


UNITED WISDOM

# Kant: The Conditions of Experience and the Limits of Possible Knowledge

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-18-N04 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

# Kant: The Conditions of Experience and the Limits of Possible Knowledge

Imagine a hypothetical scene: two people stand at the same window and discuss what is happening outside. One notices the traffic; the other, the lateness of someone they are waiting for. They see one setting but answer different questions. It is easy to conclude that everyone lives in their own reality. But this conclusion joins attention, evaluation, and the structure of experience itself too quickly.

Can we distinguish what depends on a current interest from that without which no event could be an object of knowledge for us at all? And if knowledge has conditions, does that make it merely an arbitrary story? Kant's question begins where the familiar opposition between an objective world and subjective opinion becomes insufficient.

## What This Article Is About

Kant investigates not only what we know, but what makes experience possible. We will briefly consider sensibility and understanding, space and time, the distinction between appearance and thing in itself, and the limits of applying concepts. We will then offer a contemporary development of our own: avoiding confusion between perspective and arbitrariness, explanation and an inaccessible ultimate answer, insufficient information and a principled limit. The hypothetical everyday examples here are neither proofs of Kant's system nor neuroscientific findings. They help pose the question on a familiar scale while retaining distance from the historical argument. At the centre is a double possibility: knowledge can be limited and still objectively significant; recognising a limit can support inquiry without becoming a convenient refusal to think.

## 1. Asking About Conditions Differs From Asking About Origins

In the Prolegomena, Kant distinguishes the psychological origin of experience from what experience contains as a condition of its possibility. He analyses the combination of sensory perception and judgement; an objective claim is not reducible to a personal sequence of sensations. Kant, Prolegomena, §§18–22, especially 21a.

For our contemporary reading, two questions are worth distinguishing: how someone learned to use a map, and what is required for a map to show a route. The first admits a history of learning. The second concerns relations between symbols, direction, and place. Those relations themselves cannot be explained solely by an account of the age at which someone received their first map. The analogy is ours; a map does not model Kant's entire philosophy.



@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Similarly, we can ask how we acquired the word “yesterday,” and separately what is required to distinguish a sequence of events. The answers connect, but the tasks differ. A biography of using a word does not exhaust the structure of what it denotes. Conversely, that structure does not itself recount an individual’s history.

In ordinary conversation, this distinction helps avoid substituting one question for another. If participants dispute whether a message confirms an agreement, an account of the writer’s habits may help. But first they need to establish what counts as confirmation and how it relates to the proposed obligation. Otherwise information about the person will grow while the object of assent remains unclear.

Imagine someone asking, “Why did I understand it that way?” A history of previous conversations may indeed be appropriate. But “Did I correctly understand the current condition?” also requires comparison with the condition itself. One task does not cancel the other. Explaining an opinion’s origin neither proves its truth nor automatically refutes it.

In our reading, Kant’s turn is valuable as an invitation to notice hidden requirements for knowledge. What must be defined for a claim to make sense? Which distinctions does it presuppose? What exactly does a check correspond to? These questions sometimes let us proceed without endlessly accumulating accounts that do not address the central transition.

## 2. Experience Is Not a Heap of Impressions

“Sensibility” and “understanding” designate different faculties here. In the Prolegomena, sensibility relates to intuition; understanding to thought and the combination of representations in judgement. Categories, including causality, participate in the conditions of objective experience. Kant, Prolegomena, §§20–23, 25.

Our hypothetical example: you hear a bang, then see that a door has closed. You can describe a sequence of perceptions. You can claim that a draught closed the door. The second adds a connection between the event and its conditions. It cannot be extracted from the word “then” alone. This distinguishes levels of description; it does not prove the transcendental deduction.

We often imagine knowledge as the accumulation of small facts until they assemble themselves. Yet even in this hypothetical case, we must decide which events to compare, what counts as one door, where a change begins and ends, and which difference matters. Description already organises the material; this is our analytical observation about the example’s construction.

It does not follow that we invented the door. It follows that a claim about the door has a form and requires suitable distinctions. “The door is closed,” “The door closed,” and “Someone

closed the door," for instance, are three different claims. We may check the first quite confidently, observe the second, and not yet know the third.

The same structure appears when reading a report. A table contains numbers. For them to become information about a result, defined units, periods, and a connection to the question are needed. If the number of people, visits, and actions are written with identical digits, coincidence does not make them the same quantity. Greater computational precision will not fix confused objects.

We do not call this clarification an application of Kant's categories in the strict sense. It is an independent contemporary question inspired by attention to conditions: which operations made data into knowledge of something? Content matters, but its organisation should not remain invisible.

