World Journal of Social Science Research
ISSN 2375-9747 (Print) ISSN 2332-5534 (Online)
Vol. 2, No. 2, 2015
www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/wjssr

Kant on the Experience of Passivity

Motohide Saji[1*]

[1] Graduate School of International Relations, International University of Japan, Japan

[*] Motohide Saji, E-mail: motohidesaji@gmail.com

Abstract

This article reconstructs Kant's thought on early human development and its effect throughout one's life in his empirical, anthropological work. To do so, I examine Kant's treatment of three aspects of the early human development chronologically. Kant's argument concerns processes that one goes through before becoming an adult, which take place beyond one's control, which form the basis for one's adult self, and which affect one throughout one's life. One's experience of these three aspects can be called the experience of passivity. First, while an infant, one is subject to the drive and inability to coordinate and control one's bodily motion, to the drive to communicate, and to the activity of imitation. Second, one is compelled to begin reasoning rather than actively beginning the exercise of reason. The initial activity of reason suddenly has already taken place in one beyond one's control in such a way that one cannot choose whether to begin to exercise the faculty of reason in the first place. Third, one is affected by otherness in the formation and development of one's self. Kant's thought thus reconstructed proves to be consistent with what recent empirical research demonstrates. The present analysis ends with questions and implications for social science research.

Keywords

the early human developmental process, reason, the self, memory

1. Introduction

This article reconstructs Kant's thought on early human development and its effect throughout one's life in his empirical, anthropological work (Kant, 2006, 2007). To do so, I examine Kant's treatment of three aspects of the early human development chronologically. First, while an infant, one is subject to the drive and inability to coordinate and control one's bodily motion, to the drive to communicate, and to the activity of imitation. Second, one is struck by the initial activity of reason rather than actively beginning the exercise of reason. The initial activity of reason suddenly has already taken place in one beyond one's control in such a way that one cannot choose whether to begin to exercise the faculty of reason in the first place. Third, one is affected by otherness in the formation and development of one's self. Kant's thought thus reconstructed proves to be consistent with what recent empirical research demonstrates.

Kant's argument examined here concerns processes that one goes through before becoming an adult,

which take place beyond one's control, which form the basis for one's adult self, and which affect one throughout one's life. I will call one's experience of the three aspects mentioned above the experience of passivity.[1] I do not deal with Kant's work where an adult human being is discussed or presupposed. For instance, while in many places Kant takes up the issue that as adults we find ourselves subject to drives, desires, inclinations, and so on, I do not treat this issue as such. Nor do I discuss Kant's critical, transcendental philosophy including his practical philosophy, where a human being capable of full language, judgment, reason, and moral law, namely, an adult person, is presupposed. When this article examines Kant's discussion on an adult human being, it does so in terms of how his/her self is affected by his/her early developmental process.

The present analysis opens up questions such as: given the inescapable fact of passivity, in which sense and to what extent can we be said to be a rational, free-acting being? How do we come to terms with passivity if we are to understand ourselves primarily as such a being? I conclude with questions like these and implications that they have for social science research, our self-understanding, Kant scholarship, and non-Kantian naturalistic ethics.

2. Reconstruction

2.1 First Aspect

According to Kant, infants are subject to two drives that he argues are innate in them. Kant observes that the initial condition of the infant is that he or she is both driven to and unable to coordinate and control his or her bodily motion. Kant describes this condition as infants' "drive [*Trieb*]" and "inability" to use their limbs, to change their bodily positions, and to approach objects (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232). This is the first drive to which infants are subject. Kant also finds in the "smallest" or "newborn" child the "*drive to communicate* [*Der Trieb sich mitzutheilen*]" which impels him/her to "*announce* his [/her] existence" to others (Kant, 2006, p. 232; Kant, 2007, p. 164; emphasis in original). This is the second drive to which infants are subject. Kant thinks that the second drive persists and affects one throughout one's life (Kant, 2006, pp. 168-169; Kant, 2007, p. 164).

Infants are unable to experience the initial condition of their existence as it is. Instead, they feel that their "freedom" in their drive to coordinate and control their bodily motion is "hindered". They thereby feel an "obscure" sense of "freedom", "offense", "affront", "injustice", and "justice" (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232; also Kant, 2007, p. 164). Though indeterminate, these are normative ideas. This means that

[1] I do not use the term receptivity. In Kant's work receptivity (*Receptivität*) is coupled with spontaneity. Being the two sources of knowledge for the human being, both concern presentations of objects. Receptivity refers to the way in which the mind is affected by objects and can receive presentations thereof. Spontaneity generates presentations of objects and makes possible the generation of knowledge. The term receptivity does not capture the characteristics of the experience of the three aspects analyzed in this article.

infants feel an obscure sense that they should be or become capable of coordinating and controlling their bodily motion. Kant states that infants feel that their "freedom" is "taken away" from them by something external (Kant, 2006, p. 232). Infants also feel their "inability" as a "*constraint*" or "fetter" (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232; emphasis in original). Infants feel such hindrance, offense, constraint, and fetter as something coming from outside. As a matter of fact, however, nothing external, in general, hinders, offends, and constrains their drive to coordinate and control their bodily motion. This means that infants create an illusory or imaginary cause of the inability at issue and project it onto the outside. The drive to communicate that impels one to announce one's existence to others is involved here. Infants feel an obscure normative sense of offense, freedom, justice, injustice, and so on concerning the way in which they exist. Infants feel such a sense in relation to others. Such a sense implies that others should do justice to infants, remove offense from them, and so on, because infants cannot do so by themselves. When feeling such an obscure sense, infants must learn how to communicate it to others because the drive to communicate impels infants to, but does not determine exactly how to, communicate their existence to others. Through their behavior and gesture (e.g., crying), infants express such a sense in the form of a not-yet-articulated "claim [*Anspruch*]" to justice and freedom that they feel is constrained and hindered (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232). This claim is addressed to others.

Due to the two drives, infants thus come to have an obscure sense of freedom, justice, affront, cause, effect, claim, and so on. This, Kant thinks, means that the two drives contribute to the emergence of reason's nascent activity. Kant expresses this thought when he states, without explaining, that the obscure ideas infants have of offense, freedom, justice, and injustice "point to [*hindeuten*] reason" in them (Kant, 2006, p. 16). That infants come to have these ideas is an anticipatory sign of the activity of reason in them. Presumably, Kant makes this statement for two reasons. First, the concepts of freedom, injustice, and justice are moral concepts, and for Kant these are concepts of reason. "Claim" is also a normative idea. Kant finds a nascent activity of reason in a not-yet-articulated moral "claim" to "freedom" and "justice". Second, here Kant is probably considering the mind as reason in a broad sense. As noted, feeling the inability in question as an effect, infants project its illusory or imaginary cause onto the outside. Moreover, infants' feeling of obscure ideas under consideration is accompanied and motivated by other related feelings such as "uncomfortableness", "annoyance", "indignation", and "exasperation" (Kant, 2006, p. 16, p. 168, p. 232). Here we can see a nascent activity of the mind (of cause-and-effect association, illusion-creating, imagination, projection, claim-making, feeling, and emotion), although it is not that infants are consciously doing this but that this takes place in them.[2]

[2] Elsewhere too Kant in effect treats reason as the mind. For example, in many places in the *Critique of Pure Reason* we find Kant saying that reason has, and is impelled by, its needs, interests, satisfactions, dissatisfactions, strivings, aspirations, ardors, affections, claims, pretenses, illusions, and so on. In places like these Kant should be understood as describing the activity of the mind rather than that of reason in a narrow sense, whether it is the faculty of choice, of inference, of morality, or of account-giving.

The two drives thus contribute to the emergence of reason's nascent activity. Here Kant reminds us that the mind is embodied. This is to say that its activity is inseparable from and based on our sensorimotor capacities, bodily experiences, and feelings accompanied by such experiences.

In the *Anthropology*, a piece of work that concerns human facts, Kant finds the drive to communicate in the "smallest" or "newborn" child (Kant, 2006, p. 232). Both the cry of infants and their indeterminate "claim" to freedom and justice are considered an expression of this drive (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232). Kant treats the drive at issue also in his essay entitled "On a Conjectural Beginning of Human History". Kant writes:

The *drive to communicate* [*Der Trieb sich mitzutheilen*] must have been what first moved him [the first human being], even when he was still alone, to make his existence known toward living beings outside him, especially to those who utter a sound, which he could imitate and afterward use as a name. One sees a similar effect of this drive also in children… They want to make their existence known far and wide (Kant, 2007, p. 164; emphasis in original).

