

# Is socrates a hypocrite philosophy essay



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Socrates was one of the most famous of Greek academics and is attributed as one of the creators of Hellenistic thought; he is an inscrutable entity and is recognized mainly through the interpretations of future philosophers, particularly his students Xenophon and Plato in addition to the plays of his modern Aristophanes. Many would state that Plato's discourses are the most inclusive versions of Socrates that exist from the ancient times.

Through his representation in Plato's discussions, Socrates has become prominent for his input into the discipline of morals and it is this Platonic Socrates who too loans his name to the ideas of Socratic satire and elenchus. The second continues to be a frequently employed instrument in a broad range of deliberations and is a category of instruction in which a succession of queries are asked not only to attract solitary answers, but also to inspire important understanding into the subject at hand. It is Plato's version of Socrates that also made crucial and enduring assistances to the disciplines of rational and epistemology and the inspiration of his notions and methodology continues to be robust in giving the groundwork for the Western thought that followed.

Plato's writing titled The Apology is an explanation of the dialogue made by Socrates at the hearing in which he is accused of not acknowledging the gods that were accepted by the state, formulating new divinities as well as corrupting the young of Athens and instigating them towards a revolution. Socrates' discourse is still, by no measure, an apology in the contemporary comprehension of the term. The title of the discourse is taken from the Greek expression "apologia" which can be interpreted as a safeguard to his

existence. Hence, in the dialogue, the philosopher endeavors to protect both himself and his actions & not ask for forgiveness.

He then goes on to question Meletus, the individual predominantly accountable for having Socrates up on the stand. This is the sole example in the work of a cross-examination or the elenchus which is deemed as being essential to the majority of Platonic discourse. This discussion, however, is a pitiable instance of this technique, since it appears to be aimed more at making Meletus uncomfortable than uncovering the truth. In a well celebrated piece, the thinker relates himself to an irritating and lethargic stallion which is representative of the Athens. Deprived of him, Socrates believes that the state is probable to float into a never-ending sleep, but by using his authority, as irritating as it might seem, it can be aroused into industrious and righteous activity.

Socrates was uncovered to be guilt-ridden by a thin margin and is told to suggest a fitting punishment. Socrates lightheartedly proposes that if he were to get what he warrants, he should be privileged with a prodigious feast for being of such amenity to Athens. On an extra grave note, he discards the penitentiary and deportation, proposing possibly in its place to recompense a fine. When the jury debunks his recommendation and verdicts him to death, Socrates receives the judgment stoically with the statement that no entity but the gods identify as to what transpires following death and hence, it would be imprudent to be anxious about what one is not aware of. He likewise cautions the jurymen who back against him that in muzzling their critique instead of simply attending to him, they have damaged themselves much more than they have impaired him.

Plato's tactic in *The Republic* is to initially elucidate the principal idea of communal or dogmatic integrity and then to develop an equivalent theory of singular justice. In the second, third and fourth book, Plato ascertains political fairness as agreement in an organized political organization. A perfect community contains three main categories of individuals – producers, auxiliaries as well as guardians; a civilization is just when relationships amongst these three categories are correct. Each cluster must complete its suitable utility and simply that purpose and each must be in the exact situation of influence relative to the others.

In a sequence of three resemblances – the symbols of the line, the sun and the cave – Plato clarifies who these persons are while beating out his philosophy regarding the Forms. He enlightens that the all God's creatures are separated into two dominions, namely the noticeable and the comprehensible. The observable universe is all that we experience all around us.

One may observe that none of these influences really demonstrate that righteousness is necessary separately from its concerns. In its place they institute that justice is continually escorted by real desire. In all likelihood, none of these is really thought to aid as the key motive why justice is so wanted. As an alternative, the appeal of justice is probable associated to the close association amongst the impartial life and the Forms. The evenhanded life is respectable in and of itself since it includes acquiring these vital goods and reproducing their direction and concord, hence integrating them into one's individual existence. Justice is upright since it is linked to the highest good, the Forms.

Plato culminates *The Republic* on an astonishing reminder; after explaining the concept of fairness and having proven it as the highest good, he expels composers from his municipality. These individuals, he states, plea to the vilest portion of the soul by reproducing undue predispositions. By boosting one to treat dishonorable feelings in understanding with the characters that are made aware of, poetry inspires us to treat these sentiments in life; therefore this makes it unwarranted. In concluding, Plato narrates the fable of Er, which pronounces the route of a soul following its demise. Impartial souls are remunerated for a millennium, whilst unreasonable ones are disciplined for an equal length of time; every soul has to then decide on its next life.

