

Kant's Critique of Pure Reason is shown to be a failure and complete rubbish

BY

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

Kant's Critique of Pure Reason is shown to be a failure and complete rubbish

BY

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

Poetry Books by Gamahucher Press by colin leslie dean Australia's leading erotic poet free for download

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/35520015/List-of-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press>

Gamahucher press west geelong Victoria Australia 2023

**A mere erotic poet Magister colin
 leslie dean hast woken the
 WORLDS philosophers fromst
 their dogmatic slumber**

As stated

<https://spot.colorado.edu/~huemer/papers/kant2.htm>

"The Critique of Pure Reason is unified by a single line of argument involving just two or three central ideas, which, in spite of a certain complexity and obscurity in its development, can be fairly summed up as follows: Kant poses the question, "How is synthetic, a priori knowledge possible?"

Andst

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/a-priori-knowledge>

“Latent in the distinction between the *a priori* and the *a posteriori* for [Kant](#) is the [antithesis](#) between [necessary truth](#) and [contingent truth](#) (a truth is necessary if it cannot be denied without contradiction). The former applies to a priori judgments, which are arrived at independently of experience and hold universally, and the latter applies to a posteriori judgments, which are dependent on experience and therefore must acknowledge possible exceptions. In his [Critique of Pure Reason](#) (1781; 1787) Kant used these distinctions, in part, to explain the special case of mathematical knowledge, which he regarded as the fundamental example of a priori knowledge”

So a priori judgments are

“truth (a truth is necessary if it cannot be denied without contradiction).”

Andst

Mathematics is *A priori*

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-mathematics/#_KanAnsHisQueSowDurMatPos

“There he claims, first, that “properly mathematical judgments are always *a priori* judgments” on the grounds that they are necessary, and so cannot be derived from experience”

Andst

Geometry is *a priori*

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/~uctymdg/Phil%20of%20Geom%205.pdf>

Geometry is a science which determines the properties of space synthetically and yet *a priori* (Critique of Pure Reason A25/ B40)”

BZU7

kants notion that mathematics and euclidean geometry is a priori is shown to be rubbish thus his claim that mathematics and euclidean geometry is synthetic a priori is rubbish

thus

Kants Critique of Pure Reason is shown to be a failure and complete rubbish

proof

1) from number theory

2)from geometry

mathematics ends in contradiction thus cant be a priori

proof

1)

An integer (1) = a non-integer (0.999..) mathematics ends in contradiction

from

Scientific Reality is Only the Reality of a Monkey (homo-sapiens)

<http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/scientific-reality-is-only-the-reality-of-a-monkey.pdf>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/660607834/Scientific-Reality-is-Only-the-Reality-of-a-Monkey>

let $x=0.999\dots$ (the 9s dont stop thus is an infinite decimal thus non-integer)

$$10x = 9.999\dots$$

$$10x - x = 9.999\dots - 0.999\dots$$

$$9x = 9$$

$$x = 1 \text{ (an integer)}$$

maths prove an interger=/is a non-integer

maths ends in contradiction

thus mathematics is rubbish as you can prove any crap you want in mathematics

an integer= non-integer ($1=0.999\dots$) thus maths ends in contradiction: thus it is proven you can prove anything in maths now before you all start rabbiting on take note

you have two options

just

yes

or

no

are the mathematician/maths site lying when they say

either

yes

or

no

mathematician/mathematic sites are lying when they say

An integer is a number with NO DECIMAL or fractional part

If they are lying

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then you are stuck with mathematics ending in contradiction

Because

By the definitions

a number with NO DECIMAL is \neq a number with A
DECIMAL

thus a contradiction

by definition

0.999.. is an infinite DECIMAL no last digit

https://encyclopediaofmath.org/wiki/Infinite_decimal_expansion

and

An integer is a number with NO DECIMAL or fractional part

<https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/whole-numbers/>

Whole number definitions

<https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/whole-numbers/>

A whole number means a number that does not include any fractions, negative numbers or [no] DECIMAL. It includes complete or whole numbers like 4, 67, 12, and so on

Natural number is

defined to be

<https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/natural-numbers/>

They are a part of real numbers including only the positive INTEGERS, but not zero, fractions, [no] DECIMALS, and negative numbers

Natural numbers are the numbers that are used for counting and are a part of real numbers. The set of natural numbers includes only the positive integers, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, ∞ . thus

when

a number with NO DECIMAL is \neq a number with A DECIMAL

is a contradiction

Take definitions of INTEGER

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Integer>

An integer may be regarded as a real number that can be written without a fractional component. For example, 21, 4, 0, and -2048 are integers, while 9.75, $5+1/2$, and $\sqrt{2}$ are not.

and for those interested in In modern set-theoretic mathematics

we also get

This notation recovers the familiar representation of the integers as $\{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.

