

Between Philosophers and City-state-The Charges against Socrates and His Defense

Tianlun Li^{1,*}

¹Department of Law, Liaoning Normal University, Liaoning, China

*Corresponding author: 1171203200@qq.com

Abstract: In the year 300 BC, Socrates, as a philosopher and Athenian citizen, was charged by the court of Athens with the crime of “impiety” and “corrupting the youth”. During the court session, Socrates tried his best to defend himself but still could not change his fate-Socrates was sentenced to death. Such charges against Socrates and his defense reflect city-state’s fundamental doubts about Socrates and the huge tension between philosophical life and city-state life, which can also be reflected in *The Apology of Socrates* by Plato and *Memorabilia* by Xenophon. For this discrepancy between two lifestyles, the city-state chose to expel or execute the philosopher who started to despise the city-state. However, Socrates who had always lived between the city-state and philosophers still believed that philosophers were responsible for the city-state and the city-state should also openly take opinions from philosophers - the conflict between philosophers and the city-state is reconcilable.

Keywords: Socrates; Plato; Xenophon; City-state.

1. Introduction

In the year 300 BC, initialized by Meletus, the city-state of Athens charged Socrates with two crimes publically—“impiety” and “corrupting the youth”. Diogenes Laërtius has recorded that “Socrates is guilty of failing to acknowledge the gods recognized by the city and introducing new gods; Socrates is guilty of corrupting the youth. The sentence is death.” Based on *The Apology of Socrates* by Plato and *Memorabilia* by Xenophon, Socrates made self-defense to such charge. Although there are slight differences in the content of Socrates’ self-defense recorded by Plato and Xenophon, the main purposes are the same. The analysis of these two records will reveal the truth of the charges against Socrates and his defense, which is indeed the city-state’s fundamental doubts about philosophers and the huge tension between philosophical life and city-state life. For this discrepancy between the two lifestyles, the city-state chose to expel or execute the philosopher who started to despise the city-state. However, Socrates who lived as a philosopher in the city-state still believed that philosophers are responsible for the city-state and the city-state should also openly take opinions from philosophers-the conflict between philosophers and the city-state is reconcilable.

2. The Charges against Socrates and His Defense Recorded by Plato

In *The Apology of Socrates* by Plato, Socrates had to defend himself against two different sets of accusers-the first accusers and the second accusers during the court session. The first accusers represented the long-term bias of the city-state of Athens against Socrates, and these accusers were the elder generation of the second accusers. Plato believed that the first accusers were powerful and worth studying on their initiative because their long-term bias against Socrates had a huge influence on the second accusers. To a certain extent, the first accusers were the principal culprits who cast the blame on Socrates, and the charge from the second accusers was nothing but a consequence of the influence of the first

accusers. Based on Plato’s record, Socrates gave a thorough analysis of the content of the charge from the first accusers and presented a self-defense against the charges made by the second accusers.

2.1. The first charge: Socrates’ two crimes

After stating the speaking patterns he would use in his self-defense, Socrates started to analyze the specific content of the charges against him. The first crime was generally named “impiety”. According to Socrates’ guess, the specific accusation should be: “Socrates is guilty of wrongdoing in that he busies himself studying things in the sky and below the earth; he makes the worse into the stronger argument, and he teaches these same things to others. (19c)” [1] In fact, the city-state’s accusers made a mistake here by regarding Socrates as a natural philosopher and wise man who was famous among the ancient Greek city-states at that time. As such, the first crime of “impiety” was understood by the city-state’s accusers to be “disbelief in the gods” other than “impiety against Athens’ gods by introducing new gods”. Socrates clarified such a point in his self-defense against the charge from the second accusers. Essentially, such bias was established by the first accusers such that Socrates, in the eyes of the city-state, was nothing but a godless naturalist - just like Anaxagoras school of thought - but this was not real Socrates.

