

— GNOSIS EX MACHINA {#2184}: @6 - PRINCIPLE OF ENQUIRY {#364}; @7 - PRINCIPLE OF CONTRADICTION {#312}; @8 - PRINCIPLE OF SYNCRETIC SUCCESSION {#273}

(c) 2018 Dolf Leendert Boek, Revision: 21 December, 2018

Q. #41 - TO BE OR #81 - NOT TO BE THAT IS THE #364 - QUESTION?

— INTELLECTUS AS GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS —

"TO BE SURE, TO BE SURE.
A THINKING PROCESS.
THE MIND TO ACCESS.
TAKES SOME TIME.
FOR THE SUBLIME {@379 / @350 - SEE KANT'S PROLEGOMENA
IDEA}.
AND AGES ENDURE."

YOUTUBE: "To Be Or Not To Be - Hamlet - David Tennant (HD)"

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1u8OIUS7BhU>>

IMMANUEL KANT'S (1783 - *APRIORITY* *TO* *FRENCH* *REVOLUTION*) PROLEGOMENA TO ANY FUTURE METAPHYSICS THAT WILL BE ABLE TO PRESENT ITSELF AS A SCIENCE" FOR FACILITATING #492 - AUTONOMOUS FREE WILL / #390 - SOVEREIGNTY DYNAMIC BY #391 - HOMOGENEOUS REGARD FOR #902 - RULE OF LAW IN SUSTAINABILITY OF THE IDEA @329 APPLICABLE TO #390 - BRITISH CROWN (CALENDAR (NEW STYLE) ACT 1750 / ROYAL ASSENT: 27 MAY 1751) / AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE (4 JULY 1776)} WHICH IS COMPLIANT WITH JURISPRUDENCE AS A CAPACITY TO FRAME LEGISLATION DEFINING PROTECTIONS AGAINST AUTONOMY IT BECOMES IN THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF #343 - RIGHTS OF SUCCESSION (TELOS), A TREASONOUS TRANSGRESSION AGAINST THE DIGNITY ROYAL AS SUI JURIS / MEMBRUM VIRILE #390 - SOVEREIGN ENTITLEMENT.

PROLEGOMENA SECTION #56 - GENERAL NOTE TO THE TRANSCENDENTAL AS IDEA: @350: "The objects that are given to us through experience are incomprehensible to us in many respects, and there are many questions to which **#2184 - *NATURAL* *LAW***

[**IDEA: @349**] carries us, which, if pursued to a certain height (yet always in conformity with those laws) cannot be solved at all; e.g., how pieces of matter attract one another. But ***IF* *WE* *COMPLETELY* *ABANDON* *NATURE*, *OR* *TRANSCEND* *ALL* *POSSIBLE* *EXPERIENCE* *IN* *ADVANCING* *THE* *CONNECTION* *OF* *NATURE* *AND* *SO* *LOSE* *OURSELVES* *IN* *MERE* *IDEAS*, *THEN* *WE* *ARE* *UNABLE* *TO* *SAY* *THAT* *THE* *OBJECT* *IS* *INCOMPREHENSIBLE* *TO* *US* *AND* *THAT* *THE* *NATURE* *OF* *THINGS* *PRESENTS* *US* *WITH* *UNSOLVABLE* *PROBLEMS***; for then we are not concerned with nature or in general with objects that are given, but merely with concepts that have their origin solely in our reason, and with mere beings of thought, with respect to which all problems, which must originate from the concepts of those very beings, can be solved, since reason certainly can and must be held fully accountable for its own proceedings.

