

Approach to wealth inequality by theories of nature essay samples

[Environment](#), [Nature](#)



Introduction

Wealth inequality remains a topic of concern, not only in the United States, but across various settings all over the globe. Researches carried out in the recent past indicate that the wealth disparities have and continue to worsen, and soon such disparities will reach its extreme and this would have a severe impact on economic development (Rousseau, 2007). Notably, there are various ways in which wealth inequality jeopardize economic growth of any given nation. More importantly, it results in impaired social mobility of the populations. In addition, wealth inequality results in an increase in the number of people who are less educated. Worth noting is the fact the less educated people are, the lesser they can compete in the global economy. On another note, wealth disparities result in increased political pressures, which discourage investment and trade; hence, impacting negatively on economic development.

While much has been hypothesized regarding human nature, it is of the essence to note that it primarily connotes to distinguishing features that humans are bound to have. These features are inclusive, but not limited to acting, feeling, and thinking. Many at times, there distinguishing features of human nature have an impact on politics, theology, and ethics. In a nutshell, the distinguishing characteristics of human nature dictate an individual's way of life. In the context of philosophy, Socrates was the first philosopher to study matters regarding human nature. Other philosophers including Plato, and Aristotle studied a wider array of issues aligned with human nature, specifically on how humans should live (Rousseau, 2007). As such,

philosophical assertions from these philosophers have a collateral implication on various societal factors including the topic on wealth inequality. Theories on human nature approach the topic on wealth inequality from a different perspectives.

Plato's theory on human nature and its approach to wealth inequality

Plato's theory on human nature is based on his "dualist" view of human beings. Speaking of Plato's dualist view, it is of the essence that Plato often hypothesized that human beings exist in two parts; the soul and the body. Plato further notes that the soul is immortal and controls a wider array of features that define human nature (Santas, 2010). In approaching the topic on wealth inequality, Plato notes that the soul comprises of close to three parts; appetite, reasoning, and spiritedness. Plato further notes that one of these three parts naturally dominates the other two. Plato further notes that the part of the soul that is predominant in each individual determines what an individual's perfect state should be. For this reason, the part of the soul that dominates in an individual determines the social class they will fall in the society. As an example, if appetite is the part of the soul that is predominant in an individual, that individual would naturally have the appetite to excel in their intellectual and professional pursuits. While as a result, appetite in this case example would be the main factor that determines whether an individual will fit into the ruling class, or any other class in the society.

According to Plato, it is the social interactions that people have such as exchange of goods and services, which provide a platform in which human

beings can rise to become human (Santas, 2010). Notably, it is such exchange of good and services that determines the wealth states of humans across various settings. On another note, Plato approached the topic on wealth inequality from the perspective of political and social institutions that exist in a given context. In fact, Plato devised a blue print on the manner in which social and political institutions should be like in a perfect state. As such, plate notes that failure to adhere to his blueprint would result in the failure of a state, which would be characterised by wealth disparities amongst the populations. Notably, Plato in his theory of human nature offers a schedule of various forms of governments and relations with wealth inequality.

One of the forms of government that Plato mentions is the Plutocracy form of government, which exist in cases where the wealthy rule other populations. In the presence of such a form of government, the ample relationships that exists between various social classes is replaced by harsh class antagonism amongst the poor and the rich. Democracy as the other form of government hypothesized by Plato exists in cases where people are ruled on the basis of equality and liberty. Plato links this form of governance to wealth inequality in that democracy results in a situation whereby people do what they like regardless of their abilities and talents; hence, resulting in a state of anarchy, where only the rich dominate at the expense of the poor (Santas, 2010). Overall, Plato approaches the topic on wealth inequality based on the part of the soul that is predominant in an individual and the form of governance that reigns in a given context.