The second crime was expressed as “corrupting the youth”, which was a consequence of the bias from the first accusers who believed Socrates often had conversations with various people in public places such as markets or stadiums, especially with young people who were more likely to be attracted by Socrates. Such behavior, in the eyes of the city-state, was a bad habit that corrupted public morals. Per the values of Athenians, a noble person should speak freely in political activities, such as *Ekklesia*, and should be cautious about what he says and does in private and non-political situations. Socrates, however, had seldom taken any political roles, but often expressed his thoughts on politics and the city-state in public and non-political institutions, which “violates the general life norms of Athenian citizens” [2]. Therefore, they named Socrates the Sophists - a group of people known

for their subtle and allegedly often specious reasoning. It is worth noting that Plato, who spoke out of Socrates, wrote much more on the second crime than on the first crime. Plato implied that Socrates used a lot more words on self-defense against the second less credible crime – “corrupting the youth” than against the first more credible crime - “impiety”.

2.2. The second charge: Socrates’s self-defense

The charge against Socrates from the second accusers was simply a repetition of that of the first accusers. As a result, based on The Apology of Socrates by Plato, Socrates did not put more analysis on this charge against him. Instead, he proceeded to mount his self-defense, addressing the charges in the order of “corrupting the youth” and “impiety”.

2.2.1. Defense against “corrupting the youth”

For the crime of “corrupting the youth”, Socrates first claimed that “no one does wrong willingly”, meaning no one would do evil when he fully realized what he would do was wrong. Therefore, even if Socrates made a mistake, he should not be accused publicly in court but be educated privately. In fact, this was a concept of thoughts of Socrates that was different from ordinary legal and moral practice. The core point here was “Plato läßt ihn zwischen Begehren und Wollen den scharfen Unterschied machen” [3] [4]. However, this was not a strong defense evidence because such a concept was so innovative that it could not be fully accepted by the common people, especially by the city-state of Athens, which had a great bias against Socrates at the time. In fact, what Socrates really wanted to do was proving that he was not one of the sophists, whose core characteristic was to sell the knowledge of words and make money from it - thereby corrupting the values of young people. Therefore, in The Apology of Socrates, Plato stated that Socrates kept focusing on two facts – “he did not take any money” and “what he did benefited young people”. Socrates’ statements on these two points had limited outcomes.

Unfortunately, Socrates could not eliminate the city-state’s doubts about him. In fact, Socrates was not a typical teacher because he avoided establishing a teacher-student relationship with young people attracted by him. Instead, Socrates only wanted to keep a loving community full of friendship with everyone, and in this community, one could communicate freely, equally, and honestly with each other, and ultimately achieved self-improvement. This was totally different from the sophists who attempted to instill knowledge into students. Nevertheless, what Socrates did, in the eyes of the city-state, was nothing but the behavior of sophists. The city-state believed that Socrates was indirectly dispelling the spiritual authority of the city-state by speaking with young people in public and encouraging them to question their parents. The city-state believed that Socrates had damaged the authority of the city-state - such behavior was the same as what sophists did. As such, Socrates was not able to defend himself whatsoever, and even Plato could not find a reason that was strong enough to make the city-state revoke their charge against Socrates.

2.2.2. Defense against “impiety”

In The Apology of Socrates by Plato, Socrates’ defense against “impiety” focused on “whether he was an atheist”. This defense was relatively easy because he was indeed not an atheist. In addition to making worship in public, Socrates also confessed that he believed in a kind of “daimonion”, which was a spirit. Whenever Socrates made a mistake, the

voice of this spirit haunted him, telling Socrates what things he should do and the responsibility he should take. For example, when Socrates wanted to take a public duty, the spirit stopped him. In The Apology of Socrates by Plato, Socrates said he was not an atheist because he believed in his spirit. In fact, in the eyes of the accusers, Socrates did not recognize the gods that the city-state recognizes, and furthermore by introduced new divinities. As for the atheist, the city-state accusers regarded Socrates as a natural philosopher. In addition, during the defense, Socrates successfully induced Meletus to conclude that Socrates did not believe in god and gained a relatively better defense position. That’s being said, “by asking the question, Socrates entrapped Meletus”. Finally, Socrates bypassed the dilemma about whether he believed in the city-state’s god.