This thought has a practical consequence. Sometimes greater clarity requires a more precise connection between existing material and a claim, rather than more material. Checking then ceases to be a warehouse of impressions and becomes a meaningful comparison.

## 3. Space and Time: Why Spectacles Are Too Easy a Metaphor

In the Critique of Pure Reason, space and time are considered forms of sensible intuition. They are conditions under which appearances are given, rather than properties of things in themselves established in this manner. Kant, Critique, Transcendental Aesthetic, §§2–6.

The popular analogy of spectacles can help and immediately mislead. Someone puts on tinted glasses and sees differently. But they can remove the glasses, look without them, and compare. That comparison is not available for Kant's question: it concerns conditions of human sensory experience, rather than an individual's accidental accessory. This is our explanation of the metaphor's boundary.

The hypothetical window scene therefore does not prove Kant. Two people's differing interests are not the same as the distinction between appearance and thing in itself. One watches traffic; the other waits for an acquaintance. Both can clarify observations and compare clocks. Their personal purposes change attention but do not authorise each to arbitrarily set an event's time or place.

Nor can a mood automatically be called a "Kantian form." If a conversation seemed long, its duration is not thereby unavailable for shared checking. We can distinguish experienced unpleasantness from measured time. Reducing both questions to "Everything depends on consciousness" destroys the very distinction that makes the topic useful.

Our reading proposes careful treatment of analogies. They reveal one side of a difficult concept and may hide another. Before transferring them, we should ask: what in the

comparison corresponds to the original question? What does not? Which conclusion are we not entitled to draw?

We can use a map to illustrate organised knowledge, but cannot declare the world a drawing. We can use glasses to illustrate conditions of seeing, but cannot promise that removing them gives access to a “pure” world. We can discuss two people’s different perspectives, but cannot infer complete arbitrariness of shared reality from them.

A metaphor’s accuracy is measured by the boundaries it preserves, rather than the beauty of the resemblance. A good analogy leaves the reader able to return to the question, instead of replacing it permanently with a convenient picture.

## 4. Limited Knowledge and Objectivity Are Compatible

Knowledge can concern appearances and still possess objective validity. An academic account distinguishes Kant’s idealism from empirical denial of the external world and shows the contested interpretation of the relation between appearances and things in themselves. “Kant’s Transcendental Idealism,” §§1, 1.1.

Our contemporary question is: what happens if limited understanding automatically becomes an absence of any checking? Hypothetical project participants might say, “Everyone sees their own thing, so discussing the deadline is pointless.” But the deadline can be clarified, messages compared, the result examined. Having a perspective does not cancel these actions.

Objectivity in such an everyday case need not mean a view from nowhere. It can require a defined object, shared conditions of comparison, and room for correction. Participants do not become omniscient; they gain grounds for agreeing on one question. This is our contemporary application, rather than a complete definition of Kantian objectivity.

Imagine two accounts of lateness. One concerns how long someone waited; the other, the departure time. Both can be truthful without answering the same question. Comparing them first requires establishing the object. It may then emerge that there is no disagreement, or a specific discrepancy may appear. In either case, “Everyone has their own truth” would have ended the inquiry prematurely.

Agreement does not guarantee correctness either. Everyone may read a mistaken record the same way. Shared checking matters, but its source and limits remain a separate question. We do not propose replacing truth with voting. Correcting a shared error is part of discussion’s value.

An objective fact does not automatically determine personal significance either. An hour of waiting may be established; its acceptability depends on the agreement, circumstances, and

participants' boundaries. Naming a fact does not prescribe an identical attitude towards it. Naming different attitudes does not cancel the fact.

This distinction preserves both shared reality and human diversity. We need not choose between forcefully imposing one evaluation and abandoning comparison altogether. We can check a shared object and separately discuss what it means to each participant.

## 5. The Thing in Itself Is Not a Missing Photograph

Kant's distinction easily becomes a picture of two worlds: a superficial shell before us and the real thing behind it, which a more powerful instrument will one day photograph. We do not use this picture as an established reading. Academic discussion presents several competing interpretations: two objects, two aspects, different ways of considering things. "Kant's Transcendental Idealism," §4.1 and introduction to §5.

Our practical distinction is simpler. An unknown detail of an object may become known through investigation. A principled limitation of a way of knowing is another question. If I cannot see the back of a house, I can walk around it. This is no transition to the thing in itself in Kant's sense. It is another experience of the same order.

If I do not know another person's motive, I can ask them. Even a good answer remains a message in human communication, rather than access to a person outside all conditions of knowledge. The "mystery of the other" should therefore not automatically be identified with Kant's thing in itself. The metaphor may sound respectful but mixes different problems.

