Plato’s Republic: Justice, Psychic Harmony, and Eudaimonia. Paper instructions: In addition to having an introduction, your paper should have three parts. The first two parts involve reconstruction. They ask you to explain Plato’s views; in this part, you are encouraged to make use of evidence from the text, e.g., citations that point your reader to where you are drawing from. The last question involves analysis. It asks you to evaluate the argument Plato gives about why we should prefer the just life. First Part: Plato’s account of justice is related to his account of the three parts of the soul. In the first part of your reconstruction, you should do the following: • Identify the three parts of the soul, and state the proper functions of each part. • Next, state what justice is for Plato and connect it to his account of the soul. Second Part: Plato uses his account of justice to answer the central question of the Republic: “Why be moral?” He does this by contrasting the life of the unjust person—the tyrant—with the life of the just person. He then argues we should prefer the life of the just person over the life of the tyrannical person. For this part of your reconstruction, you should: • Reconstruct Plato’s characterization of the tyrannical person: What part of their soul seems to lead and what’s one reason why this leads to a bad life? • Next, state and explain at least one of the benefits the just person has over the life an unjust person. Third Question (Analysis): In this part, you’ll evaluate Plato’s argument about why we should prefer to live a just life over living an unjust life. Is the reason you reconstructed a good reason? Why or why not? These questions might help guide your evaluation, but you don’t have to and shouldn’t address them all. In your analysis, you’re aiming to make a single point that you provide reasons for: • Does his conclusion that we should prefer the life of justice follow from what Plato says about the tyrannical person and the just person? • Do the specific examples he uses to establish his general conclusion actually support it or are they too specific and can’t be generalized? • Is there an objection to his argument Plato doesn’t consider; can that objection be answered or does it show his argument doesn’t work? • Are there counterexamples to the argument that show the premises could be true and the conclusion false?