Socrates’ argumentative strategy for why he should not escape from prison:

* He *personifies* the laws in order to imagine what they would say to him if he tried to escape from prison

The question he must consider:

* Is it just or is it not for me to try to escape from prison without the consent of the Athenians?

Three crucial premises

1. Ought we to ever act unjustly voluntarily?
2. Should we repay injustice with injustice?
3. Ought a man to carry out his just agreements?
   * + Consider: If I escape without the state’s consent, shall I be injuring those whom I ought least to injure?”

What is the *nature* of the agreement?

“Do you think the state can exist and not be overthrown if the decisions of the law are of no force and are disregarded and undermined by private individuals?”

* “Are you trying to destroy us?
* What kind of precedent are you setting?
* Distinction between individual laws and the institution of *lawfulness*

We gave you a choice: either obey us or persuade us.

You could have left Socrates!

* 70 years you remained here!
  + “You had seventy years in which you might have gone away if you had been dissatisfied with us, or if the agreement to you had seemed unjust.”

You, more than anyone, have benefited from living in Athens

* By staying in Athens, you demonstrated your consent.
  + “By the very fact of remaining here.”

You act unjustly against us on three accounts:

* Disobeys us (the laws) who are his parents
* Disobeys us who reared him
* Disobeys after agreeing to obey without persuading us that we were wrong.”

If you leave, you confirm the judges right in their ruling

* “For a man who is a subverter of laws may well be supported to be a corrupter of the young.”