

# Introduction to Philosophy: Socrates, Horses & Corruption ©2003-2009

Dr. Michael C. LaBossiere

Last Updated 6/16/2009

**Reading:** “The Apology.” The text to be summarized begins with “He says that I am a doer of evil, and corrupt the youth” and ends with “And now you bring me up in this court, which is a place not of instruction, but of punishment.”

**Thesis:** “The purpose of this paper is to summarize and critically evaluate Socrates’ Horse Trainer Analogy (HTA) and Unintentional Argument (UA).”

**Issue:** Do Socrates’ two (HTA and UA) arguments refute the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth?

## Introduction

This document is a detailed guide to writing the paper. The paper is a four part paper consisting of an introduction, a summary section, an argument section and a conclusion. Be sure to read this guide completely and carefully. This guide has the following sections:

- **The Draft & Rewrite:** This explains the difference between the draft and the final rewrite. It also details how to turn the paper in.
- **Writing the Paper:** This explains how to write the paper. Each of the four sections of the paper are presented in great detail. This section also includes the text you will be summarizing, provides detailed guides to the arguments needed for the paper, and also includes the standards by which the paper is graded.
- **Checklist & Comment Sheet:** This section explains and then provides the Checklist & Comment Sheet for this paper. Be sure to have a copy of this sheet on hand-you will need it in order to make sense of the comment marks on your paper.
- **Sample Paper:** A complete sample paper.

## The Draft & the Rewrite

The paper is intended to be written in two stages: a draft (or drafts) and the rewritten final version. The following details the draft and the rewrite of the paper.

### The Draft

The draft version of the paper is due on the date specified on the syllabus. Drafts can be turned in prior to this date and additional drafts can be done after this date as well. Drafts will be commented on, graded and returned to you. You will need the comment & checklist sheet (included in this document) to make sense of the marks on the paper. **If you do not revise the paper, the grade you received on your draft will be your grade on the paper.**

### The Rewrite

You have the opportunity to revise the paper and turn it in again. While you can do as many drafts as you would like, the rewrite must be turned in by the deadline. The following are the rules pertaining to the rewrite.

1. The rewrite must be turned in no later than the deadline date set on the syllabus. You can (and should) turn in the revised paper before this date. This is the last day a rewrite will be accepted. **Aside from using the mercy (see the syllabus) there are no exceptions to this.** Failure to turn in the rewrite by that time will result in a grade of zero (0) on the rewrite.

2. You must turn in the original paper draft with the rewrite. If you did additional drafts, turn in only the most recent graded draft with the rewrite. If you did not do a draft, then just turn in your final paper.
3. You must highlight the changes you made in the **revised paper (highlight the revised paper, not the original)**. The best way to do this is to use the ability of most current word processing programs (like Word) to highlight text. A low tech way to do this is to use a highlighter marker. Be sure to select a color that leaves the text readable. If you made no changes from the original, you do not need to turn in the paper again. If you turn it in anyway, please write “unchanged” on the first or cover page.
4. If the revised paper receives a better grade than the original paper, the grade for the revised paper will replace the original grade. If the revised paper receives a grade that is worse than the draft, then the draft grade will be the grade that counts. An exception to this is plagiarism. If the revised paper is plagiarized, then the paper grade will be a zero.
5. If you did not turn in the paper the first time, you can still turn in the ‘revision.’ Be sure to clearly indicate this by writing or typing “First Time” on the first page or cover sheet of the paper.

### **Turning the Paper In (Draft or Rewrite)**

The paper should be turned in during class. There is also a drop envelope by my office that you can use (entirely at your own risk). A paper is considered turned in when I actually receive (or find) it. Do not ask administrators, faculty or staff members to time stamp your paper-that is not their job. It is your responsibility to make sure that I receive your paper.

Because of viruses, Trojan horses and worms, I do not accept papers via email except when prior arrangements have been made and the circumstances warrant the risk. Such circumstances include such things as documented overseas military service and documented physical incapacitation such as that resulting from a broken back or legs. If arrangements have not been made in advance, emailed papers will be deleted.

Because of viruses, Trojan horses, worms and various hardware problems (such as bits of metal falling into my computer’s floppy disk drive), I do not accept papers on disks. This also includes CDs, DVDs, USB/Firewire drives, etc.

### **Additional Information**

Additional information is provided in the class notes, class lecture, on the FAQs web page, as well as in the *Paper Rules & Policies*. The *Paper Rules & Policies* document is especially important as it spells out the general rules and policies governing the paper. You are required to read the *Paper Rules & Policies* document.

I have a separate *Paper Rules & Policies* document because while the papers vary from class to class, the rules & policies remain the same.

## **Writing the Paper**

This is a step-by-step guide to the content of the paper. This guide spells out, in detail, everything that should be done in the paper.

### **The Goal**

The goal of the paper is to summarize two of Socrates’ arguments (the Horse Trainer Analogy and the Unintentional Argument) and to address the issue- Do the arguments logically refute the relevant charge against him? Do not make up your topic-doing so will result in a grade of 0 (zero) for the paper.

### **The Sections**

The paper has four sections: Introduction, Summary, Argument and Conclusion. Each section is detailed below. **Be sure to label each section in your paper** (see the sample paper for how this should look). Each section is graded based on specific criteria and hence it is important for you to indicate to me which section is which in your paper.

## Part One: Writing the Introduction

The Introduction is worth five (5) points. It should be no more than 125 words in length. The purpose of the introduction is to inform the readers about the purpose and content of the paper. The introduction should be written out as text rather than presented as an outline (see the sample paper, below) The introduction should contain the following five things:

1. **Thesis:** You can copy this—"The purpose of this paper is to summarize and critically evaluate Socrates' reply to the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth."
  - a. You should simply copy the thesis—doing so is not plagiarism.
2. **Summary Statement:** Briefly state what you will do in the summary.
  - a. Example: "In the summary I will present the charge against Socrates, his questioning of Meletus regarding the youth and give special attention to his replies to the charge, namely the Horse Trainer Analogy (HTA) and the Unintentional Argument (UA)."
3. **Position Statement:** Briefly state your position on the issue.
  - a. Issue: Do Socrates' two arguments refute the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth?
  - b. Example: "It is my opinion that Socrates' arguments fail to refute the charge."
4. **Argument Statement:** Briefly state what arguments (of your own) you will be presenting in support of your position.
  - a. Example: "The HTA will be examined using the three standards for assessing an analogical argument and it will be shown that the HTA comes up short. The key premise of the UA will be shown to be false, thus undercutting the argument."
5. **Minimal Background:** Provide some minimal background to set the stage for the reader.
  - a. Example: "The Apology is an account of Socrates' trial as presented by his student Plato. The Apology focuses on Socrates' replies to the charge leveled against him by his accusers with Meletus as his main opponent."

