Chapter – II
PLATO’S IDEA OF REPUBLIC

“Virtue comes to the virtuous by the gift of God”.¹ Yet it is not God who makes the polis virtuous, but the man. The man builds the society, the city–state or the polis. Plato’s vision of an ideal society which is so elaborately sketched in his work *The Republic* and his vision of the actual society which is again elaborately sketched in his works *Laws* and *Statesman*, can be viewed as attempts to exhibit the process of making the social–structure, ideal or actual, virtuous.

For Plato the society or the state is always more important that the man. The state is the whole, the individual a part of it. It is natural that the well being of the whole precedes the well being of the part. The individual’s virtue is a means to the state becoming virtuous. Thus Plato’s philosophy is more a philosophy of the state than a philosophy of man. If this philosophy of the state is to be reviewed, it must be read in the light of the prevailing historical and social background. The Hellenic culture moulded and influenced the development of his thoughts to a large extent. Plato and Gandhi are comparable so far as both wanted to found the political society upon the ethical individuals, though they came from different socio–cultural history. For Plato, the man was primarily the ethico–political being, for
Gandhi the man was primarily ethico–religious. We shall look into the historical cultural background of Gandhi in another part of this work.

(1) The Background:

Plato’s political ideas as expressed in his works, *The Republic*, *Laws*, and *Statesman* appear to have been influenced by two major factors viz, (i) the historical factor of the Peloponnesian War and (ii) the intellectual factor of the influence of Socrates.

(i) The historical factor of the Peloponnesian War: Plato had personally witnessed the stress of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C) in his boyhood and youth. All the cities of Greece had participated in the Peloponnesian War and the war culminated in the crushing defeat of Athens. The Peloponnesian war brought the end of the city–state as a self–sufficient unit capable of fulfilling the necessities of all its members. During the fourth century Greece moved towards new political thoughts and new ways of life so much so that it had little resemblance to Pericles’s Athens.

The political history of Greece during this period is confused, wearisome and depressing. Sparta had won the war more due to the mistakes of Athens and less due to her own credit. It was Persia who really benefited from the war. She had recovered Ionia and disunited Greece could never
take it back from her. Complete autonomy of every Greek city was desired by all, by the Greeks themselves, by Sparta and by Persia.

The post–Peloponnesian war period saw important political changes. Democracy was always in the retreat. Internally Athenian democracy became less radical, the powers of the executive officials (and of the council) were enhanced at the expense of the assembly. Sparta’s victory in the war brought oligarchic regimes to power in places like Thasos, the east Aegean and also the Thirty Tyrants in Athens. The Spartan imperialism, though harsh was widely popular with the propertied class in a place like Samos. But the Spartan methods were not generally acceptable and the dominance of the conservative propertied class in the Greek world as a whole was not established until the Hellenic and Roman periods.

However as neither the extreme and disturbing experiences of Athenian democracy on the one hand and Sparta sponsored oligarchic regimes on the other hand–proved satisfactory, a search for other kinds of political systems began, one of which was tyranny of an old–fashioned kind. This kind of tyranny went hand in hand with urbanization, for instance at Corinth and the other cities on the Isthmus. Xenophon’s account shows that the tyrants were not naturally detested by classical Greeks, for example Sicily an advocate of tyranny, especially Syracuse, returned to a tyrannical
rule under Dionysius I in 406. However these types of tyrannies were not responsible for the destruction of Athenian democratic ideal. It was the traditional hereditary monarchy of Macedon which was responsible for such destruction. The period following the Peloponnesian War is said to be a period of professionalism in general. The transition from amateurism to professionalism is evident in Xenophon’s work whose treatises like *Horsemanship* and *Cavalry Commander*, offer solid technical advice. The fact that the Peloponnesian War changed attitudes in military warfare and introduced professionalism is also apparent from the fact that we find ‘tactics’ offered as part of the curriculum of the Sophists. Plato and Xenophon report of the claims of the Sophists to give advice in military matters. The Peloponnesian War introduced novelties in warfare and in military theory and practice. This period saw the use of mercenary soldiers who were professionals par excellence. The fourth century warfare was characterized by greater flexibility and lightness of armour. This change was caused by an important economic concern—the prevalent hoplite armour was expensive, the new peltast force wearing lighter armour was cheaper. The Peloponnesian war also stressed the importance of training. In fact Sparta had a very rigorous training system but Athens bothered very little about infantry training. In the fourth century Athens introduced the
‘Ephebate’, a compulsory two year national service. The Athenian state had neglected military training until about the mid fourth century but individuals like Iphikrates in the early part of the century started training their soldiers. The greatest exponents of the professional training were the autocratic military innovators of Sicily, Thessaly and Macedon in particular. Generally the Greeks were slow to make technological innovations because of the slaves being used to perform routine dreary functions. As a result impulse towards innovative mechanization was lacking. But the military pressures of the Peloponnesian war in Greece, the Carthaginian wars in Sicily made the combatants more inventive.

The difference between the two periods—i.e. the period preceding and the period following the Peloponnesian war are noteworthy. What we witness in the fourth century is a permanent change in the attitude of the people with the growth of more individualism and freedom of thought, evident in art, in philosophy and in social life as a whole. In the philosophies of the time we find schools like Cynics and the Cyrenaics. The question which these schools discussed was ‘Where lies the good?’ , i.e. The Good of Man and the answer given took no account of the polis. The Cynics, of whom the famous Diogenes was the extreme example, held virtue and wisdom consisted in living according to nature, and abandoning such
vanities as the desire for honour and comfort. The Cyrenaics, a hedonist School, held that wisdom consists in the right choice of pleasures and in the avoidance of what would disturb the even flow of life, so that they too avoided the polis. The word ‘cosmopolis’ was coined at this time, to express the idea that the community to which the wise man owed allegiance was nothing less than the community of man. The wise man wherever he lived was the fellow citizen of every other wise man. But apart from this philosophical sense,’ cosmopolitanism’ was the necessary counterpart of the new individualism and the cosmopolis was beginning to supersede the polis.

