

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

Democracy: Doomed to fail since Plato
Bachelor Thesis

Bratislava 2016

Emma Jasmin Viskupic

BRATISLAVA INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

Democracy: Doomed to fail since Plato
Bachelor Thesis

Study Program: Liberal Arts

Field of Study: Political Science

Thesis Supervisor: Prof. PhD. František Novosád Csc.

Qualification: Bachelor of Science (abbr. 'Bc.')

Submission Date: 22 February 2016

Date of Defense: 22 June 2016

Bratislava 2016

Emma Jasmin Viskupic

Declaration of Originality

I declare that this bachelor thesis is my own work and has not been published in part or in whole elsewhere. All used literature and other sources are attributed and cited in references.

Bratislava, 22 February 2016

Emma Jasmin Viskupic,

Signed:.....

Democracy – doomed to fail since Plato.

Author: Emma Jasmin Viskupič

University: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Thesis Advisor: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc.

Head of Defense Committee: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc.

Defense Committee: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc., doc. Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Mgr.

Dagmar Kusá PhD., prof. Silvia Miháliková, PhD.

Date: Bratislava, 2016

Thesis length: 70 183 (characters with spaces)

Qualification: Bachelor of Science (abbr. 'Bc.')

Keywords: democracy, citizenship, authenticity, Kallipolis, Plato, Taylor, modernity, antiquity, hierarchies, recognition

Abstract

The focus of my work will evolve mainly around Plato and his notion of justice in *The Republic*. My main source will be *The Republic*, and its critical issues it depicts which I will then connect to the contemporary problems of a modern democracy described by Charles Taylor in *The Malaise of Modernity*. The main idea argued will be the claim that there are serious problems of democratic citizenship, creating a dysfunctional socio-political system in terms of justice, political participation and the social relations of an individual.

I bring antique and modern democracy to the same level, stripping it from the historical and political technicalities, working with a set definition of justice as a social order where power is divided among the citizens, to the contrary of an aristocracy – Plato's ideal state Kallipolis .

I believe that coming back to the antique thinkers and their timeless visionary ideas is crucial in understanding the modern status quo outside of the contemporary context for better and more constructive criticism.

Demokracia – Predurčená k zániku od Platóna

Autor: Emma Jasmin Viskupič

Univerzita: Bratislava International School of Liberal Arts

Školiteľ: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc.

Predseda komisie pre obhajobu bakalárskych prác: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc.

Členovia komisie pre obhajobu bakalárskych prác: prof. PhDr. František Novosád, CSc., doc.

Samuel Abrahám, PhD., Mgr. Dagmar Kusá PhD., prof. Silvia Miháliková, PhD.

Dátum a miesto: Bratislava, 2016

Rozsah bakalárskej práce: 70 183 (znakov s medzerami)

Stupeň kvalifikácie: Bachelor of Science (skr. 'Bc.')

Kľúčové slová: demokracia, spoločnosť, rozpad spoločnosti, Platón, Taylor, Kalipolis, moderná spoločnosť, antika, dôstojnosť

Abstrakt

Zámer mojej bakalárskej práce sa pohybuje okolo najmä na Platóna a jeho chápanie spravodlivosti v *Republike*. Hlavným zdrojom bude práve toto kľúčové dielo a jeho kritické témy, ktoré neskôr prepojam so súčasnými problémami modernej demokracie opísal Charles Taylor vo svojom diele *The Malaise of Modernity*. Hlavnou argumentačnou myšlienkou budú takzvané problémy demokratického občianstva, ktoré z pohľadu spravodlivosti, politickej participácie a sociálnych vzťahov prispievajú k existencii nefunkčného socio-politického systému, ktorým sa demokracia stala.

V práci sa pokúsím o priblíženie antickej a modernej demokracie na spoločnú úroveň, o ich oslobodenie od historických a politických technikalít a na základe toho budem pracovať s definíciou spravodlivosti ako sociálneho systému, kde sa moc prerozdělila do rúk každého jednotlivca. Tento systém je v priamom protiklade k ideálnej forme Platónovho Kallipolisu – aristokracie.

Verím, že návrat k antickým mysliteľom a ich nadčasovým víziám o chode spoločnosti môže byť užitočný pre dobré porozumenie súčasným problémom modernej doby a môže tiež prispieť ku konštruktívnej kritike.

Acknowledgment

First of all I would like to thank the institution of BISLA and its president Mr. Samuel Abrahám for creating a great study environment where my own interest could have been developed and mastered to a level, that lead me to write this thesis. Foremost the dean of BISLA and inspiring professor Novosád for his patience and kind guidance throughout the courses of political science and political sociology; and for helping me with organization and central themes of this thesis. Nonetheless Ms. Dagmar Kusá a person who creates the „international“ at BISLA and takes many of our struggles for her own and never gives up. Also I would like to thank some of external teachers of BISLA, Mr. Béla Edgyed who taught a class on Malaise of Modernity and got me thinking about authenticity and modern society; Mr. Martin Thibodeau who taught us a course on Hegel and opened my own horizons on topics like consciousness, self-consciousness and the never ending struggle for recognition; Ms. Dana Ahern a brilliant sociological mind with unbelievable interpersonal skills that managed many of my personal crises and turned them into self-discovery and provided a critical view on society as such. Finally I would like to thank everyone who was willing to listen to me and tried to contribute to the debate on modern democracy and provided me with their opinions on justice, Plato and the malaises of modern constitution.

Foreword

Being a full-fledged individual in modern society and fulfilling all the expectations and civic responsibilities is close to impossible. With great power comes great responsibility, and this is nothing but true. With all the rights and liberties we are assured in modern democracy we are indeed strong individuals within a free society. I realized this is rather dangerous. Living in technologically advanced times with little dependency on authorities leads majority to be enclosed in their own lives with a slide towards narcissism. Vague political participation, prevailing instrumental reason and neglect of citizen responsibilities all call for throughout evaluation of modern democracy as socio-political system. With these feelings I decided to turn to Plato and his timeless philosophy in *the Republic*, where democracy is depicted as the third most ill of the four constitutions, one step above tyranny. With his detailed explanation on the decomposition of an ideal state, it was very easy for me to follow the virtues and values that have long become forgotten. And as William Carlos Williams commented on Ginsberg's *Howl*, I am also using his quote now "Hold back the edges of your gown, Ladies, we are going through hell".

Contents

Declaration of Originality	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Abstrakt.....	iv
Acknowledgment	v
Foreword	vi
Contents	7
Introduction.....	8
Methodology and Literature Review	10
Chapter I: Plato and the general need for Kallipolis	12
Personal needs for studying the ideal by Plato and its decomposition	15
Plato's needs for writing the Republic and analysis of its deconstruction.....	17
Chapter II: The coming up with Kallipolis and its fall – the cardinal virtues, the three social classes and the tripartite soul	19
Introduction of the cardinal virtues and the composition of Kallipolis.....	20
The <i>Republic</i> and its Themes	22
The fall of Kallipolis.....	24
Chapter III: Taylor's democracy, the „malaised“ vision of democracy.....	30
Taylors Malaised Democracy.....	32
Plato posited next to Taylor	34
Conclusion and the personal input for the future:.....	35
Conclusion of My Bachelor Thesis	37
Appendix I.	39
Mark J. Boone.....	39
Resumé	41
Bibliography:	45

Introduction

Has modern democracy fallen where Plato has seen it in Antiquity? Have the wrong reasons to be just impacted the social order, dismantling the hierarchies, into a level, where individual recognition takes away the intrinsic value of justice, in other words, has democracy robbed us of the real chance to be just and content within a social order, by giving all of us the responsibility of holding a part of the power over a country?

The structure of today's society calls for different ways of thinking that might bring us back to the ancient times. The notion of democracy takes us to the Athenian model, and when we look back we realize that the social hierarchies in modernity are almost absent and the dominant value is equality. We find ourselves in a society with the individual's need for recognition placed high. I will try to show how similar the ancient and modern democracies are and how their structure dilates from an ideal model of Plato's Kallipolis. The first chapter explains the need to deal with this topic, my personal reasons for dealing with the topic that come out of negative opinion on modern democracy. I will introduce so-called problems of democratic citizenship, and mention rigidity of institutional and bureaucratic form of modern democracy. I will also mention Plato's needs for writing the *Republic*, which come out of his *Seventh Letter*. Second chapter will be concerned with the *Republic* directly. I dedicate enough space for the analysis of the cardinal virtues and the deconstruction of the ideal social order to the four vicious constitutions. I consider it crucial, because it explains both institutional decay and a personal decay, and it prepares the floor for introduction of the three malaises of modernity by Charles Taylor in the last chapter. Those directly correspond to the three problems of modern democratic citizenship, thus providing a direct bridge between the first and the last chapter.

Charles Taylor, as a contemporary Christian thinker, has a lot to contribute into this debate, mainly in terms of morality and the struggle for recognition. It is not the typical Hegelian struggle, where a slave wishes to be recognized by his master, but rather the inevitable social expectations to be recognized because of the socio-political transformation of the society into a democracy, famous for the equality of rights and equal treatment. And due to the formal collapse of the old hierarchies, individual recognition is expected, and when not received possibly perceived as a form of oppression.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

The aim of my structure of this thesis is to provide at first the justification for writing it by introducing own problems with the status quo and then for bringing Plato into the debate as well. Plato plays two important roles in my thesis. His *Republic* serves as a thoughtful and throughout analysis of a society and an individual, thus he provides a structure and something that many modern philosophers lack; the path of destruction of a self and the society. He enumerates the problems, but follows them through their creation providing reasons and detailed explanation. And finally, this thesis includes a modern thinker Charles Taylor, whom I posit next to Plato to finish the cycle of democracy, doomed since antiquity.

