I. TEORETYCZNE I METODOLOGICZNE ZAGADNIENIA BEZPIECZEŃSTWA

ETHICS, POLITICS AND SECURITY BEFORE PLATO. AN OVERVIEW

Piotr LIZAKOWSKI

Akademia Marynarki Wojennej

Marcin MALISZEWSKI

Akademia Marynarki Wojennej

Abstract. The concept of security can be traced back to the culture of ancient Greece. Classical philosophers from that period matched the problem of security with considerations on ethics, politics as well as good and happy life. Authors of this paper characterize selected elements which constitute the notion of security according to Heraclitus of Ephesus, Hippias of Elis, Socrates, Democritus, Antisthenes of Athens, Aristippus of Cyrene and discuss the most significant differences between them.
Keywords: The Presocratics, Socrates, minor Socratic schools, classical ethics, security.

Introduction

Ancient thinkers frequently addressed the subject of security with reference to individuals, social groups and states. It is obvious that all social problems at that time were different from the contemporary ones. For this reason all views and contentions should be interpreted in their historical context, taking into account, among others, the nature of the dangers as well as the social system of those times. Nonetheless, many of considerations should be acknowledged as valid until the present day. It concerns, for instance, the questions of polemology (war studies) and irenology (peace studies). W. Pokruszyński indicates that scientific enquiry of polemology and irenology must always be handled in a responsible and considered manner, because there is a real danger of justifying extreme positions like pacifism or militarism [1].

Ancient philosophical thought with regard to the concept of security cannot be narrowed down exclusively to considerations concerning questions of war and peace. It dealt with the essence and nature of man, reality as such, role of man in society, man's obligations towards the state and family, as well as many other crucial practical and

[1] W. Pokruszyński, *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki Euroregionalnej im. Alcide de Gasperi w Józefowie, Józefów 2013, s. 22.

theoretical questions. During analysing selected statements of ancient philosophers on security one should take into account the process of emergence of social and natural sciences from philosophy and the fact that the subject matter of philosophy of security is inseparably linked to other philosophical disciplines like, for example, philosophy of politics, axiology, ethics, metaphysics and methodology. Every philosophical statement flows from a specific situation, takes account of the current needs and is directed to the particular recipient or a vast group of recipients.

Pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli – says famous Latin expression. It means that every book has its own "internal" fates and that there are as many of them as there are readers of the book. While every reading it becomes a different book according to the reader's capacity. It seems necessary to remember how much our understanding of old philosophical doctrines depends on our efforts to reconstruct them. Another problem is whether our final interpretation is consistent with the intentions of their authors. A galaxy of ancient philosophers dealing in their works with different aspects of security is very wide. In fact, almost every one of them took into consideration questions connected with security. In this article only the following philosophers will be presented: Heraclitus of Ephesus, Hippias of Elis, Socrates, Democritus, Antisthenes of Athens and Aristippus of Cyrene. For those who have sufficient expertise in doctrines of ancient philosophers there is little doubt that their heritage, despite the elapse of time, remains timely and constitutes grounds for modern scientific research and scientific activities in many fields of knowledge. However, we should not feel relieved of further investigations, asking questions or putting into doubt the assumptions we made before[2].

Heraclitus of Ephesus

Heraclitus (fl. c. 500 B.C.) was of distinguished parentage. His native Ephesus was a prominent city of Ionia, the Greek-inhabited coast of Asia Minor, but was subject to Persian rule in his lifetime. According to one account, he inherited the honorific title and office of "king" of the Ionians, which he resigned to his brother. He is generally considered to have favoured aristocratic government as against democracy, based on his own political observations. He formulated a doctrine of the mingling of opposites. According to his belief, in strife opposites combine to produce a motion which is harmony. There is unity in the world, but it is a unity resulting from diversity. Nevertheless there would be no unity if there were not opposites to combine. Heraclitus endorsed a single source or *archè* of natural substances, namely fire. But he also observed that natural transformations necessarily involve contraries such as hot and cold, wet and dry. Indeed, without the one contrary the other would not exist, and without contraries the cosmos would not exist. Hence strife is justice

