PHIL271: Global Justice Migration, Territory, and Borders

Fall 2019 | Tues/Thurs 1500-1630 | Cohen 392

Instructor: Eilidh Beaton 430 Claudia Cohen Hall

Office hours:

Tues/Thurs 1630-1730 403 Claudia Cohen Hall

1. Course Description

Rightly or wrongly, we live in a world divided into presumptively sovereign states. In this course we will study some central questions in the global justice literature that arise from and respond to this state of affairs.

Examples of questions we will address include: Do citizens of wealthy states have strong obligations to assist the distant needy? Should economic inequalities between states always be cause for concern? Do states have a right to exclude outsiders? If so, are there exceptions to the discretion states are permitted to exercise over their borders? Are patriotic and nationalistic sentiments virtues or vices? How should the international community of states respond to climate change, and how should they accommodate climate-displaced people? What justifies a state's right to its territory, and when can a group within an existing state permissibly withdraw to form their own?

The goals of this course are: (1) to develop core philosophical skills – particularly the ability to charitably reconstruct and critically evaluate arguments, and the ability to clearly argue for a philosophical position; (2) to develop expository, critical writing, and presentation skills; (3) to learn about both foundational and contemporary debates in the philosophical global justice literature; and (4) to consider the implications of these debates for real-world states of affairs and political events.

2. Course Information

- i. Accessing Readings: There are no required textbooks for this course. All required readings (and most optional readings) will be uploaded to the Canvas site. That being said, a number of chapters from Kok-Chor Tan's What is This Thing Called Global Justice? are very relevant to the content of this course and may serve as helpful introductions to course topics. This text has been placed on course reserve at Van Pelt.
- **ii. Updates:** Please check Canvas and your UPenn email regularly for correspondence, updates to course material, and grades.

3. Course Requirements

(1) Two reading commentaries (15%)

Commentary #1 due October 3rd.

Students should submit commentaries on two readings from across the semester. At least one reading commentary must be completed by October 3rd. Commentaries should be three-pages, double-spaced, and should be submitted before the class in which the reading is discussed. Students should sign up for commentaries ahead of time. There is a maximum of two students per reading. See appendix to the syllabus for guidelines for writing an excellent reading commentary.

(2) One in-class presentation, approx. 15 mins (10%)

Students should give one in-class presentation on a reading. Students are not permitted to present on a reading about which they also wrote a commentary. Students should sign up for their presentations ahead of time. There is a maximum of one presentation per class. Students should prepare a 1-2 page handout (single spaced) to accompany their presentation, and this should be submitted 2 days (48 hours) ahead of the class in which they will be presenting. See appendix to the syllabus for guidelines on giving an excellent presentation.

(3) One 5-7 page critical commentary on a set of authors' positions on a topic (30%) Due October 25th.

Submissions should be anonymized. Questions and guidelines to follow.

(4) One 10-12 page research essay on a topic covered in the course (45%) Due December 19th.

Submissions should be anonymized. Students should choose a different topic than the one they covered in their critical commentary. Questions and guidelines to follow.

(5) Participation

Students are expected to attend class and be engaged in class discussion.

- i. Attendance: Students should maintain regular attendance. Of course, absences for medical or other legitimate reasons will be excused, but there will be penalties for excessive unexcused absences. If a student passes 3 unexcused absences, a Course Problem Notice will be submitted. After 5 unexcused absences, 1% will be deducted from the final grade for every unexcused absence thereafter. Note that arriving 15+ minutes late or leaving very early without permission will result in being marked absent.
- Participation: Active participation in class discussion is warmly encouraged, will be recorded, and may influence the final grade in borderline cases. For instance, a student on the A-/B+ border who made regular and thoughtful contributions to class discussion would be awarded the A- grade (the inverse is also true).