## Part Two: Writing the Summary

The summary is worth forty-five (45) points and should be at least 350 words in length. An outline has been provided as a guide for summarizing. Simply copying from the outline is plagiarism. Your objective is to summarize the relevant section of the text clearly, concisely, accurately and in your own words.

### Text to be summarized for the Paper

The following is the text you will summarize in the summary section of the paper. This text is from the *Apology*.

...He says that I am a doer of evil, and corrupt the youth; but I say, O men of Athens, that Meletus is a doer of evil, in that he pretends to be in earnest when he is only in jest, and is so eager to bring men to trial from a pretended zeal and interest about matters in which he really never had the smallest interest. And the truth of this I will endeavor to prove to you.

Come hither, Meletus, and let me ask a question of you. You think a great deal about the improvement of youth?

Yes, I do.

Tell the judges, then, who is their improver; for you must know, as you have taken the pains to discover their corrupter, and are citing and accusing me before them. Speak, then, and tell the judges who their improver is.— Observe, Meletus, that you are silent, and have nothing to say. But is not this rather disgraceful, and a very considerable proof of what I was saying, that you have no interest in the matter? Speak up, friend, and tell us who their improver is.

The laws.

But that, my good sir, is not my meaning. I want to know who the person is, who, in the first place, knows the laws.

The judges, Socrates, who are present in court.

What, do you mean to say, Meletus, that they are able to instruct and improve youth?

Certainly they are.

What, all of them, or some only and not others?

All of them.

By the goddess Here, that is good news! There are plenty of improvers, then. And what do you say of the audience,—do they improve them?

Yes, they do.

And the senators?

Yes, the senators improve them.

But perhaps the members of the assembly corrupt them?—or do they too improve them?

They improve them.

Then every Athenian improves and elevates them; all with the exception of myself; and I alone am their corrupter? Is that what you affirm?

That is what I stoutly affirm.

I am very unfortunate if you are right. But suppose I ask you a question:

How about horses? Does one man do them harm and all the world good? Is not the exact opposite the truth?

One man is able to do them good, or at least not many;—the trainer of horses, that is to say, does them good, and others who have to do with them rather injure them? Is not that true, Meletus, of horses, or of any other animals? Most assuredly it is; whether you and Anytus say yes or no. Happy indeed would be the condition of youth if they had one corrupter only, and all the rest of the world were their improvers. But you, Meletus, have sufficiently shown that you never had a thought about the young: your carelessness is seen in your not caring about the very things which you bring against me.

And now, Meletus, I will ask you another question—by Zeus I will: Which is better, to live among bad citizens, or among good ones? Answer, friend, I say; the question is one which may be easily answered. Do not the good do their neighbours good, and the bad do them evil?

Certainly.

And is there anyone who would rather be injured than benefited by those who live with him? Answer, my good friend, the law requires you to answer—does any one like to be injured?

Certainly not.

And when you accuse me of corrupting and deteriorating the youth, do you allege that I corrupt them intentionally or unintentionally?

Intentionally, I say.

But you have just admitted that the good do their neighbors good, and the evil do them evil. Now, is that a truth which your superior wisdom has recognized thus early in life, and am I, at my age, in such darkness and ignorance as not to know that if a man with whom I have to live is corrupted by me, I am very likely to be harmed by him; and yet I corrupt him, and intentionally, too—so you say, although neither I nor any other human being is ever likely to be convinced by you. But either I do not corrupt them, or I corrupt them unintentionally; and on either view of the case you lie. If my offence is unintentional, the law has no cognizance of unintentional offences: you ought to have taken me privately, and warned and admonished me; for if I had been better advised, I should have left off doing what I only did unintentionally—no doubt I should; but you would have nothing to say to me and refused to teach me. And now you bring me up in this court, which is a place not of instruction, but of punishment.

### **A Note on Quotes**

The objective in the summary is to clearly, concisely, accurately and in your own words convey the key details of the text. This means that quotes and paraphrases should be used as little as possible—and preferably, not at all. Quoting from the text is simply copying and not summarizing. Hence, using quotes does not help achieve the goal set for the summary section.

The only times when you should use a direct quote in the summary is when you need the exact wording in order to make your case (which is almost never needed in this paper topic) or when the use of the direct quote is

needed for special impact. Keep in mind that improperly used direct quotes can subtract from your grade while properly used direct quotes add nothing to your grade (this is a summary, not an exercise in quoting). As such, it is best to avoid using direct quotes and paraphrases.

If direct quotes or paraphrases are used, be sure to properly cite the source and indicate the quotes using the appropriate means (by quote marks or indenting). There is a penalty from using quotes or paraphrases without properly citing them. Also, copying text without using proper citation can be plagiarism.

### **Outline of Summary Content**

The following is an outline of the text that specifies the important details. You need to convey these key points clearly, concisely, accurately and in your own words. Be sure to not simply copy from the outline-that would be plagiarism.

#### **I The Charges & Socrates' Arguments**

##### **A. Charges**

1. Socrates is a doer of evil, who corrupts the youth.
2. Socrates does not believe in the gods of the state, but has his own new divinities.

##### **B. The Corrupter of Youth**

1. Meletus says Socrates is a doer of evil and corrupts the youth.
2. Socrates will prove that Meletus
  - a. Is a doer of evil.
  - b. Pretends to be earnest when only in jest.
  - c. Is eager to bring men to trial from a pretended zeal and interest about matters he never had the smallest interest in.

