

# **IGA-135: Ethics and Global Governance**

**Fall 2014**

(version updated July 3, 2014)

Instructor: Mathias Risse  
Professor of Philosophy and Public Policy  
209 Rubenstein  
[mathias\\_risse@harvard.edu](mailto:mathias_risse@harvard.edu)  
Office Hour: Tuesday 3-4

Faculty Assistant: Derya Honça  
Rubenstein 215  
[derya\\_honca@hks.harvard.edu](mailto:derya_honca@hks.harvard.edu)

Classroom Location: L332

Class Days and Time: Monday & Wednesday, 11:40 – 1

## Course Description:

Ethical questions are often at the core of policy disputes, both at the domestic level and at the global level. This course seeks to introduce students to the ethical aspects of some major problems in global governance. Topics include foundations of ethical theory, human rights, intervention, climate change, immigration and trade. Background readings come mostly from moral philosophical, political theory and political science. A typical session pays special attention to a particular policy area in the international domain and thereby combines philosophical inquiry with applied questions.

## Prerequisites:

The course is open to all students. Some familiarity with history, political theory or philosophy, comparative politics, and international relations will be helpful, but is not required. Required, however, is a willingness to engage with texts of different genres, including texts from different academic disciplines. Readings range from case specific studies to historical, legal, philosophical, and social-scientific text.

## Course Requirements:

Students are required to come to class prepared to discuss the week's readings.

Three short papers during the semester and a take home. Class attendance is required and participation is graded. Short papers count for 40% of the grade; the final counts for 40%; participation counts for 20%. Participants are expected to have thought about the guiding questions for the day. They are expected to submit three of the writing assignments, according to the following rules: (a) you must submit the first assignment within the first four weeks; (b) there must be at least two weeks between any two assignments – so if you choose to submit as the first assignment one posted for week 3, then the earliest assignment you can submit next is the one posted two weeks later: (c) the assignment is due within a week after the class for which it is posted (and is due before the next class). The length of the paper should be 750-800 words. Papers that are longer than 800 words will not be accepted. Please include a word count. Assignment will require normative argumentation. Guidance for how to write such papers will be provided. The final exercise will consist of essay questions that are to be answered in no more than 2,000-2,500 words in total (as specified). Examinations will be available on [TBD], and are due on [TBD]. Late examinations will not be accepted. All submissions will be done electronically, and assignments will be returned electronically.

*Long Writing Assignment:* Students with the required background and appropriate interests may write one 20-page paper substituting forth both the short papers and the take-home exam. Permission of instructor is required for this option.

Students with appropriate backgrounds are invited to volunteer to give *presentations* of about 10 min. If accepted, these would then substitute for one of the three short papers.

### Grading:

The HKS Academic Council has issued recommendations on grading policy, which include the following curve: A (10-15%), A- (20-25%), B+ (30-40%), B (20-25%), B- (5-10%).

### Reading and Assignments:

Required readings: Most readings are posted on the IGA135 course page. If you are a cross registered for the course or experience any delays in access to the course page, please contact Derya Honca ([derya\\_honca@hks.harvard.edu](mailto:derya_honca@hks.harvard.edu)) to obtain the first few readings.

Please also acquire the following books:

John Broome, *Climate Matters* (Norton, 2012)

Mathias Risse, *Global Political Philosophy* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)

John Ruggie, *Just Business* (Norton, 2013)

## **Shopping day TBD**

## **Why Think about Ethics? Moral Judgment and Public Policy**

### **Class 1: Friday, September 5 -- Moral Judgment and Intuition**

#### **Readings**

Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow* (2011), pp 19-30, 39-49, 450, 452-453

Joshua Greene, *Moral Tribes*, Introduction (pp1-14) and Chapter 5 (pp 66-102)

#### **Guiding Questions**

1. What does Green define as the Tragedy of Commonsense Morality, and how is this different from the Tragedy of Commons you probably have encountered before?
2. What is the phenomenon Green describes as biased fairness, and why is it important?
3. What is the difference between Systems 1 and 2 as Kahneman distinguishes them, and why is this an important distinction?
4. Reflect on the bat-and-ball experiment on pp 44f in Kahneman. How might the kind of result that experimenters found here matter to ethics?

