Welcome to A Level Religion, Philosophy and Ethics. We are very excited that you have chosen this challenging and rigorous course! This summer work is comprised of two parts – each of which will take you a while to complete well. There are work sheets attached to each ‘reading’ all of which need to be completed. Do set aside enough time over the summer to enable you to do all of the work to a high standard. This work lays the foundations for the A Level course so do your best and good luck!

1. Founders of Western Philosophy – how do the Greeks influence philosophical and religious thought?

Read the Chapter ‘The Man Who Asked Questions: Socrates and Plato’
Write down key biographical details and ideas that each of these philosophers had on the sheet at the end of this chapter.

2. Plato’s Republic

We will be studying the work of Plato. He has many ideas about what reality means, what society should be like, how it should be organised and what makes a good person. Read the chapter ‘Republic’ which is written about one of Plato’s key works. You need to answer each of the questions. The numbers next to each paragraph correlate with the question numbers to help you find the answers more easily.

Extension – do you think Plato’s ideas have any relevance in contemporary society?

**EXPECTATIONS**

- You will be expected to have this work done for the first week back
- The work represents the standard of text that you must be able to cope with in order to access the course successfully
- Completing this work is directly relevant to what you will study next year and will give you a head start to an intense year
- You will be required to show the prep work to your teacher at the start of the year
The Man Who Asked Questions

SOCRATES AND PLATO

About 2,400 years ago in Athens a man was put to death for asking too many questions. There were philosophers before him, but it was with Socrates that the subject really took off. If philosophy has a patron saint, it is Socrates.

Nigel Warburton

people from time to time and asking them awkward questions. That was more or less all he did. But the questions he asked were razor sharp. They seemed straightforward, but they weren't.

An example of this was his conversation with Euthydemus. Socrates asked him whether being deceitful counted as being immoral. Of course it does, Euthydemus replied. He thought that was obvious. But what, Socrates asked, if your friend is looking very low and might kill himself, and you steal his knife? Isn't that a deceitful act? Of course it is. But isn't it moral rather than immoral to do that? It's a good thing, not a bad one - despite being a deceitful act. Yes, says Euthydemus, who by now is tied in knots. Socrates by using a clever counter-example has shown that Euthydemus' general comment that being deceitful is immoral doesn't apply in every situation. Euthydemus hadn't realized this before.

Over and over again Socrates demonstrated that the people he met in the marketplace didn't really know what they thought they knew. A military commander would begin a conversation totally confident that he knew what 'courage' meant, but after twenty minutes in Socrates' company would be completely confused. The experience must have been disconcerting. Socrates loved to reveal the limits of what people genuinely understood, and to question the assumptions on which they built their lives. A conversation that ended in everyone realizing how little they knew was for him a success. Far better that than to carry on believing that you understood something when you didn't.

At that time in Athens the sons of rich men would be sent to study with Sophists. The Sophists were clever teachers who would coach their students in the art of speech-making. They charged very high fees for this. Socrates in contrast didn't charge for his services. In fact he claimed he didn't know anything, so how could he teach at all? This didn't stop students coming to him and listening in on his conversations. It didn't make him popular with the Sophists either.

One day his friend Chaerophon went to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. The oracle was a wise old woman, a sibyl, who would answer questions that visitors asked. Her answers were usually in the form of a riddle, 'Is anyone wiser than Socrates?' Chaerophon asked, 'No,' came the answer. 'No one is wiser than Socrates.'

When Chaerophon told Socrates about this he didn't believe it at first. It really puzzled him. 'How can I be the wisest man in Athens when I know so little?' he wondered. He devoted years to questioning people to see if anyone was wiser than he was. Finally he realized what the oracle had meant and that she had been right. Lots of people were good at the various things they did - carpenters were good at carpentry, and soldiers knew about fighting. But none of them were truly wise. They didn't really know what they were talking about.