4. Course Policies

- (i) Accommodations: I am available to discuss appropriate academic accommodations you may require as a student with a disability or for any other reason. Requests for accommodations should be made within the first two weeks of the semester, except under unusual circumstances. Students must register with Student Disability Services for access to certain academic accommodations.
- (ii) Deadlines: Reading commentaries should be submitted before the class in which that reading is discussed (i.e. by 1459). Presentation handouts should be submitted 48 hours ahead of class (e.g. by 1459 on Sunday if the presentation is on Tuesday). Both paper assignments are due by 2359 on deadline day. Late assignments will lose 4% per day they are late.
- (iii) Assignment Submission: All assignments should be submitted through Canvas. Critical commentaries and research essays should be submitted anonymously. Please remove any identifying information from both the document and the file name before submission.
- (iv) Extensions (commentaries and presentations): Extensions will not be granted for reading commentaries or presentations. If you miss the deadline for a reading commentary, just sign up to comment on another paper later in the semester. If you are due to present within the next week and need to reschedule, let me know as soon as possible. Otherwise, just sign up to present on another reading.
- **(v) Extensions (papers):** Extensions may be granted for paper assignments if you have good reason. If you think you need an extension, you must obtain my approval at least one week before the deadline. After this, extensions will only be granted for exceptional reasons (e.g. medical or family emergency).
- (vi) Plagiarism: Academic honesty is fundamental to our community, and plagiarism will be taken very seriously. Just don't do it! If you are experiencing workload issues and are tempted to plagiarize, it's much more prudent to speak to me or reach out to an on-campus resource. See here and here for more on Penn's plagiarism policy.
- (vii) Attendance and participation: Students are expected to maintain regular attendance, and egregious numbers of unexcused absences will result in grade deductions (see course requirements). However, I understand that life happens and am willing to excuse reasonable absences (e.g. illness, family emergency, religious observance). Please let me know as early as possible if you anticipate missing a class. In the event of an emergency, please let me know as soon as you can why you missed the class but equally, don't rush, your health and wellbeing come first.
- (viii) In-class discussion: Engaging in active debate with peers is often one of the most enjoyable parts of a philosophy class, and can be a really effective way to stimulate intellectual growth. It is my goal to create a classroom environment in which everyone has an opportunity to speak, and feels comfortable speaking. You can help me foster this kind of productive environment by: (1) completing the reading before class and coming to class prepared with any questions you might have; (2) being respectful to your peers (particularly in the event of disagreement) listening to what they have to say, giving others equal opportunity to speak, and addressing all participants courteously; and (3) interpreting your interlocutors charitably that is, assume their contributions

are good-faith attempts to express the truth, and if there are multiple possible interpretations of a particular contribution, assume your interlocutor is expressing the most plausible of these interpretations.

- (ix) Phone and laptop use: Phones may not be used in class except in exceptional cases (e.g. there is an ongoing family emergency, you are expecting a very important call). If you may need to use your phone during class for one of these exceptional reasons, let me know at the beginning of class. Laptop use is permitted.
- (x) Office hours: Office hours are drop in, first-come-first serve. If you plan on attending office hours, please email me at least 24 hours in advance to let me know what you would like to discuss.
- (xi) Email: Unless I have good reason, I will usually reply to emails within 2 working days. If I do not reply to your email within 48 hours (weekends not included), you may prompt me for a reply. There are two types of questions I am happy to answer over email: (1) organizational questions about absences, office hour attendance, etc., and (2) requests for supplementary reading recommendations ahead of assignments. Please do not ask me substantive philosophical questions over email. If you have a substantive philosophical question, please come to office hours this may require some advance planning around deadlines.

(xii) Resources

- <u>Jim Pryor's Guidelines on Reading Philosophy</u> for how to get the most out of class readings
- Jim Pryor's Guidelines on Writing a Philosophy Paper advice that might help with writing assignments
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy for introductory articles on various philosophical topics, including global justice, international distributive justice, immigration, patriotism, nationalism, and secession
- Weingarten Learning Resources Center for assistance with academic reading, study skills and time management

5. Schedule

Week	Topic	Date	Readings
Week 1	Introduction	8/27	No reading
		8/29	Kok-Chor Tan, 'Borders: Immigration, Secession, and Territory', in <i>What is This Thing Called Global Justice?</i> (New York: Routledge, 2017), 105-119.
Week 2	Global poverty, proximity, and obligation	9/3	Peter Singer, 'Famine, Affluence, and Morality', Philosophy and Public Affairs 1:3 (1972), 229-243.

