

On Kant

22.11.25

It is telling that Kant had no children, for if he had, his entire theory of a priori intuition, and certainly of the a priori categories of the understanding, would have fallen to the wayside.

On Religion

On Christianity

23.11.25

Question: How might a Christian, were they to accept the scientifically approximated age of the Earth and the evidence for pre-historic humans, judge the lives of beings who came before Adam, who had never known the God of Israel nor of Eden, who lived according to natural law? Rather, how might God judge the man who had not eaten of the apple and become wise?

On Eastern Philosophy

23.11.25

Question: Does Eastern philosophy more closely align with the British school of empiricism or that of Continental rationalism?

On Neutralizing Moral Arguments

25.11.25

I am presently of the opinion that any moral position (here I mostly have in mind topical political arguments), much like any knife, will be consequently dulled beyond threat by enlarging the scope of considerable information.

Now Ideas are Playthings

24.11.25

"Ideas are the playthings of adult life as toys are the playthings of childhood."

American Dialectic

25.11.25

I suppose that romanticism acts—or, at least, has acted—as the chamber to the capitalist piston: together they drive the engine of the American machine.

On Locke's Theory of Knowledge

26.11.25

"Knowledge is the perception of the agreement or disagreement of two ideas."

*That the mind might only cognize the agreement or disagreement of **two** ideas at once seems to place an unnecessary bound on its abilities. Perhaps they are complex, composed of many, if not innumerable, propositions themselves, in which case, the required cognition to execute their judgment will be great. In my judgment, it seems a superfluous convenience that these "two" ideas happen to*

meet the criteria for the ideal logical form (toward evaluating contingency, contradiction, or perhaps tautology), which leads me to a thought:

Perhaps the above is all a moot point brought about because of an underlying complaint I have, namely, that the idea of a wholly logical universe is, in my view, too simple, too rigid. It is clear that some intelligence—call it learning or instinct—is alive in what we call intuition, for in intuition we assess the world across all space as it traverses the manifold of time “immediately” as it enters our sensibilities (and this before a conscious thought is ever born). Clearly, within the human organism, there lies a “knowledge” that is inaccessible to itself, which is not grounded in logic (as to whether it is grounded in the empirical learning of childhood or rather instinct is less clear); and far less is it grounded in ideas as they are given to us through the hierarchy of reason.

It is my opinion that the method of logical deduction, which is the engine fueled by Locke’s two ideas, has clear evolutionary (or at the very least, social) utility: first, the acceptance of method demands an acceptance of outcome (judgment); secondly, and far more significantly, the method, by its very nature, concedes to reduce the supposed entropy of the data available within the context of our sensibilities of the particular conflict by packaging the essence of concepts into ideas (highly abstracted concepts) (and thus strategically eliminating what may be regarded as structural noise), then placing these ideas contrary to another in the form of gladiator combat. By eliminating the majority of conditions of a scenario quick, confident judgments may be attained. We may describe the individual who possesses this ability as “living by principles”. Often, we will admire them, for if their judgments are translated into direct action, they may be interpreted as a repudiation of fear (which indecision inevitably curdles) and this is universally admirable. If I might afford such a leap in such a brief argument, knowledge, as it pertains to decision making, finds its grounds in the evolutionary march to master our animal condition—our motility through space and time.

Particularly in Western society, which has had a long love affair with logical deduction dating back to the ancients, the mind which is logically trained, which has learned to suppress the emotionality of a given conflict to see with logical clarity the “essence” or “principle” of a thing, has possessed a type of power which cannot be dispossessed and is therefore solely individual. We implore him to be, concomitantly, magnanimous toward his fellow man. Now that he is socially-aligned, and motivated toward the “will of the good”, we crown him with laurels, for he has obtained the rights of a philosopher-king. We have trained our men in the West to adopt this struggle for greatness; perhaps now more than ever they suffer for it.