The word 'philosopher' comes from the Greek words meaning 'love of wisdom.' The Western tradition in philosophy, the one that this book follows, spread from Ancient Greece across large parts of the world, at time cross-fertilized by ideas from the East. The kind of wisdom that it values is based on argument, reasoning and asking questions, not on believing things simply because someone important has told you they are true. Wisdom for Socrates was not knowing lots of facts, or knowing how to do something. It meant understanding the true nature of our existence, including the limits of what we can know. Philosophers today are doing more or less what Socrates was doing: asking tough questions, looking at reasons and evidence, struggling to answer some of the most important questions we can ask...
people from time to time and asking them awkward questions. That was more or less all he did. But the questions he asked were razor-sharp. They seemed straightforward, but they weren't.

An example of this was his conversation with Euthydemos. Socrates asked him whether being deceitful counted as being immoral. Of course it does, Euthydemos replied. He thought that was obvious. But what, Socrates asked, if your friend is feeling very low and might kill himself, and you steal his knife? Isn't that a deceitful act? Of course it is. But isn't it moral rather than immoral to do that? It's a good thing, not a bad one – despite being a deceitful act. Yes, says Euthydemos, who by now is tied in knots. Socrates by using a clever counter-example has shown that Euthydemos' general comment that being deceitful is immoral didn't apply in every situation. Euthydemos hadn't realized this before.

Over and over again Socrates demonstrated that the people he met in the marketplace didn't really know what they thought they knew. A military commander would begin a conversation totally confident that he knew what 'courage' meant, but after twenty minutes in Socrates' company would leave completely confused. The experience must have been disconcerting. Socrates loved to reveal the limits of what people genuinely understood, and to question the assumptions on which they built their lives. A conversation that ended in everyone realizing how little they knew was for him a success. Far better than that to carry on believing that you understood something when you didn't.

At that time in Athens the sons of rich men would be sent to study with Sophists. The Sophists were clever teachers who would coach their students in the art of speech-making. They charged very high fees for this. Socrates in contrast didn't charge for his services. In fact he claimed he didn't know anything, so how could he teach at all? This didn't stop students coming to him and listening in on his conversations. It didn't make him popular with the Sophists either.

One day his friend Chaerophon went to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. The oracle was a wise old woman, a sibyl, who would answer questions that visitors asked. Her answers were usually in the form of a riddle. 'Is anyone wiser than Socrates?' Chaerophon asked. 'No,' came the answer. 'No one is wiser than Socrates.'

When Chaerophon told Socrates about this he didn't believe it at first. It really puzzled him. 'How can I be the wisest man in Athens when I know so little?' he wondered. He devoted years to questioning people to see if anyone was wiser than he was. Finally he realized what the oracle had meant and that she had been right. Lots of people were good at the various things they did – carpenters were good at carpentry, and soldiers knew about fighting. But none of them were truly wise. They didn't really know what they were talking about.

The word 'philosopher' comes from the Greek words meaning 'love of wisdom.' The Western tradition in philosophy, the one that this book follows, spread from Ancient Greece across large parts of the world, at time cross-fertilized by ideas from the East. The kind of wisdom that it values is based on argument, reasoning and asking questions, not on believing things simply because someone important has told you they are true. Wisdom for Socrates was not knowing lots of facts, or knowing how to do something. It meant understanding the true nature of our existence, including the limits of what we can know. Philosophers today are doing more or less what Socrates was doing: asking tough questions, looking at reasons and evidence, struggling to answer some of the most important questions we can ask ourselves about the nature of reality and how we should live.

Unlike Socrates, though, modern philosophers have the benefit of nearly two and a half thousand years of philosophical thinking to build on. This book examines ideas of some of the key thinkers writing in this tradition of Western thought, a tradition that Socrates started.

What made Socrates so wise was that he kept asking questions and he was always willing to debate his ideas. Life, he declared, is only worth living if you think about what you are doing. An examined existence is all right for cattle, but not for human beings.

Unusually for a philosopher, Socrates refused to write anything down. For him talking was far better than writing. Written words can't answer back; they can't explain anything to you when you don't understand them. Face-to-face conversation was much better, he maintained. In conversation we can take into account the kind of person we are talking to; we can adapt what we say so that the message gets across. Because he refused to write, it's mainly through the work of Socrates' star pupil Plato that we have much idea of what this great man believed and argued about. Plato wrote down a series of conversations between Socrates and the people he questioned. These are known as the Platonic Dialogues and are great works of literature as well as of philosophy – in some ways Plato was the Shakespeare of his day. Reading these dialogues, we get a sense of what Socrates was like, how clever he was and how infuriating.

