

Political Science 8015

Global Justice

Hilary Term 2021 • Time TBA • Place TBA

Instructor: Peter Stone

4.08 College Green • 2491 • pstone@tcd.ie • Office Hours: By Appointment (Zoom)

Module Learning Aims:

As the third millennium begins, many of the most important moral problems facing humanity transcend national boundaries. Climate change, terrorism, migration, pandemics, human rights, humanitarian intervention—all raise questions difficult to answer in a purely national context. For this reason, the concerned moral agent increasingly needs to take on a **global** perspective.

Politics, in the words of the political scientist Harold Lasswell, is all about who gets what, when, and how. In that sense, all these global problems are deeply political. Either they concern questions of who is entitled to what (rights, opportunities, material goods) or else they involve figuring out what to do when someone's entitlements are violated (through war or terrorism, for example). The moral principles that govern who gets what, when, and how are principles of **justice**. Addressing the moral problems of our day thus requires principles of **global justice**. These principles will be the focus of the module.

Module Content:

In this module, students will perform two tasks. First, they will examine the research methods employed by political theorists. These methods are distinct from those employed in empirical political research, although there is some similarity between them. Second, they will investigate how these methods are used to address questions of global justice.

Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of this module, students should be able to:

- Distinguish between different types of questions relating to global justice.

- Demonstrate understanding of some different approaches used to address those questions.
- Apply this understanding to real-world problems of international relations.
- Make and criticize arguments regarding how our international system ought to function, and what our obligations in that system ought to be.

Reading List:

All module readings can be found online, either via TCD's Library, the module's Blackboard page, or some other source.

Students should also make sure that they possess a good guide to grammar and style, as it will help them immensely with their writing. I recommend the following two works:

O'Conner, Patricia T. *Woe Is I: The Grammarphobe's Guide to Better English in Plain English*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1996.

Strunk, Jr., William and White, E.B. *The Elements of Style*. 4th ed. New York: Longman, 2000.

Assessment:

Students are expected to attend seminar each week and to participate in informed discussions of the readings. Participation will count for 10% of the grade.

Students are expected to submit short (approximately 250 words) papers in weeks 2-5 of the module on the readings for the week. These papers should be submitted through Blackboard. Each paper should make one (and only) one point about the readings. The point you make is up to you; you can attack one of the readings, defend it, relate two readings together, draw policy implications from the readings—you get the idea. Students may focus on one particular reading, or discuss multiple readings assigned for the week. Papers are due at 5 PM the day before the class in which the readings will be discussed. Each short paper counts for 5% of the grade.

Each student will give a short presentation on one of the assigned readings. Each student should select one reading. (No presentations will take place the first week, so please do not select a paper from that week.) Please note that you must inform me of your selection, which does not become official until I have approved it. No two students may present on the same reading. Students will select readings on a first come, first served basis. Students may, with my approval, swap readings if they so choose. The presentation should take approximately 10-15 minutes, and lay out the main argument of the paper with appropriate comments/criticisms. It will count for 10% of the grade.

Finally, each student will write a short seminar paper (approximately 2500 words, inclusive of everything—bibliography, etc.). In this paper, the student will lay out and critique the argument made in a paper not assigned in the class. Each student may select any paper they wish, so long as it is 1) related to global justice and 2) published in a reputable academic journal. Please note that you must inform me of your selection, which does not become official until I have approved it. No two students may write on the same paper. Students will select papers on a first come, first served basis, and may change their selections (or swap with other students) subject to my approval. A student may, with the instructor's permission, write a different sort of paper (e.g., a literature review). The seminar paper will count for 60% of the course grade.

All papers must be submitted through Blackboard. Just go to the "Assessment" section—you should be able to see all the assignments listed there. You will need to upload your assignments as Word documents or the like. Please make certain that you understand the submission procedure; I will not be sympathetic to students who submit papers late due to "Blackboard troubles." Late penalties will apply in the usual fashion (i.e., 5 points per day late, unless the late submission is approved by me in advance).

Course Website:

The course has a page at Blackboard. Please make sure you are signed up for it.

Plagiarism and Academic Standards:

Students should be familiar with what plagiarism is, and avoid it like the plague.

Plagiarism—defined by the University as the act of presenting the work of others as one’s own work, without acknowledgement—is unacceptable under any circumstances. Students are referred to Part III, Section 1.32 of the College Calendar for advice on avoiding plagiarism, including through carelessness. Penalties will apply if these rules are violated.

Students should consult the University’s webpage on plagiarism, which can be found at <http://tcd-ie.libguides.com/plagiarism>. All students must complete the online tutorial on avoiding plagiarism which can be found on this webpage. The tutorial will generate a coversheet, which should be attached to all written work submitted in the course.