However, Socrates still could not eliminate the city-state’s doubt because the core problem was still not resolved in that Socrates did not directly respond to the dilemma of whether or not to believe in the city-state’s god. For this problem, Plato simply stated a hint, “I myself believe that there are gods and am not altogether an atheist, nor am I guilty of that—not, however, the gods in whom the city believes, but others, and that this is the charge against me, that they are others. (26c5)”[5]. In fact, Plato indirectly informed us that Socrates truly doubted the city-state’s god and followed the rituals to worship the gods in public; however, privately Socrates provided a new interpretation of the god that the city-state disliked because what the city-state desired was a follower not a transcendent. Even though Socrates wanted to revive the classical spirit of the city-state, the city-state at the time could hardly tolerate dissidents like Socrates who eventually was persecuted by the city-state.

3. The Charges against Socrates and His Defense Recorded by Xenophon

Socrates’ self-defense in court was mainly recorded in the chapter “Socrates’ Defense before the Judge” at the end of Memorabilia by Xenophon. In the Book I of Memorabilia, Xenophon argued that Socrates was innocent of the two charges against him. Xenophon also recorded Socrates’ argument in Book IV. Similar to Plato’s dialogues, Xenophon also recorded the two charges against Socrates - impiety and corrupting the youth; however, the defense content recorded by Xenophon was more or less different from that of Plato. Moreover, Xenophon did not divide accusers into two types like what Plato did; instead, Xenophon treated the accusers as a whole. On top of that, unlike Plato who completely recorded Socrates’ self-defense, Xenophon gave his direct argument for Socrates’ innocence, which inevitably created a gap between the arguments from Xenophon and the arguments from Socrates.

3.1. Charge and defense against the crime of “impiety”

3.1.1. Xenophon’s defense against impiety

In Memorabilia, Xenophon gave his direct defense against Socrates’ crime charged by the city-state of Athens. Xenophon stated that such a charge was completely wrong because Socrates was very pious, which could be proved by his frequent sacrifices to gods in public and private places. Socrates also often advised his friends to do divination to seek help and blessing from the gods when they encountered difficulties. As for the accusation that Socrates was an atheist

natural philosopher, Xenophon believed that Socrates was only interested in the study of human activities, but not the knowledge of heaven and earth that had nothing to do with humans, even in "vielmehr prangerte er die, welche solchen Fragen nachgingen, als Toren an." [6][7] Therefore, in Xenophon's argument, Socrates was a pious person and was friendly to the city-state, and the city-state's accusation and trial of Socrates were completely misunderstanding. But was that true that the city-state's accusation of Socrates was entirely due to a misunderstanding that could have been avoided? We will figure this out by comparing Socrates' own arguments [8] recorded in "Socrates' Defense before the Judge" at the end of Memorabilia to Xenophon's arguments, such that we can have some strong conclusions.

3.1.2. Socrates' defense against impiety

When responding to the accusation of impiety, Socrates mentioned that he often worshiped gods in public places, but remained silent on the question of whether he worshiped gods in private places. This actually implied that Socrates himself might not be truly believing in the city-state's gods, and worshiping in public places was just a herd behavior. In private, Socrates had his own understanding of the gods. This, however, did not mean that Socrates was an atheist because from Plato's works, we knew he believed in spirit, and he performed his obligation to sacrifice to the gods in public. However, what made the city-state intolerant was that Socrates had his own views on gods; although such understanding seemed more reasonable and made the believers' life happier, it weakened the authority of the city-state, which indeed was a threat to the spiritual foundation of the city-state. Therefore, the city-state decided to execute Socrates, or at least expel him from the city-state, so that he could no longer be a threat to the spiritual status of the city-state, which, once and for all, resolved the crisis of faith that the city-state had been facing for many years.

