What Would Socrates Do?

Socrates continues to be an extremely influential force to this day; his work is featured prominently in the work of contemporary thinkers ranging from Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss, to Michel Foucault and Jacques Rancière. Intervening in this discussion, What Would Socrates Do? reconstructs Socrates’ philosophy in ancient Athens to show its promise of empowering citizens and noncitizens alike. By drawing them into collective practices of dialogue and reflection, philosophy can help people to become thinking, acting beings more capable of fully realizing the promises of political life. At the same time, however, Joel Alden Schlosser shows how these practices’ commitment to interrogation keeps philosophy at a distance from the democratic status quo, creating a dissonance with conventional forms of politics that opens space for new forms of participation and critical contestation of extant ones.
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What would Socrates do? This question first occurred to me when teaching an undergraduate course on ancient political thought at Duke University. As we read and contemplated Socrates’ injunction that “the unexamined life is not worth living,” it struck me as all too easy to fold this demand for reflection and thoughtfulness into our twenty-first century obsessions with self-knowledge, self-exploration, and even self-infatuation. My students and I were already doing this, imagining ourselves as like Socrates: uniquely perspicuous, countercultural, and critical. We stood against the grain and, despite all being part of an elite university, we were speaking truth to power.

Were we? Who was to say we hadn’t just lashed ourselves to a different mast? I kept wondering what Socrates would do, how Socrates might have questioned our assumptions, how his questions might have translated to our times. Socrates was not just an ancient version of the now famous Apple Macintosh advertisement to “Think Different.” And if Socrates was not merely going to serve as window dressing for our late modern patterns of thought, we needed to think differently about what Socrates might mean.

This line of questioning and reflection took place at the same time as a major development at Duke as well as at other universities around the country: the advent of civic engagement. In 2007, Duke received two grants of $15 million, from the Duke Endowment and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, to found its Center for Civic Engagement and flagship program, DukeEngage. These programs and others like them sought to bring service learning to a new level, making knowledge developed in the classroom functional or even leaving the classroom behind entirely in favor of the kind of experiential learning attainable only on-site and hands-on: building clinics in Kenya or teaching migrant
workers’ children in China or partnering with local organizations in Guatemala to create safer cooking stoves. The “change yourself, change your world” motto of DukeEngage expressed an underlying philosophy that while academics might give you knowledge (carried out in classrooms and laboratories on campus), transformation, both of self and of others, could only really occur outside the proverbial ivory tower. Transformation gave evidence of knowledge that really mattered. We needed to engage.

As I watched these new ideas take root (and as DukeEngage replaced Duke basketball as the number one reason given by applicants for why they wanted to attend the university), I kept wondering: What would Socrates do? Given his influence on the founder of the Academy, Plato, Socrates seemed like the quintessence of the academic: discussing theories of the good life rather than living it, hypothesizing about justice rather than making it a reality. Yet this story did not quite seem right. Yes, Socrates did not seek political accolades, although he did serve when called upon, both in the military and in high-level governmental positions chosen by lot. Yes, Socrates did not lead a revolution of the slaves against their masters or of Athenian women for greater empowerment, although nobody did such things in the Athens of his day. But Socrates’ thought was not merely theoretical, nor were his inquiries abstracted from the place where he conducted them. Instead, I had the growing suspicion that we needed to understand the practice of Socrates’ thought and how this practice mattered in its context. Only with such an understanding would we be in a position to dismiss “Socratic engagement” as abstruse and irrelevant. In any event, we had to ask ourselves: If Socrates really had been an analogue of today’s insulated academics, would the Athenians have killed him?

What would Socrates do? This became the question behind my reflections on both our appropriations in the modern classroom (and the scholarly explications behind them) as well as the contemporaneous shift of attention (and money) to civic engagement as somehow more meaningful, authentic, and – perhaps most significantly yet also most obscurely – engaged than conventional, classroom-based learning. What of Socrates’ engagement? I wondered.

As a political theorist, I also immediately began to consider these questions in the broader political context of democratic politics in the United States. If “Socrates” merely mirrored our approaches to self-actualization, if he merely functioned as another “success guru” to be placed next to Deepak Chopra and Oprah Winfrey, and if Socrates’
philosophy embodied in the academy had been eclipsed in importance by the engagement of hands-on, community-immersed learning, then was Socrates completely irrelevant to thinking about, let alone improving, political life in the twenty-first century? I didn’t want it to be so, but previous attempts to make Socrates relevant seemed guilty of domesticating him the same way my students and I had in the classroom. Socrates could be an ideal democratic citizen, an ideal dissenter, an exemplar of the liberal arts, or an enigmatic ironist. In each manifestation, Socrates became just one of us, regardless of where we stood; “Socrates” seemed infinitely malleable, and thus rarely a truly critical interlocutor.