Set against this historical background, Plato expressed and developed his own political ideas. It is evident that Plato’s aim in The Republic was to construct an ideal society that is immune from changes, both internal and external. This aim, appear to have been motivated by the fact that Plato had witnessed extreme examples of both internal disorder and external coercion during the Peloponnesian war. Plato’s dislike of tyranny on the one hand and democracy on the other hand was based upon his personal experiences. Plato and Aristotle differed in their attitude towards democracy from the other thinkers among whom this feeling of disillusionment was less profound. Tyranny, for example, was discussed in Xenophon’s Hiero. For Xenophon tyranny meant benevolent despotism and in Hiero he showed how tyranny
could be compatible with happiness and justice, provided justice is equated with beneficence. Thus, against this historical background Plato introduced his political ideas. The Peloponnesian war and the effects which it produced in the sphere of military warfare, politics and intellectual development appear to have moulded Plato’s thoughts which are sometimes characterized as ‘changeless theoretical aspirations’.

(ii) The intellectual factor of the influence of Socrates: Plato in his development of ideas and in his construction of methodology of discourse was influenced most profoundly by Socrates, than any other philosopher. Plato met Socrates at the age of twenty in 407 B.C. and his association with Socrates continued until 399 B.C. when Socrates was executed. These eight years constituted the formative period of the intellectual development of Plato. The Socratic ideals of ‘knowing the Truth’ and ‘love for wisdom’ guided Plato to construct a system in political theory as well as in moral enquiry, the evidence of which are some of the early dialogues of Plato. These ideals also justify the necessity behind Plato’s urgency to outline a political ordering that is regulated, stable and permanent. This early Plato is Socratic Plato who wrote *The Republic*. Much later followed *Statesman* and *Laws* by Plato under the shadow of *The Republic*. 
This urgency was also justified by the need to sustain both the individual man and the political state from the relativistic skeptic philosophy propounded by the Sophists. The philosophy of the Sophists was a popular philosophy because of the oratory skills of the Sophists. The Sophists advocacy of relative values and individualistic thoughts undermined the need for absolute truth and permanent order. However their concern regarding ethical issues and argumentation by reason influenced Plato no less. It was this feature of the teachings of the Sophists that led Plato to hold some of them viz Gorgias and Protagors in high regard. In fact the Sophists were all alike rationalists, spreaders of enlightenment even though varied in their views and doctrines. The thoughts of Gorgias of Leontini, Protagoras of Adbera, Prodicus of Ceos, and Hippias of Elis, each had their own stamp of individuality. The effect of their teaching was two–fold. First, they criticized traditional morality and tried to extend a solid foundation for it. Protagoras thought that there was no absolute good and evil. ‘Man is the measure of all things’ i.e. truth and morality are relative. Second, with the advent of the Sophists, education became specialized and professionalized, open to those who could and would pay for it. This created a cleavage between the enlightened and the simple as a result of which the educated class of different cities began to feel their intellectual commonality as well as
distinctness from the uneducated commoners of their own city. Cosmopolitanism was thus beginning to grow in this shape.

It was against the Sophist’s tendency and emphasis on relativism and skepticism regarding virtues that Socrates differed. Socrates’s ideal and guiding factor of his philosophy was to make virtue a matter of exact knowledge that can be taught and that in which one can specialize. It was this emphasis on specialized virtue that inspired Plato to follow the Socratic method in his diverse dialogues. The method of Socrates consisted in clarifying the ideas that can be compared to make a judgment. Thus, definition of concepts was essential in arriving at truth. Socrates chiefly applied this method in the sphere of ethics. His analysis of the notion of ‘good’ is still considered to be the preliminary basis of all later ethical enquiry. This trend of critical enquiry was not only limited to the sphere of religion. He undoubtedly believed in the existence of a God but was not convinced about the exact nature of divine principle. In the political realm of enquiry he was a great critic of democracy and was opposed to some of the principles of democratic rule. Yet he was an advocate of individualism, a trait which was not keenly followed by Plato. Plato admired Socrates not only for his intellectual exercise but also for his moral conviction. It was Socrates’s courage, honesty and power of adhering to truth even in adverse
situations that appealed to Plato equally as that of his intellectual discourse and methodology. The trial of Socrates by the democrats was made on the charges of religious heresy, teaching new and said to be erroneous doctrines about life after death and introducing new Gods, thereby corrupting the youth. His consequent death led Plato to criticize democratic beliefs and democratic mode of governance. It was hence, the death of Socrates which became the pivotal factor around which Plato’s subsequent philosophy revolved. This was also the reason why Plato looked up to the constitution of Sparta and Lacedaemonia as the nearest existing approach to the ideal, instead of the Athenian constitution. It was Socrates’s emphasis on knowledge and truth, the absolute sovereignty of reason and understanding, insistence on leading a life guided by his own intellect and above all his emphasis on leading a ‘good’ life in the sense of examined life that became the deciding principles of Plato’s philosophy.

(2) The republic of The Republic:

This historical setting provided Plato with immense opportunities to raise questions about the basic virtues of a state. Athens was in a state of upheaval because of its degraded state of virtues consequent upon the disturbing conditions after the Peloponnesian war. The task before Plato was to fulfill the practical task of ensuring the stability and permanent order of
the city–state. For this practical end he adopted the means of philosophical theorizing on polity. It is specifically for this purpose that we find in Plato the urgent quest for defining values and finding ways to sustain them for the state and the citizens. Thus, Plato’s principal contribution in the area of political theorizing, *The Republic* is also not a mere description of an ideal state, not a mere utopia, but an emphatic assertion of what the end of the political state should be and what means should ensure such an end. It is this interpretation of *The Republic* which can shed new light on Plato’s conception of value and virtues for men as citizens for all time to come. For Plato, the values that sustain the state are of course values which can also be termed ‘secular’ in the modern sense of the term, being devoid of any religious connotation. It is in this context that we can review Plato’s view of the principal virtue essential for sustaining the state–justice.

(i) **Justice in *The Republic***: Plato’s ideal state is a republic where justice as a virtue is its foundation. The modern dictionary meaning of justice is “just behaviour or treatment”, or “the quality of being fair and reasonable”, or “the administration of law in a fair and reasonable way”. The meaning of just is “right and fair” or “deserved” or “exactly”.

Thus, justice is a quality the presence of which makes a man just. But justice is not a mere quality. It is a virtue and “virtue will be acquired neither by nature nor by teaching.
Whosoever has it gets it by divine dispensation without taking thought, unless he be the kind of statesmen who can create another one like himself”. But this connotation of the objective quality of justice is not the only connotation. It has different definitions all of which try to reveal the different features of justice. The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, defines justice as “although justice is sometimes used as a synonym for ‘law’ or ‘lawfulness’, it has a broader sense which is closer to ‘fairness’”. Again Aristotle’s definition of justice is entirely different. According to him, justice consists in treating equals equally and unequal unequally but in proportion to their relevant differences.

