

IR 205/STS 212

Ethics, Technology, and International Relations

Prof. Robert McGinn
Office: 370/109; tel.: 5-0117; fax: 725-5389
mcginn@Stanford.edu
Spring Quarter, 2006
Thursdays, 2:15-4:05 PM

I. Course Purpose

The purpose of the course is threefold: to expose students to a broad range of ethical issues raised by developments in international relations, to critically analyze competing points of view on an intellectually challenging subset of these issues, and, most generally and importantly, to help students acquire and develop skill in utilizing a framework of core concepts and related principles useful for illuminating the ethical dimension of conflicts in the arena of international relations.

Note: since the class will be run as a seminar and regular class participation is expected, enrollment in IR 205/STS 212 will be limited to 20 students.

II. Course Readings

1. R. McGinn, ed., *IR 205/STS 212 Course Reader* (Stanford Custom Publishing, 2006).
2. M. Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2005).
3. T. Athanasiou and P. Baer, *Dead Heat: Global Justice and Global Warming* (Seven Stories Press: New York, 2002).

III. Calendar of Topics and Assignments

Th 4/6 Week 1: Introduction to the Course

Topics: 1. introduction to the course
2. some basic questions

Readings: 1. Gelb, L. and Rosenthal, "The Rise of Ethics in Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2003, 2-7.

2. McGinn, R., "Ethical Issues Faced By Water Professionals," in C. Davis and R. McGinn, eds., *Navigating Rough Waters: Ethical Issues in the Water Industry* (American Water Works Association: Denver, 2001), 17-38.

Note: these two articles are to be read after the first class meeting.

Th 4/13 Week 2: Key Course Concepts: Liberty, Justice, and Rights

Topics: 1. Liberty
2. Justice
3. Human rights
4. Sovereignty

Readings: 1. Donnelly, J., "Theories of Human Rights," from his *International Human Rights*, (Westview: Boulder, 1998), 18-35.

2. Donnelly, J., "The Social Construction of International Human Rights," from T. Dunne and N. Wheeler, eds., *Human Rights in Global Politics* (Cambridge U. Press: Cambridge, 1999), 71-102.

3. Follesdal, A., "Human Rights and Relativism"
(http://www.etikk.no/globaljustice/papers/GJ2003_Follesdal_Human_Rights_and_Relativism.doc)

4. Pogge, T., "What Is Global Justice?"
(http://www.etikk.no/globaljustice/Pogge_Introductory_Lecture.doc)

5. Pogge, T., "The First UN Millenium Development Goal"
(http://www.etikk.no/globaljustice/oslo_Global_Justice_mainlecture.doc)

Th 4/20 Week 3: The Ethics of War I

Topics: 1. Just War Theory
2. "Preventive War"
3. The War in Iraq₂

Readings: 1. B. Orend, "War," *Stanford Online Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/>.

2. Walzer, M., "The Right Way," *New York Review of Books*, March 13, 2003.

3. Roundtable: *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring 2003.

- a. Lang, A., "Evaluating the Preemptive Use of Force"
- b. Brown, C., "Self-Defense in an Imperfect World"
- c. Byers, M., "Letting the Exception Prove the Rule"
- d. Betts, R., "Striking First: A History of Thankfully Lost Opportunities"
- e. Nichols, T., "Just War, Not Prevention"
- f. Crawford, N., "The Slippery Slope to Preventive War"

4. Schroeder, P., "Iraq: The Case Against Preemptive War," *The American Conservative* (www.amconmag.com/10_21/iraq.html)

Th 4/27 Week 4: The Ethics of War II

Topic: 1. Humanitarian Intervention
2. The War in Kosovo

Readings: 1. Coady, C. A. J., "The Ethics of Armed Humanitarian Intervention," *Peaceworks*, No. 45, United States Institute of Peace, July 2002, 5-46.

2. Lango, John W., "Is Armed Humanitarian Intervention to Stop Mass Killing Morally Obligatory?" *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Vol. 15, No. 3, July 2001, 173-191.

3. Mertus, Julie A., "Legitimizing the Use of Force in Kosovo," *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (April), 133-152.

Th 5/4 Week 5: The Ethics of War III

Topics: 1. war against terrorism

Readings: 1. M. Ignatieff, *The Lesser Evil* (all).

Th 5/11 Week 6: Climate (May 11)

Topics: 1. ozone layer depletion
2. global warming

Readings: 1. T. Athanasiou and P. Baer, *Dead Heat: Global Justice and Global Warming* (all)

2. Jamieson, D., "Ethics and Intentional Climate Change," *Climate Science*, Vol. 33, 1996, 323-336

Th 5/18 Week 7: Foreign Aid

Topics: 1. health care
2. AIDS
3. technology transfer

Readings: 1. Mittendorff, R., "Primim Non Nocere: Implications for the Globalization of Biomedical Research Trials," *Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Summer 2001, 239-253

2. Harris, Paul, and Siplon, Patricia, "International Obligation and Human Health: Evolving Policy Responses to HIV/AIDS," *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 2001, 29-52.

3. Singer, Peter, "Famine, Affluence, and Morality," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vo. 1, 1972, 229-243 [revised ed.]

4. Collingwood, V., "Assistance With Fewer Strings Attached," *Ethics and International Affairs*, 2003, 55-67

5. *New York Times* Staff, "The Bhopal Disaster," January 28, 30, 31, and February 3, 1985.

