

15. The unimpeachable character of Socrates

by George Pisanis



George Pisanis

The unimpeachable character of Socrates

«Truth is the mirror of Justice.
But when the judges are unscrupulous
Justice wanders
and Truth is torn into pieces»

George Pisanis

It is time to examine with undiverted zeal the accusations levelled against Socrates. By applying logic and sound thought we will show that Love, Justice and Truth shone on the unimpeachable character of the great wise man of antiquity, as do the rays of the sun.

First, let us see what were the legalities of the accusations of 'impiety and the corruption of youth' levelled against him:

“Socrates acts unjustly by refusing to believe in the gods that the city believes in, and he imports new daemons. He is also corrupting the youth.” {Ancient Greek: *αδικει Σωκράτης, ους μὲν η πόλις νομίζει θεούς ου νομίζων, ετερα δέ καινά δαιμόνια εισφέρει. Αδικει δέ τούς νέους διαφθείρων*} - [translator: *daemon =etymologically from Latin daemon (spirit) which is derived from the ancient Greek δαιμον meaning: god, goddess, divine power, genius or guardian spirit. Whereas demon is a malevolent entity in mythology and/or occultism*].

As you can understand, the accusation as formulated contains two crimes that are self contained but connected with one another. One crime concerns impiety and the other the corruption of youth.

I do not believe that today there are men who do not accept Socrates' great piety towards the divine and his obedience to the laws of his country. It would have been impossible for Socrates to overturn the laws, as the accusers said, exactly as Jesus Christ did not come to overthrow the laws, but to supplement them. Despite this, both were condemned as subverts of Justice and Moral Order.

If Socrates had no moral principles and no conviction in the triumph of Virtue, when his students were urging him to escape from the prison he would not have said the famous: “... more than a father and also a mother and the other ancestors, the country is more honourable and more dignified and holy and greater valued both by gods and men who have intelligence and who must revere it, and more yielded to and cajoled it when the country is angrier than a father and persuades to do all that it commands” (Plato, Critias 11 and 12). {Ancient Greek: *... Πατρός τε και μητρός και των αλλων προγόνων απάντων τιμιώτερον εστιν η πατρίς και σεμνότερον και αγιώτερον και εν μείζονι μοίρα και παρά θεοις και παρ' ανθρώποις τοις νουν εχουσι και σέβεσθαι δει και μαλλον υπείκειν και θωπεύειν πατρίδα χαλεπαίνουσαν η πατέρα και η πείθειν η ποιειν, α αν κελεύη ... }* (Πλάτων, Κρίτιας. 11 και 12).

Unfortunately the second detestable accusation, that he corrupted the youth is accepted by many including today's intellectuals and scientists who compare their weaknesses with those of the wise man who had none. They hide behind him with the justification that, since this great man of the Spirit enjoyed the unnatural eros (love) with Alcibiades and others, why should they not do the same?

In fact, it is the impiety of the morally insensible men of intellect who secretly praise debauchery and unnatural eros and then, for appearances sake, openly criticize pederasty! These men are the worst hypocrites of all. Unfortunately, our society is full of such men. Both base accusations against Socrates are shameless falsehoods directed as much by his ancient slanderers as well as by today's defamers and

hypocrites who having no moral standing are totally lacking in anything that is sacred and holy.

Many years ago accidentally I heard a public officer in the house of a friend extol pederasty and as his defence he used Socrates. I immediately thought that impudence is an indicator of the hidden profanity and twisted nature of Man. The aforementioned public officer and those like him were seeking higher positions as members of the Greek Education system!