This book emerged from these questions and reflections. It is my attempt to think long and hard about what Socrates would do and deepen our understanding of how to go about asking this question in ways that might produce alternatives to the current situation. If followers of Socrates are wont to assimilate him to their own modes of thinking (as my students and I once were), I suggest that reconstructing what Socrates did in his own, very different situation can inhibit these tendencies. Seeing the complicated and strange relationship of Socrates to his own times can illuminate how Socrates’ philosophy might be translated in more complicated (and potentially estranging) ways to our own. If civic engagement threatens to overshadow “Socratic engagement” (as it seems to do at Duke and elsewhere), I show how Socrates’ thought was embodied in Athenian public spaces as well as what Socrates’ practices might look like in the world today. To envision what Socrates might do now, I turn our attention to innovative “Socratic” practices like the Socrates Cafés and the Clemente Courses to show how Socrates’ philosophy might continue its legacy of provocative and associative questioning conducted both in public and around matters of public concern. Finally, if Socrates’ ambivalent relationship to politics and democracy is too easily effaced by political theorists’ desires to make something of Socrates (be it a democrat, a radical democrat, a liberal dissenter, a model of civil disobedience, or otherwise), I insist on the strangeness of Socrates, what in Greek is called his atopia, which must remain fundamental to all of our interpretations and appropriations if we are to keep the questions of Socrates alive and vital. “What would Socrates do?” may be unanswerable in any ultimate sense, but asking the question with honesty and rigor can, I hope, lead us to better ways of living together.
Acknowledgments

This book has been long in the making, and I have many institutions and people to thank for their help along the way. It has been a pleasure to complete this book while on the faculty at Deep Springs College. The intellectual vitality of the Deep Springs community has been immensely important to my thinking, making possible a kind of intense and thoughtful conversation ranging from Socrates to Adrienne Rich that has sustained me throughout the writing and revising process. The sense of purpose and the industry with which this purpose is pursued at Deep Springs will never leave me and I can only hope a small portion of it is evident in my own work. To the students of Deep Springs who first brought me to the valley and have never since ceased to question—always generously and fruitfully—my own arguments and commitments, I owe the greatest thanks. I am also grateful to the president of Deep Springs College, David Neidorf, for his unstinting support of my research, as well as to the trustees of Deep Springs for the same.

At Duke University, where the book began to take shape, I owe thanks to the Department of Political Science, which fostered an astoundingly diverse and collaborative environment for work in political theory, as well as the Department of Classical Studies, which welcomed me with genuine xenia. I am also grateful for research support from the Graduate School of Duke University, the Hallowell Endowment for advanced language work, and the Earhart Foundation for substantial funding throughout my studies. During the writing process I also had the good fortune to return to Carleton College to teach in the Department of Political Science. I am grateful for the collegiality and support I received there as well as to the deans of the college, Scott Bierman and Bev Nagel, for their material support of my research.
As the book has developed, I have presented parts at many different venues and benefitted from countless insightful and humbling questions from my audiences at the following places: Deep Springs College; the University of Minnesota Political Theory Colloquium; the Duke Political Theory Workshop; the Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings; the American Political Science Association Annual Meetings; the Western Political Science Association Annual Meetings; and the Association for Political Theory Annual Meetings. An early connection between James Baldwin and Socrates sprang from my participation in the “Contemplating James Baldwin” symposium held at Carleton College, April 13–18, 2008, and the faculty reading group led by Professor Harry Williams, whom I owe great thanks for introducing me to the work of Baldwin. Some brief passages from the article that resulted from my work on Baldwin and Socrates, published as “Socrates in a Different Key: James Baldwin and Race in America” in Political Research Quarterly Vol. 66, No. 3 (September 2013) appear in Chapter 6. I am grateful to Sage Publications for permission to reprint this material.

