

A SAMPLE PAPER: A TEMPLATE*†

Boris Veytsman, A. U. Thør, and C. O. Rëspondent

Abstract: The things in themselves are what first (see <http://www.tug.org>) give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements.

As we have already seen, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

1 Introduction

The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time are the clue to the discovery of, certainly, our a priori knowledge, by means of analytic unity. Our faculties abstract from all content of knowledge; for these

* This is the first titlenote

† This is the second titlenote

1 *reasons, the discipline of human reason stands in need of*
 2 *the transcendental aesthetic.* (Gregorio, 2011)

Is this quotation necessary?

3
 4 Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since
 5 knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the tran-
 6 scendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of
 7 natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological
 8 manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves
 9 the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is
 10 that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a mystery
 11 why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be supposed that our
 12 faculties have lying before them, in the case of the Ideal, the Antinomies; so,
 13 the transcendental aesthetic is just as necessary as our experience. By means
 14 of the Ideal, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.

15 As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it
 16 remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our
 17 concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but
 18 our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment
 19 of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions,
 20 the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for
 21 these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense
 22 perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and
 23 demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.)
 24 So, it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense
 25 perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content for
 26 our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal
 27 concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general.

28 As we have already seen, what we have alone been able to show is that
 29 the objects in space and time would be falsified; what we have alone been
 30 able to show is that, our judgements are what first give rise to metaphysics.
 31 As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells us that the objects in space and
 32 time, in the full sense of these terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose
 33 that, indeed, our problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our
 34 concepts. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be
 35 treated like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena
 36 occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning the existence of
 37 natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural
 38 reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity and
 39 the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that this is the
 40 case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms. This could not be
 41 passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a
 42 merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

43 The phenomena (and it is obvious that this is the case) prove the validity
 44 of our sense perceptions; in natural theology, philosophy teaches us nothing
 45 whatsoever regarding the content of the transcendental objects in space
 46

1 and time. In natural theology, our sense perceptions are a representation
 2 of the Antinomies. The noumena exclude the possibility of, even as this
 3 relates to the transcendental aesthetic, our knowledge. Our concepts would
 4 thereby be made to contradict, that is to say, the noumena; in the study
 5 of philosophy, space is by its very nature contradictory. Since some of
 6 the Antinomies are problematic, our ideas are a representation of our a
 7 priori concepts, yet space, in other words, has lying before it the things in
 8 themselves. Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the
 9 phenomena, the Antinomies are a representation of metaphysics.

10 As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension,
 11 it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress
 12 in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive
 13 judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the con-
 14 trary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending
 15 regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the
 16 employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can
 17 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architec-
 18 tonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The
 19 practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature
 20 contradictory, and the thing in itself would thereby be made to contradict
 21 the Ideal of practical reason. On the other hand, natural causes can not
 22 take account of, consequently, the Antinomies, as will easily be shown in
 23 the next section. Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert
 24 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
 25 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our ideas,
 26 but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us suppose that
 27 this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of necessity. But the proof of
 28 this is a task from which we can here be absolved. ¹

Are all quotes here relevant?

30 2 Discussion

32 2.1 Negative Arguments

34 We can deduce that the Ideal of practical reason, even as this relates to our
 35 knowledge, is a representation of the discipline of human reason. The things
 36 in themselves are just as necessary as our understanding.² The noumena

37
 38 ¹As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of the discipline of natural
 39 reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of,
 40 in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I
 41 have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. See also (Landau
 42 and Lifshitz, 1980–1981), (Hoff, 2010), (Rao, 2007), (Fagan, 2006), (Bourget and Chalmers,
 43 Forthcoming), (Aquinas, 1951), (Mapas, 2012), (Anderson, 1997), and (Knuth, 1994).

44 ²As is proven in the ontological manuals, it remains a mystery why our experience is the mere
 45 result of the power of the discipline of human reason, a blind but indispensable function of the
 46 soul. For these reasons, the employment of the thing in itself teaches us nothing whatsoever
 regarding the content of the Ideal of natural reason.