Actually it isn't even as straightforward as that, as we can't always tell whether Plato was writing down what Socrates really said, or whether he was putting ideas into the mouth of the character he calls 'Socrates', ideas which are Plato's own.

One of the ideas that most people believe is Plato's rather than Socrates' is that the world is not at all as it seems. There is a significant difference between appearance and reality. Most of us mistake appearances for reality. We think we understand, but we don't. Plato believed that only philosophers understand what the world is truly like. They discover the nature of reality by thinking rather than relying on their senses.

To make this point, Plato described a cave. In that imaginary cave there are people chained facing a wall. In front of them they can see flickering shadows that they believe are real things. They aren't. What they see are shadows made by objects held up in front of a fire behind them. These people spend their whole lives thinking that the shadows projected on the wall are the real world. Then one of them breaks free from his chains and turns towards the fire. His eyes are blurry at first, but then he starts to see where he is. He stumbles out of the cave and eventually is able to look at the sun. When he comes back to the cave, no one believes what he has to tell them about the world outside. The man who breaks free is like a philosopher. He sees beyond appearances. Ordinary people have little idea about reality because they are content with looking at what's in front of them rather than thinking deeply about it. But the appearances are deceptive. What they see are shadows, not reality.

This story of the cave is connected with what's come to be known as Plato's Theory of Forms. The easiest way to understand this is through an example. Think of all the circles that you have seen in your life. Was any one of them a perfect circle? No. Not one of them was absolutely perfect. In a perfect circle every point on its circumference is exactly the same distance from the centre point. Real circles never quite achieve this. But you understand what I meant when I used the words 'perfect circle.' So what is that perfect circle? Plato would say that the idea of a perfect circle is the Form of a circle. If you want to understand what a circle is, you should focus on the Form of the
circle, not actual circles that you can draw and experience through your visual sense, all of which are imperfect in some way. Similarly, Plato thought, if you want to understand what goodness is, then you need to concentrate on the Form of goodness, not on particular examples of it that you witness. Philosophers are the people who are best suited to thinking about the Forms in this abstract way; ordinary people get led astray by the world as they grasp it through their senses.

Because philosophers are good at thinking about reality, Plato believed they should be in charge and have all the political power. In *The Republic*, his most famous work, he described an imaginary perfect society. Philosophers would be at the top and would get a special education; but they would sacrifice their own pleasures for the sake of the citizens they ruled. Beneath them would be soldiers who were trained to defend the country, and beneath them would be the workers. These three groups of people would be in a perfect balance. Plato thought, a balance that was like a well-balanced mind with the reasonable part keeping the emotions and desires in control. Unfortunately his model of society was profoundly anti-democratic, and would keep the people under control by a combination of lies and force. He would have banned most art, on the grounds that he thought it gave false representations of reality. Painters paint appearances, but appearances are deceptive about the Forms. Every aspect of life in Plato’s ideal republic would be strictly controlled from above. It’s what we would now call a totalitarian state. Plato thought that letting the people vote was like letting the passengers steer a ship — far better to let people who knew what they were doing take charge.

Fifth-century Athens was quite different from the society that Plato imagined in *The Republic*. It was a democracy of sorts, though only about 10 per cent of the population could vote. Women and slaves, for example, were automatically excluded. But citizens were equal before the law, and there was an elaborate lottery system to make sure that everyone had a fair chance of influencing political decisions.

Athens as a whole didn’t value Socrates as highly as Plato valued him. Far from it. Many Athenians felt that Socrates was dangerous and was deliberately undermining the government. In 399 BC, when Socrates was 70 years old, one of them, Meletus, took him to court. He claimed that Socrates was neglecting the Athenian gods, introducing new gods of his own. He also suggested that Socrates was teaching the young men of Athens to behave badly, encouraging them to turn against the authorities. These were both very serious accusations. It is difficult to know now how accurate they were. Perhaps Socrates really did discourage his students from following the state religion, and there is some evidence that he enjoyed mocking Athenian democracy. That would have been consistent with his character. What is certainly true is that many Athenians believed the charges.