[2] B. Russell, *The Problems of Philosophy*, Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 7-8.

and war is the father and king of all. In the conflict of opposites there is a hidden harmony that sustains the world, symbolized by the tension of a bow or the attunement of lyre[3]. The characteristic feature of such a world is perpetual change and that is something Heraclitus believed in: "You cannot step twice into the same river; for fresh waters are ever flowing in upon you"[4]. We may assume that for this Ionian philosopher security is a desire for a refuge from danger. But is there something everlasting, indestructible, which can resist the power of time? Heraclitus himself, for all his belief in change, answered the question briefly: fire. In his philosophy fire never dies: "the world was ever, is now, and shall be, an ever-living Fire"[5]. The existence of material world and every single finite human life should be protected in order to enable change which is necessary for life to carry on. In political theory he maintained that one good man is worth ten thousand ordinary. He criticized his fellow citizens for banishing a distinguished leader: "The Ephesians would do well to hang themselves, every grown man of them, and leave the city to beardless lads; for they have cast out Hermodorus, the best man among them, saying, 'We will have none who is best among us; if there be any such, let him be so elsewhere and among others'." Evidently he trusted the few and distrusted the many. Although Heraclitus is not known to have had students, his writings seem to have been influential from an early time. Democritus echoed many of Heraclitus' ethical pronouncements in his own ethics. Follower of Heraclitus, Cratylus brought Heraclitus' philosophy to Athens, where Plato heard it. The Stoics used Heraclitus' physics as the inspiration for their own, understanding him to advocate a periodic destruction of the world by fire, followed by a regeneration of the world. Ever since Plato, Heraclitus has been seen as a philosopher of flux. The challenge in interpreting the philosopher of Ephesus has always been to find a coherent theory in his paradoxical utterances.

Hippias of Elis

Hippias (fifth century B.C.) was from Elis, in the Peloponnesus, which used him as an ambassador. He competed at the festival of Olympus with both prepared and extemporaneous speeches. He had a phenomenal memory. Hippias was above all a polymath who claimed he could do anything, including making speeches and clothes. He wrote a book collecting what he regarded as the best things said by others. According to one report, he made a mathematical discovery (the quadratrix, the first curve other than the circle known to the Greeks). In the dialogue "Protagoras", Plato has Hippias contrast nature and custom, which often does violence to nature[6]. Hip-

[3] R. Audi (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001, p. 376.
[4] B. Russell, *History of Western Philosophy*, London, 1974, p. 63.
[5] Ibid., p. 64.
[6] R. Audi (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001, p. 863-864.

pias expressed his view that the major cause of wars is the existence of state borders and the transformation of conflicts between states into conflicts between people[7]. Consequently, the best way to eliminate wars is to remove state borders and to grant "world citizenship" to every man. References to his philosophical enquiries were also made in modern times, for example while constructing security system of the European Union, which constitutes in fact an area without internal borders. In ethics Hippias propounded an ideal of individual self-sufficiency. Plato's evidence in the "Protagoras"[8], together with that of Xenophon in the "The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates"[9], shows that Hippias made free use of the opposition between nature and convention and that he accepted the overriding claim of Nature in cases of conflict. In the "Protagoras", Hippias declares that his listeners are kinsmen, friends, and fellow citizens by Nature because the friendship of like to like comes by Nature, not by convention. In other words the division of the human population into free and slaves, into Greeks and barbarians, into states and nations is a result of *sui generis* social contract [10].

