

## Candidate 1 evidence

### Questions 9 and 10

Q9 - This exchange does represent some of the key differences between the sophist Thrasymachus and the philosopher Socrates. First of all it shows their differences in their manner of speaking. Thrasymachus is much more aggressive and angry. He resorts to verbal abuse rather than making logical arguments telling Socrates needs a nurse to look after him and wipe his nose. On the other hand, Socrates is much calmer and less emotional in his argument and asks many questions to encourage Thrasymachus to think for himself or more deeply about the question. Thrasymachus asks questions too but in a very different style. He asks rhetorical questions with no intention of letting Socrates answer him. With Thrasymachus it is more of a debating technique than getting to the

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	truth of the situation
	- They also have very different ideas about
	how Rulers should be. Socrates views
	ruling as a skill, similar to a doctor
	treating a patient or a Captain looking after
	his ship, crew and cargo. He believes
	that a Ruler should care entirely for the
	people's benefit and not indulge in selfish
	desires that become possible in positions of
	power. Thrasymachus on the other hand throws
	a different analogy back at Socrates, of
	a Shepherd and his sheep. He points out
	that a Ruler should look out for himself
	first and not rule in the best interest
	of the people. This shows how different
	the two men are with Socrates being
	more idealistic and Thrasymachus being more
	realistic as it would be rare for a ruler
	to put the people before himself.

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

- This interaction does not really show the difference between Sophists and philosophers however and that is something important to take into account. Sophists are paid orators who don't argue for what they actually believe in but would argue that 'black was white' if they were paid enough money. They also loved to talk circles around their opponent and bamboozle their audience. They focused more on dialectic technique than the philosophical conundrum. Socrates ~~used the~~ is the exact opposite of a Sophist as he never accepted money and questioned people purely to ~~get~~ try and get to the truth. He used the Socratic method (named after him) when debating which was essentially asking question after question until you eliminated options and got closer to the truth. H

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	was okay if your original hypothesis was
	wrong, in fact, - that was what he wanted.
	It showed that the person was challenging
	themselves and attempting to form a more
	accurate statement.
	- Another key difference between the sophist
	Thrasymachus and the philosopher Socrates
	was that Thrasymachus believed he knew
	all the answers and his answers were
	correct while often Socrates admitted that
	he did not know the answers himself, he
	could just show why other people were
	mistaken. He did believe that there must be
	definitive answers however, and tried to
	get as close to these answers as
	possible.
	Ultimately Source A does show the
	differences between the two main. It
	displays Socrates' calm debating style as

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	<p>opposed to Thrasymachus' much more aggressive style. It shows their different philosophies on how rulers should rule and the blatant differences between Sophists who were paid orators and Socrates who did not accept money.</p>
Q/10	<p>The story represents a topic that comes up in Cicero's <i>De Officiis</i> which is the concept of useless people, a concept that most people would not accept. Cicero is of the opinion that certain people have more value than others due to what they can contribute to society. So in the story Cicero would say that it is justified knocking the fool off the wreckage to <del>save the wise man</del> so that the wise man can save himself. However this does make the wise man now responsible for the death of another human being which would be</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	<p>morally wrong. It may be better for society as a whole but it is interesting how exactly these men's value is being judged. Their value could be subjective depending on who was judging. And who is the wise man to assume that his life is more valuable so he condemns another man to his death. And if both men were wise what would they do in that situation. How would they judge who deserved to live more? Also why should the man who owns the ship deserve more to live than the wise man. If this is about contributing to society as previously said then the wise man should get to live without question. Ultimately it is a tricky situation that doesn't have a right or wrong answer. Comparing people's values isn't useful or right. However as previously stated, Cicero would say that the man who can contribute more to society should be the one who lives.</p>

## Questions 11 and 12

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
Q11	<p>- Cicero and Aristotle have very different views of public speaking due to their background. Cicero only turned to philosophy towards the end of his life after a long political career. He was also a lawyer in his youth. Therefore he is fairly biased about the subject as public speaking is what he excelled in. His skill in oratory is <del>the</del> how he became so well known and successful which is why he believes it to be a positive thing. Aristotle however, was purely a philosopher/scientist and detested public speakers, as they used clever techniques <del>or</del> rather than attempting to educate or discuss with others. They took away listeners from Aristotle because their words sounded prettier even though they had less content.</p> <p>- Cicero and Aristotle had very different views</p>

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

public speaking had on people, in particular, in military situations. Cicero saw public speaking as this wonderful skill that can stir the people and motivate them to fight well in battle. In fact, a stirring speech before a battle could be the difference between success or defeat, therefore he again views it as a very positive thing. Aristotle on the other hand did not view public speaking as beneficial in military situations. He pointed out that unqualified people could rise to positions of power simply due to their skills in debate. They could take their way into becoming generals but once they were there they would make ignorant mistakes as they did not actually know what to do. They would be useless. Therefore Aristotle is again opposed to public speaking.