In fact the Hellenic culture believed in the presence of a natural law, which functioned as a standard against which all man made laws can be evaluated. For example, Sophocles’s Antigone appealed against the decrees of Creon, to this very law which he termed as the ‘immutable and unwritten laws of Heaven’. This law became an universal law of nature in Stoic philosophy as in Roman Jurisprudence to which all men can get access to through the exercise of reason. It is the same law to which Aquinas referred to when he said that human law is the local application of natural law, which itself is an expression of God’s rational will guiding the universe. This belief was maintained by the seventeenth century philosopher Grotius who argued
that even if one could suppose that God does not exist, one would still be bound by the laws of nature since it is from this law that the human qualities of sociability and rationality are derived. Thus according to this tradition Justice consisted in living according to the natural law.

Plato’s understanding of the concept of justice differed from that of the others in its very methodology. He attempted to arrive at a positive notion of justice simply by differentiating it from what is not justice. This he did by the well-known Socratic method. The Socratic method has its own importance in the field of any enquiry. This is “because it makes moral enquiry a common human enterprise open to every man. Its practice calls for no adherence to a philosophical system, or a mastery of a specialized technique, or acquisition of a technical vocabulary. It calls for common sense and common speech. ...But while the Socratic method makes moral enquiry open to everyone, it makes it easy for no one. It calls not only for the highest degree of mental alertness of which any one is capable, but also for the moral qualities of a high order: sincerity, humility and courage”. 7

The Socratic method also calls for the presence of a logical mind, an analytic approach and a faculty of comprehensive understanding. It is also matter of fact that the Socratic method was employed by Plato not only in the sphere of moral enquiry but also in the sphere of political enquiry.
It is following the Socratic method that Plato dismissed the conventional notions of justice extended by the different characters in the dialogue of *The Republic*. Thus Cephalus’s definition of justice as being identical with discharging all obligations was dismissed on the ground that it cannot help in differentiating justice from injustice. Polemarchus’s definition of justice as “justice is the act of giving to each what is owed” was also dismissed on the ground that it does not help in differentiating just from unjust acts. A rather unique definition of justice which deserves special mention and which Socrates tackled in an unique way, is the definition provided by Thrasymachus, a character which appears in *The Republic* who was a non–Athenian and a well known Sophist, and was famous for his rhetoric skill. The Thrasymachian position is unique for he defined justice as ‘nothing else than the interest of the stronger’. In this version justice is definable in terms of power, i.e. if the power–structure demands a particular kind of behaviour correspondence to such a behavior–pattern would be justice. Thus the Thrasymachian definition can be called a ‘naturalistic analysis of the concept of Justice’. If justice is power, it must be vested in the hands of those who wield power and it must be exercised by them in their own interest i.e. to enhance their own power. Power, here, really means political power. It is this position he maintained and observed that it is only
in a limited sense that justice aims at benefiting the interests of the weaker. It is actually and ultimately in the stronger’s benefit that justice really works. Thus, Thrasymachus in his denial of the Socratic argument compelled Socrates to leave the discussion on the definition of justice unresolved on the specific point as to whose interest justice really serves. “I can in no way agree with Thrasymachus that the just is the advantage of the stronger. But this we shall consider again at another time”. 9

Plato considered the definition of justice again not until he had settled the question on the relationship between ‘justice’ and ‘good’, on the question of what will be the ideal city like, what will be the picture of the second best city, who will be the guardians protecting the city–state, on what lines will the guardians education proceed. He again deliberated upon the question of justice and other virtues in Book IV of The Republic (427 e - 434 e). The reason for such a pause is surely due to the fact that unless the relationship between ‘justice’ and ‘good’ was made explicit justice could not be properly defined. It deserves to be noticed that Plato started his discussion on the definition of justice with the sole purpose of making his ideal state just. If we know what is justice we can instill the features of a just city in the ideal city. But Thrasymachus’s position posed a challenge to this Platonic position. Thrasymachus’s definition of justice was purely the definition of a
political concept, justice is an instrument in the hands of a political authority exercising political power. But Plato did not continue his argument in Book I, specifically because of the fact that justice for him is a moral concept because it can be found in the city by practice of the individual, i.e. by individual’s living a moral life. The ultimate end of the city and of the individual as well, is nothing but what is ‘good’, justice is good, hence justice is desirable than injustice. The property which can be found in the individual and thereby in the city, which is good, must be a moral property, a virtue in itself; hence it can be used for achieving political ends, but it can never be a political attribute in itself. Yet it is also true that for Plato that which ensures the well–being of the state is in the ultimate analysis a moral property. It is because the state should be morally just, the individuals constituting the state should also be morally just.

Thus, it is in this context that Popper’s position can be questioned. Popper in The Open Society and It’s Enemies, observed that “…In other words Plato’s moral code is strictly utilitarian, it is a code of collectivist or political utilitarianism … Morality is nothing but political hygiene”.

Plato’s contention set in proper perspective can be viewed in another way. Justice for Plato, is a moral attribute of the individuals as well as of the state constituted by the individuals. This is evident form the fact that justice is
bracketed with the other moral attributes – courage, temperance and wisdom. These moral attributes became the attributes of the Platonic ideal state. Thus for Plato, what is moral becomes political, and it is in this course that hygiene be it political, ethical or social, becomes the natural byproduct. When morality is reflected in politics, social hygiene and stability naturally follows as effects.

Thus Popper’s contention that Plato’s moral code is strictly utilitarian can also be questioned. This interpretation is based upon Plato’s observation that justice leads to happiness or pleasure and injustice leads to misery. But Plato’s contention was that justice is good not because of its consequences but it is good in itself. As J. D. Mabbott in ‘Is Plato’s Republic Utilitarian?’, observes “But, for Plato, justice is a condition of the soul and not a characteristic of actions: and the only references he makes to the good effect of just actions are that they make the soul just (444 E, 588 A, 591 A-C)”.