Socrates

Socrates (469-399 B.C.) was born in Athens. He was the teacher of Plato and other famous philosophers. His father was Sophroniscus, a sculptor or stonemason. His mother was a midwife named Phaenarete[11]. Socrates married Xanthippe[12], who is especially remembered for having an undesirable temperament. She bore for him three sons: Lamprocles, Sophroniscus and Menexenus. Socrates combined his philosophical activities with military service[13]. Athenian law required all able bodied males serve as citizen soldiers, on call for duty from ages 18 until 60. According to Plato, Socrates served in the armoured infantry – known as the hoplite – with shield, long spear and face mask. He participated in three military campaigns during the Peloponnesian War, at Delium, Amphipolis, and Potidaea, where he saved the life of Alcibiades, a popular Athenian general. Socrates was known for his courage

7 W. Pokruszyński, *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki Euroregionalnej im. Alcide de Gasperi w Józefowie, Józefów 2013, s. 24-25.

8 Plato, *Protagoras*, Plymouth 2010, 337D, p. 77.

9 Xenophon, *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates*, Oxford 2009, IV, 4, p. 123-127.

10 M.A. Krąpiec (przew. Komitetu Naukowego), *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, t. 4, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2003, s. 496-497.

11 S. Jedynak, J. Kojkoł (red.), *Encyklopedia filozofii wychowania*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Branta, Bydgoszcz 2009, s. 282-283.

12 M.A. Krąpiec (przew. Komitetu Naukowego), *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, t. 9, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2008, s. 88.

13 W. Pokruszyński, *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki Euroregionalnej im. Alcide de Gasperi w Józefowie, Józefów 2013, s. 25.

in battle and fearlessness, a trait that stayed with him throughout his life. After his trial, he compared his refusal to retreat from his legal troubles to a soldier's refusal to retreat from battle when threatened with death. Greek philosophers, before Socrates, were mainly interested in the physical world. Socrates, however, was interested in something quite different. He questioned everything, and taught his students to question everything. He, and they – under his guidance – embarked on a mutual quest not to study what *is* – such as we find in the physical world – but to search for what *ought to be*. Socrates believed that searching for – and finding – truth and justice would help everyone to live a virtuous life. Virtue, said Socrates, depends on wisdom and – together – virtue and wisdom lead to a happy life. For Socrates, being virtuous meant that he would help people in their search for knowledge. If he put the well-being of others before the well-being of himself – as he helped his students search for knowledge – he would actually benefit from his endeavours. Why did he practise philosophy? Because he believed that the world becomes a better place when people are wise. Socrates, in the *Apology*, says: „(…) For I go about doing nothing else than persuading you, both young and old, to take no care either for the body, or for riches, prior to or so much as for the soul, how it may be made most perfect, telling you that virtue does not spring from riches, but riches and all other human blessings, both private and public, form virtue"[14]. Socrates believed that virtue is knowledge and the opposite of virtue, namely vice is ignorance. If virtue is a kind of knowledge, then it can be taught. Socrates engaged in questioning of his students in an unending search for truth. He sought to get to the foundations of his students' and colleagues' views by asking continual questions until a contradiction was exposed, thus proving the fallacy of the initial assumption. This became known as the Socratic Method, and may be Socrates's most enduring contribution to philosophy[15].

In the field of security Socrates has a distinguished record of creating grounds for conceptions of personal and structural security. He pointed to the important role of structural security and, in particular, state's security. Socrates believed that the citizens have moral obligation to fulfil all their responsibilities towards the state even if it would entail the danger of losing life[16]. He said that one should always obey the state, its laws, and its courts of law. Even awaiting unjust death sentence in prison, when offered by his friends an opportunity to escape, Socrates refused claiming that state laws should be obeyed: „(…) if it sends one out to battle there to be wounded or slain, this must be done; for justice so requires, and one must not give way, or retreat, or leave one's post; but that both in war and in a court of justice, and everywhere one must do what one's city and country enjoin, or persuade it in such

14 Plato, *The Apology of Socrates*, Oxford 2009, 17, p. 22.

15 L. Kołakowski, *O co nas pytają wielcy filozofowie. Trzy serie*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2008, s. 8-11.

