



COURSE GUIDE POLS312

Semester 1, 2021

ETHICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

This course introduces you to

- a) the impact of moral concerns on the norms, institutions, conflicts, and practices of and in international relations, and
- b) ethical reflection as it is applied to the interaction of states and other actors across space and time.

Lecturer: Prof Philip Nel
e-mail: philip.nel@otago.ac.nz

Lecture times: Tues 2pm — 2.50pm (50 minutes) ME215
 Thu 9am – 10.50am (100 minutes) R7N10

Office Hours: Wednesday 2-4pm, or email for an appointment
 Room 4N6, Arts Building

Assessment

90-minute class test on 1 st part of paper:	30% of final mark
Performance as part of debating team (team mark):	25% of final mark
Two debate reports (2 x 700 words):	15% of final mark
Research Essay (3000 words):	30% of final mark

Important Things to Remember:

- ***Thu 15 April – Class test (90 minutes). Make sure that you are in a position to write this test.***
- Note that this paper is 100% internally assessed (no exam).
- There is no Course Reader: All readings are available online or on E-reserve.
- Keep copies of all material submitted for assessment.
- Two debate reports are due: one on Debates 1, 2 or 3, and one on debates 4 & 5
- Submit final essay via Turnitin, **and** email the essay to the lecturer.
- Final marks will be made available on Friday 11 June 2021 at 12noon. ***It is your responsibility to check the correctness of your marks.***

PROGRAMME

Part 1

- Tue 2 March: Lecture 1: What does it mean to make a moral judgement?
Thu 4 March: Lecture 1 (cont): What does it mean to make a moral judgement?
Tue 9 March: Lecture 2: Are morals at all relevant in international relations?
Thu 11 March: Lecture 2 (cont): Are morals at all relevant in international relations? & Lecture 3:
Shared norms and institutions in the international society of states
Tue 16 March: Lecture 4: Utilitarianism
***Thu 18 March: Lecture 4 (cont): Utilitarianism applied and evaluated
(Finalising Debate Groups – Be There!)**
Tue 23 March: Lecture 5: Challenges to Utilitarianism (Rawls and Contractarianism)
Thu 25 March: Lecture 5 (cont): Rawls and Domestic (and Global?) Justice
Tue 30 March: Lecture 6: Challenges to Utilitarianism (Virtue Ethics)
Thu 1 April: No class

2-11 April Easter & Mid-semester break

- Tues 13 April: Reviewing for the test (and meeting with debate groups for Debate 1)
Thu 15 April: Class Test (90 mins)

Part 2

- *Tues 20 April: Discussion of Debates and Essay**
Thu 22 April: Debate 1: Compromises in international politics
Tues 27 April: Discussion with Groups for Debate 2
Thu 29 April: Debate 2: What do we owe future generations? (Handing back test, in class only)
Tue 4 May: Discussion with Groups for Debate 3
Thu 6 May: Debate 3: Outer space as a commons
Tue 11 May: Discussion with Groups for Debate 4: Reparations for slavery?
Thu 13 May: Debate 4: Reparations for slavery
Tue 18 May: Discussion with Groups for Debate 5
Thu 20 May: Debate 5: Humanitarian intervention
Thu 27 May: Last meeting (Handing in of last Debate Report; Handing out debate evaluations)
Wed 2 June: Essay due (via Turnitin & emailed to reach lecturer on or before 16h00.)
Friday 11 June 2021 at 12noon: Final marks will be made available on Blackboard. *It is your responsibility to check the correctness of your marks.*

Note: * You have to attend these classes if you want to be in a Debate Group and NOT miss out on 25% of the final mark.

Academic Integrity

Having integrity means being honest in all your study activities, including the writing and submission of assignments, reports, and essays. Academic integrity is a personal virtue and is the basis for appropriate decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This virtue is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect, and courage. Students are expected to be aware of, and act in accordance with the University's Academic Integrity Policies

<https://www.otago.ac.nz/study/academicintegrity/otago006309.html>

Academic Misconduct, such as plagiarism or cheating, is a breach of Academic Integrity and is taken very seriously by the University. Types of misconduct include plagiarism, copying, unauthorised collaboration, taking unauthorised material into a test or exam, impersonation, and assisting someone else's misconduct. A more extensive list of the types of academic misconduct is available in the University's Student Academic Misconduct Procedures:

<https://www.otago.ac.nz/study/academicintegrity/index.html>

It is your responsibility to be aware of and use acceptable academic practices when completing your assessments. To access the information in the Academic Integrity Policy and learn more, please visit the websites mentioned above, or ask at the Student Learning Centre or Library. If you have any further questions, please ask your lecturer.