The question of actions crop up only in this specific reference that fair practices lead to acquirement of virtue and base practices lead to acquirement of vice. Thus justice is valuable without reference to its actions, just actions are valuable only in so far as they make the soul just, and not for the pleasurable consequence they produce. Thus Plato’s moral code can not be viewed as solely being utilitarian by nature.
In fact, the consequences of just actions which are elaborately dealt in Book IX of *The Republic* are not mere descriptions of the benefits of being just, they are means of differentiating just actions from the unjust actions. Thus pleasure or happiness which accompany justice are not really consequences of justice, ‘they are general features of justice’.\(^{12}\) So when Plato says, “justice pays” or “justice is more profitable than injustice”, it can be said that justice is not really a characteristic of the persons performing the acts and it is not a property of the acts. As Vlastos says “it (justice) stands for the active disposition to behave justly towards one’s fellows”.\(^{13}\)

As justice is in the penultimate analysis reduced to a virtue of the soul, Plato’s contention of justice in the individual deserves to be mentioned. Plato thought that justice in the individual man corresponds to the justice in the community. The soul contains three elements or parts – desire or appetite, spiritedness or anger and reason, “…each one of us, likewise will be a just person, fulfilling his proper function, only if the several parts of our nature fulfill theirs”.\(^{14}\) Or again,

“The just man does not allow the several elements in his soul to usurp one another’s functions, he is indeed one who sets his house in order by self-mastery and discipline coming to be at peace with himself”.\(^{15}\) It is clear
from such observations that justice in the individual is not a matter of external behavior towards others, but it is an internal order of the soul.

In fact this characteristic of the soul as perfect balance between the three antagonistic elements is justice in the individual. It is therefore natural that justice in state is defined as the same characteristic of the mutual balance and harmony between the different classes constituting the state. “When each order, tradesman, auxiliary, guardians keeps to its own proper business in the commonwealth and does its own work, that is justice and that makes a just society”.16 Thus, if justice is each class of the society attending to its own business, then injustice means just the converse, i.e. invasion and encroachment upon the rights and duties of others. This is clearly a functional definition of justice. What is worth noticing in these two definitions of justice, i.e. justice as defined in the individual and justice as defined in the state is that the emphasis is more on the aspect of the duty. Justice has two aspects–duties and rights. Justice consists in both “doing one’s own” and “having one’s own”. But Plato’s emphasis on “doing one’s own” does not negate the aspect of “having one’s own”. It is only when the three classes perform their duties; they can expect to “have their own”.

(ii) The Philosopher king: If the implied justice of each person, i.e. ‘having his own’ is to be ensured by duties performed properly, there must be some
authority to ensure this justice. The rights of the citizens can only be justly protected by a class whose assigned duty would be to ensure and protect such justice. This class is the guardian class whose duty is to maintain judicial justice and social justice. The class who ensures judicial justice alone is ‘fit to rule’, for ruling is a specialized art and it is only just that one who has mastered the art of ruling is fit to rule. And others who have not mastered this art will obey. Thus the kings who wield political power can function as the guardians of the city, only if they possess ‘wisdom’. Wisdom is again a cardinal virtue, a moral attribute, knowledge of what is ‘good’. So, political power bereft of moral foundation cannot ensure a good life.

Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and the princes of this world have the spirit and the power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one, and those commoner natures who pursue either to the exclusion of the other are compelled to stand aside, cities will never have rest from their evils, no, nor the human race, as I believe, and then only will this our state have a possibility of life and behold the light of the day.¹⁷

Plato’s description of a philosopher is extremely precise, “…he is a lover, not of a part of wisdom only, but of the whole”.¹⁸ “Philosophical minds always love knowledge of a sort which shows them the external nature not varying from generations and corruption”.¹⁹ He possesses the
qualities of courage, magnificence, apprehension, memory, he possesses the love of the essence of truth and justice. Thus, they are to be the rulers for they are “best able to guard the laws and institutions of our state”.20 They will best discharge the service of imparting “justice, temperance and every civic virtue”.21 Thus, to Plato civic virtue is to be understood in a practical sense. It is in this way that Plato understood the relation between the moral and the virtuous.

This philosopher ruler shall function as a guardian of the city–state to ensure a good life of the polis. This philosopher ruler is appointed as a guardian because he alone possesses the knowledge of the good. The knowledge of the good is the highest form of the knowledge. Plato’s account of what is good is again explicitly stated as for example:

(i) “…that which imparts truth to the known and the power of knowing to the knower is that I would have you term the idea of good”.22

(ii) “…the sun is not only the author of visibility in all visible things, but of generation and nourishment and growth, though he himself is not generation, in the like manner the good may be said to be not only the author of knowledge to all things known, but of their being and essence, and yet the good is not the essence, but far exceeds essence in dignity and power”. 23
Thus, Plato observed, “if we have a guardian who has this knowledge our state will be perfectly ordered”. Since a philosopher king is guided by the virtue of wisdom that presupposes the knowledge of good, he can function as the law–giver and the permanent ruler of the city–state, that is best ordered, stable and free from any kind of disruption and dissension. But political order free from any kind of split and disunity is possible only if the ruling class, whose task is to ensure such a stable order, itself maintains its unity. Such unity is possible only if the ruling class with such a philosophic nature is bred and reared continuously in a regulated way but the question remains, how can a king become a philosopher king?

(iii) The Scheme of Education: It is with the same end of achieving unity by developing a proper philosophic nature that Plato devised a very original scheme of education for the guardian class. A kind of social engineering by educated politicians may ensure stability in society and a stable society is the basic condition for good life. But stability may be a political value as Rawls says in his *Political Liberalism* (1993). But stability and justice are not the same. That is why in relation to the Socratic justice Plato spoke of wisdom, not political technology like social engineering. It is the later Plato who spoke of the state in the realistic terms of statesman and law, social engineering and education for the common man. But then what kind of
education did Plato plead for the philosopher king in *The Republic*? Plato insisted that a philosophic nature should be ‘gentle’ and a ruling nature should be ‘spirited’. So, training adequate to shape both the body and the mind is necessary. For this emphasis is to be given upon two branches of education – a) Gymnastics and b) Music. Though both of these are important, more emphasis is to be given to the proportion according to which they are to be pursued. While Gymnastics comprised mainly the military exercises, in which both men and women alike are to be trained, Music in the broader sense signified both aesthetic and ethical discipline. So, a person trained in the proper ways of music can easily distinguish the beautiful from those which are not so. Here is a novelty in Platonic thoughts on state–craft. He attached the idea of justice to wisdom, not mere knowledge, and tied politics to aesthetics, not mere craft. Rationality and sense of beauty are components, if I am allowed to use his term, of wisdom. The philosopher king is not entirely a cognitive man devoid of an aesthetic sense. But in this scheme of education, poetry does not find a place as a serious subject matter. This is because of Plato’s idea was that poetry is nothing but imitation and imitation is a form of amusement and not a serious occupation. Plato criticized Homer vehemently because of, a) the scandalous character of his Gods, b) the emotional abandonment of his heroes and c) his
conception of life after death as a decay and terrible condition. In fact, Plato’s denunciation of the poets was so severe that he gave the dictate that they must be escorted out of the city as they will otherwise corrupt the city. Music then, for Plato is creative and gives colour to wisdom, the ‘dialectic’ being the pure rational element. In fact, Plato’s scheme of intellectual education revolved chiefly around mathematics. Arithmetic, geometry and astronomy are its main divisions. However the most important of all studies which the rarest minds alone are capable of learning is ‘Dialectics’. Dialectics is concerned with the knowledge of the Good and Evil and those alone who have been trained in it are competent enough to govern the city. “And so with dialectic: when a person starts on the discovery of the absolute by the light of reason only, and without any assistance of sense, and perseveres until by pure intelligence he arrives at the perception of the absolute good, he at last finds himself at the end of the intellectual world, as in the case of sight at the end of the visible”.25 So, “then dialectic, and dialectic alone, goes directly to the first principle and is the only science which does away with the hypothesis in order to make her ground secure”.26 A person who is to be trained in dialectics is carefully chosen and preference of course is given to the surest and bravest and to the fairest, and having noble and generous tempers, they should also have natural gifts which will
facilitate their education. These natural gifts include qualities like keenness and ready powers of acquisition, good memory, industriousness, love for truth, and they should also possess moral virtues like temperance, courage and magnificence.