My hypothesis therefore stands on these grounds:

Democracy, as the second worst constitution according to Plato, stands on shaky grounds as it prefers unnecessary desires and ignores the three cardinal virtues. Emphasis on equality, prestige, recognition, money - making and freedom has turned democracy into a marketplace of constitutions without the essential emphasis on upbringing and education. This stands in direct opposition to the ideal model produced by Plato, where citizens are divided into classes, have assigned places in the society according to their abilities and justice means no meddling between those classes. Education and strict upbringing assure the right order and discipline in the society. When classes mix and start to follow wrong virtues and worship the wrong goods, society and individuals suffer. Democracy is therefore a vicious constitution and everything that has been praised about it in modernity, is actually a dark deviation from the ideal and just Kallipolis.

Methodology and Literature Review

Writing a philosophical thesis involves a great part of personal input as well as direct study of primary sources. The first chapter of this work will provide the necessary definitions of key terms like democracy and justice; it will also contain personal and Plato's justifications for the need to evaluate democracy as a socio-political system. Thus technical problems with definitions should be cleared in the first chapter and the floor will be ready for analysis of Plato.

The most crucial part of this work's methodology will be a critical reading of Plato's *Republic* and then comparing it to the fifth chapter of Taylor's collection of lectures *Malaise of Modernity* (1992). I believe that close assessment and direct study of primary sources is essential to answer my research question. As far as I am concerned with justice and other morally and technically problematic notions as recognition, I adapt Plato's strategy he uses in *the Republic* - I will follow his work while building up the Kallipolis (as an ideal city) I will follow his logic through the deconstruct of Kallipolis to one of the most decadent social orders – the democracy. This will make up for a great part of my second chapter, where I worked with a crucial secondary source *The Unity of Virtues and the Degeneration of Kallipolis* by Mark J. Boone. The structure of this paper and its logical organization of Kallipolis and corresponding organization of the tripartite soul were a great inspiration and a guide I followed when building and deconstructing Kallipolis to democracy and tyranny as well.

On the final note of this paper I will evaluate Charles Taylor's vision of modern democracy and some central themes on the struggle of recognition from the fifth chapter "The Need for Recognition". Again a great part of this chapter will be my own commentary on Taylor's ideals, problems and struggles of modern democratic society. Those after evaluation and careful consideration will be merged with the findings of Plato on democracy as a political constitution and social order both.

In the topic of my thesis both Plato and Taylor come quite close in their philosophy, as they are both concerned with a personality trait that makes a person unjust or at least dilates his just intentions – the recognition, in the old Hegelian sense of the struggle for recognition. Taylor introduces it bluntly, coming out of the status quo in 20th Century and the moral philosophy of late 1970s. Living in capitalist democracy where the ancient hierarchies

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

dissolved and transformed the society into granting every citizen an equal civic status at birth, making everyone able to claim equality of rights, equal treatment and the need for recognition which when not delivered seen as oppression. Such problem was absent in the past, where strict social hierarchy didn't create any common potential need or even expectation to be recognized. The higher in the hierarchy, the more respected and recognized and the more power the person held.

Chapter I: Plato and the general need for Kallipolis

It is important to start with stating the reasons for my personal disillusionment of democracy. This chapter will contain these reasons, which then I will be positing along with the ones of Plato and his justification of writing *the Republic*. The one source where he described these himself is *The Seventh Letter* (360 BC). I understand that there are crucial differences between the antique and current democracies, and I would like to avoid any potential attacks on my case concerning these differences, because they are not important. Therefore this chapter will state my personal needs for exploring this topic further, my observations of modern democracy as a political constitution that does not work best for its citizens. The second part of this chapter will contain Plato's views on the democratic society he lived in, his observations of democracy and other existent constitutions that he visited or observed and that contributed to his opinion on politics as such. This chapter serves as a platform of the needs for analysis of why democracy is not ideal, how society got into such a state and what could be done with it.

I understand that democracy in Athens was different in its form from the one we know nowadays, but there is some fundamental grounding we can establish as universal and therefore compare those two constitutions quite successfully. Probably the most difficult task is to work with a definition of democracy that would fit both the Athenian and modern democracy. Modern democracy as described by Merriam-Webster dictionary would be "a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free elections". The Athenian democracy was direct democracy, where citizens voted directly in the assembly and also participated in courts. Citizens were only males of a certain age after their completed military training. Even though the citizens that could participate in democracy composed only about twenty percent of the whole population of the polis, there was no other limitation on the voting power, like for example in oligarchy, where it was limited by a certain level of wealth. Therefore, I would like to introduce a general definition of democracy that fits both Athenian and modern forms, as a political constitution in which the sovereign power resides in and is exercised by the whole body of free citizens; as distinguished from a monarchy, aristocracy, or oligarchy. The most important feature of the democracy, as I understand it and further work with it, is the crucial distribution of the share

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

of the power between all people. For better understanding of this basic definition of democracy, I chose to follow the deconstruction of Kallipolis (Plato's ideal state - aristocracy) into the four other constitutions, where with each step the power is shared between more people. The focus will be also on the loss of virtues and values in the society that lead to disillusioned state of society and the malaises of modernity.

Another crucial definition I need to provide before we start the process of this paper is the modern understanding of justice. I decided to use the one of John Rawls from the *Theory of Justice*. He understands justice as fairness and follows two principles. First, he says that each person should be granted equal rights and liberties to the maximum extent. Everyone should therefore enjoy the same liberties. The second one talks about inequalities and their arrangement to everyone's advantage. Rawls introduces the concept of veil of ignorance that would block anyone from choosing to occupy any specific position in the society. Rawls formulated a very egalitarian concept of justice within a modern society allowing more attention to those born worse off. Later in the second and third chapter we will follow Plato's formulation of justice which is simple "doing one's own and not meddling professions and social classes". In the last chapter I will provide summary and comparison of the key terms and different forms of constitutions.

He identifies two principles: One, that each person should have equal rights to the most extensive liberties consistent with other people enjoying the same liberties; and two, that inequalities should be arranged so that they would be to everyone's advantage and arranged so that no one person would be blocked from occupying any position. From these two principles Rawls derives an egalitarian conception of justice that would allow the inequality of conditions implied by equality of opportunity but would also give more attention to those born with fewer assets and into less favorable social positions. He identifies two principles: One, that each person should have equal rights to the most extensive liberties consistent with other people enjoying the same liberties; and two, that inequalities should be arranged so that they would be to everyone's advantage and arranged so that no one person would be blocked from occupying any position. From these two principles Rawls derives an egalitarian conception of justice that would allow the inequality of conditions implied by equality of opportunity but would also give more attention to those born with fewer assets and into less favorable social positions. He identifies two principles: One, that each person should have equal rights to the most extensive liberties consistent with other people enjoying the same liberties; and two, that inequalities should be arranged so that they would be to everyone's advantage and arranged so that no one person would be blocked from

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

occupying any position. From these two principles Rawls derives an egalitarian conception of justice that would allow the inequality of conditions implied by equality of opportunity but would also give more attention to those born with fewer assets and into less favorable social positions.

I will examine the flaws and malaises in both ancient and modern democracies within their institutional forms, and the form it grants legitimacy to its individuals that then form the democratic society. The aim of this process is to show my personal need for writing this thesis and bringing attention to a fact that living under democratic constitution is not the best way, and that Plato has sufficiently stated it thousands of years ago. At the end of this passage, the floor should be ready for further investigation of how exactly did democracy become doomed to fail, since Plato.

The current political situation makes one wonder what exactly makes the constitution desirable and sustainable. There are a few problems which I find disturbing, when looking at the basis of current democracy and it's functioning. Many of these problems are brought up by Charles Taylor in *Malaise of Modernity* showing democracy as a flawed socio-political construct with negative impact on both the individual and the state.

First of all I consider important understanding the position of an individual within a state. In modern democracy, human individual rights and freedoms are being prioritized above everything else. We are therefore recognizing a strong individual within a democratic society. Such individual can only exist within a state that can provide and assure that; a strong enough state to guarantee individual rights and freedoms and protects an individual. Such scenario calls for a strong individual living in a strong state. Unfortunately, as the rights and freedoms are heavily emphasized in democratic society, the responsibilities and duties of its citizens are neglected and forgotten. One of key features of democracy is individual's civic and political participation in the society, which should be compulsory and automatic. The power which was held in hands of a few has now been distributed among all the citizens, and this doesn't only call for rights but also duties of the new power-holders. Therefore the so-called problems of democratic citizenship arise concerning mainly the too-much-emphasized authenticity and the neglect of civic responsibilities. Since the power has been evenly distributed, the tangible results of a single citizen's action are small and so is their sense of responsibility for the outcomes.