Aims and Outcomes

This course introduces you to

- a) the influence of moral concerns on the norms, institutions, and practices of international relations, and
- b) ethical reflection as it is applied to the interaction of states and other actors across space and time.

The course has an empirical component, but also a normative/philosophical focus as reflected in the double meaning of the term “E/ethics.” In lower case, this concept is used to refer to norms and moral practices that are relevant to a specific domain of life, such as in ‘medical ethics,’ or ‘the ethics of sport’. Ethics with a capital *E* is used to refer to a field of study or an **activity of reflection** in which the possible bases or justifications for sound moral judgments are investigated. This form of investigation is often called “normative theory” in the social sciences, but the implicit distinction between ‘theory’ and ‘normative theory’ is widely challenged. All theory is normative, as theory always implies moral choices/implications. What *Ethics* can help us to do, is to get clarity about the normative assumptions implicit in all attempts to practice, understand, and explain international affairs, and to help us to distinguish better arguments from less persuasive ones.

The course seeks to develop your ability to:

- Identify and systematically explain the role and function of moral concerns in that part of public life that we call ‘international relations’
- Explicate and evaluate the reasons and justifications for specific moral judgments and proposals that are made with respect to international public affairs today
- Refine your opinion on ethical questions of the day, and defend these in public debate.

The emphasis also falls on developing basic discipline-related capabilities. This includes the ability to:

- Identify and evaluate the main theoretical perspectives that are used by analysts and decision makers in this field of study
- Find and interpret data and information on aspects of the role of moral concerns in contemporary international relations
- Engage with the relevant scholarly literature, and to distinguish between worthwhile and less worthwhile contributions

On completion of this paper, you should also be able to:

- Distinguish between the different uses that language has in academic discourse
- “Work with” ideas, that is, understand and apply concepts and theoretical constructs in order to aid your understanding of an issue
- Participate in reasoned discussions on issues of the day (‘reasoned’ implies an ability to define concepts clearly, to argue systematically, and to use appropriate evidence to warrant your claims)
- Think independently and critically
- Cooperate in a team
- Solve problems by investigating research questions and suggesting reasonable and creative answers on the basis of your research
- Communicate your insights/findings clearly and systematically.

Organisation and Assessment

Lectures & Class Test (30% of final mark)

During the first part of the paper I will provide an introduction to ethical reflection in the study of international relations/politics. These lectures will include class discussions, so you must prepare for class by reading the prescribed texts. ***This part is concluded with a class test of 90 minutes.***

The purpose of the test is to determine whether you understand what it means to engage in ethical argumentation on international relations, whether you understand the ethical theories/approaches that we will be discussing in class, whether you can compare them and develop an argument about their relative merits, and whether you can apply these theories to current international issues.

Debates (25% of final mark)

We will stage 5 x formal class debates during Part 2 of this paper. As part of a team of students you will be given a specific proposition to defend/challenge during a class debate on a set date. In order to prepare adequately, you will have to do the readings and additional research, and as a debating team draft an Opening Statement of plus-minus 800 words (type-written), which will be delivered by your team. The typed opening statement will be taken in immediately before the debate, and the lecturer will use it, plus a general assessment of your team's debating performance, to award a mark out of 30 (see below).

Following the opening statements, each debating team will be given the opportunity to prepare and present a rebuttal after which cross-examination of the teams by the rest of the class and the lecturer will take place. The two teams will then have time to prepare closing statements and deliver them. Following ancient deliberation practice, the audience will eventually vote to determine which team had the most persuasive arguments. The outcome of this vote is not the most decisive factor in the lecturer and tutor's assessment of your debate performance, but will be taken into consideration.