In addition to the question of whether to worship in private places, Socrates also remained silent on the following two questions: whether he devoted himself to exploring human activities and rejected the nature of all things, and whether he asked his friends to seek help from divination. For the first question, Socrates' silence means that he did not completely reject natural science, which was the study of "the activities of heaven and earth". In fact, Socrates explored the nature of all things from another perspective - the study of human affairs. As for the research of natural philosophers, Socrates maintained a neutral attitude. In fact, Socrates was very interested in natural philosophy in his early years, and we could find evidence in Aristophanes' comedy *Clouds* where Socrates was a sophist and natural philosopher. The reason why Xenophon believed Socrates had always been dismissive of natural philosophy was simply because Socrates gradually turned to the study of human activities. For the second question about divination, Socrates also remained silent, which implied that Socrates did not strongly agree that his friends relied entirely on this method to escape real problems when encountering difficulties; rather he suggested a way of "enkrateia", meaning to use self-control to find their true selves, to free human reasoning ability from the dominance of animal's instincts, and to achieve high level where spirits control passions.

3.2. Charge and defense against the crime of "corrupting the youth"

3.2.1. Socrates' defense against "corrupting the youth"

It is worth noting that in Memorabilia, Xenophon put a lot more words in defense against the crime of corrupting the youth over the defense of impiety. Plato did the same thing in *The Apology of Socrates*. However, in "Socrates' Defense before the Judge", Socrates used much fewer words in defending against the crime of "corrupting the youth" than that of "impiety". This was because, from the perspective of Socrates, "Socrates treats the more credible charge much more extensively than the less credible one" [9]. This also implied that the charge of corrupting the youth was not actually a convincing charge - At least Socrates believed that this charge could not stand alone at all, and could only be appended after the more serious religious charge of "impiety" as an ancillary charge. As for the defense against this crime, as recorded in "Socrates' Defense before the Judge", Socrates first believed that his personality was so noble that he would not corrupt young people. On the contrary, Socrates could only make young people better. Then, the court proposed that Socrates guided young people to question their parents. Socrates defended by saying he was giving correct guidance to young people because the spiritual authority of wise people should be higher than that of their parents.

3.2.2. Xenophon's defense against "corrupting the youth"

In Memorabilia, Xenophon defended Socrates by listing and defending against five charges against Socrates in the court. The five charges were: inciting youth to riot, Socrates' partners committing a felony (Alcibiades and Critias who were betrayers of the city-state of Athens), subverting the authority of fathers, derogating other relatives and friends, and maliciously quoting poets' verses. For the first charge of inciting youth to riot, Xenophon believed that, as a pacifist, Socrates would not instigate young people to perform violence, nor ever participate in violent and subversive activities. For the second charge of his partners committing a felony, Xenophon believed that Alcibiades and Critias held impure intentions from the beginning of their friendship with Socrates. They were not after higher wisdom but rhetorical ability - becoming the most capable speaker and politician. After they left Socrates, their character gradually deteriorated because of no proper training. In other words, their corrupted morals were the reason that they betrayed the city-state. It had nothing to do with Socrates. Moreover, Socrates tried hard to teach them, but they didn't want to work hard. For the third and fourth charges, the defenses from Xenophon and Socrates were almost the same, stating that wise men were mentally better than parents, relatives, and friends. For the last charge, Xenophon believed that, as a populist who loved mankind, Socrates would not maliciously quote poets' verses - those who thought Socrates to be malicious were nothing but ignorant.

3.2.3. Failure of defenses

After carefully examining the defenses of Socrates and Xenophon, people would find that, from the city-state's perspective, their defenses were not strong enough in that they did not address the fact that Socrates' wisdom became a spiritual threat to the city-state. As for Socrates' defense recorded in "Socrates' Defense before the Judge", the problem was that the city-state of Athens, as the accuser,

actually did not care too much about Socrates' personal character, nor did it care too much about whether Socrates could make young people better. What the city-state really cared about was whether Socrates could subvert the spiritual order of the city-state by leading young people to question the spiritual authority of their parents. Actually, Socrates had already become a threat to the city-state that was fundamentally formed by families. In *Memorabilia*, Xenophon gave similar defense against the third and fourth charges but the defense was still not powerful enough to eliminate the threat of Socrates on damaging the spiritual foundation of the city-state. From this point, Socrates' defense actually failed, although he might have already anticipated this outcome.

