



AENSI Journals

Journal of Applied Science and Agriculture

Journal home page: www.aensiweb.com/jasa/index.html



Enlightenment and the Role of Immanuel Kant in its Promotion

¹Mahmoud Ketabi, ²(Ph.D), Masoud Jafarinejad, ³(Ph.D), Alireza Golshani, ⁴(Ph.D), & Abdolrasoul Khalili

¹Professor and member of the scientific board, Department of Political Science, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran.

²Assistant professor and member of the scientific board, Department of Political Science, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran.

³Assistant professor and member of the scientific board, Department of Political Science, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran.

⁴Ph.D student of Political Science specializing in Political Sociology, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 October 2013

Received in revised form 16

November 2013

Accepted 19 November 2013

Available online 19 January 2014

Key words:

enlightenment, self-created (self-developed) knowledge, natural laws, critical rationality, transcendental idealism, modernity

ABSTRACT

The seeds of the Enlightenment ideas were brought over to the continental Europe by report bundles of Voltaire (1732) on English society. In his book, Voltaire compared the constitutional government in England with the autocratic monarchies in the European continent, and contrasted the English religious tolerance to the Catholic Church intolerance, and Isaac Newton illuminating power of the world system and John Locke empiricism to Rene Descartes dogmatism. Despite the ban on this book, its distribution became the beginning of a philosophical movement whose rebellious tendency could be hardly digested by the English, because it had no affinity with prevailing order of the things in the English society. And right on the sixtieth anniversary of Kant death (1864), the Enlightenment ideas and thoughts which originally had been issued from England, and especially from Scotland, were once again, while divested from their originally rich content and in a highly demanding and seemingly intellectual manner, presented to the English society. The English word *Enlightenment* was devised as the equivalent of the German word *Aufklärung* and from that time up to this day the word *enlightenment* (from the transitive verb *enlighten*) has preserved its sarcastic and somewhat light-minded tincture. Kant (1784) by arguing that the laws of nature are discovered by mind revolutionized the core concept of the Enlightenment stating that there are laws of nature and human can discover them. In the book "Critique of Pure Reason", he managed to systematize the metaphysics limitations and lay down the critical basis for the knowledge produced by the natural sciences. Although Kant's transcendental idealism, despite all the emphasis it had on potency of reason, is after foundation of civilization based on self-understanding without guidance of other, it has held the mankind of today captive in the snare of the modern society mental frame and its horrible consequences, the place where there is no room for a balanced reason, feeling, heart, intuition, inspiration, and revelation.

© 2013 AENSI Publisher All rights reserved.

To Cite This Article: Mahmoud Ketabi (Ph.D), Masoud Jafarinejad (Ph.D), Alireza Golshani (Ph.D), & Abdolrasoul Khalili., Enlightenment and the Role of Immanuel Kant in its Promotion. *J. Appl. Sci. & Agric.*, 8(6): 973-981, 2013

INTRODUCTION

Kant philosophy recapitulated and represented an insight in which many philosophers and scientists of the 18th century had a share. He in 1784 after one hundred years started the late German enlightenment in metaphysical tradition which empirically was not noteworthy for the French enlightenment philosophers. Kant thought as a result of his work the truth was now became as a goal which until the end of the 18th century was not achievable.

Kant agreed with David Hume who stated human knowledge of things is founded on all what the five senses convey to his mind, but as he pointed out in the *Critique of Pure Reason*, when there is an influx of sensory perceptions into the mind, a wonderful thing happens; the mind in certain ways gives meaning to millions of random perceptions which incessantly appear to it. The mind makes a choice of them and categorizes them and finally from these divergent and aimless perceived sensory data it creates concepts. In view of Kant, the John Locke theory of mind as a *blank slate* (tabula rasa) suggesting "mind does not have any innate conception and all of our knowledge is acquired from experience" (Spencer and Krauze, 2012: 10) is not quite right, and argues that in human mind there are inborn qualities worked out for this purpose which enable the mind to make sense of the influx of the endless and irrelevant sensory perceptions rushing into it via eyes,

Corresponding Author: Abdolrasoul Khalili, Ph.D student of Political Science specializing in Political Sociology, Shahreza Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahreza, Iran.
E-mail: abkhalili@yahoo.com. mob.no:00989122305844

ears, tongue, nose, and fingers. Quantity, quality, and cause and effect are only few of the concepts which help making sense of such flood of information and these concepts from birth exist in human mind.

According to Locke, reason could explain how many images has entered human mind but it cannot measure such concepts as presence of free will, eternity, or existence of God. In view of Kant, these concepts enter human mind through other ways than senses. Although he does not say anything about where these concepts come from, but does emphasize on their inborn presence in human mind as an indication to an inherent advantage of discernment between right and wrong in mankind.

