

Conceptualising Global Justice

Workshop, GLOBUS project - Reconsidering European Contributions to Global Justice
19-20 January 2017, Gabelshus Hotel, Gabels gate 16, Oslo

In this workshop we discuss how to make sense of the EU's putative contribution to a rightful world order, against the backdrop of the broader theoretical debate on global justice. The classic assumption of international politics is that governments' duties to human beings stop at the borders of their own state. However, increased flows of migration, climate change, changing patterns of trade, and security risks, challenge borders and affect peoples' interests without regard for their status or citizenship. In this context there is a rise in claims to justice at the global level, as well as a growing realization that there may after all be a context of justice beyond the state. Still, what is just is contested. And, there is no agreement on how claims to justice beyond borders should be met. Ongoing crises in Syria and Ukraine, and the responses they have triggered from external actors, testify to the contestation over key questions such as what kinds of actors should be recognized as rightful claimants of justice at the international arena (states or citizens) - and on what grounds? As justice claims become embroiled with power relations and constrained by unequal competences and the prevailing 'system of states', these crises are at the same time reminders of the political and structural challenges to global justice.

The GLOBUS project delineates three different conceptions of global justice – *as non-dominance, impartiality and mutual recognition*. These conceptions prioritise differently with regard to main concerns of justice. They provide alternative readings of key dilemmas that arise in the international system and how they may be solved, as well as what would be feasible or desirable with reference to the structures of international order. In this workshop we discuss how these concepts should be understood, as well as to what extent they adequately capture the normative and practical dilemmas that arise beyond state borders. We pay particular attention to the European Union, and the question of how the three conceptions of global justice can be specified and developed as analytical tools to study the EU's global role.

The EU may, due to its supranational legal and institutional system, be considered to embody the idea that solutions to practical problems cannot be solved at the national level. Yet, we do not know that much about what specific dimensions of global justice are prioritized by the EU or about how its principled commitment to justice is translated into concrete policies. The overall conception of justice that it subscribes to in the Treaties, may take on different mutations with reference to different substantive issues. In practice, its policies in some issue areas, for example migration, also suggest that there are clear limits to the kinds of responsibilities it is willing to take on behalf of human beings outside its own borders.

While there is increasing recognition that there is a context of justice beyond the state, there are also countervailing trends. They manifest themselves for example in the arguments of the newly elected president of the United States, whose approach to international issues seem to rest on a conception of justice that is akin to mutual advantage.

Not surprisingly questions of distributive justice have often been the main focus in debates on global justice. Global economic inequalities are major sources of injustice. However, rather than discussing what would be a fair distribution, the three conceptions of justice that constitute the starting point of the GLOBUS project concern themselves with the underlying *political* question of how decisions on distribution are made and who actually makes them. They point our attention to the underlying structures of power within the global system, and the different prioritisations that might be made in terms on how challenges to global justice might be settled, and by whom.

As outlined in the first paper in the GLOBUS research paper series (Eriksen 2016), the first concept - *non-domination* - rests on the recognition that states remain the main actors in global politics. States may often be the cause of injustices, yet, given their status as legally constituted communities, they are also key to resolving issues of injustice. The second conception of *justice as impartiality* emphasises the need to find some sort of neutral, unbiased solution, that may in principle be seen as justifiable from the perspective of all. It points towards a Universalist, Kantian, solution to problems of injustice/dominance. This conception does not require to 'do away with' states, but rather to ensure international procedures and structures that give individuals the key status as rightful claimants of justice. The conception of *justice as mutual recognition* pertains to the need for procedures to be shaped in a manner that takes heed of the (identities) difference and voice of all involved.

Papers in this workshop will address the conceptual and normative debate on global political justice, the status and relevance of different conceptions of global political justice for international politics, and the specific relevance and applicability of different conceptions of global political justice as analytical tools for understanding and assessing the EU's external policies.

Conceptualising Global Justice

Workshop, GLOBUS project - *Reconsidering European Contributions to Global Justice*
19-20 January 2017, [Gabelshus Hotel](#), Gabels gate 16, Oslo

Programme

Thursday 19 January

- 09:00** Welcome and introduction
Helene Sjursen
- 09:15** Three conceptions of global justice
Erik O. Eriksen
Comments: Barbara Buckinx
- 10:15** Three conceptions of climate justice
Alexa Zellentin
Comments: Kjartan Koch Mikalsen
- 11:15** Coffee
- 11:30** Trade, development and social justice in Africa – some preliminary thoughts
Pundy Pillay
Comments: Sonia Lucarelli
- 12:30** Brexit, historical responsibility and the legitimacy of withdrawals from the European Union. Are there any implications for global justice?
Christopher Lord
Comments: Pundy Pillay
- 13:15** *Lunch*
- 14:30** Justice in foreign policy: the case of the EU
Helene Sjursen
Comments: Alexa Zellentin
- 15:30** European definitions of migration and their implications in terms of justice: preliminary evaluations
Sonia Lucarelli and Michela Ceccorulli
Comments: Erik O. Eriksen
- 16:30** The irrelevance of history: in defense of a pure functionalist theory of territorial jurisdiction
Kjartan Koch Mikalsen
Comments: Christopher Lord
- 17:30** *End of session*
- 19:00** *Dinner (common departure from the hotel at 18:45)*
[Mares](#), Skovveien 1

Friday 20 January

- 09:00** **Foreign policy and domination: Burden sharing in the ongoing refugee crisis**
Barbara Buckinx
Comments: Espen D. H. Olsen
- 10:00** **The relevance of Rawls' late political liberalism**
Silje Aambø Langvatn
Comments: Kjartan Koch Mikalsen
- 11:00** *Coffee*
- 11:30** **Law, recognition and global Justice**
Lars Blichner
Comments: Thomas Diez
- 12:30** *Lunch*
- 13:30** **Justice and the EU's security strategy**
Nikola Tomic and Ben Tonra
Comments: John Erik Fossum
- 14:30** *Coffee*
- 14:45** **The EU's green diplomacy**
Mai'a K. Davis Cross
Comments: Ben Tonra
- 15:45** **Two dimensions of global justice claims**
Thomas Diez
Comments: Mai'a K. Davis Cross
- 16:45** *End of workshop*
- 17:00** **GLOBUS Executive Board meeting**
- 19:30** *Dinner (common departure from the hotel at 19:00)*
[*Skur 33, Akersbusstranda 11*](#)