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

- Another concern Aristotle has about public speakers is the effect this will have on the ordinary people in the state. An orator could say anything and because it sounds nice or clever, people will listen to them, particularly uneducated people. This generally leads to instability and class warfare. ~~Then~~ These demagogues as he calls them can manipulate the common people into thinking in a particular way, or, his primary concern, setting the classes against each other. Again this causes general discontent and instability which could lead to revolution. Revolution on the whole is to be avoided.

- Cicero, unsurprisingly, has a different opinion on the effect of public speaking on the people. He sees it as this great intellectual talent that ~~it~~ can bring the

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

people closer together and unite them for or against one goal. It creates great ~~power~~<sup>a</sup> patriotic state which would be stable and not lead to revolution as Aristotle thinks. This is only ~~used~~ possible if public speaking is used in the right way as he seems to think it will be. Cicero doesn't entertain the notion that someone could abuse their skills as an orator and create strife and war. In this way, Cicero could be perceived as naïve.

Ultimately Aristotle have very different views of public speaking as shown in the sources. Due to their different backgrounds both men are biased in one way or another about the subject. Aristotle believes that public speaking can be very damaging in military matters ~~and~~ whereas Cicero believes that it is a great thing to unify the soldiers

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	<p>and succeed. Both also have different views on the effect of public speaking on the masses - Aristotle believes it will lead to factions and instability while Cicero believes it will unify the people. In the end they have completely different opinions</p>
Q12	<p>- Aristotle believes that the ordinary people should have some sort of say in who the rulers are. He says that even if the individual people are incapable of ruling competently they still have the ability to judge a good ruler. He uses the analogy of the homeowner to express his point. A person may not have the expertise to build a house, however from observing a house that has been built, they can form an opinion on whether it is good sound or not. However once a ruler has been selected then the</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	<p>common people have no further say in what happens, so the ruler/rulers can make their own decisions and still have a lot of power.</p>
	<p>But if they turn out to be incompetent or cruel then the people will not choose them again which is somewhat similar to the system we have today.</p>
	<p>- Plato on the other hand does not believe ordinary people should have any say in who is ruling them. He views the masses as largely incompetent. Their only purpose in his society is to work and therefore they have no time for leisure and no time for a proper moral education, therefore he views it as foolish to give them a say in anything. As stated previously, Plato views ruling as a skill and only a person/people who have mastered and understood this skill should be allowed to rule. He</p>

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

compares it to a Doctor. You would not let people who haven't trained to be a doctor have any say in medical procedures so why should ruling be any different.

- Another thing - that Plato believes very strongly in is class divisions and no social mobility. you cannot move between classes or choose what you do. Everything is decided for you. Aristotle famously said that a ruler should 'Rule and be Ruled' which directly contradicts with Plato's opinion. This means that the ruler is more likely to rule in the best interest of the people as they have had experience in what it is like to live is a commoner. Often a problem in ruling is that the monarch is so detached from the reality of the situation as luxury has been all that they have known.

- Aristotle decided that the most stable form

ENTER  
NUMBER  
OF  
QUESTION

of government would be the mixed constitution which largely relies on the middle classes to form a virtuous middle. This reduces the tension between the wealthy and the poor and leads to a more stable society where the people can come together. Plato's view on what makes a good government seems to be aristocracy. He believes in an elite, skilled group to be the rulers of society. This group has been well educated and essentially groomed to rule. It does not specifically say that the wealthy will be the ones forming this elite group but often - that will be how it turns out as the wealthy can afford a better education - Ultimately Aristotle and Plato do disagree on what makes a good government. Aristotle believes that the masses should have a say in the government while Plato is completely closed to democracy. Aristotle believes that a

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	
	<p>ruler should have experience as <del>an</del><sup>a</sup> commoner to rule better while Plato does not believe in social mobility. Both <del>have</del> have different ideas on what the "ultimate best form of government would be with Aristotle deciding on his mixed constitution and Plato concluding aristocracy would be the best. The two share some similar ideas however in the end they disagree on what makes a good government.</p>