Because ***THE* *PSYCHOLOGICAL*, *COSMOLOGICAL*, *AND* *THEOLOGICAL* *IDEAS* *ARE* *NOTHING* *BUT* *PURE* *CONCEPTS* *OF* *REASON***, which cannot be given in any experience, the questions that reason puts before us with respect to them are not set for us through objects, but rather through mere maxims of reason for the sake of its self-satisfaction, and these questions must one and all be capable of sufficient answer – which occurs by its being shown that they are principles for bringing the use of our understanding into thoroughgoing harmony, completeness, and synthetic unity, and to that extent are valid only for experience, though in the *totality* of that experience. But although an absolute totality of experience is not possible, nonetheless the idea of a totality of cognition according to principles in general is what alone can provide it with a special kind of unity, namely that of a system, without which unity our cognition is nothing but piecework and cannot be used for the highest end (which is nothing other than the [**IDEA: @350**] system of all ends); and here I mean not only the practical use of reason, but also the highest end of its speculative use.

Therefore the transcendental ideas express the peculiar vocation of

reason, namely to be a principle of the systematic unity of the use of the understanding. But if one looks upon this unity in the manner of cognition as if it were inhering in the object of cognition, if one takes that which really is only *regulative* to be *constitutive*, and becomes convinced that by means of these ideas one's knowledge can be expanded far beyond all possible experience, hence can be expanded transcendentally, even though this unity serves only to bring experience in itself as near as possible to completeness (i.e., to have its advance constrained by nothing that cannot belong to experience), then this is a mere misunderstanding in judging the true vocation of our reason and its principles, and it is a dialectic, which partly confounds the use of reason in experience, and partly divides reason against itself. [CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, IMMANUEL KANT'S PROLEGOMENA (1783), pages 100 - 101]

PROLEGOMENA IDEA: @379: "There is still a great deal needed for a learned gazette, however well-chosen [**IDEA: @378**] and carefully selected its contributors may be, to be able to uphold its otherwise well-deserved reputation in the field of metaphysics just as elsewhere. Other sciences and areas of learning have their standards. Mathematics has its standard within itself, history and theology in secular or sacred books, natural science and medicine in mathematics and experience, jurisprudence in law books, and even matters of taste in ancient paradigms. But in order to assess the thing called metaphysics, the standard must first be found (I have made an attempt to determine this standard as well as its use). Until it is ascertained, what is to be done when works of this kind must be judged? If they are of the dogmatic kind, one may do as one likes; no one will for long play the master over others in this without finding someone who repays him in kind. But if they are of the critical kind, and indeed not with regard to other writings but to reason itself, so that the standard of appraisal cannot be already assumed but must first be sought: then objection and censure are not to be forbidden, but they must be rooted in tolerance, since the need is common to us all, and the lack of the required insight makes an air of judicial decisiveness unsuitable.

But in order at the same time to tie this my defense to the interest of the

philosophizing community, I propose a test, which is decisive as to the way in which all metaphysical investigations must be directed toward their common end. This is nothing else than what mathematicians have done before, in order to decide the merits of their methods in a contest – that is, a challenge to my reviewer to prove in his own way any single truly metaphysical (i.e., synthetic, and cognized *a priori* from concepts) proposition he holds, and at best one of the most indispensable, such as the principle of the persistence of substance or of the necessary determination of the events in the world through their cause – but, as is fitting, to prove it on *a priori* grounds. If he can't do this (and silence is confession), then he must admit: that, since metaphysics is absolutely nothing without the apodictic certainty of propositions of this sort, their possibility or [IDEA: @379] impossibility would first, be fore all else, have to be settled in a critique of pure reason, and hence he is obliged either to acknowledge that my principles of critique are correct or to prove their invalidity. Since, however, I already foresee that, as heedlessly as he has hitherto been relying on the certainty of his principles, still, now that it comes down to a rigorous test, he will not find a single principle in the whole compass of metaphysics with which he can dare come forward, I will therefore grant him the most favourable terms that can ever be expected in a competition; namely, I will take the *onus probandi* ('Burden Of Proof') from him and will have it put on me. [CAMBRIDGE TEXTS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, IMMANUEL KANT'S PROLEGOMENA (1783), pages: 129-130]