	Optional: Chpt 2 of What is This Thing Called Global Justice?	9/5	Richard Miller, 'Moral Closeness and World Community', in <i>The Ethics of Assistance: Morality and the Distant Needy</i> ed. by Deen K. Chatterjee (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 101-122.
Week 3	Global inequality and distributive justice	9/10	Background: John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1971), §1-4 and §11.
	Optional: Chpt 3 & 4 of What is This Thing Called Global Justice?		Charles Beitz, 'Justice and International Relations', <i>Philosophy and Public Affairs</i> 4:4 (1975), pp. 360-389.
		9/12	Beitz, cntd.
	Giorna Jimino.		John Rawls, <i>The Law of Peoples</i> (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), §15 and §16 (on burdened societies and distributive justice).
Week 4	Open Borders vs The Right to Exclude Part 1: The Classic Debate	9/17	Michael Walzer, 'The Distribution of Membership', in Boundaries: National Autonomy and its Limits ed. by Peter G. Brown and Henry Shue (Totowa NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1981), 1-35.
		9/19	Joseph Carens, 'Aliens and Citizens: The Case for Open Borders', <i>The Review of Politics</i> 49:2 (1987), pp. 251-273.
			Supplementary (optional): Joseph Carens, "The Case for Open Borders', in <i>The Ethics of Immigration</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 225-254.
Week 5	Open Borders vs The Right to Exclude	9/24	David Miller, <i>Strangers In Our Midst</i> (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), Chpt 3 'Open Borders' & Chpt 4 'Closed Borders', 39-75.
	Part 2: Liberal Nationalism, and Immigration and Human Rights	9/26	Kieran Oberman, 'Immigration as a Human Right', in Migration in Political Theory: The Ethics of Movement and Membership ed. by Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 32-56.
Week 6	Open Borders vs The Right to Exclude	10/1	Amy Reed-Sandoval, 'The New Open Borders Debate', in <i>The Ethics and Politics of Immigration</i> ed. by Alex Sager (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016), 13-28.
	Part 3: Some Hands-On Perspectives		Eric A. Posner & Glen Weyl, 'Uniting the World's Workers: Rebalancing the International Order Towards Labor', in <i>Radical Markets</i> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 127-167.

	At least one		
	reading commentary must be completed by Oct 3rd.	10/3	José Jorge Mendoza, 'Philosophy of Race and the Ethics of Immigration', in <i>The Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Race</i> (New York: Routledge, 2018), 507-519.
			Shelley Wilcox, 'Immigrant Admissions and Global Relations of Harm', <i>Journal of Social Philosophy</i> 38:2 (2007), 274-291.
Week 7	Exclusion exceptions Part 1:	10/8	Sarah Song, 'The Claims of Family', in <i>Immigration and Democracy</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 132-150.
	Family unity		Optional: Matthew Lister, 'Immigration, Association, and the Family', <i>Law and Philosophy</i> 29:6 (2010), 717-745; and Matthew Lister, 'The Rights of Families and Children at the Border', in <i>Philosophical Foundations of Children's and Family Law</i> ed. by Elizabeth Brake and Lucinda Ferguson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), see especially 159-166.
		10/10	Fall Break – no class
Week 8	Exclusion exceptions Part 2:	10/15	UNHCR, Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951 & 1967), Introductory Note, Final Act §4, and Chapter 1 Article 1.
	Who is a refugee?		Andrew Shacknove, 'Who is a Refugee?', Ethics 95:2 (1985), 274-284.
		10/17	Matthew Lister, 'Who Are Refugees?', Law and Philosophy 32:5 (2013), 645-671.
			David Bezmozgis, 'Common Story', in <i>The Displaced:</i> Refugee Writers on Refugee Lives ed. by Viet Thanh Nguyen (New York: Abrahms Press, 2018).
			Dina Nayeri, 'The Ungrateful Refugee', in <i>The Displaced:</i> Refugee Writers on Refugee Lives ed. by Viet Thanh Nguyen (New York: Abrahms Press, 2018).
Week 9	Patriotism, Nationalism, and Cosmopolitanism	10/22	Martha C. Nussbaum, 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', in For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism ed. by Joshua C. Cohen (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1996), 2-17.
	Optional: Chpt 5 of What is This Thing		Kwame Anthony Appiah, 'Cosmopolitan Patriots', in For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism ed. by

	Called Global Justice?		Joshua C. Cohen (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1996), 21-29.
	Critical commentary due Friday October 25th.		Optional: Martha Nussbaum, 'Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism', <i>Daedus</i> 137:3 (2008), 78-93.
		10/24	Alasdair MacIntyre, 'Is Patriotism a Virtue?', Lindley Lecture at the University of Kansas (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, 1984).
Week 10	Patriotism, Nationalism, and Cosmopolitanism	10/29	Will Kymlicka, Chpt 10 'From Enlightenment Cosmopolitanism to Liberal Nationalism' in <i>Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 203-220.
			Excerpt from Will Kymlicka and Christine Straele, Chpt 11 'Cosmopolitanism, Nation-States, and Minority Nationalism', in <i>Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 221-229.
		10/31	Arash Abizadeh and Pablo Gilabert, 'Is There a Genuine Tension Between Cosmopolitan Egalitarianism and Special Responsibilities?', <i>Philosophical Studies</i> 138:3 (2008), 349-365.
Week 11	Climate Change Justice	11/5	Kok-Chor Tan, 'Climate Change Justice: Sharing the Burden', in <i>What is This Thing Called Global Justice?</i> (New York: Routledge, 2017), 120-133.
		11/7	Brian Berkey, 'Climate Change, Moral Intuitions, and Moral Demandingness', <i>Philosophy and Public Issues</i> 4 (2014), 157-189.
			Catriona McKinnon, 'Climate Change: Against Despair', Ethics and Environment 19:1 (2014), 31-48.
Week 12	Climate Change and Migration	11/12	Jane McAdam, 'Swimming Against the Tide: Why a Climate Change Displacement Treaty is not the Answer', International Journal of Refugee Law 23:1 (2011), 2-27.
		11/14	Cara Nine, 'Ecological Refugees, State Borders, and the Lockean Proviso', <i>Journal of Applied Philosophy</i> 27:4 (2010), 359-375.
Week 13	Secession and Territorial Rights	11/19	Allen Buchanan, "Theories of Secession', <i>Philosophy and Public Affairs</i> 26:1 (1997), pp. 31-61.

