

For the wise man must not be ordered but must order, and he must not obey another, but the less wise must obey him.

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*

In Aristotle's "Politics" we can see the model of true and perverted states, through which we are able to link how the wise men can affect the rest of the society, either using justly or succumbing to the pressure of the masses or their own selfish desires. In Aristotle's world of ancient Greece we can see all of his state archetypes rising and falling, showing us to some degree how they function in practice and why it is important for the wise men to maintain order. Prime example would be the Athenian democracy, now a fallen juggernaut in Aristotle's lifetime, once the most affluent city in classical Greece. While under the leadership of general Pericles, democracy managed to flourish with little to no corruption with a sense of unity that he brought. But after Pericles fell to plague, democracy slowly fell apart, culminating with Socrates' death sentence caused by the public outrage, later met with bitter feelings of regret for letting such rash and senseless action take place.

Democracy is with reason a perverted state according to Aristotle as it is a double edged sword, while it provides a sense of unity and equality, it mixes in the wise and the less wise as equals and causes senseless decisions to be taken under influence of charismatic leaders that can either guide the people or abuse their trust, or just let the majority simply choose the most obvious course of action with little to no thought how it would affect the greater scheme of things in the long run.

Here we already have a dilemma, should we let the majority decide even if they are wrong and it would harm them in the end, but have the needed numbers to say it is the will of people, or let the sensible minority decide for the greater good, even if it would cause a public outrage and deny the right of majority to decide? Such was the case when Athens got an abundance of silver and had an assembly to decide how to divide properly this enormous influx of wealth. Most of the citizens were in favour of dividing it equally among the city folk, but admiral Themistocles wanted to invest it into a new Athenian navy, even if it wasn't a popular decision. Later on this investment saved Athens in Persian war as people of Athens were now well prepared to take on Persian fleet at battle of Salamis with its now experienced and well equipped naval force, all thanks to Themistocles' long term investment, if they had simply gave out the silver they'd only have more coin to offer to Persians to plunder and this thriving democracy would perish.

Of course there was a fear of powerful individuals taking over the democracy, hence the practice of ostracism was introduced to banish the unwanted temporarily to avert political crisis. But this also indicates that there was already a sense of instability and commoners felt as if they were under the threat of pretentious aristocrats, giving the rise to populist leaders that would later on dismantle democracy and reinforce oligarchy, yet another one of Aristotle's perverted systems, lead by men of great wealth, but not necessarily the greatest wisdom, the lack of which would eventually lead to its downfall, this usually led to rise of tyranny, completing this loop of perverted states or reverting back to the democracy, as it was the case with Athens, at least temporarily.

So here we have a fragile balance between rule of commoners and sly individuals trying to either preserve the system or abuse it to gain more power. It ends up with the herd mentality where they choose the shepherd that is either a messianic figure or a disguised wolf stalking his prey, it is only a matter of time before the populus is torn apart.

Such is the danger of wise men abusing their knowledge for their own personal gains at the cost of the state, causing unrest and mistrust, to this present day. This creates the need for some sort of control and

power limitation to be enforced, as seen in constitutional governments, where the state representatives are elected for limited terms, both appeasing the mass and giving the executive power to the leaders, but the wise still depend from public opinion to get elected, hence they still need to obey the less wise to some extent, but the overall stability is achieved this way. Still, what is the real cost for this stability? It is only a matter of time before we have the incompetent trying to reach power, by false promises and honed words to appease the majority, and once again we reach the majority, and once again we reach the cheap populism with all the transparency needed to simplify things down so that even the people with smallest interest in wellbeing of the state could say that they have a decent grip on politics. Such a state only ends up with a whole lot of blind people that are led to over and over thinking that they are doing good while they are harming their community instead. Sensible individuals slowly start avoiding the ever more hostile bureaucracy where nepotism takes over with no regard to the meritocracy that should be implemented to choose the most able individuals to lead. Instead people of any real worth are pushed out as they are seen as an existential threat to the weak that have taken over the leadership. Here we end up with the most apocalyptic scenario where the wise are totally subdued to the feeble minded megalomaniacs drunken with the power they can't comprehend.

The wise can now only watch the community further rot in false sense of security, being shunned as naysayers and agitators against the glorious regime. Ignorance is a bliss and it is easier for the herd to not put its mind on such matters that require additional responsibilities and avoid more stress from it. Instead of the wise taking care of the wellbeing of the rest, now everybody is caring for the egos of the chosen few despotic oligarchs.

To put it simply, people want to live easier, not better, thus there is a need for wise men willing to take on themselves the burden of leadership to provide for others that luxury of easy carefree life, but with all the conformity that we are used to, the number of such people is ever decreasing as most of us are discouraged from stepping up and taking responsibilities and it leaves open space for the greed and hubris to take over when it would have been pushed out if there was a healthy sense of responsibility in the community. As the state of such society further deteriorates it is only a matter of time when it will collapse, a final chance to restore order, to teach the people how to rule and not how to be ruled. The real slaves are not ones forced to serve their masters as they can still have the free spirit, with sufficient wisdom and ability one can break out of such bondage, but the broken spirit will forever be bound to serve its master.

Of course a system led only by wise people is idealistic and unachievable. We can only strive to maintain the balance between those truly benevolent and altruistic, and those opportunistic and willing to abuse their abilities to corrupt society for their own gains. Yet the worst in my opinion are the silent bystanders, those that can acknowledge problems, opposite to the ignorant ones that never get out of their cave to see the light, those that lack the spine to act and consciously suffer until it's too late to mend the wounds they have caused by their indecisiveness. So it is of utmost importance to try to integrate everyone into the society to preserve the order and understand everyone's needs, else we'll end up with ruthless despots or meek puppets.

Not everyone wants to rule and some will simply want to go with the flow of events rather than to try and control it, and we should respect that as the true wisdom is in knowing ourselves and what we are capable of, stepping down when we are not up to the task and not being selfish when our abilities are needed. This is the nature of Aristotle's obedience, to simply be able to acknowledge our abilities and do not disrupt the order once it is properly established, but alas, the human nature would never allow us to do so, as some would always rather bring everyone down with themselves instead of letting others succeed where they could not. In the end we have this complex system where we need to balance out the sometimes unpredictable human nature, our personal desires and sense for the wellbeing of our society.