##### **C. Questioning Meletus**

1. Meletus claims to think a great deal about the improvement of youth.
2. Socrates asks Meletus to tell the judges who improves the youth.
  - a. He must know since he took pains to discover their corrupter.
  - b. He takes Meletus' initial silence to prove what Socrates is saying.
3. Meletus claims that all the judges are able to instruct and improve youth.
4. Meletus claims the audience and the senators improve the youth:
5. Meletus claims that every Athenian improves the youth except Socrates, the sole corruptor.

##### **D. The Horse Trainer Analogy**

1. Socrates: One man is able to do the horses good, or at least not many.
2. The trainer of horses does them good.
3. Others who have anything to do with them injure them.
4. This is true of horses and any other animals.
5. The condition of youth would be happy if they had one corrupter and everyone else improved them.
6. Meletus shows he never had a thought about the young.
7. His carelessness is seen in not caring about what he brought against Socrates.

##### **E. Unintentional Argument**

1. Meletus agrees: It is better to live among good citizens than bad citizens.
2. Meletus agrees: The good do their neighbors good and the bad do them evil.
3. Meletus agrees: No one would rather be injured than benefited by those who live with him.
4. Meletus agrees: No one likes to be injured.
5. Meletus has accused Socrates of intentionally corrupting the youth.
6. Meletus admitted: the good do their neighbors good, and the evil do them evil
7. Socrates: he knows if he corrupts a man he has to live with, it is very likely he will be harmed by him.
8. Socrates: either I do not corrupt them, or I corrupt them unintentionally.
9. Socrates : either way Meletus is lying.
10. If his offence is unintentional, the law has no cognizance of unintentional offences.
  - a. Meletus ought to have privately warned and admonished Socrates.

- b. If he had been better advised, he would have stopped doing what he did unintentionally.
  - c. Meletus had nothing to say to Socrates and refused to teach him.
  - d. And now brings him to court, which is a place of punishment, not instruction.
11. Socrates: Meletus has no care at all about the matter.

### **Assessment of the Summary (Rubric)**

The summary is worth 45 points. Assessment is based on two main factors: the completeness of the content and the quality of the writing. The completeness of the content is defined in terms of whether all the required details (as specified above) are provided within the summary.

#### **Excellent Summary (A) (41-45 points)**

- Clearly and concisely presents all the key points in your own words.
- Clearly shows the connections between the key points.
- Presents the summary as a coherent whole.
- Clearly presents the arguments in the text and shows their structure and relation to the whole.
- Is extremely well organized.

#### **Good Summary (B) (36-40 points)**

- Does most of what an excellent summary does, but has some flaws that prevent it from being excellent.

#### **Adequate summary (C) (32-35 points)**

- Presents all the key points.
- Is adequately clear and organized.
- Does not achieve the quality of a good summary, but does not have any major flaws.

#### **Poor Summary (D) (27-31 points)**

- Leaves out some key points.
- Leaves out some key arguments.
- Is unclear and/or presented in a disorganized manner.
- Has a few major flaws or numerous minor flaws.

#### **Failing summary (F) (0-26 points)**

- Leaves out most key points.
- Is very unclear and/or disorganized.
- Has many major flaws.

### **Part Three: Writing the Argument**

The argument is worth forty-five (45) points and should be at least 500 words in length. An outline has been provided as a guide for writing the argument section.

#### **Position Statement**

The argument section should begin with a statement of your position on each of the issues. The overall issue is: do Socrates' arguments logically refute the charges against him? In order to address this issue, you will need to address each of the four sub-issues: 1) Does the HTA (Horse Trainer Analogy) succeed as an analogy? 2) Does the HTA refute the charge? 3) Does the UA succeed as an argument? 4) Does the HTA refute the charge? Be sure to clearly state your position on each of these issues. As will be discussed below, it is possible to have various combinations of positions on the issues.

**Assessing the HTA**

The second step in the argument section is to assess Socrates' Horse Trainer Analogy. This is, obviously, an analogical argument.

*Analogical Argument*

An analogical argument is one in which it is concluded that two things are alike in a certain respect because they are alike in other respects. More formally, an analogical argument has the following logical structure:

Premise 1: X has properties P, Q, and R.

Premise 2: Y has properties P, Q, and R.

Premise 3: X has property Z as well.

Conclusion: Y has property Z.

X and Y are the two things being compared, such as horses and children. P, Q, R, and Z are properties, such as being in need of training. P, Q, and R are just examples-the things being compared might have more or less properties in common.

Like all inductive arguments, inductive arguments are assessed in terms of their strength. The strength of an analogical argument depends on three main factors. First, there is the number of properties that X and Y have in common. The more properties they share, the better the argument. The fewer properties they share, the worse the argument. Second, is the relevance of the shared properties to property Z. The more relevant the shared properties are to Z, the stronger the argument. For a property, say P, to be relevant to Z means that the presence or absence of P makes it more or less likely that Z will also be present. For example, the property of being a Catholic is relevant to the property of being a person who is morally opposed to abortion-if a person is catholic, then she is likely to be morally opposed to abortion. Third, there is the question of whether X and Y have relevant dissimilarities as well as similarities. The more dissimilarities and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument.

*Applying the Standards to the HTA*

The Horse Trainer Analogy is to be assessed in terms of the standards presented above. As such, there are three main questions to answer in the course of the assessment. First, do the youth and horses share enough properties? If you think they do, then briefly make a case for the claim that they do share enough properties. If you think they do not, then briefly make a case against the claim they share enough properties.

If you hold that the overall argument fails, it is perfectly acceptable to concede that the youth and horses share enough properties. This is known as conceding or accepting a point for the sake of the argument. To be specific, rather than arguing against a point you simply assume it is true and then go on to argue against what you consider to be a more important point. This is often done when a point is very plausible or when the point is not seen as important enough to dispute. There is no special requirement to argue against every point made in an argument-provided that the key points are adequately addressed. It is important to note that if you agree with a claim and intend to argue for it, then you cannot simply "concede" the point or assume it to be true-this would be begging the question.

