

Paper 3

1. “It may be expedient but it is not just that some should have less in order that others may prosper. ... [T]he division of advantages should be such as to draw forth the willing cooperation of everyone taking part in it, including those less well situated. The two principles ... seem to be a fair basis on which those better endowed, or more fortunate in their social position, neither of which we can be said to deserve, could expect the willing cooperation of others when some workable scheme is a necessary condition of the well-being of all”
(Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, §3).

Reconstruct and critically evaluate Rawls’ argument for this claim. In your reconstruction, be sure to explain both (i) why Rawls thinks that the two principles are a fair basis for social cooperation (*i.e.*, the “veil of ignorance” argument), and (ii) why he thinks that the better endowed cannot claim to deserve even greater rewards than the second principle would allow.

2. G. A. Cohen claims that “the justice of a society is not exclusively a function of its legislative structure, of its legally imperative rules, but also of the choices people make within those rules”
(*Rescuing Justice and Equality*, p. 123).

Reconstruct and critically evaluate G. A. Cohen’s argument for this claim.

3. “[M]ost U.S. citizens think that everyone, including the poor, should obey the law and that all able-bodied, working-age citizens ... should support themselves through legitimate work, even if that work is hard, low-paying, and unsatisfying. Thus, when the ghetto poor engage in criminal activity or refuse to work legitimate jobs, this is widely regarded as a failure of reciprocity on their part. This would be the wrong conclusion to draw, however. ... [W]hen the ghetto poor in the United States refuse to accept menial jobs or to respect the authority of the law qua law, they do not thereby violate the principle of reciprocity or shirk valid civic obligations”
(Shelby, “Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto,” pp. 146, 151).

Reconstruct and critically evaluate Shelby’s argument for this claim.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice: Original Edition*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005. All rights reserved.
Cohen, G. A. *Rescuing Justice and Equality*. Harvard University Press, 2008. All rights reserved.
Shelby, Tommie. “Justice, Deviance, and the Dark Ghetto.” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 35, no. 2 (2007): 126-60.
All rights reserved.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

24.04J / 17.01J Justice
Spring 2012

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.