Thus, the Platonic scheme of education for the guardian class, necessarily demanded the existence of some innate moral attributes, which can be refined and cultivated by a proper education process and which in turn can help in building the character of a philosopher–ruler. The character of a philosopher–ruler demands an essential unity on its part. This unity is always threatened by the lures of private property and the pursuit of wealth. So, the guardians and the rulers must lead a life that is free from these temptations. It is because of this that Plato devised a particular life style for the guardians and the auxiliaries.

(iv) The Guardian’s life and narration of eugenics: It deserves to be mentioned that Plato’s devised life–style for the guardians was influenced by the customs prevalent in ancient Greece, for example the Dorians who were primarily a warrior class observed the custom of living in company and messing together as in an army. Again, the Spartan institutions forbade the private possession of gold and silver. The guardian’s life–style ought to be simple and free from the temptations of worldly riches. Hence there has to
be a) total abolition of private property except for that which is absolutely necessary, b) abolition of dwelling houses or store houses where free access of all is not permitted, c) there must be common living of the members of the ruling class, which includes taking meals at public tables, d) any contact with gold and silver is forbidden for the craving for it and possession will foster hatred amongst the people who would be governed by them.

It is with the sole motive of maintaining the unity of the guardian class and for the regulated breeding of the guardian class that Plato devised total abolition of the family by introducing the community of wives and children. The existence of the family will be a natural hindrance to the cause of fostering unity amongst the guardian class for each family will have its own self-interest. Platonic society of guardians, in fact would shun the modern liberal social ideal of ‘privacy’. He tied the idea of freedom with the absence of family attachment and absence of privacy. Another reason behind the proposed abolition of the family was to set the women free from their household jobs so that they can perform their civic role equally with men. Plato’s contention was that women like men must be bred and trained as the members of the governing class. This idea of women’s liberation attracts comparison with its corresponding idea in modern times. The institution of ‘community of wives and children’ is of course a natural off–shoot of the
abolition of the institution of the family. If the women are to be freed from the task of rearing their children, their task has to be performed by somebody else and this has to be done by professional nurses. The reason behind the establishment of the community of wives and children of course has the same concern of letting the guardian class be ignorant of their own blood–relations so that they can govern the city impartially and justly without any family interest.

Plato’s carefully devised scheme of eugenics was ultimately directed by the motive of producing a good stock of citizens capable of successfully imparting their respective duties. His strict regulations on sexual intercourse, fixing the ideal age of marriage to be between twenty-five and fifty-five for men and twenty and forty for women, fixing the occasions for sexual observances, forbidding such relation between mothers and sons and between fathers and daughters, and even recommending abortion for illegitimate children, i.e. children about to be born without the sanction of the state, are all features of his programme of eugenics, so very meticulously devised to ensure the well–being of the state.

(v) Degeneration of the polis: The socially engineered schematic republic of Plato will be just, but the question that remains is that, will it be enduring? Will it be free from the dangers of degeneration? It was this
concern to which Plato devoted his attention in the later books of The Republic. It was his apprehension that this ideal city–state can also succumb to the threats of decay and corruption.

The seed of this decay is contained in the breeding process of the guardian class. It is because of improper breeding that the children produced will become unworthy guardians. Improper breeding will naturally result in improper education. Music and Gymnastics will lose their bearing. The consequence of such improper breeding and education will result in ‘inequality and inharmonious discrepancy’ amongst the guardian class. Some members of the governing class would like to retain the old constitution and some will want to possess wealth. Property will become private. This will cause a change in the constitution which will cease to be aristocratic in nature and will be something in between an aristocracy and an oligarchy, more precisely termed by Plato as timocracy where honour will be the dominant principle. The process of the degeneration is to bound to continue. The dominant principle of honour in timocracy will be replaced by the qualification of wealth and hence will degenerate into oligarchy where the city will be sharply divided between the rich and the poor. As a result of this division a civil war is almost bound to happen which will eventually culminate in the victory of the pauperized masses. Oligarchy will hence
recede into democracy. In a democratic set up the wealthy class will be plundered by the masses. In such an event the wealthy class can appoint a single man to represent and protect them. This man will have his own following who will always be ready to obey his orders and carry on a violent mode of action. Democracy thus is bound to turn into tyranny, which is the worst form of government.

Hence, a moral degeneration will cause the degeneration of the polis or the political structure. Hence, Plato’s contention was that a genetic degeneration will cause an educational degeneration which will result in a political degeneration.

(3) The republic of Statesman:

Plato, apprehending the moral degeneration of the guardian class, proposed an objective guardian of justice which would be nothing but laws. Yet, it is also true that the transition from the personal to the impersonal guardianship of justice is not a sudden transition. Plato’s own political activism in Sicily which happened about the same time as the writing of the The Republic, and which ended in a failure, was perhaps the chief cause of Plato in his mature older age, suspending the ideal scheme of republic as prescribed in The Republic and prescribing a practical state of affairs in
Statesman and Laws, retaining of course the ideal of The republic as a background narrative, a grand narrative.

