This course studies “Global justice.” Justice here just names the enforceable part of morality. A moral duty is apt for enforcement just in case those who violate the duty are liable to penalties, so long as the penalties are not disproportionate (so it would be disproportionate, and wrong, to shoot someone who has violated a duty not to steal your milk shake, or your car). The study of global justice is the study of (a) the duties we have to people anywhere on Earth and of (b) the institutions and practices that are morally required. Otherwise put, theories of global justice advance claims about what conditions would have to obtain, for the relationships that people have to other people around the globe to be fair, morally acceptable.

Talk about global justice can sound utopian—pie in the sky. We can just as well think of our enterprise as studying global worseness and global betterness. What states of the world are morally better, which ones worse? What’s the morally best situation we can feasibly get to from where we are? What are the moral constraints on the duties we might have to improve the world? (Examples: Maybe it would not be OK to kill your innocent grandmother to make the world better, and maybe you would not be required to sacrifice your life, letting a shark eat you, even if that would make the world a lot better.)

One central topic we will cover is how to draw the boundary between the moral duties do we have to people as such, wherever and whenever they may live, by comparison with moral duties we may have to present members of our own society. What moral entitlements do we have, if any, to favor those near and dear to us over distant strangers, when deciding whom to harm or help? We also consider (1) what duties we have, if any, to help the global poor and those in peril in other ways. Also: (2) what border control policies are morally acceptable? Also: (3) when, if ever, is it acceptable for one nation or group of people to resort to war against another nation or group of people, and in war, what duties do we have to combatants and noncombatants?

The topics we discuss are seriously controversial among reasonable people, people like us. Opinions will differ. Course authors defend starkly opposed positions. You will after your own reflection disagree with the views of some or all of course authors’ views and the course the instructor’s as well. Not all the readings are balanced; sometimes we will have to figure out for ourselves what can be said in support of other sides of the issues in dispute.

The goals of the course are to develop our skills at reading and understanding hard texts and assessing their arguments, and to also reflect on our own political values in the light of current controversies.

Course Texts consist of essays accessible under the reading for each week at the Canvas course page. The expectation is that students will read the required readings before that day’s class. If more than 1 essay is required reading for a class, we will designate a single reading that will be the primary focus of class discussion.

Listed also for some classes are merely recommended readings. These are not required—they won’t show up on an exam; and you don’t need to read any of them to do well on your writing assignment. The
recommended readings are purely optional. They are suggestions for further reading in case you want to explore a further topic in greater depth. To reiterate: at the Canvas course page, recommended readings are labelled “merely recommended,” to emphasize that they are not a required component of the course.

Course Requirements: There is a class participation course requirement (described in the next paragraph). The other course requirements are a takehome midterm exam, an analytical writing assignment (about five to seven pages in length), and a regular final exam. The writing assignment will not require extra reading, but will ask you to interpret and assess some required course texts. On the writing assignment you will have a choice among topics assigned in class. The writing assignment has two components: (1) write a draft or outline of your paper and discuss it with me and (2) complete and turn in a final draft of your paper. The final exam will comprehend all course materials (required readings, lectures, and handouts). The final will be a takehome final.

To encourage keeping up with the reading class by class and week by week, there will be a class participation component of your grade. On all class days, there will be class discussion for about half of the class, usually on questions posed in advance of class (and relating to the readings assigned for that class). During the lecture portion of any class, you are 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. For full class participation credit for any class, you must be present at it, and participating. Since you will likely sometimes have good reasons of your own to miss class, you can earn partial credit for a missed day’s class by sending me email questions or comments before that class begins regarding some significant aspect of the assigned reading for that day. Think of an ideal comment as a one-paragraph essay on some aspect of the day’s reading. A good class participation email comment engages with the reading for the day, not merely with my email message sent before class. If you both submit an email participation comment before class and also attend class, that’s great. (Each day of class counts the same toward your class participation grade.).

Grading: Class participation counts for 20 per cent of your final grade, the midterm takehome exam for 15 per cent of your final grade, the writing assignment for 30 per cent, and the final exam counts for 35 per cent. Course grading for those enrolled on a Pass/Not Pass basis: If you are taking the course on a Pass/Not Pass basis, and you have an A- average or better on all class work up to the final, you will be excused from the final exam.

