

Accounted for, transcendental method, precisely because it objectifies the operations employed in any and every revision, can reach conclusions that are definitive in the sense that they will have to be presupposed if a revision is to take place. Finally, transcendental method not only brings to light (1) what one is doing when one is knowing, (2) why doing that is knowing, and (3) what one knows when one does it, but also uncovers the antinomies between performance and accounts of performance that underpin the chaotic disarray of the philosophies.

Now if it would indeed be folly for scientists to surrender their autonomy and admit the suzerainty of conflicting philosophies, it is quite another matter for them to admit that they have minds, that they use them, and that while special methods ensure that use against much abuse, there are points where the special methods give no guidance. Thus, the very antinomies involved in naive realism, empiricism, Kantianism, idealism, and their progeny, also are found in the mechanist determinism that dominated physics for centuries and that now has been abandoned to be replaced by a no less unfortunate Copenhagen interpretation.

See Patrick Heelan, Objectivity and Quantum Theory,
The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 196 , pp.

accounted for, transcendental method, precisely because it objectifies the operations employed in any and every revision, can reach conclusions that are definitive in the sense that will have to be presupposed in any future attempt at revision. Finally, transcendental method not only brings to light (1) what one is doing when one is knowing, (2) why doing that is knowing, and (3) what does one know when one does it, but also uncovers the antinomies between performance and accounts of performance that underpin the ~~cha~~ chaotic disarray of the philosophies.

Now if it would be folly for scientists to surrender their autonomy and admit the suzerainty of conflicting philosophies, it is another matter for them to admit that they have minds, that they use them, and that to know what this use consists in and implies is intrinsic to the sciences themselves. Admittedly, of course, the natural sciences go about their everyday business quite satisfactorily without any recourse to cognitional theory, and it is only in larger issues that ~~it~~ they can be helped by it. Transcendental method could have saved them from centuries of mechanist determinism; ~~and~~ it could liberate them from the Copenhagen interpretation; it could warn them against surrendering the on-going fluidity of method and becoming fixed in a deductivist formalization. But with human sciences matters stand far otherwise, for there transcendental method is not only the a priori of the investigator's procedures but also the a priori of the objects under investigation. So the human sciences are confronted with the dilemma either of assimilation to the natural sciences with a consequent disregard of specifically human reality, potentiality, value, or else of discovering a critical ~~philosophy~~