6. T. Pogge, "World Poverty and Human Rights," *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2005.

Th 5/25 Week 8: Border Control and Cultural Issues

Topics: 1. immigration
2. tourism
3. repatriation of cultural patrimony
4. controversial cultural practices of immigrant ethnic groups

Readings: 1. Carens, Joseph, "Who Should Get In? The Ethics of Immigration Decisions," *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spring 2003).

2. Lea, John, "Tourism Development Ethics in the Third World," *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 20, 1993, 701-715.

3. Prosser, Robert F., "The Ethics of Tourism," in D. Cooper and J. Palmer, eds., *THE ENVIRONMENT IN QUESTION* (NY: Routledge, 1992), 37-50

4. Merryman, John, "Thinking About the Elgin Marbles," in *Thinking About the Elgin Marbles: Critical Essays on Cultural Property, Art, and Law* (Kluwer: 2000), pp. 24-63, reprinted with permission from the *Michigan Law Review*, August 1985, Vol. 83, No. 8, pp. 1881-1923.

5. Dugger, C., "Developing Lands Hit Hardest by 'Brain Drain'," *New York Times*, October 25, 2005.

6. Scolino, Elaine, "Ban on Religious Apparel Advances in France," *New York Times*, February 10, 2004.

Th 6/1 Week 9: Presentations, Group I

Topics: First set of in-class presentations

Note well: articles to be read beforehand to be handed out by presenters in week 8

Th 6/8 Week 10: Presentations, Group II

Topics: Second set of in-class presentations

Note well: articles to be read beforehand to be handed out by presenters in week 9

IV. Grading

- Participation in Seminar: 40%
- Weekly questions: 25%
- Presentation: 35%
- Presentation-related paper (10%)

V. Comments on the Grade Components

- a. Participation (40%)

You are expected to attend each class, to have completed all assigned readings, and to have done so in such a way that you are able to participate in seminar discussions in a thoughtful way.

b. Weekly questions (25%)

Except for the first week and the last two weeks of the course, by 9 PM on the Wednesday before the weekly Thursday meeting, each student will mail the instructor two (2) probing questions that he or she has formulated about one or more of the week's assigned readings and that the student believes it would be useful or fruitful to explore in class. **One question should be of a general nature and pertain to the week's assigned readings as a whole, while the other question should be of a more specific nature and concern one specific assigned reading for the next day's session.** The student's grade on this component of the class will depend on the quality of the questions he or she formulates and submits. Each week the instructor will choose a few the best questions submitted and bring them to the attention of the class for exploration at the next day's meeting.

c. In-class Presentation (25%)

The seminar will culminate with in-class student presentations (weeks 9 and 10). Class members will be organized into pairs. Each students duo is to select a specific, intellectually rich article published after September 1, 2003, in some scholarly journal or, if necessary, intellectually serious magazine. **Newspaper articles are presumptively unacceptable.** The article must involve some noteworthy phenomenon of or development, trend, practice, or policy in international relations – probably but not absolutely necessarily involving technology in a central way (technology could be indirectly involved) -- that the student believes raises an *important, intriguing, challenging, non-obvious, and non-hackneyed ethical issue* not covered in the course. (If in doubt about whether your proposed issue satisfies this characterization, as the instructor.) To maximize intellectual payoff, the ethical issue chosen for analysis should be one about which the student duo have not made their minds. Each student pair should be sure to run its idea for a presentation topic by the instructor by the end of week 6.

Each duo is to make a well-organized, 15-minute, in-class presentation on the chosen ethical issue. During the presentation the student should...

-- convey the crucial foreground and background factual aspects of the issue raised or covered in the chosen article, insofar as they are not obvious from the article handed out to the class for prior reading (see below);

-- indicate why it is believed that an *ethical* issue is in fact raised in the situation described in the article and why the duo regards that issue as intriguing and challenging;

-- illuminate the chosen ethical issue by subjecting it to *probing critical analysis*. In so doing, at least some of the following should be addressed: key concepts involved in the debate over the issue, criteria used to apply key concepts/terms, presuppositions held or principles invoked by various parties to the dispute, pertinent “patients” (= affected parties or stakeholders) and their respective “protectable interests” that are or are not taken into consideration by one or the other side of the debate on the issue in question, and the key arguments deployed by the disputants; and,

-- finally, in light of the foregoing, the student duo should indicate where it stands on the issue dispute in question *and why*; however, if the duo members disagree in the ethical positions they take and cannot overcome their differences – a quite acceptable outcome -- they may make that clear and explain it in their presentations and indicate what they see as the key source(s) of their difference in views.

Each duo must make photocopies of its article: two for itself, one for each of the other students in the class, and one for the instructor. The articles must be distributed in class no later than *the class meeting before the duo’s talk is scheduled*. Consult with the instructor to see if you have selected an appropriate article, i.e., one in which a noteworthy ethical issue is in fact raised and one such that, by virtue of the coverage given the issue in the article, lends itself to the kind of probing critical analysis required in class. What is **imperative** for this assignment is that the student adroitly/deftly “unpack” the chosen ethical issue and make a serious effort to convince the rest of the class, including the instructor, that the probing critical analysis the student carried out on that issue contributes to reaching a more compelling normative ethical judgment or position on the issue in question.

d. Presentation-related paper (10%)

Each duo must submit a written report of 1000-1250 words describing the case studied and relating the most important ethics lesson(s) it extracted from its analysis of the case.