<<http://www.grapple369.com/images/HOSPITABILITY.PNG>>

**@1 {#451 - INCEPTION} +
@2 {#41 - AN ETHICAL / MORAL PRESCRIPTION "HAS TO CARRY
ABSOLUTE [#41 - *ONTIC* X n] NECESSITY WITH IT" WHICH
IMPLIES A TRINOMIAL WORLDVIEW} EQUALS
@3 {#492 - VOLUNTARY FREE WILL IN THE EXERCISE OF THE
INTELLECTUS AS GENITIVE VOLUNTĀTIS: #205 🌀 #164} +**

@4 {#123 - JUDGEMENT SENSIBILITY} EQUALS

**@10 {#615 - TO PRONOUNCE JUDGMENT AND TO SUBJECT TO
PROCEDURES / #41 = #15}**

[http://www.grapple369.com/Groundwork/
Sale%20Hospital%2020181219.pdf](http://www.grapple369.com/Groundwork/Sale%20Hospital%2020181219.pdf)

MECHANISM TO ACTIVATE AS TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION QUEEN
VICTORIA'S {@66}

LETTERS PATENT 29 OCTOBER 1900 FOR AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION AND
SECURING {@69}

THE AUTONOMY / SOVEREIGN DYNAMIC AS TRANSCENDENT
JUXTAPOSITION PRINCIPLE {@72}

**IMMANUEL KANT'S PROLEGOMENA (1783 - *APRIORITY* *TO*
FRENCH *REVOLUTION*) IDEA @A145:** "The schema of possibility
is the agreement of the synthesis of various representations with the
conditions of time in general (e.g., that opposites cannot occur
simultaneously in one thing, but only one after another), therefore the
determination of the representation of a thing to any time whatsoever.

The schema of reality is existence in a determinate time.

The schema of necessity is the existence of an object for all time.

One can now see from all this what the schema of each category contains

and makes representable: the schema of magnitude, the production (synthesis) of time itself in the successive apprehension of an object; the schema of quality, the synthesis of sensation (perception) ***WITH*
THE *REPRESENTATION* *OF* *TIME*, *OR* *THE*
FILLING *OF* *TIME*;
THAT *OF* *RELATION*, *THE*
RELATION *OF* *PERCEPTIONS* *AMONG* *THEMSELVES*
AT *ALL* *TIMES* (I.E., *ACCORDING* *TO* *A* *RULE*
OF *TIME*-*DETERMINATION*); *FINALLY*, *THE* *SCHEMA*
OF *MODALITY* *AND* *ITS* *CATEGORIES*, *TIME*
ITSELF, *AS* *THE* *CORRELATE* *OF* *THE*
DETERMINATION *OF* *WHETHER* *AND* *HOW* *AN*
OBJECT *BELONGS* *TO* *TIME***. The schemata are therefore nothing but time-determinations a priori in accordance with rules, and these refer in the order of the categories to the time-series, the time-content, the time-order, and finally the time-totality with respect to all possible objects. [pages 176-177]

THERE ARE THREE 'FROM TIME TO TIME' CLAUSES WITHIN THE LETTERS PATENT AS THE ORDINANCE OF #451 - JUSTICE FACULTY WITHIN TRINOMIAL SAPIENT NOTION #902 - RULE OF LAW

APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNOR GENERAL' AS ANTHROPOLOGIC HOMOGENEOUS PRINCIPLE {@2184}:}

And whereas We did on the 17th day of September, 1900, by and with the advice {#492 - **VOLUNTARY FREE WILL (LIBERTÉ {17 SEPTEMBER 1900}: #12 X #41)}**} of Our Privy Council declare by proclamation that, on and after the 1st day of January, 1901, the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania and also Western Australia, should be united {#391 - **HOMOGENEOUS PRINCIPLES (FRATERNITÉ {29 OCTOBER 1900})}**} in a Federal Commonwealth of Australia:

