

Phil 115: Study Questions for the Final Exam

On the final exam, you will be given **four** of the following questions. You will be asked to write essays on **two** of the four questions that you are given.

1. Evaluate the following claim: “Even if Rawls shows that his two principles would be chosen in the original position, he still does not succeed in his aim. The mere fact that I *would have* agreed to do something in a hypothetical situation does not morally obligate to do it now.”
2. Evaluate the following claim: “The main difference between Rawls’s theory and Nozick’s is that Rawls recognizes that individual rights sometimes need to be curtailed in the interests of distributive justice.”
3. In what way, according to Nozick, can a person come to hold *justly* something that was previously unowned? Is Nozick’s view plausible? Is it consistent with the rest of his theory of justice in holdings?
4. Under which circumstances, if any, would Rawls’s theory permit restricting citizen’s participation in the political process? Do you find the answer plausible?
5. What is the “fact of reasonable pluralism”? What challenge(s) does Rawls think it poses? How does Rawls propose to meet the(se) challenge(s)?
6. What kind of political duties do *individuals* have, according to Rawls? What, if anything, is there to be said in favor of Rawls’s view? What, if anything, is there to be said against it?
7. Pogge and Rawls propose different extensions of Rawls’s theory to the international order. How do they differ? Which, if either, is more faithful, in your view, to Rawls’s theory of domestic justice? Which, if either, is more compelling in its own right?