GLOBAL JUSTICE

This course examines questions of justice as they apply beyond the limits of the state. Do we have reason to care about inequality at the international level? Do we have special duties towards our compatriots? What is the legitimate reach of international organizations? Are our immigration policies too restrictive or too permissive? What interests should be protected as human rights? And how should we protect them? The first half of the course would cover major theoretical approaches to problems of global justice. The second would turn to more specific questions, including immigration, climate change, fair trade, human rights and global institutional design.

In addition to surveying literature on global justice and encourage students to grapple with the various questions in the field, the class is designed to prepare students for the experience of writing a senior thesis in normative political theory (a.k.a political philosophy) by requiring them to develop an original normative argument and defend it in a research paper. The research paper should be developed over the course of the whole semester – students will be required to submit a topic idea, discuss it with the instructor and present a brief prospectus to the rest of the class. This process will emphasize two important aspect of writing academic papers. First, writing is an ongoing process of revision and refinement over a period of time. Second, it’s a collaborative process of engaging with other people’s feedback and responses, and incorporating it into the writing process. The latter will be integral to the seminar as students’ responses paper will also be circulated to the class.

Assignments. The course will take the form of a seminar. Attendance and participation are therefore of great importance and comprise 20% of the grade. I take attendance regularly. If you have to miss a class for good reason, it’s best to notify me in advance. Students are also encouraged to visit office hours to discuss the readings and/or their paper.

Each student will write 2 short response papers (3-5 pages, double spaced), each on one piece of reading from the syllabus. Response paper should offer a brief recap of the argument (or an important part of it), and provide some critical reflections. The purpose of the response papers is to rehearse for writing the final paper and experience the writing style of argument-focused analytic philosophy. The emphasis should therefore be on
forming a thesis and structuring the paper around it. Students are asked to choose their response papers by **February 3rd**. Response papers are due via the course website to the instructor by 8pm on Tuesday evening of the assigned week and will be circulated to the class in advance. Response papers comprise 30% of a student's final grade. Students who wrote response papers are expected to present briefly their take on the reading in class (5-10 minutes).

Students' final assignment will be a final seminar paper (20-25 pages) on a topic of their choice that relates to the materials of the class. Papers topic should address normative questions in the field of global justice, advancing an original argument, providing reasoning for it and supporting it by engaging with the literature. Papers can address theoretical questions as well as specific concrete problems as long as they focus on making a normative argument and engage with the materials of the course.

Students will send in paper proposals for approval by **February 29th** (one page max.) and meet with the instructor in office hours to discuss it. Students will then submit a 2-3 page prospectus and a sample bibliography by **March 21st** at 8pm via the course website. The students would be required to present their topic and discuss it in class on **March 23rd**. The final paper comprises 50% of a student's final grade. Final papers are due on **April 25th at 8pm**.

**Grading.** Papers are graded according to four criteria: format, writing, argument and comprehension. **Format** refers to the proper presentation of the paper. Was the paper submitted on time? Are there citations when needed and are they done correctly? Is the paper within the word limit and in the required format? **Writing** refers to clarity, precision, conciseness, appropriate terminology, correct use of punctuation and grammar and the like. **Argument** refers to the structure of the argument and its soundness, and will be graded on the basis of an answer to questions such as these: is there a clear and focused thesis to the paper? Are there arguments supporting each premise and inference? Do conclusions follow from premises? Lastly, **comprehension** refers to the discussion of the readings. Is this a plausible interpretation of the author's view? Is this an accurate representation of their purported project? Does the paper engage meaningfully with the course material that is relevant to this issue?

There is no specific formula to the weight of the different ingredients but as a general rule **argument** carries the most weight in a grade and format the least. Under no circumstances will students be penalized for the content of the views expressed in their paper and/or discussion. I do not grade your views, only the way you argue for them.

**Discussion.** The purpose of the discussion in class is to provide **productive, inclusive and stimulating** environment for discussion about the material of the course. **Productive** means it should help students reach a better understanding of the reading material, the theories presented and the questions that are at stake. **Inclusive** means it should help **all** students
express themselves, regardless of their views, backgrounds or previous experience in
philosophy. *Stimulating* means it should provide an opportunity for students to challenge
themselves and reexamine their opinions by listening to each other and expressing
themselves candidly in a respectful manner.

I hope to promote this goal by contributing from my experience and acquaintance with the
material, clarifying complicated points, structuring the class in a productive manner and
facilitating constructive discussion. I expect of you to attend class and participate in a
sincere, open and serious manner that allows others the same space. Presenting your
opinion as clearly as possible and subjecting it to criticism of your peers, as well as your
own, is a good philosophical (and intellectual) practice.

**Course Collaboration policy.** Discussion and the exchange of ideas are essential to
academic work. For assignments in this course, students are encouraged to consult with
classmates on the choice of paper topics and to share sources. Discussions between
students, as well as feedback on each other work, is encouraged and will be practiced in-
class. However, students should ensure that any written work they submit for evaluation is
the result of their own research and writing and that it reflects their own approach to the
topic. Students must also adhere to standard citation practices in this discipline and
properly cite any books, articles, websites, lectures, etc. that they have used. Instances of
suspected plagiarism will be reported to the Harvard administration, per the Harvard
College Honor Code ([http://honor.fas.harvard.edu/honor-code](http://honor.fas.harvard.edu/honor-code)):

*Members of the Harvard College community commit themselves to producing academic work
of integrity – that is, work that adheres to the scholarly and intellectual standards of accurate
attribution of sources, appropriate collection and use of data, and transparent
acknowledgement of the contribution of others to their ideas, discoveries, interpretations, and
conclusions. Cheating on exams or problem sets, plagiarizing or misrepresenting the ideas or
language of someone else as one’s own, falsifying data, or any other instance of academic
dishonesty violates the standards of our community, as well as the standards of the wider
world of learning and affairs.*

**Reading.** Course materials will be available on the course’s website or via HOLLIS. Most of
these are philosophical essays that require careful reading so please make time to read all
of them. Please bring all assigned readings to the class. Every class has a section of ‘further
reading’ that is meant to help interested students find additional materials for their papers
and future research. These readings will not be discussed in class and you are not expected
to read them. Some of these readings will be available on the website.

