Course Overview

The term global justice is both ancient and a neologism. Globe derives from the Latin *globus*, meaning round mass, or sphere, and has been applied to planet earth since the sixteenth century. Justice, in ancient Greece, originally meant authoritative custom, or the traditional manner of doing things, but early on shifted to that which should be enforced by authorities in the form of law (Latin, *jus*). Global justice, then, means the moral and political laws that apply to all human beings who share the planet. The Greek Stoics and Cynics considered themselves lovers of humanity, or cosmopolitans, and today we increasingly recognize that our fates intertwine across the globe.

As a senior values seminar, this course digs deeply into the philosophical and political issues surrounding global justice. We pursue this project by engaging several profound thinkers of global justice, beginning with Immanuel Kant, whose essay on perpetual peace continues to shape modern conceptions of cosmopolitanism. Then, we consider John Rawls’s vision of an overlapping consensus of decent peoples, Martha Nussbaum’s defense of cultural universals, Samuel Huntington’s diagnosis of a clash of civilizations, Leo Strauss’s interpretation of tyranny, BR Ambedkar’s constitutional vision for Indian politics, and Tongdong Bai’s theory of *tian xia*. The course thus aims to construct a Socratic dialogue about global justice between profound representatives of diverse schools of thought: Enlightenment liberalism, political liberalism, cosmopolitanism, realism, neoconservativism, Indian democratic, and Confucian.

Throughout, we test each author’s ideas by how well they help us grasp contemporary issues of global justice, including human rights, American foreign policy, international trade agreements, war, nongovernmental organizations, media, and the Olympics. Students are encouraged to form a mental map of the world and the flows across by it by reading the *New York Times*, *Financial Times*, *Foreign Affairs*, and other international journals and newspapers. The hope is that by weighing contending theories, in the light of world events, we may clarify our own thinking and practice of global justice.

**Texts**
Immanuel Kant, *Toward Perpetual Peace* (Yale) 978-0300110708
Martha Nussbaum, *Sex and Social Justice* (Oxford) 978-0195112108
Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations* (Simon & Schuster) 978-0684844411
Leo Strauss, *On Tyranny* (Chicago) 978-0226776873
BR Ambedkar, *Annihilation of Caste* (Zone Books) 978-1784783525

**Course Requirements**

(1) The midterm covers the visions of global justice advanced by Kant, Rawls and Nussbaum. A week beforehand, I will distribute 6 essay questions, and on the day of the exam we will roll a die to determine 2 questions (on different authors). Well-written essays should incorporate material from the lectures, readings, presentations, and your own thoughts. You may study in groups, but the exam is close-booked. The exam is 1 hour.

(2) The final has the same format as the midterm, and is on Huntington, Strauss, Ambedkar, and Tongdong Bai.

(3-4) Students will write and present a 2000-word page research paper exploring what the author would say about a current international political event or controversy.

(5) By noon on May 9, send me a research page paper comparing and contrasting two of the authors on the syllabus about a matter of global justice. The paper should be 4500 words and include at least 10 academic sources plus a few newspaper articles. The essay should have an introduction that describes a recent development in the world and raises a question; a section that explains how one author answers it; a section on another author; a conclusion where you share your thoughts; and a bibliography.

(6) Class participation. Students are expected to come to class on time prepared to discuss the readings. I employ the Socratic method in the classroom, which means that I will often call on you even if your hands are down; be ready!

**Grade Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final exam</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation paper</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper contrasting 2 authors</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class participation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Class Schedule**

**An Enlightenment Conception of Global Justice**

We start with Immanuel Kant’s 1795 essay, *Toward Perpetual Peace*. Kant’s essay continues to shape contemporary discussions about global justice. On the one hand, its call for
republican states, international federations, and principles of universal hospitality opens a vista for liberal cosmopolitanism. On the other, Kant’s defense of principalities and sovereignty is a stumbling block for liberal interventionists. In this seminar, we’ll discuss how Kant presents and problematizes a modern conception of global justice.

1. January 13 – “Perpetual Peace,” First Section (pp. 66-71)
2. January 16 – “Perpetual Peace,” Second Section (pp. 72-85)

A Liberal Conception of Global Justice

In 1971, John Rawls published perhaps the most important work of liberal political philosophy in the 20th century: A Theory of Justice. For over two decades, international relations scholars assumed that Rawls’s domestic principles—of civil rights and liberties and basic economic justice—could apply to the globe. The Law of Peoples, much like Kant’s essay, encouraged and disappointed liberals. Rawls insists that democratic republic live up to their ideals; yet he also thinks that democracies can form alliances with well-ordered hierarchical peoples and can assist burdened societies.

6. February 3 – The Law of Peoples, Part II
7. February 6 – The Law of Peoples, Parts III, IV
8. February 10 – Student Presentations

An Aristotelian Conception of Global Justice

Martha Nussbaum presents a capabilities-approach conception of global justice that draws heavily on Aristotle’s account of basic human needs. For Nussbaum, there are universal obligations to protect human functioning and its dignity, and Western liberals should fight for these values.

10. February 18 – Sex and Social Justice, Women and Cultural Universals
11. February 20 – Sex and Social Justice, Judging other Cultures
12. February 24 – Student Presentations

13. February 27 - Midterm

A Realist Conception of Global Justice

Samuel Huntington has argued that civilizations necessarily define themselves by their enemies and that “global justice” is just a tense stalemate between civilizations.

14. March 2 – Clash of Civilizations, Chapter 1
A Neo-conservative Conception of Global Justice

Leo Strauss’s interpretation of Xenophon’s dialogue, *Hiero or Tyrannicus*, presents a defense of benevolent tyranny. Through the influence of Paul Wolfowitz, Strauss’s student at the University of Chicago in the 1960’s, Strauss’s position became enshrined in neoconservative political thought and American foreign policy for the George W. Bush administration. In this seminar, we consider the roots and implications of Strauss’s essay.

A Chinese Conception of Global Justice

Chinese is a rising world power and may soon possess a military capability to challenge America, particularly in Asia. In this unit, we consider how Tongdong Bai envisions China’s role in global politics.

An Indian Conception of Global Justice

BR Ambedkar studied with the American pragmatist John Dewey at Columbia University and then returned to India where he advocated on behalf of the *dalits*. In this unit we consider his debate with Gandhi, his role in drafting India’s constitution, and the relevance of his ideas for thinking about Indian and global politics.

May 7 (noon) – Send research paper electronically
Final Exam – Monday, May 11, 9:30 am