When Socrates portrayed reality, his characterisations were not insults as many thought, but mirrors of the political, moral and spiritual decline. The sophists were proclaiming that real Truth does not exist and that the meaning of Justice cannot possibly be defined objectively, that is, Justice “is nothing but for the use of the strongest, whereas injustice is the principle of that which is moral and just”. (Plato, Republic A). *{Ancient Greek: “ουκ αλλο τι η του κρείττονος συμφέρον, η δε αδικία αρχει των ως αληθως ευηθικων τε και δικαίων” (Πλάτωνος Πολιτεία Α)}.*

When the sophist Thrasymachus was asked “what is Justice”, he answered: “courageous stupidity” for those who believe it, and *[translator: when asked what is]* injustice *[translator: he answered]* “soundness of judgement” (cleverness) and he continued: “by nature, injustice is good and justice bad! He who is just will be perverted, will be lashed and will suffer scorching of his eyes. And after he suffers all these bad things he will be impaled, and, finally he will learn that he must not be truly just, but only appear as such” (Plato, Republic B). *{Ancient Greek: “Εκ φύσεως τό μέν αδικειν ειναι αγαθόν, τό δε δίκαιον κακόν! Ο δίκαιος θά μαστιγωθη και θά στρεβλωθη, θά υποστη καυσιν των οφθαλμων και, αφου δοκιμάσει ολα τά κακά, θά ανασκολοπισθη και, εν τέλει, θά μάθη, οτι δέν πρέπει νά ειναι πράγματι δίκαιος, αλλά μόνον νά φαίνεται τοιουτος” (Πλάτωνος Πολιτεία Β´ 62 }.*

Socrates was accused for the Truth and similarly was Jesus Christ who was crucified for the Truth. When men of dark enlightenment, talk of the Truth they lie shamelessly, exactly as when the immoral talk about ethics, without having any inclination look inside themselves in order to understand that secretly they harbour inside them unmentionable degradation.

In subsequent years, Isocrates painfully protesting against the distortion of men’s logic by the sophists, said: “some have reached such a level of callousness so as to consider that injustice is shameful but profitable and advantageous, whereas Justice is honourable but useless, able to be more beneficial to others rather than to those who have it” (Isocrates, About Peace 31). *“Εις τοιουτον βαθμόν πωρώσεως έχουν φθάσει μερικοί, ώστε νά θεωρουν, ότι η Αδικία είναι μέν επονείδιστος, αλλ’ είναι επικερδής και συμφέρουσα, ενω η Δικαιοσύνη είναι μέν έντιμος, αλλ’ ανωφελής, δυναμένη περισσότερον τούς άλλους νά ωφελη, παρά τούς έχοντας αυτήν”.*

From the few examples that I mention, we can perceive that the work of the sophists was to deceive the people in the gatherings.

Contrary to the sophists Socrates, wanted to open the eyes of his fellow citizens and reveal the vulnerable areas of the religion of that time that was attributing human weaknesses and enmity to the gods. (Euthyphro IX and Republic B).

Socrates, proclaimed that ‘living in virtue’ opposed the sophists’ theories on virtue especially obedience to the laws, proving with his dialectic that the aim of a citizen must not be for his personal happiness that harms the whole, as the sophists were teaching, but for the happiness of the whole from which stems the prosperity of the individual.

If one exempts the trial of Jesus Christ, there is no other that has incited such interest as that of Socrates. This trial reveals the unrivalled spiritual grandeur of the most eminent of the Greek wise men of antiquity, as a forerunner in our Saviour's Boulevard.

Let us keep in our minds the historic images of the antithesis between the prevailing loosening of morality of the Athenian City of that time and the political wretchedness there. Of course, we are not going to examine it in detail but restore the moral substance of the Teacher, of this brilliant star with high ideals and unimpeachable character.

The result of the Peloponnesian war and the defeat of Athens (*translator: by Sparta*) had wounded the proud spirit of the Athenians, and the political and social corruption had undermined its citizens' faith in moral and social values. The establishment by the Lakedaimonians (*translator: Spartans*) of the Government of Thirty Tyrants was a real scourge and a calamity for the democratic citizens. Initially (the Tyrants) pretended to govern the city according to the 'traditions and institutions of their ancestors and with this falsehood changed the laws, under the pretext that they were doing so for the benefit of the citizens. But when they were established in Authority, with unprecedented harshness they persecuted every one who opposed their work. Following this tyranny and with the demagogues Athens entered into a chaotic moral decay.