16 I.F. Stone, *Sprawa Sokratesa*, Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo, Poznań 2003, s. 26-29.

manner as justice allows; but that no offer violence either to one's mother or father is not holy, much less to one's country (…)"[17]. Here is a similar testimony: „(…) He chose rather to die in an exact observance of the laws, than to save his life by acting contrary to them (…)"[18]. Socrates made a point of saying that he *never took part* in the *politics* of Athens and *never* held office except for a single occasion in his long *life. This does not mean that his teaching did not concern politics*[19]*. Undoubtedly, he aimed at forming virtuous citizens who could be characterized by the following personal qualities: temperance, internal freedom and autarkia*[20]*. Such people would be able to take care of public affairs in the best way possible. According to Plato, Socrates stated that a "good politician" can only be a person who is morally excellent and has his mind always fixed upon this, how to implant justice in the souls of the citizens and eradicate injustice, to engender self-control and extirpate self-indulgence, to engender all other virtue and remove all vice*[21].

Democritus

Democritus (c. 460-c.370 r. B. C.) was born at Abdera. It is known that he travelled widely in the ancient world in search of knowledge, visiting not only Athens but Egypt, Persia, the Red Sea, possibly Ethiopia, and even India. Scholars also agree that he lived a very long life of between 90 and 109 years. Democritus was a contemporary of Socrates and the Sophists[22]. Because he lived in the times od Socrates, that is the beginning of moral philosophy, much of his attention was directed to ethics. One central idea of his ethics is that the soul must control the desires, bodily and otherwise, and that the goal of life is contentment, well-being and serenity[23]. Democritus writes like this: "Happiness does not dwell in flocks or gold; it is the soul which is the home of a person's soul"[24]. He also calls it *euthumia* and says that it consists in distinguishing and discriminating pleasures, and that this is the finest and most advantageous thing for humans. Democritus believed that human nature is not fixed or determinate, but can be reformed by teaching and reasoning: "Medicine heals diseases of the body, but wisdom removes the sufferings of the soul", "Nature and teaching are nearly like. For teaching also reforms the person, and by reform-

[17] Plato, *Crito*, Oxford 2009, 12, p. 46.
[18] Xenophon, *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates*, Oxford 2009, IV, 4, p. 122.
[19] F. Copleston, *Historia filozofii. Tom I. Grecja i Rzym*, Warszawa 1998, s. 128-129.
[20] Autarkia, ancient Greek term meaning „self-sufficiency". Autarkia was widely regarded as a mark of the human good, happiness (Eudaimonia). A life is self-sufficient when it is worthy of choice and lacks nothing. What makes a life self-sufficient – and thereby happy – was a matter of controversy. For more details please refer to: R. Audi (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001, p. 62.
[21] Plato, *Gorgias*, London 1864, 504D, p. 98.
[22] Diogenes Laertios, *Żywoty i poglądy słynnych filozofów*, Warszawa 1984, IX, 7, s. 535.
[23] Ch. Bobonich (Editor), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics*, Cambridge 2017, p. 21-22.
[24] D.W. Hudson, *Happiness and the Limits of Satisfaction*, London 1996, p. 66.

ing it produces a nature", "The senseless are formed by the gains of luck, but those who are experienced in these things by the gains of wisdom"[25]. It seems that what Democritus had on mind was a limited transformation from one kind of human being to another, that is a change of personality or character.