		11/21	A. John Simmons, "Territorial Rights: Justificatory Strategies', in <i>Boundaries of Authority</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 93-115.
Week 14	Secession and Territorial Rights	11/26	Lea Ypi, 'A Permissive Theory of Territorial Rights', European Journal of Philosophy 22:2 (2012), 288-312.
		11/28	Thanksgiving Break – no class
Week 15	Colonialism and Structural Injustice	12/3	Catherine Lu, 'Colonialism as Structural Injustice: Historical Responsibility and Contemporary Redress', The Journal of Political Philosophy 19:3 (2011), 261-281.
	,		

Appendix A: Reading Commentary Guidelines

The Basics

- Reading commentaries should be three-pages (give or take a couple of lines), double-spaced
- Commentaries must be submitted before the class assigned to that reading
- At least one reading commentary must be submitted by October 3rd

Guidelines

There are two main components to a reading commentary. First, a commentary should reconstruct the author's main argument. Second, a commentary should (you guessed it!) comment on that argument. To write a good commentary, it is essential that both components are included. The paper needn't be perfectly divided into 50% reconstruction, 50% analysis – but to do justice to each section, at least one full page should be dedicated to each component of the paper.

The reconstruction section should outline the author's main argument. Things to consider here are: What is the author's main thesis? What argument(s) does she use to support this thesis? What are the key components of these argument(s)? A good reconstruction should not be a paragraph-by-paragraph description of an article. Rather, it should identify the key argument(s) made in the article, and outline them very clearly and succinctly. (If there are a lot of major arguments, you can focus on one or two that you find most interesting.) As far as possible, a good reconstruction will use new language to outline the original author's arguments, and will include either no quotations or only very minimal quotations.

The commentary/analysis section should respond to the author's main argument as outlined in the reconstruction section. Things to consider here are: Are the premises of the author's argument true? Is the reasoning process she uses to defend her conclusion valid? Try to think of some question(s) about the paper you would be interested to discuss in class, and use these questions as a springboard for your analysis. The points you raise should be original – try to avoid repeating objections the author already raises and responds to in her paper. A good analysis section will raise new objections and thoughts. As a general rule it is better to raise fewer question(s) and develop them well, than to raise several points and offer only a shallow analysis in each one. For a paper of this length, it would be appropriate to raise 1-2 substantial questions/objections. (Of course, these are only rough guidelines – e.g. in some cases there may be space to raise smaller questions alongside 2 substantial points. Ultimately, students should use their good judgement about how to allocate space in their commentaries.)

Appendix B: In-Class Presentation Guidelines

The Basics

- Give an in-class presentation on the topic of one of your reading commentaries
- Presentations should be approx. 15 minutes long (no less than 10 minutes, no more than 20)
- Students should prepare a 1-2 page (single spaced) handout for their presentation, and this should be submitted 2 days before class
- Presentations should raise questions for class discussion

Guidelines

The purpose of the in-class presentation is to refresh your peers' memories about the reading and set the agenda for the day's class. Like the critical commentary, the presentation should both reconstruct the material from that week's reading, and comment on it.

Like the critical commentary, the reconstruction section of the presentation should focus on the key components of the author's argument. Presenters should assume that their audience have read the text, but just need a little reminder about its content to get discussion going – so no need to reconstruct every part of the paper.

Like the critical commentary, the analysis section of the presentation should raise new questions/objections about the text for class discussion, and develop some thoughts on these questions/objections. It is entirely permissible to be biased here – presenters can defend their own thoughts about the text.

Note: it is permissible to focus your presentation on a particular subsection of the text. E.g. if an author develops two arguments for open borders in their article, it is permissible to focus on reconstructing and evaluating only one of these arguments in your presentation. Students should use their good discretion to decide how best to approach their presentation.

Students should prepare a 1-2 page handout (single spaced) for their presentation. I will make copies to be distributed during class.