Laws, Plato’s longest dialogue, advocates the supremacy of law over the supremacy of the law–giver. But Statesman is an intermediary dialogue, espousing the cause of rule of a statesman, who is a possessor of the knowledge of the royal science, i.e. knowledge of the ‘commanding sort’.

“Then shall we mingle the kingly art in the same class with the art of the herald, the interpreter, the boatswain, the prophet, and the numerous kindred arts which exercise command: …”. Thus, the Statesman is not only a judge, he is also a ruler for he possess the knowledge of the art of command. A Statesman is not a tyrant, for his rule is voluntary and not compulsory.

“And if we call the management of violent rulers tyranny, and the voluntary management of herds of voluntary bipeds politics, may we not further assert that he who has this latter art of management is the true king and statesman?”

It is in Statesman that Plato discussed the principal forms of government. There are three chief forms of government – monarchy, rule of the few, and rule of the multitude or democracy. Based upon the criterion of voluntary and involuntary, poverty and riches, law and the absence of law, monarchy can be further divided into royalty and tyranny. Government
by the few is further divided into aristocracy and oligarchy. Yet, it is not actually the question of who will wield state power which is important. The important question regarding the mode of true government is that whether it rules scientifically or not. Thus, governance is more than a technique, because it involves both practice and knowledge. “Hence we are led to observe the distinguishing principle of the state cannot be the few or many, the voluntary or involuntary, poverty or reaches; but some notion of science must enter into it”.³¹

It was Plato’s contention that the science of governance can only be possessed by a few. And as long as the ruler or the rulers rule “scientifically”, it does not matter whether they rule with or without laws.³² This is, “because the law does not perfectly comprehend what is noblest and most just for all and therefore cannot enforce what is best”.³³ So Plato contended, “As the pilot, by watching continually over the interests of the ship and of the crew not by laying down rules but by making his art a law, preserves the lives of fellow sailors, even so, and in the self same way, may there not be a true from of polity created by those who are able to govern in a similar spirit, and who show a strength of art which is superior to the law? Nor can wise rulers ever err while they, observing the one great rule of distributing justice to the citizen with intelligence and skill, are able to
preserve them, and so far as may be, to make them better from being worse”. The Platonic position is quite clear. The ruler is superior to the law only in the sense that it is wisdom of the ruler that guides the application of law. Law as such is blind. Law is nothing but the kingly art of ruling. He, of course allowed for exceptions. The imitation or the copies of the true government will make use of these laws, and in these forms of government, such laws as mechanically applied will reign supreme.

It is in the Statesman, that Plato distinguished between the best or the true government and the second best or copies of the true government. The statesman or the ruler of the true government can rule without adhering to a definite set of laws, but in the second best state adherence to laws is compulsory. “Then the nearest approach which these lower forms of government can ever make to true government of the one scientific ruler, is to do nothing contrary to their own written laws and national customs”. If law is viewed as an art, monarchy when bound by good prescriptions or laws is the best forms of government. The government of the few is intermediary between ‘the good and the evil. Democracy is the best of lawless governments and worst of all lawful governments.

The royal art is the political art. It is the ‘political web’, to use Plato’s words. The political web weaves different antagonistic natures of courage
and temperance into one, and thus makes the statesman govern a city which is happy and balanced. “… royal science appears to be the mistress of all lawful educators and instructors and having this queenly power, will not permit them to train men in what will produce characters unsuited to the political constitution she desires to create, but only in what will produce such as suitable”.

The Statesman is to function as the judge and the ruler solely because, “…the opinion about the honorable and the just and good and their opposites, which is true and confirmed by reason, is a divine principle” and, “only the statesman and the good legislator, having the inspiration of the royal muse can implant this opinion”.

It is evident from Plato’s account in Statesman that the ideal sort of rule is the rule of a monarch or a statesman. The ideal of The Republic is not abandoned because his belief is that it is only one or some who can possess the knowledge of what is ‘just’ and what is ‘good’. Guided by such moral wisdom can the statesman exercise rule that is universally benevolent. Thus Plato’s statesman is the philosopher king of The Republic in practical terms. The emphasis on wisdom makes this rule different from democracy. In such a rule the role of laws is secondary. But in the second best modes of
government, where the ideal order cannot prevail, the need for laws to regulate life is deemed necessary.

(4) The republic of the *Laws*:

The republic as described in *Laws* is not the republic of *The Republic* except for the basic concern. *Laws* of course is a much later work of Plato and signify a remarkable change in attitude and content. Plato, as the author of *Laws* is less strict, and more compromising. He accepts that human nature is prone to follies and the society is not always as perfect as it should be. Attempts should be made to make the political structure just, and therefore justice as a cardinal virtue remains the value epitome in *Laws*. The all important difference is that the *Laws* unlike *The Republic* are not chiefly concerned with defining the nature of justice. It assumes that the nature of justice has already been known and the need is to enforce it. Thus, the enforcement of justice through laws is the chief concern of *Laws*.

In *The Republic*, the task of enforcing justice was entrusted in the hands of the philosopher king, and the very concept of the philosopher king is substituted by the realistic concept of statesman in *Statesman*, though in the shadow of the ideals of *The Republic*. In *Laws* the ruler is the more matter of fact statesman, presumptuously because: a) “There is no mortal soul that can bear supreme and irresponsible power without losing his
wisdom and integrity”.39 b) “No absolute ruler can avoid interpreting the public good in terms of his private interest”.40

Thus, Plato’s anxiety about the possibility of co-existence of wisdom, power, and private interest led him to replace the sovereignty of the philosopher–ruler by the sovereignty of the laws. “Unless the laws are sovereign, and the rulers are the servants of the laws, the state would be on the road to destruction”.41

“The highest of all the civic virtues, and the highest qualification for office, is obedience to the laws”.42 The sovereignty of the laws however do not signify the non–existence of the guardians. The guardians still exist but only as guardians of the laws. They are to be known as Nomophylakes. It is in the same vein that Aristotle, later said that, “And if it is better that certain persons rather then others should rule, let them be established as guardians and servants of the laws”.43

