

It looks from the standpoint of the reality, there is some ideal. Probably, from the standpoint of ideal, it seems there is some reality.

When people begin to talk about *ideal* world, I begin to lose their steps to reach their enthusiasm. For simple objects like *circle*, yes, we may talk about an ideal but suppose we have a frog, how can an *ideal* frog be?

I'd suggest, there is no such frog. The reason Plato and his followers reached such an absurd position is probably because they have to limit humane/subjective aspect of cognition. It's almost paving way to a totalitarian understanding of the world. There is this *ideal* and we should aspire to reach that and here comes *the definition* of ideal in the mouth of *philosophers*.

They absolutely won't bother themselves about *ideal frogs* but their work should be about ideal *men*. I see, when these philosophers talk about some ideal, it's like a politician's talk about taxes. Although it's for *the grand scheme* of things, it boils down to my pocket. Idealism is similar in this case, although it talks about *ideal* world, it becomes a burden for man at the end.

Because frogs don't have ideals.