Second, are the shared properties relevant? If you think the shared properties are relevant, then clearly present these properties and argue why they are relevant. This involves showing why the horses and the youth are relevantly similar. The properties that seem to be the most important relative to the issue are as follows: 1) Being in need of training. 2) The trainer must be skilled in order to benefit those being trained. 3) The skilled trainers are few in number. 4) The unskilled are many in number. 5) The unskilled are harmful to those they influence. The overall goal is to show that the youth and the horses are alike in these key ways and that these qualities are relevant to the property in question-namely being trained by the skilled one or corrupted by the unskilled many.

If you think that the properties are not relevant, then you would need to support this claim. This would involve showing that these qualities are not, in fact, relevant. If you are arguing that the argument fails you can elect to

concede this standard for the sake of the argument. In this case you would need to show that the argument fails in some other way. Naturally, if you contend that the argument succeeds, then you cannot simply assume that it does-you need to argue for the relevance of these qualities.

Third, are there any relevant dissimilarities between the youth and the horses? If you think the argument is a good one then you need to argue that either there are not any relevant dissimilarities or that the relevant similarities outweigh the dissimilarities. The overall task would be to show that young humans and young horses are not different in ways that are relevant to the analogy.

If you think the argument is flawed you would need to argue that the dissimilarities outweigh the similarities. To do this you would need to find relevant differences between young horses and young humans that would make the analogy fail.

Another approach, if you think the argument is flawed, is to argue that the analogy fails because Socrates is comparing two different types of training that are not analogous. To be specific, it could be argued that Socrates' analogy involves comparing a situation in which a horse is trained by a human to perform human tasks with a situation in which other humans raise young humans. The task would be to clearly show the differences between the situations and to argue that the analogy is flawed because the differences are relevant. In other words, the goal is to show that it is unreasonable to draw a conclusion about the raising of humans from the training of horses.

When addressing the third standard, be sure to focus on differences that are relevant. Horses and young humans are different in many ways, for example, horses have hoofs and (with the obvious exception of Mr. Ed) cannot talk, but not all these differences are relevant. For example, it would be unreasonable to conclude that the analogy fails because horses are herbivores and humans are omnivores.

### **Does the analogy respond to the charge?**

Once the analogy has been assessed you will need to decide whether the analogy refutes the charge that Socrates corrupts the youth or not. There are actually two versions of the charge, the original and the modified version. Be sure to address both versions of the charges.

#### *The Original Charge*

The original charge is simply that Socrates corrupts the youth. If the analogy reasonably shows that Socrates did not corrupt the youth, then it would refute the original charge. If it does not, then it would not refute the charge.

If you believe the argument refutes the original charge, you would need to do two things. First, you would need to have argued that the analogy is a good analogy (see above). Second, you would need to argue that the analogy supports the conclusion that Socrates did not corrupt the youth. To do this, you would need to show that the reasoning in the analogy logically leads to the conclusion that Socrates did not corrupt the youth.

If you believe that the argument does not refute the original charge, you have two options and can use either or both. If you have already argued that the analogy fails as an argument, then you can conclude that the analogy does not refute the charge. This would be because a failed argument cannot adequately support a conclusion. The second option is to argue that the analogy, even if it succeeds as an analogy, fails to refute the charge. In this case you would need to show that even if the analogy shows that the one with knowledge benefits the youth and the many who lack knowledge harm the youth, Socrates has failed to show that he is the one with knowledge and not one of the many who harm the youth.

It is possible to take the position that the analogy is a good analogy and also take the view that it fails to refute the original charge.

#### *The Modified Charge*

In the course of his defense Socrates modifies the original charge-he gets Meletus to claim that Socrates is the sole corruptor of the youth. While this seems like a minor change, it actually changes things substantially. In order to refute this charge Socrates need not show that he is not a corruptor. Rather, he just needs to show that there is at least one person, who is not Socrates, who corrupts the youth.

If you believe the argument refutes the modified charge, you would need to do two things. First, you would need to have argued that the analogy is a good analogy (see above). Second, you would need to argue that the analogy supports the conclusion that Socrates is not the sole corruptor of the youth. To do this, you would need to show that the reasoning in the analogy logically leads to the conclusion that there are many corruptors. This is easy to do—you simply need to make it clear to the reader how the argument does this.

If you believe that the argument does not refute the modified charge, you would need to show that the analogy fails as an analogy (see above). If the analogy succeeds, then it almost certainly shows that there are many corruptors and hence would refute the modified charge.

### Assessing the Unintentional Argument

Unlike the Horse Trainer Analogy, the Unintentional Argument is not an analogy and is not assessed in the same way. It is, instead, assessed as a “generic” argument in terms of two main standards. First, are the premises plausible? Second, do the premises logically support the conclusion?

#### *Assessing the Premises: Introduction*

For an argument to be successful, it must have plausible premises. Premises serve as evidence for the conclusion of the argument. Hence, if the premises are dubious, then there will be no reason to accept the conclusion based on them. Thus, showing that one or more of the premises of an argument are flawed serves to show that the argument is flawed. While plausible premises are essential to a good argument, showing that the premises are plausible does not show that the argument is a good one. This is because an argument could have plausible premises but also have poor reasoning connecting them to the conclusion.

If you believe that the unintentional argument is successful, then you would need to argue that the premises are plausible. If you think the argument is not successful, then you can argue that the premises are flawed or you can argue that the reasoning is flawed (see below) or both.

Many arguments, including the Unintentional Argument, have a key premise or premises upon which the argument hinges. While a complete and utter assessment of an argument would involve assessing every premises, in this case it is quite acceptable to focus primarily on the key premise of the argument: “if he corrupts a man he has to live with, it is very likely he will be harmed by him.” The other premises in the argument play a role in the argument, but they all seem rather plausible—for the sake of the paper it is fine to assume that they are acceptable.

If you think the argument succeeds, you will need to argue that Socrates is right—if he corrupted the youth, then they would harm him. If you think that Socrates is wrong, then you will need to argue that he could corrupt the youth without being harmed by them. You can also attack the other premises in the argument if you believe that they are implausible. It is possible to hold that the overall argument is flawed and that the key premise is plausible—in this case you would argue that the reasoning is flawed (see below).

