Chapter Four

Three Examples of a Post-Structuralist Reading of Plato’s

*The Republic*

Introductory Remarks:

There are different attitudes towards Plato in the western tradition of philosophy. Although one encounters admiration for Plato in most of the philosophical works of almost every phase in history, there have also been some critical attitudes towards his philosophy. One can easily come across such critical views on Plato in a twentieth century context while the number of critiques on Plato prior to twentieth century is relatively low.

Friedrich Nietzsche was one of the first philosophers that approached him critically. Nietzsche, however, refers to Plato’s master, Socrates, most of the times and criticizes him severely. Nietzsche was aware of this fact that Plato without Socrates meant nothing because the basis of the philosophy of Socrates was in the teachings and advices of Socrates.

The aim of the present chapter is to present a critical reading of Plato’s *The Republic* based on a Post-Structuralist approach. Although this approach would ultimately be in parallel with Nietzsche’s criticism of Socrates, it is different from that of Nietzsche in that it provides a close reading that is full of specialized terminology of the contemporary critical theory. Examples of Nietzsche’s criticism of Socrates were provided throughout the thesis.
The criticism presented here is also different from that critique of Socrates that criticizes Socrates for focusing on speech and ignoring writing (mentioned in the third chapter of the present study). The criticism provided here differs from above in that it is a practical one; that is, it points to sentences and words in the text under consideration, and avoids any extra-textual information or concerns enter the application process.

It should be mentioned that several theoretical approaches are available to the modern reader when he/she wants to read a text in a critical way. As a matter of fact, developing ‘theory’ has never had such a high speed in any other time prior to the last part of twentieth century. Post-Structuralist applied theory, influenced by the critical philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, is one of the widespread and current approaches of reading and criticizing a given text.

The criticism presented here is, however, based on only one of the different theoretical and philosophical approaches of Post-Structuralism. That is to say that the applied theory here is that presented by Jacques Derrida, which is generally called deconstruction. To apply a deconstructive theory on different texts is indeed an act of courage because, as the name ‘deconstruction’ implies, the conclusions of such an application are completely opposite to our common sense and understanding.

The deconstructive approach seems more unaccepted and even sometimes ‘disapproved’ and ‘rejected’ when it is supposed to be applied on the works of one of the highlights in the long history of man’s thought, that is, Plato. Almost every body agrees that Plato was the first great and the founder of western philosophy. Accordingly, to deconstruct Plato means to deconstruct the whole bunch of that western philosophical tradition that is based on Plato’s
philosophy. Such an applied theory is, however, illuminating because of “making us aware of” the following fact mentioned by Derrida:

It [deconstruction] also enables us to interrogate the covert philosophical and political presuppositions of institutionalized critical methods which generally govern our reading of a text … It is not a question of calling for the destruction of such institutions, but rather making us aware of what we are in fact doing when we are subscribing to this or that institutional way of reading. (1)

A. Insistence on Transcendental Signifieds in

Part I of The Republic

Although transcendental signifieds are always found in different traditions of philosophical discourses of the west, it seems necessary to name those philosophers who employed them for the first time. There are various attitudes regarding who was the first philosopher that used transcendental signified in his works. However, it should be mentioned here that the transcendental signified existed before any Ancient Greek philosopher. The question rather is who that philosopher was that thought of transcendental signifieds as highly important in his works.

It is usually believed that the Plato is the first major philosopher of the West. Influenced by Socrates, Plato began to establish his philosophical system by writing a dozen of books most of which containing Socrates’ dialogues with other persons and especially with Sophists. His work is the place where different transcendental signifieds were projected on the next generations of philosophers.
There are two differences between Plato and the Pre-Socratic philosophers. First, his works signify the end of a major philosophical debate of Ancient Greek civilization between Socrates and the Sophists. Secondly, Plato was both more productive than the previous philosophers by writing several volumes of philosophical works and more influential than them by establishing his school called “academia”. Therefore, Plato is usually considered as the first great philosopher of the west.

The next question to ask regarding our selection of Plato’s works here in this part of the present research is why Plato is regarded as that philosopher whose works are the first place where one can find both a frequent usage of transcendental signified and an insistence on their validity? The answer to this question is found both in his moralist philosophy and in the ethical philosophy of his master, Socrates.

