

The Republic Of Plato

Posted on October 22, 2019

This paper will discuss the relationship between knowledge and politics according to Plato and thereafter give an argument on his notion of the relationship.

Introduction

It would be argued in this paper that Plato's view of the relationship between the two is practically unrealistic and demeaning to society. It would be structured as follows: The first would be a review of Plato's views on the relationship between knowledge, and Secondly, the thesis will be broadly discussed, and finally, it will be shown that Plato's arguments are unrealistic and unacceptable in the current society (Allan Bloom).

Plato justified that power is exercised and given to people who are well endowed with skills and expertise to be able to carry out administrative duties. He argued that philosopher kings should be leaders and rulers since all philosophers focused on discovering the ideal polis. The concept of Gallipolis is a beautiful city with total dependence on knowledge for political rule by kings and not power. This strongly emphasizes his firm belief in knowledge as a tool for leadership rather than power wielded by an individual since the philosopher kings possessed immense knowledge but not power.

Plato also brought forward his other argument that sought to say that philosophers should be made kings. He argued that making political decisions required judgment, which should be left to the experts. (Wolf 2006) he stressed using the idea of specialization, which is seen as the key to running the republic efficiently (Allan Bloom). He continued to elaborate that each member of the polis had a skill, and ruling itself was a skill that required some special training that could only be administered to a few. He maintained that the philosophers had to possess the qualities that were vital for their ruling, consequently, they had to love wisdom and knowledge since it was through knowledge which was a virtue that they could rule efficiently.

Criticism Of Plato's Arguments

Plato argued that a group of people who had the skills and the necessary knowledge were very wise and had the ability to ensure justice on the land and differentiate effectively between the friend and the foe is a good idea but is practically unrealistic since it was inevitable for human beings especially the elites to show their interest in politics since it is always an intrinsic force that formed within us (Allan Bloom). Moreover, it abandons our freedoms, rights, and opinions into the hands of the few skilled, which indeed leads to a total state of benevolent dictatorship where a few dictate what

happens to the majority without seeking their inclusion or opinion at all. Consequently, it promoted authoritarian rules that were only a recipe for chaos that was characterized by a struggle for democracy. Therefore, his argument on the relationship between knowledge and politics is not only unrealistic but also unacceptable.

In conclusion, Plato failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the existence of a strong relationship between knowledge and politics due to his arguments that lacked realistic facts.

2. Discuss Plato's Understanding Of Individualism

This essay seeks to give an insight into Plato's understanding of the individualism concept and an argument about his understanding of individualism.

This essay will discuss the concept of individualism in detail. The first part would give an overview of Plato's concept in the same discussion as the thesis. Finally, the essay will argue in support of Plato's understanding of individualism.

Plato's views in his book emphasize individualism and promote it through a series of contradictions (Allan Bloom). Plato says that each human soul contains what makes his inward self trespass on each other's functions: reason, spirit, and appetite, spirit consists of acquired desires such as honours and self-respect. Appetite consists of instinctive drives, while reason consists of the ability to acquire knowledge. He drew interesting implications from the nature of the soul. First, a just man will not allow the three elements that make up his inward to trespass each other's functions, moreover, the function of the reason is to rule the soul and must have foresight and wisdom.

The sole duty of the spirit is basically to obey and support the reason. Eventually, he made it clear that morally virtuous character and true happiness flow from proper functionality and order of the soul that is ruled by reason (Allan Bloom). The way Plato brought out Socrates in the dialogue clearly showed his undying support and yearning for individual virtue. The Socrates model insisted that virtue is knowledge, and rational dialectics bring one complete knowledge and understanding. This contradicts the ideals that the opponents of Plato bring out to the city discussed in the republic, which was a city that gave no value to the individual even though Plato's dialogues portray the virtue of the individual soul as the to be the highest good.

It is significant to note that Plato's dialogue is contradictorily in support of the virtue of individualism, which strives to ensure individual satisfaction that will then culminate in the community eventually (Allan Bloom). I believe it's widely applicable since goals of focusing on making all classes of people happy are largely unrealistic and unlikely to succeed since the majority of individuals live with their own range of passions, which is extremely difficult to harmonize and secondly, rationally developing them need freedom and responsibility and being rational was concluded beyond the capacity for the majority of people.

In conclusion, Plato convincingly elaborated his understanding of the concept of individualism.

Work Cited

Allan Bloom "Republic of Plato" third edition 2013