# 1st Off

**Moral Realism is true –**

**And, that’s only accessible through procedural transcendental idealism – a) Is/ought gap –b) It’s circular c) Motivation – empirical circumstances change based one each individual, only transcendent moral truths can motivate all agents absent those features.**

**Jindal 99,** Jindal, Bobby. Louisiana Law Review, 1999. Web. <http://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5780&context=lalrev>.//Scopa

Modem political philosophers ranging from Robert Nozick to John Rawls have attempted to discern the principles of justice that should guide societal arrangements. This project is of vital importance since it informs society of its obligations to its weakest and most vulnerable members. Yet, the question of **why one should be just is** an **intelligible** one to ask and deserves some response. This paper argues that the political-legal **obligation to be just is derivative from** man's more general duty to be moral, a commitment grounded in intuitions which are themselves based on **transcendental values**, i.e., values that exist apart from a particular society. Those **political theories** that lack a transcendental notion of morality **lack binding force; the theorist who persuades without asserting t**

**ruth is helpless** to convince or judge those committed to different principles. Modem liberalism, with its explicit commitment to neutrality, has nothing to say to individuals who do not share its values; similarly, communitarianism, with its cultural relativism, cannot critique an unjust society from the outside. Many liberals and communitarians underpin principles of justice, which require an individual to sacrifice his interests to secure the welfare of others, with that justification available to convince one that his preference for vanilla ice cream is mistaken; yet, justice, unlike ice cream, is not merely a matter of taste. **Principles of justice not based on objective moral principles are arbitrary at best and prejudicial at worst, without binding** authority or persuasive **moral force**. Though Rawls claims the "conception of justice is a practical social task rather than an epistemological or metaphysical problem,"1 **there must be some a priori, non-subjective commitment** to justice, as well as positive laws, **that compels individuals to sacrifice their self-interest**. Transcendental morality alone provides a substantial answer to those-anarchists, narcissists, libertarians, individualists, racists, isolationists, and others-who question the obligation to serve the common good, i.e., sacrifice one's interests for others. Merely discerning the claims of justice is not enough; these claims must be legitimized. **The gap** between "is" and "ought" **reflects the distance between** factual claims and moral ones, between truth and motivation, between **description and obligation.**

**That transcendental truth is the forms – they are the essence of the world that transcend space and time. The material world inherently lacks a capability to manifest the form and cannot generate true reality, only the forms themselves understood by reason allow for true moral and epistemic knowledge.**

