

44800DTE060 – translation by R. Doran

Accept responsibility for judging

Judgment: Yes, Yes, No, No

It is not a complex of terms: in an opinion related to someone  
in a hypothesis  
in a story  
but an absolute positing of the complex of terms: I am a man  
or of a simple term: I am

Responsibility: non moral properly, universally, because morality itself supposes some judgments

but intellectual: La Rochefoucauld  
everyone complains about his memory  
nobody about his judgment  
Memory does not seem to be in our power  
Judgment is: we can say Yes, No, I don't know, certainly, probably

[page 2]

The importance of this rule

- avoidance of this responsibility arises in various sources
- mechanization of knowledge / omission of the subject
  - we see things
  - concepts correspond to things
  - we see the nexus between concepts
  - we conclude from the seen nexus
  - judgment is superfluous
  - it is assent to what was known before judgment

this is false

- because understanding precedes concepts
- understanding is multiple
- concepts of themselves are not knowledge
- but thought
- (1) whether universals are real
- (2) whether particular sensible things [?] are real and possible
- (3) whether there is given ??
- (4) whether ???
- (5) whether there is given pure reason

whether An sit + Est

one does not move from thought to knowledge

[page 3]

Exaggerated objectivism: symbolic logical tendencies

but there are many  
propositions are objectively true  
demonstrations are objectively valid  
as if there is truth without a mind / scientific faith  
what God reveals is true  
this has truly been revealed  
therefore, this is true  
as if there is demonstration without a mind  
a process that is not rational but objective  
in which process there is required the responsibility of judging

Objection: the matter is not demonstrated

= a thing is not known without a knower

[page 4]

False notion of science:

(1) science is of the necessary

in fact finite essences are contingent

that there are these essences and not others somewhat different is contingent

that God exists is necessary quoad so

quoad nos: those things are contingent that exist, that ?, that we can

deduce, that we do in fact deduce

(2) scienc is about what is known by everyone [?]

(a) in natural things: *in facto esse* trans

*in fieri* it is denied

illegible

(b) in humans affairs subjectivity has a further importance

Catholic history

Protestant history

about the same things

agnostic history

??

??

Are they the same history as they would be the same math, physics, chemistry?

(c) there is an underlying flight from scientific individualism

to a common mentality

indifferentiation in which not so much the individual as the tribe thinks, judges,

discerns

(d) there is a complication in theology – wisdom judges about the divine: human wisdom,  
no; divine [?] wisdom, yes

[page 5]

(3) empiricism, positivism, intuitionism

science is about data, neglecting all understanding

(1) in fact if it is neglected, it ?

(2) we are able to judge more truly the better and more fully we understand

(3) intention of existence

It seems OK - ????

(4) Kantianism

(a) rejects intuitionism – phenomenalism ?? Berkeley

Illegible

thing in itself is unknowable

is conceptualism: it says what we know

(b) phenomena: a priori forms of sensibility

schematism

categories of intellect: de se logical

whence experience without intuition empty

without category blink

RD: the last few lines are very difficult to read

(c) ratio – nullam ??

- facit ut ?, ? sit ens: categorium, phenomena

- regula est 'unconditionatum' ex synthesi omni in conditione

(d) obiectivitas = validitas = inconditionatum

non quasi perspicitur affirmatione absoluta → esse

sed: mens quam Deus Kant dedit, haec exigit

mens quam Kant descripsit automatica ??