In this essay Kant tries to offer a conjectural beginning of human history with *Genesis* of the Bible as a guiding thread. In the first sentence Kant is speaking of the "first human being" in *Genesis*. This first human being is assumed to be a "fully formed" adult (Kant, 2007, p. 164). In the next sentence, however, Kant says that a "similar effect" of the drive at issue is found in "children". What Kant says about children in this essay is based on observation. In fact, referring to actual human life, Kant stresses that he also tries to use human "experience" as a guiding thread as much as possible (Kant, 2007, p. 163). Accordingly, with modifications we can read Kant's argument in this essay as revealing his thought on what takes place in the early developmental process of real human beings.

To modify Kant's cited remarks on the drive in question, the first human being and non-human creatures in *Genesis* are replaced with a real infant and real humans, respectively. Kant says that the drive to communicate must have impelled the first human being to announce his existence. Similarly, this drive impels an infant to announce his/her existence. The first human being tries to make his existence known to "living beings outside him, especially to those that utter a sound, which he could imitate and afterward use as a name". By these 'living beings' Kant means the animals with whom God presented Adam before He created Eve as his mate. If we replace these non-human "living beings" with human beings, we get Kant's idea that an infant is impelled by the drive to communicate to announce his/her existence to other human beings, above all to those around him/her (see also Kant, 2006, p. 232). A "sound" uttered by non-human living beings is replaced with "sounds" that those around an infant utter in speaking to and about him/her.

To elaborate on the modifications, an infant is born surrounded by others who, knowing who he/she is, respond to and speak to and about him/her. To anticipate Kant's view examined in the third section, that is why a young child named Karl was able to say of himself that "Karl wants to eat". He would not have been able to say so if others around him had not appropriately and sufficiently responded to him. Initially, however, an infant does not know who or what he/she is. Nor can he/she participate in the talk

of others to and about him/her, because what he/she hears are mere "sounds" emitted from the mouths of others. Connecting the drive to communicate with the activity of imitation, Kant refers to a process in which the first human being was able to "imitate" a "sound" and "afterward" use it as a "name". What is implied is that an infant goes through a similar process. An infant responds to "sounds" uttered from the mouths of others around him/her by making sounds such as crying, screaming, and so on (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232). An infant also responds to such "sounds" by imitating them. In doing so, an infant also imitates the facial expressions and movements (tongue protrusion, mouth opening, etc.) and accompanied gestures of others. Otherwise an infant would be unable to utter in an appropriate manner sounds that he/she would "afterward use" as words, for example as his/her "name". Through imitating movements of others, an infant gradually learns to coordinate and control his/her bodily motion. An infant comes to feel that in imitating others he/she is responding to others in a way similar to that in which they are responding to one another via "sounds". An infant comes to feel that these "sounds" are more than mere sounds. "Afterward" an infant somehow comes to understand these "sounds" as words with meaning and to use some of these words as "names" including his/her name (e.g., "Karl"). Kant thus considers the drive to communicate inseparable from the activity of imitation. Since the drive in question is an innate one, the activity of imitation is also innate or almost innate. Infants have no choice but to imitate "sounds" and others' movements if they are to survive and develop successfully, although the way in which they imitate others varies depending on the context in which they are placed with others. To that extent, infants are subject to the activity of imitation.

Infants are subject to the process described thus far. This is Kant's reconstructed argument on the first aspect of the experience of passivity. It is important to note that the overall picture Kant offers is consistent with what empirical research shows. As infants' hands, arms, and legs are initially unresponsive to their commands (Thelen & Smith, 1996), that is, as they are unable to coordinate and control their bodily motion, they must somehow learn to do so. As Clark (2008) says, "the human infant must learn (by self-exploration) which neural commands bring about which bodily effects and must then practice until skilled enough to issue those commands without conscious effort… and until the infant body becomes transparent equipment" (pp. 34-35). Empirical research indicates the existence in infants of an "innate or instinctive motive for communication" and of "an inborn ability to communicate" (Legerstee, 1999, p. 220). This, however, does not guarantee the success of communication. Thus Gibson and Pick (2000) argue that infants must master not only the task of coordinating and controlling their bodily motion but also the task of communicating with those around them if they are to develop successfully. Inseparable from the drive to communicate, the activity of imitation plays a crucial role in mastering these two tasks. "Imitation" in infants is an inborn "social mechanism intended to promote interpersonal communication" (Legerstee, 1999, p. 219). Infants innately and automatically respond to human voices, faces, and bodily movements differently than to inanimate objects. Infants innately and automatically imitate vocalizations, facial expressions including emotional expressions, and movements of others. Infants modify their imitative response in relation to

others. This modification is more social than innate in that it is performed in relation to others.[3] We will return to the topic of imitation at the end of the third section. Based on infant studies, Gopnik (2009) argues that the mind of an infant is equipped with an innate mechanism for causal thinking, creativity, and imagination so that this mechanism underpins his/her reality and fantasy (pp. 3-46). Reviewing empirical research, Johnson (2007) emphasizes the "embodied character of reasoning" and of the mind, offering a view on the activity of the mind similar to that of Kant. Johnson (2007) also argues, as Kant had suggested before him, that abstract concepts such as "justice" and "freedom" are embodied, that is, are grounded in and rely on sensorimotor, bodily, and emotional aspects of experiences (p. 31, pp. 103-104, p. 106, p. 157, pp. 176-195). Similarly, Siegel (2012) says that our ideas of "freedom" and "justice" have "their origins" in our bodily, sensory, and perceptual experiences within interpersonal relationships (p. 223). Thus, Kant's thought on the first aspect of the experience of passivity is supported by empirical research.

2.2 Second Aspect

Since an adult is capable of reason while an infant is not yet thus capable, in the human's developmental process there is a moment in which the exercise of reason begins. After discussing the "drive to communicate", Kant turns to the issue of what takes place when one experiences the initial activity of reason as the faculty of choosing. Kant's view is that at such a moment one is struck by the initial activity of reason rather than actively beginning the exercise of reason. This is Kant's thought on the second aspect of the experience of passivity.

Kant argues that in his "first attempt at a free choice" the human being discovers or becomes aware of the faculty of reason, or "a faculty of choosing for himself a way of living" (Kant, 2007, p. 166). With this operation of reason, there opens up "an infinity of them [objects of desires among which to choose]" (ibid.). Here Kant is in effect discussing consciousness in its primary function. As Koch (2004) argues, in its primary function, consciousness provides a "compact representation" of "the present state of affairs in the world" and "make[s] this terse summary accessible to the planning stages [of the brain]". Consciousness allows actions that are "more flexible" than instinctive, reflex, automated, or "stereotyped" behaviors, so that one can deal with those "novel or surprising situations" encountered in the world for which such behaviors are inadequate. Consciousness allows one (or the relevant "parts of the brain") to "choose among different plans of action" to "decide a future [and optimal] course of action" (Koch, 2004, p. 233, p. 234, p. 235, p. 236, and p. 246).[4] It thus turns out that, by discussing what takes place when one becomes aware of the faculty of reason as that of

[3] For imitation in infants, see Legerstee (1999, p. 217, p. 219), Rochat (2004, pp. 7-8), and Marotos (1998, pp. 145-160).

[4] For the function of consciousness, its evolutionary advantage, and its neurological locations in the brain, see Koch (2004, pp. 231-247). I do not go into the issue of the definition of consciousness. For the difficulty of defining consciousness rigorously, see Koch (2012, pp. 32-34; also 2004, p. 332).

choosing, Kant is in effect considering what one experiences when consciousness begins to perform its primary function. With this in mind, let's examine Kant's thought.

We live constantly choosing among various things in our everyday lives. Thereby our lives become enriched. We feel afraid that we would have a poor way of life without the faculty of choosing. Accordingly, we may be tempted to think that the human being, when faced with the operation of reason for the first time, would have felt excited about the infinite possibilities that opened up for his/her way of living. That, however, is not Kant's view. While not sure whether a human being felt "delight" at the moment he/she makes the first attempt at a free choice, Kant is convinced that he/she must have been struck by "anxiety and fright" at that moment (Kant, 2007, p. 166). Kant regards the activity of reason as accompanied by the feelings of anxiety and fright, as well as by those of uncomfortableness, annoyance, indignation, and exasperation.

Kant links "anxiety" with the initial activity of reason. Fear is called "anxiety" when it is unknown what kind of threat the object of fear will bring about and/or when it is unclear which particular object that fear is a fear of (Kant, 2006, p. 153). The situation under consideration is not that in which there are too many options to choose from. Nor is it that in which a person is solely and entirely held responsible for whatever consequences may result from his/her choice. While these two situations too would induce anxiety (Salecl, 2010, pp. 14-44), the situation in question is that in which the human being is faced with the act of choosing as such in the first place. Kant explicitly says that the human being must have felt "anxiety and fright concerning… how he should deal with this newly discovered faculty [of choosing for himself/herself a way of living, that is, the faculty of reason]" (Kant, 2007, p. 166). The human being is confronted with choosing as such without knowing what it would be or mean to choose and what choosing as such would bring about in the first place. That is why Kant says that the initial activity of reason is accompanied by anxiety.

