

Phil 115, Third Paper Topic

Due: Tuesday, June ~~19~~ **26** at the start of section(=10:10).

Maximum Length: Five double-spaced pages, 12-point font, one-inch margins

Consider two claims: (i) that Rawls's two principles provide a satisfactory minimum and (ii) that alternative principles have unacceptable outcomes. What roles do claims (i) and (ii) play in Rawls's overall argument that his two principles would be chosen in the original position? Supposing, at least for the sake of argument, that Rawls's *other* premises are defensible, is the argument sound? In other words, if we grant that the other premises are correct, are claims (i) and (ii) sufficiently plausible to support Rawls's conclusion?