Xenophon also failed to convince the city-state with his defense stated in *Memorabilia*. As for inciting youth to riot, although Socrates himself did not participate in the rebellion, nor did he encourage young people to perform violence to subvert the city-state's regime, Socrates' subversive speech was actually real, which was stated in the third and fourth charges. By encouraging young people to question their parents, relatives, and friends, Socrates was actually a time bomb in the eyes of the city-state. Young people affected by his speech could easily go on rebellion. Although young people who truly understood Socrates would not choose to use violence, they could carry out spiritual rebellion against the city-state - Plato was one of those young people. The same reasoning applies to the last charge, where although Socrates quoted poems in an academic way, his understanding of those poems was different from that of the city-state, and his understanding could be easily abused by some young people who were not good at academics. Eventually, such abuse of his understanding would subvert the ideological tradition of the city-state.

The problem of the betrayers Alcibiades and Critias was a bit more adversely challenging because they did betray the city-state, they did claim they were students of Socrates, and they did once follow Socrates. Although Socrates repeatedly stated that he had never had these two students, the city-state still blamed Socrates because of the close contact between Socrates and the two betrayers in the past. In the eyes of the public, Socrates used to teach and had a good relationship with two unscrupulous students who were later confirmed to be the betrayers of the city-state of Athens. In fact, the reason why Socrates spent a lot of time teaching these two people was probably that he hoped that "through his influence, they would become moderate also in their political activity" [10]. The city-state, however, was almost impossible to understand Socrates' painstaking efforts but to link the deeds of Socrates' former students, the betrayers of the city-state, to one of his crimes.

4. Truth of the Charges against Socrates and His Defense - Tension between City-state Life and Philosophical Life

From *The Apology of Socrates* by Plato and *Memorabilia* by Xenophon, people could find that the city-state's doubts about Socrates always existed. As a result, no matter how Socrates defended himself, it would be difficult for him to avoid the fate of being convicted; Socrates himself was also aware of this outcome very well. During the trial and defense of Socrates, the tension between city-state life and

philosophical life completely emerged, and such tension was reflected in the city-state's verdict that Socrates was guilty as well as in Plato's description of the city-state in his works. However, the contradiction between the city-state and philosophers was not irreconcilable, and both parties were not completely in conflict. What Socrates did was actually an unremitting effort to reconcile the contradiction between the two.

4.1. City-state's doubt about the philosopher

The city-state's doubts about the philosopher had a long historical origin, which could be traced back to the creation of philosophy. Philosophy was born out of the experience of *thaumazein*, that was, a sense of astonishment or amazement at something extraordinary or remarkable. Initially, philosophy paid no attention to politics and morality, but rather to natural things and the universe. Although natural philosophers had reinterpreted the gods that the city-state believed in, which had dispelled the spiritual authority of the city-state to a certain extent, the city-state could still tolerate it because philosophy at the time had not yet interfered with the operation of the city-state's political life. As nature philosophy was booming, sophists also became popular gradually. Most of the sophists did not have a fixed place to live, but wandered around in various city-states in ancient Greece, and spread the wisdom of rhetoric among the people who later became disgusted towards the sophists in that sophist had a tendency to confuse right and wrong. People even simply treated sophists the same as philosophy and criticized them. However, the purpose of sophists was to make money, and their goal of training young people was to increase their rhetorical abilities, which could help them obtain political status. In ancient Greece, especially the city-state of Athens, rhetorical skills were valued very much in the political field. An excellent debater could often obtain a higher political status. Therefore, the city-state was still able to tolerate sophists.