According to my understanding of modern democracy, and thanks to good articulation of Stanford encyclopedia, there are three problems of modern democratic citizenship in total. The first of them is connected to a point already made by Plato that some people are more intelligent and moral and therefore they ought to rule, which is directly anti-democratic. The second would be the need of division of labor in a consumption-driven society – which is hard to combine with political duties of the same citizens. The combination of complex manual labor and the time and precision in making rational and intelligent political choices are hard to combine – and that is expected of the whole population of a democratic country. If they are to engage in complex physically demanding labor, how could they devote enough time to make rational decisions in politics; or reversely, if everyone is to engage intelligently

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

into politics, they will have little time to do other tasks essential for the society. The tradeoff between labor specialization and political participation is a big problem, created by the fair and equal distribution of power. Third, I have already mentioned above, is the lack of individual sense of responsibility for own political actions. As it is said, chances that a single vote will affect the outcome are very close to a zero. Moreover according to Anthony Downs (1957, ch. 13) citizens who vote have therefore little reason to get informed how to vote. Consequently if citizens do behave like that, the society would be better off if run by a few with a little input from the others, or otherwise the society would be run very poorly.

Acknowledging these three problems of democratic citizenship, the reason why the problem of authenticity and individual preferences occur is simple. Since citizens cannot see their voice in a collective environment, their individual interests have become more important, as they directly affect them and see the results immediately. The strong individual within the strong state gains more individual importance and loses its general responsibilities towards the state (the civic participation, the monitoring of the conduct of their leaders, etc.). This construct is the result of the strong state being inefficient in its fair distribution of power and follow up on the citizen's participation.

Even though the political hierarchy has almost disappeared and the power has been re-distributed equally, the bureaucracy and the institutional form of a state has remained the same. This sort of rigidity diminishes the power of an individual within the society, creating a narcissistic, self-interested individual with little political action and potential.

One more fundamental difference in the logical form of Plato's social order, which has crucially changed since then, is the way legitimacy is obtained and justified. Plato's justification is only wisdom, also one of the cardinal virtues; in other words, the ideal leader (the Philosopher King) in Plato's Kallipolis obtained the legitimacy to rule over the city by his supreme wisdom and knowledge of everything. In our understanding of socio-political order, the discussion (democratic discussion) and common agreement is what justifies legitimacy of any ruling unit. The so-called *collective will* is a criterion that decides and awards legitimacy.

Having stated my personal desire and need to write on the topic of democracy and its flaws in the previous paragraphs, I will now present Plato's needs as well. His seventh letter is being considered as an explanation and additional justification of his *Republic*. The dominant feature of Plato's theory is the desire of a radical makeover of Athenian and Greek political institutions. This need came from his personal experience of political defeat and despair. The much criticized utopianism of the *Republic* could be seen as a reverse side of the profound disillusionment Plato felt at the actual experience of the Athenian polis.

Nevertheless, there was a point in Plato's life when he admitted that all the states and constitutions are "ill" and it is rather difficult to lead a state. When Plato was young, Athens were under the infamous tyranny of the thirty; he wrote the Seventh letter when he was much older. Some of those men were his acquaintances and friends and they called him to rule with them. Young Plato was driven towards politics but he was also a great follower and a student of Socrates, whom the thirty tried but failed to make a part of their party. Plato expected them to lead the State and its men out of the bad ways of life into the good one. Unfortunately, Plato became aware of the fact that these men made the former government (democracy) look like a golden age. Plato disapproved of all their proceedings and distanced himself from them and their politics completely. After some time the tyranny of the thirty was overthrown and Plato once again felt his political ambition in the new constitution. To his disappointment again, the new constitution and many who came back from the exile executed Socrates, a man who supported them and helped them when they were in exile. Plato observed those in power and in short time concluded that it is difficult to handle public affairs right. The lessons he learned are following: It is hard to manage a city. One needs virtuous friends to govern a city right, but it is rather difficult under the current conditions to find such friends (virtuous men) and train them. Political and moral corruption made Plato dizzy and unwell. After observing other States and their political affairs, he decided that all states are bad and incurable, unless some sort of luck with assistance of miracle assist the transformation. Furthermore, he observed and concluded that only true philosophy can discern the nature of justice in an individual, and in a state both. Finally, also a famous note from *the Republic*, human ills will never end unless true philosophers become rulers and rulers become philosophers.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

These experiences come from both Athens and from his failed efforts to turn Dionysius' kingship in Sicily into a successful philosophical rule. Historically, he tried to bring the constitution in Sicily into a practical image of his philosophy: "and finally the scale turned in favor of the view that, if ever anyone was to try to carry out in practice my ideas about laws and constitutions, now was the time for making the attempt; for if only I could fully convince one man, I should have secured thereby the accomplishment of all good things" (Plato, Seventh Letter). Plato's case study of Sicily, as to implement his philosophy in practical terms failed and left him skeptical. He disapproved of the excessive hedonistic lifestyle people of Sicily lead. He observed that such way of life prevents virtue and this lack of virtue then prevents political stability and good government. All these were notions and motives of Plato's famous *Republic*, where he follows the disillusionment of an ideal Kallipolis (virtuous city led by Philosopher Kings) as it fades, along with its virtues in both men and the society, into four vicious constitutions. Plato follows a trend of uncovering different types of men that come forward within the vicious constitutions, the virtues and values they honor, and what are the flaws of these men and the society as such.

Chapter II: The coming up with Kallipolis and its fall – the cardinal virtues, the three social classes and the tripartite soul

The study and analysis of cardinal virtues as described in *the Republic* is crucial, as far as these values and their later dissemination show the character of the city and the kind of a person it prefers. The unity of the virtues is essential for the ideal city to exist, whereas the degeneration of Kallipolis is due to the virtues' incompleteness. Democracy is one of the four vicious constitutions and it lacks a complete presence of two virtues and worships a perverse form of justice; therefore suffers incompleteness and cannot offer a happy life to its citizens. The aim of this chapter is to bring more insight into the decomposition of an ideal social order.

The incentive to create an ideal model of a city came from the challenge brought up by brothers Adeimantus and Glaucon at the beginning of *the Republic*. Socrates suggests that the best thing to do is to show justice in a state rather than in an individual (368c). State is compared to a single human being in a sense that well organized state corresponds to a well-organized human. The city that is being composed, Kallipolis has three social classes, the ruling class, the guarding class and the money-making class. Due to over production and accumulation of wealth in this city, the war is an inevitable occurrence. There are two possibilities of war according to Socrates, the internal war that is the civil war among the friends and the intercity war. The main feature of a just city is not meddling between classes and professions. For this reason a city needs ruling class, guarding class and money-making class. "We thought that we'd find justice most easily in such city and injustice, by contrast, in the one that is governed worst and, that, by observing both cities, we'd be able to judge the question we've been inquiring for so long. We take ourselves, then, to be fashioning the happy city, not picking out few happy people and putting them in it, but making the whole city happy. We'll look into the opposite city soon" (420b).

Towards the middle of Book IV Socrates and the brothers distinguish the ruling class – it would be the selected few from among the guardians, naming them the complete guardians in lines at 428d. Complete guardians have wisdom and the complete knowledge of everything, internally and externally. There is a hint of metaphysics behind the guardians' ultimate knowledge. Plato was famous for his philosophy of forms, the ultimate knowledge whose reflection we receive on Earth, but only great minds with great capacity are able to

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

touch up to these forms. Wisdom is also compared to good judgment, as of the whole city needs to have good judgment. In nowadays understanding we could call it common sense or the general knowledge.

Introduction of the cardinal virtues and the composition of Kallipolis

To prepare the floor for deconstruction of Kallipolis, it is important to present the cardinal virtues, namely the wisdom, courage, moderation and justice, as they correspond to the three social classes in the city and the tripartite soul in an individual. Virtues become intact if they are disunited; without the wisdom's leadership, they each become only a little better than a vice. When wisdom - the rational part - gets eliminated; the other virtues fast lose their excellence. I am focusing on democracy and its flaws in this paper but I will follow all stages of degeneration in the *Republic*. It will help me to show that the stages of the degeneration correspond to the loss of a certain virtue in each constitution. Conclusively, I will try to summarize and show that democracy, as a third stage of degeneration of Kallipolis, is strongly lacking organization, two cardinal virtues and unity of all of them, is rather unsatisfactory constitution, that leads to unhappy life.

Having briefly described the form of Kallipolis and its corresponding structure to the human soul, we can follow the threefold natural order of both. Human flourishing requires all the parts to be in harmony. "We will call the part of the soul which it calculates the rational part and the part with which it lusts, hungers, thirsts, and gets excited by other appetites the irrational appetitive part, companion of certain indulgences and pleasures (439d)". The third part is introduced, which allies with reason and keeps the irrational part under control; so these two parts heed the rule of the reason to promote their own good. As C.S. Lewis pointed out "The head rules the belly through the chest" (Lewis, 1947). The same applies to the city, where wise rulers follow the rational element in the soul, military the spirited part and the city's working class to its appetites.

Justice is described as "having and doing of one's own" (433e-434a) and assures the natural hierarchy. It gives each of the three parts of the soul its exact place. Justice exists in a city where the wisest rule, the bravest undergo training and others work according to their capabilities. *Wisdom* is the lead of the virtues. At a person, wisdom is necessary for the functioning of the rational part of the soul, which coordinates the whole body; whereas in the city it is the ruling class – the Philosopher Kings. Wisdom is a superior virtue to the other virtues due to its universal philosophical insight.

