Introduction:

In the canonical works of political thought (i.e. Plato to Marx) justice is taken to be a requirement that applies between citizen and citizen and between citizen and state: that is to say, it is taken to be something that comes into play only within the borders of political societies. In terms of the long history of political thought, the emergence of the idea of *global* obligations is very recent – we may date it to the path-breaking work of Peter Singer and Charles Beitz (both of whom we read, in weeks 2, 3 and 4). As one might expect, basic approaches are highly contested, and in the first part of this course we critically review five influential positions: the humanitarian rescue thesis, the “harm principle” approach, liberal cosmopolitanism, statism, and nationalism: in each case we examine the view in light of a critical response. In the second part of the course we move on to discuss six of the issues that have divided global-justice theorists: the nature of imperialism, immigration policy, exploitation, crimes against humanity, collective punishment, and climate justice.

Evaluation:

UNDERGRADUATES:

Major essay (70%), due on last day of classes (April 5). Late penalty 2% per day, but essays cannot be accepted after April 8. The essay should be on one of the week’s topics. Each week, two required sources are listed. A third source is also listed as “supplementary,” and your essay must take account of that reading as well as the two required readings. Further readings are discouraged (unless as a source for empirical information that you use as evidence for a point). Expected length 12-15 pages.

Minor essay (15%), due in week 6. Email to me on Feb 12 before 6 p.m. (Late penalty 2% per day). 5 pages double-spaced: 2/3 pages stating what you take to be the best case for the theory that you favour, 2/3 pages defending it against what you take to be its most serious challenger, among the views that we have discussed.

Participation, (15%) which means (i) showing up every week with a 1-page (single-spaced – normal margins!) commentary on the readings that encapsulates their main points and raises a question for discussion, and (ii) contributing helpfully to the work of the seminar. The commentary is pass/fail, but any week in which you fail to attend with an acceptable written commentary will result in the loss of one full percentage point from the 15 available. The commentaries must reach me by email by 4 p.m. on the day before the class.

GRADUATES:
Major Essay, 80% due April 5. Late penalty 2% per day, but essays cannot be accepted after April 8. The essay should bring together readings from two (or more) weeks. Expected length: 15-20 pages.

Participation (20%): contribution to seminar discussion. No written submission is required, but graduate students will be called on to give a 5-10 minute presentation on the supplementary reading, bringing out what it adds to the discussion.

Week 1 (Jan 07): Introduction to the course

**Part One: Big theories**

Week 2 (Jan 14): Does distance make a difference? Humanitarianism vs Compatriot preference

Peter Singer, *One World*, Yale University Press, chapter 5
David Miller, “Reasonable Preference for Compatriots,” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* (2005), 63-81

*Supplementary:*

Week 3 (Jan 21): Liberal cosmopolitanism I: Who owns natural resources?

[Note: these readings presuppose some basic knowledge of Rawls’ theory of justice. If you need some background, a brief extract from *A Theory of Justice* is posted on the OWL site]

Charles Beitz, “Justice and International Relations,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 4 (1975) 360-89, up to page 373 only
Margaret Moore, “Natural resources, Territorial Right, and Global Distributive Justice,” *Political Theory* (2012), 84-107

*Supplementary:*

Week 4 (Jan 28: Liberal Cosmopolitanism 11: Distributive Justice, local or global?

Beitz, “Justice and International Relations,” p. 373 to end

*Supplementary:*

Week 5 (Feb 4): A global harm principle?


Mathias Risse, “Do We Owe the Global Poor Assistance or Rectification?” *Ethics & International Affairs* (2005) 9-18.


Week 6 (Feb 11): Nationalism


Robert Goodin, “What is so Special about our Fellow-Countrymen?” *Ethics* (1988), 663-86


Reading week

Part Two: Cases

Week 8 (Feb 26): What’s wrong with Colonialism?


Week 9 (Mar 04): Opening and closing borders


Week 10 (Mar 11): What (if anything) is wrong with exploitation?

**Supplementary:**

Week 11 (Mar 18): Can individuals be held responsible for global crimes?


**Supplementary:**
Either Norman Geras, *Crimes Against Humanity*, Manchester University Press, 2011, chapter 2
(a conceptual analysis), or, from a legal perspective: Massimo Renzo, “Crimes Against Humanity and the Limits of International Law,” *Law and Philosophy* (2012), 443-76.

Week 12 (Mar 25): Can collectives be held responsible for global crimes?


**Supplementary:**

Week 13 (April 1): Responsibility for climate justice
Peter Singer, *One World*, chapter 2

**Supplementary:**