Democritus recommended mastering the art of politics as most important, and undertaking its tasks, from which significant and magnificent benefits are obtained for the people: „We ought to regard the interests of the state as of far greater moment than all else, in order that they may be administered well; and we ought not to engage in eager rivalry in despite of equity, nor arrogate to ourselves any power contrary to the common welfare. For a state well administered is our greatest safeguard. In this all is summed up: When the state is in a healthy condition all things prosper; when it is corrupt, all things go to ruin"[26]. When analysing his statements on politics we should always keep in mind that he lived in the times of the Great Peloponnesian War (431-404 B.C.) fought between two leading city-states in ancient Greece, Athens and Sparta. Each stood at the head of alliances that, between them, included nearly every Greek city-state. The fighting engulfed virtually the entire Greek world, and it was the biggest and the longest of wars that ancient Greeks ever fought. During this conflict, lasting over quarter of a century, almost one tenth of the Greek population perished. Heavy loss of life, enormous material damage and havoc in the minds and hearts of many caused by the unprecedented escalation of cruelty left their mark on later history of Greece. Therefore it was not unusual that Democritus, as an eye-witness of atrocities, perceived feuds and civil wars as particularly ominous and disastrous. He considered civil war an evil that befalls both the winners and losers[27]. A state torn apart by injustices and internal conflicts becomes an easy prey for the external enemies. Thus Democritus concludes: "The greatest undertakings are carried through by means of concord: there is no other way"[28]. In his political views, Democritus was a defender of democracy and of the equalitarian principle of society, but only for the free citizens of *polis*. He believed so much in the superiority of democracy so as to declare: "Poverty in a democracy is as much preferable to prosperity under a despot as is freedom to slavery"[29]. A society functioning upon democratical principles, for Democritus, will be prosperous only if its citizens, and mainly the rich ones, show an altruistic behaviour. He underlined the importance of mutual aid to integrate society: "When the powerful champion the poor and render them service and kindness, the men are not left desolate but become fellows and

[25] Zob. G. Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej. Tom I. Od początków do Sokratesa*, Lublin 1999, s. 202.
[26] M. Gagarin, P. Woodruff, *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists*, Cambridge University Press 2003, p. 157.
[27] J. Dillery, *Xenophon and the History of his Times*, London 1995, p. 52.
[28] A. Krokiewicz, *Sokrates. Etyka Demokryta i hedonizm Arystypa*, Warszawa 2000, s. 209.
[29] H.W. Spiegel, *The Growth of Economic Thought*, London 1991, p. 14.

defend one another"[30]. The altruistic behaviour of individuals is shown through the assistance which the strong and rich men offer to the weak and poor. According to Democritus, this behaviour can be strengthened by the increase of friendship among the citizens. Besides, he stressed that "as cheerfulness is the ideal for the individual, so homonoia is that of the state"[31]. Homonoia is "oneness of mind". It brings together unrelated groups, including *polis*[32]. The continuation of an existing homonoia among the citizens of a state required, as Democritus says, is a moderate and not extreme economic inequality among citizens. Democritus believed that one of the conditions of public security is the existence of private ownership since in his writings he declared that: "Toil is sweeter than idleness, when men gain what they toil for or when they know that they will use it"[33]. As B. Gordon mentions, according to Democritus "a society, organized in terms of private ownership of resources, will enjoy economic superiority over one where communal ownership prevails. The possibility of private ownership lends the stronger incentive for productive activity"[34]. Aristotle, following the steps of Democritus, became a defender of private ownership[35]. Plato also – while in his earlier work "The Republic"[36] was against the existence of private property – in his later work "Laws"[37] changed his mind and accepted the existence of private property but only to the extent of producing the necessary goods for living, namely, for a moderate material life.

Antisthenes of Athens

Antisthenes of Athens (c.445-c.360 B.C.). He fought bravely on the battle of Tanagra and claimed that he would not have been so courageous if he had been born of two Athenians instead of an Athenian and a Thracian slave. He studied with Gorgias, but later became a close companion of Socrates and was present at Socrates' death. Antisthenes was proudest of his wealth, although he had no money, because he was satisfied with what he had and he could live in whatever circumstances he found himself[38]. Diogenes Laertius in the "Lives of the Eminent Philosophers", describing Antisthenes' biography, says: "He was said to be not legitimately born. And

[30] Ibid.
[31] T. Sinclair, *A History of Greek Political Thought*, London 1967, p. 65.
[32] See: *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (in:) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah17203/abstract (access: 25th November 2017).
[33] H.W. Spiegel, *The Growth of Economic Thought*, London 1991, p. 13-14.
[34] B. Gordon, *Economic Analysis before Adam Smith: Hesiod to Lessius*, London, 1975, p. 14.
[35] See: Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Cambridge 2004, 1134b, p. 92-93; Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Cambridge 2014, 1361a, p. 19-20.
[36] Plato, *The Republic*, London 2003, 417 d-e, p. 119; 543A-C, p. 276.
[37] Plato, *The Laws of Plato*, The University of Chicago Press 1988, 679b-e, p. 63.
[38] R. Audi (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001, p. 200.

this is also why he said to someone who reproached him, 'Also the mother of gods is Phrygian'. For he was believed to be from a Thracian mother"[39]. Antisthenes heredity and legal status at Athens are often considered a primary explanation for his rejection of Athenian custom and authority as well as his bent for personal independence.