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

Knowledge in this case comes from the Forms I have already mentioned in the previous section. Wisdom has a privileged understanding of the natural order and inculcates that order in the soul (Kraut, *The Defense of Justice in Plato's Republic*, 1992). *Courage* is a virtue of the spirited part of the soul and the auxiliary class in a society. It is the part that through good education in music and poetry and also through physical training distinguishes what is to be feared and what not (430b). It is a part of body or a city that through the guidance of wisdom allows to live under pressure of an enemy. Last but not least, *moderation* is the mastery of the irrational part of the soul or the money-making class of a city. Such harmony is obtained when "the naturally better part of the soul is in control of the worse" (431a).

All four virtues are conditioned under the guidance of wisdom which is mastered by the ultimate guardians of the natural hierarchy. A just city remains just when the metaphysics represented by the guardians is present and a just person remains just when the rational part of his soul overlooks the rest of him.

I would like to elaborate here a little more on some fundamental themes of the *Republic*. After this elaboration I will present the decomposition of Kallipolis. I will be dealing with collapse of both the city and a person and his soul, therefore it is essential for us to understand the relationship between these two.

Book IV of the *Republic* concludes with a similarity between the soul and the city where the three parts of soul are equal to three classes found in a city. The parts of the soul therefore correspond to the classes in a city (441). It is important to mention that three parts of a soul and three classes of a city are to be found in any constitution, not just in the best one. But only in the best one these parts won't meddle and therefore create a well-functioning individual within a well-functioning city. Kallipolis can have two forms, a kingship if one man emerges from many to rule; or aristocracy, when more men emerge and become the ruling class. Such constitution should be preserved if they follow the upbringing and education that Socrates and his fellows describe in previous pages of Books III and IV.

Book III carries a few very crucial notions. Most importantly, it brings into the light the fact which is going to be emphasized later – the non-mixing of professions and the importance of moderation. An interesting passage is introduced that seems to be in favor of a lie, so called useful myth or the noble lie, that would make the citizens love their city more and respect their social positions to make them less likely to mix the classes, because as we already know, mixing (professions or social classes) is going to lead to an end of justice in a city. Socrates rather unwillingly introduces a tale, a noble myth, about the mother earth and citizens as brothers, some having gold, some silver and some bronze mixed in their souls which determines their professional and social status. The myth emphasizes not to mix bronze into the silver class and vice versa because that would ruin the city (414d -415d). This tale is important for two different reasons, Socrates tries to say that even the best of the best guardians, hence the rulers, should be able to spread these helpful falsehoods (414c) to keep the community united and build patriotic sentiments in the citizens; and secondly it confirms that Plato felt the presence of a potential flaw to his master plan – the human nature. He realized that the common class of the money-makers must be allowed the material ownership and other luxurious sides of life, but if such person entered the guardian class, this materialistic urge might corrupt the whole system. Same might happen in the ruling class. For this reason the allegory is powerful, because it is the blue print for any other examples of possible consequences if “mixing” in classes, virtues or possession happens.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

I believe that Plato emphasizes two important themes here, the education and the need of a noble lie. It is obvious that those are the most effective techniques to make people content with their social role and social status and at the same time educates them for the best.

These techniques when combined create the ideal constitution with natural hierarchy. When education becomes neglected, the cardinal virtues become less transparent and prevailing, creating a possibility for this ideal to collapse. And that is exactly what Plato seen happening and described in the *Republic*.

Kallipolis represents an ideal constitution understood as aristocracy. Socrates recognizes four other vicious constitutions, where the ruling class is composed of people worshipping the wrong virtues. Each step of this devolution of Kallipolis represents a loss of one of the cardinal virtues: wisdom, courage, moderation and justice. The failure of wisdom creates a timocracy; the failure of courage creates an oligarchy; the failure of moderation creates a democracy; the failure of justice creates a tyranny. The whole process of degeneration shows the importance of unity of the cardinal virtues under the leadership of wisdom.

For better illustration let me introduce the first vicious constitution, timocracy. This constitution emerged from aristocracy, the perfect social order where kings are philosophers and look after proper education and upbringing of the society. As A. E. Taylor says, the city suffers a moral decline, marked by a tendency to hold up lesser goods as the greatest good. Timocracy as a constitution lost wisdom as a cardinal virtue, the society became misguided and failed to distinguish what the greatest goods were. The reference made on Muses speaking in *the Republic* (546), refers to the philosopher kings' insight into metaphysics, which in timocracy diminishes.

When the kings lose their knowledge of ultimate reality – they lose their connection with the Forms (metaphysics), they lose knowledge of the good they are meant to show and bring to the city. As a consequence, they bear children who don't know or love the best thing: they bear children who are not wise. Plato tries to describe this process by introducing a complicated mathematical formula for bearing children (546-547). I believe he is trying to say that we can only control human behavior to a certain point, but cannot control the human nature; that is why a strong emphasis on education and upbringing is always present in *Republic*. These children eventually become the rulers and the perfect order gets interrupted, creating timocracy. Wisdom is lost and the greatest good is courage: timocracy pursues honor, the oligarchy money, the democracy equality, and the tyrannical constitution sexual pleasures.

Timocracy:

First the ruling class in timocracy gets pre-occupied with keeping an order within the classes and guarding its citizens from whom they enslaved. We can observe the fall from the ruling class ruled by reason and philosophy to auxiliary class ruled by courage, valuing honor and spiritedness. Their values transform from love of reason and philosophy to love of honor

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

and spiritedness. Courage preserves beliefs about what things and sorts of things are to be feared, but it must receive these beliefs from wisdom (429c). One must be courageous about the right things. In a timocracy the wisdom is lost, courage is worshiped but in a perverted form and the last two virtues, courage and moderation, are still intact and so are their corresponding social classes the auxiliary and the money-making class.

After this step the city becomes scared to appoint the golden class to rule, because as a class, it became mixed. Finally simpler people become appointed to the ruling class who are spirited and incline to war. Such people secretly admire gold and material possessions. The auxiliaries replace the philosopher kings and the new constitution strives for a victory in war and neglects the education of its population (547d-8a). Courage is imperfect without wisdom to guide it and such society becomes unbalanced and completely lacks reason. In short, the timocracy has lost wisdom. Its corrupted form of courage is mainly love of honor, which is also the city's highest ideal.

Oligarchy:

Continuously, oligarchy comes out of this constitution as the second vicious constitution. It represents the rule of a few rich, with the poor having no share in the ruling. As was mentioned in timocracy, timocratic person secretly admires money and wealth, but accumulates it secretly. And this secret subliminal love for money destroys the constitution. Money-making becomes more valued than other virtues, and what is valued is practiced and what is not is forgotten. Values connected with virtues of moderation, courage, wisdom and justice are being neglected and money-making becomes the only ambition and form of competition among people. From honor and victory loving person raises a money-lover, who is appointed to rule. As money and wealth become the highest value in the society, the richest people become valued as the best and are appointed as rulers. This sort of shift in qualification from reason to wealth corresponds to the shift from the ruling class to the money-making class, and the good they value as the highest. In timocracy it was the most courageous and honor loving, the qualities assigned to the silver guardian class. In oligarchy, the third money-making class comes to the front and the previous classes' values become forgotten and not honored anymore.

The city becomes naturally divided between the rich and the poor, creating a civil war. Virtues like courage and moderation are forgotten, so is the training of the auxiliaries, because the rich oligarchs do not want to pay a professional army and therefore the majority of the population must wage city's external wars. The city then breaks another significant

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

condition, as its citizens must start mixing their professions (money-maker becomes also a soldier, etc.). The city is polluted by beggars, robbers, thieves and evildoers due to lack of training and overall bad constitution, lack of education that would assure the presence of good virtues in everyday life.

It is obvious that oligarchy struggles with moderation, as its major virtue. There is a perverse form of moderation present, as far as an oligarchic person is a money hoarder, whose evil appetites keep him in a civil war within himself. The greediness for money and his fear of losing his possessions keep them under control, and he only spends for necessary appetites. Oligarchic city is divided between the rich and the poor, and as Plato says in 421e-422a, "Both wealth and poverty. The former makes for luxury, idleness, and revolution; the latter for slavishness, bad work, and revolution as well." We can see that oligarchy lost both wisdom and courage, and the perverse form of moderation rules the city. In an oligarchic soul, it is the love for money ruling over the unnecessary desires; in oligarchic city it is the wealthy class dominating over the drones and beggars. The love and desire for money replaces the love of honor (as was in former constitution, the timocracy) due to the absence of wisdom, which would guide the soul and the city for the love of better things and values.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

Democracy:

Following the same trend, we can see that democracy has lost moderation and its dominant virtue becomes perverse form of justice, the last of the cardinal virtues. I say perverse, because of the collapse of the other cardinal virtues, mainly wisdom. Emerging from oligarchy, the city is left immoderate with no courage. As Plato says in 555 c-d, a city cannot both serve money and remain temperate.

Let us briefly review injustice as it appears in these declining constitutions. The timocrat avoids shame, although escaping deserved shame is unjust. The soldiers of a timocratic city are like dogs that have been trained to attack enemies, but not to treat friends gently (375c). This much injustice is allowed by two imperfect virtues absencing wisdom, courage and moderation. The greatest injustice in the democratic city is the large class of drones who has nor does their own duty. The democratic person is unjust for these two reasons due to the absence of the other three virtues: He fails to cultivate a skill in order to have and do his own work, and through indulgence he honors desires that do not deserve to be honored.