This moral sense tells people do the right thing when encountered with an ethical issue. Kant says everyone should act in a way that can be used a general rule observed by others. He also believed that humans should not use someone as a means to reach certain ends. In his studies, he concluded that it is this inherent moral advantage in human, and not the reason, which is the strongest foundation of religious faith and requires humans in their belief and action to admit existence of God, though only for the function it has in giving meaning to life and order to society (Dunn, 2003: 79-80). Kant opinions in Critique of Pure Reason (1781) managed to systematize metaphysics limitations and lay down a foundation for the knowledge produced by natural sciences. Kant tried to resolve the tension which caused secession of Jean Jacque Rousseau and the French Encyclopedists, yet in the absolute distinction made by Kant between the scientific knowledge within the area of phenomena and that of the inner area (noumena) this tension still persisted (Spencer and Krauze, 2012: 151). For the love that he felt for Rousseau, he aimed to lay down a foundation for moral principles and ethics corresponding to Rousseau's name.

Kant theories brought about major changes in philosophy and became a turning point in the Enlightenment movement. By stating that mind gives its rules to nature, he changed the key enlightenment concept which assumed an independent existence for laws of nature outside of human mind which could be discovered by man. According to Kant, mind assigns laws to nature, so as it develops its laws as the necessary concepts which organize all our experiences and knowledge.

1. Problem statement:

The modern critic has been long ignorant to the fact that the Kantian Enlightenment was built on the principle which called for use of reason in public affairs which in today language is the same as JurgenHabermas, the contemporary philosopher and political sociologist, calls it the *publicsphere*. Kant requested for creation of a public domain in which people (citizens) could find opportunity to freely use and apply their reason through collective discussions.

In the preface to the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant addresses reason and wants it "to undertake once again the most difficult of its tasks, i.e. the task of self-knowledge, and to hold a tribunal to substantiate all its just and unquestionable rights, and by relying on its eternal, immutable and valid laws to refute all the ungrounded allegations and power claims (Machtsprüche) (Kant, 1781). This plea for universal rule of the critical reason entails presumption of the public sphere. Neither religion for its sanctity nor legislative power for its grandeur and authority is exempt from scrutiny and critique (of reason), because if it was other than this, then they both would lose their validity and reputation, and reason approves those that in an open and collective discourse come out of its trial as the victorious ones (Barr, 2007: 16).

What does the author of the Critique of Pure Reason think of the Enlightenment issue? He clearly describes his view on the Enlightenment. He not only considers his critical self-consciousness by no means in conflict with the concept of Enlightenment, but quite consistent with it (idem, 113).

In 1784, the German monthly journal of **BerlinischeMonatsschrift** on the occasion of the Enlightenment 100th anniversary asked its readers to answer the question "what is Enlightenment?" Many of German philosophers, including Immanuel Kant who in the time was well known as the professor of philosophy, answered this question. In his answer, Kant accepted many fundamental ideas of the Enlightenment and in some important respects went even beyond them. He began its essay immediately with a definition and writes: "*Enlightenment is the out coming of human being from immaturity of his own fault. And immaturity is the inability in using one's own understanding without guidance of another one. This immaturity is to be blamed on oneself, when not lack of understanding, but lack of courage and will power in using it without guidance of other is the reason.*"

Kant views this immaturity a result of the leisure a large portion of humans takes in willingly remaining immature all their life to let others be their protectors and patrons, despite that they long have been brought up to maturity by nature (Barr, 1998: 31).

He considers training of people's mind a decisive step for moving out of this immaturity. According to Kant, freedom in using one's reason to the full in public affairs is an essential requirement for realization of enlightenment. One's reason should be always freely used in public affairs and this is the sole means of guiding humans toward enlightenment, though their private use might be limited without causing any special problem for progress of the enlightenment. Kant perceives public practice of reason as the use one makes, in position of

a scholar, of one's reason versus readers (pupils), and the private use thereof as the allowable use one makes of one's reason in the administrative or civil position to which one has been appointed (idem, 34). Thus, enlightenment, in his view, is freedom of human from a self-imposed immaturity. Here, immaturity means human inability in independent utilization of his intelligence and talent without guidance of other.

He states, "the Enlightenment does not simply mean that humans can liberate their mind from all kinds of bond, but essential to Enlightenment is a condition in which humans are enabled to freely and openly apply their reason, and to enjoy unlimited rights of reporting the results of their thinking by speech and writing" (Spencer and Krauze, 2012: 1530154).

On the other hand, he suggests some restrictions on these rights which rather than causing any problem for the Enlightenment is consistent with it. These restrictions can be applied to individual where he in a civil or social position is likely to make special use of his mind.

Kant response in fact summarized and represented an insight to which many philosophers and scientists of the 18th century contributed. He asks again: which political constraints do hamper Enlightenment? Public practice of reason should be always free, and this condition alone will bring the Enlightenment amidst humans (idem).

