

Premise: If Socrates dies then Crito loses not only a friend, but social standing. He will be thought ill of for allowing Socrates to die as nobody will believe that Socrates denied Crito's offer of paying for his freedom.

Comment [dp1]: This is the conclusion of this piece of the series of arguments. It could be stated as loss of reputation with "the many" which plays into the whole line of thinking about the difference between wisdom and the opinions of "the many."

Premise: Socrates argues that it is not the collective's opinion that we should value, rather the people whose opinion do matter will know what took place.

Counter Premise: Crito states that we should value the opinion of the collective since it is the collective who have the power to inflict the greatest of evils (the unjust fate of Socrates and the slandering of his reputation). He uses Socrates' situation as his proof for his statement. Should one insult the collective, then one must be wary of the repercussions.

Comment [dp2]: This is a premise indicator and the phrase prior to this is the conclusion it supports.

Comment [dp3]: All of which goes to support the conclusion that what the many think is important. Or to be valued.

Counter Premise/Premise: Socrates counters that if the collective can inflict the greatest evils, then it is capable of doing the greatest good. He also states that the collective cannot make a man wise or foolish; in turn they do things recklessly (a nod to the rhetoric the Sophists use and how opinions can sway rapidly).

Comment [dp4]: Which are the greatest good and the greatest harm.

Conclusion: The collective's opinion cannot be given any value since it is easily swayed in any way a person with sufficient charisma wishes.

Comment [dp5]: This is the actual conclusion of Socrates.

Comment [dp6]: Premise indicator

Comment [dp7]: premise

Premise: Crito advises Socrates that he should have no fears over the fates of any of his benefactors for money is not a matter of concern. The people willing to pay for Socrates' escape have plenty of money to pay off anyone willing to denounce them.

Premise: Crito also says that if it is his personal relationship with Socrates that prevents him from accepting his offer of escape, then there are foreigners in the city who have brought money to free Socrates should this be the case.

Premise: Crito states that Socrates is doing wrong by allowing his accusers to execute him. He states that Socrates is doing his sons wrong by abandoning his sons to grow up as orphans and choosing the easiest path out (execution).

Comment [dp8]: there are three premises here: the ones you have and the either/or of either do not have children or fulfill the obligation of raising and educating them. Implied fourth premise: You DID have children. Conclusion: you have an obligation to raise and educate them. Implied fifth premise: you cannot raise and educate them if you die. CONCLUSION: Therefore, you must escape. This is in fact the conclusion of every argument Crito makes in this series

Premise: Crito says that Socrates should instead choose the path of good, stating that it would be virtuous to escape and not allow his accusers to kill him.

Premise: Crito states Socrates is doing evil by allowing the outcome of the trial come to be.

Conclusion: Injustice does not hold the same grounds as justice, in which case one is to not allow injustice the ability to fulfill itself. Giving injustice the same treatment as justice is unjust, not only is it wrong to stand back allows injustice to continue but it is unjust to accept injustice as justice.

Premise: Socrates says that one should value the opinions of some men, not all; he then asks Crito if it is correct and Crito agrees. Socrates asks if one should value only good opinions and not bad ones, Crito agrees. Socrates then asks that if the good opinions are pertaining to wise men, then the bad ones are those of fools; Crito agrees. Socrates then gives the example of an

athlete and his crowd, the athlete is to listen to the trainer for he knows best and not his crowd. The reason is due to the risk of personal injury he may suffer.

Conclusion: With health one should trust the opinion of the individual who knows of the subject, not of the many who simply base themselves on opinion.

Premise: Socrates states that a life worth living is not one in where the body is ruined. He then states that our virtue is even more important than our bodies, for it is our virtue that keeps us away from unjust actions; Crito agrees to this.

Conclusion: One should value virtue above all else. If the collective (who opinionate) deem the physical body more important, but the few know that virtue is more important, then one should heed the few and protect virtue.

Premise: Socrates states that one must never do wrong willingly, doing wrong is never good nor is it admirable, and to do wrong is not only harmful but shameful as well.

Premise: Socrates says that should not do wrong to those that have wronged him. By wronging them, he would be acting of unjust virtue and that is wrong.