The distinction matters for our attitude towards our own explanations too. In a hypothetical situation, someone says, "I still do not understand why I chose this work." Lacking an answer now does not mean the question is in principle uninvestigable. Expectations, information, and actions can be compared. Conversely, new details need not yield ultimate knowledge of one's essence.

We propose avoiding the use of a philosophical limit as a universal "No entry" sign. First identify the kind of unknown. Are data missing? Is the question unclear? Does the checking method fail to match the claim? Has the claim exceeded what the chosen material can show at all?

Each kind of uncertainty calls for its own response. Further observation may close the first gap; clarifying a term, the second; changing the check, the third. The fourth sometimes requires narrowing the conclusion. All four tasks cannot be solved with the same quantity of new information.

Understanding Kant's project also requires a brief distinction between analytic and synthetic. The first judgement clarifies what is already thought in a concept; the second adds content.

The possibility of synthetic a priori knowledge is a problem of the Critique. A priori means that the grounds are independent of experience, rather than an early guess. Kant, Critique, Introduction, I, IV–VI.

Our hypothetical example explains only part of this distinction. If an agreement defines “urgent” as a task due by the end of the day, “An urgent task has this deadline” unfolds the accepted formulation. “This task can be completed by the end of the day” adds a different claim: it now concerns scope, resources, and working conditions. Perfect clarity in defining urgency does not prove feasibility. The example does not classify every judgement under Kant’s system; it shows the difference between unpacking meaning and adding a claim about the matter at hand.

This transition is especially easy to lose in words about a person. If “reliable” is defined as someone who fulfils commitments, the definition does not establish whether a particular participant is reliable. Information about their actions is needed. Repeating the definition with greater confidence adds no such information. It only makes the question look settled.

But Kant’s central task is harder still than our example: can we have knowledge that extends what we know on necessary, nonempirical grounds? We do not answer it with a working table or replace it with “Everything needs checking.” This is why the historical project should not be read as a simple list of cautious habits. It attempts to explain the possibility of knowledge of a certain kind, rather than merely reduce everyday errors.

A substantive question remains for the reader: when did my conclusion merely clarify an accepted meaning, and when did it communicate something new that therefore needs different grounds? Not every clear formulation extends knowledge. Not every new content is confirmed by a clear definition. This is a contemporary way to see the difficulty, rather than a completion of Kant’s argument.

The boundary of possible knowledge thus does not eliminate ordinary uncertainty open to investigation. It helps us avoid presenting that uncertainty as an ultimate answer already achieved, or promising such an answer where the question’s very form remains unchecked.

## 6. When a Concept Exceeds Its Field of Application

In the Critique, Kant limits the cognitive use of concepts of the understanding to possible experience; the concept of a noumenon does not furnish positive knowledge of a special supersensible object. Kant, Critique, “On the Ground of the Distinction of All Objects in General into Phenomena and Noumena”.

For contemporary reflection, we can take a more modest transition. We know a procedure is useful in a particular kind of work, then call it “the law of a successful life.” The new claim far exceeds the initial check. The concept remained familiar, but the object changed.

A hypothetical person masters an accurate accounting method and wants to apply it to relationships. Clarifying agreements may help. But feelings cannot automatically be treated as one quantity, consent as a number, or the meaning of intimacy as a final sum. An analogy may suggest a question without gaining the right to resolve everything transferred.

Another example is “cause.” In a limited event, it directs a search for a sequence. In “What is the ultimate cause of my entire life?”, it may demand a single answer for which the listed episodes are insufficient. This does not mean the question is forbidden. It means distinguishing philosophical reflection, personal meaning-making, and an established causal conclusion.

We propose checking a transition through three signs. Did the object change? Do the conditions of the initial check remain? Did a word begin promising more than the material confirms? If at least one sign appears, naming the new status helps: metaphor, hypothesis, proposal, or worldview.

Naming it does not diminish its meaning. A metaphor can be expressive and a worldview question important. But they should not acquire the evidential standing of a neighbouring measurement merely by standing next to it in a text. If an image of a life route helps someone, that does not prove there is one objectively prescribed path.

A concept’s boundary of application is both a restriction and a protection. It prevents one successful tool from occupying every domain of experience. Where the tool is suitable, we can use it more precisely; where it does not supply the necessary grounds, space for other questions remains.

## 7. Objections to the Critical Turn

The first objection asks: how can we speak of things in themselves if they are not known? Academic discussion notes difficulties in the relation between appearance, an independent object, and affection. Interpreters have no unanimous answer. “Kant’s Transcendental Idealism,” §3.4. We do not close the dispute with a simple phrase about hidden reality.

The second objection concerns modern knowledge of perception. Should Kant’s philosophy be replaced by psychology or neuroscience? We retain the distinction between tasks: an empirical description of a particular process is not identical to an argument about the conditions of possible experience. Yet a historical system does not gain immunity from criticism simply because its task is philosophical. The argument’s content still needs discussion.