The debate in summary:

Pre-debate voting	
Opening statement (affirmative team):	8 minutes (max)
Opening statement (opposing team):	8 minutes (max)
Preparation of rebuttals and questions	5 minutes
Delivery of rebuttal (affirmative team)	4 minutes (max)
Delivery of rebuttal (opposing team)	4 minutes (max)
Cross- examination by Respondents and class discussion:	50-60 minutes
Preparation of closing statement	3 minutes
Closing statement (opposing team)	3 minutes (max)
Closing statement (affirmative team)	3 minutes (max)
Audience complete voting paper	

In preparing for a debate, a debate team must consult not only the prescribed readings but also additional sources, and must do empirical research as required by their theme. **All sources used must be listed below the text of the Opening Statement.**

No referencing required in the text, except if you cite someone's words/phrases directly.

Scale and criteria used by lecturer to evaluate opening statement and debating performance

Understanding of theme: Team gets maximum points if they demonstrate clear and in-depth understanding of the issue/theme. Teams must define core concepts and use them consistently. Tell the audience how you are interpreting the proposition (they are sometimes deliberately ambiguous). Empirical research is encouraged, as verified information and generalizations based on data can help us to formulate ethical questions more precisely, and can assist us in resolving some – but not all –ethical disputes.	10
Organization of arguments: Team gets maximum points if their opening statement and arguments are based on thorough presentation of pertinent evidence, if the opening statement has a clear and effective introduction and conclusion, and if it is well structured, logical, and coherent. I consider whether the arguments used are relevant and unambiguous.	5
Persuasive delivery: Team gets maximum points if their arguments are delivered succinctly, confidently, and persuasively, with the right emphasis on the important points. (Degree to which audience was persuaded will be taken into consideration here, but is not the most important factor).	5
Strategy of defence and effectiveness in counter-arguments: Team gets maximum points if they show due consideration of possible counter-arguments, choose an effective strategy to counter the contentions of their opponents, and if they demonstrate the ability to use evidence and logic to refute the core points on which the opponents' case rests.	5
Total	25

I meet with debate groups during the Tuesday class preceding their debate.

Written debate reports (15% of final mark)

Two debate reports are due: one on Debates 1, 2 or 3, and one on debates 4 & 5. You have to have attended a debate to submit a Debate Report. *You cannot write a debate report on your own debate.*

These reports must exclude the theme of your debate.

The debate reports must be your own work, must be type-written, and must contain:

- a) Your own summary of the *most important* ethical issue raised/entailed by the debate (200 words maximum).
- b) Statement of which arguments used by the debating teams you found most persuasive, providing reasons for your choice. If you believe that both teams missed the crucial point(s), I would like to hear what you think the crucial issue is and what the relevant arguments should have been (700 words maximum).

Your understanding of the ethical issue involved, plus your ability to write clearly, succinctly, and to the point will be assessed. The quality of your report will be enhanced if you read the prescribed readings, and pay careful attention during the debate.

No referencing required in the text, except if you use someone else's words/phrases directly. If you use sources not listed in the course readings for this debate, please add a list of works consulted at the end of your Report. Although it is not a requirement to use additional sources, it is likely that your learning experience in writing a report will benefit from the use of additional sources.

A debate report will be marked out of 10 (and the 2 x marks reworked into 15% of final mark).

Your debate report on one week's debate has to be handed in at the end of the next week's debate/class. *I only accept debate reports if you were in class for the whole debate on the handing-in day.*

Reports not handed in on time will not receive a mark.

Research Essay (30% of final mark)

Thirty per cent of your final mark is contributed by a typed research essay of 3000 words.

Essays must be submitted via Turnitin and as an electronic copy (emailed to lecturer with Politics declaration appended).

You can write on any issue in the field of the Ethics of International Relations/Politics, **but your choice must exclude the theme of your Debate**. You can write on a debate if that debate was the focus of one of your debate reports.

You are welcome to write on a theme of a debate (excluding your own, of course) and if you do so you do not have to stick to the proposition for that debate. If you are not sure what to write about, consult the lecturer.