Antisthenes admired in Socrates mostly the independence of his character which allowed him to act in accordance with his convictions irrespective of the circumstances. He learnt from Socrates how to manage emotions. Antisthenes used to say: "I would go mad rather than have pleasure"[40]. Antisthenes preached that virtue is knowledge, it is sufficient for happiness, can be taught and is not inherent, adding that only those who are virtuous qualify as noble. He added that virtue is a successful culmination of good deeds. Thus, a wise person is self-sufficient, content and happy. Socrates was convinced of legitimacy of Athenian political system and fairness of its laws whereas Antisthenes negated historical and traditional city-state, despised public opinion, adherence to conventional, standardized codes of expression and conduct as well as rejected traditional religion. He laughed at patriotism. Antisthenes propounded that the laws of virtue, which allow for persons to be gauged by their actions, should be enforced rather than laws of the land – or those accepted by the population – which aims at punishing violators. The laws of virtue, he believed, would galvanize people into performing good deeds and become wise. Drawing from the abundant sources of Socrates' wisdom Antisthenes totally overlooked the fact that Socrates did not perceive material goods and social recognition as something bad. He simply did not pay much attention to such goods so as to concentrate on achieving a greater good in the shape of true wisdom. Similarly the Socrates' emphasis on ethics Antisthenes transformed into aggressive contempt for sciences and art. Practical consequences of radical interpretation of Anthistenes' teaching were shown by ardent disciple of his, Diogenes of Sinope (c. 400-c.325 B.C.) who continued the emphasis on self-sufficiency and on the soul, but took disregard for pleasure to asceticism. He was the son of disreputable money-changer who had been sent to prison for defacing the coinage. Diogenes came to Athens and took "deface the coinage!" as a motto, meaning that the current standards were corrupt by being defaced and so he refused to live by them. For example, he lived in a wine cask, ate whatever scraps he came across, and wrote approvingly of cannibalism and incest. One story reports that he carried a lighted lamp in broad daylight looking for an honest human, probably intending to suggest that the people he did see were so corrupted that they were no longer really people. He apparently wanted to replace the debased standards of custom with the genuine standards of nature – but nature in the sense of what was minimally required for human life, which an individual

[39] S. Prince, *Antisthenes of Athens. Texts, translations and commentary*, University of Michigan Press, 2015, p. 27.
[40] Ibid., p. 371.

human could achieve, without society. For the above reasons he was called a Cynic, from the Greek word *kuon* (dog), because he was as shameless as a dog[41].

Aristippus of Cyrene

Aristippus (c. 435-c. 360 B.C.) was born in Cyrene, a Greek colony in Northern Africa and According to Plutarch and Diogenes Laertius, as a youth was captivated by the fame of Socrates and moved to Athens to associate with the philosopher. After Socrates's death, Aristippus moved on to establish his own philosophical school, which was later known as Cyrenaic[42]. Undoubtedly he was very different from other followers of Socrates with regard to both style of life as well as philosophical views. Socrates pursued knowledge and virtue. Experiencing pleasure was subordinate to intellect. Aristippus, however believed and taught that the meaning of life was pleasure and that the pursuit of pleasure, therefore, was the noblest path one could dedicate oneself to. He had a completely hedonistic vision of life. "I desire to lead a more quiet and easy life" – he used to say[43]. Aristippus claimed the highest truth one could attain was the recognition that pleasure was the purpose of human existence and the pursuit of bodily pleasure was the meaning of life. But is living in a community for a hedonist really possible? Since it would force hedonist to limit his personal freedom for the purpose of coexisting with other people who have different and divergent objectives as well as ways of achieving happiness, it seems justified well enough to answer in the negative. Aristippus took advantage of his social status and intelligence so as to live easily and comfortably at the expense of other people. While concentrating on the present he completely disregarded potential dangers for *polis* resulting from social inequalities. "Aristippus uses his 'wisdom' as if it was capital producing interest in the shape of present pleasures. It is characteristic that although he is aware of social injustices and very hard living conditions of life in his times, he cunningly takes them for granted and confines himself to taking care of his own pleasures" [44] – notices Adam Krokiewicz.

