

Discussion of Blog Article - "Reality Does Not Require Being Eternally The Same"

Post by "Cassius" of March 31, 2026 at 2:05 PM

Martin it looks to me like I mention Kant once in the article, in a sentence that is focused on rejection of the senses:

Quote

On one side stands a tradition stretching from Plato through the Stoics, through medieval theology, through Kant, and into much of modern religion and academic philosophy: the view that what is genuinely real must be eternal, unchanging, and accessible not through the senses but through some higher faculty — pure reason, divine revelation, or the intellectual intuition of necessary truths.

I don't see that sentence as significantly a problem for the article's credibility. Of all the murkiness that surrounds Kant his rejection of sensation as a sufficient basis for considering this world of sensation as reality justifies including him in the general trend which is the focus of the article. For example I see in "Twilight of the Idols" that Nietzsche wrote:

Fourth proposition. Any distinction between a "true" and an "apparent" world--whether in the Christian manner or in the manner of Kant (in the end, an underhanded Christian)--is only a suggestion of decadence, a symptom of the decline of life. That the artist esteems appearance higher than reality is no objection to this proposition. For "appearance" in this case means reality once more, only by way of selection, reinforcement, and correction. The tragic artist is no pessimist: he is precisely the one who says Yes to everything questionable, even to the terrible--he is Dionysian.

If you see something specific or see other aspects of the article you'd like me to consider revising please let me know as I value your input and will include it as I consider revisions.