From the time of Pericles' death and following the overthrow of the Thirty Tyrants the political enmity were not quelled. Guided by the wretched demagogues, the people, contributed greatly to the destruction of political and moral order. Citizens who opposed the destructive actions of the demagogues were brought to trial. The pure democratic political system by which the Athenians had achieved great things was shaken. Bribery of politicians and judges during that period, when positions were not given to virtuous and prudent citizens but selection by lot, brought about the spiritual fall of all areas of the civilised country.

Unfortunately this continues today within the various parties that give opportune positions to inappropriate persons because they supported the party.

The Athenians who were steeped in customs, religion and historical tradition considered the unwritten laws superior even to the written laws of the city, because their origin was attributed to the gods and their authority was recognised as being divine, eternal and indissoluble.

We all know how much toil Socrates exerted whilst searching for the Truth. His wisdom was not only known to the Athenians but beyond their borders. With the light of his knowledge he was discovering, in the darkness, the hidden iniquities, debaucheries and various corrupt acts of his fellow citizens. He cauterised the wickedness that appeared in the darkness of the day wearing the dress of virtue. Socrates acquired pupils worthy of his intellect, who later glorified his name.

During his life Socrates never sought wealth. He scorned it. In the agora he taught without reward, that is why so many followed his teachings. An Athenian who admired his method of teaching, asked him:

- Oh Socrates, you who has so many attributes to easily acquire wealth why do you detest it? Don't you know that wealth is the main guardian of your teachings?

- Wealth, my friend, replied Socrates is the counter balance for a sold conscience.
- So what, when you know better than any one how to manage it?
- I will give a good example. When the conscience is not clear it repels Truth. As a man approaches Truth, his conscience becomes more purified. To understand my principle, you must know that knowledge has two opposite ends. That is necessary to achieve balance. How are you going to achieve this? Simply: by being enlightened from the height and by searching the depths.

At another time, when he was teaching in the agora:

- We deify everything that has natural powers. However, these natural powers are not accidental, they have a common source as do the rivers, the waterfalls, the subterranean lakes and all other similar that have a common source, the unknown ocean. What is this unknown source? It is the Unknown Authority of All, that is, God, the Undivided, Present Everywhere with its different physical shades. In my search I discovered that the roots of Truth are invisible and therefore they spring from the invisible God, which means, that God is Truth and, therefore cannot be captured by our intellect.

To understand the role of Socrates, it is good to bear in mind the general situation of Athens during the second half of the 5th century BC, as we described it above. I repeat, that Athens then had many intellectual people who discussed everything. Their discussions on the meaning of religion and ethics created such controversy that it caused the intellectual development of the words not to have a sound base. There was a need for someone to self examine the Greek thought, with new research, to eliminate its useless elements. They had to be developed, have a methodical manner, and a sound knowledge of Truth. But who could undertake such a difficult task?

It was necessary that the person who would undertake this work would have a refined and flexible intellect so he could have the ability to explore the various thoughts of men with firmness and courage. These rare attributes no man had concentrated other than the humble son of Sofroniskos, whose genius was innate.

[translator: Sofroniskos was Socrates' father who was a sculptor] As Socrates confesses he was guided by an inner voice that he called his 'daemon'.

It is undisputed that Socrates had a divine mission to fulfil, which is why he searched for the meaning and purpose of life, so that, by going forward with his work, he would learn so he could teach the others. He arrived at the conclusion that the vagueness of others stemmed from the lack of knowledge of 'knowing themselves'.

There are many who were deceived by the shallow words of vague knowledge and for this reason Socrates found a new way, that is, to enable the discovery of Truth, so that nothing could escape from the careless intellect. His method consisted of analysis, comparison and deduction. In other words, he brought the man with whom he was conversing to the point that he himself pursued, without of course his opponent realising it, and thus he entered into the deeper purpose of his teaching. Socrates called this method 'obstetrics' from his mother's profession. *[translator: the name of Socrates' mother was Phaenarete; she was a midwife]*.

In discussions he was invincible. From wise man to common citizen, Socrates gave such answers so as to always enchant and charm his fellow speaker. He rejected

most theories, saying that the real aim of Philosophy is the study of Man, that is the way by which Man must acquire his happiness, which is the main aim of his life.