### **Class 2: Monday, September 8 -- Recognizing Ethical Situations in Professional Settings**

#### **Readings**

Max Bazerman and Ann Tenbrunsel, *Blind Spots*, Chapters 1 and 8 (pp 2-22 and pp 152-172)

Jonathan Haidt, *The Righteous Mind*, Chapter 1 (pp 3-32)

Mahzarin Banaji and Anthony Greenwald, *Blindspot. Hidden Biases of Good People*, Chapter 7 (pp 123-145)

## Guiding Questions

1. What do Bazerman and Tenbrunsel mean by “bounded ethicality?” Can you connect this to situations in your life where this might have mattered?
2. Recall what Bazerman and Tenbrunsel say about ethical gaps in the context of the Challenger space shuttle explosion. Do you know of similar incidents?
3. How does Haidt address the question of “where does morality come from?”
4. In the Banaji/Greenwald text, what lessons do you think we can draw from the story of “Carla’s hand” for the way hidden biases operate?

## Ethical Theory

### Class 3: Wednesday, September 10 - Consequentialism (Case Study: Global Responsibilities -- Famine)

#### Readings

William Shaw, “The Consequentialist Perspective,” in James Dreier, ed., *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory* (2006), pp 5-20

Peter Singer, “Famine, Affluence, and Morality,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1:3 (1972), pp 229-243

#### Recommended

Dan Brock, “Utilitarianism,” in Tom Regan and Donald Van De Veer, eds., *And Justice for All: New Introductory Essays in Ethics and Public Policy* (1982), pp. 217-240

John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*, Chapters I-III

#### Guiding Questions

1. Singer’s fundamental principle is the following: “If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing something of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it.” Explain how this principle is intelligible as a form of utilitarianism.
2. Is Singer’s criticism of our way of life correct? Is it true that all of us are, when you get down to it, moral monsters for not donating more income to Oxfam?

3. Is there room within Singer's approach for a notion of responsibility? If the drowning child had entered the puddle as a result of his own foolish choices, would that make a difference to our duties? If a bully had pushed the child, would that make a difference?

### **Writing Assignment**

"If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it" (Singer, p. 231). Singer concludes that we are obligated to give away large sums of money for famine relief, up to the point where the marginal cost to us of doing so equals the marginal benefit to starving recipients. Certainly, according to Singer, we are morally obligated to spend our money on famine relief, rather than on new clothing for ourselves. Are we morally obligated to give away a large share of our discretionary income to relieve famine? Why or why not?

## **Class 4: Monday, September 15 - Non-Consequentialism (Case Study: Global Responsibilities -- Famine)**

### **Readings:**

Thomas Hill, "Kantian Normative Ethics," in David Copp, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (2006), pp 480-514

Onora O'Neill, "Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems," in T. Regan, ed., *Matters of Life and Death* (1980), pp. 285-294

Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, Bundesverfassungsgericht Press Release No. 11/2006 (Feb. 15, 2006), "Authorization to Shoot down Aircraft in the Aviation Security Act Void," pp. 1-5.

### **Guiding Questions:**

1. Think of two examples in which an application of Kant's Categorical Imperative would lead to different recommendation from utilitarian reasoning. How do the views respectively apply to famine relief?
2. Non-consequentialists often claim that their approach makes sense of the fact that we all have separate lives to lead, whereas consequentialism does not. Do you think this is a decisive refutation of consequentialism?
3. What is the formula-of-humanity version of the Categorical Imperative? Think of three scenarios where somebody's behavior violates this formula

## **Class 5: Wednesday, September 17 -- Non-Consequentialism, Cont.**

### **Readings**

Thomas Pogge, "Eradicating Systemic Poverty: Brief for a Global Resource Dividend," Chapter 8 of Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (Second Edition, Polity, 2008), pp. 202-221

T. M. Scanlon, "Contractualism and Utilitarianism," in *The Difficulty of Tolerance* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp.124-125, pp 132-145, p 150

### **Recommended**

Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, 406 ("If we have so far...") – 436 ("and of every rational nature.")

### **Writing Assignment**

Consider O'Neill's Kantian discussion of famines. Formulate two or three objections that Peter Singer could raise against this discussion and offer responses O'Neill could give. Who do you think has the better of the debate?