1 prove the validity of the manifold. As will easily be shown in the next
 2 section, natural causes occupy part of the sphere of our a priori knowledge
 3 concerning the existence of the Antinomies in general.³

4 The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven
 5 in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose
 6 that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of
 7 knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on
 8 the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that,
 9 irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need
 10 of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle,
 11 pure logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from
 12 all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in
 13 accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time.
 14 I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like
 15 metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects
 16 in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

17 As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension,
 18 it is necessary to explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress
 19 in the series of empirical conditions is a representation of our inductive
 20 judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of, on the con-
 21 trary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending
 22 regress in the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the
 23 employment of the Antinomies, in respect of the intelligible character, can
 24 never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the architec-
 25 tonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles. The
 26 practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature
 27 contradictory, and the thing in itself would thereby be made to contradict
 28 the Ideal of practical reason. On the other hand, natural causes can not
 29 take account of, consequently, the Antinomies, as will easily be shown in
 30 the next section. Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I assert
 31 that this is true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our
 32 experience would thereby be made to contradict, for example, our ideas,
 33 but the transcendental objects in space and time (and let us suppose that
 34 this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of necessity. But the proof of
 35 this is a task from which we can here be absolved.

36 Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on the other hand,
 37 natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next section. Still, the reader
 38 should be careful to observe that the phenomena have lying before them the

40 ³The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions can be treated like the objects
 41 in space and time. What we have alone been able to show is that, then, the transcendental
 42 aesthetic, in reference to ends, would thereby be made to contradict the Transcendental
 43 Deduction. The architectonic of practical reason has nothing to do with our ideas; **however,**
 44 **time can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal, it depends**
 45 **on hypothetical principles.** Space has nothing to do with the Antinomies, because of our
 46 necessary ignorance of the conditions.

1 intelligible objects in space and time, because of the relation between the
2 manifold and the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle
3 tells us that, in reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should
4 be careful to observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content
5 of the empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole
6 exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics exists
7 in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in itself (and I
8 assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that
9 it may be in contradictions with the transcendental unity of apperception;
10 certainly, our judgements exist in natural causes.) The reader should be
11 careful to observe that, indeed, the Ideal, on the other hand, can be treated
12 like the noumena, but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict
13 the Antinomies. The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the
14 whole content for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.

16 2.1.1 *An Aside on Numbers*

17 Since some of our sense perceptions are hypothetical, philosophy proves
18 the validity of natural causes; on the other hand, our experience, in other
19 words, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like our
20 experience, it depends on synthetic principles. Natural causes, in natural
21 theology, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body
22 must be known a priori. What we have alone been able to show is that
23 philosophy is a representation of our concepts, as will easily be shown in the
24 next section. The Ideal may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that
25 it may be in contradictions with, in the study of the transcendental aesthetic,
26 our sense perceptions. (As is shown in the writings of Galileo, the reader
27 should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time, by means
28 of necessity, are by their very nature contradictory.) The Antinomies can
29 not take account of our experience, by virtue of natural reason. Therefore,
30 the noumena, in view of these considerations, are by their very nature
31 contradictory, as will easily be shown in the next section.

34 2.2 Positive Arguments

35 The reader should be careful to observe that the objects in space and time
36 are the clue to the discovery of, certainly, our a priori knowledge, by means
37 of analytic unity. Our faculties abstract from all content of knowledge;
38 for these reasons, the discipline of human reason stands in need of the
39 transcendental aesthetic. There can be no doubt that, insomuch as the
40 Ideal relies on our a posteriori concepts, philosophy, when thus treated as
41 the things in themselves, exists in our hypothetical judgements, yet our a
42 posteriori concepts are what first give rise to the phenomena. Philosophy
43 (and I assert that this is true) excludes the possibility of the never-ending
44 regress in the series of empirical conditions, as will easily be shown in the
45

1 next section. Still, is it true that the transcendental aesthetic can not take
 2 account of the objects in space and time, or is the real question whether the
 3 phenomena should only be used as a canon for the never-ending regress
 4 in the series of empirical conditions? By means of analytic unity, the
 5 Transcendental Deduction, still, is the mere result of the power of the
 6 Transcendental Deduction, a blind but indispensable function of the soul,
 7 but our faculties abstract from all content of a posteriori knowledge. It
 8 remains a mystery why, then, the discipline of human reason, in other words,
 9 is what first gives rise to the transcendental aesthetic, yet our faculties have
 10 lying before them the architectonic of human reason.

11 However, we can deduce that our experience (and it must not be sup-
 12 posed that this is true) stands in need of our experience, as we have already
 13 seen. On the other hand, it is not at all certain that necessity is a repre-
 14 sentation of, by means of the practical employment of the paralogisms of
 15 practical reason, the noumena. In all theoretical sciences, our faculties are
 16 what first give rise to natural causes. To avoid all misapprehension, it is
 17 necessary to explain that our ideas can never, as a whole, furnish a true
 18 and demonstrated science, because, like the Ideal of natural reason, they
 19 stand in need to inductive principles, as is shown in the writings of Galileo.
 20 As I have elsewhere shown, natural causes, in respect of the intelligible
 21 character, exist in the objects in space and time.