A democratic person's life is a picture of immoderation: he desires healthy food, but often yields to "the desire that goes beyond these" described in the *Republic* at 559c-d. He has no wisdom to distinguish the good from the bad, no courage to try it, and no moderation to resist. Throughout this he is completely uninspired, and spends all his life seeking the nearest pleasures.

The following problems extracted from Plato's criticism of democratic constitution are applicable to modern democracy. The key point of democratic constitution is treating all pleasures as equal. Under this condition we perceive the perversion towards which democratic justice tends. In democratic soul, all pleasures are treated equally. The same applies to a democratic society where all citizens deserve equal treatment, whether they are diligent workers or lazy drones. The personal freedom granted to everyone is the ideal of the democratic state (562b-c). Democracy has lost the true meaning of justice that wisdom prescribes: the having and doing of one's own (433e-4a), and not meddling businesses. Instead, democracy gave justice a new meaning of a radical equality of all things, regardless of merit. Plato's understanding of justice has a hint of *meritocracy* that is directly connected to its strict but logical hierarchy. "We have already seen that the timocracy exemplifies an attenuated form of courage that has ceased to defend wisdom and that the oligarchy exemplifies a corrupted form of moderation that suppresses some desires to others. The democracy has its own corrupted form of its own dominant virtue, namely this justice which

Viskypic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

scatters honors around on things that deserve no honor. But this confused sense of justice is the best justice can do absent the wisdom to know what is good, the courage to defend it, and the moderation to love it. But even in the democracy there is a hint of genuine justice. Although he desires intercourse with his mother, with beasts, and with gods he restrains these desires while he is awake, indulging them only in dreams (571c-d)" (Boon, p. 14).

Shame prevents him from indulging the very worst of his desires. His piety towards family and state is the democrat's last piece of justice. The tyrannical constitution displays complete injustice when it finally throws off that piety. Thus democracy has lost wisdom, courage, and moderation. A corrupted form of justice dominates democracy: for the democratic soul, the equality of all desires; for the democratic city, the radical equality of citizens without regard for citizens' characters. The lack of moderation in the soul soon results in the loss of what justice remains in the democracy.

Tyranny:

We can still distinguish three social classes in declining democracy: the working class, the drones and the wealthy class (564-5). The working class has the greatest say in the elections, but the drones dominate the city through games they play in the process in order to get as much money from the wealthy class as possible. At a certain point, the smartest from the drones becomes the tyrant. He acts out the whole range of injustice when he kills anyone 'brave, large-minded, knowledgeable or rich (567b). Such is the tyranny as a constitution with injustice as a parricide. To establish tyrannical rule, the tyrant must eliminate anything left by the fathers; "the old traditional opinions that he had held from the childhood about what is fine or shameful" (574d). The complete degeneration that begun by the loss of wisdom is completed when the tyrant sheds the last trace of virtues by disregarding the old traditional opinions. The complete reverse of the natural order occurs, when fathers are obeying their sons and sons are killing their fathers.

Injustice ruling the soul lets the unrestrained sexual appetites dominate it. The soul of a tyrant tries to mimic the harmony of a healthy balanced soul. To compare how a tyrannical soul works, unlike the oligarch who still suppresses the immoral desires, tyrant suppresses and destroys the good ones. This way the tyrant remains miserably unsatisfied, proving us and everyone in the Socratic dialogues, that an unjust life is miserable and unhappy. The tyrant is unhappy and always fearful for his life (566d-7b); tyrannical soul is unhappy because the never-ending desires prove no satisfaction (574a-576b).

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

Conclusively, it is now obvious that a completeness of the desires is necessary for happiness and it is only possible under the guidance of wisdom. Happiness requires virtue, and virtue requires wisdom. A disunited virtue is better than an absolute vice, but is still inferior to the pure form of the virtue when all four unified. Disunited virtue is unstable and only proves the claim that any virtue must be united with the other ones in order to be functional. Big emphasis is put on wisdom, which guides separate virtues to achieve the best out of their potentials. Unfortunately, as Plato understood at the beginning, and so was commented by Mark Boone such is the human nature: Our desires go astray without the wisdom given by a properly functioning reason (Boone, p. 17).

The aim of this chapter was to show the importance of the unity of the virtues as presented in the *Republic*, to emphasize the completeness of Kallipolis as a constitution. I believe that following the construction and then the deconstruction of the ideal constitution was essential for the final step in the next chapter, which will evaluate the modern democracy in respect to the one, just described. In such a manner, the process of showing democracy as a constitution with insufficient means to meet the ends of a happy life, will be completed. For a more authentic comparison, I will be bringing Charles Taylor into the debate as a contemporary philosopher with modern understanding of Plato's remarks on democracy.

Chapter III: Taylor's democracy, the „malaised“ vision of democracy

The reason I chose Charles Taylor to represent the critical view on modern democracy is because of his Hegelian stance towards recognition, and also for his critical view on modern age of authenticity. In *Malaise of Modernity*, which is a collection of Massey lectures, he distinguishes three major malaises of modern socio-political democratic system. I will summarize them in short in the following paragraph, but for the supporting of my argument and Plato's vision of democracy I will use chapter five of *Malaise of Modernity* "The Need for Recognition".

Taylor recognizes three malaises of modernity that corrupt the society in a democratic system. "The first source of worry is individualism" (Taylor, 1992, p. 2). He claims that the modern freedom was won by breaking loose from the historic, older moral horizons. His source of worry is connected to the loss of individual's importance within larger social and cosmic horizons of his actions. Another aspect of individualism is a loss of broader vision as individuals focus on them, which can lead to a loss of higher purpose in life, something worth dying for (Taylor, p. 4). The dark side of individualism is both flattening and narrowing of lives, which makes them poorer in meaning and less concerned with other individuals in the society, which leads to a creation of the so-called „me society“ and possible narcissism. Personal reflections to this problem depicted by Taylor are that individualism has been viewed positively, as emancipation from the traditional ties in a society. The question therefore should be asked, which hierarchies are good and which are bad; what makes up for good source of authenticity and which slides to perverted reality of narcissism and Taylors "me-generation". I agree that individualism in modern democracy creates certain problems with political participation, civic involvement and greater individual interest in the public sphere. But individualism as such, first came around to break the rigid social bonds and to free an individual from the tight social network. Because of that, it is necessary to understand individualism as a revolutionary step that freed and created an individual as such. Nowadays the current socio-political circumstances created a worrisome environment where individuals become too preoccupied with their own lives and forget their still prevailing civic and social responsibilities.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

The second malaise is connected with the primacy of instrumental reason, the rationality a person uses to calculate the most efficient and economic application of means to a given end. The economic calculation of the best cost-output ratio has been transformed to every day decisions and private life of an individual as the measure of success. This is also connected to the fact that a society has no longer a sacred structure, and the goals of an individual have been redesigned as the individual's self has been posited on top of the value pyramid. The prestige and aura surrounding technology made us believe that instrumental reason is essential for everyday life. It makes us believe that we should seek technological solutions even when something very different is called for (Taylor, p. 6). Taylor suggests that the solution for primacy of instrumental reason is institutional, as I have also pointed in my first chapter that democracy has its undemocratic flaws in its rigid institutional forms; change in this domain has to be institutional as well, even though it cannot be as sweeping and total as the great theorists of revolution proposed (Taylor, p. 8).

Reflecting on the second malaise, the instrumental reason seems to be judged here a little bit too hastily. First, we need to ask a question again, what is the rate and the nature of the instrumental reason we are concerning in this debate. It is inevitable to think of instrumental reason within the boundaries of individualism. If the individualism becomes so called toxic, and instrumental reason prevails into such spheres of private life as romantic and family relationships, it becomes a source of worry in modern society. Otherwise using of instrumental reason can bring efficiency and effectively to everyday life which is absolutely necessary in modern technological lifestyle. Therefore we must be careful when judging instrumental reason, and specify which sphere of modern life it creates a dangerous dimension, and in which on the other hand it could be useful and necessary.

The third malaise that creates a worry in modern democracy is connected to the previous two, but is focused on the public sphere where individuals become alienated from the political life. Modern society undermines individual choice by its technological structure, imposing so called soft despotism on the individuals. They then become „enclosed in their own hearts“ and the private life becomes more important than the social life. Soft despotism is not oppressive and tyrannical like in the old days but mild and patriarchal, supporting lesser civic activity and deeper individualism. The vicious circle of soft despotism is run by political mechanism that allows little space for civic activity and further de-motivates citizens to participate. They are left powerless and alone to face bureaucratic state. This alienation from the public scene and the utter loss of political control is happening due to the highly

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

centralized and bureaucratic political world. I have mentioned this in the first chapter as one of my own problematic visions of modern democracy, where the rigid institutionalization of so-called free society creates an individual that is powerless despite his equal share of power.