I am especially grateful to the many people who read portions or all of this manuscript at various times. While I shoulder responsibility for any missteps or errors in what follows, I owe the following people great thanks for their time and attention over the years: Josh Anderson, Libby Anker, Danielle Allen, Ali Aslam, Jed Atkins, Andreas Avgousti, Ryan Balot, Lawrie Balfour, David Belanich, Susan Bickford, James Bourke, Brendan Boyle, P.J. Brendese, Winter Brown, Peter Burian, Keegan Callanan, Evan Carver, Brother Kenneth Cardwell, Doug Casson, Jeff Church, Diskin Clay, Rom Coles, Larry Cooper, Brent Cusher, Stefan Dolgert, Bill English, Peter Euben, Jill Frank, Michael Gillespie, Ruth Grant, Laura Grattan, Shlomo Griner, Malachi Hacohen, Nora Hagan, Ben Hertzberg, Kinch Hoekstra, Matt Holbreich, Demetra Kasimis, Alisa Kessel, Matt Landauer, Melissa Lane, Christine Lee, Rebecca LeMoine, John Lombardini, Richard Mahon, Hollie Mann, Gerry Mara, Patchen Markell, Liz Markovits, David McIvor, Annie Menzel, David Neidorf, Jennifer Rapp, Dennis Rasmussen, David Rice, Steve Salkever, Arlene Saxophon, Dan Schillinger, George Shulman, Kim Smith, Tom Spragens, Christina Tarnopol, Rachel Templer, Nick Troester, Chip Turner, John Wallach, Laurie Ward, Amity Wilczek, Akira Yatsuhashi, John Zumbrunnen, and two anonymous readers for Cambridge University Press. I am also very grateful for the support and insight of Robert Dreesen, of Cambridge University Press, as well as to his staff.
Some people require more than a single mention. First of all, I owe even more thanks to my dissertation committee, the members of which supported and productively challenged this project in its early years. I thank Peter Euben, Jill Frank, Michael Gillespie, and Ruth Grant again for the time and attention they gave me and the continuing support they have offered in the years since my defense. As my “academic grandparents,” Michael Gillespie and Ruth Grant have supported me generously since before my arrival at Duke; I am very grateful for these many years of wisdom and encouragement. Jill Frank joined the project from outside and contributed immensely to it; I am grateful for her enthusiastic support from our first encounter, not to mention her precise and scrupulous readings and unfailingly intelligent suggestions. Peter Euben never seemed to tire of talking about Socrates and buying me drinks while we did so; I am deeply grateful for the constancy of his questions and the unflagging intensity of his concern. I continue to learn from our conversation and from a body of work I have taken as exemplary for my own.

The development of this book emerged from the special community of political theorists around Duke University during my early years there. My fellow denizens of “Strauss House,” Ali Aslam and Nick Troester, had a formative influence beyond their knowing, as did those who joined me around the table for lively discussions at Peter Euben’s house: Ali Aslam, James Bourke, Winter Brown, P.J. Brendese, Stefan Dolgert, Bill English, Laura Grattan, Nora Hanagan, Ben Hertzberg, Liz Markovits, Alisa Kessel, and David Rice. My good fortune at happening upon this vibrant political theory community is only exceeded by my gratitude for the friendships that emerged from it. To Ali Aslam and David McIvor, fellow “Demophiles” and long-standing members of our “Dinner and Democracy” reading group, I am especially grateful.

I also owe a special debt to my teachers from Carleton College as well as the broader community I found there. Outside of Political Science, I am especially grateful to my teachers Kenneth Huber, Louis Newman, Susannah Ottaway, and Martha and Roger Paas. My two teachers in political theory, Larry Cooper and Kim Smith, humored my ingenuous intensity and encouraged my ambitions. I am grateful to Kim Smith for her fearless speech, especially as it pertained to my own work. Larry Cooper taught me how to read and brought me to appreciate the great and particular wisdom of ancient political thought; he also exemplified the insightful and responsive teacher that I hope to have become. To him I am very grateful. Some of my fellow Carls (and some early members of
the short-lived “Political Philosophy Colloquium”) also deserve special thanks for time and energy enduring (or enjoying) conversation: Tony Anderson, Eli and Lauren Barach, Katie Berg, Evan Carver, Caitlin Elsaesser, Alex Gallin-Parsisi, Tony LePage, Reid Koester, Liz Krebs, Andrew Palmer, Charles Petersen, Drew and Meredith Weitz, Judy Wemhoff, Hans Wietzke, and Stelios Xenakis.

Long before I even read my first line of Greek, my family has supported my reading, writing, and thinking. I owe my parents, Tom Schlosser and Marilyn Loveness, as well as my brother, Peter Schlosser, and the whole Schlosser-Loveness family the deepest thanks. To Sarah Trent, I am grateful for years of confidence, intelligence, and playfulness. She has taught me far more than she knows. I am also grateful to her for the gift of another family; I thank Marilyn, Emily, and Liam, and especially Leo, for their love and support.

This book is dedicated to John Wesley Robb. Great-uncle, teacher, and friend, Wes put me on my present path many, many years ago.
Gadfly explanation

In Plato’s _Apology_, Socrates describes his relationship to Athens as like a gadfly to a noble horse. Like the incessant gadfly, Socrates tells the jury, “I never cease to rouse each and every one of you, to persuade and reproach you all day long and everywhere I find yourself in your company.” This striking image captures the essence of Socrates’ own strangeness. Socrates appears opposed to conventional political life, but like the gadfly, this anti-conventional appearance stems not from a rebellious intent so much as an unflagging commitment to question the assumptions upon which the Athenian democracy rests, to rouse the horse to wakefulness. The image of the gadfly thus helps to illuminate philosophy’s peculiar challenge for democracy more generally: its unremitting interrogation that can often irritate; yet its concomitant promise of a more lively, perhaps even better, politics.