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## 1 The Nature of Tortious Liability

### What is tort?

#### Principles of Liability
- Compensation
- Fault
- Retributive justice
- Deterrence
- Economic efficiency (market deterrence)
- Loss distribution

#### Conclusions

### The Interests Protected by Tort

- Personal harm
- Harm to property
- Harm to reputation
- Harm to financial interests
- Harm to the due process of law

### The Role of Tort in the Law of Obligations

- The distinction between tort and contract
- The distinction between tort and restitution

### The Impact of European and Human Rights Law

### Tort in Modern Society

- Tort and other compensation systems
- Why not tort?
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(2) Invitees
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The need for reform
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The scope of the 1957 Act

(1) The Act covers damage to property as well as personal injury

(2) Liability under the Act may be limited by an express term of a contract, or by a notice given to visitors

(3) The Act is thought to apply only to the "occupancy duty"

Definition of "occupier"

Definition of "premises"

Definition of "visitor"

Persons entering by authority of law

Persons exercising rights of way

Implied permission

Limitations on permission

The "common duty of care"

Discharging the common duty of care

Children

Professional visitors

Giving a warning of the danger

Entrusting work to independent contractors

Exclusion of liability

(1) Displaying a notice on the premises

(2) An express term of a contract
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