They voted on whether or not he was guilty. Just over half of the 501 citizens who made up the huge jury thought he was, and sentenced him to death. If he wanted to, he could probably have talked his way out of being executed. But instead, true to his reputation as a gadfly, he annoyed the Athenians even more by arguing that he had done nothing wrong and that they should, in fact, be rewarding him by giving him free meals for life instead of punishing him. That didn’t go down well.

He was put to death by being forced to drink poison made from hemlock, a plant that gradually paralyzes the body. Socrates said goodbye to his wife and three sons, and then gathered his students around him. If he had the choice to carry on living quietly, not asking any more difficult questions, he would not take it. He'd rather die than that. He had an inner voice that told him to keep questioning everything, and he could not betray it. Then he drank the cup of poison. Very soon he was dead.

In Plato’s dialogues, though, Socrates lives on. This difficult man, who kept asking questions and would rather die than stop thinking about how things really are, has been an inspiration for philosophers ever since.

Socrates’ immediate impact was on those around him. Plato carried on teaching in the spirit of Socrates after his teacher’s death. By far his most impressive pupil was Aristotle, a very different sort of thinker from either of them.

---

**Chapter 2**

**True Happiness**

*Aristotle*

“One swallow doesn’t make a summer.” You might think this phrase comes from William Shakespeare or another great poet. It sounds as if it should. In fact it’s from Aristotle’s book *The Nicomachean Ethics*, so called because he dedicated it to his son Nicomachus. The point he was making was that just as it takes more than the arrival of one swallow to prove that summer has come, and more than a single warm day, so a few moments of pleasure don’t add up to true happiness. Happiness for Aristotle wasn’t a matter of short-term joy. Surprisingly, he thought that children couldn’t be happy. This sounds absurd if children can’t be happy, who can? But it reveals how different his view of happiness was from ours. Children are just beginning their lives, and so haven’t had a full life in any sense. True happiness, he argued, required a longer life.

Aristotle was Plato’s student, and Plato had been Socrates’. So these three great thinkers form a chain: Socrates—Plato—Aristotle.
Founders of Western Philosophy

Socrates 469 BC - 399

Plato 428 - 347 BC
philosophy for the first time a feel for the subject matter. It might be that Leibniz, Spinoza, Voltaire, Russell and even lesser thinkers are better philosophers than some of those included here. But if you are aiming for a decent introductory mix, you might think that leaving them out and putting others in is a good idea. No book about philosophy books can say everything worth saying about them. But this book does try to deal with the largest thoughts in those books, and it does so plainly and critically. There is no formal logic here, nor is there needless jargon. You will hear about not just the great thoughts and the arguments for them, but also the troubles associated with thinking about them. This book has objections and counter-arguments in it. It is not just a cheer for great books. It is also organized chronologically, by the publication date (as far as we know it) of the books themselves. The chapters build on each other, but each one is more or less self-contained. You can dip in where you like or read it straight through.

Some people who have dipped in and read parts of this book, and others who are owed thanks for different sorts of help, include: Laura-May Abron, Sophie Davies, Mark Hammond for insights into Nietzsche, Kim Hastilow, Ted Honderich, Julia LeMense Huff, Justin Lynas, Yolonne MacKenzie, Anthony O'Hear, Raj Sehgal for his alarmingly comprehensive grasp of Marx, Barry Smith, Jeremy Stangroom, Joanna Taylor, Slav Todorow, Jon Webber for his godlike understanding of Sartre, and Sarah Douglas at Continuum for explaining why 'deadline' has the word 'dead' in it. Those who know the secondary literature will recognize my many other debts. All mistakes in this book are theirs.

Finally, this book is dedicated to Judy Garvey, the most influential philosopher I have ever met.