Kant links "fright" with the initial activity of reason. This is because that activity suddenly has already taken place in us beyond our control in such a way that we cannot choose whether to begin to exercise the faculty of choosing in the first place. As the faculty of choosing begins to operate there opens up an "infinity" of objects among which to choose. Before reason begins to operate, choice as such does not exist in the first place. Here "instinct" directs one to this or that object (Kant, 2007, p. 166). Somehow the move takes place from the condition in which choice as such does not exist to the condition in which choice exists and in which one has to exercise the faculty of choosing constantly. Let us call the latter condition (which is the condition of our everyday life) the practice of choice. We cannot choose whether to make this move to begin with. We cannot choose whether to begin the practice of choice in the first place. Whether to make this move, whether to begin the practice of choice in the first place, is not itself a matter of choice. If this were an object of choice, it would mean that one chooses whether to make the move and that one chooses whether to begin the practice of choice. This means that the move has somehow already taken place and the practice of choice has already begun. Whether to make *this* move, *this* choice, is not itself an object of choice. The same situation just appears at a higher level, *ad*

infinitum. Thus, it is not an object of choice whether to make the move to begin with or whether to start the practice of choice in the first place. It is not that we happen to be unable to choose whether to make the move or whether to begin the practice of choice in the first place. It is that we cannot choose this. And yet we are engaged in the practice of choice. It then must be the case that the move or the practice of choice somehow suddenly has already taken place and hit the human being beyond his/her control. Such an abrupt stroke must have caused a sudden affect in the human being and disturbed his/her mind. That is why Kant thinks that the initial activity of reason is accompanied by "fright", which is a "suddenly aroused fear that disconcerts the mind" (Kant, 2006, p. 153).

Just as we cannot choose whether to begin the practice of choice in the first place, so we cannot choose whether to end it. Kant states that the human being cannot choose to return to the state in which choice did not exist as such (Kant, 2007, p. 166). Not to choose at all for the rest of life does not end the practice of choice, because this amounts to continuously choosing not to choose and thus the practice of choice continues. (I leave aside the case of a suicide as a way to end the practice of choice.) The move to the practice of choice, once it has taken place, is irreversible although one cannot choose whether to make the move. The human being is struck by the activity of reason so that he/she finds himself/herself already involved in the practice of choice without being able to choose whether to start it or whether to end it.

We find Kant's surprising notion of the exercise of reason when we look at his remarks on anxiety, fright, and affect. According to Kant, both anxiety and fright belong to affect (Kant, 2006, p. 153). Before and after his discussion of anxiety and fright, Kant repeatedly connects affect with mental illness. Kant says that a person seized by affect is "probably always" suffering an "*illness of the mind*" (Kant, 2006, p. 149; emphasis in original). Such a person "resembles a deranged person" (Kant, 2006, p. 151). "Affects are generally diseased occurrences (symptoms)" (Kant, 2006, p. 154). As his words "probably always", "resemble", and "generally" indicate, Kant thinks that, when going through the initial activity of reason accompanied by the affects of anxiety and fright, one experiences a state identical, or if not identical, then very similar, to mental illness or derangement.

We also find Kant's equally unusual view of the activity of reason when we look at his figurative description of it. Kant depicts metaphorically the situation in which the human being was initially faced with the faculty of reason as that in which "he stood, as it were, on the brink of an abyss [*Abgrund*]" (Kant, 2007, p. 166). This "abyss" passage comes immediately after the passage on how to deal with the faculty of choice (reason) as such that suddenly emerged accompanied by anxiety and fright. The moment one discovers or becomes aware of the faculty of reason is likened to the moment one discovers an abyss and finds oneself standing on its brink. If he were to use figurative language, Kant could have compared the beginning of reason's activity with the emergence, discovery, or establishment of a ground because he discusses reason of an adult human being using the term ground

(*Grund*) (Caygill, 1995, pp. 217-219).[5] The fact is, however, that Kant resorts to the image of an abyss. The "abyss" passage, where Kant refers to an "infinity" of objects of choice, is immediately followed by the passage where Kant argues that, once one begins the practice of choice, one cannot return to the situation in which choice as such did not exist. These three passages are successive with the "abyss" passage being located in the middle. An abyss is a bottomless gulf. Accordingly, the bottomlessness of an abyss is meant to represent the infinite regress concerning the beginning of the practice of choice, the infinity of objects among which to choose, and the impossibility of getting out of the practice of choice. As we have seen, according to Kant, one finds oneself already involved passively in the activity of reason and struck by anxiety and fright, rather than actively choosing to begin the exercise of reason. In Kant's metaphorical language, the moment one becomes aware of the faculty of reason corresponds to the moment one discovers an abyss and finds oneself standing on its brink. Then, beginning to use reason turns out to be similar to being engulfed by and into, rather than to actively entering, an abyss that suddenly appears and which produces anxiety and fright in us. Exercising the faculty of reason without being able to end the practice of choice turns out to be analogous to being stuck in an abyss rather than to actively choosing to stay in it.

The words "anxiety", "fright", and "abyss" are meant together to characterize our experience of the initial activity of reason. Kant likens using reason in our everyday lives (the practice of choice) to being stuck in an abyss. If using reason in everyday life requires a sound mind, the expression of being stuck in an abyss seems to be an inappropriate figurative depiction for a sound mind. This expression, if it is to depict either a sound mind or a diseased mind, appears to be an appropriate metaphorical depiction for the latter. This is especially so when affect, to which anxiety and fright belong, is related to mental illness. To be sure, we may not feel anxiety and fright that accompanied the initial activity of reason any more. If we do not, and yet if anxiety, fright, and abyss are intended together to characterize the exercise of reason, does this mean that we are no longer stuck in the abyss? That is not what Kant suggests. Clearly, Kant suggests that we are stuck in an abyss because we constantly exercise the faculty of reason and are engaged in the practice of choice. Then, if we no longer feel anxiety and fright, that would be because we either have got used to or have forgotten the fact that we are in fact stuck in an abyss. In either case, we would continue to feel uneasy about the depiction of using reason in our everyday lives as being stuck in an abyss. Certainly, it would be too much to say that Kant is saying that we in fact are all deranged and mentally ill. Still, if we feel uneasy, that would be because here Kant is suggesting that the line between exercising the faculty of reason and suffering an illness of the

[5] In the preface to the *Critique of Practical Reason*, Kant says that the concept of freedom is the "keystone" of the whole structure of reason, and alone keeps it from falling into "an abyss of skepticism [*einen Abgrund des Skeptizismus*]" (Kant, 1996, p. 139). As I argued elsewhere, Kant also resorts to the image of an abyss when he describes how reason cancels itself through its operation (Saji, 2006).

mind or that between a sound mind and a diseased mind would be thinner and less certain than we may wish to believe. Indeed, as I argued elsewhere, in the *Anthropology* Kant undermines the division between reason and unreason (Saji, 2009a). At any rate, one is struck by the initial activity of reason. This experience is of such nature that it is to be characterized by the words "anxiety", "fright", and "abyss". This is Kant's view on the second aspect of the experience of passivity.

2.3 Third Aspect

Kant's thought on the third aspect of the experience of passivity concerns how one's self and one's sense thereof are formed and developed. Kant expresses his thought on this theme when he writes in a section entitled "On consciousness of oneself" in the *Anthropology*:

It is noteworthy that the child who can already speak fairly fluently nevertheless first begins to talk by means of "I" fairly late (perhaps a year later); in the meantime speaking of himself in the third person (Karl wants to eat, to walk, etc.). When he starts to speak by means of "I" a light seems to dawn on him, as it were, and from that day on he never again returns to his former way of speaking—Before he merely *felt* himself; now he *thinks* himself—The explanation of this phenomenon might be rather difficult for the anthropologist (Kant, 2006, p. 15; emphasis in original).

I will spell out Kant's view on the third aspect by explicating this passage.

Here Kant is dealing with the empirical developmental process through which young children come to begin to use the first-person pronouns in their self-reference and self-description. Two dimensions of consciousness of oneself are at issue. The first dimension is consciousness of oneself that one has when one speaks of oneself in the third person without being able to speak using first-person singular pronouns. The second dimension is consciousness of oneself that one acquires after one has spoken in the first person "I". One goes through a developmental process from the stage where the first dimension exists to that where the second emerges. Kant focuses on what takes place in this process. Kant's view is that the self is formed in this process by otherness in such a way that this otherness cannot be coherently integrated into the second dimension of consciousness of oneself. What Kant's idea implies is that one's self develops on the basis of this otherness and that one is affected throughout one's life by this otherness in the formation and development of one's self.