The essay must answer a research question that you pose at the very beginning in the “Introduction”. This question must refer to an ethical (or meta-ethical*) issue that has relevance for international relations. Use the essay to review the various arguments advanced in the literature, and develop your own answer to the question. Be explicit about the ethical theory/approach that you apply to this question and tell the reader why you regard this theory to be more appropriate than its contenders. ***The emphasis falls on your ability to engage critically and creatively with ethical arguments on a specific issue and to develop and justify your conclusions. I will also assess your ability to engage critically with the literature on the specific issue.***

Useful examples of additional essay questions, other than those related to the Debates:

- Should environmental migrants be treated as refugees?
- Can global inequality be justified morally?
- Do citizens of a democracy have a moral duty to promote democratic practices in other states?
- Is child labour morally wrong?
- Is Just War Theory the best possible moral approach to war?
- Am I justified in using religious principles to answer ethical questions in international relations?*

*Note: This is a meta-ethical question. This type of question places quite high demands on us, so make sure you are up for the challenge before you tackle a question like this.

At this advanced (300) level, essays written the night before and first drafts will not ensure you a good mark. Essays will be assessed on the basis of the following criteria (listed in order of importance):

- **Argument:** the essence of a good politics essay is the development of an integrated argument throughout your essay, and coming to a clear conclusion.
- **Critical analysis:** students are expected both accurately to *describe* the arguments under consideration, and to subject these arguments to critical *evaluation*.
- **Research:** students should consult published, quality sources. As far as possible your sources should be integrated into your argument. They should primarily be made up of academic books and journal articles. As this is a research essay, you need to conduct your own research, but do seek support from the politics research librarian or myself. I expect you to consult at least **eight** sources additional to the readings provided in the course reader when you write an essay. **At least four** of these sources must be articles from academic journals (which you can locate by doing a search via articles databases such as Philosopher’s Index or Proquest (see Library website). If you use online sources, make sure that they are peer-reviewed by academics. For instance: the *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy* <http://www.iep.utm.edu/> and the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* <http://plato.stanford.edu/> are acceptable. You can use Wikipedia only if you can show me how you revised and improved the specific entry that is of relevance to your essay.

- **Balance:** you need to consider both sides of an argument and be fair to your opponents, whilst demonstrating their errors with supporting evidence. A research essay is not a political treatise and so polemical discussions and unsubstantiated opinions are inappropriate.
- **Introduction and conclusion:** both are vital to a well-integrated argument – introduce your research question at the outset and summarise the main points and crux of your answer to that question in your final paragraph. Quotations and footnotes are not usually appropriate at this point.
- **Style** (grammar, spelling, clarity of expression, organization) and presentation.
- **Proper referencing and a bibliography/list of sources:** You can use any recognized referencing style, as long as you use it correctly and consistently. For Style Guides, *see*

http://otago.libguides.com/citation_styles

Lectures

Please read the relevant readings BEFORE a particular lecture/debate. They are listed in order of importance.

I have placed a number of books on Reserve in the Central Library. These books provide additional insights on ethics and international relations in general, and on specific themes listed below.

A very useful general source is the *Encyclopedia of Global Justice*, edited by Deen K. Chatterjee, Springer Publishing. Available at:

<http://link.springer.com/referencework/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5/page/1>

Readings marked with an asterisk (*) are available on E-Reserve via Blackboard.

All other readings are available online or through the E-journals website of the Library (Library > Search > E-journals).

Part One: An Introduction to Ethics and IR

Lecture 1: What does it mean to make a moral judgement?

Readings:

*Rachels, James & Stuart Rachels (2007) “What is Morality?” Chapter 1 of *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (5th edition), New York: McGraw-Hill, pp.1-15.

Mt. Sun Antonio College: “Requirements for Moral Judgements”. Available at:

<http://faculty.mtsac.edu/cmcruder/moraljudgements.html>

Optional reading:

If you are philosophically minded, here is a very good, but taxing, discussion:

Richmond Campbell, Richmond (2007) “What Is Moral Judgment?” *The Journal of Philosophy*, 104 (7): 321-349.

Lecture 2: Are morals at all relevant in international relations?

Readings:

Thucydides (1900) “Sixteenth Year of the War - The Melian Conference - Fate of Melos,” *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book V, Chapter XVII (17),. Available at:

<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/7142/7142-h/7142-h.htm#link2HCH0017>

*Nel, Philip (2006) “Morality and Ethics in International Relations,” in: McGowan, P.J. et al. (eds) *Power, Wealth and Global Justice: An International Relations Textbook for Africa*, 3rd edition, UCT Press, Cape Town, pp.46-66.