It is essential that the source for your material is always clear to the reader. This does not apply only to direct quotes from a book or article; it applies to any point taken directly from something that you have read. Paraphrasing the work of others and presenting it without attribution as your own is unacceptable—a citation must be given. You should be sure that (i) direct quotes are always enclosed in quotation marks so that it is clear that you are not claiming to have written the phrases yourself; (ii) you always give the source of ideas and facts, including the precise page reference; and (iii) you cite your sources, not your source’s sources. In other words, if you read a book published in 2014 and it contains a quote from a book published in 1964, make it clear that you discovered the point in the 2014 book—don’t give the impression that you consulted the 1964 book and found the quote yourself.

Students must also ensure that academic work submitted for each module is “new work”, i.e., it has not been previously submitted for other modules at Trinity or elsewhere.

Class Schedule:

Please note that this schedule is subject to revision.

Date	Readings	Due Dates
Week 1	James Robert Brown and Yiftach Fehige, "Thought Experiments", <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> (Winter	

	<p>2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/thought-experiment/; Norman Daniels, "Reflective Equilibrium", <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> (Summer 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/reflective-equilibrium/; Daniel C. Dennett, <i>Intuition Pumps and Other Tools for Thinking</i> (New York: Norton, 2013), Part I; Keith Dowding, <i>The Philosophy and Methods of Political Science</i> (London: Palgrave, 2016), ch. 9.</p>	
		Short Paper #1 due @ 5 pm
Week 2	<p>Peter Singer, "Famine, Affluence, and Morality." <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 1, no. 3 (Spring 1972): 229-243; Garrett Cullity, "International Aid and the Scope of Kindness." <i>Ethics</i> 105, no. 1 (October 1994): 99-127; Paul Gomberg, "The Fallacy of Philanthropy." <i>Canadian Journal of Philosophy</i> 32, no. 1 (March 2002): 29-66; Andrew Kuper and Peter Singer, "Debate: Global Poverty Relief." <i>Ethics & International Affairs</i> 16, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 107-128; Richard W. Miller, "Beneficence, Duty and Distance." <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 32, no. 4 (Autumn 2004): 357-383.</p> <p>Optional: For an introduction to the topic, please see http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/ and http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/principle-beneficence/. You might also find the following useful: http://bostonreview.net/forum/peter-singer-logic-effective-altruism.</p>	
		Short Paper #2 due @ 5 pm
Week 3	<p>Charles R. Beitz, "Justice and International Relations." <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 4, no. 4 (Summer 1975): 360-389;</p>	

	<p>John Rawls, "The Law of Peoples." <i>Critical Inquiry</i> 20, no. 1. (Autumn, 1993): 36-68; Thomas Nagel, "The Problem of Global Justice." <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 33, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 113-147; A.J. Julius, "Nagel's Atlas" <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 34, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 176-192; Joshua Cohen and Charles Sabel, "Extra Rempublicam Nulla Justitia?" <i>Philosophy & Public Affairs</i> 34, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 147-175; Andrea Sangiovanni. "Global Justice, Reciprocity, and the State." <i>Philosophy and Public Affairs</i> 35, no. 1 (2007): 3-39.</p> <p>Optional: For short introductions to this topic, please see http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/international-justice/ and http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/#LawPeoLibForPol. For a more detailed introduction Rawls and his critics, please consult the entire essay at http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/.</p>	
		Short Paper #3 due @ 5 pm
Week 4	<p>Alan Dershowitz, "Want to Torture? Get a Warrant." <i>SFGate</i>, January 22, 2002, https://www.sfgate.com/opinion/openforum/article/Want-to-torture-Get-a-warrant-2880547.php; David Luban, "Liberalism, Torture, and the Ticking Bomb." <i>Virginia Law Review</i> 91, no. 6 (2005): 1425-1461; Henry Shue, "Torture in Dreamland: Disposing of the Ticking Bomb." <i>Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law</i> 37, no. 2 (2006): 231-9; Rosa Brooks, "Tick, Tick, Bull, Shit: Don't Believe the CIA's Ticking Time Bomb Excuse When It Says It Had to Torture." <i>Foreign Policy</i>, December 10, 2014, http://foreignpolicy.com/2014/12/10/tick-tick-bull-shit-senate-torture-report-cia-ticking-time-bomb/.</p>	
		Short Paper #4 due @ 5 pm
Week 5	<p>Joseph Carens, "Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders." <i>Review of Politics</i> 49, no. 2 (1987): 251-273; Arash</p>	

	<p>Abizadeh, "Democratic Theory and Border Coercion: No Right to Unilaterally Control Your Own Borders." <i>Political Theory</i> 36, no. 1 (2008): 37-65; David Miller, "Why Immigration Controls Are Not Coercive: A Reply to Arash Abizadeh." <i>Political Theory</i> 38, no. 1 (2010): 111-120; Arash Abizadeh, "Democratic Legitimacy and State Coercion: A Reply to David Miller." <i>Political Theory</i> 38, no. 1 (2010): 121-130; Bryan Caplan, "Why Should We Restrict Immigration," <i>Cato Journal</i> 32, no. 1 (Winter 2012): 5-24.</p>	
		Final Paper due @ 11:59 pm