

**JURISPRUDENCE AND PHILOSOPHY OF LAW MAKE-UP TEST**

This make-up test is meant to help you improve the grade you got in the first midterm. If you missed the midterm, you need to do this test. You have to answer **ALL** questions. This test evaluates your ability to apply the methods, theories, concepts, and principles that we discussed. Clarity and precision are essential. In all your answers, you must refer to sources (topics, theories, concepts, examples, readings, etc.) that we discussed in class. You are not permitted to consult with anyone about this test. Please do not ask me questions about the test once I give it to you. As a matter of fairness, I do not want to give answers to some students that others do not have the benefit (or detriment) of hearing. You will simply have to use your own judgment about how to handle any possible difficulties, including the interpretation of the questions and tasks. **Submission:** You need to **submit this evaluation to the Algoma University Moodle platform for this course in a MS Word document by the deadline, i.e., Thursday, December 2, 2021, 10 pm EST.** Please include your name on top of the test and don't include a title page. **NO EXTENSIONS!**

1. Discuss the following argument "If the government can control what you put in it, what you do with it, and what you allow others to do to it, then the government is the de facto owner of your body and every organ in it." Do you agree with it? Why or why not?
2. Choose three crimes from the Canadian Criminal Code. Transcribe the definition of the crimes and apply Critical Legal Studies' deconstructive method to those crimes.
3. Identify where the following authors are in the rationalism-empiricism spectrum and what their main theory of knowledge is. Give two examples that illustrate their theory of knowledge.

Philosopher	<b>Heraclitus</b>	<b>Freud</b>	<b>Nietzsche</b>
Category			
Rationalist vs Empiricist			
Main theory of knowledge			

NAME:

JURI 4816. Prof.: Dr. Julian Hermida

Example 1			
Example 2			

4. Look for a case from the Supreme Court of Canada where the court interprets a law. Discuss that interpretation in light of Umberto Eco's and Richard Rorty's interpretation theories.
5. Discuss the following questions.
  - a. How do you know things?
  - b. Is all knowledge political? Does objectivity exist?
  - c. Do men and women think and construct knowledge in different ways?
  - d. Can you know through stories? Think of a story that gives you knowledge better than a concise argument would have.