Lecture 3: Shared norms and institutions in the international society of states

*Jackson, Robert (2000) "The political theory of international *societas*," in: *The Global Covenant* by Robert Jackson, Oxford University Press, pp. 97-129.

Price, Richard (1998) "Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines," *International Organization*, Summer, 1998, Vol. 52, No. 3 (Summer, 1998), pp. 613-644.
Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2601403.pdf>

*Thomas, Ward (2000) "Norms and security: The case of international assassination," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 105-133.

Lecture 4: Utilitarianism: Its strengths and weaknesses

Readings:

West, Henry R. "Utilitarianism," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, available at <https://www.utilitarianism.com/utilitarianism.html>

Peter Singer (2013) "The why and how of effective altruism," TED talk available at:

https://www.ted.com/talks/peter_singer_the_why_and_how_of_effective_altruism

Hardin, Russell, "Utilitarianism," in B. Badie et al. (eds) *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* (online), available at:

<http://sk.sagepub.com/reference/intlpoliticalscience/n624.xml?term=Utilitarianism>

*Goodin, Robert E. (1995) "Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy," in *Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy*, Cambridge: CUP, 3-27.

Lecture 5: Challenges to Utilitarianism (1): Rawls and Domestic (and Global?) Justice

Readings:

Richardson, Henry S. 'John Rawls (1921-2002)' *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, accessed on 22 November 2016, available at: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/rawls/>

*Rawls, J. (1999) *The Law of Peoples*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA, 105-120.

Nagel, Thomas (2005) 'The problem of global justice', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 33 (2): 113-147.

Beitz, Charles R. (2005) 'Cosmopolitanism and Global Justice', *The Journal of Ethics*, 9 (1/2): 11-27.

Lecture 6: Challenges to Utilitarianism (2): Virtue Ethics

Readings:

Bongrae Seok, (2011) 'Virtue Ethics', *Encyclopedia of Global Justice*, edited by Deen K. Chatterjee, Springer Publishing, pp. 1130-1132. Electronic version (remember to page down) available at: http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-1-4020-9160-5_29.pdf

Gaskarth, Jamie (2011a) 'Where would we be without rules? A virtue ethics approach to foreign policy analysis.' *Review of International Studies*, 37(1): 393-415.

Gaskarth, Jamie (2011b) 'The virtues in international society', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 13, No 3, pp. 431-453.

Part Two: Debating Ethical Issues in International Relations

During Part 2, I will use the Tuesday class to meet with the debate groups debating on the Thursday of that week. Attendance is compulsory for the relevant debate groups.

Other debate groups are welcome (but not required) to meet in class during that time slot.

Debate groups are called 1Aff (= Debate 1, Affirmative) and 1Opp (Debate 1, Opposing), etc.

1st Debate: Compromise: Is it Always Acceptable?

Proposition: *Any compromise is acceptable in international politics, as long as it leaves the contracting parties better off than before the compromise was struck.*

Readings:

Margalit, Avishai (2010) 'On Compromise and Rotten Compromises', Lecture presented, BookTV.

Available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wnWn84-LA20>

Margalit, Avishai (2010) *On Compromise and Rotten Compromises*, Princeton: Princeton University Press (On reserve).

Shell, G. Richard (2010) 'The Morality of Bargaining: Identity versus Interests in Negotiations with Evil', *Negotiation Journal*, Vol 26, No 4, pp. 453-481.

Menkel-Meadow, Carrie (2010) 'Compromise, Negotiation, and Morality', *Negotiation Journal*, Vol 26, No 4, pp. 483-499.

2nd Debate: The responsibility of sustainable development (or, do we owe future generations anything?)

Proposition: *Current generations are morally obliged to leave enough resources for future, non-overlapping generations to achieve at least the same standard of living than they enjoy.*

Readings:

Meyer, Lukas (2015) "Intergenerational Justice", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2015 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2015/entries/justice-intergenerational/>

Grosseries, Axel (2001) "What Do We Owe the Next Generation(s)," *Loyola Law Review* 293 (2001). Available at: <http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/llr/vol35/iss1/8>

Howarth, Richard (2011) *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*, edited by John S. Dryzek et al. Oxford University Press. Available online through library website.