#### *Assessing the Premises: Using an Argument by Example*

One way to argue for or against the key claim in Socrates’ Unintentional Argument is by using an argument by example. You are **not** required to use this method, but it is a useful approach. Not surprisingly, an argument by example is an argument in which a claim is supported by providing examples.

Although people generally present arguments by example in a fairly informal manner, they have the following logical form:

Premise 1: Example 1 is an example that supports claim P.

Premise n: Example n is an example that supports claim P.

Conclusion: Claim P is true.

In this case  $n$  is a variable standing for the number of the premise in question and  $P$  is a variable standing for the claim under consideration.

The strength of an argument from example depends on four factors. First, the more examples, the stronger the argument. Second, the more relevant the examples, the stronger the argument will be. Third, the examples must

be specific and clearly identified. Fourth, counter-examples must be considered. A counter-example is an example that counts against the claim. One way to look at a counter example is that it is an example that supports the denial of the conclusion being argued for. The more counter-examples and the more relevant they are, the weaker the argument

If you chose to argue in support of Socrates, then you would provide real examples in which people corrupt other people and then are harmed by those they corrupt. If you have decided to argue against Socrates, then you would present examples of real cases in which people corrupted others but were not harmed by those they corrupted. History is full of both sorts of cases-so examples are very easy to find. It is best to use people who are well known and cases that are well documented. Using people that are not well known, such as someone who was a bad influence on others in your third grade class, will make for a much weaker argument.

### *Assessing the Premises: General Arguments and Hints*

While using an argument by example is an effective way to argue for or against the key premise, it is not the only way. There are many other ways to argue for or against that premise (or any of the premises) and a few of these will be discussed here. It is important to note that while you are required to assess the premises you are not required to use any of the specific hints in your approach.

One approach is to use an Argument by Analogy. If you agree with Socrates, then you could create an analogy that supports his claim. For example, you might use the analogy of a person who is cruel to his dog-it is likely that the dog will turn on him someday. If you disagree with Socrates, then you would create an analogy that undercuts his claim. For example, you might use the analogy of a person who trains her pit bulls to be vicious killers-they brutally attack other dogs and other people, but never harm her. Regardless of the position you take, be sure to adequately develop the analogy (the standards are presented above in the discussion of the Horse Trainer Analogy).

One approach that should be avoided is arguing that Socrates was insane or did not care if he was harmed and therefore his premises are false. In addition to the fact that this does not seem particularly relevant, there does not seem to be any evidence for this and unsupported speculation about such matters does little in the way of assessing his premises. Naturally, if you do have access to such evidence, be sure to properly cite the source.

### *Assessing the Reasoning*

As noted above, an argument can have plausible premises yet still fail because the reasoning is poor. In an argument, the reasoning is how the premises connect to the conclusion. In general terms, the reasoning in an argument is good when the premises logically support the conclusion. In other words, if the premises were true, then it would be reasonable to accept that the conclusion is true.

Roughly put, his reasoning is that since no one wants to be harmed, and if he corrupts the youth they will harm him, then either he did not corrupt the youth or did so unintentionally.

If you agree with Socrates, you will need to argue that the logic of the Unintentional Argument is reasonable. In other words, that the premises adequately support the conclusion so that if you accept the premises, then you have good reason to accept the conclusion.

If you disagree with Socrates you will need to show that the reasoning is flawed-that even if the premises are true, then you would not have good grounds for accepting his conclusion.

### *Overall Assessment*

If you think the argument is successful overall then you will need to argue that the premises are plausible and that the reasoning is good. If you think that the argument fails overall, then you can argue that the premises are implausible or argue that the reasoning fails or both. A good argument requires both good premises and good reasoning but a bad argument need only fail in one way.

### **Does the Unintentional Argument respond to the charge?**

Once the Unintentional Argument has been assessed you will need to decide whether it refutes the charge that Socrates corrupts the youth or not. There are actually two versions of the charge, the original and the modified version. Be sure to address both versions of the charges.

### *Original Charge*

If the argument reasonably shows that Socrates did not corrupt the youth, then it would refute the original charge. If it does not, then it would not refute the charge.

If you believe the argument refutes the original charge, you would need to do two things. First, you would need to have argued that the argument is a good argument (see above). Second, you would need to argue that the argument supports the conclusion that Socrates did not corrupt the youth. To do this, you would need to show that the reasoning logically leads to the conclusion that Socrates did not corrupt the youth.

If you believe that the argument does not refute the original charge, you have two options and can use either or both. If you have already argued that the argument fails as an argument, then you can conclude that the analogy does not refute the charge. This would be because a failed argument cannot adequately support a conclusion. The second option is to argue that the argument, even if it succeeds as an argument, fails to refute the charge. In this case you would need to show that even if the argument shows that a person would not intentionally corrupt the youth, Socrates has failed to show that he did not corrupt them.

It is possible to take the position that the argument is a good argument and also take the view that it fails to refute the original charge.

### *The Modified Charge*

In the course of his defense Socrates modifies the original charge—he gets Meletus to claim that Socrates intentionally corrupts the youth. While this seems like a minor change, it actually changes things substantially. In order to refute this charge Socrates need not show that he is not a corruptor. Rather, he just needs to show that if he did corrupt the youth, then he did so unintentionally.

If you believe the argument refutes the modified charge, you would need to do two things. First, you would need to have argued that the argument is a good argument (see above). Second, you would need to argue that the argument supports the conclusion that Socrates did not corrupt the youth intentionally. To do this, you would need to show that the reasoning in the argument logically leads to the conclusion that he did not corrupt the youth or did so unintentionally. This should be easy to do—you simply need to make it clear to the reader how the argument does this.

If you believe that the argument does not refute the modified charge, you would need to show that the argument fails as an argument (see above). If the argument succeeds, then it almost certainly shows that either he did not corrupt the youth or did so unintentionally.

## **Assessment of the Argument Section**

The argument section is worth 45 points. It is assessed in terms of two factors: the quality of the arguments presented and the quality of the writing. The following standards are used to assess the work.