**Heyüman 15,** http://ftp.oxfordphilsoc.org/Documents/StudentPrize/2015\_H1b.pdf

**Forms** can be thought of **as abstract entities** or qualities that **are the essence of sensible things**. Take, **for example, an apple: Roundness, color and weight of the apple are all the properties that make up that apple, each of which is a separate form in itself**. According to Plato, two apples are “round” because they both partake in the form of “roundness”. This “partaking” in any form is what makes things share similar attributes. **All material objects owe their existence to these forms; whereas each form exists by itself, independently of the object that exemplifies the particular form**. In Phaedo, which is widely agreed to be the first dialogue Plato introduced the forms, forms are “marked as auto kath auto beings, beings that are what they are in virtue of themselves1 .” **Forms are transcendent to our material world in that they exist beyond space and time, whereas material objects occupy a specific place at a specific time**. Atemporal and aspatial features of forms have very important implications. First, this explains why **the form of F does not change**, and remains stable beyond a spatio-temporal world while particulars are subject to continuous change. Second, **since F does not exist in space, it can be instantiated in many particulars at once or need not even be instantiated to exist**. The forms are also pure. The roundness of an apple is one of its properties and roundness is only “roundness” in its pure and perfect form. Unlike forms, **material objects are impure, imperfect**, and are complex combinations of several forms. **Being is the ontological relation that ties the form of F to its essence, and each form of F is of one essence** (monoeides). It follows from these principles that each form self-predicates; each form of F is itself F. The form of beauty is itself beautiful, and Helen would not be beautiful if the form of Beauty were not beautiful itself. **The forms are real, sublime entities that belong to an intelligible realm that can only be grasped by reason. They are not subject to change; are stable and enduring, while particulars/material objects belong to this material world of change**, becoming and perishing in a Heraclitean flux. The Idea Behind Platonic Forms As can be seen from his early and middle period dialogues, Plato both explored ethical concepts such as “virtue” and “justice” just like his mentor, Socrates, and he also elaborated upon the essence of the 1 Silverman, A., Fall 2014 Edition, ‘Plato’s Middle Period Metaphysics and Epistemology’, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, p. 10 1 Hilary 2015 Joint 1st Prize: Sinem Hümeydan universe by questioning what there really is in this world of appearances. Plato’s theory of forms, then, can be thought to explicate basically two vital concerns of philosophical inquiry. First, the theory explores the question of how everything seems both to be changing and permanent at the same time. We know that the physical world we perceive through our senses is exposed to continuous change by “becoming” and “ceasing to be2 ”. Nonetheless, there is also permanence beyond what seems to be changing and that can only be grasped by reasoning. Second, the theory of forms is an attempt to find the answer to the question of how people can live a happy and fulfilling life in a world that is ultimately defined with beginnings and endings, and is exposed to change in every possible respect. In the Republic, Plato poses questions about moral concepts in an effort to demonstrate that the life committed to knowledge and virtue will result in happiness and self-fulfillment. To achieve happiness, one should render himself immune to changes in the material world and strive to gain the knowledge of the eternal, immutable forms that reside in the intelligible realm. Indeed, Plato splits the existence into two realms: the visible realm and the transcendent realm (intelligible realm) of forms. **The visible realm is the physical world that is perceived through senses, and is susceptible to “becoming” and “ceasing to be”. On the contrary, the intelligible realm represents the ultimate reality, is enduring, and is accessible only via reasoning** or intellect. Furthermore, Plato believes that this visible world is an imperfect model of the transcendent realm of forms. As is depicted in his famous Allegory of Cave, he thinks that everything perceptible through senses is like the shadows on the Cave Wall, or merely imperfect representations of the reality. Since **what we perceive through our deceptive senses in this world of appearence are merely shadows of reality, one cannot have any genuine knowledge of these things, but can only have beliefs/opinions** about these objects. In other words, Plato thinks that one can only have “knowledge of forms and of Forms one can only have knowledge3 .” Because forms are the only objects of knowledge, individuals should endeavour to reach the intelligible realm and endow themselves with the knowledge of forms in order to achieve a happy and fulfilling life. Plato employs the Sun metaphor, which represents the form of “Good” to compare intelligible and visible realms. As the Sun provides the light to see the physical world, the “Good” provides the power to “know”, and is not only the ultimate cause of knowledge, but it is also the object of truth and knowledge. Being virtuous or pursuing good relies on having the knowledge of the Good, and because forms are the only objects of knowledge, one can only live a fulfilling life and pursue good if one knows the Form of Good. Plato’s Arguments for the Forms and Concluding Remarks According to Plato, reality is very much associated with objectivity. His argument from objectivity asserts that the more objective concepts are of higher reality, and that because **what we perceive via our senses is usually deceitful, the objects of experience cannot be real entities**. Besides, **it is possible to form different subjective views of the same objects; depending on the perceptual or mental states of the observer**. However, forms represent a higher objectivity, and thereby reality through a dialectic process, which is illustrated in the hierarchical system of forms and physical objects, “good” being first among others. Plato appeals to mathematical examples to further his arguments and states that the most definite knowledge is the knowledge of mathematics, and that this knowledge cannot be gained via senses or experience, but only by reasoning. For example, we know for certain that the sum of the interior angles of a triangle is 180 degrees, yet we also acknowledge that no such perfect triangle exists in the world. Then, he concludes, if these abstract entities do not reside in this world, there must a different realm of such perfect forms outside this world of experience that is ultimately real.

**Thus the standard is consistency with transcendental forms of objects.**

**Prefer –**

**1. Infinite regress –**

**2. Performativity –**

**3. Constitutivism –**

**4. Ideal theory first –**

**5. Linguistics – appealing to bare nouns is the form of the object rather than any particular instance.**

**Jannotta 10,** Anthony (2010). Plato’s Theory of Forms: Analogy and Metaphor in Plato’s Republic. Undergraduate Review, 6, 154-157. Available at: <http://vc.bridgew.edu/undergrad_rev/vol6/iss1/28//Scopa>

**The Forms**, then, **are universal, eternal, and unchanging**. They are perhaps best understood as concepts or essences. Take, **for example, the concept dog**. Plato would say that **each particular dog that we encounter in the visible world participates in the Form of dog; there are many particular dogs, but there is only one Form of dog. The fact that we employ the word “dog” implies that there is something common to all dogs**, that is, **some kind of dog-essence. Even though particular dogs are born, live, and die, the concept dog remains eternal** and unchanging. For Plato, we can only have beliefs, and not knowledge proper, of dogs in the sensible realm. **In order to get beyond beliefs of particular dogs we would need to employ dialectical reasoning to acquire real knowledge**; and knowledge, as we will see, is **reserved for the Forms only. So, to have knowledge of dogs would be to have knowledge of the Form of dog**. Let’s now look at several arguments or metaphors that Plato provides to help us understand the Forms.

**Contention –**

**1. Nuclear weapons are a mastery of their form as instruments of war.**

**2. Intrinsic nature of the form of an object cannot be a justification for the elimination of an object**

**3. Enforcing the forms in international arena good**

**4. Elimination of a form is incoherent since they transcend through physical space and time,**