## **Class 6: Monday, September 22 – Virtue Ethics (Confucian, Aristotelean)**

### **Readings**

Confucius, *The Analects*, Chapter 1 ("To Learn, then"), Chapter 2 ("In Government, The Secret") and Chapter 4 ("Of Villages, Humanity")

Bryan Van Norden, *Introduction to Classical Chinese Philosophy*, Chapters 2 and 3

Mark Timmons, *Moral Theory: An Introduction*, Chapter 10 ("Virtue Ethics")

### **Guiding Questions**

1. Confucius' style of philosophizing is very different from what we have encountered so far. How do you characterize the differences? Do you find this style of philosophizing helpful?
2. In Van Norden, what are the two senses of "gentleman" that he ascribes to Confucius?

3. What is “virtue” ethics, and how is it different from the moral theories we have encountered so far?

### **Writing Assignment**

Choose one of the aphorisms (sections) in the Confucius chapters and identify a question that this aphorism answers or a subject matter on which it gives advice. What is the answer/advice provided by the passage? How could one support that answer? How could one object? What is your view?

## **Class 7: Wednesday, September 24 -- Human Rights – Universalism vs. Relativism (Case Study – Rory Stewart Speech in British Parliament)**

### **Readings**

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Debate in British Parliament, especially contribution by Rory Stewart, MP, Penrith and the Border:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm130301/debtext/130301-0001.htm>

Paul Gordon Lauren, *The Evolution of International Human Rights*, Chapter 7 (“Proclaiming a Vision: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights”, 2003), pp. 199-232.

### **Guiding Questions**

1. Do you think the United Kingdom should continue to subject itself to the ruling of the European Court of Human Rights? Why or why not?
2. When the Universal Declaration was passed, in 1948, there about one third as many countries as there are today. Do you think the Declaration is binding on people in countries that did not even exist then?
3. Do you think there can be universal values of the kind that the Universal Declaration proclaims?

## **Class 8: Monday, September 29 - Human Rights – Universalism vs. Relativism, Cont.**

### **Readings**

Mathias Risse, *Global Political Philosophy*, Chapters 1 and 2

### **Writing Assignment**

In his article “Human Rights as a Neutral Concern,” the American philosopher T. M. Scanlon raises the following question:

“But even if the victims did take the view that they have no rights against what is done to them (...) couldn’t they be wrong in thinking this? [W]hich is the more objectionable form of cultural superiority, to refuse to aid a victim on the ground that “they live like that – they don’t recognize rights as we know them,” or to attempt to protect the defenseless even when they themselves feel that suffering is their lot and they have no basis to complain of it?”

Using the readings on relativism, provide an answer to these questions. Offer some arguments in support of your answer. Introduce some objections and respond to them, and come to a conclusion.

### **Class 9: Wednesday, October 1 -- Human Rights – Individual Accountability and American Exceptionalism (Case Study – the Creation of the International Criminal Court)**

#### **Readings:**

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Articles 1-33

Genocide Convention:

<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/x1cppcg.htm>

Kathryn Sikkink, *The Justice Cascade*, Chapters 4 and 7

#### **Guiding Questions**

1. What is American Exceptionalism?
2. Critics of the ICC says that we can expect more conflict if oppressive leaders do not have the opportunity of retiring to a country that is offering them asylum but instead have to worry about standing trial. What do you think about this criticism?
3. What, according to Sikkink, is the Justice Cascade?

**Class 10: Monday, October 6: Human Rights – Individual Accountability and American Exceptionalism, Cont.**

Harold Hongju Koh, “America’s Jekyll-and-Hyde Exceptionalism”, in Ignatieff, *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights* (2005)

**Writing Assignment**

The United States government declined even to seek ratification of the Rome Statute because they were concerned that politically motivated trials would be brought against Americans. (Often, Henry Kissinger is mentioned as a very plausible target of such trials.) Given the provisions of the Rome Statute (i.e., those articles that you were asked to read), how warranted do you think such concerns were? What do you think are the best arguments that would justify the decision of the United States not to ratify the Rome Statute? What are the best arguments for the opposing view? Do you think the US should ratify the Statute?