1 Republic
Plato (427–347 BC)

Reasonable people can lose their composure when reflecting on Plato and his various accolades. He is generally considered to be the father of the West's intellectual heritage, a thinker who single-handedly set philosophy on a course it still follows more than two thousand years later. A. N. Whitehead memorably claimed that the safest general characterization of Western philosophy is that 'it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato.' It has been said since that this is an exaggeration, but not much of one. From our historical vantage point, Plato seems also to have the singular distinction of creating and bringing to perfection a kind of literary art, the philosophical dialogue. Even if his philosophy were of no real interest to us, his writing would still be captivating. Cicero tells us that if God were to speak, it would be in a language like Plato's. Put worries about your composure to one side. Be flabbergasted by Plato. His genius really is remarkable, his dialogues really are breathtaking, his influence really is incalculable, and philosophy really is what it is because of him. His masterpiece is the Republic.

By some miracle of history, we have not just the Republic but all the dialogues Plato wrote. The dialogues take the form of philosophical cross-examinations. A question is asked — say, What is courage? — and an answer is given. The answer is subjected to scrutiny, a series of further questions and replies are made, and eventually the original answer is found wanting in some respect. Perhaps it leads to an absurdity or contradicts something else said. A new attempt at an answer is made, in light of the recent discussion, and the process continues.

Plato's mentor, Socrates, is the hero and interrogator in most of the dialogues. We know very little about him, but we do know that he was a master of argumentation. According to Xenophon, he 'could do what he liked with any disputant'. This he did, loudly and publicly, more often than not demonstrating that the great and the good of
Justice

The question of justice arises in book one with an oft-quoted remark by Cephalus, who maintains the advantages of being well-heeled. He says, to know that you have the means to treat others justly, to tell the truth and return what you have borrowed. The remark is enough to get Socrates going.

Suppose you borrow a weapon from a friend, Socrates says, who meanwhile goes mad. He demands the return of his property. If Cephalus were to have it without an outburst, he would be the stronger. But it is not so. And so, what more conventional definitions of justice are offered by others and found unconvincing. So, Socrates, Thrasymuchus, having had enough of the preceding high-minded talk, insists that what we call 'justice' is nothing more than self-interest. Those in power make laws which suit their own interests and aims, and justice is nothing more than the codification of the will of the strong. Might really does make right. Furthermore, the company they keep is the most important. We generally admire those who do well, even if they do wrong, because they get what they want. Being in the conventional sense is simply not worth it, not advantageous, not desirable. We would all rather be money-launderers than crooks because, end of the day, we think, they are happier. Being just in the conventional sense is not what we value. Being just and virtuous when looking after your own interests is as one can imagine.

Thrasymuchus' outburst has echoes throughout the history of philosophy and beyond. It is the first expression of a suspicion about the foundation of morality which has grown into nihilism, ethical immorality of the soul. We will consider some of these themes in what follows.
Plato's rest of the dialogue to deal with it.

The answer begins with an unusual move on the part of Socrates. He argues that since their quarry, the nature of justice, is hard to spot, the best place to look for it is on a large scale: in the just city. Since cities and individuals can be just, what is true of one should hold true, by analogy, for the other. What, then, is the nature of the just city on Plato's view? The answer, or part of it, is more than a little alarming.

The just city

Socrates imagines the beginnings of any human collective. Human beings are not self-sufficient; we need each other and a measure of cooperation to survive. We are also naturally suited to different tasks, and efficiency counsels that individuals do what they are best suited to do. These two simple lines of thinking lead Socrates to a certain conception of justice in the ideal city. It would be unjust, maybe even a kind of theft, if a person occupied someone else’s natural role. It would amount to taking something from someone else. It is best for me and for everyone else if I do what I am naturally best-suited to do. It is a short step from these thoughts to the view that justice in the city consists in everyone doing what they are naturally supposed to do.

For Plato, then, there are three classes of citizens: the guardians who rule, the auxiliaries who police and defend, and the artisans who produce goods and render services. Given Plato's conception of justice in the city, the right people must be assigned the right roles, and this is accomplished by a kind of selective breeding programme, coupled with a regime of education and indoctrination—some might say censorship, propaganda and brain-washing. Furthermore, the people need to stay in the roles to which they are assigned. Although Plato countenances the possibility of some class mobility, just any craftsman putting on airs, thinking he might make a fine ruler, simply won't do. Plato suggests that the rulers should tell a ‘noble lie’:

the Gods settle the state of every individual at birth, mixing a metal into their bodies which corresponds to their class. Thus, guardians are children of gold and born to rule; auxiliaries are children of silver and born to fight; and craftsmen are children of iron or bronze and born to produce. There can be no shifting of roles, as one’s place is literally constitutionally fixed or preordained.