But happiness without virtue cannot exist. Therefore, what hinders men from becoming happy with virtue, he verified, was self-deceit and prejudice. However, men were unable to understand this and for this reason he tried to clarify these basic ideas, opposing all that were incorrect, especially ambition and the desire for wealth.

Despite the ethics of the period of his time and the prevailing laws, he was against anyone rendering evil to evil. With the noble depth of his soul, Socrates appeared as the precursor of the Christian ideal, so the Greek-Christian education was to form the pedestal of the psycho-spiritual entity, that is, of the inner and unknown civilisation of the human race.

As we know from history, in Athens, at that time pederasty was widespread. Some of the debauched managed to argue and prove that the youth would gain character through humiliation without of course, this unnatural pathos – as it has been proven – eliminating their masculinity. The youth considered it an honour to be friends of the great and experienced men. Homosexuality was totally different to that of today where pathetic types totally lacking masculinity occupy positions in society or high ranks.

Since we are talking about homosexuals and pederasts, let's not forget that such were the three accusers of Socrates: Melitos, Anytos and Lykon. Their life was interwoven with debauchery and spiritual callousness. What pushed them to become guilty of the unjust accusation of the great spiritual teacher? It was their unscrupulousness together with their twisted nature. They joined forces with other depraved compatriots and turned their satanical arrows against him who cauterised their passions and ignorance. These abhorrent sycophants, incited by the enemies of the wise man, tried to conceal their abnormal pleasures by planning, at the appropriate time, to confuse everything, so that their twisted natures would not be persecuted.

They first started accusing Socrates of introducing new daemons in order to shake the foundations of religious sentiments and of misleading the youth etc. These slanders that were images of their own acts, they attributed to Socrates. Their impudence had no limits to ensure preservation of their exposure.

Envy, ignorance and the laziness to think about the rulings of Justice, have blackened those exposed to the Light for the unjust condemnation to death of this gentle and good wise man of all centuries.

As an argument for the condemnation of Socrates, they cited the behaviour of his students Critias and Alcibiades, were causing great calamities to the city. The arguments had such tremendous power that they agitated Socrates. He was neither responsible for their wicked characters nor did he teach them to commit crimes. Can a father who is honest and good be blamed for the twisted nature and disobedience of his son?

During Socrates' defence, the Truth, with its logic had a negative effect on the judges, because Socrates was speaking the Truth whereas they were sinking in dark hatred, perceiving their exposure as vile worms of human decadence. An unbridged chasm was separating the bright knowledge from darkness, the correct from the twisted, the ethical from the unethical.

Lysias had offered to undertake Socrates' defence. Using legal argument he could have dismissed the charges. But Socrates the great friend of Truth, once said 'Plato is a friend but more so is the Truth', and he could not tolerate the blackening of Truth for the sake of his salvation; He chose death for the triumph of Virtue, the same way as Jesus Christ chose crucifixion for the triumph of Love.

I stress again that Socrates never indulged in physical pleasures. Incorrectly has Ioannis Sycoutres, in his misinterpretative comments on the 'Symposium' portrayed Socrates as he and those like him wished. It is worthy of questioning how some of our academics tolerated and supported such a slanderous, misinterpreted and defamatory act against Socrates.

I. Sycoutres, despite his wide knowledge and the elegance of his written words has bequeathed to us sophists' excuses and misinterpretations of ancient as well as modern authors in order to glorify the desire of pederasty as legal and necessary. He was included amongst those who took pleasure in this and he gave validity to his analyses by making reference to a large number of deviant authors and devotees of pederasty.

Indeed, it is a most shameful slander by men of Letters and Sciences and artists who dare, with the impudence of a goat, to accept the slander as good for their spirits' desire. The soul has no connection with the distortions of the spirit and bodily desires. Only the unscrupulous spirit of Man is attracted to the decline of his ethical substance. I do not judge these abnormal types by the greatness of their intelligence or education, but I condemn them for their imprudence and unscrupulous subjective actions as sly seducers of societies.

If the clergy considers free love between two heterosexuals as being a sin, what position has it taken towards homosexuality when is making such audacious advances? The natural canon does not classify heterosexual love as sin when there is no guile or self-interest. But the deviant eros is debauchery and must be confronted as unreserved prostitution.