2. Kant transcendental idealism:

Kant transcendental idealism is among the important intellectual streams of the Enlightenment movement which has place somewhere between subjective idealism and objective idealism and assumes three dimensions in philosophy. The first one is the human mind dimension which is of personal essence and cannot be subject to knowledge. The second one concerns the supreme truth or *noumen* which is not cognizable and is out of the realm of knowledge. Hence, it should be called the *non-cognitive dimension*. Human connection to such dimension is only possible through moral laws, sense of duty, and conscience. The third dimension is nature and the visible world which is subject to knowledge. In Kant's words, mind has an active and dynamic functioning and should not be regarded as a blank slate. It is the mind that applies order and form to nature. Sensory experiences in fact provide mind with themes or raw materials. Hence, it can be said that our reflections on the surrounding world are modified and altered by mind and in this way they acquire mind structure (Bayers et al, 2006: 163-164). Therefore, our knowledge of the world can be explained in light of the *synthetic a priori knowledge*, so as by applying Euclidian absolute geometric laws to the natural world, any natural or mental process produced by causal relations can be used. It means that change requires existence of material essence which in terms of quantity is always the same. Secondly, neither empirical knowledge nor any prior and early knowledge is ever able to answer the issues regarding human destiny, and such matters as existence of God, eternity of the world and humans, etc.

The only way of explaining and interpreting the material and subjective world is the use of *synthetic a priori knowledge* which makes us aware of our cognitive essence and nature. Time and space are forms of our perceptive intuition and causal categories, substance and accident and alike are the concepts in light of which we find out about the world and perhaps due to existence of the *thing-in-itself* and *non-cognitive entities* we are not able to answer the questions regarding God, eternity, etc.

The thing-in-itself will always remain unknown to us and this might be the reason why we yield to absolute ethical rules, because our knowledge and reason fall short of answering them.

Today, Kant believers maintain that knowledge and cognizance motivated by the thing-in-itself to a great degree forge the innermost truth of objects, yet the truth of the thing-in-itself remains unknown to us. Some believe that Kant in terms of cognitive stand was very close to George Berkeley, but he himself would never admit his epistemological approach to be so close to George Berkeley's. Kant believed in transcendental nature of idealism, while Berkeley suggested an empirical idealism (idem, 164-165).

3. Modernity and propagation of Kant ideas:

Despite all the differences that exist about the dawn of Modernity, it is a contemporary to the Age of Enlightenment and emergence of Rationalism, especially with propagation of Kant ideas. The significance of Kant ideas was to the degree that Jean François Lyotard considers his name both a beginning and an end for the Modernity. Michelle Foucault views modern being and modern living to an aspect of human understanding and consciousness dating back to the time of Kant and after him which has turned into a philosophical issue as the necessary condition to the age of modernity. Impressed by philosophical ideas of Leibnitz and Christian Wolff, physics of Isaac Newton, psychology of John Locke, and skepticism and empiricism of Hume looked for a method to define boundaries of reason. By raising the question as how reason by issue of synthetic a priori knowledge can perceive sensory knowledge, he launched a Copernican revolution in philosophy. In view of Kant, the main duty of human reason is combination and compilation of sensory findings and in the process of such combination and compilation, human mind relies on certain rules such as causal relation. By propounding

his theory in the Inaugural Dissertation and in Critique of Pure Reason in 1781, he gave answer to the above question. In this book and in Critique of Practical Reason, he discusses round the issue of cognitive agent and free and moral agent. The knowledge agent seeks for objective findings with certainty, but free or moral agent looks for realization of free ethical action.

By contemplating in the meaning hereof, the roots of Modernity can be clearly found in Kant philosophy. He, like Jean Jacques Rousseau, related all important matters to the essence or substance of self or human himself. Kant assigned particular importance to human conscience above human actions. He considers sense of duty and responsibility something subjective and rational suggesting that even religion is included into the realm of practical reason and such affairs as faith in God and eternity or survival of the soul like freedom can be regarded as part of the absolute principles of the practical wisdom and necessary conditions for realization of practical moral ultimate purposes.

In his third critique, Critique of Judgment, he explains his approach to art and aesthetics which laid foundation for the modern art expression. He says in human mind there is an inherent substance which is closely connected to his freedom, i.e. no state of states and no action of actions can occur outside of human freedom.

Kant critical philosophy or the transcendental idealism, as some call it, served as the basis of the Modernity and as result with appearance of the Modernity, the reason broke its bond with faith leaving the faith in the realm of conscience. This breaking with the tradition in Kant philosophy continued also after Hegel. From the time of Hegel, who himself was under influence of Kant, onward reason became suitable for interpretations of historical phenomena so as the time was considered a crucial factor in the course of its development. The same approach prepared the grounds for emergence of Marxist interpretation of reason. This interpretation received full treatment by ideas of Ernst Cassirer and Thomas Cohen in the Marburg School and via the Frankfurt School.

Kant poses two essential conditions for human to set oneself free from childhood and to arrive at maturity or perfection; two conditions which are spiritual, institutional, and political. The first condition is using power of reason. Kant says that everyone should be free in use of one's power of reason to the full like realization of a general principle. Foucault explains that the word applied by Kant, i.e. *Razonieren*, in German language signifies a particular form of rationalism. This word in each of the three Critiques is applied to practice of reason only by means of reason and not by anything else: *practice of reason by means and support of reason*. On the other hand, as we freely use reason in personal matters, we should do so in social domain as well. However, in personal issues, we apply reason "like part of an apparatus", and we learn to use reason in "specified situations". But, the Enlightenment teaches us to practice reason freely: *reason should be used as a rational being, and one should act as part of the rational and wise humanity*.

