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It seems so.
Then the person who achieves the finest blend of music and physical training and impresses it on his soul in the most measured way is the one we'd most correctly call completely harmonious and trained in music, much more so than the one who merely harmonizes the strings of his instrument.
That's certainly so, Socrates.

Then, won't we always need this sort of person as an overseer in our city, Glauccon, if indeed its constitution is to be preserved?
It seems that we'll need someone like that most of all.
These, then, are the patterns for education and upbringing. Should we enumerate the dances of these people, or their hunts, chases with hounds, athletic contests, and horse races? Surely, they're no longer hard to discover, since it's pretty clear that they must follow the patterns we've already established.
Perhaps so.
All right, then what's the next thing we have to determine? Isn't it which of these same people will rule and which will be ruled?

Of course.
Now, isn't it obvious that the rulers must be older and the ruled younger?
Yes, it is.
And mustn't the rulers also be the best of them?
That, too.
And aren't the best farmers the ones who are best at farming?
Yes.
Then, as the rulers must be the best of the guardians, mustn't they be the ones who are best at guarding the city?
Yes.
Then, in the first place, mustn't they be knowledgeable and capable, and mustn't they care for the city?
That's right.
Now, one cares most for what one loves.
Necessarily.
And someone loves something most of all when he believes that the same things are advantageous to it as to himself and supposes that if it does well, he'll do well, and that if it does badly, then he'll do badly too.
That's right.
Then we must choose from among our guardians those men who, upon examination, seem most of all to believe throughout their lives that they must eagerly pursue what is advantageous to the city and be wholly unwilling to do the opposite.
Such people would be suitable for the job at any rate.
I think we must observe them at all ages to see whether they are guardians of this conviction and make sure that neither compulsion nor magic spells will get them to discard or forget their belief that they must do what is best for the city.

What do you mean by discarding?
I'll tell you. I think the discarding of a belief is either voluntary or involuntary—voluntary when one learns that the belief is false, involuntary in the case of all true beliefs.
I understand voluntary discarding but not involuntary.
What's that? Don't you know that people are voluntarily deprived of bad things, but involuntarily deprived of good ones? And isn't being deceived about the truth a bad thing, while possessing the truth is good?
Or don't you think that to believe the things that are to possess the truth?
That's right, and I do think that people are involuntarily deprived of their opinions.
But can't they also be so deprived by theft, magic spells, and compulsion?
Now, I don't understand again.
I'm afraid I must be talking like a tragic poet! By "the victims of theft" I mean those who are persuaded to change their minds or those who forget, because time, in the latter case, and argument, in the former, takes away their opinions without their realizing it. Do you understand now?
Yes.
By "the compelled" I mean those whom pain or suffering causes to change their mind.
I understand that, and you're right.
The "victims of magic," I think you'd agree, are those who change their mind because they are under the spell of pleasure or fear.
It seems to me that everything that deceives does so by casting a spell. Then, as I said just now, we must find out who are the best guardians of their conviction that they must always do what they believe to be best for the city. We must keep them under observation from childhood and set them tasks that are most likely to make them forget such a conviction once deceived out of it, and we must select whoever keeps on remembering it and isn't easily deceived, and reject the others. Do you agree?
Yes.
And we must subject them to labors, pains, and contests in which we can watch for these traits.
That's right:
Then we must also set up a competition for the third way in which people are deprived of their convictions, namely, magic. Like those who lead others into noise and tumult to see if they're afraid, we must expose our young people to fears and pleasures, testing them more thoroughly than gold is tested by fire. If someone is hard to put under a spell, is apparently gracious in everything, is a good guardian of himself and the music and poetry he has learned, and if he always shows himself to be rhythmical and harmonious, then he is the best person both for himself and for the city. Anyone who is tested in this way as a child, youth, and adult, and always comes out of it untainted, is to be made a ruler, as well as a guardian; he is to be honored in life and to receive after his death the most prized tombs and memorials. But anyone who fails to prove himself
in this way is to be rejected. It seems to me, Glaucon, that rulers and
guardians must be selected and appointed in some such way as this, though
we've provided only a general pattern and not the exact details.

It also seems to me that they must be selected in this sort of way.

b Then, isn't it truly most correct to call these people complete guardians
since they will guard against external enemies and internal friends, so that
the one will lack the power and the other the desire to harm the city? The
young people we've hitherto called guardians we'll now call auxiliaries
and supporters of the guardians' convictions.