As it is known, Plato was a moralist and the importance of some fixed and positive concepts, is beyond question for a moralist. Moreover, Socrates’ ethics is built upon some essential concepts that one must follow and not try to violate at all. Subsequently, one can express this proposition that Plato’s works are the first important place where there are a plenty of transcendental signifieds as well as a reliance on them.

In the third section of the first chapter of Plato’s The Republic there is a dialogue between Socrates and Thrasymachus, a Sophist, about the acceptance or rejection of conventional morality. It is interesting to mention that the word “morality” is itself a centered concept in Plato’s philosophy. It is so much privileged in the moralist philosophy of Plato that one can call it a transcendental signified.
As discussed earlier in this thesis, transcendental signified is that center or basis upon which our set of believes has been established. “Morality,” which usually acts as a concept for us, becomes a transcendental signified for Plato. Plato’s view on man’s commitment to the principles of ethics mentioned by Socrates is another reason for considering morality as a transcendental signifies in the works of Plato.

A transcendental signified does not exist in reality; it is rather found only in language. However, Plato’s philosophy, as long as with Christianity, was so influential that western man has ever thought of morality as an independent entity that is present in reality. Morality and its principles were created by the ethics of Socrates, and they were developed in Plato’s moralist philosophy. Thus, morality is a signified found in Plato’s discourse not in reality. It is transcendental because it is privileged and man thinks highly of it.

Another transcendental signified of the first part of The Republic is “justice,” that is defined and advocated by Socrates in his dialogue with Thrasymachus:

Indeed, when we presumed to speak of unjust men carrying out any effective joint action between them, we were quite wrong. For had they been completely unjust they would have never kept their hands off each other, and there must have been some element of justice among them which prevented them wronging each other as well as their victims, and brought them what success they had. (2)

Here Socrates advocates justice by taking side with the just men, and ultimately comes to this conclusion that the just men are happier than the unjust. Employing the idea of “function,” Socrates states that man is in need of justice in order to be able to do his particular function. The goal behind this proper function is “happiness.”
Therefore, the word “justice” is considered by Plato as instrumental in doing our functions, and it helps us in recognizing just men from the unjust. But where is this justice to be found? The answer is like given to the question where is morality to be found? They are found in Plato’s philosophical discourse. They are transcendental signifieds established, or, better to say, emphasized and privileged by Socrates.

The insistence of Socrates on the existence and importance of transcendental signifieds originates from his ethics according to which one must respect and follow “morality” and “justice.” The end of such a respect for transcendental signifieds is to make people follow the principles of ethics. This, in turn, will result in the “happiness” of those who have done so. In this context even “happiness” is defined and characterized by Socrates. Thus, Plato’s philosophical discourse is inventive in defining some of the concepts and making them transcendental signified.

Perhaps the most important and fundamental transcendental signified is “God,” that is also alluded to several times in The Republic:

“Yet neither deceit nor force is effective against the gods.” But if there are no gods or of they care nothing for human affairs, why should we bother to deceive them? And if there are gods and they do care, our knowledge of them is derived from tradition and the poets… We must believe them in both types of testimony. (3)

Thus, Socrates expresses his belief in the existence and importance of an important, actually the most important, transcendental signified, that is, God. The main transcendental signifieds of the first part of Plato’s The Republic are God, justice and morality. Plato establishes his moralist philosophy here based on these transcendental signifieds.
Socrates’ frequent usage of transcendental signifieds in his dialogues with the Sophists and Plato’s insistence of their validity were highly influential in the western philosophy. It was Plato who projected transcendental signifieds on the whole tradition of western philosophy. Another important discourse that was influential in projecting transcendental signifieds was Christianity.

There is a similarity between Christianity’s set of moral values on one hand and Plato’s moralist philosophy on the other hand. Thus, it is believed that transcendental signified were emphasized, privileged, and ultimately projected on the western philosophy by both Plato and Christianity. As a result, to demonstrate the presence of transcendental signifieds in the works of Plato and in Christianity is the same as showing those favorite and privileged concepts in the western philosophy and theology.

Plato insisted on the presence, truth and functionality of the transcendental signifieds. The quotations from his *The Republic*, mentioned in this chapter, are examples of how he thought of transcendental concepts. Later philosophers, under the influence of Plato, were to follow such a belief in these concepts and their functionality.