A young child first speaks of himself/herself in the third-person and later begins to use the first person "I" in his/her self-reference and self-description. Kant sees this fact as crucial for considering how consciousness of oneself develops. Recognizing the importance of this fact, empirical researchers show that it is not until around four years that the majority of children stop giving a third-person account of themselves and use consistently first-person singular pronouns for their self-reference and self-description (Rochat, 2004; Lewis, 2003).

Of the transition from the use of the third person to that of the first-person pronoun "I", Kant says that "before he [a young child] merely *felt* himself; now he *thinks* himself". By saying "now he thinks himself" Kant means that this child thinks himself/herself when referring to and describing himself/herself in the first-person singular pronouns. The consciousness of oneself to which Kant refers

here is consciousness of oneself *as* oneself. Capable of using the first-person singular pronouns "I", "my", "me", "mine", and "myself" to refer to oneself, one can conceive of oneself as oneself. In this self-awareness, one can also be conscious of oneself as "one and the same person" to which "all changes", namely, different experiences, are ascribed to oneself as one's own (Kant, 2006, p. 15). Kant's view is consistent with what empirical research shows. Based on recent infant studies, Lewis argues that the start of the use of first person pronouns in children reflects or shows the emergence in these children of the "*idea of me*", "*self-representation*", or "meta-representation" (that is, consciousness of oneself as oneself) (Lewis, 2003, pp. 281-282; emphasis in original).

Kant says that "before [that is, before speaking in the first-person singular pronouns] he [a young child] merely felt himself". By saying "he merely felt himself" Kant does not mean to claim that this child who could not think at all through language. Karl has mastered the use of concepts of "want", "eat", "walk", and more. as well as the use of the third person pronoun "Karl". To that extent, Karl at this stage is able to think. However, Karl cannot think of himself as "me" or "myself" because he has not mastered the use of the first-person singular pronouns.

Kant gives an example in which a child named Karl gives third-person self-descriptions such as "Karl wants to eat, to walk, etc". By this time Karl has experienced, lived, or lived through, passivity in its first and second aspects discussed in the previous two sections. Kant presents two ideas in this example. First, for Karl, how others see Karl precedes how he sees himself. Second, Karl's expressive behavior (the outer self) precedes the identification of his supposedly corresponding mental state (the inner self). The example of Karl is meant to describe what takes place in one's early developmental process. Together these two ideas show that before speaking of oneself by means of "I" one initially appears to oneself as an other for others without having the "idea of me" and without being able to conceive of oneself as oneself.

The words "Karl", "want", "eat", and "walk" and the meaning thereof are not Karl's creation. Initially, these words are just sounds to Karl. As indicated in our earlier discussion of the topic of imitation, Karl has no choice but to learn these sounds by imitating others who utter these sounds, especially others around him such as his "mother and nurse" (Kant, 2006, p. 16). "Karl" is the name others use when they call and describe this child as an other for them. "Karl wants to do this or that" is originally a statement that others make about Karl when they speak to and about him as an other for them. Karl somehow comes to understand these sounds as words that have meanings. The child comes to refer to himself as Karl and gives third-person self-descriptions. This means that, without being able to give first-person self-reference and self-description, Karl has internalized the perspective in which others see him as an other for them.

What is puzzling is how Karl has come to take such a perspective concerning the verb "want". The expression "Karl wants to eat" describes a mental state (feeling a desire for food). What Kant implies is that there is a certain period of time in the early developmental process of Karl when others know and identify which mental state of Karl is to be differentiated and named as such and such whereas Karl

does not. Others cannot directly gain access to Karl's mental states. The items available to others are Karl's behavior and the situation in which it is embedded. Since Kant regards the cry of an infant as an important way for him/her to communicate, and an expression of the drive to communicate (Kant, 2006, p. 168, p. 232), let us consider situations in which Karl cries.

Suppose Karl starts crying when he has not had milk for a while. Seeing Karl's cry as an expression of his hunger, that is, his desire for food, others speak to and about him saying "Karl is hungry and wants to eat". They give milk to him, and Karl stops crying. Suppose Karl starts crying after having been in a baby car seat for a while. Understanding Karl's cry as an expression of his desire to walk, others speak to and about him saying "Karl wants to walk". They get him out of the baby car seat and let him try to walk. Karl stops crying. Suppose Karl starts crying when he hits his head hard on the floor. Regarding Karl's cry as an expression of his pain, others soothe him bodily and verbally. Suppose Karl, having had to keep awake for a while, starts crying. Seeing his cry as an expression of his desire for sleep, others speak to and about him saying "Karl is sleepy and wants to sleep". They let him sleep. When others misperceive and respond to Karl's cry in an inappropriate manner, Karl continues to cry. He may cry harder and louder. Others then adjust their understanding and response. Through these and similar processes, others appropriately differentiate, identify, describe, and respond to Karl's cry and his supposedly corresponding mental states while they also speak to and about him. It is through others that Karl becomes able to differentiate his mental states and behaviors. Karl used to just cry. Now he can express his mental states by saying "Karl wants to eat, to walk, to sleep, is hungry, in pain, sleepy, etc". The same would hold for the process in which Karl learns other words that describe his mental states in the third person.

Certainly, Karl learns through these various situations what it is like to experience this or that mental state. But Karl learns which mental state is to be differentiated as this or that only through copying and internalizing others' identifications and descriptions of his mental state of which his behavior is supposedly expressive. Kant's view is in line with what infant studies show. Initially unable to gain access introspectively to their own differential basic emotional states and mental states, infants gradually become capable of doing so through parental or primary caregiver's feedback (Fonagy, Gergely, Jurist, & Target, 2002).[6] This indicates that if an infant did not receive appropriate and sufficient responses from others in his/her early developmental process, later he/she would have problems with his/her mental states. We will return to this topic.

When drawing attention to the fact that there can be no "dissimulation" present in an infant (Kant, 2006, p. 16), Kant also recognizes the fact that for a certain period of time others know and identify which mental state an infant is in while the infant does not. Once one knows the connection between one's mental state and one's behavior supposedly expressive of it, one can dissimulate one's mental state by

[6] Especially (pp. 145-222), where the authors offer an extensive review of the empirical research on this topic.

manipulating that connection. Dissimulation is absent in an infant because such a connection is unknown to him/her. Here others alone can know and identify the connection while he/she cannot.

Kant's view is confirmed by empirical research, which shows that the first-person singular pronoun use precedes dissimulation, pretense, or pretend play. Dissimulation, pretense, or pretend play represents an "early manifestation of the ability to understand mental states including one's own" and to know them as an "object of knowledge" (Lewis, 2003, pp. 282-284). The toddler gradually becomes capable of concealing his/her inner world (desires, intentions, etc.) around 48 months of age (The Boston Change Process Study Group, 2010, p. 61). As one begins at around the age of four to use consistently the first-person singular pronouns to refer to and describe oneself, one becomes able to know and dissimulate one's own mental states as "my" mental states.

Thus, the outer self precedes the inner self in the process in which one comes to learn how to refer to and describe one's mental states in the third person. Others' descriptions of one as an other for them precede and make possible one's self-reference and self-description in the third person. Through copying and internalizing such descriptions by others, one identifies oneself with an other for others and refers to and describes oneself in the third person. As one begins to use consistently the first-person singular pronouns in one's self-reference and self-description, one takes over this other for others as one's self ("I") and comes to have the "idea of me" (consciousness of oneself as oneself). From this point forward, one's self grows on the basis of such identification and taking-over.

What takes place inside Karl in the transition from the use of the third person to that of the first-person singular pronouns in his self-reference and self-description? Kant expresses his view on this issue when he states that "when he [Karl] starts to speak by means of "I" a light seems to dawn on him, as it were, and from that day on he never again returns to his former way of speaking". I argue that here Kant is referring to what may be called the unconscious. Kant thinks that what takes place in the transition under consideration is that one's memory of oneself prior to one's use of "I" is kept out of consciousness of oneself as oneself because it cannot be coherently integrated into that consciousness. In this sense, Karl's memory of himself before his consistent use of the first-person pronouns remains unconscious for him. I spell out this thought of Kant's by examining what he means by the metaphor of "light" in connection with the use of the first-person singular pronoun and by the expression of "he never again returns to his former way of speaking [in the third person]".