The second essential condition has the same general bearing; enlightenment not only wants human as a free and rational being, but much in the same way, it views the whole humanity as a rational being. Foucault emphatically states that this is an important point. The key point underlying in this universal orientation of rationalism is that *the applied reason is not in service of a predetermined goal*, a goal determined by others, but as a course of development and progression which creates its own goal. Foucault states that in this way, instrumental rationality is invalidated. In this interpretation of Kant essay, Foucault apparently approaches the critical view of Adorno and Horkheimer, and he himself admitted this in the end of his work "What is the Enlightenment? Kant" (Foucault, 2001: 66).

Here, Kant asks, "How the general and public rationalism is promoted?" The Enlightenment answered this question by allowing a political implication for "practice of reason". Then, the question is posed as: What is the generic form of rationalism, i.e. what is the right political form? And it is here that Kant refers to a contract or pact between state and society; a pact based on the principle of free and collective rationalism.

If general, rationalism is considered the principal, freedom of thinking, in the sense that no authority has the power to limit it, is formed. Only in this condition, scrutiny and critique is possible. Discovery of limitations of reason is a momentous philosophical mission which cannot be realized unless we are free in practice of reason. Foucault writes that for this reason, integrity of freedom and critique is put to discussion. It is because of the correlated pair of freedom and critique that we call the Enlightenment the age of scrutiny or as Kant puts it, "our age is the real age of critique to which everything ought to be subjected" (Kant, 1983: 12). Thus, the Enlightenment which called for rational responsibility and maturity was itself the dawn of the age of maturity. From that time on, everyone became accountable for his actions as a member of a human system. By this statement, Foucault derived an important conclusion: by careful attention to this "critical contemplation on history" (i.e. to this short essay of Kant), philosophy finds its boundaries. This is not the first time that a philosopher talks about his time, but it is the first time that a philosopher puts his work in pawn for active engagement of the society of his time, so heroic comes to grips with the established ideas and status quo of his time and from this struggle finds implication of his work in light of historical contemplation. If today is so different from any other day, then my philosophical work too should be something new. Foucault adds that this perception itself represents the Modernity approach.

From study of the Kant essay, Foucault concluded that explanation, assumption, or prediction— and of course the limitations – of the functions the reason was going to have were not the main concerns but the key point was the understanding of the specific situation awaiting the Enlightenment philosophers and Kant. A philosophy, which is the product of a specific condition, tries to get and provide insight into this condition as its duty is very valuable. Foucault cites an example from Charles Baudelaire: “modern man in view of Baudelaire is not the one who is after self-discovery and the ultimate truth about oneself, but the one who tries to invent oneself. Such modernity does not liberate human in his existence, its mission is creation and invention of human (Ahmadi, 1995: 252).

4. Kantian reason and its implications:

Having learned and achieved the promised freedom of knowledge and despite all the emphasis is made on potential of reason foundation of civilization on “practice of one’s own understanding without guidance of other” would still fail. Due to certain a certain degree of immaturities and shortcomings peculiar to human being, he is not likely to independently find his way through, and it is right for such grave defection in his constitution he has kept being a brute throughout the centuries. In this regard, Frederick Schiller asks: “what is truly the reason that we are still a brute?” Development of the events in the age of Enlightenment and its consequences up to this time, which despite all the benevolent advices to establishment of a free and fair society, in presence of cruel and greedy people who sought power and grandeur and were apt to any evil action and atrocity to achieve their goals, all hopes for a new era vanished. The wave of terror and hate during dictatorship of Jacobins and in the subsequent periods in the Age of Enlightenment up to now which led to a complete disappointment with the French Revolution, and the endless atrocities and massacres during Nazism in Germany, as well as other events in the Age of modernity and during the contemporary era in bloody revolutions in the West or in the fight against the Western colonialism, and especially the recent time the genocide in Srebrenica in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina and other humanitarian catastrophes should be considered as the consequences of the Age of Enlightenment which in principle relied upon human reason, the reason which according to the wise old German wanted to be brave in knowledge, and this braveness was necessary for removal of the obstacles put by human’s indolent and cowardly nature in the way of knowledge. But it was unaware of the truth that “in the outside world and outside of us, no reason is in work, and there should be something underlying within us and in our character which makes comprehension of the truth – no matter how vividly it might shine before our eyes – and acceptance of the truth – no matter how vigorous and assuring it might be – impossible for us (Barr, 1998: 106).