22 Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason, are by their very
 23 nature contradictory. The objects in space and time can not take account
 24 of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the possibility of, certainly,
 25 space. I assert that our ideas, by means of philosophy, constitute a body of
 26 demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori,
 27 by means of analysis. It must not be supposed that space is by its very
 28 nature contradictory. Space would thereby be made to contradict, in the
 29 case of the manifold, the manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals,
 30 Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of
 31 human reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions
 32 has lying before it our experience. This could not be passed over in a
 33 complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay
 34 the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

36 3 Conclusions

38 Because of the relation between pure logic and natural causes, to avoid all
 39 misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that, even as this relates to the
 40 thing in itself, pure reason constitutes the whole content for our concepts,
 41 but the Ideal of practical reason may not contradict itself, but it is still
 42 possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, natural reason. It
 43 remains a mystery why natural causes would thereby be made to contradict
 44 the noumena; by means of our understanding, the Categories are just as
 45 necessary as our concepts. The Ideal, irrespective of all empirical conditions,
 46

A numbered list of conclusions might be better

1 depends on the Categories, as is shown in the writings of Aristotle. It is
2 obvious that our ideas (and there can be no doubt that this is the case)
3 constitute the whole content of practical reason. The Antinomies have
4 nothing to do with the objects in space and time, yet general logic, in
5 respect of the intelligible character, has nothing to do with our judgements.
6 In my present remarks I am referring to the transcendental aesthetic only in
7 so far as it is founded on analytic principles.

8 With the sole exception of our a priori knowledge, our faculties have
9 nothing to do with our faculties. Pure reason (and we can deduce that this
10 is true) would thereby be made to contradict the phenomena. As we have
11 already seen, let us suppose that the transcendental aesthetic can thereby
12 determine in its totality the objects in space and time. We can deduce that,
13 that is to say, our experience is a representation of the paralogisms, and
14 our hypothetical judgements constitute the whole content of our concepts.
15 However, it is obvious that time can be treated like our a priori knowledge,
16 by means of analytic unity. Philosophy has nothing to do with natural
17 causes.

18 By means of analysis, our faculties stand in need to, indeed, the empirical
19 objects in space and time. The objects in space and time, for these rea-
20 sons, have nothing to do with our understanding. There can be no doubt
21 that the noumena can not take account of the objects in space and time;
22 consequently, the Ideal of natural reason has lying before it the noumena.
23 By means of analysis, the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to,
24 therefore, space, yet our sense perceptions exist in the discipline of practical
25 reason.

26 The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know, our faculties. As
27 we have already seen, the objects in space and time are what first give rise
28 to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; for these
29 reasons, our a posteriori concepts have nothing to do with the paralogisms
30 of pure reason. As we have already seen, metaphysics, by means of the
31 Ideal, occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence
32 of the objects in space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility
33 of our sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby be
34 made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so regarded,
35 exist in our judgements.

36 The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions may not
37 contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with,
38 then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of
39 space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a
40 representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline
41 of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of
42 empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it
43 must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself
44 excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be
45 shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the
46

1 things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be treated like
 2 the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce
 3 that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves,
 4 indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of
 5 the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the
 6 ontological manuals.⁴

7
 8 Boris Veytsman
 9 Computational Materials Science Center, MS 6A2
 10 George Mason University
 11 Fairfax, VA 22030
 12 USA
 13 E-mail : borisv@lk.net
<http://borisv.lk.net>

14 A. U. Thør
 15 C. O. Rëspondent
 16 Kant-Forschungsstelle Universität Mainz
 17 Colonel-Kleinmann-Weg 2
 18 55128 Mainz
 19 Germany

20 Bibliography notes:

21 As we have already seen, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space
 22 and time would be falsified; what we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements
 23 are what first give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells us that the
 24 objects in space and time, in the full sense of these terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose
 25 that, indeed, our problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As any
 26 dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated like the transcendental unity
 27 of apperception, but the phenomena occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning
 28 the existence of natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural reason,
 29 the solution of which involves the relation between necessity and the Categories? Natural
 30 causes (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) constitute the whole content for the
 31 paralogisms. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy,
 32 but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

33 Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and time (and I assert, however, that
 34 this is the case) have lying before them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary
 35 ignorance of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic (and what we
 36 have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a representation of the never-ending
 37 regress in the series of empirical conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this
 38 expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the Antinomies. By means of
 39 analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated
 40 science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the whole
 41 content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our experience is just as necessary as, in
 42 accordance with the principles of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space
 43 and time abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested that it remains
 44 a mystery why there is no relation between the Antinomies and the phenomena? It must
 45 not be supposed that the Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the
 46 clue to the discovery of philosophy, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions.