Conclusion: To act wrong in any manner is wrong; there is no excuse for acting wrongly. Socrates cannot then act in any manner that is wrong because it goes contrary to what he has just established in his argument.

Premise: Socrates states that if one is to enter a contract, then one should honor it. By leaving the prison and escaping his sentence Socrates is breaking the laws. By breaking the laws he is acting unjustly to the city. By being raised by the city Socrates has entered a contract that has him abide by the laws of the city. By being educated and gaining his insight from the city he is to act in accordance to what the city decrees, do to otherwise would be unjust. To act in accordance with the laws is just, even if those laws are contrary to what you consider just. To obey the laws is just, so one must obey the laws for it is just, obedience to the laws is of the utmost importance. To disobey the laws of the city is to take arms against the city, to do so is unjust. One must then acknowledge that the laws of the city are the truth. By gaining everything from the city one is to be indebted to the city. The collective has given Socrates everything he has, if he is to disobey the decree of the city then he will do wrong.

Comment [dp9]: It is important to notice in the dialogue that Socrates (Plato) says "just agreement." That would exclude agreements that are unjust. Best to insert the word just as the dialogue has it.

Conclusion: By disobeying the city Socrates is doing wrong in three ways: he is disobeying his parents, the people who raised him, and he is not attempting to better the collective. He has constantly shown pride and respect to his city, Socrates has defended his city, he was given the chance to spare himself death via exile but has refused it, thus Socrates would rather die than be parted from his city. To run away now would be to dishonor the city; in turn it would be contrary to everything he has ever done as a citizen of the city. Socrates has deemed Athens as congenial to him; he cannot back out of his agreements with Athens, to do so would make him a hypocrite.

Premise: Leaving Athens would make him the enemy of any city he immigrates to, Socrates would already be showing no respect to the laws by arriving in another city by defying the laws

of Athens. Foreign governments would deem Socrates a danger because he has defiled the laws of Athens, the city he so faithfully served his entire life; this new city would mean little to Socrates and thus Socrates would treat it worse.

Conclusion: By escaping his sentence, Socrates then commits exactly what he was accused of by his enemies. His actions destroy the laws and corrupt the young and ignorant; willingly.

Premise: If Socrates avoids a well governed city then he cannot live a life worth living. Socrates will be lacking people of worthy intellectual stimulation, he will be lacking virtue, and he will be lacking justice.

Premise: If Socrates joins Crito and his friends in Thessaly for the sake of his children then he will be denying his children a proper upbringing in Athens, his children will be raised to simply feast in Thessaly as strangers. His children will not be taken care of in Athens should he leave, although they would be if he was to leave for the underworld (accept the execution).

Sub Conclusion: Socrates has not been wronged by the laws. The laws have always been just to Socrates and it is men who have wronged him, not the laws. By escaping he wrongs the laws (who have not wronged him), the jury, the city, his entire previous agreement with the city, himself, and his friends. This is because Socrates will have wronged the city by attempting to wrong the laws (unjustly). Socrates cannot turn his back on his contract with Athens by disrespecting its just laws in an attempt to get back at the men who have wronged him.

Final Conclusion: Unjust men have used the just laws against Socrates. It was men that have wronged Socrates and not the laws. If Socrates was to defy the laws (wronging them) in an attempt to defy his accusers then he would be only doing the laws wrong (thus actually perpetrating what he was originally accused of). If Socrates dies then he does well by the laws (and effectively Athens) by upholding them. Socrates cannot wrong the laws for they have done nothing to wrong him. Socrates cannot wrong his accusers by fleeing because wronging anyone by even the slightest is wrong (by account of the act of wronging is itself wrong). The conclusion then is that Socrates has no option but to accept his fate if he is to act virtuously. In fact, the only way he can act virtuously is to die in accordance to his sentence.

John,

I only commented enough to give you an idea of how to parse the premises and conclusions more completely. Your general flow of the reasoning in the Crito is correct. But there are many more premise conclusion relationships, counter premise counter conclusion relationship than what is indicated. You could also indicate somewhere that Crito's arguments are all appeals to consequences and even a perverse appeal to what is right. Socrates indicates that justice is the only concern when considering consequences, not what people want or believe.

Nonetheless, good job.

Grade: B+/A-