POLI 219: Global Equality, For and Against  
Fall 2013  
Instructor: David Wiens  
Office: SSB 323  
Office Hours: W 13:30–15:30 or by appt  
Email: dwiens@ucsd.edu  
Web: www.dwiens.com

Course Description

How far do liberal egalitarian principles of socioeconomic justice extend? Do they apply globally or only within the context of smaller political communities (e.g., the state, the nation, ethnic or religious communities)? We will survey recent attempts to answer this question, paying close attention to the justification, content, scope, and application of the proposed principles of justice. Our inquiry will be framed by several broad questions:

- What are the fundamental moral and social values grounding the proposed principles?
- How are the proposed principles justified?
- How should political power and authority be arranged in a just institutional scheme? (What place should the sovereign state occupy in a just institutional scheme?)
- What are the practical implications of designing institutions to satisfy the proposed principles?

We will also pay close attention to methodological issues: What role do empirical facts play in specifying the proposed principles? How well do the proposed principles square with our best theories of political and economic development and of international organization?

Required Texts

* Available electronically from UCSD library; † Available as hard copy from UCSD library

5. †Darrel Moellendorf, Cosmopolitan Justice (Boulder: Westview Press, 2002)
Assignments

Paper stubs: 4 × 500–750 words 10% each (best 3 count; due 1 day after reading)
Critical review: 1500–2000 words 20% (due 2 days after reading)
Research paper: 6000–7500 words 50% (to be presented in final weeks)

Expectations

1. Readings. Everyone will be responsible for the required reading plus one recommended reading. We will try to allocate responsibility for the week’s recommended readings so that everything gets covered. You will not be expected to absorb every detail of the reading, so do not read every word. Your responsibility is to read enough to be able to answer the questions in the course description and to have a decent grip on the argument’s overall structure. (Recommended readings — lengthy ones in particular — should be skimmed. We will likely pare down the list of recommended readings as we go along.) The readings are meant to give you a sense of the current debate but, ultimately, to stimulate your own thoughts about how you might contribute to an ongoing debate. Your primary aim should be finding something worthwhile to say when it comes time to write (see next item).

2. Assignments. One key objective this term is to help you think largely in terms of scholarship production rather than merely consumption. Think of yourselves as apprentice scholars. This means (among other things) developing a habit of writing frequently. The writing assignments are designed to facilitate your transition to scholarship production. You should be thinking in terms of research outputs: conference papers, publications, etc. The paper stubs are meant to give you a folder full of abstracts that you can later use as a basis for conference or workshop papers, perhaps a publication. The critical review can serve as a basis for a longer research article or be written as a self-contained book review or research note. The research paper is meant to be a first draft of a journal article — ideally, something you could reasonably turn into a publication. (I’ll provide examples of paper stubs and critical reviews by the end of the first week of class.)

3. Works in progress. Although you should look for ways to turn your written work into future research outputs, you should also keep in mind that everything at this stage is a work in progress. The writing assignments (esp. the paper stubs) are meant to be low stakes, in the sense that you should feel free to test out ideas and see where they lead. There are no penalties for attempting an argument that ultimately fails. Written assignments are only penalized for being tedious, unimaginative, careless, or sloppy. Not every idea you have will lead to a publication; but you should at least give yourself a chance by starting with interesting ideas and promising arguments.

In this spirit, paper stubs and critical reviews should be drafted prior to class and everyone should be prepared to discuss whatever they’ve written for that week. Your writing combined with the assigned reading will serve as the basis for class discussion. This will give you a chance to get feedback on what you’ve written. You can then use that feedback
to revise your writing before you submit it (within a day or two of class). The last week of class will be devoted to student presentation and class discussion of research paper drafts. Final versions will be then be submitted

(NB. Your research paper can build on a paper stub or critical review. So you can also use class discussion to get early feedback on an idea for your research paper.)

4. **Collaboration.** You are free to collaborate on assignments with other members of the class, under one condition: I give equal credit to all collaborators. I don't want to take the time to sort out who contributed what to the project; I'll just assume that all collaborators are equally responsible for the final product. So don't enter a collaboration with someone who won't pull their weight; you'll only have yourself to blame when they get credit for your hard work. Also, note that collaborating is certainly not half the work of solo authorship. Collaboration can enhance and refine your work, perhaps make the process more fun, but it does not necessarily decrease the amount of work.

5. **Word limits.** Word limits are strict — no exceptions. If you're over the word limit, I'll send the paper back without grading it. Tailor your focus to the word limit (don't bite off more than you can chew). Streamline your arguments (without sacrificing necessary details). Cut the fat in your prose (no unnecessary words).

6. **Obligatory note about plagiarism.** Plagiarism is a serious academic offence. Accordingly, it will be treated seriously. Plagiarism will not be tolerated in any form. The first offence will result in immediate failure of the class and the academic dishonesty will be noted on your student record.

Plagiarism will be defined as follows:

*Plagiarism* consists in taking credit for academic work that did not originate with you. The following are examples: (1) Using the words of another person without citing the reference. (2) Collaborating on a paper without noting the contribution of the other author(s).
### Reading Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Oct</td>
<td><strong>Common humanity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gilabert, <em>From Global Poverty</em>, chs. 1, 2, 5–7 (skim 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Oct</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Ypi, <em>Global Justice &amp; Avant-Garde Political Agency</em>, chs. 2–6 (skim 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oct</td>
<td><strong>Coercion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Miller, <em>Globalizing Justice</em>, chs. 1–3, 6, 8 (skim 5, 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 Oct  
Required
1. Valentini, *Justice in a Globalized World*, chs. 3, 5, 6–8 (skim 2, 4)

Recommended

29 Oct  
Cooperation
Required
1. James, *Fairness in Practice*, chs. 1–3, 5, 7 (skim 4, 6)

Recommended

5 Nov  
Required
1. Moellendorf, *Cosmopolitan Justice*, chs. 1–4

Recommended
12 Nov  **Common identity**
Required
Recommended

19 Nov  **Common ownership**
Required
1. Risse, *On Global Justice*, chs. 1, 5–8
Recommended
26 Nov  **Competition**  
**Required**
1. David Wiens, “Cosmopolitanism and Competition: A Challenge to Global Egalitarianism” (manuscript)  
**Recommended**

3 Dec  **Student presentations**