However, Socrates completely broke the delicate balance between city-state and philosophers. Since Socrates shifted his attention from the ethereal things of metaphysics and natural science to human activities, he naturally had many comments on the political and moral life of the city-state. Socrates observed that the citizens of Athens had not been pursuing a life that truly would make them happy, and they cared only about material and glory which gradually made them lose themselves. He believed that what the citizens should really pursue was the excellence of soul and nobility of morals, and he also believed that only those wise people who controlled the wild desires within themselves were truly self-sufficient and closest to God who was completely self-sufficient and needed nothing. As a result, the city-state clearly regarded Socrates, the philosopher, as a threat to the city-state because Socrates only focused on city-state life - the political and moral life. Naturally, Socrates' remarks had a huge impact on the spiritual authority of the city-state. The city-state decided to solve this problem once and for all by expelling Socrates completely from the city-state or killing him.

The development of real politics had greatly aggravated this process. After the "Thirty Tyrants" period, the democrats in Athens regained power after tremendous efforts. However, the political situation was not yet stable at the time, and both internal and external enemies were trying to attack this new regime. Therefore, the sensitive democratic politicians

intended to completely eliminate the dissidents in the city-state, so they targeted Socrates. At this time, Socrates was already suspected by the city-state for a long time because of many of his criticisms about politics. Even worse, he used to have close contact with the notorious Alcibiades and Critias. Therefore, the city-state decided to execute Socrates at this sensitive time in order to permanently eliminate the threat of philosophers to the city-state and to demonstrate the power of the new regime. Due to above reasons, the city-state's anger was completely dumped onto Socrates, "divine and human have chosen his earthly person as the field for their clash" [11], and the city-state's doubts about philosophers reached their climax, which led to the death of Socrates and the complete corruption of the Athenian spirit.

4.2. Philosopher's dislike of the city-state

The city-state's doubts about and expulsion of the philosophers caused the dissatisfaction of philosophers. After Socrates' death, his student, the philosopher Plato, began to criticize the city-state with his works, and provided a disposition towards the city-state. In Dialogues of Plato, the death of Socrates had always been the driving force of his philosophical thoughts, and this death brought Plato huge stimulus. As Plato clearly stated in his book *The Republic*, not only the city-state of Athens but also all the city-states of the Greek world and even the entire political world shall be purified by philosophy. In his book *The Republic*, Plato also successfully established the concept of city-state that made city-state life completely subordinate to philosophical life. The fundamental feature was that philosophy governed everything, including the city-state that once killed Socrates. In Plato's concept of city-state, family was completely canceled because Plato believed family represented the most selfish aspect of city-state life, and the existence of family in city-state life essentially blocked the philosopher from pursuing goodness. In contrast, the "philosopher king" political system was established to replace the city-state life that could harm the philosophical life. Plato believed that philosophers' safety could be guaranteed only under a political system where philosophy completely ruled the city-state. This was how "a common laughingstock...was turned by Plato against the city" [12].

Nevertheless, the establishment of Plato's concept of city-state was only in words. After the failure of the Sicilian Reform, Plato gradually realized that the idea of philosophers ruling the city-state was almost impossible to realize. Then, Plato decided to transfer his idea from "ruling the city-state" to "staying away from the city-state". As a result, Plato gradually transformed himself from an innovator and artist who was enthusiastic about city-state politics to a natural philosopher who gave his full attention to ideas. Socrates, in Plato's book, was transformed into a mathematician who was indifferent to social activities. In such context, people found that Plato lowered his standards for politics in his political philosophy works - from the legal rule of *The Statesman* to the mixed government of *Nomoi*, showing that Plato did not expect too much from city-state life but only rhetorically wished his ideas could be implemented as much as possible. Therefore, Plato as a philosopher discarded his idea of ruling the city-state and adopted the attitude of staying away from the city-state, and such transformation had a profound impact on western political thoughts. Since then, typical philosophers have always had a low opinion on political life, "the abyss which immediately opened between thought and action" [13]

and the gap between city-state and philosophers had also become wider and wider such that both parties did not understand each other and rejected each other.

