS NATURE: {ZAYIN / \*PRINCIPALITIES\* (Gk. \*EXOUSIA\* - (in the sense of ability); privilege, that is, (subjectively) \*force\*, capacity, competency, freedom, or (objectively) mastery (concretely magistrate, superhuman, potentate, \*token\* \*of\* \*control\*), delegated influence:—authority, jurisdiction, liberty, power, right, strength)}}}

**THE LAW OF THE NEGATION OF THE NEGATION** {OPINION: #5 + #6 = #11 (HEPTAD) - TRANSFORMING NATURE: {KAF (DOUBLE - #4 - NATURE AMENDED IN ITS NATURE {#7 - ENGENDERING NATURE}) / Government & Non-Government Organisations}}}

That the dialectic method is therefore understood as being a process of

determined **SENSIBILITY** where the product is "enlightenment, whereby the philosopher is educated so as to achieve knowledge of the supreme good, the Form of the Good." {SENSE: #7 + #8 = #15 - NATURE SURMOUNTS NATURE: {SAMEK}}

Accordingly dialectical materialism is understood as an aspect of the broader subject of materialism, which asserts the primacy of the material world: in short, matter precedes thought. Materialism is a realist philosophy of science, which holds that the world is material; that all phenomena in the universe consist of "matter in motion," wherein all things are interdependent and interconnected and develop according to natural law; that the world exists outside us and independently of our perception of it; that thought is a reflection of the material world in the brain, and that the world is in principle knowable.

However within the third chapter of the "Analytic of Principles," on phenomena and noumena, Kant in Critique of Pure Reason (1781 and second edition 1787) emphasizes that because the categories must always be applied to data provided by **SENSIBILITY** in order to provide cognition, and because the data of **SENSIBILITY** are structured by the transcendently ideal forms of intuition, the categories give us knowledge only of things as they appear with sensibility ("phenomena," literally "that which appears").

Although through pure understanding (**nous** in Greek) we may think of objects independently of their being given in sensibility, we can never cognize them as such non-sensible entities ("noumena," literally "that which is thought" as a subject of some 112 mentions). The meaning of Kant's use of the term "phenomena" is self-evident, but the meaning of "noumena" is not, since it literally means not "things as they are in dependently of appearing to us" but something more like "things as they are understood by pure thought." Yet Kant appears to deny that the human understanding can comprehend things in the latter way."

<<http://www.grapple369.com/docs/kant-first-critique-cambridge.pdf>>

Thus I am proffering an informed and reasoned opinion as that which Immanuel Kant states is an impossibility for a human being to accomplish by transcendent sapiential thought and capably demonstrate it's temporal congruence as coherence by a mathematical theoretical noumenon as an Intellectual Property which Immanuel Kant himself calls noumena as the proof of a valid and rational concept attained by pure thought.

Whilst the HOMOIOS ternary conception of the THEORY OF NUMBER is in

all probability a **SENSIBILITY** of which Immanuel Kant appears cognisant and that is exemplified by the conveyance of them as explicit meta-prototype descriptors within the formative construct of his CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE postulates { #1 - Formula of Universal Law / #2 - Formula of Humanity / #3 - Formula of Autonomy } conveyed within his Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals (1785) / Critique of Pure Reason (1781 / 1787) it is then a conundrum as to commensurability of his articulation in rationally deriving the purest and logical essence of being and whether his anthropocentric reality still deploys a counterfactual and impractical intuition which is provisioned by the genitive prescriptive or the biological normative propositions as imposition made by an encapsulated dialectic:

**PROGRESSION:** Lesser Yin (shaoyin: West / Autumn / Metal)  
+ 0, H27 - YI [Nourishment / ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) below + GEN (ie. #8 - Transforming Nature) above], H54 - GUIMEI [\*MARRYING\* \*MAID\* / DUI (ie. #7 - Engendering Nature) below + ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) above] {ie. **Realm of its Nature as Heaven - Formula of Universal Law**}

**SYNTHESIS:** Greater Yin (taiyin: North / Winter / Water and which also refers to the Moon)  
+ 0, H9 - XIAOXU [Lesser Domestication/QIAN (ie. #6 - Form of Nature) below + SUN (ie. #4- Nature Amended in its Nature) above], H18 - GU [Ills to Be Cured / SUN (ie. #4- Nature Amended in its Nature) below + GEN (ie. #8 - Transforming Nature) above] {ie. **System's Cosmology as Earth - Formula of Humanity**}

**ANTI-THESIS:** Lesser Yang (shaoyang: East / Spring / Wood)  
+ 0, H3 - ZHUN [Birth Throws / ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) below + KAN (ie. #1 - Nature Contains Nature) above] as 'fundamentality [yuan], prevalence [heng], fitness [li] and constancy [zhen]', H6 - SONG / \*JIHAD\*? [Contention/KAN (ie. #1 - Nature Contains Nature) below + QIAN (ie. #6 - Form of Nature) above] {ie. **Self identity as Sea - Formula of Autonomy**}

**THESIS:** Greater Yang (taiyang: South / Summer / Fire and which also refers to the Sun)  
+ H1 - \*MONAD\*: QIAN [Pure Yang / QIAN (ie. #6 - Form of Nature) above + QIAN (ie. #6 - Form of Nature) below] as MALE, H2 - \*DUAD\*: KUN [Pure Yin / KUN (ie. #2 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature) above + KUN (ie. #2 - Nature Rejoices in its Nature) below] as FEMALE, H3 - \*TRIAD\*: ZHUN [Birth Throws / ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) below + KAN (ie. #1 - Nature Contains Nature) above] {ie. **Fountains as**

## Formula of Progression of individual phenomena}

= TETRAGRAMMATON HIERARCHY VALUE AS HOMOIOS THEORY OF \*NUMBER\*.