He who wanted reason to be in control of the absolutist human did not know that under its banner what felonies he might have caused to humanity of today. Human reason is indeed defective and in solving his problems and it cannot act free from greed and selfishness. Human reason now has turned into “a mere instrument in service of the prevailing economic system. It functions as an all-round tool suitable for making any other tool, and without any hesitation is goal-directed, and its performance is as decisive and fateful as the exactly calculated operation of material production, the production operation estimation of whose results for mankind is rational beyond any kind of calculation it may require. The old ambition of reason for becoming a pure instrument to serve the aimed ends finally has come true. The exclusive nature of the logical laws is derived from this stubborn adhesion of reason to function, and eventually from the deterministic and compelling nature of the self-preservation (Adorno and Horkheimer, 2005; 72-73). With change of self-preservation into an automatic process, now reason is discarded by those who in position of production managers have inherited the reason achievements and fear for presence of this very reason among those deprived of inheritance. The essence of Enlightenment is the very choice between a two-way which like domination itself is inescapable. Humans all the time had to choose either being subjugated to nature or subjugating nature. With development of bourgeoisie commodity economy, the dark horizon of myth is enlightened by the sun of the calculative reason; the same sun under whose cold rays, seeds of modern savagery grow and strand. Human work, under coercion of dominance, has always opened a way for moving away from the myth, yet under the domination system, became once again a captive of the myth enchantment (idem, 75-76).

Thank to this Kantian self-centered bravery, the Enlightenment of our century is a false dawn at which no cosmopolitan Platonic chiasm would ever be able to do anything but talking about a prophetic dream from nearby of his cozy fireplace. All these claims are the rant and pedantry of the immature people who try to appoint themselves to patronage of others, but at the same time have a catch dirk hidden in hand. It is a frozen and barren moonlight which does not shed any light on the indolent minds, neither any warms to timorous wills, and the answer so far given to this question is like a dismal and cheerless lighting for the immature people who walk in the midday sun (Barr, 1998: 50).

It should be known that even in the dark there are beautiful divine duties which can be fulfilled. This eclipse of the sun, however, “indicates that after lapse of a century during which light of God has been smothered, there will be again opportunity for close contact with the absolute truth we are heading for. As a matter of fact, the

God truth has been undermined in metaphysical conscience of the fallacy group, yet vivacity of religious motives at other levels of society are not deniable, and it is conceivable that presence of God will once again find room to manifest itself in a variety of forms and ways (Buber, 2011: 150). The truth is that the fundamental subjectivism of the Modern philosophy which prohibits any access to supernatural and super empirical elements causes a kind of blindness to presence of God Almighty. It practically has taken possession of my relation and the incontestable dominance of the contemporary technological society. Obviously, only by having recourse to God substantive, and not by any other method, we can be saved from the senseless and futile abyss of the modern time. In view of Martin Buber, the foundation of real religious identity is the revelational aspects of the whole human existence and the other unique one which can be called the *Eternal Thou*. That is to say, God is the Eternal Thou from which other thous are resulted. In his view, the concept of existence which implies something other than the underlying reality in the entire universe, i.e. the thing that exists, is a completely void concept. This suggests that we have no choice but taking refuge in religion and only in religion, we can observe divinity philosophical quality (idem, 95). The absolute moral dimensions are deduced only through a personal relationship with absolute truth, and without such relationship, no complete knowledge of self is acquired, even when we want to extract our criteria from an absolute criterion derived from the religious tradition. If our own criteria want indeed to achieve true validity, they ought to be tempered in the heat of our true personal relationship with the absolute truth (idem, 122).

According to this definition, Kant should find his way to the place where the true enlightenment pursues immature human move out of guardianship on ground of his own fault. The fear is for start of the wisdom, and this wisdom takes away our courage in telling lies and makes us indolent in composing poems. Thus let's be braver in the confrontation with the guardians who can at most destroy our body and empty our bags, and let's have more compassion towards our immature brothers and be more generous in good deeds which guarantee our immortality. Making a distinction between public and private use of reason is as ridiculous as distinguishing between comic books and the comic books of the satire history (Barr, 1998: 51).

Thus, Kant should be criticized for the distinction he made between private and public use of reason and consequently the assumed underlying polarity in the enlightenment under protection of "an organized and sizable army" should be pointed out. Obviously, it is here a matter of reconciliation between two (incompatible) natures of the guardian and the immature one, but making an unctuous and self violating entity of each of the two domain, is not a secret to anyone, yet the political bottleneck of the matter lies right here. Indeed, what use could have freedom exquisite garment for me, when I put on the garment of servitude in my own cottage.

In reading Kant views on relationship of reason and religion, we find that in his critical works he directly addresses the domain of pure and practical reason and concludes that structure and mechanism of pure reason is basically of such quality that no judgment on such matters as God, self, volition, and the universe can be expected from it. His evaluation of the arguments adduced regarding this area is simply an attempt for clarification of pure reason inefficiencies in study and assessment of the inextricable subjects. However, practical reason, in his view, opens a way towards divine matter, yet human interpretation and inference changes nature and position of religion and reorders the relationships of reason and religious faith (Bakhshayesh, 2009: 1).

Under influence of the Enlightenment rationality, Kant announces "closed door of religion and religious issues to theoretical to pure rationalism". Positivists and those with practical disposition have interpreted this view of Kant as repudiation of metaphysics. However, Heidegger, Wundt, and those with metaphysical orientation maintain that Kant by invalidating dogmatic metaphysics aimed to pave the way for the new metaphysics (Popkin and Stroll, 196).