You might be wondering, rightly, how a just city can be built on lies, censorship, propaganda and selective breeding, with the citizens programmed from birth to do just what the guardians tell them to do. Perhaps the city is just in Plato's sense, and maybe the trains run on time, but shouldn't ideal cities be more than simply stable and efficient? Shouldn't the people be happy, maybe have a little freedom, a say in how the city works? Hasn't Socrates, who objected so vigorously to Thrasymachus's outburst, fallen into advocating just what he denied earlier, that justice is nothing more than obeying the will of the powerful?

There is a kind of response to this, and it might not exactly work, but we will have a look at it anyway. Plato argues that the ideal city cannot be a reality until philosophers become kings, until the ones in charge have a share in wisdom, particularly an understanding of what goodness really is. The rulers are not mere tyrants, but individuals who by nature and nurture are best placed to choose what is in the interests of everyone. Lies and eugenics aside, maybe the people really will be happy, as they will be looked after by those trained to consider their interests. This is not simply obeying the will of the strong, but being governed by the ones who know best. Perhaps more details of the nature of the knowledge the rulers allegedly have will help.

The theory of forms

Plato proposes a number of analogies in books six and seven, all designed to make clear the sort of knowledge required by the rulers, the knowledge of the Good. To make sense of this, we will need to consider Plato's theory of forms, and you can find your way into it by
prisoners can only see the shadows of objects before them, and this they take to be reality. By some miracle, a prisoner frees himself, sees what is going on, and realizes that he has been mistaking mere illusions for real objects. He drags himself out of the cave, into the blinding light of the sun and, eventually, sees the true nature of the world.

For Plato, we are like prisoners in the cave, and this world of physical objects is merely a procession of shadows compared to the unchanging world of perfect forms. The philosopher who manages to free himself and look upon the objects outside the cave, the forms themselves, finally sees the sun, the Form of Goodness, which illuminates all. It is worth noting that the philosopher has to return to the cave - no doubt he would rather stay outside in restful contemplation - to free us. And freeing the crowd is no easy job. He suffers, being taken for a lunatic with his talk of the so-called 'real world'.

Plato is here suggesting that the philosopher king rules out of a sense of duty to his subjects and has their best interests at heart. What he wants, more than the joy attending the contemplation of the forms, is justice for the city.

It is a nice image, but what truth is there in Plato's theory of forms? Perhaps the largest objection to the view, considered by Plato himself, is the Third Man Argument, which runs as follows. Beautiful things in this world are beautiful only insofar as they have a share in the Form Beautiful. The Form Beautiful itself is beautiful, Plato admits. Does this not require a third thing, a third form, which the Beautiful itself resembles? Socrates and Plato are both men insofar as they have a share in the Form Man. The Form Man must also have a share in manhood, just as the Form Beautiful is beautiful. Does this not require a third man which the Form Man must resemble for it to be a man? And isn't this third man itself a man? Reflection on the theory of forms seems to generate an embarrassing vicious regress.

You can wander into other sorts of trouble too, if you start wondering about the perfect and unchanging Form of Acne or worry a little about the forms of things which do not yet exist. Has there always been a form of Interplanetary Teleportation Device? Could Plato have contemplated it?
Justice in the individual

Put these worries to one side for the moment and recall the just city. The just city, on Plato’s view, is one in which the three classes do what they are supposed to do: the classes stay in their proper place, perform their proper roles and do not interfere with one another. Having discovered justice in the city, Plato turns to justice in the individual. By analogy to the just city, a just person has three parts which must work together. Reason, spirit and appetite, for Plato, correspond to the classes of citizen in the city. A just person’s inner life is structured like social life in a just city – the parts of her mind are in a similar kind of balance.