**B. Desire for Logocentrism in Parts VII and XI of The Republic**

Logocentrism is a term coined and universalized by Jacques Derrida that means “the belief that there is an ultimate reality or center of truth that can serve as the basis for all our thoughts and actions” (4). Although this definition might bear to the mind some similarities with
transcendental signified, it should be noted that there are differences between logocentrism and transcendental signified.

While transcendental signified is a concept, logocentrism remains as a tendency or way of thinking. Furthermore, the number of transcendental signifieds present in western philosophical discourse is small and includes such terms as God, human being, reason, justice, morality, self and soul. On the other hand, logocentrism is always present when man wants to think and behave. That is to say that the number of those ‘centers’ that are chosen by man because of the present logocentrism is large number that includes those privileged parts of different binary oppositions.

In Post-Structuralist theory it is believed that western man’s way of action in almost all occasions has been logocentristic. This means that the western man usually tends to consider some concepts as more important, privileged and positive than its counterpart. The reason behind such a tendency might be, as Claude-Levi Strauss has argued, this fact that man’s mind functions like a system that consists of a structure with a center. This characteristic is the cause behind considering other phenomena as having a system, a structure and a center. (5)

If one wants to apply a Post-Structuralist theory on a given text, one of the steps for such an application is to demonstrate the dominant logocentrism in the text. In order to observe logocentrism in a work one is supposed first to show the different binary oppositions at work. Then, it is convenient to see which part of the binary opposition is usually taken as the centered. And finally we should see whether the author of the work considers the privileged part of the binary opposition as the centered one in his thought or not.
Attempt is made here to show those parts of *The Republic* that best reflect the present logocentrism in the thought of Plato. Part XII of *The Republic* begins with a differentiation between the Idea and the Actual. Here Socrates is discussing the practicability and other characteristics of his Ideal State. He argues that although such an Ideal State would never be fulfilled in every detail, it can be regarded as a standard for what man could aim at.

Before pointing to some statements and propositions of this part, we should say that the title of this part itself and the way Socrates differentiates the Ideal from the Actual show both an important binary opposition and an obvious logocentrism in the thought of Socrates. He thinks that the Ideal is far more important than the Actual. He thought that what was to come, the Ideal, could be better than what really existed, the Actual. To consider the Ideal superior to the Actual is an example of logocentrism in Plato’s philosophic discourse.

Plato was not an actualist, but it is fair to call him an Idealist. Here Idealism, with capital ‘I’, is different from idealism, with small ‘i’. While the second one, idealism, refers to a widespread movement and seems more general and familiar, Idealism is that specific thought of Plato based on his definition of the world of Ideas. Thus, Plato’s logocentrism is evident also from his doctrine of “the World of the Ideas.”

In this thought the Idea is taken to be more significant and privileged than the real or the actual. As it is common, people usually see the truth to be present in the ideal, and the real is most often condemned for its deficiencies. Therefore, Plato, too, believes that his Ideal could be more practical and much better than the present Actual.
Asked by Adeimantus about the position of the philosophers in the Ancient Greek society and their relationship with the government, Socrates presents the following answer that is full of logocentristic tendencies to select only the centered part of different binary oppositions:

And tell him that it’s true that the best of the philosophers are of no use to their fellows; but that he should blame, not the philosopher, but those who fail to make use of them… The true and natural order is for the sick man, whether rich or poor, to wait on the doctor, and for those in need of direction to wait on him who van give it. (6)

“It is true” is the counterpart of “it is wrong,” and, as it is clear, Socrates here is using the word “true” because of its good connotations. Every body know—or, in a Post-Structuralist way, every body has been made to know—that true is far better and positive than wrong. True is the centered part of true/wrong binary opposition as thought by people. Therefore, Socrates also uses this word in its centered implications. Thus, Socrates here has a tendency to take side with the centered. It means that his action is logocentristic.

The same argument is right about Socrates’ selection of such centered and privileged words as the best (opposed to the unprivileged the worst), natural (opposed to unnatural), order (opposed to disorder), philosopher (opposed to the implied government), and doctor (opposed to the sick man). In this discussion the above centered words have been used as having a positive meaning, and Socrates places them in a positive context of his words.