I agree.

How, then, could we devise one of those useful falsehoods we were
talking about a while ago, a noble falsehood that would, in the best
case, persuade even the rulers, but if that's not possible, then the others
in the city?

What sort of falsehood?

Nothing new, but a Phoenician story which describes something that
has happened in many places. At least, that's what the poets say, and
they've persuaded many people to believe it too. It hasn't happened among
us, and I don't even know if it could. It would certainly take a lot of
persuasion to get people to believe it.

You seem hesitant to tell the story.

When you hear it, you'll realize that I have every reason to hesitate.

Speak, and don't be afraid.

d I'll tell it, then, though I don't know where I'll get the audacity or even
what words I'll use. I'll first try to persuade the rulers and the soldiery
and then the rest of the city that the upbringing and the education we
gave them, and the experiences that went with them, were a sort of dream
that in fact they themselves, their weapons, and the other craftsmen's tools
were at that time really being fashioned and nurtured inside the earth;
and that when the work was completed, the earth, who is their mother,
delivered all of them up into the world. Therefore, if anyone attacks the
land in which they live, they must plan on its behalf and defend it as their
mother and nurse and think of the other citizens as their earthborn brothers.

It isn't for nothing that you were so shy about telling your falsehood.

 Appropriately so. Nevertheless, listen to the rest of the story. "All of
you in the city are brothers," we'll say to them in telling our story, "but
the gods who made you mixed some gold into those who are adequately
equipped to rule, because they are most valuable. He put silver in those
who are auxiliaries and iron and bronze in the farmers and other craftsmen.
For the most part you will produce children like yourselves, but, because
you are all related, a silver child will occasionally be born from a golden
parent, and vice versa, and all the others from each other. So the first and
most important command from the gods to the rulers is that there is nothing
that they must guard better or watch more carefully than the mixture of

metals in the souls of the next generation. If an offspring of theirs should
be found to have a mixture of iron or bronze, they must not pity him in
any way, but give him the rank appropriate to his nature and drive him
out to join the craftsmen and farmers. But if an offspring of these people
is found to have a mixture of gold or silver, they will honor him and take
him up to join the guardians or the auxiliaries, for there is an oracle which
says that the city will be ruined if it ever has an iron or a bronze guardian."

So, do you have any device that will make our citizens believe this story?

I can't see any way to make them believe it themselves, but perhaps
there is one in the case of their sons and later generations and all the other
people who come after them.

I understand pretty much what you mean, but even that would help to
make them care more for the city and each other. However, let's leave this
matter wherever tradition takes it. And let's now arm our earthborn and
lead them forth with their rulers in charge. And as they march, let them
look for the best place in the city to have their camp, a site from which
they can most easily control those within, if anyone is unwilling to obey
the laws, or repel any outside enemy who comes like a wolf upon the

And when they have established their camp and made the requisite
sacrifices, they must see to their sleeping quarters. What do you say?

I agree.

And won't these quarters protect them adequately both in winter and
summer?

Of course, for it seems to me that you mean their housing.

Yes, but housing for soldiers, not for money-makers.

How do you mean to distinguish these from one another?

I'll try to tell you. The most terrible and most shameful thing of all is
for a shepherd to rear dogs as auxiliaries to help him with his flocks in
such a way that, through licentiousness, hunger, or some other bad trait
of character, they do evil to the sheep and become like wolves instead
of dogs.

That's certainly a terrible thing.

Isn't it necessary, therefore, to guard in every way against our auxiliaries
doing anything like that to the citizens because they are stronger, thereby
becoming savage masters instead of kindly allies?

It is necessary.

And wouldn't a really good education endow them with the greatest
caution in this regard?

But surely they have had an education like that.

Perhaps we shouldn't assert this dogmatically, Glaucon. What we can
assert is what we were saying just now, that they must have the right
education, whatever it is, if they are to have what will most make them
gentle to each other and to those they are guarding.

That's right.

Now, someone with some understanding might say that, besides this
education, they must also have the kind of housing and other property

34. See 382a ff.
that will neither prevent them from being the best guardians nor encourage
d them to do evil to the other citizens.

That's true.