Aristippus denounced all government. He was not at all interested in being a citizen of *polis*. Neither did he want to govern the city-state nor to be governed by other people. He maintained that taking part in public life does not allow for living a life devoid of worries and concentrated on achieving present pleasures which interested him most. Aristippus was a cosmopolite who loved freedom. In the following words he described his views on citizenship: " 'I can never', said Aristippus, 'consent to be

[41] R. Audi (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001, p. 200.
[42] A. Cameron, N. Gaul, *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, New York 2017, p. 27.
[43] Xenophon, *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates*, Oxford 2009, II, I, p. 39.
[44] A. Krokiewicz, *Sokrates. Etyka Demokryta i hedonizm Arystypa*, Warszawa 2000, s. 258.

a slave; but there is a way between both that leads neither to empire nor subjection, and this is the road to liberty, in which I endeavour to walk, because it is the shortest to arrive at true quiet and repose.' 'If you had said', replied Socrates, 'that this way, which leads neither to empire nor subjection, is a way that leads far from all human society, you would, perhaps, have said something; for how can we live among men, and neither command nor obey? Do you not observe that the mighty oppress the weak, and use them as their slaves, after they have made them groan under the weight of oppression, and given them just cause to complain of their cruel usage, in a thousand instances, both general and particular? And if they find any who will not submit to the yoke, they ravage their countries, spoil their corn, cut down their trees, and attack them, in short, in such a manner that they are compelled to yield themselves up to slavery, rather than undergo so unequal a war? Among private men themselves, do not the stronger and more bold trample on the weaker'? 'To the end, therefore, that this may not happen to me,' said Aristippus, 'I confine myself not to any republic, but am sometimes here, sometimes there, and think it best to be a stranger wherever I am' "[45]. It seems that Aristippus did not observe the fact that living outside of a state may also not be truly safe and, consequently, happy. Instead of longed-for pleasure it may bring the opposite, suffering. Socrates pointed out that somebody who is not a citizen of any state is treated like a "*(…) wretch who preys on the properties of others*"[46]. At the same time he believed that one of the major tasks of the state's authorities was to ensure security of their citizens[47]. Socrates throughout his whole life was a faithful citizen and died because of his allegiance to Athenian laws. Aristippus claiming that there are no permanent values in life (even "good" or "evil" can be reduced to pleasure and pain), decided to care only for himself and his sensual pleasures. He deliberately dispensed with living in an authentic community, denying himself of all the goods which are inseparably linked to such a life.

Conclusions

The considerations on the concept of security in Greek philosophical thought before Plato are very engaging but still difficult to be summarized synthetically. The difficulties are due to a number of factors. For one thing, there are particular historical, civilizational, cultural, legal and political circumstances of Greece at the time. Although they are very interesting, taking a closer look at them goes beyond the object of this paper. Another factor that complicates correct assessment is, quite different from our contemporary, understanding of the concept of the state, its institutions and relation combining citizens with the state of their birth and domicile. Likewise,

[45] Xenophon, *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates*, Oxford 2009, II, I, p. 39.
[46] Ibid., p. 40.
[47] Ibid.

in this area finding a proper context demands profound and more systematic research. A very important issue in all enquiries on man and his security within a state is the concept of man we assume as well as understanding of man as such. In all these respects, Heraclitus of Ephesus, Hippias of Elis, Socrates, Democritus, Antisthenes of Athens, Aristippus of Cyrene do not agree with one another. However each and every of them, despite dissenting views, noted a significant role of security in the lives of the individual and the state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Cambridge 2004.