By treatment of practical reason, that is, the aspect of reason which guides human action, Kant wants to demonstrate that absolute matter which is a definitive command above all laws of nature is derived from practical reason. Practical reason, in addition, with knowledge of moral law comes to know freedom. Freedom is awareness about "ought and ought-not" or the moral obligations and consequently arriving at ability. Kant maintains that the moral law or the ethical code which is originated in human conscience, can serve as a clue for liberation toward human life spiritual aspects and a path to the supersensory world as well as towards the idea of God as legislator and enactor of the moral law and the highest good.

Therefore only the pure practical reason is able by means of its ethical principles to reach the idea of God. In other words, arriving at the true idea of God is possible only when human reaches the domain of moral consciousness. Kant emphasizes that practical use of God ideas, freedom and immortality of soul in the moral life never implies knowledge on proof of these ideas. Hence, in view of Kant, only dogmatic metaphysics, and not metaphysics on the whole, is considered invalid. He believes, "human, under any circumstance, cannot discard principles of the subjective metaphysics. However, human cherish a hope in heart, this hope through perfection turns into the reality of soul preservation and eventually it leads up to faith in God and the proof thereof as philosophical issue" (Mojtahedi, 2013: 12).

The true religion, in view of Kant, is the very rational religion or the religion acknowledged by reason and with universal character. He views relationship and comparison between rational religion and revelational or

historical religion and the consistency and inconsistency between the two from the same perspective. The concept of God in rational and practical reason concerns such truth that if we believe it, logical we have right to believe in the remaining religious premises and principles.

Kant also learns about some issues by virtue of critique, as he says in introduction of the book *Critique of Pure Reason*, "our period is the real period of critique to which everything ought to be subjected" (Kant, 1983: 12). He makes a distinction between faith and religion and states the true religion is not but one the mundane form of which is manifested in a variety of religions. Then, while maintaining the principle of religious faith, he criticizes many doctrines and beliefs in Christianity. For instance, he deplores the way Christian clerics deprive people from any reasoning and thinking by claiming religious expertise and spiritual revelations and refers to these experiences and meditations worthless (Kant, 1960: XII). After blocking the way pure rationality to faith-related issues, he interprets the true faith within the domain of practical reason. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, he discusses about how objective knowledge (synthetic a priori principles) is possible in mathematics and empirical sciences and why this knowledge in religious matters is not possible. Hence, Kant's metaphysics at length turns into the philosophy of mathematics and natural sciences, i.e. "metaphysics of nature". After being disappointed with existence of synthetic a priori rules in metaphysics, he resorts to pure practical rationality based on which he justifies, interprets and proves religious and faith-related matters and keeps holding on to it (Bakhshayesh, 2009: 5-6). Apparently, the Kantian Categories and configuration of moral principles are some contrivances to help humans to attain the essence of pure, theoretical and practical reason (idem, 8-9). Therefore, the Kantian moral principles are the very rational basis. According to Kant, as long as religion practical precepts are fit into the framework of practical pure reason, to act according to them is rational and our moral obligation. However, if a religious precept goes beyond practical reason, like when a father is commissioned to behead his innocent child. Kant, as a rule, refutes such orders because they are against the moral code and argues that for this same reason we find such commands as not truly religious precepts. At this point, Kierkegaard separates his way from Kant, because believes religion to be of higher order relative to ethics and states in religion, there are commands which extend beyond ethics.

For this reason, Kierkegaard suggests a jump for transition from ethical stage to religion. It means that for transition from rational knowledge to religious faith there is always a distance which cannot be covered by reason (idem, 11). This viewpoint of Kant indicates that he in the critiques of pure reason reached the conclusion that pure knowledge has no way to religious and metaphysical matters. Thus, the maximum benefit of theoretical efforts is a rational justification for behaving in a way as if there is a God.

In the *Critique of Practical Reason*, he first explains the principles of his moral philosophy and then at the stage of religion, he interprets and rationalizes religious beliefs (faiths) and convictions within the boundary of practical reason (idem, 107). Kant maintains that thinking can only through reason add revelation to the concept of religion, because if the heavenly aspects through reason are not added to the natural religion and the God of this religion is not regarded as pure reason concept the way of reason to religion becomes blocked and such a religion will not be intelligible for human and cannot be publicized" (idem, 153). According to him, the origin and source of legitimacy for moral principles is the practical pure reason, a reason which exists in all human. By means of this pure practical reason, a network of wise people is formed all of whom are subjects of one government. In the practical government of Kant, every human is on the one side the enactor and legislator of the ethical laws and principles which are issued by him himself and on the other hand, is subject to laws and regulations ordained by others (Kant, 1949: 95).

According to this in-between view of maximal rationality, sensory and intuitive knowledge can be the critic of the positivistic views and help us in reaching the ideal in the modern era, so as it cuts off our connection with humanity ethnic attitude which considers Europe as the origin of all inventions and progresses, especially given the fact that for critique of the Modernity, Kant reason-based view need to pass a critical review for introduction of an alternative model for better life in today society. Hence, it can be inferred that the rout for critique of the Modernity goes through the path of Immanuel Kant ideas rather than through ideas of Georg Wilhelm Frederick Hegel!