#231 - JUXTAPOSITION CONTROL (ANKH BINOMIAL HETEROS / TORAH PROTOTYPES OF THE PERENNIALIST ECONOMY)@{

@1: Sup: 81 (**#81**); Ego: 81 (**#81**),

@2: Sup: 78 (**#159**); Ego: 78 (**#159**),

@3: Sup: 72 (**#231 - *AT* *THE* *GOING* *DOWN* *OF***

***THE* *SUN* *AND* *IN* *THE* *MORNING*); Ego: 75 (#234),
@4: Sup: 71 (#302); Ego: 80 (#314),
@5: Sup: 67 (#369 - #9 X #41); Ego: 77 (#391 - *ANTAGONISM*
WITH #902 - RULE OF LAW (EGALITÉ {9 JULY 1900}: #22 x
#41 AS *ONTIC* NECESSITY COMPRISING A SUBSET OF 21
CONSONANTS WITH #VOWELS OF SEMITIC ORIGINS), #492 -
VOLUNTARY FREE WILL (LIBERTÉ {17 SEPTEMBER 1900}: #12 X
#41), and #391 - HOMOGENEOUS PRINCIPLES (FRATERNITÉ {29
OCTOBER 1900}) OF QUEEN VICTORIA'S LETTERS PATENT TO THE
FEDERATION OF THE AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH 1901),
@6: Sup: 60 (#429); Ego: 74 (#465),
@7: Sup: 58 (#487); Ego: 79 (#544),
@8: Sup: 53 (#540); Ego: 76 (#620),
@9: Sup: 45 (#585); Ego: 73 (#693),
Male: #585; Feme: #693
}**

And whereas by the said recited Act {#902 - RULE OF LAW (EGALITÉ {9 JULY 1900}: #22 x #41 AS *ONTIC* NECESSITY COMPRISING A SUBSET OF 21 CONSONANTS WITH #VOWELS OF SEMITIC ORIGINS} certain POWERS, FUNCTIONS, and AUTHORITIES were declared to be vested in the Governor General: And whereas We are desirous of making effectual and permanent provision for the office of Governor General and Commander in chief in and over Our said Commonwealth of Australia, without making new Letters Patent on each demise of the said office. Now know ye that We have thought fit to constitute, ORDER, and DECLARE, and do by these PRESENTS CONSTITUTE ORDER, and DECLARE, that there shall be a Governor General and Commander in Chief (hereinafter called the Governor General) in and over Our Commonwealth of Australia (hereinafter called Our said Commonwealth), and that the person who shall fill the said office of Governor General shall be FROM TIME TO TIME APPOINTED by Commission under Our Sign Manual and Signet.

SECTION VIII AS PRINCIPLE OF JUXTAPOSITION:

@1 - SOVEREIGNTY: SECTION VIII TO QUEEN VICTORIA'S LETTERS

PATENT 29 OCTOBER 1900: #27 + #54 = #81

VIII - And We do hereby REQUIRE and COMMAND ALL OUR OFFICERS AND MINISTERS, CIVIL AND MILITARY, AND ALL OTHER THE INHABITANTS of Our said Commonwealth TO BE OBEDIENT, AIDING, AND ASSISTING unto Our said Governor General, or, in the event of his death, INCAPACITY, or absence, to such person or persons as may, FROM TIME TO TIME, under the PROVISIONS OF THESE OUR LETTERS PATENT, ADMINISTER THE GOVERNMENT of Our said Commonwealth.

SECTION IX AS PRINCIPLE OF CONTINUITY:

@5 - SUCCESSIVE PRINCIPLE: SECTION IX TO QUEEN VICTORIA'S LETTERS PATENT 29 OCTOBER 1900: #9 + #18 = #27

IX - And We do hereby reserve to Ourselves Our heirs and SUCCESSORS, FULL POWER AND AUTHORITY FROM TIME TO TIME TO REVOKE, ALTER, OR AMEND these Our Letters Patent, as to Us or THEM SHALL SEEM MEET.

