

There were several reasons which prevented Kant from destroying the remnant of reality which he assigned to external things. When it was pointed out to him by some of his critics that the logical consequence of his doctrine would be to negative altogether the conception of Things in themselves, and that this would lead inevitably to the position taken up by Berkeley, he strongly objected to the statement, maintaining that this would be leading back to the position of idealism, the refutation of which was one of the main objects of his critical philosophy. Whilst he insisted that all we know about things was what followed from our own sensuous and

11.  
His objec-  
tion to  
Idealism.

conception. An analysis of external phenomena (Kant) or of experience in general (Spencer) seems to leave an unexhausted Something without which neither the Unity, nor the "Together," nor the immediate evidence of phenomena, can be explained. We seem to have lost the kernel of reality and to grasp only the shell. Examples of a similarly unsatisfactory state of knowledge are, however, so to speak, of daily occurrence. A prominent example is the impossibility of defining life, that Something which distinguishes a dead from a living organism. We seem to grasp this only by the synoptical function of some sense, be this lower or higher, physical or spiritual. It can, so to speak, only be seen and experienced but not reproduced by any synthetic action of the intellect. A more serious objection attaches to Kant's Unknowable which does not in the same degree apply to that of Spencer. It recurs again in dealing with Schopenhauer's doctrine. Both Kant and Schopenhauer, following Hume, consider Causation as a subjective form or habit of

thought, but they nevertheless—as Jacobi had pointed out in dealing with Kant's view—apply this category to the "Unknowable Thing in Itself" which lies, as it were, beyond or beneath the region of experience, whereas causation refers only—it is maintained—to things as they appear. A third objection which has been urged against Kant's Unknowable, and which does not apply to that of Spencer, is this: that Kant does not only speak of the Thing in itself, but goes even the length of speaking of Things in themselves. This plural is, as Lotze amongst others has remarked, quite unjustifiable, as no reason exists to conceive of the Unknown as a plurality and not as a unity. In fact, as the former error consisted in transferring and applying the phenomenal category of causation to that which is supposed not to enter into the phenomenal world at all, so, in the other instance, the error arises through tacitly applying distinction which depend on time and space to a content which is supposed to be outside of time and space.