The opposite of the above is also right, and is found in the work. That is to say that there are some words with negative meaning in the
above quotation that Socrates, too, uses them in a negative sense. These words are the unprivileged part of the binary oppositions. They are “no use” (opposed to use), “fail” (opposed to succeed), and “in need of” (opposed to not in need of). Therefore, the traditional hierarchy between two parts of the different binary oppositions is followed here. In other words, logocentrism is present.

Although these examples are very straightforward and even ‘clear’ for everybody, the question is who created such a hierarchy? That is to say that who or which tradition created this presupposition that one part of a binary opposition, the centered, is positive, and the other part is negative? Accordingly, who said true is true and wrong is wrong?

It is here that the task of a Post-Structuralist thinker begins. Friedrich Nietzsche had already found an answer for such a question and even reversed the meaning in some cases—what he called devaluation (7). The Post-Structuralist thinkers and especially Derrida, however, explored the mechanism behind such a valuation and naming process in a theoretical way.

Although the answer to the above question can found in the works of any philosopher, poet or historian before Plato, such an answer would be right only concerning some of the general binary oppositions such as health/sickness, large/small and day/night. But who created the hierarchy between reason/emotion, soul/body, that world/this world and justice/injustice oppositions that considers the first part superior to the second? This question is the same as Who created logocentrism present in those binar oppositions? Post-Structuralists argue that the logocentrism present in such binary oppositions is the result of Plato’s metaphysics:
In the binary oppositions upon which Western metaphysics has built itself from the time of Plato, Derrida declares that one element will always be in a superior position, or privileged, while the other becomes inferior, or unprivileged. (8)

As a result western philosophical discourse since Plato has been functioning based on a logocentristic treatment of different binary oppositions. It was Plato whose metaphysical philosophy paved the way for the superiority of one part of some of the binary oppositions over the other part. Plato was under the influence of the common logocentrism of the different discourses of his time, and influenced the philosophy after him by creating logocentrism in some of the other binary oppositions. A good example to show Plato’s influence in this regard is to point to Part XI of *The Republic*. Here Plato’s desire for logocentrism in the soul/body binary opposition is evident:

We must maintain that the soul remains quite unaffected by fever or disease or injury, or even by the body being cut to fragments… We cannot admit that either the soul or anything else can be destroyed by the presence in it of another thing’s specific evil in the absence of its own. (9)

Thus, as observed in the above quotation, Plato considers the soul to be more important than the body. The soul here is the centered and privileged part of the soul/body binary opposition. Such a desire for the center—the center here is the soul—is a good example of Plato’s desire for logocentrism. Such a consideration, to take the soul superior to the body, is what we can see in the metaphysical discourse of the western philosophy after Plato. The following quotation from his *The Republic* illuminates our discussion in a better way:
Our recent argument and the others prove conclusively that the soul is immortal. But if we want to see it as it really is, we should look at it... when it is deformed by its association with the body and other evils... We shall then find that it is a thing of far greater beauty, and shall be able to distinguish far more clearly justice and injustice and all other qualities we have talked about. (10)

We pointed to this passage not to show that Plato believed the soul was immortal, but to show that considering soul as immortal by Plato led to the superiority of “immortality” to “moratality” in western metaphysics. Moreover, based on the previous proposition that soul is better than the body, every quality attributed to soul would ultimately turn out to be “better.” Correspondingly, “immortality,” one of soul’s characteristics, is better than “mortality” that is the characteristic of the opposite of the soul, that is, the body.

Thus, Plato’s desire for logocentrism in such binary oppositions as soul/body and immortality/mortality was projected on the western metaphysics. This projection was more empowered by his moralist philosophy in which one must consider one of the parts of binary opposition as the centered one otherwise this moralist philosophy cannot meet its goals. Socrates’ view on ethics and his way of behavior in the last moments of his life were other causes for such a powerful projection.