When describing Karl's mental life with the metaphor of light, Kant must have in mind something that is to be depicted by the metaphor of darkness or shade because the former metaphor makes sense in contrast to the latter. This something is Karl's mental life before he speaks by means of "I". I advance this supposition because Kant makes the link between the metaphor of light and the use of the first-person pronoun "I" and because he thereby implies a contrast with Karl's state before and after that use. Since one's using the first-person singular pronouns concurs with one's having consciousness of oneself as oneself, "light" is meant to depict consciousness of oneself as oneself. Accordingly, "darkness" or "shade" should be meant to indicate something of which one is unaware in consciousness

of oneself as oneself. This something may be called the unconscious in relation to that consciousness. Indeed, a little later Kant describes consciousness and the unconscious in general through the metaphors of light and darkness or shade. The mind is, as it were, a vast map, and consciousness is just a small, "*illuminated*" part of it (emphasis in original). Consciousness is depicted as the field of "light" or the area where "rays of light" are cast. The rest of the mind, where there are countless representations of which we are not conscious, exists "in the shade" or "in the dark" (Kant, 2006, pp. 24-25).[7]

It does not follow from the above that the unconscious in question, that is, something of which one is unconscious in consciousness of oneself as oneself, cannot be brought to that consciousness. Kant's statement that "he *never again* returns to his former way of speaking [in the third person]" (emphasis added) shows, however, that Kant is pointing to what cannot be integrated into consciousness of oneself as oneself.

We should think that by "never again" Kant means something different from an everyday fact that usually those who speak in the first person no longer speak of themselves in the third person. This is because as a matter of fact they can speak of themselves in the third person if they want to. We should understand Kant as saying that even if these people speak again of themselves in the third person, they cannot be said to be returning to their former way of speaking in the third person. Let us call Karl who spoke of himself in the third person without speaking by means of "I" the third-person Karl, and Karl who speaks by means of "I" the first-person Karl. Kant's view is that episodes experienced by the third-person Karl cannot be integrated into the first-person Karl's consciousness as "my" episodes, as episodes experienced by "me". To generalize, the unconscious in question cannot be integrated into consciousness of oneself as oneself because one cannot gain access, as "my" memory, to the memory of the time before one becomes able to speak in the first person. That is why Kant says "never again".

What is at issue is Karl's memory. Certainly, the problem of memory does not appear in the paragraph in which the "never again" sentence occurs. In the next paragraph, however, Kant says that the period of childhood he is discussing is not yet the period of "*experience* [*Erfahrung*; emphasis in original]" (Kant, 2006, p. 16). Then in the next paragraph Kant discusses the problem of "memory [*Erinnerung*]" of the period of "childhood" to which one cannot "reach back". Kant says that one cannot gain access to the memory of this period of childhood because it is "not the time of experiences [*Erfahrungen*]" (ibid.). What is at issue in these three paragraphs are the mode of experience of a very young child like Karl and the problem of memory of childhood.

The concept of memory entails that the subject who recalls something (an object, person, or event) and the subject who experienced the remembered thing are one and the same person. Kant argues that the "faculty of memory [*Erinnerungsvermögen*]" is based upon the "association of representations of the past…consciousness of the subject with the present" (Kant, 2006, p. 75). The faculty of memory serves

[7] I discussed Kant's view on the unconscious in Saji (2009b, pp. 316-321).

to "connect in a coherent experience [*Erfahrung*] what *no longer exists*… with what *presently exists*" (ibid.; emphasis in original). Recall Kant's statement that by means of "I" one has consciousness of oneself as "one and the same person" to whom different experiences are ascribed to oneself as one's own (Kant, 2006, p. 15). One's remembering something is remembering it as that which one once experienced. One's recalling something is recalling it as one's past experience. Memory has to take the form in which "one is conscious of one's ideas as those which would be encountered in one's past" (Kant, 2006, p. 75). This is what it means for one to remember something. (This does not imply that the memory of autobiographical events and past personal experiences is infallible.) The problem with the case of Karl is that the way in which the first-person Karl tries to remember the episodes experienced by the third-person Karl is incompatible with the form of memory thus understood. The first-person Karl cannot "connect in a coherent experience" episodes experienced by the third-person Karl with the first-person Karl's life.

When the third-person Karl speaks of himself, he cannot think "I am speaking of myself in the third person". The third-person Karl cannot describe his episodes as episodes experienced by "me". Suppose the first-person Karl tries to recall the episodes experienced by the third-person Karl. The first-person Karl cannot recall them as "my" episodes. It is not "I" who once experienced them. The first-person Karl cannot have and remember the memory of them as "my" memory. It was the memory of the third-person Karl without his being "I". If the first-person Karl were to recall episodes experienced by the third-person Karl, the form in which the first-person Karl does so would have to be something like this: "I am recalling episodes once experienced by the third-person Karl without his being 'me'". A person, however, cannot remember and recall as his own experience something that was not experienced by "me".

If the first-person Karl is to "connect in a coherent experience" episodes experienced by the third-person Karl with those experienced by the first-person Karl, these two species of episodes must be organized as episodes experienced by "me". Otherwise the first-person Karl cannot "connect in a coherent experience" these two species of episodes. However, if by connecting the two species of episodes "in a coherent experience" the first-person Karl recalls episodes experienced by the third-person Karl as episodes once experienced by "me", this amounts to distorting the nature of the episodes experienced by the third-person Karl.[8] If the first-person Karl cannot "connect in a coherent experience" the two species of episodes without distorting the nature of one species of episodes, this in effect means that the first-person Karl cannot "connect in a coherent experience" the two species of episodes.

To be sure, in the period before his use of the first-person singular pronouns, Karl is not the subject of

[8] What is under consideration is linguistic autobiographical memory. The memory of the third-person Karl may occur to the first-person Karl's consciousness in other forms of memory such as perceptual and procedural memory. I do not go into this issue.

experience (*Erfahrung*) in that he cannot "connect in a coherent experience [*Erfahrung*]" episodes as "my" episodes. But Karl is the subject of experience (*Erlebnis*) in that he experiences, lives, or lives through, events without being able to connect them in a coherent way. Certainly, the memory of episodes lived through by Karl in this period is retained inside him (I leave aside the topic of its exact location). These episodes, however, cannot be coherently integrated into the first-person Karl's "my" consciousness (consciousness of oneself as oneself) as episodes experienced by "me". Karl's experience of these episodes cannot be coherently integrated into the first-person Karl's life as "my" experience. Karl's memory of these episodes cannot be coherently integrated into the first-person Karl's mind in the form of "my" memory. The first-person Karl cannot recall these episodes as those experienced by "me" and cannot access the memory of them as "my" memory.

There are two more points worth noting about Kant's remarks on Karl. First, the fact that Kant lets the third-person Karl speak only in the present tense ("Karl wants to eat, to walk, etc".) indicates that Kant is aware that the third-person Karl has difficulty integrating his past self into his present self. This has to do with the age of the third-person Karl. Recall Kant's observation that the child first speaks of himself/herself in the third person and then "begins to talk by means of "I" fairly late (perhaps a year later)". Since the majority of children begin to use consistently the first-person singular pronouns at the age of around four, the third-person Karl is probably less than three years old. Based on empirical research, Rochat says: "it is not prior to approximately 3 years that children begin to grasp the temporal dimension of the self" (Rochat, 2004, pp. 11-12). Second, since Kant focuses on what it was like for Karl to experience the transition from the third-person Karl to the first-person Karl by beginning to speak by means of "I", Kant would have wanted to let the first-person Karl speak in direct discourse: "When I started to speak by means of "I" a light seemed to dawn on me, as it were. Before I merely felt myself; now I think myself". Instead, however, Kant gives a third-person description of what it was like for Karl to experience the transition at issue. This is because Kant is aware that the first-person Karl cannot coherently express this experience (and more generally episodes experienced by the third-person Karl) using the first-person singular pronouns. The birth of the first-person Karl is not yet an experience (*Erfahrung*) of the first-person Karl. Nor is it an experience (*Erfahrung*) of the third-person Karl. Certainly the transition took place in Karl, however. This can be said to be an experience (*Erlebnis*) that Karl lived or lived through without being able to locate it coherently in his memory.

This transition is a phenomenon difficult to describe. Kant states that "the explanation of this phenomenon [the transition at issue along with the emergence of consciousness of oneself as oneself] might be rather difficult for the anthropologist". Kant is right because this phenomenon still has not been fully explained by empirical research. Lewis says: "the critical events that lead to this meta-representation ["the idea of me"] have not been fully worked out" (Lewis, 2003, p. 291). Even so, Kant's thought on Karl's memory explained above is consistent with what empirical research has thus far been able to show.

