Plato's And John Ayer's Theories Of Truth: A Comparative Analysis

Plato is an ancient Greek philosopher who is commonly known for the reasoning that he employs in giving out his arguments. Among the famous works of Plato comprises of “Allegory of the Cave” it is in this theory that he presents truth as something deeper than an experience created by our senses(Cohen, 2000) . Plato’s theory is however challenged by John Ayer’s logical positivism theory, in that he believes truth is only achieved through experience which offers verification. In his arguments, Plato states that truth is a property of statements that can only be transcended via sense and experience that can be verified via abstract thinking and reasoning. Plato recognizes that it is essential to employ abstract reasoning when arguing with an individual since it aids us in obtaining a clear sense of experience. Thus, by using this mechanism, an individual will be able to come up with the best decision that will aid in dealing with the situation at hand. The other perspective is based on logical positivism by Ayer. Ayer claims truth to be a property of statements, which can only be verified via sense and experience, which in this context majors on observation and experiments (Cohen, 2000).

Ayer’s approach to truth is stated to contrast with Plato’s. According to Ayer’s approach to the aspect of reality, it is perceived that Platonist’s approach seems to be way outside the ideal standard of truth. Ayer sees the sense of experience to be the only correct standard of truth and that individuals should adopt this measure in their arguments. Based on this analysis, it is evident that Ayer has opened up a possibility of there being more than one accurate description that can be applied in the context of the description of reality (Cohen, 2000). He states that as long as the manner of depicting reality works for the purposes at hand, it, therefore, portrays that it qualifies as accurate. Thus, this implies that scientists inhibit a unique way of describing reality for their purposes based on applied experiences.

Based on the analysis of the two statements, it is evident that they correspond with one another. Both comments portray a quest on the aspects that correspond to the truth. According to Plato, truth is stated to have to correspond to the aspect of abstract thinking and reasoning. Ayer, on the other hand, says that truth ought to correspond to observation and experiments. The two statements also portray reality ranks for individuals. In the context of Plato’s arguments, ultimate reality tends to be the transcendent forms (Cohen, 2000). However, Ayer mentions it to be an empirically verifiable fact. The two philosophers caption truth as a static relationship to ideas that results in external reality. Thus, this implies that it is better to think over an issue based on experience before engaging in delicate actions.

Both arguments are essential in that they try to drive out a point on the need to employ the aspect of truth in the making of decisions. However, based on my analysis, I perceive Plato’s argument to inhibit much power over Ayer’s. In his argument, he points out that critical thinking is an essential aspect in that it creates a different exposure to an individual. Thus, this makes it easier to engage in the best actions when it comes to the making of decisions without being affected by peers. However, Ayer, on the other hand, claims it to be a property of experiences that can be made through observation and experience. Thus, this implies that it majors on the opinions of other individuals who may not always be right.