**Review from Apology (Euthyprho?)**

1. The charge
2. The judgment
3. Maybe civil disobedience stuff from there
4. something about virtue here?

**Introduction**

**Civil Disobedience: Discuss**

1. Rosa Parks
2. Edward Snowden
3. Maybe tax avoidance
4. Were these illegal acts morally permissible? If not, why not? If some were, but others weren't, what's the salient difference?

**Socrates' Argument: Introduced**

1. Social Contract.

**Elements of a Contract**

1. Basically, benefit, obligation, penalty, and assent.
2. Analogy with course policies. 1) Set of benefits. 2) Set of obligations. 3) Penalty 3) Tacit assent ( they could have left)

**Return to Socrates Argument to identify these three distinct elements.**

1. Benefits:
2. Obligations: Obey or persuade them otherwise.
3. Penalty:
4. Assent: he could have gone elsewhere

**Return to the four examples above. What would Socrates say about these cases? Can they think of problematic cases?**

*Goal is to make sure they understand the view. Gives them a way of thinking with and beyond the material.*

**Exegetical Puzzle**

1. Socrates in Apology offers says that he did not obey the Thirty Commanders. He will also never stop philosophizing. I want to make this look really inconsistent. I won't examine alternative ways of responding to it.
2. This is an apparent inconsistency. Ask students to look in text for find ways of alleviating the puzzle.
3. If/when a student identifies a way of alleviating the inconsistency that has been explored in the text, point it out and develop the view further for her/him. Direct them to that literature.