

M.A. EXAMINATION 2004

for Internal Students

PHILOSOPHY**Political Philosophy**

Thursday, 27 May 2004: 10.00 - 1.00.

Answer THREE questions. Avoid overlap in your answers.

1. EITHER (a) 'Hypothetical contracts have no binding force.' Does this observation refute Rawls's arguments for his principles of justice?

OR (b) Explain the role of Rawls's concept of 'primary goods' in his theory of justice.
2. Does Nozick adequately show how an individual can legitimately acquire private property?
3. EITHER (a) 'Dworkin's "expensive tastes" arguments show that we need to give up equality of welfare. They don't show that we have to adopt equality of resources.' Discuss.

OR (b) Explain the difference between priority to the worst off and equality. Which, if either, is to be preferred?
4. 'The concept of "enough" can play no role in political argument.' Discuss.
5. Can we explain our political obligations in terms of the tacit consent we have given to the state?
6. Does a legislature have the right to pass laws which bind succeeding generations?
7. Is there a natural right to punish?
8. How should the relationship between natural capacities and natural rights be understood?
9. "'Liberal Perfectionism" is a contradiction in terms.' Discuss.
10. Assess the significance of conceptions of the human for political philosophy.
11. Do the communitarian critics of liberalism have a positive political view of their own?

12. Does one have a prima facie obligation to obey the law?

END OF PAPER