We should admit that the midway view involves a kind of critical rationality through steady search of all human capabilities which are the source of his thriving and perfection, with an emphasis on the ceaseless and endless critical reflections which pave the way for rationality via maximal rationality, sensory knowledge, and particularly stoic knowledge in which heart is the factor of knowledge, and revelational faith which involves a kind of *ultimate concern* in individual as well as devotion and taking risk in the search for truth in terms of their logical consistency and adaption to real matters. In this way, "the Christian Theology both Catholic, and Protestant as a result of fundamental treatment of modern science and philosophy, could produce such prominent theologians as Karl Barth (1886-1986), Paul Tillich (1886-1965), Rudolf Bultmann (1884-1976), Karl Rahner (1904-1984) each of whom gave the relationship between reason and revelation an in-depth treatment (Borujerdi, 2008: 252). Bultmann, in empathy with Heidegger, chose the mission of demythologization of Christianity and called for reconciliation of reason and revelation (MojtahedShabestari, 1986: 19). The proponents of religious faith which involves devotion and taking risk, under influence of

SorenAabye Kierkegaard (1813-1885), the Danish philosopher and pioneer of the Existentialism philosophical movement, became the inspirer of such philosophers as Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann in the Neo-Orthodox theology. Kierkegaard says, "Without taking risk, there is no faith. Faith is exactly the contradiction between immense passion of the individual soul and objective uncertainty. If I am able to objectively perceive God, then I have no faith. But, exactly because I am unable to do so, I need to have faith. If I want to safeguard myself in the realm of faith, I have to permanently fight against that objective uncertainty, in order to keep safe my faith in the water depth, at a depth more profound than seventy thousand fathoms (Kierkegaard, 1941: 182).

The Critical Rationalism tells us we should claim a rational certainty more than what is realizable for us, and at the same time, when we want to take the most important decision of our life, we should not close down our reflecting and reasoning ability. Of course, unification between religious commitment which require *total devotion* and reasoning and thinking which stands open to alternatives gives rise to inner tensions. But these tensions are not necessarily harmful, and at times, especially in life of many religious thinkers were the source of creativity and very fruitful.

Hence, if the Enlightenment is a non-static process which from the beginning up to this day has been in working, also in the future will keep being in working, and as Kant puts it, if the life ultimate purpose is human, only within domain of reason alone, he cannot perform effectively, because "reason while serves as human perception or cognition power, tends to dominate and influence others, reason or law has generated systems to dominate over humans" (Marcuse, 1983: 175); especially the human who, according to Voltaire, because of his insatiable greed and intractable pride has turned this world into the torrent of tears (Durant, 2001; 41).

This Enlightenment which from its birth up to this date has been constantly the subject of controversy, despite all its achievements, is in fact a superficial or shallow enlightenment, differs from the true enlightenment. Given the influence exercised by the Freemasonry on the Enlightenment movement, its ideals are so blended with the ideals of the Freemasonry that the latter group considered themselves as the main propagators of the Enlightenment. These ideals in Deism, Humanism were outlined as empirical knowledge and human reason. It should be noted that also the slogan of *liberté, égalitéetfraternité* which was among the slogans of the French Revolution was originally introduced in the Freemasonry.

Therefore, Kant view of the Enlightenment as liberation of self from captivity and bondage of ignorance through self-knowledge and arrival at freedom, should be contributed to the historical condition of the time and his private life condition, being brought up in a restricted environment and pietistic family, he considered immaturity in the religious domain as one of the most obnoxious form of immaturity. His speech and tone here is like that of the Declaration of Independence. He bravely steps in a path which leads to his self-emancipation and freedom. On this path, he talks about the ultimate purpose of human existence and his advancement in the Enlightenment highway and about the felonies against human nature and his sanctimonious rights. In this time, sciences and arts had not yet been subjected to a central surveillance and censorship and the main problems of the Enlightenment had roots in the religious domain. In addition, it has been reported that Kant in later-life in bitterness referred to the years of his captivity and servitude, and his intellectual immaturity. It can be even said that his idea of mind liberation had a leading and principal role in his life and the effort for its realization and propagation of this idea was the main concern in his life (Popper, 1987: 138).

In the end of his essay, he returns to the political issue of the Enlightenment and explicates the Enlightenment position, role and dynamism in politics. The predominant elements in Kant treatment of the issue are difficult to identify and one cannot say for sure whether he wants to tell in advance about certain forms and considerations or it is because of the fear for confusion and uprising that he brings them up. He profits from the example of immature egg and its shell and keeper to explain the following paradox: how can Enlightenment grow under protection of an organized and large army. In his final words, Kant considers a kind of dialectic movement for the Enlightenment process, so as once having worked on people, it will eventually affect the state behavioral principles.