For Plato, the author of laws is clearly a God. In Crete he is Zeus, in Lacedaemonia he is Apollo. Since laws are of divine origin, Plato in Laws accepted the existence of Gods and observed that it is the judgment after death that makes man hold fast to their duty.44 It is interesting to note in this connection that Gandhi’s ideal ruler, ‘Rām’ (conceptualized) is also bound by law and the law is prescriptive in nature.
The ultimate aim of laws is to achieve wisdom. “A statesman and legislator ought to ordain laws with a view to wisdom”.\textsuperscript{45} For Plato, “…the noblest and the greatest of harmonies may be said to be the greatest wisdom and of this he is a partaker who lives according to reason; whereas he who is devoid of reason is the destroyer of his house and the very opposite of saviour of the state, he is utterly ignorant of political wisdom”.\textsuperscript{46} Thus, in Plato’s term wisdom is living according to reason. It is this wisdom as identical to rationality that must be the guiding principle of legal legislation and enactment. Historically speaking the Socratic Plato freed reason from the Sophists and set the Socratic tradition of Greek rationality and wisdom. Comparably, Gandhi looked to the long tradition of Indian rationality and morality integrated – a prescriptive theory of morality. A political structure guided by such political wisdom leads to a state of happiness and good life.

The intention, as we affirm, of a reasonable statesman, is not what the many declare to be the object of a good legislator, namely that the state for which he is advising should be as great and as rich as possible, and should possess gold and silver, and have the greatest empire by sea and land; this they imagine to be the true object of legislation, at the same time adding inconsistently, that the true legislator desires to have the city best and happiest possible. …The citizen must indeed be happy and good, and the legislator will seek to make him so, but very rich and very good at the same time he cannot
be, not, at least, in the sense in which the many speak of riches. … For there are, in all, three things about which every man has an interest; and the interest about money, when rightly regarded is the third and the lowest of them; midway comes the interest of the body; and first of all, that of the soul; and the state which we are describing will have been rightly constituted if it ordains honours according to this scale. But if, in any of the laws which have been ordained, health be preferred to temperance, or wealth to health and temperate habits, the law must clearly be wrong.⁴⁷

Thus, the laws which regulate life are bound to be so constituted so as to ensure the well-being of the soul, there by making the citizen happy and the citizen’s life a good life. Yet, it is not the individual’s interest the protection of which is the prime concern of the laws. “legislate with a view to what is best for the whole state; …for I justly place the interests of the individual on an inferior level of value”.⁴⁸ Or, “Every artist …executes the part for the sake of the whole, and not the whole for the sake of the part”.⁴⁹ Or, yet again, “…but I will legislate with a view to the whole considering what is best both for the state and for the family esteeming as I ought the feelings of an individual at a lower rate”.⁵⁰ The reason behind giving such priority to the whole is also explicit, “…and that both the public and the private good as well of individuals as of states is greater when the state and not the individual is first considered”.⁵¹ Thus Plato’s laws are sovereign
because it is constituted to safeguard the interest of the state. The Platonic republic of *Laws* is a republic in which the well–being of the individual lies in the well–being of the state. Thus the legislator will legislate to make the state virtuous.

This virtuous state need not be rich and affluent. It will be a small self–sufficient agricultural state, where the chief problems will be water–supply, vintage, bee–culture and similar small problems. Overseas trade is to be conducted by the state and not by private persons. Resident strangers and not citizens are to pursue retail trade and no credit is to be given to such retailers. In such a state Plato devised means of reducing economic inequality and disparity. Private property is permitted but there has to be limits to its possession. No man is to have more than four times the value of the acquired ancestral property. If any individual acquires more than such an amount by trade or any other means, the excess amount has to be returned back to the public treasury. The possession of individual wealth is to be kept in public record. Strict regulatory measures are to be maintained on the possession of gold and silver and metals in the form of money is only to be permitted. It is clear from the above observation that the simple and economically moderate life style prescribed for the guardian class in *The Republic* is prescribed for the whole community in *Laws*, but the institution
of holding property in common prescribed in *The Republic* is abandoned in the *Laws*.

In the same vein ‘community of wives and children’, so characteristic a feature of *The Republic* is also abandoned in the *Laws*. Though he maintained his stand of *The Republic* on the position and the role of women, in *Laws*, he accepted the existence of the institution of marriage. Women are directed to participate in all the activities of men. They are to serve as soldiers, and members of the governing assembly. If the strength and the capabilities of the women folk are not used by the state, “The state instead of being a whole, is reduced to a half….; and what can be a greater mistake for any legislator to make?” 52

Even if the women do share in all the activities of the men, family is not to be totally abolished. Plato in *Laws* advocated monogamist marriage and monogamist family. Men are to marry between thirty and thirty five years, women are to marry between sixteen and twenty years. The process of procreation is to continue for ten years. In such a case women can be free of their duty of procreation from the age of thirty and can pursue military service and public work for the rest of their lives. The purpose of marriage is not pleasure but procreation, hence marriage is compulsory for all, those who do not marry are to be fined heavily.
In order to ensure citizens of a good stock population has to be limited. On an average, each couple has to have two children only and excess children should be turned over to families where the number is few. Plato here also admitted the use of birth control devices to control excessive population. He actually fixed the number of citizens to 5040. This figure, of course, only indicates the numbers male citizens. In addition to it, the female folk, children, artisans, resident foreigners and a large number of slaves constitute the entire population.

A good stock of citizens cannot only be attained by good breeding but also by good rearing. Hence, Plato sketched an elaborate scheme of education in *Laws* as in *The Republic*. The basic principle of ‘training of the body and of the soul’ underlying the scheme of education is the same in *Laws* as is in *The Republic*. But the major difference is that in *Laws* education is to be given to the members of the whole community and not only to the members of the governing class. Education is to begin at infancy and formal education is to begin at the age of three in the form of children’s games. At the age of six the two sexes are to be separated, but both boys and girls are to receive education provided by the teachers who are paid by the polis. The girls as well as the boys are to go through military training. Training in music and gymnastics is emphasized yet again. Popular Greek
dance is vehemently denounced and it is only poetry composed by mature, “...those who are good and honourable in the state, poets of noble actions”\textsuperscript{53}, that can be permitted. He thereby discouraged unbridled imagination and whatever Plato said against the poets reflects a disciplined mind. The basic curriculum of intellectual education as in \textit{Laws} differs in an important respect from that of \textit{The Republic}. Here, no importance is attached to training in dialectics which was the most important element in the educational scheme of the guardians. Here, Plato emphasized on reading, writing, arithmetic and astronomy. In \textit{Laws} education is for the whole population and the whole population may not be able to comprehend the principle of dialectics. This may be the reason behind Plato’s omission of dialectics from the scheme of intellectual education.