Consider, then, whether or not they should live in some such way as
this, if they're to be the kind of men we described. First, none of them
should possess any private property beyond what is wholly necessary:
Second, none of them should have a house or storeroom that isn't open for
to all to enter at will. Third, whatever sustenance moderate and courageous
warrior-athletes require in order to have neither shortfall nor surplus in
a given year, they'll receive by taxation on the other citizens as a salary
for their guardianship. Fourth, they'll have common messes and live to
together like soldiers in a camp. We'll tell them that they always have gold
and silver of a divine sort in their souls as a gift from the gods and so
have no further need of human gold. Indeed, we'll tell them that it's
impious for them to defile this divine possession by any admixture of
such gold, because many impious deeds have been done that involve the
currency used by ordinary people, while their own is pure. Hence, for
them alone among the city's population, it is unlawful to touch or handle
gold or silver. They mustn't be under the same roof as it, wear it as jewelry,
or drink from gold or silver goblets. In this way they'd save both themselves
d the city. But if they acquire private land, houses, and currency them-
selves, they'll be household managers and farmers instead of guardians—
hostile masters of the other citizens instead of their allies. They'll spend
their whole lives hating and being hated, plotting and being plotted against
more afraid of internal than of external enemies, and they'll hasten both
themselves and the whole city to almost immediate ruin. For all these
reasons, let's say that the guardians must be provided with housing and
the rest in this way, and establish this as a law. Or don't you agree?

I certainly do, Glaucon said.

Book IV

And Adeimantus interrupted: How would you defend yourself, Socrates,
he said, if someone told you that you aren't making these men very happy
and that it's their own fault? The city really belongs to them, yet they
derive no good from it. Others own land, build fine big houses, acquire
furnishings to go along with them, make their own private sacrifices to
the gods, entertain guests, and also, of course, possess what you were
talking about just now, gold and silver and all the things that are thought
to belong to people who are blessedly happy. But one might well say that
your guardians are simply settled in the city like mercenaries and that all
they do is watch over it.

Yes, I said, and what's more, they work simply for their keep and get
no extra wages as the others do. Hence, if they want to take a private trip
away from the city, they won't be able to; they'll have nothing to give to

their mistresses, nothing to spend in whatever other ways they wish, as
people do who are considered happy. You've omitted these and a host of
other, similar facts from your charge.

b Well, let them be added to the charge as well.

c Then, are you asking how we should defend ourselves?

Yes.

d I think we'll discover what to say if we follow the same path as before.

We'll say that it wouldn't be surprising if these people were happiest just
as they are, but that, in establishing our city, we aren't aiming to make
any one group outstandingly happy but to make the whole city so, as far
as possible. We thought that we'd find justice most easily in such a city
and injustice, by contrast, in the one that is governed worst and that, by
observing both cities, we'd be able to judge the question we've been inquir-
ing into for so long. We take ourselves, then, to be fashioning the happy
city, not picking out a few happy people and putting them in it, but making
the whole city happy. (We'll look at the opposite city soon.)

Suppose, then, that someone came up to us while we were painting a
statue and objected that, because we had painted the eyes (which are the
most beautiful part) black rather than purple, we had not applied the most
beautiful colors to the most beautiful parts of the statue. We'd think it
reasonable to offer the following defense: "You mustn't expect us to paint
the eyes so beautifully that they no longer appear to be eyes at all, and
d the same with the other parts. Rather you must look to see whether by
dealing with each part appropriately, we are making the whole statue
beautiful." Similarly, you mustn't force us to give our guardians the kind
of happiness that would make them something other than guardians. We
know how to clothe the farmers in purple robes, festoon them with gold
ejewelry, and tell them to work the land whenever they please. We know
ehow to settle our potters on couches by the fire, feasting and passing the
wine around, with their wheel beside them for whenever they want to
make pots. And we can make all the others happy in the same way, so
that the whole city is happy. Don't urge us to do this, however, for if we
do, a farmer wouldn't be a farmer, nor a potter a potter, and none of the
others would keep to the patterns of work that give rise to a city. Now,
if cobblers become inferior and corrupt and claim to be what they are not,
that won't do much harm to the city. Hence, as far as they and the others
like them are concerned, our argument carries less weight. But if the
guardians of our laws and city are merely believed to be guardians but
are not, you surely see that they'll destroy the city utterly, just as they
to alone have the opportunity to govern it well and make it happy.

If we are making true guardians, then, who are least likely to do evil
to the city, and if the one who brought the charge is talking about farmers
and banqueters who are happy as they would be at a festival rather than
in a city, then he isn't talking about a city at all, but about something else.

1. This discussion is announced at 445c, but doesn't begin until Book VIII.