Nel, Philip (2011) 'Sustainable Development', in *International Encyclopedia of Political Science* edited by Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and Leonardo Morlino. London: Sage. Online.

3rd Debate: Should outer space be protected as a "global commons"?

Proposition: *Non-terrestrial resources should be subjected to private property rights.*

Readings:

Brehm, Andrew R. (2015) "Private Property in Outer Space: Establishing a Foundation for Future Exploration," *Wisconsin International Law Journal* 33 (2): 353-379, available at: https://repository.law.wisc.edu/api/law_files/serve/search?mediaID=77012

Babcock, Hope M. (2019) "The Public Trust Doctrine, Outer Space, and the Global Commons: Time to Call Home ET," *Syracuse Law Review*, Vol. 69, No. 2, 2019, available at: <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/2201>

- Dalton, Taylor R. (2010) "Developing the Final Frontier: Defining Private Property Rights on Celestial Bodies for the Benefit of All Mankind," Cornell Law School Graduate Student Papers, available at: http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/lps_papers
- Beauvois, Erwan & Guillaume Thirion (2020) "Partial ownership of outer space resources," *Advances in Astronautics Science and Technology*, 3:29–36, available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42423-019-00042-0>
- Shackelford, Scott (2019) "The 'global commons' of outer space is turning into a battlefield," *FastCompany*, available at: <https://www.fastcompany.com/90290871/outer-space-new-space-race-competition-cooperation#:~:text=This%20states%2C%20%E2%80%9CNotwithstanding%20any%20other,our%20ability%20to%20address%20common>
- Kyriazi, Iris (2020) "Outer space as global commons," *Katoikos*, 25 May 2020, available at: <https://katoikos.world/analysis/outer-space-as-global-commons.html>
- Basulto, Dominic (2015) "How property rights in outer space may lead to a scramble to exploit the moon's resources," *The Washington Post* (online), 19 November 2015, available at: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/innovations/wp/2015/11/18/how-property-rights-in-outer-space-may-lead-to-a-scramble-to-exploit-the-moons-resources/>

4th Debate: Reparations for Slavery?

Proposition: Western states that allowed slavery are morally bound to offer reparations to the victims of slavery.

Readings:

- Posner, Eric & Adrian Vermeule (2003) "Reparations for Slavery and Other Historical Injustices," *Columbia Law Review* (103): 689-747. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/209193512.pdf>
- Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda E. (2021) "Why the West is morally bound to offer reparations for slavery," *The Conversation*, 21 Jan 2021. Available at: https://theconversation.com/why-the-west-is-morally-bound-to-offer-reparations-for-slavery-153544?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20January%2025%202021%20-%201843317941&utm_content=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20January%2025%202021%20-%201843317941+CID_9d64d4b243b1d5ad4e1500ef46d9a1ac&utm_source=campaign_monitor_africa&utm_term=argues
- Baten Joerg & Laura Maravall (2021) "The influence of colonialism on Africa's Welfare: An anthropometric study," *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 2021, available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0147596721000019>
- Bernard, Boxhill (1972) "Morality of Reparation," *Social Theory and Practice* 2: 113–122 (available through Central Library website).
- Thompson, Janna (2001) "Historical Injustice and Reparation: Justifying Claims of Descendants." *Ethics: An International Journal of Social, Political and Legal Philosophy* 112(1): 114–135 (available through Central Library website).
- McArdle, Megan (2019) "Opinion: Kamala Harris and Elizabeth Warren are wrong. We shouldn't pay reparations for slavery," *The Washington Post*, 27 Feb 2019. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/kamala-harris-and-elizabeth-warren-are-wrong-we-shouldnt-pay-reparations-for-slavery/2019/02/26/8cbf9c66-39fa-11e9-a06c-3ec8ed509d15_story.html
- Sherwin, Emily (2004) "Reparations and Unjust Enrichment," *Boston University Law Review* 84(5): 1443-1465. Available at: <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Print?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/bulr84&id=1455>

5th Debate: Humanitarian Intervention?

Proposition: Our common humanity imposes a duty/obligation on us to protect people who are systematically persecuted/mistreated by their own government/authorities.

