

1. Would people in Rawls's original position choose his two principles of justice?
2. 'It could be rational to give talented people a financial incentive to use their talents for the benefit of society, but it is unjust for talented people to use their bargaining power to obtain such extra payment.' Discuss.
3. **Either** (a) Does the liberal state treat each person with equal respect?
Or (b) Can a liberal perfectionist state secure autonomy for all?
4. Why do communitarians criticise liberals for endorsing 'the priority of the right over the good'? Is this criticism fair?
5. **Either** (a) Is Rorty's 'anti-foundationalist' reading of Rawls a fair interpretation? Is it a convincing position?
Or (b) Does Rawls's 'political liberalism' successfully reconcile pluralism and justice?
6. What are the objections to 'equality of welfare'? Can they be answered?
7. Do theorists who are sympathetic to equality have an adequate answer to the problem of 'levelling down'?
8. What role should there be for individual responsibility in the theory of justice?
9. Can voluntary transfers create injustice?
10. Does self-ownership entail economic inequality?
11. Can political obligation be explained in terms of individual consent?
12. What are duties of 'fair play'? Are they genuine duties?
13. Does natural duty explain political obligation?

END OF PAPER