[2] Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, Cambridge 2014.

[3] Audi R. (General Editor), *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Cambridge 2001.

[4] Bobonich Ch. (Editor), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Ethics*, Cambridge 2017.

[5] Cameron A., Gaul N., *Dialogues and Debates from Late Antiquity to Late Byzantium*, New York 2017.

[6] Copleston F., *Historia filozofii. Tom I. Grecja i Rzym*, Warszawa 1998.

[7] Dillery J., *Xenophon and the History of his Times*, London 1995.

[8] Diogenes Laertios, *Żywoty i poglądy słynnych filozofów*, Warszawa 1984.

[9] The Encyclopedia of Ancient History (in:) http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah17203/abstract (access: 25th November 2017).

[10] Gagarin M., Woodruff P., *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists*, Cambridge University Press 2003.

[11] Gordon B., *Economic Analysis before Adam Smith: Hesiod to Lessius*, London 1975.

[12] Hudson D.W., *Happiness and the Limits of Satisfaction*, London 1996.

[13] Jedynak S., Kojkoł J. (red.), *Encyklopedia filozofii wychowania*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Branta, Bydgoszcz 2009.

[14] Kołakowski L., *O co nas pytają wielcy filozofowie. Trzy serie*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2008.

[15] Krąpiec M.A. (przew. Komitetu Naukowego), *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, t. 9, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2008.

[16] Krąpiec M.A. (przew. Komitetu Naukowego), *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii*, t. 4, Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu, Lublin 2003.

[17] Krokiewicz A., *Sokrates. Etyka Demokryta i hedonizm Arystypa*, Warszawa 2000.

[18] Plato, *The Apology of Socrates*, Oxford 2009.

[19] Plato, *Crito*, Oxford 2009.

[20] Plato, *Gorgias*, London 1864.

[21] Plato, *The Laws of Plato*, The University of Chicago Press 1988.

[22] Plato, *Protagoras*, Plymouth 2010.

[23] Plato, *The Republic*, London 2003.

[24] Pokruszyński W., *Filozofia bezpieczeństwa*, Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki Euroregionalnej im. Alcide de Gasperi w Józefowie, Józefów 2013.

[25] Prince S., *Antisthenes of Athens. Texts, translations and commentary*, University of Michigan Press 2015.

[26] Reale G., *Historia filozofii starożytnej. Tom I. Od początków do Sokratesa*, Lublin 1999.

[27] Russell B., *The Problems of Philosophy*, Oxford University Press 1997.

[28] Russell B., *History of Western Philosophy*, London 1974.

[29] Sinclair T., *A History of Greek Political Thought*, London 1967.

[30] Spiegel H.W., *The Growth of Economic Thought*, London 1991.

[31] Stone I.F., *Sprawa Sokratesa*, Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo, Poznań 2003.

[32] Xenophon, *The Memorable Thoughts of Socrates*, Oxford 2009.

ETYKA, POLITYKA I BEZPIECZEŃSTWO PRZED PLATONEM. WPROWADZENIE

Streszczenie. Pojęcie bezpieczeństwa sięga swoimi korzeniami do czasów kultury starożytnej Grecji. Klasyczni filozofowie łączyli zagadnienie bezpieczeństwa z rozważaniami na temat etyki, polityki oraz dobrego i szczęśliwego życia. Autorzy w artykule charakteryzują wybrane elementy składające się na pojęcie bezpieczeństwa występujące w poglądach Heraklita z Efezu, Hippiasza z Elidy, Sokratesa, Demokryta, Antystenesa i Arystypa oraz omawiają najistotniejsze różnice występujące między nimi.
Słowa kluczowe: presokratycy, Sokrates, szkoły sokratyczne mniejsze, etyka klasyczna, bezpieczeństwo.