Not to criticize Taylor just to evaluate his rather critical view here, we must remember that modern political life is closely tied to the economic aspect of life and therefore it is quite easy to become alienated from the political life when dealing with economic issues of everyday life. Other questions stand in the way of harsh and fast criticism, where lies the decision making, who is in full power of it. Of course there will be political alienation within a society where individuals are too preoccupied with their economic well-being and have little time and energy to actually participate in the political sphere especially when they are denied real decision making power. As Plato has already seen it in his age, the demagogic leaders (ancient sophists) are the most successful ones in an imperfect society. Individuals in such society have too much responsibility on their shoulders dealing with different tasks and they don't have enough time or capacity to cope with political life to fully participate and control their political leaders.

These were the three main malaises of modernity that helped Taylor paint the negative picture of modern democracy. In the following lines I will use some of Taylor's passages from chapter five of this book, where he focuses on the fall of hierarchies and the effect it creates on an individual; his understanding of justice, dignity and recognition and its problems in modern democracy. Then I will posit those next to Plato and his visions as described in previous chapter of this work; his reasons for democracy as an ill constitution. I believe that the four cardinal virtues described by Plato happen to be close to Taylor's values describe in the *Malaise of Modernity*. The aim of this chapter and this work in general, is to use the comparison of Plato and Taylor to support my thesis in its simple statement that democracy is doomed to fail, since Plato.

Taylor's Malaised Democracy

Taylor's vision of current society is translated into a contemporary culture of authenticity, where purely personal understanding of self-fulfillment prevails. "A person becomes purely instrumental in their significance and anti-ethical to any strong commitment to the community. Our culture then lets allegiance and duty to political community become more

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

and more marginal. Authenticity is defined in a way that it centers on the self and distances from the relations to others" (Taylor, p. 44). Authenticity is a facet of modern individualism, and as all forms of individualism, they also propose models of society (Taylor, p. 44). Modern philosophy of mid-seventies has provided a moral principle of authenticity and individualism through ideas on ordinary life and how should people coexist with others. This became highly relevant in the sphere of relationships and personal life and emphasized acknowledgment that our identity required recognition by others. Not only is the self-discovery and self-exploration emphasized, but so is its form in confirmation of own existence in others. This logic has come due to two significant changes in structure of society that made modern individuals preoccupation with identity and recognition inevitable.

First came the collapse of the old social hierarchies. This was already observed in Plato's democracy, where failed justice as a cardinal virtue created the third most imperfect constitution. It ultimately showed its effects in tyranny where the natural order was reversed by sons ruling over fathers and the fathers obeying their sons. Taylor claims that ancient hierarchies were the basis for honor and the presence of inequality. "For some to have honor in this sense it is essential that not everyone have it" (Taylor, p. 46). Same way as Plato concluded in his *malaised* vision of democracy, which had its own corrupted form of its own dominant virtue, namely this justice which scatters honors around on things that deserve no honor. But this confused sense of justice is the best justice can do with absent wisdom to know what is good, the courage to defend it, and the moderation to love it. It is obvious that collapse of hierarchies is a problem that both Platonic and Taylors societies face. Structured society used to bring better organizational structure and coherent understanding of a social position to its individuals.

Taylor continues to make his point by describing how honor changed into the modern notion of human dignity, now intrinsic to every human being the "citizen dignity" (Taylor, p. 46). The essence to this is that everyone has a share to it. "This concept of dignity is the only one compatible with a democratic society, and it was inevitable that the old concept of honor be marginalized" (Taylor, p. 46). The importance of recognition has been modified and intensified by the understanding of identity emerging with the ideal of authenticity (p. 47), meaning that with the collapse of formal hierarchies, a person's identity was largely fixed by his or her social position. Whether a person was important and recognized was determined by place in a society and what roles were attached to it. This does not necessarily need to emerge from democratic society only, because people can still define themselves by their

Viskovic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

social roles, which simply imply from their intimate and professional relationships. The forms of equal recognition have been translated to everyday life, where everyone should be called Mr or Mrs rather than some people being called Lord or Lady; some cultures with strong democratic societies such as the USA it was crucial to call people by their first names. More recently Mrs and Miss have been collapse to simple Ms (Taylor, p. 47). Modern democracy has become an essential part of politics of equal recognition, which transforming over the years has come to forms of demands for the equal status of cultures and genders.

What really determine the social identification is the ideal of authenticity itself and the self-discovery of own originality. And such action cannot be socially derived, but must emerge within an individual.

Plato posited next to Taylor

On the final step of this paper, the best I can do is to clarify the reason democracy fails in the *Republic* of Plato, which will then become clear how close it is to the reasons why modern democracy is not the most desirable socio-political system. The reason is that a democratic society has no interest in any virtue except for justice. This way it ends up with a confused and perverse understanding of justice, defining justice as equality. This is a political problem, leading to both social and economic problems that pave the way to tyranny. In modern liberal democracy, equality is the central theme that the whole system builds on. Plato's justice was not mingling of professions and the parts of souls, a just person was content with his social role and his given predispositions. In an ideal state, the whole society would come to a realization, that they were given a place and should not overestimate their predispositions. What modern democracy tells us is that we can become whoever we are, achieve anything we think of no matter our abilities or defects we were born with.

Unfortunately, due to high technologisation and advanced industrial development, some of that is true, even though the opportunity cost could be bigger at the end of the day. This is ushered by the confused term of justice for equality, scattering equal treatment to unequal beings and situation finally creating more unequal and unstable society.

But it is fundamentally a spiritual and a moral problem. To this respect Plato's critique of democracy aligns with Alexis de Tocqueville's analysis of democracy: Virtue comes first. Part, though not all, of the problem involves the improper distribution of honors: equally, without regard to merit. In this respect the failure of a democratic society resembles the

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

failure of a democratic soul, which treats all things sought in life with equal honors, without regard to whether they deserve to be sought.

Conclusion and the personal input for the future:

The modern democracy has several flaws pointed out by Charles Taylor, who is mainly concerned with modern authenticity, too individualistic approach towards political life and the calculative use of the instrumental reason. The reasons that I found most interesting, relevant and also Platonic, were the collapse of formal hierarchies and the confused understanding of justice as equality. This comes very close to what I have defined in the first chapter under the modern understanding of justice according to Rawls, justice as fairness. Although Rawls has not defined his justice in the terms of democracy, his theory applies to modern democratic societies.

In modern democratic society everyone is automatically granted honor and dignity. This basic human equality is being placed on top of the priority pyramid, allowing individualism to escalate into forms of narcissistic apolitical citizens. This goes hand in hand with the institutionalized rigid form of modern democracy where political participation is limited to the facet of political representation, but the bureaucracy stays manipulated by powerful few. The flaws of the political system and the re-arranged values in modern democracy create discouraged individuals ready to give up on political life and rather pre-occupy themselves with their own lives, seeking mutual recognition in their relationships, where they apply instrumental reasons with economic cost-benefit ratio rather than something completely else that is being called for. Being a citizen in modern democracy takes up too much cognitive, physical and rational energy, that there is nothing a person can fully commit to and achieve the best in it.

Connecting the three problems of democratic citizenship mentioned in the first chapter and the three malaises of modernity of Taylor, I came to a conclusion that political participation is a major key here. Individuals were granted rights and freedoms, but are ignoring their responsibilities. At the end of the day, democracy should be the voice of the majority. When this majority becomes minority due to apolitical approach of the citizens, the basic definition of democracy as an equal share of power gets lost. We are then talking about oligarchy or even tyranny of the irrational majority that used their political power, even though in numbers they were a minority.

Viskopic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

Realizing these issues, I bravely propose an addition to a modern democracy to motivate citizens to perform their political duties. I propose financial penalties for every citizen who does not participate in the elections. In the age of authenticity and instrumental reason, financial aspect plays a big role in everyone's life, therefore I don't see any better option to motivate these individuals to fulfill their civic duties. Only if we have full political participation we can actually evaluate the real impact of democracy as a constitution and as a socio-political system. Until then, we will live under the label of democracy, but truly living as an oppressed majority by the meritocratic wealthy and influential minority. As I mentioned at the beginning of this paper, the real power citizens hold in their hands is representative. There is very little civic influence in the institutional departments or the bureaucracy of the state. Modern society doesn't have social hierarchies, but has very rigid institutional forms. For this reason, political participation is essential as well as individual's controlling and checking of his elected representatives. The only way to achieve such level of participation, is by financial penalization of citizens who refuse to do that.

I understand that this brave proposal does not solve the problem of the tradeoff between labor specialization and political participation which makes an individual unable to both fully, intelligently and wisely participate in political decisions and also engage in professional career. However, it eliminates one of these problems, political participation, which goes hand in hand with the extreme use of instrumental reason, the threat of the so-called "me-generation", individualism and political indifference. I believe that this could lead to better democracy, where actually the majority will have a say.

Conclusion of My Bachelor Thesis

Comparing antique democracy with the modern model to point out its flaws, was very challenging and at some aspects of this thesis almost impossible. At the beginning I managed to strip the term democracy of the time-binding technicalities and leave the fundamental grounds that democracy described by Plato shared with the modern one. Under those conditions I was able to follow Plato and build Kallipolis as an ideal constitution, and consequently follow his deconstruction into the four vicious constitutions.