The structure of such a polity will be of a different nature. It will have a mixed constitution. The guardians of law will be selected by the procedure of voting by those eligible and fit for military service. The first three hundred candidates will be chosen through an election. By a second election the number of candidates will be reduced to hundred. By a succeeding third election, one–third of the number of such members will be elected, which will be approximately thirty–seven. Of these thirty–seven candidates the director of education and certain priests will be chosen. A nocturnal council
consisting of ten eldest members will be constituted. This council is to be entrusted with the powers to control and direct all the legal institutions of the state and is itself above all laws.

The most important feature of the polity described in *Laws* is of course the judicial system. He devised a system “in which both popular participation and selected competence find a place”.54 It is hence, he retained the popular courts, insisting that people should have a share in the administration of justice. The reason behind is two fold, first popular courts are less susceptible to corruption and secondly, participation in the judicial procedure is a criterion of citizenship. “He who has no share in the administration of justice, is apt to imagine that he has no share in the state at all”.55 It is important to note that the same Platonic contention was shared by Aristotle. “The special characteristic of the citizen is that he shares in the administration of justice and in access to office, particularly the ‘indefinite office’ of ecclesiast and dicast”.56 The question of ‘selected competence’ crops up because Plato adhered to the principle of specialized action, when he said that, “A multitude cannot easily give judgment, nor a few, when they are incompetent”.57 Keeping in view this principle, Plato contended that it is easier for a small court to get at the bottom of the case; they will be able to question the parties and their witnesses, whereas the judges in a large court
will be merely passive listeners to the speeches of the litigants.\textsuperscript{58} It is in adherence to such principles that Plato devised his procedure of appeal. He proposed three grades of court, a) courts of first instance, which are bodies frequently called ‘neighbours’ or ‘arbitrators’, above this courts will be, b) popular courts and above these courts will be, c) courts of select judges, whose decision will be decisive in all matters.

Plato’s insistence on the primacy of the legal procedure calls for the basic maintenance of the principle of justice, so emphasized in \textit{The Republic} and place it above all personal judgments. It is in pursuit of the same principle of justice that Plato formulated the penal principles and penal code of his proposed polity in Book IX of \textit{Laws}. Following the Socratic view, Plato contended that no one does wrong voluntarily, but only when his real judgment is overcome by passion or clouded by ignorance. “Passion, ignorance and concupiscence are the origin of crimes, and all alike are obscurities clouding the natural sound judgment of the soul. Crime, therefore, if by that we mean deliberate wrong, does not exist, but injuries are none the less inflicted and that is why there must be punishment. For the motive of punishment is \textit{reformation}. It is very desirable, therefore that admonition should precede punishment”.\textsuperscript{59} The Platonic view on crime and punishment is thus quite clear. It is pertinent here to take into account of
Plato’s contention in the *Timaeus*, that the wrong doer is not alone in his guilt; but the entire community, because of its tolerance of bad government and faulty educational practices, it is also guilty. Thus for Plato every crime is not only a social harm but also a harm unto the guilty himself. It is a view of crime and punishment that at no stage isolates the guilty from the community.

The question of obedience to laws is the question which signifies the importance of laws and the legal system. This question was raised in the famous trial and condemnation of Socrates. When Crito suggested to Socrates who was in the prison waiting for his execution, that his escape could be arranged, the famous reply of Socrates can be quoted in this context, “Do you imagine that a state can subsist and not be overthrown, in which the decisions of law have no power, but are set aside and trampled upon by individuals?” 61, or yet again, “Has a philosopher like you failed to discover that our country is more to be valued and higher and holier far more than mother or father or any ancestor, and more to be regarded in the eyes of the gods and men of understanding? …And when we are punished by her, whether with imprisonment or stripes, the punishment is to be endured in silence; …he must do what his city and his country order him”. 62 Thus he who disobeys the laws is wrong, “first, because in disobeying us (laws) he is
disobeying his parents; secondly, because we (laws) are the authors of his education; thirdly, because he has made an agreement with us (laws) that he will duly obey our commands”.63 These Socratic observations make it explicit why laws are to be obeyed. It was the belief in the ancient argument, ‘that not life, but a good life, is to be chiefly valued”64, which led Socrates obey the command of the state and it is this same Socratic belief which led Plato devise his code of laws and legal system for ‘a good life is equivalent to a just and honourable one”65, and good life is also the life of law abiding member of the polis.

A review of Plato’s idea of republic expressed in The Republic, Statesman, Laws exhibit Plato’s effort to answer the Socratic question, ‘What is good life and how to live a good life”? The answer to this question constitutes Plato’s idea of the ideal state, citizenship, law, and morality. The exposition of justice as a moral virtue in The Republic, in fact introduces the question. It is the same concern that is discussed in Plato’s idea of the philosopher king, the scheme of education for the guardian class, the description of guardian’s life–style, the narration of eugenics. It is the apprehension of not being able to ensure such a good life that was the chief concern of Plato in his discussion of the degeneration of the polis. In Statesman Plato deliberated on the practical state of affairs, to ensure the
theoretical possibility of good life actualized. The statesman’s rule is in fact the only practical rendering of the rule by a philosopher king. But surely the rule of the statesman is not possible in every political realm. In the second best form of state the only alternative is an impersonal mode of governance and such governance is a rule of laws. Law being impersonal, that is free of personal interests and bias, is universal and thereby commands the obedience of its citizens. Yet, it is founded upon the morality of justice, the protection and execution of which is the aim of laws. So ultimately, law is ingrained in individual’s virtue. It is here that Plato’s idea of state, law and citizenship exhibit a combination of individuality and universality. It is also here, that Plato by exhibiting a practical statement of the way to lead a good life, exhibited an unique combination of theory and practice.

So viewed, Plato’s idea of republic can be compared to Gandhi’s idea of republic. Gandhi, in spite of emanating from a totally different socio-cultural and historico-political background, developed his system of thoughts, the comparison of which to Plato’s system of thought, is significantly relevant. An exposition of Gandhi’s idea of republic is necessary to answer the basic queries such as, is Plato’s view of the political state and Gandhi’s view of political state similar or are they different? Plato’s political state is ultimately a moral state, is it so with Gandhi? how
do their political constructions reflect their cultural differences? and lastly, but no less significantly, what is the common concern of Plato and Gandhi that lie behind their political constructions? It is the objective of the succeeding chapter to discuss and answer these questions.
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