The third objection concerns our application: has everything become merely ordinary carefulness? Indeed, checking a deadline is not transcendental philosophy. We claim no such identity. Everyday examples show the contemporary value of asking about conditions and the scope of claims. Understanding Kant himself requires more than mastering these questions.

The fourth objection concerns power over another's experience. If we declare general conditions of knowledge, might we start rejecting everything unlike our own? Our reading permits no such conclusion. Differences in experience should first be heard and accurately described. Shared checking of a fact does not cancel someone's right to report what they experience.

Finally, critique may become a convenient evasion: any difficult claim is declared beyond the limits. But first we must show which exact limit is implicated. Otherwise "critical" itself becomes an unchecked privilege. A justified restriction must address a specific object and way of knowing.

The topic's philosophical worth persists when limits are investigated, rather than handed out. Readers may accept one argument, doubt another, and withhold final assent. Accurately naming disagreement is sometimes more important than the impression that a difficult system has finally been reduced to one easy formula.

## 8. What This Means in Practice

If this way of reflecting suits you, choose a claim that seems too large for its grounds. A hypothetical "I know this conversation will never work," for example. You need not start an argument about it. You can first clarify its structure.

What counts as "working": agreement, absence of conflict, clarity about a decision, the ability to agree on a next step? These outcomes differ. Which conversations have already happened? What exactly was difficult in them? Are there conditions not yet tried? What observation might alter the present conclusion?

The next question concerns the kind of unknown. Perhaps time or information is missing. Perhaps the participants want different outcomes. Perhaps you demand an agreement that depends on another's choice and cannot be guaranteed by your action. The next step differs in each case.

You can voluntarily choose limited clarification: name the topic in advance, suggest a time, identify which question needs deciding. Then check a particular outcome, rather than "the entire ability to communicate": did the disagreement's object become clear; did a decision emerge; was a pause needed? If the other person declines to participate, that is an independent fact that a prettier formulation cannot cancel.

It also helps to retain levels of speech. “This is how I experienced the conversation” reports experience. “This deadline was agreed” needs comparison. “This person is by nature incapable of agreement” is much broader. We can relinquish the third while retaining the first two and a decision about our own participation.

A limit need not be unpleasant. Sometimes it removes an unnecessary task: no ultimate essence of a person need be established to decide whether a current agreement suits us. We need not know the meaning of all life to check the suitability of the nearest obligation. These are our contemporary conclusions, rather than the promised result of a Kantian exercise.

If reflection yields no useful distinction, it can be ended. Philosophy does not demand that every everyday situation become a tribunal over reason’s capacities. The measure of application depends on your question and the clarity actually gained.

## 9. A Limit That Leaves Room

In the opening scene, two people look at one street. Their interests differ. We can now describe this without too large a conclusion about different realities. One notices traffic; the other, the awaited person. They can compare the time while retaining different meanings of waiting.

Kant’s topic offers a deeper question than this difference of interests: what makes experience of an object possible, and where does the cognitive use of our ways of knowing end? We have retained the distance between the historical question and the contemporary example so that both remain useful.

Our reading does not promise to see the world finally without any conditions. It proposes noticing the conditions of a particular claim. What material do we rely on? How do we organise it? What claim do we add? Where does a fact become interpretation, and interpretation a conclusion about a worldview?

If we name this sequence, incomplete knowledge need not become helplessness. We can establish one fact, leave one motive unknown, and make one limited decision. The importance of personal experience does not require abandoning shared checks. Shared checking does not require identical evaluations from everyone.

Perhaps the quietest benefit of this topic is reducing unnecessary claims. We need not declare every conclusion final to act. Nor need we declare everything subjective to acknowledge perspective. Between these pronouncements remains a space of experience open to investigation.

Knowing less than we would like and knowing enough for a particular question are compatible. Critical thinking in our reading helps hold them together: avoiding presenting a limit as an

answer, avoiding presenting an answer to a small task as the structure of the entire world, and continuing inquiry where it can actually show something.

## Sources

1. Immanuel Kant. *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, English edition by Paul Carus, third edition, 1912: §§18–25, especially 21a. Project Gutenberg.

2. Immanuel Kant. *The Critique of Pure Reason*, translated by J. M. D. Meiklejohn: Introduction I, IV–VI; Transcendental Aesthetic §§2–6; section on phenomena and noumena. Project Gutenberg.

3. Nicholas F. Stang. *Kant's Transcendental Idealism*: §§1, 1.1, 3.4, 4.1; introduction to §5. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Academic discussion of contested readings is used without declaring one interpretation uncontested.