The aim of this work was to present a personal view on democracy as an undesirable constitution the way Plato has presented it in the *Republic*. The picture he painted lacks the four platonic virtues that compose a just human individual and a perfect socio-political system. The notion of justice was especially crucial, as far as Plato puts a lot of emphasis on the fact that a person must be just in order to lead a happy and fulfilling life. The main goal of this work was to elaborate on Plato's negative view of democracy, and bridge it to the modern times. I took Taylor's arguments from *The Malaise of Modernity* as a critique of modern democracy such as the dismantling of the original hierarchies and the age of authenticity we live in. The need for recognition, the equal division of power that was usually held by one person - aristocracy, created a jungle of needs, requests and equally valued ideas. The status quo is nowhere near to the ideal as we nowadays believe. Plato has seen it in antiquity when he placed aristocracy – the rule of one (or a few) Philosopher King, as the ideal and most beneficial social order of all, for all.

I followed a path where I first built up the ideal social order of the fictional Kallipolis. I did not pay much attention to all the details explained in the *Republic*, just the key factors such as the three social classes, the notion of metaphysics of the philosopher king and the necessary natural hierarchy of a society. I mentioned two interesting concepts that I find corresponding to nowadays'. The first were the noble lies, which would conceptually correspond to modern ideologies nowadays. The second was the emphasis put on education and upbringing, including a careful choice of topics and subjects for education, balancing mind, body and soul. It was important because only by careful education the uncontrollable human nature could be mastered and therefore we could eliminate the risks of the whole hierarchy collapsing.

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

The collapse of Kallipolis itself took quite some time to analyze and describe, introducing all four vicious constitutions. The four cardinal virtues were explained alone and they were also analyzed in each of the four constitutions individually. The central topic was democracy and its perverse form of justice, with already three cardinal virtues absent. Justice then gained a new dimension to its definition in Platonic democracy, and its main feature was equality, as treating all people and all desires in soul equally. At this point social hierarchy collapsed, individuals became equal and their natural inequalities that previously granted them a place in a society are now ignored. So were desires in individual's soul, whether they were evil or good, individual treated them equally and therefore found himself in an internal war not being able to satisfy neither one of them. Such was democracy in Plato's eyes. In the third chapter I brought Charles Taylor into the picture, as a representative of modern critical view of democracy. I described his three worries of modern society; individualism, instrumental reason and political alienation. After reviewing them I focused on the fifth chapter of his book dealing with the notion of recognition.

To the end of this thesis I tried to bridge the ancient criticism of Plato to the modern cry over *The Malaises of Modernity* by Charles Taylor. The core of this thesis was to depict democracy in darker colors and point out its flaws. I didn't try to praise Plato's practices or to suggest we should live in aristocracy as was Kallipolis. I also understand the limitations of current socio-political situation, due to industrialization and high technology and the economic engine of capitalism, there is little we can do about the political system. For this reason I suggested a way to eliminate the scope of the three malaises. Connecting the three problems of democratic citizenship and the three malaises of modernity, I came to a conclusion that political participation is the major key to eliminating other problems of modern democracy such as individualism, which leads to overuse of instrumental reason and the so-called me-generation. At the end of chapter three in this thesis, I briefly proposed financial penalties for citizens who do not participate in political life. I cannot propose a radical change of a society, as far as political system and the ways of living are too interconnected. For that reason all I could have suggested was a strict measure to assure political participation, to make democracy as close to democratic as possible.

Appendix I.

Mark J. Boone

From: emma.jasmin@gmail.com

To: markboone@fccollege.edu.

January 2, 2016

Hello Mr. Boone!

I am a senior undergrad student at BISLA (Bratislava School of Liberal Arts) in Bratislava Slovakia, and i am currently working on my Bachelor Thesis.

I came across your article "The Unity of Virtues and the Deegeneration of Kallipolis" as I write my thesis on Plato, his dissuallion of democracy and criticism of the loss of virtues and then I compare it to modern democracy, its dissilusionment, using Charles Taylors Malaise of Modernity.

Anyway, I found Your article helpful in organizing my own thoughts on the fall of šlipolis, which is a central topic of my second Chapter. Via this email, I would kindly ask You, if You have time of course, for Your opinion or advice, on my final step and that will be the comparison of the athenian and modern democracy, the malaises enlisted by both Plato and Taylor, where I bridge them together and come to a conclusion, which is also my title: Democracy: doomed since Plato.

Central themes are of course authenticity, loss of hierarchy, struggle for recognition, equal distribution of honor etc.

What I find challenging though, is the universal definition of democracy that would fit both the antique and the modernity, in order to strip it from the historical and only keep what is essential: the equal distribution of power and the inclusion in political participation.

please if You have time to answer this email, i would be honored by Your advice.

Have a Great start to 2016

Sincerely,

Emma Jasmin Viskupič

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

From: markboone@fccollege.edu

To: emma.jasmin@gmail.com

January 3, 2016

Thanks for your email. I'm not sure I can help much, but at least I can reply with my first thoughts.

On the definition of democracy: I think yours is good: Equal distribution of power and equal participation in political process. I don't think I can improve on that.

On the final step of the paper, since I don't know enough about Taylor, probably the best I can do is try to clarify the reason democracy fails in the *Republic* of Plato. That reason is that a democratic society has no interest in any virtue except justice, and so it ends up with a confused understanding of justice, defining justice as equality. This is a political problem, leading to the social and economic problems that pave the way to tyranny.

But it is, most fundamentally, a spiritual and moral problem. In this respect Plato's critique of democracy aligns with

Alexis de Tocqueville's analysis of democracy: Virtue comes first.

Part, though not all, of the problem involves the improper distribution of honors: equally, without regard to merit. In this respect the failure of a democratic society resembles the failure of a democratic soul, which treats all things sought in life with equal honors, without regard to whether they deserve to be sought.

Well, I hope some of that was helpful. Good luck with your project,

Dr. Mark J. Boone

Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Forman Christian College

Resumé

Moderná demokracia sa stala idealizovaným socio-politickým systémom modernej doby. Moderná spoločnosť skladajúca sa z rovnoprávných a rovných občanov si nevie predstaviť inú formu existencie než tú, v ktorej žijeme. V tejto práci som sa snažila poukázať, že momentálne status quo nesie v sebe určité problémy, s ktorými som sa obrátila na antického Platóna a jeho opis ideálneho Kallipolisu. Platónova Republika sa zaoberá témami ako spravodlivosť, demokracia, rovnoprávnosť a hierarchická spoločnosť. Z mnohých hľadísk sa antická demokracia nedá porovnať s modernou demokraciou, preto bolo nevyhnutné na začiatku práce priniesť všeobecnú definíciu demokracie, ako systému v ktorom sa moc prerozdelení medzi všetkých občanov. Z tohto hľadiska som neskôr bola schopná porovnať a opísať problémy modernej demokracie a problémy moderného demokratického obyvateľa z pohľadu Platóna a jeho rozpadnutého ideálneho štátu Kallipolis.

Hypotéza mojej bakalárskej práce sa odvíjala práve od hodnôt prebratých z Platónovej Republiky a pozície ktorú demokracii Platón dal ako druhému najhoršiemu politickému systému iba krok pred tyraniou. Demokracia teda stojí na kolísajúcich pilieroch jednej zo štyroch kardinálnych cností, spravodlivosti, ktorú si pletie s prehnaným dôrazom na rovnosť. Toto stojí v priamom protiklade s Kallipolisom, ktorý je rozdelený na tri spoločenské vrstvy s presným určením miesta v spoločnosti v rámci ich schopností, a spravodlivosť znamená nemiešať a nekombinovať vlastné danosti v iných spoločenských vrstvách. Ak v spoločnosti nastane takéto miešanie, spoločnosť stratí svoju prirodzenú hierarchiu, začne uznávať nižšie hodnoty za svoje najvyššie a spoločnosť aj jedinec trpia. Demokracia sa z tohto hľadiska stáva nemravnou a nevyhovujúcou a ako socio-politický útvar iba chabým tieňom ideálneho a správneho Kallipolisu.

Metodológia sa držala najmä dôkladného študovania primárnych zdrojov, teda Platóna a Charlesa Taylora ako predstaviteľa moderného kriticismu demokracie. K prvej kapitole som čítala Platónov Siedmy List, z ktorého som následne čerpala Platónove odôvodnenia pre celkové písanie Republiky. Prvá kapitola bakalárskej práce sa zaoberala mojimi osobnými odôvodneniami k potrebe venovať sa rozboru a kritike demokracie a zaoberala sa aj odôvodneniami Platóna, ktoré boli obsiahnuté v spomínanom Siedmom Liste. Medzi osobné dôvody písania práce som zahrnula tri problémy modernej demokracie: prirodzená

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

hierarchia a predpoklady jedincov. Tento argument je priamo antidemokratický, lebo zastáva názor, že niektorí jedinci v spoločnosti sú morálnejší a inteligentnejší a preto by mali vládnuť. Na to nadväzuje aj druhý argument, a to je potreba prerozdelenia práce. Je priam nemožné aby sa každý jedinec plne angažovať na politickej sfére a robil správne premyslené politické rozhodnutia, a tak isto sa plne venoval svojej práci aby zabezpečil seba a svoju rodinu. Myslím si že je nemožné aby sa jedinec dokázal plne sústrediť na politickú participáciu a aj osobnú profesionálnu kariéru, čo od neho moderná spoločnosť očakáva. Tretí argument je naviazaný na predchádzajúce a je to akýsi začarovaný kruh osobnej apolitickosti. Politická zodpovednosť jedného občania je veľmi blízko k nule. Čiť pre zodpovednosť sa vytráca vysokými až nesplniteľnými nárokmi politickej participácie, a tak isto dopadom jedného občianskeho hlasu vo voľbách. Tento mechanizmus funguje takmer ako perpetuum mobile, a robí nemožným motivovať jednotlivca k vyššej politickej participácii.

