1. What is the legal rule at issue in “The Speluncean Explorers”? 

The legal rule at issue in this story is whether the defendants “willfully [took] the life of another” (619).

2. How is it possible that the judges in this case came to different conclusions about what the legal result should be? 

The judges came to different conclusions for a few reasons. Aside from choosing specific court cases to support their respective viewpoints, they also interpreted the law in unique ways. J. Foster, for example, took a more philosophical view of the situation, claiming that the explorers were no longer within the confines of the law but rather in a “state of nature.” J. Tatting, on the other hand, took a more literal approach; he refuted Foster’s argument by asking “at what point” the explorers made this transition to such a state.

3. What were the facts or issues that preoccupied the judges in determining their decisions? 

The judges considered issues of self-defense, the public’s opinion, the limitations and literal interpretation of the law itself, and the “state of nature” vs. “state of civil society” arguments.

4. Which judge’s opinion did you find the most persuasive and why? 

I found the opinion of J. Tatting the most persuasive. His way of methodically addressing each point and looking at it from all possible angles was incredibly clever. More than anything, though, it was his rhetorical questions that swayed me to his side. He made the reader see very clearly that it was not logical to hold any opinion other than the one he set forth.

5. What argument made by a judge whose opinion you ultimately disagree with did you find most persuasive? 

Though I decided I disagreed with J. Foster after reading Tatting’s argument, I did find his reasoning persuasive. The way he looked at the situation was identical to the way I viewed it at first. Intellectually, I know Tatting’s arguments are logical, but on an emotional level I do want to side with Foster.

6. After reading this “case,” do you think law is straightforward? 

Not at all – after reading this case I realize law is incredibly complicated.