⁴ As is shown in the writings of Hume, it remains a mystery why our judgements exclude the
 possibility of the transcendental aesthetic.

Acknowledgements The work on this package was supported by Sant Lois University.

1 As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our
 2 understanding (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives rise to the
 3 architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close examination.

4 The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological
 5 manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apper-
 6 ception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of
 7 human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that,
 8 irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive
 9 judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of the discipline of
 10 natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation
 11 of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I
 12 have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the
 13 Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the
 14 employment of pure reason.

15 As is evident upon close examination, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to
 16 explain that, on the contrary, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions is a
 17 representation of our inductive judgements, yet the things in themselves prove the validity of,
 18 on the contrary, the Categories. It remains a mystery why, indeed, the never-ending regress in
 19 the series of empirical conditions exists in philosophy, but the employment of the Antinomies,
 20 in respect of the intelligible character, can never furnish a true and demonstrated science,
 21 because, like the architectonic of pure reason, it is just as necessary as problematic principles.
 22 The practical employment of the objects in space and time is by its very nature contradictory,
 23 and the thing in itself would thereby be made to contradict the Ideal of practical reason. On
 24 the other hand, natural causes can not take account of, consequently, the Antinomies, as
 25 will easily be shown in the next section. Consequently, the Ideal of practical reason (and I
 26 assert that this is true) excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. Our experience would
 27 thereby be made to contradict, for example, our ideas, but the transcendental objects in space
 28 and time (and let us suppose that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of necessity. But
 29 the proof of this is a task from which we can here be absolved.

30 Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on the other hand, natural causes, as
 31 will easily be shown in the next section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that
 32 the phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and time, because of
 33 the relation between the manifold and the noumena. As is evident upon close examination,
 34 Aristotle tells us that, in reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to
 35 observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the empirical objects in space and
 36 time. Our experience, with the sole exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore,
 37 metaphysics exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in itself (and
 38 I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in
 39 contradictions with the transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist
 40 in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the Ideal, on the
 41 other hand, can be treated like the noumena, but natural causes would thereby be made to
 42 contradict the Antinomies. The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole
 43 content for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.

37 References:

- 38 Anderson, Thomas C. 1997. "Kierkegaard and Approximation Knowledge." In *Concluding*
 39 *Unscientific Postscript to "Philosophical Fragments,"* edited by Robert Perkins, Vol. 12 of
 40 *International Kierkegaard Commentary*, 187–204. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.
 41 Aquinas. 1951. *Super Evangelium S. Matthaei lectura, Reportatio Leodegarii Bissuntini*. 5th
 42 edn. Edited by R. Cai. Turin: Marietti.
 43 Bourget, David and David J. Chalmers. Forthcoming. "What Do Philosophers Believe?"
 44 *Philosophical Studies* (in press).
 45
 46

- 1 Fagan, Andrew. 2006. *Human Rights*. In *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/h/hum-rts.htm>.
- 2
- 3 Gregorio, Enrico. 2011. *The kantlipsum Package. Dummy text in Kantian Style*. <http://mirrors.ctan.org/macros/latex/contrib/kantlipsum>.
- 4
- 5 Hoff, Karla. 2010. "Fairness in Modern Society." *Science* 327 (5972): 1467–1468. <http://www.sciencemag.org>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1188537>.
- 6
- 7 Knuth, Donald Ervin. 1994. *The T_EXbook*. Computers & Typesetting A. Illustrations by Duane Bibby. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- 8
- 9 Landau, L. D. and E. M. Lifshitz. 1980–1981. *Statistical Physics*. 3rd edn. Vol. 5 of *Theoretical Physics*. Rev. and Enl. by E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii. Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press.
- 10
- 11 Mapas, J. 2012. "Donald Davidson." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Winter 2012 edn., edited by Edward N. Zalta. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/davidson/>.
- 12
- 13 Rao, Rajesh P. N. 2007. "Neural Models of Bayesian Belief Propagation." In *Bayesian Brain: Probabilistic Approaches to Neural Coding*, edited by Kenji Doya, Shin Ishii, Alexandre Pouget, and Rajesh P. N. Rao, Computational Neuroscience, chap. 11, 239–267. Cambridge, MA; London, England: The MIT Press.
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46