Readings:

- *Lang, A.F. (2010) 'Humanitarian Intervention', in Bell, Duncan (ed.) *Ethics and World Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 324 – 341 (book is also on reserve).
- Nardin, T. (2006) 'Introduction', in Nardin, T. and M. Williams (eds), *Humanitarian Intervention*, Nomos XLVII, New York University Press, New York, 1-30.
- Eric A. Heinze (2006) 'Maximizing Human Security: A Utilitarian Argument for Humanitarian Intervention', *Journal of Human Rights*, 5(3): 283-302
- Brockmeier, S. *et al.* (2016) 'The impact of the Libya intervention debates on norms of protection', *Global Society* 30(1): 113-133.
- Jamieson, Dale (2005) 'Duties to the Distant: Aid, Assistance, and Intervention in the Developing World', *The Journal of Ethics*, Vol 9, pp. 151-170.

STUDENT SUPPORT

Any student should feel free to approach me if they are having any problems or concerns with the course. Office hours exist for this purpose when you can just drop in or please email me for an appointment. If you need some additional support and advice with your research essay, please see me and/or the lecturer in charge of that particular seminar during their office hour(s) or send them an email to make an appointment.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you read the course outline, attend the lectures and tutorials, regularly access blackboard and read your emails.

Essential information for POLS students is available here:

<http://www.otago.ac.nz/politics/study/current-students>.

Library Support

The Politics Subject Librarian is Kate Knox: kate.knox@otago.ac.nz

Self Help resources

This guide offers tips and techniques in developing independent research & information skills. <http://otago.libguides.com/selfhelp>

Library Website: <http://www.otago.ac.nz/library>

The Library website provides online access to resources and services, including the Catalogue, Library Search, Article Databases, Group Room Bookings, Hours, Library Locations, Library News, New Books, Exam Papers, Subject Guides, and more!

Politics Subject Guide

This guide will help you find information for your assignments including articles, books, websites and more! <http://otago.libguides.com/politics>

Ask a Question

Library staff are available via LibChat 9am - 4.30pm, Mon - Fri. Find LibChat on the library website.

Phone: +64 3 479 8910 Email: ask.library@otago.ac.nz

Contact your Subject Librarian for research and library related queries, available via email, phone, or by appointment.

Kate Knox, Phone: +64 3 479 8976 Email: kate.knox@otago.ac.nz

Study Smart

The Study Smart tab in Blackboard offers advice and links to services and resources to help you with your studies. It includes information about the Library, Student IT and the Student Learning Centre.

Student Learning Centre

The Student Learning Centre at the University of Otago provides support for students in reading, writing, study skills and note taking. Academic research and writing are specific skills they specialize in teaching at all levels. They even provide individual essay consultations and can assist with your grammar and essay planning. Check their website for information and contacts: <http://hedc.otago.ac.nz/hedc/sld.html>

Māori and Pacific Students

Politics Contact

Professor Janine Hayward is the Politics Programme's kaiawhina (support person) for Māori and Pacific Island students. Her contact details are: Room N5, 4th Floor, Burns/Arts Building, Email: janine.hayward@otago.ac.nz Tel: 03 479 8666

Humanities Division Contacts

Jovan Mocaraka and Ella Walsh are jointly the Kaiāwhina Māori – Māori Student Support – Officer for the Division of Humanities. Email: humanities.kaiawhina@otago.ac.nz
Tel: 479 8681.

Shivankar Nair is the Pacific Islands Students' Support Officer for the Division of Humanities. Email: pacificsupport.humanities@otago.ac.nz Tel: 479 9616.

Disability Support

If you have an impairment that affects your study in this paper, please inform Philip so he can make any adaptations in teaching and learning strategies and resources that may be necessary. If you are experiencing difficulty with your studies due to a disability, temporary or permanent impairment, injury, chronic illness or deafness, you may contact, in confidence, the University support staff to discuss adaptations in teaching and learning strategies and resources that may be helpful.

University Contact:

Disability Information and Support

Phone: 479 8235

Email: disabilities@otago.ac.nz

Website: <http://www.otago.ac.nz/disabilities>

Location: West Lane, Information Services Building

Support for International Students

Telephone: 0800 808 098

Email: international.support@otago.ac.nz

Website: www.otago.ac.nz/international

Location: North End of the Clocktower Building

1 March 2021

* * *