both works concerned with the project of education
both’s notion of education based on notions about polis/policy

The Philosopher-King vs. the Prince, Forms vs. the Actual

Allegory of Cave
this theatrical benighted world of shadows is our own
how get out of cave? need a guru, teacher, questioner
need to recognize complexity, relative & absolute values
sun of Truth & Good & Forms to be absolute

*Republic*: “It is not the law’s concern to make one group in the city
outstandingly happy but to contrive to spread happiness throughout
the city, by bringing the citizens into harmony with each other by
persuasion or compulsion, and to make them share with each other
the benefits which each group can confer upon the community” (172).

developing ideal republic, ideal leader
*Republic*, cont.

communitarian, good of whole polis at stake
ruler to be disinterested
yet, elitist as well, special class for whom education reserved
knowledge itself is “above,” hierarchical nature of Forms
Being as over & above Becoming
Jeffersonian democracy partly built on distrust of *demos*
after sports, math, geometry, & astronomy, to come dialectic
conversation & dialogue basic to achieving knowledge
dialogue a way of keeping knowledge democratic
yet dialogue here is oddly like a monologue
what is Glaucon other than a yes-man to Socrates?
education in play: experiential models of learning
The Prince

classical examples, but puts equal emphasis on contemporary

“Many authors have constructed imaginary republics and principalities that have never existed in practice and never could; for the gap between how people actually behave and how they ought to behave is so great that anyone who ignores everyday reality in order to live up to an ideal will soon discover he has been taught to destroy himself, not how to preserve himself. . . . So it is necessary for a ruler, if he wants to hold on to power, to learn how not to be good, and to know when it is and when it is not necessary to use this knowledge” (48).

Policy here as more to do with gaining & keeping power, than needs of polis governance also becomes about performance embraces actual, yet that becomes about appearance real kindness & cruelty less important than effective PR

“A ruler need not have all the positive qualities I listed earlier, but he must seem to have them” (55).
**The Prince, cont.**

- pity not useful if it allows disorder to reign
- new ruler especially encouraged to use strategic cruelty
  - social contract of reciprocal interests less important than in not overly oppressing people
- leader must be fox & lion

**Connections to performance**

- Plato’s anti-representationalism (& anti-theatricalism)
  - legacy to Christian Patristic tradition
  - traces in Rousseau & Artaud
  - R: performance as self-dividing
  - A: theatre to violate theatre to achieve truth
  - *MND*: “if we shadows have offended . . .”

**Machiavelli’s new model of politics, also a new model of Man**

- Machiavellian myth: means to fit the ends
  - the malcontent, cynic about human institutions
  - in Shakespeare, Jacobean tragedy particularly
For next time:

*Life is a Dream*, tonight at 8pm, Nitery
Try to read as much as possible before performance

Some questions to consider:
How does Segismundo’s character change over play,
and what does that tell us about how human character is formed?
How are ethics and politics conceived in *Life*?
Is politics motivated by the good of the polis?
By risk-analysis, fitting means to ends?
By conception of duties or rights?
Compare Segismundo’s display of Christian mercy at end to that of Prospero in *The Tempest*:
How do you read in relation to rebel soldier?