**Class 11: Wednesday, October 8 -- Human Rights – Obligations of Businesses? (Case Study – John Ruggie as Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on Business and Human Rights)**

**Readings:**

John Ruggie, *Just Business: Multinational Corporations and Human Rights*

**Guiding Questions**

1. Do you think businesses should have human rights obligations? Why or why not?
2. How does Ruggie think about the human rights obligations of businesses?
3. What kind of a policy priority should Ruggie’s proposals have in your home country?

**Writing Assignment**

Choose a thesis from Ruggie’s book and present arguments for and against. What is your view on that thesis?

**Monday, October 13, is Columbus Day – No Class**

## **Class 12: Wednesday, October 15 – Human Rights and Confucianism**

### **Readings:**

Joshua Cohen, "Minimalism About Human Rights: The Best We Can Hope for?" *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 12, 2 (2004): 190-213

Stephen Angle, *Contemporary Confucian Political Philosophy*, Chapter 5, pp 74-90

Roger Ames, "Rites as Rights: The Confucian Alternative," In L. S. Rouner (ed.), *Human Rights and the World's Religions*

### **Guiding Questions**

1. Explain Cohen's distinction between justificatory and substantive minimalism. Why is this an important distinction?
2. Why does Cohen think human rights are acceptable to Confucianism?
3. What according to Ames is the relationship between rites and rights in Chinese culture?
4. What are the possible views on the relationship between Confucianism and human rights that Angle identifies?

## **Class 13: Monday, October 20 – Human Rights and Confucianism, Cont.**

### **Readings**

Henry Rosemont, "Why Take Rights Seriously? A Confucian Critique." In L. S. Rouner

Mathias Risse, "From Third World to First - What's next? Singapore's Obligations to the Rest of the World From a Human Rights Perspective" (Speech given to the National University of Singapore Society, October 2013)

### **Writing Assignment**

What are Risse's arguments for the thesis that Singapore should ratify more human rights treaties? How could one argue against that thesis? What is your view?

## **Class 14: Wednesday, October 22 -- Confucian Approaches to Democracy**

### **Readings (plus a video):**

Daniel Bell, "Political Meritocracy is a Good Thing," Parts 1 and 2

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-a-bell/political-meritocracy-china\\_b\\_1815245.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-a-bell/political-meritocracy-china_b_1815245.html)

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-a-bell/political-meritocracy-china\\_b\\_1815288.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/daniel-a-bell/political-meritocracy-china_b_1815288.html)

Joseph Chan, Talks on "Democracy, Human Rights and Confucian Values" (March 2012)

<http://www.cornell.edu/video/joseph-chan-democracy-human-rights-and-confucian-values>

### **Guiding Questions**

1. What is Chan's "Second Chamber," and how do its members get selected?
2. What does Chan regard as "Confucian civility," and how might it help with improving democracy?
3. According to Bell, how does meritocracy in China work, and what lessons does it teach to the rest of the world?
4. How does Bell see the relationship between meritocracy and the one-person-one-vote principle?

### **Writing Assignment**

What do you think is the strongest argument for the one-person-one-vote principle? Drawing on Bell or Chan (or other theorists/views you are familiar with), how do you think one could resist that principle? What is your view on the matter?

## **Class 15: Monday, October 27 – Human Rights and Political Theory in Africa**

### **Readings:**

Frances Deng, "Human Rights in the African Context," in Kwasi Wiredu (ed.), *A Companion to African Philosophy*

Kwasi Wiredu, "What Can Philosophy Do For Africa?," in Kwasi Wiredu, *Philosophy and an African Culture*

Thaddeus Metz, "Human Dignity, Capital Punishment, and an African Moral Theory: Towards a New Philosophy of Human Rights," *Journal of Human Rights* 9 (2010), pp 81-99

### **Guiding Questions:**

1. How does Deng think that traditional African notions of participatory governance can be combined with the human rights language and thereby be used to criticize autocratic power in African countries?
2. What does Wiredu think philosophy can do for Africa?
3. Why, according to Metz, does ubuntu rule out the death penalty but allows killing in the defense of others?

### **Writing Assignment**

Immanuel Kant is famously supportive of the death penalty: certain crimes are so heinous that the appropriate response is to execute the perpetrator. They deserve to be killed, and if the world came to an end tomorrow we should execute people on death row to bring as much desert into the world as possible. Much like Kant, Metz's reconstruction of ubuntu makes the notion of dignity central. Why does Metz think imposing the death penalty is wrong? How could one resist Metz's argument, both in terms of dignity and in other ways? What is your view: is Kant right, or Metz?