It is interesting to mention that Socrates himself was a part of one of the most important binary oppositions of the philosophical discourse of Ancient Greece. In other words, Socrates/Sophists binary opposition led to the most important philosophical debates of Ancient Greece. This debate resulted in the superiority of Socrates to the Sophists, at least as Plato came to such a conclusion in his works. Therefore, the discourse of Socrates became the centered in Plato’s works, and his desire for logocentrism appears here too.
Socrates attempted to define a concept and, thus, create order and structure based on which binary oppositions emerged. The Sophists, on the contrary, tried to violate logically-accepted definitions presented by Socrates. They did this by the help of their mastery of rhetoric and their playing with language.

Therefore, Plato’s philosophical discourse influenced western metaphysics in developing a desire for logocentrism. Such a characteristic was in close parallel with Christian discourse and its logocentristic treatment of such binary oppositions as Heaven/Hell, God/man and the other world/this world. Plato’s desire for logocentrism was unquestionably accepted and followed by the western metaphysics.

C. Deconstructing Plato’s Views on Art and Poetry in Part X of *The Republic*

This section can be considered as the concluding one because it is based on the ideas developed in the first two sections of the present chapter. While the first section demonstrated Plato’s insistence on the transcendental signifieds, and the second dealt with his desire for logocentrism, the present section aim at deconstructing Plato’s attitudes on art and poetry. In other words, attempt is made here to read Plato in a critical way. Discussing such critical readings, Nicholas Royle argues that:
Deconstruction – which is never single or homogeneous, but which can here, at least provisionally, be identified with ‘the work of Derrida’ – is concerned with the lucid patient attempt to trace what has not been read, what remains unread or unreadable within the elaboration of concepts and workings of institutions. (11)

Hence a deconstructive approach is a critical way of encountering a text while revealing at the same time the shortcomings or the weak points of the discourse of that text. Deconstructive reading ultimately comes up with a theme that is in direct opposition to the theme already presented by the text. Therefore, to deconstruct a text means to criticize the discourse of that text, which results in the destabilizing of the institution that has produced that discourse. As Derrida writes:

[The premises of a discourse] are not absolute and ahistorical … They depend upon socio-historical conditions, hence upon nonnatural relations of power that by essence are mobile and founded upon complex conventional power structures that in principle may be analysed. (12)

Derrida, in the above passage, tries to bring some other reasons to free us from the anxiety of a deconstructive reading. The anxiety of the application of a deconstructive approach on a text emerges because of the conclusions the application comes to. These conclusions are the main reason for the researcher’s anxiety since they are opposite to what the text originally wants to express.

One can see the same anxiety in the application of deconstructive approach on Part X of Plato’s *The Republic* because Plato’s high position in the history of philosophy is clear to almost every body. On the other hand, deconstructing Plato’s views on arts and poetry gives result in the admiration of the opposite of what he said in this regard.
Plato begins to explain his views on the relation between art and illusion by referring to the idea of “mimesis,” or imitation. He argues that the artist, while pointing to an object in his art, is really imitating an object that is itself the imitation of an image in the mind of the person who has made that object. This image, too, is the imitation of the ideal form of that object in the world of idea.

The ideal form of that object is the truth, which exists in the world of ideas. The artist, therefore, is dealing with illusion and not with truth. The artist in this regard is three stages far from the truth. Thus, he is condemned by Plato. In a dialogue, which takes place between Socrates and Glaucon, Socrates says:

You may perhaps object that the things he [the painter] creates are not real; and yet there is a sense in which the painter creates a bed, isn’t there?

‘Yes,’ he agreed, ‘he produces an appearance of one.’

‘And what about the carpenter? Didn’t you agree that what he produces is not the form of bed which according to us is what a bed really is, but a particular bed?’

‘I did.’

‘If, then, what he makes is not “what a bed really is”, his product is not “what is”, but something which resembles “what is” without being it. (13)

The truth here is the ideal form of the bed in the world of idea. The carpenter has an image of it in his mind and makes a bed according to the image of his mind. The painter, then, paints the bed, which is an imitation of the image of the mind of the carpenter. Accordingly, the artists (such as painters and poets) are considered to be three stages far from the truth: “So the tragic poet, if his art is representation, is by nature at third move from the throne of truth; and the same is true of all other representative artists.” (14)
Hence, Socrates believes that truth is not found in the works of artists and poets. They are far from truth; they are “deceivers” other people:

‘the art of representation is therefore a long way removed from truth, and it is able to reproduce everything because it has little grasp of anything … For example, a painter can paint a portrait of a shoemaker or a carpenter or any other craftsman without understanding any of their crafts; yet, if he is skilful enough, his portrait of a carpenter may, at a distance, deceive children or simple people into thinking it is a real carpenter.’ (15)

Plato’s repetition of the word truth in the above passages and the superiority of the truth as found in mathematics to the truth in art and human feelings go back to his doctrine that reality existed in forms that were fixed and immortal. According to him, truth is not found in the changeable and material world where man lives. Plat considers this world as an illusion of another world that is unchangeable and more perfect; such a world is the world of ideal.

