

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

Post by "TauPhi" of April 2, 2026 at 7:21 PM

[Martin](#) and [Cassius](#) . Please correct me if my reasoning is faulty at any point but at the moment here are my thoughts about some of the things you mentioned in the posts above:

## [Quote from Martin](#)

Within Kant's epistemology, certainty with respect to knowledge about phenomena is possible but the metaphysical claim that that knowledge is the truth about how things actually are is unfounded.

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

That certainly sounds to me like the equivalent of making the assertion that because we observe progress in science we cannot claim "knowledge" of anything physical. And since the physical is this world, and we can't claim knowledge of it.

I'm sorry but this doesn't make any sense based on what Martin said. We certainly can claim knowledge. We can't claim that our knowledge is equivalent to the truth about how things are.

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

That sounds like the functional equivalent of saying that there is in fact a "true world" which is inaccessible to the senses and toward which we can never do anything more than approach knowledge.

Again, this conclusion is incompatible with what Martin said above. There's no "true world". There simply is the world which we can gradually obtain knowledge about. The world doesn't care if some species on a third planet from their star declares that the world is "true". What we call "true" is what we experience with our senses, feelings and anticipations and these stimuli are processed with a bit of reasoning powers we possess. That is all. That is our limit. And Nature doesn't work this way: "Oh, humans got some knowledge about me. I better adjust to what they have just discovered and act accordingly so I am true to them." Our knowledge will never be the truth about how things actually are. And this statement is not incompatible with Epicurean philosophy. There are only subjective, human faculties in Epicurus' canon: feelings, senses and anticipations. There's not even one canonical faculty that would allow us to measure how things are outside of our human experiences.

### [Quote from Cassius](#)

And I would say that it sounds like the equivalence of saying "nothing can be known" to any regular person who has to choose how to live today based on whether there is a supernatural god and reward/punishment after death.

And again, I have real difficulty understanding how you draw conclusions like that. Your equivalences sound more like: There are stairs to knowledge we need to climb but we can't see the end of them therefore we must declare that the stairs don't exist.

Things can be known. We can most definitely get knowledge from our human perspective. And the things we don't know about doesn't make them supernatural. We simply didn't find a way to discover them yet or we won't be able to discover them at all because of our human limitations. The knowledge we acquire is our "truth" but that knowledge doesn't mean we conquered Nature and know it to its core. We are not Nature. We'll never be Nature. We are only a part of it. Nature's "truth" is not equivalent to our "truth". And that's how I understand [Martin](#)'s initial quote.