

**INTRODUCTORY HANDOUT PHILOSOPHY 139  
GLOBAL JUSTICE**

**WINTER, 2016**

Professor: Richard Arneson.

Lecture Tuesdays & Thursdays 5:00-6:20 in Warren Lecture Hall 2114.

The final exam for this course will take place on March 17, 2016, from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. If you enroll in this class, you must be free to take a regular final exam for this course at this time.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION.** What do we owe to people anywhere on Earth just in virtue of our common humanity? Do we owe more to fellow countrymen than to outsiders, and if so, on what basis, and to what degree? These are old questions, but philosophers have been paying more attention to them in recent years.

We use the term “justice” to refer to the part of morality that affirms duties that are especially stringent and apt for enforcement. If injustice is being done, some people are wronging others, and they ought to be stopped from doing so. Institutions and social practices are also praised as just or condemned as unjust. These assessments are supposed to be especially important. The philosopher John Rawls wrote, “Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well-arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust. Each person possesses an inviolability founded on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override.” Justice duties fall on each of us, and require fair treatment of all of us. But what is fair treatment? People approach this question from very different perspectives, and end up holding deeply conflicting opinions. The recent philosophical literature on global justice is in a somewhat chaotic, unsettled state: Theorists disagree about what are the right questions to ask, as well as about answers to the questions that get posed. There’s lots of room for fresh thinking here.

In this course we do not attempt a complete survey of the field. We will explore several central issues. One is whether there is one set of fundamental justice norms that apply everywhere, or rather one set of principles regulating the relations of people within each separate state and another set of norms regulating relations among states and among the members of different nation states. Discussions of this issue tend to focus on questions of distributive justice. The basic arrangements of society (or global society) shape the benefits and burdens people get from social cooperation and the resource holdings and life prospects of individuals. Distributive justice theory asks what distribution of benefits and burdens across individuals would be just.

A second issue we discuss is just and unjust violence. One way that people around the Earth can relate to each other is by making war on each other or deliberately attacking each other. Under what conditions is attacking people with a view to killing or seriously injuring them morally acceptable? Just war theory, devised hundreds of years ago by theologian-philosophers, offers answers, but the world is very different now. In a globalized world, nonstate actors using modern technology have initiated campaigns of violence that many of us label “terrorism” and regard as beyond the pale. What is “terrorism” and how does a reasonable morality assess it? Another facet of modern controversies regarding war and campaigns of violence can be traced back to the idea of global justice theory. If people everywhere have important moral rights, which all of us are bound to uphold, can violent incursions (and threatening them) across borders in order to alter the internal affairs of a sovereign state be sometimes morally justified as necessary to protect human rights? If so, under what conditions? Or is talk of “humanitarian intervention” just an excuse for more powerful nations to bully less powerful countries?

A third issue is justice in the national borders separating countries. One question arising under this heading is secession. A secessionist movement inside a nation aims to withdraw from the existing government and set up a new state on some territory currently within the jurisdiction of that rump state. (Back in the 18<sup>th</sup> century the United States was formed by a secession struggle. The U. S. Civil War in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was also a secession struggle.) Under what conditions are the demands of a secession movement just demands? Another question concerning justice in the management of national borders is immigration. In the world today, some people would like to resettle, temporarily or permanently, in some other country. Their aspirations are often blocked by the use of coercive force by governments intent on controlling entry into the territory over which they claim jurisdiction. Under what conditions is this use of coercive force morally justifiable?

The fourth issue we explore in this course is environmental justice or more exactly, one aspect of environmental justice: justice in greenhouse gas emissions and the resultant problems of climate change. As societies become economically developed, over time normal activities of life are unleashing global warming processes that threaten harm to current people and to future generations. To reduce or stop global warming, cooperation by countries across the globe would be required. Cooperation to stop harms of global warming can also involve efforts at adaptation, for example, building seawalls. The issue how fairly to divide the costs of this cooperation is contentious. The economic development of currently poor and less industrialized countries seems to many a moral imperative but also threatens to worsen climate change problems. How fairly to balance these concerns is also contentious. The harms of global warming are likely to fall very unevenly across the globe and disproportionately on people living in poor countries; this factor also complicates the determination of what is a just response to the problem of global warming. The harms of global warming, should they occur, will fall mostly on people in future generations, so the issue of climate change justice is entangled with contentious issues of intergenerational justice and of population ethics (how many people should there be?).