+ 0, 81,  $9(9^2+1)/2 = \#369$  {ie. ORGANIZATION OF THE MYRIAD OR \*NUMBER\* OF THINGS (WAN WU) OF SOCIETY AND NATURE}

The consideration is then one of criteria basis upon which the anthropological conceptional notion of its sapient freedom {Humanity / Autonomy} is formulated as either a binomial methodology by a TRANSFORMATIVE PROTOTYPE applied as an encapsulation of an anti-theoretical anthropocentric identity

**JEWISH VIEW:** H54 - GUIMEI [Marrying Maid / DUI (ie. #7 - Engendering Nature) below + ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) above] {ie. **Realm of its Nature as Heaven - Formula of Universal Law**} + H18 - GU [Ills to Be Cured / SUN (ie. #4 - Nature Amended in its Nature) below + GEN (ie. #8 - Transforming Nature) above] {ie. **System's Cosmology as Earth - Formula of Humanity**} = #72 - Self-Love, Holding Oneself Dear; I-Ching: H39 - Adversity, Obstacles, Limping, Obstruction, Afoot; Tetra: 79 - Difficulties)

**GENTILE VIEW:** H27 - YI [Nourishment / ZHEN (ie. #3 - Nature Surmounts Nature) below + GEN (ie. #8 - Transforming Nature) above] {ie. **Realm of its Nature as Heaven - Formula of Universal Law**} + H9 - XIAOXU [Lesser Domestication / QIAN (ie. #6 - Form of Nature) below + SUN (ie. #4 - Nature is Amended in its Nature) above] {ie. **System's Cosmology as Earth - Formula of Humanity**} = H36 - MINGYI [Suppression of the Light / LI (ie. #9 - Autonomous Nature) below + KUN (ie. #1 - Nature Contains Nature) above])"

Nevertheless when this trinomial HOMOIOS {#81 bits} ontological conception of #NUMBER deploys a binomial {64 bits} encapsulation as artifice it then introduces a logical contradiction {H54 + H18 + H6 + H3 = #81} within it's DISCRIMINATING NORM and the SOCIETAL ORDER of things by an incommensurability made against the proprietary, propriety and probity as the viability of SUI JURIS / MEMBRUM VIRILE which properly is the paradigmatic providence and \*ONTIC\* necessity {H27 + H9 + H3 + H2 = #41} as a SOVEREIGN and central characteristic within the Formula of Autonomy by its purveyance of permissibility only within the construct of an INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMY in deployment of a TRANSFORMATIVE PROTOTYPE AS CANON OF TRANSPOSITION within the bifurcated HETEROS {@1 - GENDER {MARRIAGE} / @5 - PHALLUS



{HERITAGE} conception of #NUMBER as the philosophical basis to its methodology since the MOBIUS '8' LOOP OF PYTHAGOREAN SOPHISTRY AS WISDOM SO CALLED is not homoiotic as anthropocentric but rather "homeomorphic to a circle".

Obviously, one can draw the parallel here to the modern terminological distinction between such Formula of Universal Law descriptive statements made against the Formula of Humanity which present an account on how the cosmology of world is being similarly analogous to the LIMITED {#9 - JUXTAPOSITION CONTROL AS DAEMONIC IMPERATIVE OF GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS / SEMINAL REASON GENERALLY DETERMINED FROM BIRTH} and the normative statements presenting an evaluative account, or an account of how the syncretic world should be as existentially the UNLIMITED {#72 - ANTHROPOCENTRIC PROTOTYPE} in being optimally something that should be lived up to; or that should be pursued.

Thusly having given a preliminary definition to our anthropocentric criteria as impetus for enquiry, we will now consider the practicality of Kant's reasoning and whether his Categorical Imperative is truly free of the strictures which is the Latin worldview of perennial biological duality as the HETEROS viability of things "independently of their appearing to us" and whether there is to be deduced by a HOMOIOS noumena modality as the vital basis for a singularity of existence by which humanity is rationally capable of conceiving "things as they are understood by pure thought."

- dolf

SEE ALSO: "(SYNCRETIC DRAFT: 25 AUGUST 2018) WHAT IS A METAPHYSICS OF MORALS: #56 - TARGETED RELIGIOUS #312 - HATRED, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THEFT AND SLANDER BY MISNOMERED PIETY WITHIN SAINT ANDREWS CAUSE CÉLÈBRE AS BOER / ANZAC DEFAMATION?"

<<http://www.grapple369.com/docs/Augustus.pdf>>

Initial Post: 25 August 2018