The episodes experienced by Karl before his consistent use of the first-person pronouns cannot be coherently integrated into the memory of the first-person Karl even though Karl is the subject who experienced these episodes. This can be considered an example of infantile amnesia. Infantile amnesia refers to the "lack of genuine memories of personally experienced events that occurred prior to about 3 to 4 years of age" (Fonagy et al., 2002, p. 245). Infantile amnesia occurs because young children before this age are unable to "encode personally experienced events as *personally experienced*" (Perner, 2000, p. 306; emphasis in original). Certainly, it is they who experienced these events. They cannot, however, integrate these events in a coherent organization as "*personally experienced*", that is, as events experienced by "me". One factor for this is that they are not yet capable of using the first-person singular pronouns in describing their experiences. Another factor is that these young children have difficulty grasping the temporal dimension of their self. Kant is aware of these two factors. Infantile amnesia disappears "at around 4 to 5 years of age" when the "autobiographic organization of memories as personally experienced events", that is, as events experienced by "me", is established (Fonagy et al., 2002, p. 245).[9] Children come to have consistent autobiographical memory at around the age of four as they begin to use consistently the first-person pronouns in their self-reference and self-description.

Kant thinks that one's experiences before speaking by means of "I" cannot be coherently integrated into consciousness of oneself as oneself that one comes to have through consistently using the first-person singular pronouns. In terms of the formation of one's self, one's experience of otherness in its four respects cannot be integrated into consciousness of oneself as oneself. To take the example of Karl, first, Karl was initially an other for others ("Karl") without being "me". Second, by copying and internalizing others' descriptions of Karl as an other for them, Karl identified himself with the Karl-as-an-other-for-others (the third-person Karl). Third, through using consistently the first-person singular pronouns in self-reference and self-description, the third-person Karl takes over the Karl-as-an-other-for-others as his self ("I", the first-person Karl). Fourth, it is Karl without being "me" who initiated and underwent this process. As we have seen, the move from the situation where choosing as such did not exist to that where the practice of choice begins, once it has taken place, is irreversible while we cannot choose whether to begin the practice of choice. And the move took place. Similarly, as our discussion of Kant's statement "never again" has shown, the transition from the use of the third-person to that of the first-person pronouns, once it has occurred, is irreversible. Here, too, since it is not "I" who makes the transition, "I" cannot choose whether to do so. And the transition occurred. In both cases, we passively go through an irreversible process. From the transition forward, the first-person Karl's self will develop from the Karl-as-an-other-for-others whom the third-person Karl took over as his self ("I").

Rochat (2004) describes the difficulty children are confronted with in this process of self-identification

[9] For the authors' review of the relevant research including that on young children's use of the third person and first person in their self-descriptions, see Fonagy et al. (2002, pp. 245-246).

as a "Me as an other" or "Me but Not Me" dilemma (pp. 11-12). Lewis (2003) describes the same difficulty when he points out that the child's use of his/her own name [that is, the third person] in describing him/her [e.g., "Karl wants to eat"] is "not necessarily reflecting a representation of the self" (p. 282). Through the example of Karl, Kant too describes this difficult early developmental process that one must go through if one is to become conscious of oneself as oneself, capable of referring to and describing oneself in the first-person pronouns, and capable of developing one's self. Kant's thought is that in the early developmental process consciousness of oneself as oneself is formed by otherness in such a way that, while such otherness cannot be coherently integrated into that very consciousness, one has no choice but to develop one's self on the basis of such otherness.

Such otherness persists and affects one throughout one's life. Kant is right that the use of the first-person singular pronouns is crucial for the development of the self. Based on recent infant studies, Lewis (2003) says: "the advent of this capacity [to refer to and describe oneself by means of the first-person singular pronouns] is a milestone in the development of human cognition, action, and emotional life" (p. 291). Kant's thought, however, also implies that this later development of one's self (the development of one's self after one becomes capable of self-reference and self-description in the first-person singular pronouns) continues to be affected at its basic level by the otherness under consideration.[10]

To take the example of Karl, the first-person Karl has no choice but to develop his self from the Karl-as-an-other-for-others whom the third-person Karl took over as his self ("I"). The Karl-as-an-other-for-others is the only basis on which the development of the first-person Karl's self is

[10] Kant's thought differs from and adds to Charles H. Cooley's discussion of the "looking-glass self" because "I" is already at work in the looking-glass self. According to Cooley (1902), in order for a self to form and develop, it needs three components: "(1) The imagination of our appearance to the other person, (2) The imagination of his judgment of that appearance and (3) Some sort of self-feeling-Pride, Mortification" (p. 152). What I think others think I am or should be is crucial here. Considering a self always a social self, Cooley calls it a "looking-glass self" (p. 152). Cooley says that "by the word "self" in this discussion is meant simply that which is designated in common speech by the pronouns of the first person singular, "I", "me", "my", "mine", and "myself" (p. 136). The self in Cooley's discussion is already capable of referring to and describing oneself in the first person singular pronouns. Based upon his observations of his children's behavior, Cooley discusses how they come to use the first person singular pronouns (pp. 142-143, pp. 157-162). Cooley, however, does not examine how one's self in Cooley's sense is formed and affected by one's experience before being capable of using the first person singular pronouns in such a way that this experience cannot be coherently integrated into the consciousness of one's self in Cooley's sense. Kant examines precisely this problem. Thus, while Kant would agree with Cooley that a self is always a social self, Kant's argument differs from and adds to Cooley's discussion.

possible. Presumably, the Karl-as-an-other-for-others sets the basic structure of the first-person Karl's self and constrains the basic pattern of the development of that self. If there are problems with this basis, the first-person Karl's self takes over these problems. Suppose that in his early developmental process Karl did not receive appropriate and sufficient feedback about his behaviors and mental states from his parents or primary caregivers. Karl would not be able to copy and internalize appropriate and sufficient descriptions of his states. Karl would identify himself with the Karl-as-an-other-for-others without internalizing such appropriate and sufficient descriptions (the third-person Karl). This third-person Karl would be taken over as Karl's self (the first-person Karl). In developing his self from the third-person Karl thus taken over as his self, the first-person Karl would have problems with his behaviors and mental states. For example, he would likely experience confused or insufficiently differentiated mental states, expressing them in inappropriate manners. It would be too much to say that it is impossible for the first-person Karl to know why he has these problems and how he has come to have them, because it is Karl who experienced his childhood and the memory of it is retained inside Karl. Still, because of the memory problem discussed earlier, it would be difficult for the first-person Karl to know why he has these problems and how he has come to have them. It would be difficult for the first-person Karl to resolve these problems and modify the basis of his self if he does not know why he has these problems and how he has come to have them. These problems would likely persist.

This is one example to illustrate Kant's suggestion that the later development of one's self continues to be fundamentally affected by the otherness under consideration. The picture Kant suggests is consistent with what empirical research demonstrates. It is shown that what kind of parental or primary caregivers' feedback one receives in one's early developmental process has profound and enduring effects on how one's later self develops especially in terms of affect regulation and mentalization.[11]

The later development of one's self is also affected by otherness via unconscious imitation of others. As we have seen, Kant thinks that in infants the innate drive to communicate is inseparably connected with the innate activity of imitation and that this drive persists and affects us throughout our lives. In fact, Kant argues that we are also affected by imitation, including unconscious imitation, throughout our lives so that a huge part of our lives is formed by imitation.

Kant (2006) states that "the human being has a natural tendency…to imitate the other person's ways" (p. 142). This innate tendency is at work whether one is aware of it or not and whether one is an infant or an adult. Kant (2000) argues that "learning is nothing but imitation", equating imitation with the capacity to learn in the broadest sense, that is, with "facility for learning (capacity [*Kapazität*]) as such" (p. 187). Under the name of "sympathetic power of imagination", Kant (2006) discusses what is now called emotional or affect contagion, that is, unconscious automatic mimicry of others' emotions and

[11] For such effects, their neurobiological basis in the brain, and their treatment when they are pathological, see Bromberg (2011), Peter Fonagy et al. (2002), Ogden and Fisher (2015), and Schore (2012).

emotional expressions (p. 72). Kant (2000) says that "even if one thinks or writes for himself, and does not merely take in what others have thought", it may well be that in fact one thinks "by means of imitation" (p. 187). While in one's consciousness one thinks that one thinks for oneself, one may actually be imitating others without being aware of doing so. The same can be said of one's values, tastes, desires, and so on. Indeed, Kant (2004) stresses that imitation (of others' understanding, judgment, reason, taste, etc.) has such a profound and pervasive influence on us throughout our lives that we can never be freed from that influence (p. 5, p. 9, p. 33, p. 128, p. 131, p. 136, p. 138, p. 140, p. 149, p. 258, pp. 316-318, p. 436, p. 474, p. 579). It turns out that we communicate our self thus formed and developed to one another in a chain of imitation. Kant seems to be right. Empirical research shows that we constantly and unconsciously imitate others (their facial expressions, vocal intonations, speech patterns, accents, postures, gestures, words, thoughts, emotions, etc.) in our daily lives.[12] Stressing the significance of imitation in the development of our self and culture, McGilchrist (2009) goes so far as to say that "imitation is a human characteristic, and is arguably the ultimately most important human skill" (pp. 240-256; here p. 248). In any case, the later development of one's self is affected by otherness via unconscious imitation of others.

