

Running head: Although Socrates was a wise Philosopher, he missed several holes in his Moral Intellectualism Doctrine

**Although Socrates was a wise Philosopher, he missed several holes in
his Moral Intellectualism Doctrine**

Johan S. Farfan

Salt Lake Community College

Introduction to Philosophy 1000

March 28th, 2019

Brandon Bowen

Socrates and his Philosophy

When Socrates started his journey searching for the truth, the meaning of life and questioning everything. There is no doubt he was an outstanding intellectual man at the times of the ancient Greece, which is the reason why he noticed that the believes at that time didn't make much sense. Part of his constant questioning of philosophies and theories might be in the base of his moral intellectualism, as he used to study the society that surrounded him, something that helped to build his way of living.

Although Socrates was wise, and most of his teaching were correct, Socrates was wrong about his moral intellectualism.

Moral intellectualism: concepts of Psyche, Techne and Virtue

The Moral intellectualism is founded on other strong beliefs that were present in the ancient Greece.

Life was an abstract concept. One of it's representations, Psyche, was not only involved with breath and spirit, but also with an individual's mind. Thoughts, that transforms into actions reflects a person's soul.

Another concept, Techne, is the application of knowledge. The way it's used with a certain purpose.

Probably the most important thing for a Greek life was Virtue. Virtue represented their moral, a trait of excellence as a result of personal values and principles. Virtue also meant for them doing what is right for personal objectives, leading to achieve greatness.

Other Ideas

Probably the most controversial idea Socrates left was on the phrase “the unexamined life is not worth living.” What does this mean? To start, this idea is strongly related to “know thyself”, or what is known in psychology as introspection. In other words, the lack of self examination of behavior and life moves people to a life that is not worth living.

The unexamined life that becomes “not worthy of living” can be interpreted as a missing of sense of fulfillment or joy, because of the lack of self knowledge. So actions and experiences are vane, for Socrates you might be living a life that you don’t completely enjoy or it is not in harmony with your true self.

Socrates' Reasoning of Moral Intellectualism

In his moral intellectualism Socrates basically states that an individual who is missing knowledge will be driven to a wrong act, just because of the ignorance of that specific matter the individual is facing.

In contrast, having knowledge will prevent falling into wrong acts, only and just because of the knowledge of it. This thinking derives in a couple of important points;

- Someone could behave immoral because the idea of that act is wrong, something is not ok in that person’s mind -Ignorance.

- According to the whole moral intellectualism concept, there is nothing like acting by pure pleasure with negative consequences, or at least not after having a wise mind, free of ignorance.

Moral Intellectualism Holes

Coming from a culture where teachers did not have any fixed concepts of morality or science (the Sophist believed that everything was relative, and the only important thing was power,) was definitely an influence for Socrates to teach -even if he said he wasn't a teacher,- to correct what it was wrong at his time, and to invite people to think critically, fighting the existing ignorance.

Unfortunately, it seems like an excessive focus on ignorance as a main point to develop the moral intellectualism, made him fail questioning his own theory.

Something that Socrates missed is that knowledge or intellect, can also be used just for personal benefit involving bad acting, knowledge doesn't just equal good, they are different concepts and they can be used separated or in combination.

In decision taking involving inappropriate actions there is always a balance of outcomes, this is because -although not everything is relative- what is "good" can be relative. So having the knowledge might not stop someone of taking a bad decision, probably not personally bad but bad for others.

Moral Intellectualism as a philosophy is extremely positivist, to the point of ignoring what the main actors are; humans! How much intellect would take to remove the fallibility of a human being? Even if humans are able to avoid wrong doing just by considering the situation

and results, some behavior is driven by the excess of needs, there are so many factors that intellect by itself could not control.

If this theory were right, weakness of will wouldn't exist. It can be assumed that Socrates, as someone who studied Athenians needed to have a broader sample to study, probably other cultures with other problems and other ways to live. Weaknesses can be situational, but they are always present in every person and not everybody have the same weaknesses.

In cases like weakness and needs omitted by the moral intellectualism, both can be diminished, but they will require more than just pure knowledge and wisdom, because knowledge is not a primary neither a secondary need for anyone to live.

This assumption would not only means that anyone can be wise -which I happen to agree-, but also that humans are able to reach perfection, a term that in it's whole is not applicable to human beings.

References

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Aug 3, 2004) Ancient Ethical Theory. Retrieved from

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-ancient/>

J. M. Ambury (n.d). Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Socrates (469—399 B.C.E.).

Retrieved from <https://www.iep.utm.edu/socrates/>

Wikipedia. Moral Intellectualism. Retrieved from

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_intellectualism

Wikipedia. Socrates. Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socrates#Philosophy>