

Philosophy 9121b [combined with Politics 4206g/9726b]
Theories of Global Justice

Instructor: Richard Vernon (rv53239@gmail.com)

In 2020-21 this seminar will be offered synchronously, via Zoom meetings 11.30-1.30 on Thursdays. There will also be a Zoomed office hour, time TBA.

The seminar will (1) discuss the main approaches to the idea of global justice developed by political theorists and philosophers since the emergence of the field in the late 20th century, and (2) examine six controversial issue areas currently debated in the field.

In part 1 of the course we will read and discuss humanitarian, cosmopolitan, harm-based and nationalist views. In each case we will read an influential statement of the view in question and also a critical appraisal of it:

1. Humanitarianism: does distance make any difference? (Peter Singer, David Miller)
2. Cosmopolitanism I: Who owns natural resources? (Charles Beitz, Margaret Moore)
3. Cosmopolitanism II: What is the scope of distributive justice? (Beitz, Michael Blake)
4. Is there a global "Harm Principle"? (Thomas Pogge, Mathias Risse)
5. Is nationalism defensible? (Miller, Veit Bader)

In Part 2 of the course we will discuss the following (readings TBA):

1. Immigration: Are borders indefensibly coercive?
2. What is wrong with colonialism?
3. Does the developed world exploit the global South?
4. What is "Crime against Humanity"?
5. Can nations be punished?
6. How should the burdens of climate change be distributed?

Philosophy 9121b [combined with Politics 9506b]
Toleration

Instructor: Richard Vernon [rv53239@gmail.com]

In 2020-21 this seminar will be offered synchronously via Zoom meetings on Mondays 9.30-11.30. There will also be a Zoomed office hour, time TBA.

The idea of toleration comes to prominence in the context of religious differences in the early modern period. We will begin our discussion by examining one important early-modern debate, between John Locke and a critic: what issues were at stake, and how was the case for toleration made? We will go on to consider whether the original case for toleration can be sustained today, and also whether “toleration” is the right response to political difference.

1. Locke’s *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689), Jonas Proast’s critique (1690), and selections from the subsequent exchanges
2. Interpretations of Locke: was he a kind of fallibilist, an advocate of personal autonomy, or a political liberal?
3. Is the idea of toleration sustainable today? Some different views
4. Autonomy and a critic: Mill’s *On Liberty* and Sarah Conly’s *Against Autonomy*.
5. Epistemic humility as a reason for toleration? The “epistemology of disagreement” debate.
6. The “agonist” alternative: defending partisan conviction – contestability and partisanship as values.
7. Instead of “tolerating” difference, should we “Recognize” difference as something positive?
8. Cultural accommodation (Kymlicka) and two critics (Appiah, Barry)