3. Conclusion

I have reconstructed Kant's thought on the experience of passivity, that is, the thought that before becoming an adult, one goes through processes that take place beyond one's control, which form the basis for one's adult self, and which affect one throughout one's life. Kant's thought thus recast gives us an insight. The insight is that passivity analyzed here persists and affects us throughout our lives even if we are not aware of this and even if we may not know exactly how and to what extent.

Keeping this insight in mind, I conclude with questions that the present analysis opens up and implications that they have. For this, let us look at the project of the *Anthropology* as a whole and illustrate a problem that the present analysis reveals with it. As stated in the Preface to the *Anthropology*, the project is designed to investigate "what he [the human being] as a free-acting being makes of himself, or can and should make of himself" (Kant, 2006, p. 3). This is investigated mainly in the sections entitled "The character of the person" and "The character of the species" (pp. 185-201, pp. 225-238). Here the human being is conceived of as "a being endowed with the power of practical reason and consciousness of freedom of his [/her] power of choice (a person [*Person*])" (p. 229). Specifically, what is investigated is the adult's process of self-making in which one "actively" creates one's self following those "practical principles" about one's "way of life [*Lebenswandel*]" which one prescribes to oneself by one's "own reason" (p. 185, p. 192, p. 194, p. 226, p. 230). Kant regards the

[12] For a review on this topic, see Chartland, Maddux and Lakin (2005). People also consciously imitate others. I do not discuss this issue.

self thus created as the self in a genuine sense, calling it "character".[13] Kant argues that "the *imitator* (in moral matters) is without character" whereas one who creates one's "character" has "originality in the way of thinking [*Originalität der Denkungsart*]" (pp. 192-193; emphasis in original).

The present analysis reveals a problem with the project of the *Anthropology*. The problem is that Kant investigates the adult's process of self-making without considering how one's adult self is formed and affected by the experience of passivity analyzed here, despite his discussions of that experience. Based on our analysis, let us illustrate the problem using Kant's words above that describe the project. One experiences passivity concerning "consciousness of freedom of his [/her] power of choice" as such. The basis of one's adult self "actively" engaged in the process of self-making is formed by otherness in such a way that this otherness cannot be incorporated into one's self-consciousness. The basis of one's adult self is formed also by the activity of imitation. Imitation is the basis of "originality". What lies at the basis of one's adult self is an "imitator" of others. The same can be said of "practical principles". Originally, these are principles of the conduct of others. One first learns these principles by imitating the conduct of others and only later prescribes them to oneself as one's own. This is illustrated when Kant says in his discussion of "teaching ethics" in the *Metaphysics of Morals* that "for a still undeveloped human being [i.e., a child], imitation is the first determination of his will to accept maxims that he afterwards makes for himself" (Kant, 1996, p. 593).[14] Lastly, one is affected by passivity throughout one's life. That is to say, one's "way of life" is affected by passivity. A full investigation of the adult's process of self-making would require taking into account these factors. They are not, however, considered in Kant's investigation in the *Anthropology*.

Thus, the present analysis opens up questions. Given the inescapable fact of passivity examined here, in which sense and to what extent can we be said to be a rational, free-acting being (as described in the project of the *Anthropology*)? How do we come to terms with passivity if we are to understand

[13] I do not go into Kant's conception of character. For this, see Munzel (1998).

[14] "Practical principles" and "maxims" can be considered virtually the same here. Kant illustrates "practical principles", which we prescribe to ourselves by our "own reason", in terms of how we "act" according to them (Kant, 2006, p. 192). In the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* Kant says: "A *maxim* is the subjective principle of acting…[and] contains the practical rule determined by reason conformably with the conditions of the subject (often his ignorance or also his inclinations), and is therefore the principle in accordance with which the subject *acts*". A maxim differs from an "imperative", which is "the objective principle valid for every rational being, and the principle in accordance with which he *ought to act*" (Kant, 1996, p. 73; emphasis in original). Kant says that the "practical principles" at issue may sometimes be "false" and "incorrect" (Kant, 2006, p. 192). Presumably this is because, to use Kant's words in the *Groundwork*, these are principles conformable to "the conditions of the subject" often including one's "ignorance" and "inclinations". In any case, one would go through a process of imitation in learning "practical principles".

ourselves primarily as such a being? Does this self-understanding need to be revised? How can we modify the effect of passivity upon our present self? Are there other aspects than those analyzed here in which early human development affects us throughout our lives? If there are, what are such other aspects, and how are we affected? While leading us to these questions, the *Anthropology* does not tackle them. Kant's thought reconstructed here invites us to consider these questions beyond the *Anthropology* as they have implications for social science research, our self-understanding, Kant's philosophy, and non-Kantian naturalistic ethics.

We cannot avoid considering the problem of human agency in social science research. When considering it, we would need to take the insight and the questions noted above into account. In our contemporary culture, we may tend to undervalue passivity and overvalue activity. Our attitude to our daily lives would then be that in which we should be active as much as possible in as many aspects of our lives as possible. We may be obsessed with originality. We would tend to devalue our experience to the extent that we feel ourselves affected by, and our activity compromised by, passivity. Correspondingly, we would be liable to treat one another in a devaluing way and vulnerable to such treatment.[15] Acknowledging the insight and the questions may help us begin to reconsider, appreciate, and shape our everyday life in both its activity and passivity in a more balanced way.

The insight and the questions might challenge what is conventionally done in Kant scholarship. Kant's philosophy has been discussed in the context of concrete human examples and situations to consider an application of its principles (which, according to Kant, do not need empirical support for their foundation or justification). Usually, such discussions deal with examples and situations in which an already fully formed adult is the subject. A sufficient examination of such examples and situations would require taking account of how this adult subject is formed by and affected in his/her present thinking, emotion, and conduct by his/her experience of passivity analyzed here. Nevertheless, neither Kant's thought recast here nor the questions opened up above are considered in such discussions.[16] The

[15] Cf. Salecl (2010), in which Salecl discusses the discontent and disquiet that we feel with our lives when we overvalue choice. Choice can be seen as representing the active side of our lives.

[16] See Allison (1990, 2001, 2004); Butts (1984); Caygill (1995); Clark (2001); Cohen (2008); Deligiorgi (2002); Fenves (2003); Foucault (2008); Frierson (2003, 2005); Grenberg (2013); Guyer (1992, 2006a, 2006b); Henrich (1992); Höffe (1994); Hunter (2002); Jacobs and Kain (2003); Keller (2001); Kitcher (1993); Kuehn (2001); Kukla (2006); Louden (2000, 2011); Melville (1999); Morgan (2000); Munzel (1998); Neiman (1994); O'Neill (1989); Powell (1990); Schmidt (2007, 2008); Shell (1996); Van Cleve (2003); Velkley (1989); Willson (2007); Wood (1999); and Zammito (2002). Kitcher (1993) finds in Kant's discussion of Karl "nothing of philosophical interest" (p. 255, n. 23). Referring to the same discussion of Kant's, in one article Schmidt says in less than four full lines that here Kant just reports observations about the use of "I" and the behavior of children (2007, p. 170) and in another article simply summarizes Kant's observations in one short paragraph (2008, p. 464).

insight and the questions might challenge what has been done in such discussions.[17]

As we have seen, Kant's thought reconstructed here is consistent with what recent empirical research demonstrates. This has implications for naturalistic ethics and for cognitive developmental psychologists. Arguing that the recent findings of cognitive science show Kantian moral philosophy to be seriously flawed,[18] Johnson (2014) develops a naturalistic ethics, an ethics compatible with and supported by the findings in the various fields of cognitive science. As with the *Anthropology*, this ethics too aims to investigate what "the making of a moral self" is like (Johnson, 2014, pp. 192-221). Both the problem of passivity examined here and the questions raised above are relevant to such an investigation. But Johnson, although he refers to vast literature in cognitive science, philosophy, and naturalistic ethics, considers neither of these. Taking into account both of these may contribute to reflecting further on naturalistic ethics. Also, it may help cognitive psychologists consider ethical implications of their research.

