

Continuing as there  
are kinds of cities.

[Education](#)



Continuing off of those points, Plato has an argument that cities come to be certain ways because of the ways that the people are as I mentioned before and if that's true then there must be as many kinds of people as there are kind of cities.

Therefore, there are as many kinds of people as there are kinds of cities. This is where I have a problem with Plato's argument. I believe that even if cities have their characteristics because of the type of people that live in them, the number of kinds of cities don't add up to the number of kinds of people. Cities can have mixtures of people. With my argument, I make Plato's second premise deemed false. My thought process for this is that there can be cities that have a variety of people, but it could be people who repeat the same qualities as another city, therefore, the number of cities and people are not equal. For example, if you have three cities; City A, City B, and City C. City A are filled with only nice people, City B is filled with bad people and City C is filled with bad and good people.

This means that there are two kinds of people (bad and good), but only three cities. Therefore, Plato's second premise would be false, making his conclusion false and his argument no longer valid. This argument would be successful against Plato because the reasons above would be valid enough to prove that Plato's second premise would be false. Again, because of the mixture in cities, they can have people who repeat the same qualities over and over again making the number of cities outnumber the kinds of people. The only way that Plato's argument could be real is if each city had a unique aspect and did not repeat characteristics between people.

Take the example I just used, if instead of City C having a mixture of bad and good people, it consists of average people then his theory would be correct, but in most cases, I believe that each city will always have a mixture of people because of characteristics that humans share with one another. In conclusion, throughout my paper, I talked about Republic by Plato and his comments and argument in chapter eight of this book. I answered and explained two of Plato's main questions which were: What is justice? And what leads to democracy? It touched upon some features where Plato's talks about how they help make the city just such as wives must be in common, children and all their education must be in common as well as that sex is only restricted by the rulers. When another is in childbearing years, the rulers can decide who can have sex with who and after they complete that, anything except incest would be allowed. Following the definition of a just city of man, Plato and Socrates listed five cities where he believed each of the cities had their own type of people which made the city how it was such as democratic, tyranny and oligarchic. Plato's argument was as followed: Cities come to be certain ways because of the ways their individual people are. If that's true, then there must be as many kinds of people as there are kinds of cities.

So, there are as many kinds of people as there are kinds of cities. As I mentioned in my paper, I did not agree with his argument and came up with an objection to it and why it would succeed against Plato. My argument was: if you have three cities; City A, City B, and City C. City A are filled with only nice people, City B is filled with bad people and City C is filled with bad and

good people. This means that there are two kinds of people (bad and good), but only three cities.

This argument is fairly straightforward and simple, but it gets to the point that there can be cities that have a mixture of people and that not all cities have as many kinds of people. Making Plato's premise 2 false and his argument no longer valid since the premises do not add up to the conclusion. My objection is strong and although there can be objections against it by many people, I believe that it would withstand them and still be strong enough to be a true threat to Plato's argument because of real-world examples we have today with different kinds of people and the number of cities. Although not every person is the same, they share mutual characteristics or personality traits that enable them to be classified as the same type of person and undermine the fact that there could be fewer people than there are kinds of cities.