Like the other issues we explore in this course, a reasonable resolution of moral questions posed by the threat of global warming requires understanding of complex empirical facts and causal processes. The phenomena of globalization are complicated and in many important ways, poorly understood. Since this is a course in moral philosophy, we focus on the normative issues. The empirical issues are also of utmost importance, but to make some progress on the questions of moral principle, we set the empirical issue to the side or fix them provisionally by stipulation. This means we hope to reach conclusions such as, "If the empirical facts are A and B, we morally ought to do X." This of course does not tell us what to do if the empirical facts are not actually A and B.

A distinction to keep in mind as we take up various issues of global justice is that between the fundamental moral principles that bear on an issue and practical guidelines and social norms we should perhaps adopt as aids to fulfilling these principles. Take for example the issue of noncombatant immunity in just war theory. This says that soldiers fighting wars should aim fire only at combatants and never at noncombatants. Should we embrace the doctrine of noncombatant immunity? Some might affirm it at the level of fundamental moral principle, some might deny that there is any fundamental moral principle that requires noncombatant immunity but nevertheless hold it is a good practical guideline for soldiers and for international treaties and guidelines regulating the conduct of war to adopt. And some might deny that we should embrace noncombatant immunity as a general rule either at the level of fundamental principle or at the level of practical guideline. To avoid talking at cross-purposes we need to keep the distinction in mind.

**COURSE GOALS:** The goals of the course are to improve our skills at interpreting challenging texts and assessing their arguments, to understand a variety of approaches to the theory of global justice, and to gain a more reflective understanding of our own moral and political values. A secondary aim is to sharpen our analytical writing skills.

**COURSE TEXTS:** Andrew Altman and Christopher Wellman, *A Liberal Theory of International Justice*, and Mathias Risse, *Global Political Philosophy*. All other course readings will be available at the course TED page.

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS:** (1) regular participation in class discussion, (2) nine short weekly discussion papers, each about one page in length, commenting on some aspect of the reading for that class that strikes you as significant, (3) a longer writing assignment, six to eight double-spaced pages in length, topics to be assigned in class, and (4) a regular comprehensive final examination. You will have some choice of topic on the writing assignment. On your discussion papers, writing assignment, and final exam you will be graded according to the clarity of your prose, the cogency of your arguments, and the soundness of the understanding of course materials that you exhibit. The final examination will comprehend all course materials including required readings, lectures, and handouts distributed in class. (This means that merely recommended readings will NOT be covered on exams.)

To encourage keeping up with the reading class by class and week by week, there will be a class participation component of your grade. At each class meeting, there will be class discussion for about half of the class, always on questions posed in advance of class (and relating to the readings assigned for that class). This

class discussion usually will take place at the start of class, before the instructor's lecture starts, but sometimes will occur at the mid-way point. During lectures, you are always encouraged to interject questions and comment. I will take notes after every class on the class discussion, and the quality and frequency of your contributions to discussion will be the basis of your class participation grade.

The weekly discussion paper examines one line of thought or argument or claim made in a course reading for that day (the day you are turning in the paper). In the paper you can highlight something in the reading you think would be a good focus for class discussion. You can present a claim or argument advanced by the course author. You can raise an objection to what the author is saying, or defend a controversial claim in the reading against some possible objection. You have a lot of choice as to what to do in the short paper. Trying to summarize the entire reading in a one-page paper is probably not a good idea, but you might summarize and clarify an argument in the reading that seems complicated or pivotal or both. The weekly discussion paper is due at the start of class on either Tuesday or Thursday and should discuss some part of the assigned reading for that day's class.

If you turn in ten discussion papers I will count your nine best grades.

**GRADING:** The final exam counts for 40 % of your exam grade, the writing assignment for 30%, the nine discussion papers for 15%, and class participation for 15 %.

Only medical excuses certified by a note from your physician or a comparable certified excuse will be accepted for late submission of the writing assignment or the midterm exam, or to justify the assignment of an Incomplete course grade.

**Arneson's office hours: Tuesdays 3-4 and Fridays 2-3 in HSS 8057. Office phone 534 6810. Email [arneson@ucsd.edu](mailto:arneson@ucsd.edu)** If you want to see me and these listed office hours are inconvenient, see me at class and we can set up a day and time to meet.