### **Class 16: Wednesday, October 29 - Intervention -- The Long Shadow of the Past (Case Study: The Earthquake in Haiti)**

#### **Readings:**

Thomas Pogge, "Introduction," "The Causal Role of Global Institutions in the Persistence of Severe Poverty," and "Eradicating Systemic Poverty: Brief for a Global Resources Dividend," in *World Poverty and Human Rights*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (2008): pp 13-32, 118-123, 202-221

Lea Ypi, Robert Goodin, and Christian Barry, "Associative Duties, Global Justice, and the Colonies." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 37 (2009): 103-135

Sher, George. "Ancient Wrongs and Modern Rights." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 10 (1980): 3-17

#### **Guiding Questions**

1. What does Thomas Pogge mean by the resource privilege, borrowing privilege, and arm-buying privilege? Explain what role these terms play in his theory.

2. How do Ypi, Goodin, and Barry argue for the conclusion that former colonial powers owe enormous transfers to the people in the now former colonies?

3. How can we use Sher's article to formulate an objection to Ypi et al?

### **Writing Assignment**

Do some quick background research about the history of Haiti. About a decade ago, then Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide asked France for a payment of \$21,685,135,571.48 in restitution. This demand was based on a sum France had extorted from Haiti in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in return for an assurance not to try to re-colonize the island, and it includes the interest that has accrued on the principal of that payment in the course of the time that has passed since then. Do you think the French should have paid?

## **Class 17: Monday, November 3 - Intervention - Is there a "Fit" between Governments and Peoples? (Case Study: Libya and the Responsibility to Protect)**

### **Readings:**

Fernando Teson, "The Liberal Case for Humanitarian Intervention," chapter 3 in J. L. Holzgrefe and Robert Keohane, *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas* (2003)

David Luban, "Just War and Human Rights," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* (1980)

Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (1977), chapter 6 ("Interventions")

### **Guiding Questions**

1. What, according to Teson, is the liberal case in favor of intervention? Do you think Teson's argument licenses too many interventions?

2. What, according to Luban, is the connection between just war and human rights?

3. Do you believe that there is a "fit" between a people and a government, and if there is such a fit, intervention is inappropriate? Could it happen that a

good fit for a people is a highly authoritarian government, or a government that is a major human rights abuser? Would it still be the case then that there should be no intervention?

### **Writing Assignment**

Do some research on R2P and the intervention in Libya. Do you think the intervention was (a) in accordance with R2P (including the regime change), and (b) justified? Present the strongest argument of those who deny (a) and those who deny (b).

## **Class 18: Wednesday, November 5 -- Climate Change – The Nature of the Problem (Case Study: Disappearing Island Nations)**

### **Readings:**

Lynn White, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis," *Science* 10 March 1967: pp 1203-1207

Stephen Gardiner, "A Perfect Moral Storm," Chapter 1 of *A Perfect Moral Storm: The Ethical Tragedy of Climate Change* (2011), pp 19-49

Mathias Risse, *Global Political Philosophy*, Chapter 5

### **Guiding Questions**

1. What are the three "storms" that Stephen Gardiner thinks form the perfect moral storm of climate change? What is the problem of moral corruption? Do you think that humanity will be able to deal with climate change successfully (why or why not)?
2. What, according to Lynn, is the connection between climate change and Christianity?
3. What do you think your home country should do about disappearing island nations?

### **Writing Assignment**

Why does Peter Singer think everybody should have an equal right to pollute? Do you think Singer is right or wrong (and why)?

**Class 19: Monday, November 10 -- Climate Change – The Distribution of Burdens (Case Study: United States and China as Major Polluters)**

**Readings:**

John Broome, *Climate Matters: Ethics in a Warming World*, chapter 1-5

**Guiding Questions**

1. What does Broome think you should do in response to climate change?
2. What does Broome think your country should do in response to climate change?
3. What kind of a policy priority should climate change have in your home country?

