Proposed Syllabus: PHIL 309: Global Justice
Summer 2012
Instructor: Johanna Luttrell

Course Summary:
Philosophers have only recently begun to address the topic of global justice. Given the recent acceleration of globalization, in terms of the economic interconnectedness of the majority of the planet, as well as the exponential increase in wealth and income discrepancy between the rich and the poor, theorists concerned with global justice have become especially attentive to the problems of large-scale, absolute poverty. The purpose of this class will be, first, to account for how it is we got to this situation, and second, to give a normative account of what we should do about it. Thus, we will consider both empirical and normative approaches to global justice. Specifically, we will examine various positions on global poverty including arguments from beneficence, arguments from distributive justice, arguments from harm, and the Capabilities Approach. Further, we will consider varying positions on global justice, including liberal, cosmopolitan, and communitarian positions. Finally, we will consider the relevancy and soundness of these positions in light of a widespread, geographical phenomenon specific to globalization: the problem of global slums. Central questions of the course include: Does a basic right to subsistence constitute a corresponding duty by someone? If so, who (private actors? national governments? international organizations?) holds this duty? Do national boundaries, the constitution of communities, or relative wealth play a role in which people owe what to the poor? What is a robust vision of human flourishing that can guide policies in international development and law?

Given that this is an advanced-level class in philosophy, the pace will be quick and the reading will be plenty. You are expected to read the material assigned for the day and to actively participate in all of the discussions.

Required Texts
Course Reading Packet (available both at the Campus Copy Shop and in individual article format on Blackboard.)

Note: you are expected to do the readings listed for the day of class ahead of time, and bring them to class, unless specified as ‘read in class’. Readings with a star (*) appearing after them are from the course reading packet; readings without a star are in the Pogge and Mollendorf anthology.
Schedule

Week 1

Monday:
On the present situation of global injustice: standpoint of those in poverty.

Tuesday:
How did we get the kind of globalization we see today?: A [very] short history of late-stage global capitalism, origins of the IMF and World Bank, and the de-regulation of the global market
- David Harvey, “Uneven Geographical Developments”, ch. 4 of *A Brief History of Neo-liberalism*

Wednesday:
The challenge globalization presents to theories of justice: replies to Rawls’ liberal vision of distributive justice
- John Rawls, selections from *The Law of the Peoples*
- Charles Beitz, “Justice and International Relations”

Thursday:
Distributive Justice: Basic Rights
- Henry Shue, Introduction and Chapter 2, “Correlative Duties” of *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and U.S. Foreign Policy*

Week 2

Monday
Review of Week 1 and introduction to Cosmopolitanism
- Cecile Fabre, “Global Distributive Justice”, Ch. 5 of *Justice in a Changing World*

Tuesday
The topic of Global Poverty: arguments from beneficence
- Peter Singer, “The Argument: Saving a child; Is it wrong not to help?; Common Objections to Giving” in *The Life You Can Save* 
- Peter Singer, “Famine, Affluence, and Morality”*
- In-class video of Singer on the utilitarian approach to global poverty

Wednesday:
Global Poverty: anti-cosmopolitan and nationalist perspectives

• David Miller, “The Ethical Significance of Nationality”

**Essay #1 DUE**

**Thursday**
Global Poverty: Arguments from harm


**Week 3**
**Monday:**
Review of week 2 and introduction to the capabilities approach: from a focus on rights and duties to an inquiry into human flourishing

• Selections from Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* *

**Tuesday:**
Gender and global poverty: Nussbaum’s vision of the capabilities approach

• Introduction and ch. 1 of Martha Nussbaum, *Women and Human Development* *

**Wednesday:**
The capabilities approach’s contribution to more accurate measurements of poverty

• Martha Nussbaum, “Cultural Diversity” and “The Nation and Human Development” Ch. 5 and 6 of *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach* *

**Thursday:**
Visiting lecture: Rhea Muchalla. “Can Rawls or Sen account for the expanding influence of multi-national corporations?”
Discussion: the capacity of these discourses --- one of rights and obligations, the other of capabilities --- to account for, and respond to, global economic trends.