**Textbook version corner.** The textbook *Global Distributive Justice: An Introduction* is a terrific
resource for students who find the primary sources difficult or look for a brief summary to
refresh their memory on a particular topic. For some of the classes I’ve suggested ‘textbook’
versions (by noting page numbers in the book) that cover roughly the same materials.
These are not mandatory readings, but rather short summaries of the main arguments
presented in the required readings. These readings are not a substitute for reading primary sources but they can help students who wish to use them.

Although this course is meant as an introduction to the subject of global justice, and although there are no official prerequisites, students will likely find it helpful to have taken at least one prior course in political theory, philosophy, or ethical reasoning. If you have any questions about the course’s level of difficulty, and whether you will be prepared for it, please come speak to me at the beginning of the semester.

The following books are available on reserve at Lamont Library:


Feedback. You are welcomed to email me with any question, concern or feedback you may have. You are also invited to my office hours. I would love to get your feedback on the class early on in the semester – if there’s something you think we should do more, or less or not at all or in addition – do tell me.

COURSE SYLLABUS AND SCHEDULE OF CLASSES

Part 1 – Theoretical approaches to global justice

January 27th
Introduction and Information Session (before the lottery)

1. February 3rd
Realism, relativism and normative theory

- “The Melian Dialogue” in Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War
- George Kennan, Morality and Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy, pp. 205-218
- Michael Walzer, Thick and Thin, Chapter 1.
- Simon Caney, Justice Beyond Borders, chapters 1 (pp. 1-15) and chapter 2.
Further readings:

- Bernard Williams, "Realism and Moralism in Political Theory," In Williams, *In the Beginning was the Deed* (Princeton University Press, 2005)

Multimedia corner: a podcast interview about moral relativism:  

2. February 10th

**Nationalism and Associative Duties**

- A selection of the evolution of David Miller’s thoughts on nationalism:
  - David Miller, excerpts from “National Identity” (Chapter Two) and “National Self--Determination” (Chapter Four), in *On Nationality* (1995): 17-27, 81-90.

Further readings:

3. February 17th

**Coercion and Cooperation in the priority of States**

- Risse, *On Global Justice*, Ch. 2

**Further reading:**


**Textbook version:** *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 93-101

4. February 24th

**Global Distributive Justice – Minimalist and Egalitarian Approaches**

- Leif Wenar, “Why Rawls is Not a Cosmopolitan Egalitarian,” in *Rawls’s Law of*
5. March 2\textsuperscript{nd}

**Individual duties or a system problem? Poverty and the duty to give**

- Peter Singer, “Saving a Child” and “Is it Wrong Not to Help?” (ch. 1 and 2) in *The Life You Can Save: How to do your part to End World Poverty* (2010), pp. 3-22.
- Joshua Cohen, “Philosophy, Social Science, Global Poverty”, *Pogge and His Critics*.

Further readings:

- William Easterly, “Review of Singer’s *The Life You Can Save*”

**Textbook version:** *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 25-30

Multimedia corner: A podcast interview with Peter Singer about *The Life you Can Save*:
6. March 9\textsuperscript{th}

**Human Rights**


**Further readings:**

**Textbook version:** *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 107-135

7. March 16\textsuperscript{th}

**NO CLASS, SPRING BREAK**

8. March 23\textsuperscript{rd}

**In-class prospectus presentation**

Part 2 – Specific issues

9. March 30\textsuperscript{th}

**Migration and open borders**

**Further Reading:**

• Michael Blake, 'Immigration, Jurisdiction, and Exclusion', *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 41 (2013).

**Textbook version:** *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 221-251

**10. April 6th**

**Climate change justice**


Further readings:

• Eric Posner and David Weisbach. “Climate Change and Distributive Justice: Climate Change Blinders” (Chapter Four) and “Punishing the Wrongdoers: A Climate Guilt Clause?” (Chapter Five), in *Climate Change Justice* (2010): 73---118.

Textbook version: *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 189-219

11. April 13th

**Fair trade**


Further readings:


**Textbook version:** *Global Distributive Justice*, pp. 163-187

12. April 20th

**Global Governance and Democracy**

• David Miller, “Democracy's Domain”, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*.
• Luis Cabrera, “the Cosmopolitan Imperative” (chapter four) and “Democratic Distance” (chapter five) in *Political Theory of Global Justice: A Cosmopolitan Case for the World State*, pp. 71-89, 90-104 (2004).
• Terry MacDonald, “Citizens or stakeholders? Exclusion, equality and legitimacy in global stakeholder democracy” in *Global Democracy: Normative and Empirical Perspectives* edited by Daniele Archibugi, Mathias Koenig-Archibugi, Raffaele Marchetti, pp. 47-68

Further readings:


13. April 27th

**Conclusion**