Judeo Christian Theory on Human nature and its approach to the topic on Wealth Inequality

The second theory of human nature is that of Judeo Christian school of thought. This school believes in the existence of an ultimate being who aids functionality of the world. In any case, the world is nothing without God. In order to find success, human beings must thus, trust in God also for the sake of finding their path, which the creator is already aware. The only way to success is to submit to God and obey the rules by which he operates. This school of thought believes also in the freewill given unto man by God to help him make decisions about the manner in which he should live (Harris, 2011). Freewill among other gifts should be used according with the stipulated rules. In the event that such rules are not adhered to, then there are consequences. Human beings should thus, utilize the freedoms they have as though it is a loan to be accounted for. In this theory, human beings are the product of God's creation. They are valuable to Him as His own sons and daughters as they are His very image. In the teachings of Paul, the government is an authority provided by God to operate the world. Our moral condition is a result of our choices as we make them in the eyes of God. Paul argued that while human beings are primarily capable of all sorts of wickedness, they are also capable of noble acts.

Human beings in the Judeo Christian theory are followers of either their evil nature or a good nature. These determine the moral situation in every community. It is only through divine intervention that the society can achieve perfection of behaviour. As Paul explained it, human behaviour does not restrict itself to rationality, as human passions know no borders until

they find achievement. Human beings who embrace the help of God however, struggle against the nature of wickedness and emerge winners over their distorted wretchedness. If people learned to live in the realms of religion and obey the commands provided by God, then there would be a reasonable distribution of wealth among members of the society. This is because; the morals would have changed as people would not take advantage of others to live off their hard work. Paul explained that even he worked hard for himself and burdened not the church where he served. He also encouraged helping the poor and sharing in the groups of brethren. He explained to his followers that a brother ought not to suffer lack when God had provided for other people in the same flock. In any case, the Bible emphasizes also the need to give to others with a willing heart. It does not coerce any person into doing so. In the story of Ananias and his wife Sapphira, the couple was killed for giving half-heartedly (Harris, 2011). The couple was rebuked. They were told that it is better not to give than to give without completeness of the heart.

Karl Marx Theory on Human Nature and its Approach to Wealth Inequality

In the school of Karl Marx, human beings are created as producers. They are naturally makers of their own provision through work. Such productivity is dependent on the historical conditions. These conditions affect the very human beings act. According to Marx therefore, the political and social history of a people will determine the current situation of a people.

Furthermore, it will also affect the decisions they make. The thought of Marx followed previous French Enlightenments with the thought that men are not

perfect. Even so they were imperfect, it was believed that they could be made perfect through government. This government would serve the purpose of regulating matters between the members of the society. It would ensure a useful flow of resources among members of the society and consequently the state of wealth distribution. According to Karl Marx, it is owning societal wealth communally that would ensure a reasonable distribution among members of a society. Through communal wealth, the government would also gain power and be in a position to control the society (Harris, 2011). The belief that human beings were imperfect implied that such power would allow the government to aid their adjustment to living as a society through influencing social behaviour by resources. Consequently, human beings would hold the government in awe and produce according to the outlined provision.

My position on the topic on wealth inequality

Based on my personal thought, wealth inequality emanates from the irrational behaviours that human have. From the rationalist point of view, humans are beings with rational minds, which can allow humans to control their spiritedness, aggression, and appetites. However, the fact that humans have turned to become irrational creatures hinders the development of rational thoughts that are based on reasoning (Harris, 2011). Instead self-centeredness resulting from appetite, aggression, and spiritedness is the main factor that guides the manner in which humans operate. This have offered a platform that encourages the occurrence of wealth inequalities across various settings all over the globe.

Deductively, there are various features associated with human nature, which explain the scope of wealth inequality. More importantly, human beings have ego, which exists in an individual's physical body. Ego as a feature of human nature is conscious and rational and guides human behaviour in a number of ways. Many at times, humans being have the belief that ego is the sole determinant of their destiny. In addition, human beings tend to have the notion that their ego is continuous and can exist even after death. As a result, people often strive to satisfy their ego; hence, resulting in a society where selfishness in the order of the day. It is as a result of such selfishness that the society has and continues to experienced wealth inequality. As people strive to satisfy their ego, they engage in unhealthy competition, which result in the division of people in the society on the basis of their social class. This analysis explains my view regarding wealth inequality as an eminent concern in the society.

Conclusion

References

Harris, F. (2011). *The Ascent of Man: A Philosophy of Human Nature*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Rousseau, J. (2007). *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. S. I.: Filiquarian Pub., LLC.

Santas, G. (2010). *Understanding Plato's Republic*. Chichester, West Sussex, U. K: Wiley-Blackwell.