All the defenders of Sycoutres used Socrates as a defensive wall to justify their desires. They did this by slandering the great magician of words and of prudence as a pederast. And these unscrupulous supporters of the deviant eros who mistranslate the meanings of the 'Symposium' say: "since the wise Socrates was pleased by the enjoyment of paranormal eros, why should we not imitate him?" With these tricks of speech they have blackened the ethical pedestal of Socrates who had an unimpeachable character, hiding behind him, to prove that the pathos of pederasty is not pathos, but a beneficial act and not harmful to society.

I criticize all those lewd, psychically twisted who for the enjoyment of their body and their unscrupulous spirit, strip naked their twisted and licentious selves by having the audacity to talk on ethics!

Sycoutres has made a huge and irreparable mistake in slandering Socrates. But Divine Providence punished his debauchery, and as a result of his pathos he ended his life because of all that was accused. *(translator: Ioannis Sycoutres born in 1901 was a Greek philosopher and author who wrote about child and homosexual eros. Amongst other transgressions he was accused as an atheist. He committed suicide in 1937).*

Let us not forget, that despite pederasty being prevalent at the time of Socrates, the wise man was never a pederast, although his unscrupulous slanderers wanted him to

be. True spiritual men do not have time to occupy themselves with any kind of physical pleasure and even less so with unnatural decadence.

The great teachers of India, had and have their preferences amongst their students, but this does not mean that they are considering the satisfaction of their senses, since they fight these as obstacles to the ascent of their entity. The same occurred with Socrates. He was a husband and father of children; therefore he fulfilled even this destiny. His desire was to search for the Truth; but because it is impossible to capture it in its entirety – since its roots are invisible – his mind always searched.

This wise head, which delved into the deepest meanings of the soul, without ever finding the source, was not pleased by its search. And it is exactly this that convinced Socrates that with toil he had arrived at the point of knowing something more than the others about that which he could not grasp. He expressed it, as 'I know that I know nothing'. (Greek: «Εν οίδα, ό,τι ουδέν οίδα»). What is the meaning of this expression? It means, that Socrates was humble. His humility is an indicator of his understanding of life. And he who understands the purpose of life cannot be bad and unjust. Therefore, he does not deceive anyone for physical satisfaction.

A philosopher with ethical depth does not enjoy material pleasures, only spiritual ones. The separation of spiritual and sensual love are at two opposite ends. Erome (ερωμαι) means *I enter with interest and love into the depths of another, to be taught and to teach.*

A wise man of the calibre of Socrates could not be interested in earthly matters as much as in the unknown (heavenly matters) that act with unknown influence on his character.

When Socrates presents the naked Truth, it causes horror to the depraved and because he cauterises everything unproven, those affronted did not hesitate to slander and defame the quality of his unimpeachable character.

Socrates met an unjust death and to honour him with just reward the Lord in the throne of His Lords proclaimed him as a great glory of the Heavenly Authority. Socrates bequeathed to us brilliant teaching. What have his slanderers bequeathed us? The eternal shame of human malice.

In Phaido, Plato describes the swan song of his Teacher. There he brings us to understand who was Socrates. In the 'About Immortality' chapter, his interpretation is unsurpassable. It opens wide the path for the later teaching of our Saviour.

And now I ask those without conscience who today take pleasure in slandering the mild and magnanimous Socrates – justify the charge against him?

Which of the unscrupulous men has ever defied death?

Who from the hidden debauched of our society, finding himself in jail would prefer to remain there if an opportunity arose for him to escape?

Which of the slanderers ever taught the Truth?

Who from the malevolent has been praised for his kindness?

Who from today's materialists has taught without self interest?

Who from the time he started thinking and searching, has ever exchanged the desire for searching for the lowly desire of bodily satisfaction?

Do any of today's slanderers know of the existence of a second Socrates?

To cover their inadequacies the ignorant and twisted in spirit have expressed their dwarf selves through misinterpretation of the meaning of words at the expense of the intrinsic value of the colossus of knowledge.

The hemlock killed the body of Socrates but it resurrected his soul.

Written by George H Pisanis

Translated by Yianni Attikiouzel
11 April 2013