### **Excellent Argument Section (A) (41-45 points)**

- Clearly and concisely presents your position on the issue.
- Presents effective and well-developed arguments.
- Presents the argument section of the work as a coherent whole.
- Clearly presents how the arguments impact on the overall issue.
- Is extremely well organized.

### **Good Argument Section (B) (36-40 points)**

- Does most of what an excellent argument does, but has some minor flaws.

### **Adequate Argument Section (C) (32-35 points)**

- States your position.
- Presents basic arguments that are relevant.
- Does not achieve the quality of a good argument section but does not have any major flaws.

**Poor Argument Section (D) (27-31 points)**

- Does not clearly present your position.
- Presents weak or poor arguments.
- Contains some fallacies.
- Is poorly organized.
- Is incomplete.
- Has some other major flaws or has numerous other minor flaws.

**Failing Argument Section (F) (0-26 points)**

- Contains very poor arguments.
- Contains fallacies.
- Is unclear.
- Is poorly presented.
- Is very poorly organized.
- Is incomplete.
- Has many other major flaws.

**Writing the Conclusion**

The conclusion is worth five (5) points and needs to contain the following five points. It should be no more than 125 words in length. The conclusion should be written out as text rather than presented as an outline. See the sample paper, below. The purpose of the conclusion is to remind the reader what was done in the paper.

1. **Thesis:** “The purpose of this paper was to summarize and critically evaluate Socrates reply to the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth.”
  - a. You should copy the thesis.
2. **Summary Statement:** Briefly state what you did in the summary.
  - a. Example: “In the summary I presented the charge against Socrates, his questioning of Meletus regarding the youth and gave special attention to his replies to the charges, namely the Horse Trainer Analogy (HTA) and the Unintentional Argument (UA).”
  - b. This statement must be in your own words-simply copying the example is plagiarism.
3. **Position Statement:** Briefly state your position on the issue.
  - a. Issue: Do Socrates’ arguments refute the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth?
  - b. Example: “It is my opinion that Socrates’ arguments fail to refute the charge.”
  - c. Be sure to state your position-don’t just copy the example.
4. **Argument Statement:** Briefly state what arguments (of your own) you presented in support of your position.
  - a. Example: “The HTA was examined using the three standards for assessing an analogical argument and it was shown that the HTA comes up short. The key premise of the UA was shown to be false, thus undercutting the argument.”
  - b. Be sure the statement is about your arguments-don’t just copy the example.
5. **Final Relevant Remark:** Make some final relevant remark.
  - a. Example: “Though Socrates was put to death long ago, his words live on-perhaps he is still corrupting the youth from beyond the grave.”
  - b. Be sure to provide your own relevant remark-simply copying the example is plagiarism.

**Checklist & Comment Sheet**

The Checklist & Comment Sheet is provided below. It is also available as a separate file, for easy printing. Be sure to print a copy of the sheet and attach it to your paper. The sheet is divided into four parts. The first part is the Checklist for the draft (and final version). It is a list of things that could cost you points if they were not done. The main purpose of the checklist is to give you a quick way to check that you haven’t missed any points

needlessly. The second part is the Rewrite Checklist. This has the same purpose as the Checklist, but includes the additional requirements for the rewrite (final version) of the paper.

The third part is the signature section. Signing this indicates that the paper is your own work, that you are aware of the requirements of the paper, and so on-as spelled out on the sheet. Please be sure to sign this before turning the paper in.

The fourth part consists of the codes for the comments. When grading papers I found that I tended to write the same comments over and over. That fact, combined with my horrific handwriting, inspired me to develop the comment sheet.

When you get your draft(s) and final rewrite back, it will have various comments codes on it (such as S2, A14, and so on). To figure out what those marks mean, consult the sheet on the next page. The comments are divided into five categories. The first is Organization/Style/Presentation. These comments, amazingly enough, relate to the organization, style and presentation of the paper. The second is Introduction/Conclusion and these are comments specific to the Introduction and Conclusion sections of the paper. The third category consists of the Summary comments and these are specific remarks about the Summary section. Some of these comments might be applied to other parts of the paper as well-but they most often apply to the Summary. The fourth set of comments applies to the Argument section of the paper. These include rather specific remarks about what should be in a complete argument section as well as comments on the quality of the reasoning. The fifth category of comments is Penalties. As the name indicates, these are specific things that can cost points off from your grade. The final category is Quality. The remarks relate to the quality of the work.

**Intro to Philosophy Checklist & Comments Sheet**

Dr. LaBossiere (Revised 11/14/2008)

Important: You must print this sheet, check the boxes, print your name, sign it, and then staple it to the paper. A paper is not considered officially turned in until all these steps have been taken.

**Checklist**

- Paper is typed/computer printed (-10 penalty for handwritten papers).
- All four sections are labeled (-1 per section that is not labeled).
- All direct quotes/paraphrases are properly cited (-1 per failure to cite, possibility of plagiarism).
- Pages are stapled together (-1 for failing to staple pages).
- An extra copy has been made and put in a safe place.
- Your name and the name of the course (Intro to Philosophy) are on the paper.
- All requirements for the paper have been met and the paper is on the proper topic.
- All pages are present and the paper is the correct paper for the course.
- You have signed and attached this Checklist & Comments sheet to the paper (the paper is not officially turned in until this is done).

**Rewrite Checklist**

- The rewrite has been completed before the deadline.
- The original paper (if there is one) has been turned in with the rewrite.
- Changes from the original (if any) have been highlighted in the **revised** version.
- If the paper is being turned in for the first time on the rewrite deadline, it has been marked "First Time."
- If the original paper was late and is being turned in again unchanged, it has been marked "Unchanged."

I, \_\_\_\_\_ (print your name), assert that this paper is my own work and that all sources have been properly cited and documented. I further assert that I understand the concept of plagiarism and I am aware of the penalties associated with plagiarism. Finally, I assert that I have completed the checklist above and that I am aware of the requirements for the paper.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Paper Comments**

Information: The letters and numbers in the paper correspond to the letters and numbers on this comment sheet—simply match what is marked on your paper to this list of comments. These are general comments so your paper might not contain all of them.