• Thomas Donaldson. "Moral Minimums for Multinationals," *Ethics and International Affairs*, 1989*

**Week 4**
**Monday:**
Returning to the situation ‘on the ground’: the problem of global slums: ecological degradation

• Introduction and Chapter 1 of Flammable: Life in an Argentine Shantytown*

• Selections from Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums* *

**Essay #3 DUE**
Tuesday:
Global slums: meaningful work and gendered responsibilities
  • excerpts from Sylvia Chant *Gender, Generation, and Poverty.*
  • Read in class: statistics from the UN development report, *The Problem of the Slums*, 2003

Wednesday: Globalization and the slums, responsibility and guilt.
  • Chapters 2 and 3 of Iris Marion Young, *Responsibility for Justice*


Final essay must be submitted electronically to blackboard the by Friday of the following week after the last day of class.

Assignments, Grading, and expectations:
Essay #1: 10%
Essay #2: 15%
Essay #3: 10%
Final Paper: 45%
Attendance and Participation: 20%

Assignments
Essay #1: 2 pages. Define the challenge the globalization presents to a liberal (re: Rawlsian) theory of justice and discuss how EITHER Beitz, Shue, or Fabre responds to this challenge. Extra credit: include an additional single page critical discussion of whether or not you think this theorist has succeeded in giving a valid and/or sound response.

Essay #2: 3 pages. Given the fact that global poverty is contingent and not inevitable, construct EITHER policy memo for the US Department of State OR a manifesto for the Occupy Wall Street movement that 1) adopts a utilitarian (Singer), anti-cosmopolitan/communitarian (Nagel or Miller), or deontological (Pogge) position and 2) argues for a concrete practical action to be taken on the basis of the strength of this theoretical position.

Essay #3: 2 pages. Explain how the Capabilities Approach understands itself as accommodating multiculturalism by emphasizing development policies should have as their goal ‘the opportunities of satisfaction of capabilities without forcing them to function’. Extra credit: include an additional single page critical discussion of whether or not you think the Capabilities Approach succeeds in accommodating the demands of multiculturalism through this qualification.
Final essay: 8 pages. Question: Which theoretical position on global justice is best poised to respond to the exigencies of global capitalism? Why? What are the strengths of this account, and what’s still missing? The essay should include a critical discussion of what some of the exigencies of global capitalism are, i.e., (as per the topics we have discussed in this class) empirical evidence on global slums and the unprecedented influence of multi-national corporations, as well as a historical-economic definition of globalization. As you will recall, the theoretical positions we have discussed in this class are the following:

- Rawl’s liberalism
- Beitz’ vision of distributive justice
- Shue’s standards of basic minimums
- Fabre’s cosmopolitanism
- Singer’s utilitarianism
- Nagel’s anti-cosmopolitanism
- Miller’s communitarianism
- Pogge’s deontological argument from harm
- Sen’s mandate for development
- Nussbaum’s capabilities approach
- Young’s distinction between guilt and responsibility

**General Grading Standards of the UO Philosophy Dept.:**

A= excellent, no mistakes, well-written, and distinctive in some way.
B= good, no significant mistakes, well-written, but not distinctive in any way.
C= OK. Some errors, but a basic grasp of the material.
D= poor. Several errors. A tenuous grasp of the material.
F= failing. Problematic on all fronts indicating either no real grasp of the material or a complete lack of effort.

- No late assignments will be accepted without documentation of extenuating circumstances.
- Unexcused absences will result in a significantly lower participation grade. Excused absences are made at my discretion.
- No cell phones/ blackberries/ gaming devices will be allowed in class. Laptops should only be used for note taking on Word documents- social networking sites and other internet sites are not allowed.
- **Academic Dishonesty:** you are responsible for knowing and following the UO’s official guidelines: [http://libweb.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/](http://libweb.uoregon.edu/guides/plagiarism/students/) Plagiarism, fabrication, and cheating of any kind or shade is strictly prohibited, and punished harshly (usually, this means a student will receive an ‘F’ for the course). Ways to avoid questionable behavior in this class: cite all sources thoroughly, even sources in conversation (ex: In the course of a conversation with my friend Jenny, I discovered that Berger was completely correct about the way late stage capitalism encroaches upon the authenticity of the art work), DO NOT
use internet sources beyond the ones I mention in class (this includes, of course, Wikipedia)- most internet sources are suspect at best. Do not invent sources, etc.