References

Allison, H. E. (1990). *Kant's Theory of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allison, H. E. (2001). *Kant's Theory of Taste*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Allison, H. E. (2004). *Kant's Transcendental Idealism: An Interpretation and Defense* (revised edition). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bromberg, P. M. (2011). *The Shadow of Tsunami and the Growth of the Relational Mind*. New York:

[17] Let me just open up three issues. First, how do such discussions of Kant's practical philosophy respond to the insight and the questions? Second, the third-person Karl becomes able to think via otherness. His thoughts cannot be accompanied by "I think". They affect the first-person Karl throughout his life. Their nature is distorted when they are recalled by the first-person Karl accompanied by "I think". How does Kant's philosophy deal with such thoughts? Third, judgment of taste, in order for it to be possible, presupposes common sense (*sensus communis*). *Sensus communis* requires an ability to put, in reflecting, oneself into the position of everyone else, imagine possible judgments of others, and compare one's judgment with these judgments (Kant, 1987, pp. 87-88, p. 160, p. 162). This ability can be seen as part of so-called "theory of mind" or "mentalization" in cognitive psychology. It is shown that this ability is compromised when one goes through inadequate early developmental processes (see the references in note 11 above). How does Kant's theory of judgment of taste treat those for whom this ability is compromised?

[18] According to Johnson, these findings show that: "*there is no such a thing as a faculty of pure practical reason*"; "*faculty psychology is outdated and misleading*"; "*there is no single faculty of will*"; "*there is no such a thing as radically free will*"; "*there is no set of universal literal concepts that can be used as elements in universal moral principles*"; and "*moral absolutism is profoundly mistaken*" (Johnson, 2014, pp. 24-26; emphasis in original). Johnson elaborates each point in detail in the book.

Routledge.

Butts, R. E. (1984). *Kant and the Double Government Methodology*. Boston, MA: Reidel.

Caygill, H. (1995). *A Kant Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chartland, T. L., Maddux, W. W., & Lakin, J. L. (2005). Beyond the Perception-Behavior Link: The Ubiquitous Utility and Motivational Moderators of Nonconscious Mimicry. In R. H., Ran, S. U. James, & A. B. John (Eds.), *The New Unconscious* (pp. 334-361). New York: Oxford University Press.

Clark, A. (2008). *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clark, D. L. (2001). Kant's aliens: The Anthropology and its others. *The New Centennial Review*, *1*(2), 201-289.

Cohen, A. A. (2008). Kant's answer to the question "what is man"? and its implications for anthropology. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, *39*(4), 506-514.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Deligiorgi, K. (2002). Universality, publicity, and communication: Kant's conception of reason. *European Journal of Philosophy*, *10*(2), 143-159.

Fenves, P. (2003). *Late Kant: Towards Another Law of the Earth*. New York: Routledge.

Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E., & Target, M. (2002). *Affect Regulation, Mentalization, and the Development of the Self*. New York: Other Press.

Foucault, M. (2008). *Introduction to Kant's Anthropology*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

Frierson, P. R. (2003). *Freedom and Anthropology in Kant's Moral Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frierson, P. R. (2005). Kant's Empirical Account of Human Action. *Philosophers' Imprint*, *5*(7), 1-34.

Gibson, E. J., & Pick, A. D. (2000). *An Ecological Approach to Perceptual Learning and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gopnik, A. (2009). *The Philosophical Baby: What Children's Minds Tell Us About Truth, Love, and the Meaning of Life*. New York: Picador.

Grenberg, J. (2013). *Kant's Defense of Common Moral Experience: A Phenomenological Account*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guyer, P. (1992). *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Guyer, P. (2006a). *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Guyer, P. (2006b). *Kant*. London: Routledge.

Henrich, D. (1992). *Aesthetic Judgment and the Moral Image of the World: Studies in Kant*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Höffe, O. (1994). *Immanuel Kant*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hunter, I. (2002). The Morals of Metaphysics: Kant's Groundwork as Intellectual Paideia. *Critical*

Inquiry, *28*(4), 908-929.

Jacobs, B., & Kain, P. (Eds.) (2003). *Essays on Kant's Anthropology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, M. (2007). *The Meaning of the Body: Aesthetics of Human Understanding*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (2014). *Morality for Humans: Ethical Understanding from the Perspective of Cognitive Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kant, I. (1996). *Practical Philosophy* (M. Gregor, Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2000). *Critique of the Power of Judgment* (P. Guyer, Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2004). *Lectures on Logic* (J. M. Young, Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2006). *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (R. B. Louden, Trans.). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2007). Conjectural beginning of human history (A. W. Wood, Trans.). In Z. Günter., & L. B. Robert (Eds.), *Anthropology, History, and Education* (pp. 163-175). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Keller, P. (2001). *Kant and the Demands of Self-Consciousness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kitcher, P. (1993). *Kant's Transcendental Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koch, C. (2004). *The Quest for Consciousness: A Neurological Approach*. Englewood, Colorado: Roberts and Company Publishers.

Koch, C. (2012). *Consciousness: Confessions of a Romantic Reductionist*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kuehn, M. (2001). *Kant: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kukla, R. (Ed.) (2006). *Aesthetics and Cognition in Kant's Critical Philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Legerstee, M. (1999). Mental and Bodily Awareness in Infancy. In G. Shaun, & S. Jonathan (Eds.), *Models of the Self* (pp. 213-230). Thorverton, UK: Imprint Academic.

Lewis, M. (2003). The Development of Self-Consciousness. In R. Johannes, & E. Naomi (Eds.), *Agency and Self-Awareness* (pp. 275-295). New York: Oxford University Press.

Louden, R. B. (2000). *Kant's Impure Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Louden, R. B. (2011). *Kant's Human Being: Essays on His Theory of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marotos, O. (1998). Neonatal, Early and Later Imitation: Same Order Phenomena? In S. Francesca., & B. George (Eds.), *The Development of Sensory, Motor and Cognitive Capacities in Early Infancy: From Perception to Cognition* (pp. 145-160). East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press.

McGilchrist, I. (2009). *The Master and his Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western*

World. New Have, CT: Yale University Press.

Melville, P. (1999). "Illuminism and Terrorism": Melancholia and Hypochondria in Kant's Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View. *The Dalhousie Review, 79*(3), 335-354.

Morgan, D. (2000). *Kant Trouble: The Obscurities of the Enlightened*. New York: Routledge.

Munzel, G. F. (1998). *Kant's Conception of Moral Character*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neiman, S. (1994). *The Unity of Reason: Rereading Kant.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ogden, P., & Fisher, J. (2015). *Sensorimotor Psychotherapy: Interventions for Trauma and Attachment.* New York: W. W. Norton.

O'Neill, O. (1989). *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perner, J. (2000). Memory and Theory of Mind. In T. Endel, & I. M. C. Fergus (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Memory* (pp. 297-312). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Powell, C. T. (1990). *Kant's Theory of Self-Consciousness*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rochat, P. (2004). The Emergence of self-awareness as co-awareness in early child development. In Z. Dan, G. Thor, & P. Josef (Eds.), *The Structure and Development of Self-Consciousness* (pp. 1-20). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Saji, M. (2006). On tensions in Kant's account of reason in politics. *Textual Practice*, *20*(4), 679-702.

Saji, M. (2009a). On the division between reason and unreason in Kant. *Human Studies: A Journal for Philosophy and the Social Sciences*, *32*(2), 201-223.

Saji, M. (2009b). Three aspects of the self-opacity in the empirical subject in Kant. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, *35*(3), 315-337.

Salecl, R. (2010). *The Tyranny of Choice*. London: Profile Books.

Schmidt, C. M. (2007). Kant's Transcendental, Empirical, Pragmatic, and Moral Anthropology. *Kant-Studien*, *98*(2), 156-182.

Schmidt, C. M. (2008). Kant's Transcendental and Empirical Psychology of Cognition. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, *39*(4), 462-472.

Schore, A. (2012). *The Science of the Art of Psychotherapy*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Shell, S. M. (1996). *Embodiment of Reason: Kant on Spirit, Generation, and Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Siegel, D. J. (2012). *The Developing Mind: How Relationships and the Brain interact to Shape Who We Are*, second edition. NY: The Guilford Press.

The Boston Change Process Study Group. (2010). *Change in Psychotherapy*. New York: Norton.

Thelen, E., & Smith, L. B. (1996). *A Dynamic Systems Approach to the Development of Cognition and Action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Van C. J. (2003). *Problems from Kant*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Velkley, R. L. (1989). *Freedom and the End of Reason: On the Moral Foundations of Kant's Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willson, H. L. (2007). *Kant's Pragmatic Anthropology: Its Origin, Meaning, and Critical Significance*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wood, A. (1999). *Kant's Ethical Philosophy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zammito, J. H. (2002). *Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.