4.3. Mutual tolerance between city-state and philosophers

In fact, as far as Socrates was concerned, he had always favored that philosophers and city-state be mutually tolerated and stay in harmony, and he had devoted his whole life to achieving this goal. In Socrates' opinion, all human beings, including philosophers, lived in the world of opinions, and everyone was "comprehension of the world 'as it opens itself to me'" [14]. Therefore, people should treat each other sincerely and actively exchange opinions with each other, so that they can find truth from their respective opinions. This was the real meaning of Socrates' maieutic - the method of eliciting new ideas from another. In this context, Socrates hoped that the city-state and the philosophers could treat each other sincerely, trying to exchange their "opinions" as much as possible to achieve harmony. Unlike Plato, Socrates would not devalue too much the status of "opinions", nor would expect philosophers to completely rule the city-state. Instead, Socrates wanted to be the "gadfly" of the city-state, not the "philosopher king". In other words, Socrates wanted to be a friend of all the Athenians, rather than their teacher. Socrates believed that a city-state without philosophers was spiritually depraved, while a philosopher without a city-state lacked practical wisdom and was weak and lonely. Therefore, although philosophers and city-state were incompatible in some ways, the two parties should make every effort to adapt to each other because the consequence of such effort benefited both parties.

From Socrates' point of view, he always considered himself as a part of the city-state of Athens. No matter how unfairly he was treated, Socrates always believed that philosophers, including himself, must be responsible for the city-state. This was also the fundamental reason why Socrates chose to submit willingly to execution upon the verdict of the court. This also meant that Socrates had always lived between the city-state and philosophers, which constituted the tragedy of Socrates' life. He tried very hard to make philosophy to be a useful part of the city-state and encourage other philosophers to improve their political capabilities so that philosophers and city-state could trust each other. However, Socrates's efforts were not completely successful because the city-state still chose to expel or execute philosophers, and many philosophers chose to stay away from politics. Nevertheless, Socrates was still a perfect model of political philosophers and moral models. Even nowadays, Socrates is considered as the benchmark for human wisdom and morality. Although there is still tension between human philosophical life and political life, Socrates' efforts to reconcile the two are forever engraved in people's minds. His endeavor was not in vain and many people after him devoted themselves to human happiness and order of the society.

5. About the author

Li Tianlun (1998-), male, a native of Yingkou City of Liaoning Province, a graduate student of the master's degree program of Political Theory in School of Government at Liaoning Normal University.

References

- [1] Plato, Plato complete works, Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by John M. Cooper, HACKETT PUBLISHING COMPANY Indianapolis/Cambridge. 1997.
- [2] Plato. The Apology of Socrates. Translated by Wu Fei. Beijing:Huaxia Publishing House. 2007.
- [3] Werner Jaeger, Paideia die Formung des Griechischen Menschen, WALTER DE GRUYTER. BERLIN. NEW YORK. 1973.
- [4] Translation: "Plato let Socrates make a clear distinction between desire and will".
- [5] Plato, Plato complete works, Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by John M. Cooper, HACKETT PUBLISHING COMPANY Indianapolis/Cambridge. 1997.
- [6] Xenophon, Erinnerungen an Sokrates, AKADEMIE-VERLAG. BERLIN. 1955.
- [7] Translation: "trying to prove the foolishness of those who would rather think about such questions".
- [8] Although its contents may have been embellished by Xenophon.
- [9] Leo Strauss, Xenophon's Socrates, Cornell University Press. 2011.
- [10] Leo Strauss, Xenophon's Socrates, Cornell University Press. 2011.
- [11] Eric Voegelin, Order and History, Volume III, Plato and Aristotle, University of Missouri Press. 1984.
- [12] Hannah Arendt, The Promise of Politics, SCHOCKEN BOOKS, NEW YORK. 2005.
- [13] Hannah Arendt, The Promise of Politics, SCHOCKEN BOOKS, NEW YORK. 2005.
- [14] Hannah Arendt, The Promise of Politics, SCHOCKEN BOOKS, NEW YORK. 2005.