If we compare Part XII and Part X of Plato’s The Republic, we come to this conclusion that Socrates considered the philosophers as superior to the artists. The rationale of Socrates here is that the philosophers use logic and reason to discover the truth, whereas the artists make use of their emotions when they make representations of the world we inhabit.

All art, in Socrates’ view, is representational. Both artists and poets imitate objects that are far from the ideal perfection. Therefore, the truth in art and poetry is not perfect. While the artists and poets attempt to reach truth by their feelings, they fail. On the other hand, the philosophers are successful in this regard because their instrument is rationality.
Towards the end of Part X of *The Republic* Plato did what was common in the totalitarian political systems of the twentieth century: He sends the poet on exile. In other words, he expels the poet from his ideal Republic because he thinks that the poet is dangerous for his State:

‘Then we can fairly take the poet and set him beside the painter. He resembles him both because his works have a low degree of truth and also because he deals with a low element in the mind. **We are therefore quite right to refuse to admit him to a properly run state**, because he wakens and encourages and strengthens the lower elements in the minds to the detriment of reason, which is like giving power and political control to the worst in a state and ruining the better elements.’ (16) (Bolds mine)

Plato’s way of thinking and acting here has is not different from that of the dictators of the twentieth century at all. Plato was ready to sacrifice any thing, even the artists and the poets, for the sake of the welfare of his Republic. Thus, his Republic was not a means for man’s happiness; it was rather an end for which every other thing was sacrificed.

Thus, Plato was the first writer in whose works the poets and artists were sent on exile. He was also the first writer who believed in the advantages of censorship. In his *Laws* he argues that only those who are politically approved are allowed to write poetry. Even the works of such poets should be first approved by the authorities. These poets might finally be allowed to compose poems only about those warriors who have been victorious in fighting with enemies of the State.

Although this part of Plato’s opinions has been mostly refused by both contemporary thinkers and artists, one should also point to the de-stable basis upon which he built his philosophical discourse. Plato presents his theory of imitation in art and poetry founded on a de-
stable basis. In other words, the **Ideal** referred to in his works is indeed a transcendental signified that does not exist in reality. It is only a privileged concept in Plato’s metaphysical discourse. Therefore, it can be de-centered and change into an unprivileged concept.

Thus, the discourse created by Plato is subject to criticism. Such a criticism is a destructive one because it reveals that those bases on which Plato built his philosophical discourse could be redefined, criticized, de-stabilized and ultimately deconstructed. Most of such bases used by Plato are declared nowadays to be transcendental signifieds that are present only in Plato’s discourse and not anywhere.

Moreover, the **truth**, mentioned several times in his discussions on the goal of art and poetry, shows his logocentrism in dealing with such a concept. There are also several other concepts in Part X of *The Republic* the definition of which is subject to Plato’s philosophical discourse, and subsequently such a definition can change in another discourse.

The number of the binary oppositions in *The Republic* is large and to some extent more than Plato’s other works. The hierarchy between the two parts of these dual pairs can be rejected like what was done in his Ideal/Actual opposition above. Ultimately, the binary oppositions can be reversed and produce new set of oppositions such as Actual/Ideal.

Plato’s harsh criticism of man’s emotions is another idea in his works that can be refused. Plato thought of man’s reason as superior to his emotions. Accordingly, he was highly influential in creating the reason/emotion binary opposition in the philosophical discourse of the west.
To deconstruct Plato’s views on arts and poetry in Part X of his *The Republic* actually means to deconstruct his reason based by the help of which he established his philosophical discourse. It was this reason that advocated censorship in artistic and poetic invention. And finally, it was this reason that did not admit the artists and poets to live in his Republic and, hence, sent them on Exile.
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