## Initial Thoughts on Plato's Republic

Now that we have gone briefly through Plato's Republic (Book 1), I would like to hear your initial impressions. Prior to Tuesday's session (Sep 16th) please provide some informal thoughts on one of the two following question:

1) In the debate between Socrates and Thrysimacrus, would you agree with Socrates' that justice is more than what is in the interest of the stronger? If so, why?

2) Which of the arguments in Book 1 did you find most convincing or least convincing?

*(There is no need to put much thought into this - just a couple sentences off the top of your head will suffice. The purpose is just to generate "food for thought".)*

I side with Socrates against Thrasymachus. First, the “advantage of the stronger” collapses once rulers err: if a law accidentally harms them, obeying it would be “just” yet not to their advantage, so the definition contradicts itself. Second, Socrates’s craft analogy persuades me. A craft serves its object: doctors patients, helmsmen crews; so ruling, as a craft, should serve the ruled. If medicine were “whatever helps the doctor,” we’d reject it; why accept that move in politics? Third, collective life works better under justice. Injustice breeds distrust and splits teams, while justice coordinates action. Even in Book I’s Athens, moving from revenge to law, Socrates’s view fits the civic shift better than Thrasymachus’s cynical power rule in the long run.