The symmetry between the parts of a person and the parts of a city is pleasing, but how much weight can the analogy bear? Many have argued that human psychology cannot really be reducible to only three principles – and it nearly goes without saying that societies are no less complex. Others note that arguments by analogy just cannot do the sort of heavy lifting required here.

Despite these worries, we now know what Plato thinks justice is, but what of his second question: Is justice worthwhile or desirable? Plato takes it that proving this amounts to showing that the just person is the happiest sort of person and that the just state has the happiest people in it. He attempts to do this by considering all sorts of unjust people and unjust political organizations. In each case, his aim is to show that compared to a just person or city, the unjust version has less happiness in it.

He proposes some specific arguments too. A just person escapes a kind of inner conflict, conducive to unhappiness, when the rational part of her mind rules the others. Thus, justice brings happiness, a sort of happiness unavailable to a person whose mind is tugged this way and that. Plato also argues that the parts of the person have particular, corresponding desires – the appetite part loves gain, the spirited part loves honour, and the rational part loves wisdom. Disputes between the parts of the mind require the best judge to resolve them, and only the rational part knows the kinds of desires proper to each part of the mind. Therefore, reason is the best judge when it comes to the satisfaction of desire, and the person whose reason is in charge, the just person, will find the most satisfaction in life.

You can have some worrying thoughts about all of this. You can think that Plato has departed from ordinary morality, the everyday conception of justice. He is talking about something else when he discusses reason ruling the other parts of the mind. You might be thinking, too, that the totalitarian utopia he envisions cannot be a just state. You can go on thinking this if you like, but it will take more than thoughts to answer Plato. He has levelled arguments for his views, and what is needed to reply to him are arguments, not merely discomfited thoughts. You might lose your composure again if you think that almost everyone since Plato has had just the same worrying thoughts, and other thoughts besides, on reading his dialogues. Perhaps much of philosophy since has been engaged in turning such thoughts into proper replies to Plato.
Plato’s Republic

1. Give 3 reasons why people think Plato is still considered as a ‘father’ of philosophy.
   
a) ..............................................................................................................................
b) ..............................................................................................................................
c) ..............................................................................................................................

2. Explain in your own words what ‘dialogues’ are and why you think Plato wrote using dialogues.
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................
   ..............................................................................................................................

3. Write down 3 pieces of information about Socrates
   
a) ..............................................................................................................................
b) ..............................................................................................................................
c) ..............................................................................................................................

4. Draw a diagram to show the three groups of dialogues and what scholars think they mean
5. A) Which of the three groups of dialogues do some scholars see Plato’s Republic as and why?

B) Write definitions of the following key terms.

Ethics:

Metaphysics:

Epistemology:

6. Complete the following table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato’s Republic is Divided into 10 books (by a late editor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 2 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Books 5 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 8 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justice

7. Explain in your own words what Cephalus says about Justice

8. A) Explain briefly the example that Socrates, Cephalus and Thrasymachus disagree on in terms of justice.

B) Find out what the following terms mean:

Rhetorician

Sophist

9. Write down three ideas that Thrasymachus had about justice

a)

b)

c)

10. Where does Socrates say we should look to spot justice?
The Just City

11. Explain what you think the 'Human Collective' is.

12. Complete the table and answer the question below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato's Three Classes of Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does Plato think about citizens being assigned their roles and staying in their roles?

13. What philosophical questions are raised by Plato's ideas about the Just City?

14. What responses did Plato offer to these challenges?
The Theory of Forms

15. How does the example of the apple help us to question knowledge?

16. Explain what Plato’s theory of forms is

17. A) What is the cave metaphor meant to represent?

B) What are the key elements of the cave (e.g. raised platform)
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 

18. How did Plato compare us to the Prisoners in the cave? What does Plato think a philosopher should do?
19. Explain the ‘Third Man Argument’

Justice in the Individual

20. Complete the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plato’s 3 parts of a person which must work together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What do you think it means when it says that ‘human psychology cannot really be reducible to three principles’?

23. Why does Plato think that Justice is worthwhile or desirable?

24. Explain what Plato’s specific arguments?

25. Why has Plato influenced Philosophical thinking today?