The informal research into the TIME to TIME question which I have in relation to knowledge pragmatics and the spacial dynamic of speech itself which is evident by an arbitrary truncation of the text in @1, @2, @3 segments:

MECHANISM TO ACTIVATE AS TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION QUEEN VICTORIA'S {@1: Sup: 25 (**#25**); Ego: 53 (**#53**)}

LETTERS PATENT 29 OCTOBER 1900 FOR AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION AND SECURING {@2: Sup: 13 (**#38**); Ego: 65 (**#118**)}

THE AUTONOMY /SOVEREIGN DYNAMIC AS TRANSCENDENT JUXTAPOSITION PRINCIPLE {@3: Sup: 4 (**#42**); Ego: 27 (**#145**)}

Is whether other proportions to % #41 / % #81 can be used or whether this is only an ordinal construct or also a question of magnitude by any designated length such as % 72 line length as an innate anthropogenic capacity:

Could I for instance make an #2184 {#24 x #7 x #13 as either:

#6 x #364 - PRINCIPLE OF ENQUIRY

#7 x #312 - PRINCIPLE OF CONTRADICTION

#8 x #273 - PRINCIPLE OF SYNCRETIC SUCCESSION

} APPRAISAL of any intuited fluidity, capacity or propensity for truth telling by deploying vEVENT categories #432 which conveys the propositional factoid of a common ISOPSEPHIC {ie. **isos** meaning 'equal' and **psephos** meaning 'pebble'; The Hebrew word for 'pebble' is tz'ror – and it happens that this word also means 'bond'} association whereby the propensity for violence increases where there is a lack of any truth content as a depreciated integrity between persons:

#432 - VIOLENCE PROPENSITY as [#5, #80, #10, #300, #10, #9, #8, #10]

#432 - TRUTH QUOTIENT as [#40, #1, #300, #1, #10, #70, #10]

This category #432 as #5, #80, #10, #300, #10, #9, #8, #10 = epitithemi (G2007): {#10 as #472} 1) in the active voice; 2) in the middle voice; 1a) to put or lay upon; 1b) to add to; 2a) *TO* *HAVE* *PUT* *ON*, *BID* *TO* *BE* *LAID* *ON*; 2b) *TO* *LAY* *OR* *THROW* *ONE'S* *SELF* *UPON*; 2c) *TO* *ATTACK* *ONE*, *TO* *MAKE* *AN* *ASSAULT* *ON* *ONE*;

[#5, {@1: Sup: 5 (#5); Ego: 5 (#5)}

#80, {@2: Sup: 4 (#9); Ego: 80 (#85)}

#10, {@3: Sup: 14 (#23); Ego: 10 (#95)}

#300, {@4: Sup: 71 (#94); Ego: 57 (#152)}

#10, {@5: Sup: 81 (#175 - I AM NOT A TRANSGRESSOR {%22}); Ego: 10 (#162)}

#9, {@6: Sup: 9 (#184 - I PUT NO CHECK UPON THE WATER IN ITS FLOW {%36});

Ego: 9 (#171 - I AM NOT UNCHASTE WITH ANY ONE {%20})}
#8, {@7: Sup: 17 (#201); Ego: 8 (#179)}
#10] {@8: Sup: 27 (#228 - I HAVE NO UNJUST PREFERENCES {%40});
Ego: 10 (#189)}

Tells me that a person might have loyalty and empathy with the person whom assaulted me.