<p><b>Organization/Style/Presentation</b></p> <p>O1. This needed to be better organized.  O2. This needed to be better presented.  O3. This needed to be clearer.  O4. This is too vague.  O5. This is ambiguous.  O6. This needed to be more concise.  O7. You need to start a new paragraph here.</p> <p><b>Introduction/Conclusion</b></p> <p>I1. Not all five required points are present.  I2. This is needlessly long.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>S1. This needs to be more detailed.  S2. Important details have been left out.  S3. This is not accurate.  S4. This should be in your own words.  S5. Too many direct quotes are being used.  S6. This is not part of the assigned text.  S7. Delete this—this does not need to be in the paper.  S8. Don't assess/comment in the summary.</p> <p><b>Argument</b></p> <p>A1. You needed to clearly state your position on each issue.  A2. This is not the issue/you are not addressing the issue.  A3. This is summary material.  A4. This is not relevant to the issue/you needed to show relevance.  A5. There is no argument here.  A6. You needed to support this.  A7. You needed to develop this argument more.</p>	<p>A8. This just repeats the claims without assessing them.  A9. You needed to show how this impacts the issue.  A10. This is a fallacy.  A11. You needed to assess the Horse Trainer analogy (HTA) using the standards for assessing an analogy.  A12. You needed to argue whether or not the HTA refutes the original charge.  A13. You needed to argue whether or not the HTA refutes the modified charge.  A14. You needed to assess the Unintentional Argument (UA).  A15. You needed to argue whether or not the UA refutes the original charge.  A16. You needed to argue whether or not the UA refutes the modified charge.</p> <p><b>Penalties</b></p> <p>P1. You needed to properly cite this. -1 point/incident.  P2. This is plagiarism.  P3. All four sections are not labeled. -1 point per unlabeled section.  P4. The paper not stapled. -1 point.  P5. The paper not typed/computer printed -10.  P6. The paper is not on the assigned topic.</p> <p><b>Quality</b></p> <p>Q1. Okay.  Q2. Good.  Q3. Excellent.</p>
--	--

## Sample Paper

This paper is intended to serve as an example of the sort of paper you should write. Copying or paraphrasing from it (with the exception of the thesis statement) would be plagiarism.

### I Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to summarize and critically evaluate Socrates' reply to the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth. In the summary I will present the charge against Socrates, his questioning of Meletus regarding the youth and give special attention to his replies to the charge, namely the Horse Trainer Analogy (HTA) and the Unintentional Argument (UA). It is my opinion that Socrates' arguments fail to refute the charge. The HTA will be examined using the three standards for assessing an analogical argument and it will be shown that the HTA comes up short. The key premise of the UA will be shown to be false, thus undercutting the argument. The Apology is an account of Socrates' trial as presented by his student Plato. The Apology focuses on Socrates' replies to the charges leveled against him by his accusers. Socrates' main opponent is Meletus-the spokesman for those who have brought him to trial.

### II Summary

Although Socrates has been charged with many 'crimes', one of the main accusations made against him is that he is wrongdoer who has corrupted the young men of Athens. Although a group of men have brought Socrates to trial, the main spokesman is Meletus. In reply to the accusation that he is a corruptor, Socrates turns the tables on Meletus and raises three charges against him: First, Meletus is the true corruptor of the youth. Second, Meletus acts as if he is serious but is clearly joking in regards to the matter at hand. Third, Meletus is quick to take people to court, though his claimed motive is but a false one.

Since Meletus claimed to be greatly concerned with the well being of the young men of Athens, Socrates asks him to identify those who serve to improve them. Though Socrates has to lead Meletus through a series of questions, he eventually gets him to assert that all the Athenians, with the sole exception of Socrates, help improve the young men. Socrates, he claims, is the sole corrupting influence in the city.

In reply, Socrates presents the Horse Trainer Analogy. He begins by claiming that, in the case of horses, one man (the horse trainer) can improve them. In contrast, people who are not horse trainers will harm the horses if they attempt to train them. Socrates claims that, by analogy, this is true of all animals-including, presumably, the young men of Athens. Socrates notes that the young men would indeed be well off if they only faced one corrupting influence while being aided by all other Athenians. Socrates concludes by asserting that Meletus did not really have any concern for the youth-his sole concern seemed to be to simply bring a charge, any charge, against Socrates.

After concluding the Horse Trainer Analogy, Socrates presents the Unintentional Argument. Using his usual method, he leads Meletus through a series of questions. By the use of said questions, he gets Meletus to agree that it is preferable to live with good people rather than bad people. This is because good people aid their fellows and bad people harm them. Meletus also admits that everyone would prefer to be aided by others rather than harmed-this is because everyone prefers not to be harmed. When Socrates inquires as to whether his corruption was intended or not, Meletus claims that Socrates meant to corrupt the young men. In reply, Socrates reminds Meletus that he agreed that good people aid their fellows but bad people harm them. Socrates points out that he knows full well that if he makes those around him bad, these bad people will probably harm him. Given this, Socrates concludes that either he did not corrupt the young Athenians or, if he did corrupt them, he had no conscious intent to do so. If he did not corrupt the youth, then Meletus' charge would have no foundation. If Socrates corrupted the youth without intending to do so, he asserts that Meletus should have warned him of his accidental misdeeds so that he, Socrates, might put an end to the activity. But, as Socrates claims, Meletus did not say anything to Socrates and instead brought him to court to be punished. From this Socrates concludes, once again, that Meletus is not actually concerned about the issue at hand.

### III Argument

When faced with Meletus' initial charge that he is a corruptor of the youth, Socrates elects to modify the charge twice and reply to each of these modifications. The first modification is to change the charge from being a corruptor of the youth to being the sole corruptor of the youth. Socrates addresses this charge with the horse trainer analogy. His second modification is to change the charge from being a corruptor of the youth to being an intentional corruptor of the youth. This modified charge is addressed by the unintentional argument. Socrates' replies to the three charges (the original and the two modified) will be assessed in terms of how effectively they refute said charges.