**Class 20: Wednesday, November 12 -- -- Climate Change – The Distribution of Burdens, Cont.**

**Readings**

Broome, *Climate Matters*, remaining chapters

**Writing Assignment**

Choose a thesis from Broome's book and present arguments for and against that thesis. What is your view on that thesis?

**Class 21: Monday, November 17 -- Immigration – Open or Closed Borders? (Case Study: Illegal Immigration to the United States)**

**Readings:**

David Miller, "Immigration: The Case for Limits," in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics*, ed. Andrew Cohen and Christopher Wellman (2005): pp 193-206

Chandran Kukathas, "The Case for Open Immigration," in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics*, pp 207-220

## Guiding Questions

1. Where somebody is born is entirely a matter of luck. Nobody chooses her parents. In light of this fact, are those of us who were luckier than others in terms of the richness of the environment where they were born entitled to keeping the others out?
2. One major reason why states are relocating to allowing immigration is because immigrants tend to influence and often shape the culture in which they settle down. Do you think states are justified in keeping out immigrants to guarantee the purity of their culture? (Do not dismiss lightly the positive aspects of living in a relatively homogenous society.)
3. Should a country bar those who are HIV positive from immigrating?

## Class 22: Wednesday, November 19 -- Immigration – Open or Closed Borders?, Cont.

### Readings

Michael Blake, "Discretionary Immigration." *Philosophical Topics* 30 (2002), pp 273–291

Mathias Risse, "On the Morality of Immigration," *Ethics and International Affairs* 2008

### Writing Assignment

Discuss the following view: "It is wrong to make differences among people on the basis of their sex or race. 'Shared Citizenship', however, is just as arbitrary a criterion as sex or race. So we should not make differences among people on the basis of their citizenship. This implies in particular that, except for people who would come in order to inflict harm, we have no right to exclude people from immigrating into our country."

## Class 23: Monday, November 24 -- Global Trade (Case Study: Catfish in Vietnam and the United States)

### Readings:

"The Great Catfish War," *New York Times* (July 22, 2003), pp. A18

Malgorzata Kurjanska and Mathias Risse, "Fairness in Trade II: Subsidies and the Fair-Trade Movement." *Politics, Philosophy, and Economics* 7 (2008): pp 29-56

Oxfam, Executive Summary, *Rigged Rules and Double Standards: Trade, Globalization, and the Fight Against Poverty* (2002), pp 1-18

Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (1994), Preamble and Articles I-III, [http://www.wto.org/english/docs\\_e/legal\\_e/04-wto\\_e.htm](http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/04-wto_e.htm)

### **Guiding Questions**

1. It is sometimes argued that the WTO's mission is merely to contribute to the liberalization of trade. According to the WTO's preamble, do you find this view vindicated?
2. Do you buy Fair Trade coffee at the cafeteria? Would you do so if it were, say, 30% more expensive than other coffee? Why or why not? (Consider here the discussion in Kurjanska and Risse.) How much responsibility does a consumer have to know about the circumstances under which the product she buys was produced?
3. Do you think that Kurjanska and Risse are right that farmers in the EU and Japan have a prima facie bigger claim to subsidies than farmers in the US?

### **Class 24: Monday, Dec 1 – Global Trade, Cont.**

#### **Readings**

Aaron James, "Economic Skepticism," Chapter 2 of *Fairness in Practice: A Social Contract for a Global Economy* (2012)

Zwolinski, Matt. "Structural Exploitation." *Social Philosophy and Policy* 29 (1): 154-179 (2012)

#### **Writing Assignment**

Think about the duties that we have to others. Some duties we owe to all persons, simply in virtue of their status as moral equals. Others we acquire in virtue of cooperative ventures we have entered into, promises we have made, benefits we have received, harms we have inflicted, or other forms of interaction and relation. Still more stringent duties are owed to our fellow

citizens in order to justify the coercion that we subject each other to under law—a singularly encompassing system of social cooperation. Now think about international trade, the effect on people in other countries of various policies to open or restrict trade, and whether people in other countries are owed anything more than what is owed to persons simply as persons. Is the US government justified in pursuing policies that favor Louisiana catfish farmers over Vietnamese catfish farmers? Why or why not? (Assume—perhaps contrary to fact—that these protectionist measures do not violate any law or treaty.)

### **Class 25: Wednesday, Dec 3 - Conclusion**