The argument between Achilles and Agamemnon is a fierce argument that tears the two apart and almost does the same to the army. Although both men have satisfactory arguments Achilles’ argument is much better for the collective. Achilles’ argument shows that he has a greater concern than the army and the nation then himself. The first argument of the king is that his honor will be stripped along with his prize. If this man had the interest of the country in mind he would have no concern with his own honor. It would cause the country no harm if the king had one less woman. However when compared to the argument of Achilles the king’s argument is somewhat understandable being that he is the king and in societies past the king was the number one priority. For instance in egypt where people slaved away for the grave of a pharaoh. Achilles counter argument smashes any sympathy for the king. Achilles says that if Agamemnon were to give up his prize now he can indulge himself with many more prizes when the battle is won. Achilles also implies that if the plague continues the whole army will die out which means there will be no prize in the end, and the kings homeland will be undefended and Agamemnon's selfishness will leave nothing. Agamemnon comes back with a very logical counter argument which is, Achilles should not be able to indulge himself with briseis, his prize while Agamemnon is left in shame, and without his well deserved prize. So Achilles should give his prize over to the king, at which point Agamemnon will give the girl back to the priest. Achilles refusal to do so shows that he is as selfish as the king. However Achilles argument is still more logical considering that, Achilles not giving his price up has no apparent consequence, except the king being shamed. While Agamemnon's refusal to give up his prize causes his army to die and the other consequences listed above. In addition, it appears that Achilles is far more attached to briseis herself, than preserving his own honor. Despite the fact that this argument is won by Achilles, this chapter does say something about the importance of a mans honor. If agememon is willing to sit by while his army is assaulted with plague, just so that he may reserve a bit of his honor is astounding. He also risks losing the whole war all over one prize. Achilles however does the same. Agamemnon's counter argument to Achilles is if Achilles gives up the girl Agamemnon will give up his prize. However the selfishness of a hero once again prevents Achilles from compromising for the lives of the men. Although both men exercise a complete lack of regard for the lives of the men in the end Achilles argument proves more logical.

Another argument in The Iliad takes place in the trojan camp in book 18, on a night when each army is planning their next move. Polydamas makes the argument that they should retreat to the walls of troy. He gave several quite logical reasons for the retreat of the army. Firstly he said that the army would be tougher now, due to the fact that the fighting amongst the argives had stopped, and Achilles and Agamemnon were once again getting along. He also said that Patroclus death would make Achilles go mad and that Achilles would be much tougher to defeat. His speech was prolific scaring the men where it hurt. He spoke of Achilles taking the wives of the men and for the whole city. He spoke of all the riches troy would lose and how if they were in the walls of the city they would be safe. Hector, completely turned the table saying that the pleading of Polydamas was pathetic. He spoke of being crammed in the city, without their riches. Hector then generates a logical plan that would pin the argives to sea. This plan does nothing to sway the men. As they were all tired, and would want nothing more then to stay in the walls of the city. Even so Polydamas stops because Hector gave the order to do so.