The lack of truth and waste of time is conveyed by this category #432 as [#40, #1, #300, #1, #10, #70, #10] = mataios (G3152): {#11 as #622} 1) *DEVOID* *OF* *FORCE*, *TRUTH*, *SUCCESS*, *RESULT*;
2) *USELESS*, *OF* *NO* *PURPOSE*;

[#40, {@1: Sup: 40 (#40); Ego: 40 (#40)}
#1, {@2: Sup: 41 (#81); Ego: 1 (#41)}
#300, {@3: Sup: 17 (#98); Ego: 57 (#98)}
#1, {@4: Sup: 18 (#116); Ego: 1 (#99)}
#10, {@5: Sup: 28 (#144); Ego: 10 (#109)}
#70, {@6: Sup: 17 (#161 - I AM NOT A TELLER OF LIES {%9}); Ego: 70 (#179)}
#10] {@7: Sup: 27 (#188); Ego: 10 (#189)}

So what methodology ought I then deploy to resolve such propensity against any given narrative.

a) whole of narrative approach made against the #432 - GNOMIC IMPERATIVE INSTRUCTION SET

b) a twining approach to the whole of narrative where the % #432 segmentation is made against the GNOMIC IMPERATIVE INSTRUCTION SET

c) Can then the propensity for a conditional vEVENT: #432 be said to occur when the threshold criteria of probability associated to the ONTIC_OBLIGANS such as @161 - I AM NOT A TELLER OF LIES {%9} is sufficiently high as the requisite specific #41 - ONTIC necessity CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE HOT ZONES which are transmitted and

accumulated by the narrative;

d) That such core sapient functions may have then applied a taxable as transactional revenue opportunity which is shared between participating #390 - SOVEREIGN nations.

HUME (died 25 August 1776, Edinburgh) had raised objections to the notions of equality and congruence (among others) in geometry, which objections appealed to experience (Treatise, i.ii.4.4, pp. 42–53), thereby subjecting mathematics to experience, and whereby he also

INCORRECTLY rejected **THE CONCEPTION THAT MATHEMATICS CONSIDERS ITS OBJECTS INDEPENDENTLY OF THEIR EXISTENCE IN NATURE:**

GNOSIS EX MACHINA {#2184}: @6 - PRINCIPLE OF ENQUIRY {#364}; @7 - PRINCIPLE OF CONTRADICTION {#312}; @8 - PRINCIPLE OF SYNCRETIC SUCCESSION {#273}

#2184 - (#390 + #312 + #390) = #1092 as 'OTH CYCLE of 3 x #364 / 4 = #273 - *MOMENT*

As an IDEA that the **#2184 - NATURE AND SO TO SPEAK THE *LEGAL* *CONSTITUTION* *OF* *THIS* *PROVINCE* *OUGHT* *REST* *ON* *COMPLETELY* *DIFFERENT* *PRINCIPLES***, namely solely on the principle of **#312 - CONTRADICTION:**



#364 - ADMITTANCE +

#312 - RESISTANCE {*WITHERED* *STATE* WREATHS* / RUSSIAN CONTRADICTIONS ON NOVICHOK #274 - PERFUME POISONING} +

#728 - REACTANCE {8 x #91} +

#390 - BRITISH CROWN (CALENDAR (NEW STYLE) ACT 1750 / ROYAL ASSENT: 27 MAY 1751) / AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE (4 JULY 1776) +

#390 - *WREATHS* / ROBBERS / EXTORTION = #2184 {#24 x #7 x #13 - PRIESTLY SERVICE DIVISIONS TO JERUSALEM TEMPLE FROM 1550 BCE - [LUKE 1:5]}

If this trinomial #NUMBER paradigm image of Jewish / Christian / DAOist sapient identity: #369 = #205  /  #164 as empire governance occasioning #41 - ontic necessity of moral prescriptions existed in 4 BCE {#81 = 17 to 21 December} then ISIS is defeated because they are only a binomial {#ALLAH: 9-1-7-3-5 / #ALLAT: 8-2-6-4} methodology as notion of #NUMBER.

- dolf

The various PDF resources being essays as work in progress notations for the prospect of producing a viable syncretism with Immanuel Kant's Ground Work for the Metaphysics of Morals are now available within the directory:

<<http://www.grapple369.com/Groundwork/>>

Initial Post: 21 December 2018