K týmto trom argumentom som pridala ešte vlastný pohľad na skostnatenu inštitucionálnu stránku moderného štátu. Z reálneho hľadiska nemá na byrokratickú a inštitucionálnu stránku štátu jedinec nijaký dopad. Tým pádom demokracia ako taká je veľmi povrchová, a opäť nadväzuje na predchádzajúce tri argumenty, kde volič ako taký má veľmi obmedzenú až abstraktnú moc v demokratickej spoločnosti.

Z metodologického hľadiska som bola ovplyvnená prácou Marka J. Boona *Degenerácia Kallipolisu a potreba zjednotených cností* (The Unity of the Virtues and the Degeneration of Kallipolis). Celá druhá kapitola tejto práce sa zaoberala *Republikou*, jej témami ako spravodlivosť a štyri kardinálne cnosti, ich strata v rozpadajúcom sa Kallipolise a následne rozbor štyroch „chybných“ konštitúcií. Hlavným argumentom bol fakt, že jednota štyroch cností je nevyhnutná pre existenciu ideálneho stavu štátu a šťastného jedinca. Zakaždým keď sa vytratila jedna z cností, úpadok Kallipolisu bol hlbší a do úpredia vystupovali nižšie hodnoty. Najdôležitejšou zložkou šťastného spoločenstva je prítomnosť prvej cnosti – rozumnosti. Tá dáva jednote všetkých cností správny smer a dokáže udržať jedinca v rovnováhe.

Prvou chybnou konštitúciou bola timokracia, ktorá namiesto rozumnosti uznávala odvážnosť (guráž). V popredí už neboli najrozumnejší zo spoločnosti, ale tí najodvážnejší. Ich hlavným cieľom ale nebolo priniesť medzi občanov najlepšie dobro získané z najvyššieho poznania Foriem, ale vyhrávať vojny a získať rešpekt a spoločenské ocenenie. Práve táto láska k

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

vítazstvu a ctižiadostivosti priviedla timokratickú spoločnosť k záhube. Bez rozumnosti spoločnosť nevedela rozoznať čoho sa má báť a voči čomu sa má odvážiť čeliť. A práve kvôli tomuto sa nezjednotené cnosti stávajú iba o čosi lepšími ako nemravnosti.

Druhým levelom rozpadajúceho sa Kallipolisu je oligarchia. Nielenže jej chýba rozumnosť ale aj guráž a jej hlavnou cnosťou sa stala deformovaná umiernenosť. Dominantnou vlastnosťou oligarcha a oligarchie je láska k peniazom a majetku. Je ťažké rozoznať čo je potrebné a čo je nepotrebné, preto sa v takejto spoločnosti považuje majetok za mierku úspechu a dôležitosti. Mesto sa rozdelí na bohatých a chudobných a dostáva sa do občianskej vojny.

Duša oligarcha je rozvrátená a bez pomoci rozumnosti a odvahy nevie a ani nechce rozoznať čo je pre ňu dobré a čo zlé. Láska k majetku a peniazom nahradila lásku k poznaniu a odvahe. Tretia „chorá“ konštitúcia je demokracia, ktorá stratila takmer všetky hodnoty a vládne jej len prekrútená forma spravodlivosti. V spoločnosti sa rozdeľujú tituly a hodnosti každému, v demokratickej duši sú všetky naše túžby uznávané rovnako či sú pre nás dobré alebo škodlivé. Preto tu vládne nespravodlivosť, nikto si neplní svoje úlohy no každý si automaticky zasluhuje pozíciu v spoločnosti. Demokracia má od tyranie na skok, v ktorej nastane absolútny chaos a prevráti sa prirodzený poriadok vymazaním akýchkoľvek historických návykov a tradícií. Vrcholom tyranie je keď otcovia poslúchajú synov a synovia vraždia vlastných otcov.

Druhou kapitolou som ukončila opis rozpadu Kallipolisu a opis kardinálnych cností. Cieľom bolo detailne vykresliť dôležitosť vyváženej spoločnosti a prítomnosti prirodzených hierarchií. V tretej kapitole som priniesla do debaty Charlea Taylora a jeho súbor lekcií v knihe *Malaise of Modernity*. Charakterizovala som tri výčitky modernej demokracie: prehnaný individualizmus, prevaha inštrumentálneho myslenia a de-politizácia občanov. Po každom uvedení Taylorovho argumentu som ho podrobila kritike na základe spoločenských a historických okolností. Mnohé z tvrdení v tejto kapitole nadväzovali na tvrdenia dôvody z prvej kapitoly, cieľom bolo ukotviť obraz o „zlej“ demokracii k jednému konkrétnemu autorovi, ktorého následne prirovnám k Platónovi. To som aj urobila v druhej časti poslednej kapitoly, kde som spojila status quo vysvetlené Taylorom k Platónovmu opisu a záveru na tému demokracia. Dva hlavné dôvody dominovali u oboch autorov: rozpad pôvodných hierarchii (socio-politických) a zmena chápania cti na ľudskú dôstojnosť. Tieto dva úzko späté dôvody viedli nielen k zmene spoločnosti ale aj k zmene chápania jedinca v spoločnosti. Jedine v demokracii sa mohla rozvinúť rovnomerná spoločnosť s rovnoprávnymi jedincami, ktorí očakávajú nielen slobody a práva občana ale aj osobné uznanie a spoločenskú

Viskupic: Democracy: Doomed since Plato

dôstojnosť. To čo bolo kedysi vydobyté buď sociálnym postavením alebo úsilím v spoločnosti, je dnes dané každému pri narodení bez rozdielu. Verím, že to uberá jedinca o cieľ, za ktorý by bol „schopný obetovať svoj život“ a uberá to teda určitú nevyhnutnú dimenziu demokratického života. Ľudia sa naďalej môžu definovať sociálnymi rolami, no v momentálnej spoločnosti bez rigidných hierarchií je to stále ťažšie a ťažšie. Prapôvodný boj o česť a spoločenské poznanie sa takmer vytratil. Automatické očakávanie týchto hodnôt sa stalo samozrejým a nie len v každodennom živote ale aj v súkromí. Prevaha inštrumentálneho zmýšľania sa ocitá aj v prípadoch, kedy by sme mali hľadať úplne iný druh riešenia ako logika zisku a profitu.

V tejto práci som sa snažila podotknúť niekoľko chýb modernej demokracie a na konci som tak isto poskytla určité riešenie. Zistila som, že momentálne status quo nedá riešiť žiadnym radikálnym spôsobom. Osobne pokladám za riešenie jedine motiváciu občanov k vyššej politickej participácii. V závere tretej kapitole navrhujem finančnú penalizáciu pre občanov, ktorí sa nezúčastnia volieb. Verím že v momentálnej spoločnosti riadenej ekonomikou a technológiou, sa nedá jedinec motivovať ináč, ako finančnou sankciou. Tak isto to považujem za nutné, keďže momentálne v spoločnosti politicky participuje menšina. V takom prípade ani nemôžeme momentálnu situáciu plnohodnotne vyhodnotiť ako demokraciu, keďže sme ju zedefinovali ako prerozdelenie moci medzi všetkých občanov, no momentálne rozhoduje o politickej scéne iba určitá časť aktívnych voličov.

Som si vedomá toho, že implementácia môjho návrhu je drastická a nerieši všetky spomínané problémy, ale politická participácia je kľúčom k akejkoľvek fungujúcej spoločnosti. Verím že by môj návrh mohol pomôcť k lepšej demokracii a neskôr v budúcnosti k jej konštruktívnejšej kritike či iným návrhom na ich riešenie. Momentálne je sila jednotlivca jediné čo v demokracii má, ak ju nevyužije, stáva sa otrokom systému a sám ho predurčuje na neplnenie si svojej funkcie.

Bibliography:

- Annas, J., *An Introduction to Plato's Republic*, Oxford University Press, 1981
- Boone, M., *The Unity of Virtues and the Deeneration of Kallipolis*,
<http://www.academia.edu/911436/_The_Unity_of_the_Virtues_and_the_Degeneration_of_Kallipolis_>
- Christiano, T., *Democracy*, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =
<<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/democracy/>>.
- Downs, A., *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, New York: Harper&Row, 1957
- Kraut, R., "The Defense of Justice in Plato's Republic", *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 328 and 319
- Lewis, C. S., *The Abolition of Man: or reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools* (New York: Macmillian 1947), 34
- Plato, *The Republic*, translated by G.M.A. Grube, Hackett Pub. Company, 1992
- Plato, *The Seventh Letter*, translated by J. Howard,
http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/seventh_letter.html
- Rawls, J., *Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA : Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971
- Santas, G., Plato's Criticism of the Democratic Man in the Republic, *Journal of Ethics: An International Philosophical Review* 5 (2001), 71
- Taylor, A. E., *The Decline and Fall of the State in republic*, VIII, *Mind* 48.189, January 1939
- Taylor, Ch., *Malaise of Modernity*, House of Anansi Press, 1991