Conclusion:

Kant transcendental idealism as one the most salient streams in the Enlightenment movement, by recapitulating the ideas and theories of many prominent thinkers of the 18th century, aiming to revolutionize the enlightenment succeeded in concluding the late German Enlightenment movement to the point where mind dictated its rules to nature. He considered subjective concepts as indicators of human capacity in discernment of right and wrong. After lapse of a century since the birth of the Enlightenment, Kant (1784) interpreted the Enlightenment as human liberation from the bonds of his immaturity. In his view, the Enlightenment is moving out of an immaturity which is to be blamed on oneself, because this immaturity is a result of one's own failure in using own understanding without guidance of someone else. This immaturity is an own fault, when its reason is not lack of understanding but failure in use of this understanding without direction of other. Kant chose the following phrasing as slogan of the Enlightenment: be brave in practice of your understanding! Due to the correlated pair of freedom and critique, in Critique of Pure Reason, calls the contemporary period the concrete

era of criticism to which everything ought to be subjected. Reliance of Kant on capability of human mind practically caused imprisonment of today humanity in the snare of modern mindset and its catastrophic consequences. Therefore, from a perfectly rational point of view, it can be argued that mankind due to some degree of immaturity and shortcomings is not able to find his way through matters and for this serious disadvantage, he couldn't give up his savage traits through the centuries. The events in the age of Enlightenment and consequences of the modernity up to this time, which despite all the honest advises for establishment of a free and fair society, in which justice and freedom was expected to have the first saying, with appearance of cruel and greedy people who sought power and authority in their own interest and for the cost of justice and freedom and apt to any evil action and atrocity to achieve their goals, all hopes of modern humanity for a new era free from violence and terror were frustrated. The wave of terror and hate during dictatorship of Jacobins and in the subsequent periods in the Age of Enlightenment up to now which led to a complete despondency with the French Revolution, and the endless atrocities and massacres during Nazism in Germany, as well as other events in the Age of modernity should be considered as the consequences of the Age of Enlightenment which in principle relied upon human reason, the reason which according to Kant intended to act bravely in knowledge, and this braveness was necessary for removal of the obstacles put by human's indolent and cowardly nature in the way of knowledge. But he was unaware of the truth that "in the outside world and outside of us, no reason is in work, and there should be something underlying within us and in our character which makes comprehension and admission of the truth impossible for us, and no matter how lively and assuring it might be. Therefore, the self-created reason needs a complementary partner in human to support each other, so as reason in interaction with intuition and divine revelation may take on different roles per case.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T., M. Horkheimer, 2005. *Enlightenment Dialectic, Philosophical Pieces*, Tehran: press: Gaam-e-No
- Ahmadi, B. 1995, *Modernity and Critical Thinking*, Tehran: Markaz Publication.
- Spencer, L., K. Andrzej, 2012. "Enlightenment", Translation by Mehdi Shakibania, Tehran: Pardis Danesh,
- Barr, E., 1998. "What is the Enlightenment? Theories & Definitions", Translated by Siroos Ariyanpour, Tehran: Agah
- Bayers, F., A. Buoy, D. Birzili, G. Geovani, 2006, "A Review of Modernity Enlightenment and its Discontents; Subjectivity, Knowledge and Aesthetics", Adaptation and Translated by Mohammad Zamiran, Tehran: Elm Publications
- Bakhshayesh, R., 2009, *Reason and Religion in View of Kant*, Qom, Seminary and University Joint Research Center, Philosophy of Theology, pp: 111.
- Borujerdi, M., 2008. *Iranian Intellectuals and the West*, Translated by Jamshid Shirazi, Foruzanfar Publication and Research.
- Buber, M., 2001. *Eclipse of God, Studies on the Relationship of Religion and Philosophy* Popkin, Richard H. and Stroll, Avrum (1402 AH), Philosophy Made Simple, Translated by Seyed Jalaladdin Mojtavavi, Tehran: Hekmat Publication
- Peterson, M., 2008. *Reason and Religious Faith; An Introduction to Philosophy of Religion*, Translated by Naraghi.A., Soltani. E., Tarh-e-No Publications
- Dunn, J.M., 2008. "The Age of Enlightenment", Translation by Mehdi Haghighatkha, Tehran: Ghoghnoos
- Durant, W., A. Durant, 1989. "Story of Civilization", Vol.7, "Beginning of the Age of Reason", Translation by Esmaeel Dolatshahi, Tehran: Islamic Revolution Publication and Education Organization.
- Foucault, M., 2001. "What is the Enlightenment?" Kant, Translated by Homayoun Fouladpour, Tehran: Kelk
- Kant, I., 1983. *Critic of Pure Reason*, Translated by Sh. Adib Soltani, Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications
- Marcuse, H., 1983. "The One-Dimensional Human", Translated by Mohsen Moayedi, Tehran: Amir Kabir Publications
- Mojtahed Shabestari, M., 1987. "Medieval Christianity and Historical Backgrounds of Secularism in the West", Tehran: Keihan Havayee
- Mojtahedi, K., 2013. "We Live Still in the Kantian World", *Etemad Newspaper*, pp: 2659.