Socrates maintained that experiencing a good life meant living with quality. In turn, the conceptualization exemplifies virtue and consequently, life itself is a belief system. As stated by Socrates, the only life that deserves to be lived is that of philosophy; devoid of it, life is not worth living at all. Socrates also affirms that he will feel the pain of demise instead of defying the state. In *The Apology* the philosopher believes that he will continue to conceptualize even if the activity is made illegal, determining it as a punishable offence. Even though both these phrases appear to be flagrant paradoxes, the rationality of their non-contradictory character is not difficult to comprehend. Socrates' explanation and understanding of values and influence aid in the abolition of the superficial absurdity amongst both his proclamations and assist to advance his thought process.

Socrates describes his thought as the lucid condemnation of ethical philosophies. Such disapprovals function as an examination of the ethical

values in question. If the philosophies are unpredictable, reciprocated alteration need to take place between them, one that passes them into coherence with each other. Correspondingly, the values of the state in coincidence with the doctrines of Socrates do not approve and hence the two ideologies are unpredictable. The philosopher, in *The Apology*, endeavored to encourage the state into trusting his philosophies are accurate. His disappointment, nevertheless, permitted these philosophies regarding the state to surpass his own. At the climax of the aforementioned trial, he gives due credit to the penalty levied upon him and permits the state to reserve its values. This alteration is shared, and consequently, brings the philosopher into harmony with the state. Even though the Socratic values and beliefs were precluded, the simple circumstance that his effort to shift the focus of the state embodies his philosophy and therefore he attains accord. The state accomplishes this through merely its justification and appealing debate regarding its philosophy. While the philosopher waits for his penalty to be actually enforced, he achieves the objective of proactively moralizing, which he claimed to carry on doing so even if it would end his life. He obviously practices rationality in both *The Republic* and *The Apology*, stressing that simply through subordination of one's own yearnings, in this situation his existence, can an individual expect to gain prominence. This is again hypocritical as achieving such greatness would mean ending one's life which in fact would negate the usefulness of that greatness.

This importance that Socrates attains is due to of his belief regarding influence; he maintains that an individual must submit to the will of the city or coax it regarding the character of impartiality. In this situation, the

philosopher;½s defense comprises of his prospect to convince the court and he was allowed a chance to try to change the opinion of the state to the approval of his point of view. Still, he botched up this objective and hence, in accordance with his philosophy, must submit to the belief system promulgated by the city. His belief regarding influence as opposed to obedience permits for two end results; the first being the persuasion of the state itself and the triumph of one’s though. The other is the failure at convincing the state and hence bowing down to its will. Evidently, the latter consequence was to be that of Socrates and disobedience of the orders of the state would translate into Socrates contradicting himself and being labeled as a hypocrite. By actually going through with this, the government is provided with additional motives into trusting his misrepresentation in the beginning. In The Apology, the philosopher declares that if he had actually corrupted the youngsters against his better judgment, the rules do not necessitate the punishment to be dished out for such unintended acts that break the law; the authority in question behaved in the exact same manner that Socrates believed it would. The philosopher was also barred from thinking but he refused to adhere to this command. Hence, the penalty was a necessity in accordance with both the law or any corresponding natural law regarding education.

The victory or miscarriage of an endeavor to persuade the state is immaterial to the projected incongruity amongst both the two writing. A significant detail is that the philosopher struggled to defend and validate himself. Through this, he did justice both to himself but also to his viewpoint. In this circumstance, the philosopher;½s activities demonstrate his beliefs

louder than his words and through the acceptance of his death, he has not simply attained what his attitude addresses, but further accomplishes the features his life operates upon. Even if aggrieved, he maintains that the Gods following his death will give him with a newfangled trial. It would be one that is prepared in an even stouter manner through his perseverance and reception of his chastisement. The philosopher headed through his actions and his tenacity was very robust. Possibly he did make an error, but even so, escaping the authorities and consequently his fault, would be challenging and even more inconsistent than his hypothetical and incompatible declarations.