When first considered, the Horse Trainer Analogy seems to be a very plausible argument. After all, training an animal requires special skills and abilities that most people simply do not possess. However, a closer examination shows that the Horse Trainer Analogy is ready for the glue factory.

Since the Horse Trainer Analogy is an analogy, it must be assessed by the standards of that sort of argument. To be specific, the quality of the argument depends on the number and relevance of the similarities between the two things being compared. The greater the number and relevance of these similarities, the better the argument. Also important is the number of relevant dissimilarities between the two things. The greater the number and relevance of these dissimilarities, the worse the argument.

In the Horse Trainer Analogy, the situation involves a horse being trained by a human trainer. However, this situation is not analogous to the situation of the youth of Athens. The youth are humans being trained by other humans and not by members of another species. For the analogy to fit the situation correctly, the trainer of the horse would need to be another horse. That this is relevant difference can be shown by the following argument.

Horses are clearly able to train other horses. This is supported by the fact that horses have been successfully training other horses to be horses since there have been horses. Yet, there do not appear to be any special horse training horses that educate the other horses in the ways of being horses. If humans are like horses (as Socrates' own analogy requires) then it would follow that humans should be able to train other humans to be humans without the need for a special human trainer. The situation would no doubt be different if the youth were being trained by a non-human species. Such a trainer would require skills comparable to that of a human horse trainer. Fortunately for the youth of Athens, they are being trained by other humans and not by some other species.

In sum, the analogy fails because it involves comparing a situation in which one species is training another with a situation in which one species is training its own members. Since this difference is relevant, the analogy fails. Now, to turn to the issue at hand: does the argument refute the charges or not.

The original charge is, of course, that Socrates corrupted the youth. Even if it is assumed that the Horse Trainer Analogy succeeds, it does not refute this charge: Even if the many do corrupt the youth and only horse trainers can aid them, it does not follow that Socrates is not one of the many. While he is no doubt implying that he is the horse trainer, there is nothing in the argument itself that establishes this. If the argument fails, as has been argued, that it is quite obvious that it cannot refute the charge—a failed argument cannot establish its conclusion.

The modified charge is that Socrates is the sole corruptor of the youth. If the analogy was successful, then this charge would have been refuted for it would show that many people were harmful to the youth. However, it was shown that the argument fails. Because of this it does not refute the modified charge. I now turn to the second argument, which is also flawed.

As with the Horse Trainer Analogy, the Unintentional Argument has a degree of initial plausibility. After all, it certainly makes sense to believe that a person would not intentionally put himself at risk by corrupting others.

Unfortunately, the argument is flawed. The main flaw in the Unintentional Argument is that a key premise is implausible. This critical premise is the claim that he knows that if he makes the youth bad, then they will probably harm him. This premise can be countered by the following argument.

While it is reasonable to believe that bad people do bad things, there is adequate evidence to support the opposite of what Socrates' claims, namely that a person can corrupt others without being harmed by them. That this is the case can be shown by an argument from example.

First, consider a variety of 'cult' leaders such as Jim Jones, David Koresh, Marshall Applewhite and Charles Manson. These men corrupted their followers and lead them to do terrible actions. For example, the followers of Charles Manson and those of Jim Jones murdered people and the followers of Jones, Koresh, and Applewhite

committed suicide at the behest of their leaders. Yet, in spite of this corruption, the followers did not turn on their masters-even in those cases in which their masters ordered them to commit suicide.

Second, consider a variety of political leaders such as Stalin, Hitler, Pol Pot, and even George W. Bush. These men clearly corrupted their followers. For example, Hitler led the German people to embrace the Nazi path and this plunged Europe into war and genocide. Stalin set up a police state which exterminated millions of its own citizens. Pol Pot dragged Cambodia into the bloody whirlpool of genocide. George W. Bush has led America into a brutal war 'against' terror in which Americans torture, degrade and terrorize people. Yet, despite the corruption inflicted by these men, their followers remained loyal and they were able to avoid being harmed by those they corrupted.

While it is not claimed that Socrates was a bad person, it is evident that he had a great deal of influence over people. This is supported by the fact that Meletus was worried about his influence and is also evident in the *Apology* and other dialogues. Given his influence, he could have well corrupted the youth while using this influence to avoid being harmed by them,

In light of these examples, it is evident that a person can corrupt others and avoid being harmed by them. Since Socrates' argument rests on the claim that he knows he will probably be harmed by those he corrupts, his argument is severely weakened. After all, he could corrupt them and remain unharmed-as many leaders have done throughout history.

What remains to be seen is whether his argument refutes the charges or not. The unmodified charge is that Socrates corrupted the youth-with no reference to intent. The Unintentional Argument clearly fails to refute this charge. Even if it is assumed that the argument succeeds it establishes a disjunction-either he did not corrupt the youth or he did so unintentionally. This naturally leaves open the possibility that Socrates was an accidental corruptor.

It has, of course, been argued that the unintentional argument fails to establish that if Socrates corrupted the youth, then he did so unintentionally. Thus, he could have corrupted the youth intentionally or accidentally. So, it must be concluded that the original charge is not refuted.

The modified charge is that Socrates corrupted the youth intentionally. As noted above, he tries to refute this by arguing that he either did not corrupt the youth or did so unintentionally. But, as has been shown, he could have corrupted the youth intentionally and relied on his influence over them to avoid harm. Thus it should be concluded that the argument does not refute the modified charge.

In light of the above arguments it should be concluded that Socrates' arguments fail to refute the original and modified charges.

#### **IV Conclusion**

The purpose of this paper was to summarize and critically evaluate Socrates' reply to the charge that he is a wrongdoer who corrupts the youth. In the summary I presented the charge against Socrates, his questioning of Meletus regarding the youth and gave special attention to his replies to the charge, namely the Horse Trainer Analogy (HTA) and the Unintentional Argument (UA). It is my opinion that Socrates' arguments fail to refute the charge. The HTA was examined using the three standards for assessing an analogical argument and it was shown that the HTA came up short. The key premise of the UA was shown to be false, thus undercutting the argument. Though Socrates was put to death long ago, his words live on-perhaps he is still corrupting the youth from beyond the grave.