

BACHELOR'S THESIS EXAMINER REPORT
PPE – Bachelor's in Politics, Philosophy and Economics
Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University

Thesis title:	The Injustice of the Current Global Economic Order in the Light of Thomas Pogge's Argument from Negative Duties
Student's name:	Constantin Zeithammer
Referee's name:	Janusz Salamon

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Contribution and argument (quality of research and analysis, originality)	42	
	Research question (definition of objectives, plausibility of hypotheses)	13	
	Theoretical framework (methods relevant to the research question)	13	
<i>Total</i>		68	
Minor Criteria			
	Sources, literature	7	
	Presentation (language, style, cohesion)	4	
	Manuscript form (structure, logical coherence, layout, tables, figures)	4	
<i>Total</i>		15	
TOTAL		83	

Reviewer's commentary according to the above criteria:

Constantin Zeithammer wrote a good Bachelor's thesis which is, nevertheless, relatively modest in what it attempts to show (compared with some other Bachelor's theses written by students of the same study programme) and also not always entirely convincing in arguing what it aims to establish. What is commendable in Constantin's work is an in-depth critical analysis of the arguments of one of the most influential living theorists of global justice with the intent of complementing his approach which Constantin in principle approves of. What seems to be less obvious is whether the supposed main weakness that Constantin

identifies in Thomas Pogge's famous argument from the negative duties of justice can be plausible ascribe to Pogge. While Constantin is right that Pogge does assign negative duties of justice *also* to individuals, it does not necessarily follow that he does not assign negative duties to collectives (does at least implicitly making space for the collective action approach that Constantin advocates). So it is not that the approach that Constantine advocates is misguided and implausible, only that it seems to me that he is on the same page as Pogge more so than he suspects. Pogge's theory of justice is of an 'institutionalist' type (in which he is a faithful pupil of his doctoral supervisor, John Rawls) and so is his cosmopolitanism. What is primarily just or unjust for him (in the political sense of "justice") are constitutional or institutional 'regimes' (such as free trade agreements) generated by laws and rules (legislated nationally and transnationally), and it is the predictable harm occurring in such context that he is primarily having in mind when developing his theory of negative duties of justice across borders.

Having said that, Constantin in a helpful and convincing way applies the collective action approach to negative duties to the analysis of the economic data about the current state of global poverty he analyses (attempting to bring an interdisciplinary/PPE perspective to bear on his discussion which is in itself commendable).

On the other hand, judging by the list of References, the amount of reading he has done in the process of writing his thesis might helpful be more expansive.

Proposed grade (A-B-C-D-E-F): B

Suggested questions for the defence are:

- (1) The "problem of collective action" is one of the most difficult and widely discussed topics in social sciences. Given the sufficiently challenging problem of value pluralism that underlies the debate about global justice, wouldn't the problem of collective action that your interpretation of the arguments from negative duties of justice invite only aggravate the difficulties to generate global consensus regarding the duties of justice beyond borders?
- (2) Which of the criticisms of Pogge's political philosophy presented in the book *Thomas Pogge and His Critics* you found implausible?

I recommend the thesis for final defence.

**Janusz Salamon,
Ph.D.**

Digitally signed by Janusz
Salamon, Ph.D.
Date: 2022.06.06 22:05:23 +02'00'

Referee Signature

Overall grading scheme at FSV UK:

TOTAL POINTS	GRADE	Quality standard
91 – 100	A	= outstanding (high honor)
81 – 90	B	= superior (honor)
71 – 80	C	= good
61 – 70	D	= satisfactory
51 – 60	E	= low pass at a margin of failure
0 – 50	F	= failing. The thesis is not recommended for defence.