Academic Honesty. Students are expected to understand and follow the University policy on academic honesty (Integrity of Scholarship). You can read this at http://students.ucsd.edu/academics/academic-integrity/policy.html

Integrity of scholarship—the basic idea is simple: be honest. Don’t cheat.

**********************************************

Schedule of readings and lecture/discussion topics.

Word of advice: The key to do well in this class is staying current with the weekly readings.

Schedule of readings and lecture/discussion topics (continued.)
**MON: No Class. Martin Luther King Jr. Day.**
**WED:** Two reactions to Singer. (1) The world is complicated—the relation of people in wealthy countries to the global needy is unlike the relation of the person in Singer’s example to the drowning child he happens to come upon. (2) Our duties to other people are all duties not to harm them and include no duties to help. Reading: Leif Wenar, “Poverty Is No Pond: Challenges for the Affluent”; also Jan Narveson, “We Don’t Owe Them a Thing.”

**WED:** Still more on beneficence and duties to aid. Does the duty to help others dictate that whatever sacrifice we make for others must do the most good it could do? Reading: Larry Temkin, “Singer’s Pond Example and Some Worries about Effective Altruism.”
Merely recommended reading: Larry Temkin, “7.4 Blurry Lines” and “7.5. Goma.”

Week 4. January 30-February 5.
**MON:** 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.”
**WED:** Reciprocity, the principle of fairness, insiders and outsiders. Reading: Andrea Sangiovanni, “Global Justice, Reciprocity, and the State.”
Merely recommended reading: David Miller, “In Defense of Nationality.”
Merely recommended reading: Simon Caney, “Humanity, Associations, and Global Justice.”
Merely recommended reading: David Miller, “Justice and Boundaries” (relevant to week 7 also).
**Takehome midterm due Friday, February 3, at Canvas, before 12 midnight.**

Week 5. February 6-12.
**MON:** Moderate cosmopolitanism regarding (1) culture and (2) justice. Reading: Samuel Scheffler, “Conceptions of Cosmopolitanism”; also Jeremy Waldron, “Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative.”
**WED:** Extreme cosmopolitanisms. Reading: Richard Arneson, “Extreme Cosmopolitanisms Defended.”
Merely recommended reading: Arneson, “Is Patriotism Immoral?.”

**MON:** The legacy of colonialism and global justice now. Reading: Lea Ypi, Robert Goodin, and Christian Barry, “Global Justice, Associative Duties, and the Colonies.”
**WED:** Open Borders. Reading: Joseph Carens, “The Case for Open Borders” and “The Claims of Community,” chapters 11 & 12 of his *The Ethics of Immigration.*
Merely recommended reading: Jason Brennan and Chris Freiman, “Can Socialism Allow Open Borders?”

**MON: NO CLASS. Presidents’ Day.**
**WED:** Closed Borders. Reading: Christopher Wellman, “Immigration and Freedom of Association.”
Merely recommended reading: David Miller, “Justice and Boundaries (relevant to week 4 also).
Schedule of readings and lecture/discussion topics (continued).

Week 8. February 27-March 5.
WED: More on temporary guestworkers. Reading: Richard Arneson, “Guest Worker Programs and Reasonable, Feasible Cosmopolitanism.”

Week 9. March 6-12.
MON: Just war theory—justice in the conduct of war (jus in bello). Reading: Michael Walzer, Just and Unjust Wars, chapters 3, 8, and 9.
WED: Criticism of traditional just war theory. Reading: Jeff McMahan, “The Ethics of Killing in War.”
WRITING ASSIGNMENT DUE WEDNESDAY, March 8, at Canvas, before 12 midnight.

MON: Just war theory—justice in the resort to war (jus ad bellum). Reading: Michael Walzer, chapter 4 (“Law and Order in International Society”) and chapter 6 (“Interventions”) of his Just and Unjust Wars,
WED: More on just war theory. Reading: Thomas Hurka, “Proportionality in the Morality of War.”