

# Summary of plato's "protection of socrates"

[Profession](#), [Philosophers](#)



Plato's "Protection of Socrates" takes after the preliminary of Socrates, for charges of misguidance of the young. His opponent, Meletus, claims he is doing as such by instructing the young of Athens of a different otherworldliness from that which was generally acknowledged. Socrates' contention was one of a kind in that he endeavored to persuade the jury he was only a normal man and not to be dreaded, but rather, in reality, exhibited how sharp and persevering he was. In view of his stoic impression of death, he offers an absurd counter-proposition: the first being free suppers for him in the Prytaneum. Somewhat later, his supporters persuade him to settle on a direct fine of 30 minas. His thinking for proposing such silly counter-punishments is that since he feels demise would be great, he has no motivation to subject himself to a far more terrible destiny, for example, oust.

Socrates proceeds to decline to change his courses with a specific end goal to keep away from death for two reasons. The first being that he believes he is taking the necessary steps of the divine beings, and the second, that what he does advances a larger amount of thought and astuteness; changing his ways would conflict with the essentials Athens was based upon. It was a totally bad idea to throw these types of arguments in the court which was indicating he was trying to be blunt and not thinking straight. The counter-argument he should have presented that would lead to his acquittal will be discussed, and will examine how this acquittal will not be consistent with Socrates in his views of life mission. He starts his argument, with a tale of his visit to the Oracle of Delphi, which disclosed to him that there was no man more intelligent than he. He, being as modest as he seems to be, couldn't

underestimate the Oracle's answer and approached addressing Athenians he felt outperformed his insight. The arguments can be raised in a well-thought manner not just bluntly, his first argument has given the impression of a sense of superiority which gave a negative impact of his personality to the court.

Meletus says that Socrates is the individual in Athens who is in charge of the debasement of the adolescent. However, it is crazy to state that just Socrates misguide the young. This infers every other person helps the young. Be that as it may, similarly as there are few pony trainers, so there are rare sorts of people who are in a situation to truly "prepare" the young. What's more, as opposed to what Meleteus affirms, Socrates is one of these coaches. Who might deliberately degenerate the young? In the event that Socrates deliberately hurt the young, at that point they would hurt him. Also, no normal individual intentionally hurts himself.

However, in the event that he hurt the young unintentionally, at that point he ought to be taught not rebuffed. If Socrates get acquitted from the allegations it does not change his life missions, he had a staunching stance in the matter and none conviction can change that. Socrates proceeds to reject changing his life with a specific end goal to stay away from death. He believes he is taking the necessary steps of the divine beings, and the second being that what he does advances a more elevated amount of thought and intelligence; changing his ways would conflict with the basics Athens was based upon.

Anyway, Socrates does not fear death. He assumes that demise could mean a hereafter that rewards the individuals who are great and since he believes he has been a decent individual, passing would be welcoming. His other hypothesis is that demise measures up to non-presence, which in all likelihood looks like a profound rest. So both of these final products are not deserving of being dreaded.