## **SCHEDULE OF LECTURES, DISCUSSIONS, AND READINGS**

Week 1. January 4-10.

TUES: Introduction to global justice.

Reading: Peter Singer, "Outsiders: Our Obligations to Those Beyond our Borders."

THUR: Other perspectives on duties to help distant needy strangers.

Reading: Leif Wenar: "Poverty Is No Pond: Challenges for the Affluent"; Liam Murphy, "The Demands of Beneficence."

Recommended reading: Thomas Pogge, "'Assisting' the Global Poor."

Week 2. January 11-17.

TUES: John Rawls on global justice: ideal theory--the law of peoples.

Reading: John Rawls, *the Law of Peoples*, pages 3-44 and 59-82.

THUR: Rawls on nonideal theory.

Reading: Rawls, *The Law of Peoples*, pages 89-120.

Week 3. January 18-24.

TUES: An argument for a two-tier social justice doctrine: egalitarian within each nation, sufficientarian across the globe.

Reading: Michael Blake, "Distributive Justice, State Coercion, and Autonomy."

THUR: For and against global egalitarian justice.

Reading: Andrea Sangiovanni, "Global Justice, Reciprocity, and the State"; also Simon Caney, "Humanity, Associations, and Global Justice: In Defence of Humanity-Centered Cosmopolitan Egalitarianism."

Week 4. January 25-31.

TUES: Two types of egalitarianism: "luckist" and relational. Altman & Wellman on relational egalitarianism and international justice.

Reading: Andrew Altman and Christopher Wellman, *A Liberal Theory of International Justice*, chapter 6; also Mathias Risse, *Global Political Philosophy*, chapter 4.

THUR: Cosmopolitanism, moderate and extreme.

Reading: Samuel Scheffler, "Conceptions of Cosmopolitanism"; also Richard Arneson, "Extreme Cosmopolitanisms Defended."

Week 5. February 1-7.

TUES: Modern Just war theory.

Reading: Michael Walzer, *Just & Unjust Wars*, chapters 4, 5, & 6 (excerpts).

THUR: Just war: against "the moral equality of soldiers."

Reading: Jeff McMahan, "The Ethics of Killing in War."

Week 6. February 8-14.

TUES: Terrorism.

Reading: Samuel Scheffler, "Is Terrorism Morally Distinctive?"

THUR: Is terrorism always morally wrong?

Reading: Lionel McPherson, "Is Terrorism Distinctively Wrong?"; Frances Kamm, "Failures of Just War Theory: Terror, Harm, and Justice"; Noam Zohar, "Innocence and Complex Threats: Upholding the War Ethic and the Condemnation of Terrorism."

Week 7. February 15-21.

TUES: Humanitarian Intervention.

Reading: Altman & Wellman, "Armed Intervention and Political Assassination," chapter 5 of *A Liberal Theory of International Justice*; also Jeff McMahan, "Humanitarian Intervention, Consent, and Proportionality."

THUR: Secession.

Reading: Altman and Wellman, chapter 3 of *A Liberal Theory of International Justice*; also Allen Buchanan, "Theories of Secession."

Week 8. February 22-28.

TUES: **[WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE IN CLASS.]** Immigration.

Reading: Joseph Carens, "The Case for Open Borders" and "The Claims of Community," chapters 11 and 12 of his *The Ethics of Immigration*.

THUR: Immigration.

Reading: Altman & Wellman, chapter 7 of *A Liberal Theory of International Justice*; also Risse, chapter 6 of *Global Political Philosophy*.

Recommended reading: Michael Blake, "Immigration, Jurisdiction, and Exclusion."

Week 9. February 29-March 6.

TUES: Climate change: justice and greenhouse gas emissions.

Reading: John Broome, chapters 2 and 3 of *Climate Matters*; Simon Caney, "Just Emissions."

THUR: What should individuals do.

Reading: John Broome, chapters 4 & 5 of *Climate Matters*, Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, "It's not My Fault: Global Warming and Individual Moral Obligations."

Week 10. March 7-13.

TUES: Alternative perspectives on climate change and social justice.

Reading: Luc Bovens, "A Lockean Defense of Grandfathering Emissions Rights"; Eric Posner and David Weisbach, *Climate Change Justice* (excerpts).

THUR: Collective Responsibility?

Reading: David Miller, "National Responsibility" and "Inheriting Responsibilities" from his *National Responsibility and Global Justice*.