

# Lesson #3: The Apology

Thursday, January 15, 2015 4:14 PM

Socrates argues in front of 501 jurors.

- Extreme arrogance
- He never accepted pay for his teachings
- Sincerity is key
- Must be sincere for truth

Meletus puts Socrates on trial.

- Socrates shows that Meletus is insincere
- Because he is not sincere, no truth will be the result of this trial

3 part argument in showing what philosophy actually is (against Meletus): CROSS EXAMINATION

1. 24b-25c Cross-examining: Yes/No questioning (Sophistic method)
  - Incapable of helping someone, while everyone else can
2. 25c-26b
  - Does anyone want to be harmed?
  - Why would he harm anyone?
  - Argument: Wicked people hurt people, he would not do this, because it would potentially harm himself.
  - Either don't harm the youth or he does not know that he is corrupting the youth (unwillingly)
3. 26d-28a
  - He makes Meletus confirm two different statements, which are not compatible with each other
    - a. Meletus states that Socrates is an atheist
    - b. Meletus states that Socrates introduces new spirits to the city, which means that he believes in spiritual things.

- He characterises him in 2 ways (1) Atheist and (2) spiritual man. Catches Meletus in a contradiction.
  - Cant be both.
  - Socrates: Meletus does not know what he is talking about.
    - No idea how he can harm someone
    - Accusing him of 2 contradictory things
  - Meletus is not interested in the Truth or Justice
- Plato shows us how Socrates was not a Sophist.  
Vindication of a philosophical life.

What comes from this?

- 28b-30b
  - Provides a new foundation for tradition values
  - Socrates has no fear of death (neither thus Achilles)
    - Warrior persona
    - Justification of courage
    - "not afraid of death, because he does not know what/how it is (after life)"
    - Defence of conventional values based upon reason, justified rationally.
    - Does not know what to fear (unconventional hero)
- Political, what comes from it?
  - Socrates says:
    - If you want a good life (moral life), you will lead a private life.
      - Someone who leads this life, will be misunderstood by society, will risk death
  - He is challenging the Status Quo to try a provide a better foundation for it [Philosophy]
- Politics and philosophy are compatible: when they [political institutions] are arranged to pursue the truth then politics and justice are compatible.

## In the Text (Apology):

- What is the relationship between democracy and truth?
  - Plato suggests that democracy can be compatible with philosophy, under certain circumstances.
1. IF Philosopher, keep to yourself
  2. Need to pursue in a private life (Not in public affairs, because not true)

So when is philosophy and democracy compatible?

- When politics makes space for the pursuit for truth, then there is a possible compatibility
- When people are purposely deliberating towards the truth.

! Socrates is accused on :

1. Official charges
  - Introduces new Gods to the city
    - He does not refute (defend) himself
    - He tells them that he has a spiritual voice who speaks to him
    - Thus, he proves this point. AND he refers to the Dog (an Egyptian God)
    - He makes it seem suspect
  - Corrupting the youth
    - ★ ○ Strong causal statement: Ideas directly cause behaviour
      - The Youth have no autonomy
      - To what extent do ideas influence individuals?
    - Socrates says:
      - He blows it off: not responsible for what they do
      - Young people find it entertaining that he makes fun off others (elders)
2. Unofficial charges
  - Being unpopular
    - People don't like what he does/ says
    - Proves people are unwise

- Pissed off at me for insulting you in public
- Socrates has a special calling

Next step of his argument: What do I do as a philosopher?

Does that while cross-examining Meletus.

★ Strong causal statement: Ideas directly cause behaviour