<https://www.cuemath.com/numbers/integers/>

Integers Definition

An integer is a number with no decimal or fractional part A few examples of integers are: -5, 0, 1, 5, 8, 97,

<https://www.mathsisfun.com/definitions/integer.html>

A number with no fractional part (no decimals) the counting numbers $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

<https://tutors.com/lesson/integers-definition-examples>

To be an integer, a number cannot be a decimal or a fraction

<http://www.amathsdictionaryforkids.com/qr/i/integer.html>

integer

- a positive number, a negative number or zero but not a fraction or a decimal fraction. To be an integer, a number cannot be a decimal or a fraction. when

when mathematics proves

1 (NOOOOOO decimal or fractional part-thus an INTEGER)
 $= 0.999\dots$ (the 9s dont stop no last digit thus is an infinite decimal with a decimal part thus **CANNOT** be an integer but a non-integer)

maths prove an interger= \neq is a non-integer

thus

maths ends in contradiction

AGAIN

If they are lying **ABOUT** the definitions

Then you go take it up with them

If they are not lying but telling the truth

Then you are stuck with mathematics ending in contradiction

a number with **NO DECIMAL** is \neq a number with **A DECIMAL** is a contradiction

Now

When

an integer \neq non-integer ($1=0.999\dots$) thus maths ends in contradiction: thus it is proven you can prove anything in maths

proof

you only need to find 1 contradiction in a system ie mathematics to show that for the whole system

you can prove anything

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_explosion

In classical logic, intuitionistic logic and similar logical systems, the principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from falsehood, anything [follows]'; or ex contradictione [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from contradiction, anything [follows]'), or the principle of Pseudo-Scotus (falsely attributed to Duns Scotus), is the law according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[1] That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it; this is known as deductive explosion

Scientific Reality is Only the Reality of a Monkey (homo-sapiens)

<http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/scientific-reality-is-only-the-reality-of-a-monkey.pdf>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/660607834/Scientific-Reality-is-Only-the-Reality-of-a-Monkey>

Magister colin leslie dean Australia's leading erotic poet: poetry is for free in pdf

"[Deans] philosophy is the sickest, most paralyzing and most destructive thing that has ever originated from the brain of man." "[Dean] lay waste to everything in its path..."

Scientific Reality is Only the Reality of a Monkey (homo-sapiens)

<http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/scientific-reality-is-only-the-reality-of-a-monkey.pdf>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/660607834/Scientific-Reality-is-Only-the-Reality-of-a-Monkey>

further proof mathematics is not the structure of reality as geometry ends in contradiction meaningless nonsense

as you cant even construct what your mathematics creates

2) Euclidean geometry ends in contradiction thus cant be a priori

from geometry

one example

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle cannot be constructed-
mathematics ends in contradiction

Mathematics ends in contradiction:6 proofs

<http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/MATHEMATICS.pdf>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/40697621/Mathematics-Ends-in-Meaninglessness-ie-self-contradiction>

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle cannot be constructed-
mathematics ends in contradiction

but

it is simple

before you all start going on

have a read and have LAUGH at someones ridiculous
arguments to refute the Magister colin leslie dean

https://www.reddit.com/r/AnarchyMath/comments/14rt7hi/a_1_unit_by_1_unit_triangle_cannot_be/

mathematician will tell you

$\sqrt{2}$ does not terminate

yet in the same breath tell you

A 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle can be constructed

even though they admit $\sqrt{2}$ does not terminate

thus you cant construct a $\sqrt{2}$ hypotenuse

thus you cannot construct 1 unit by 1 unit $\sqrt{2}$ triangle

thus maths ends in contradiction

thus

you can prove anything in mathematics

All things are possible

With maths being inconsistent you can prove anything in maths ie you can prove Fermat's last theorem and you can disprove Fermat's last theorem

<http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/All-things-are-possible.pdf>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/324037705/All-Things-Are-Possible-philosophy>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Principle_of_explosion

In classical logic, intuitionistic logic and similar logical systems, the principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from falsehood, anything [follows]'; or ex contradictione [sequitur] quodlibet, 'from contradiction, anything [follows]'), or the principle of Pseudo-Scotus (falsely attributed to Duns Scotus), is the law according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[1] That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it; this is known as deductive explosion

Magister colin leslie dean the only modern Renaissance man with 9 degrees including 4 masters: B,Sc, BA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, B.Litt(Hons), MA, MA (Psychoanalytic studies), Master of Psychoanalytic studies, Grad Cert (Literary studies)

He is Australia's leading erotic poet: poetry is for free in pdf

<http://gamahuchepress.yellowgum.com/book-genre/poetry/>

or

<https://www.scribd.com/document/35520015/List-of-FREE-Erotic-Poetry-Books-by-Gamahucher-Press>

"[Deans] philosophy is the sickest, most paralyzing and most destructive thing that has ever originated from the brain of man."

"[Dean] lay waste to everything in its path... [It is] a systematic work of destruction and demoralization... In the end it became nothing but an act of sacrilege

Scientific Reality is Only the Reality of a Monkey (homo-sapiens)

<http://gamahucherpress.yellowgum.com/wp-content/uploads/scientific-reality-is-only-the-reality-of-a-monkey.pdf>

or <https://www.scribd.com/document/660607834/Scientific-Reality-is-Only-the-Reality-of-a-Monkey>