

Exam and examination guidelines autumn 2022.

1) Should states have the right to control immigration? Why (not)?

This is a complex question, and there are several adequate ways of answering it. It is good if the students make clear that the question is one where there are different, and seemingly strong and plausible claims on both sides. States have reasonable interests in controlling immigration into their territory, and (many) immigrants have reasonable claims for protection and/or resources needed for a decent life, and sometimes this is not available in their country of origin. It is fine, but not necessary to distinguish between immigrants and refugees (the latter enjoy protection in international law that the former lack).

The syllabus on immigration ethics encompasses several arguments for closed borders, including ones that refer to economy, security, state benefits, political functioning, jurisdiction, realism, and indirect cosmopolitanism. Arguments in favor of open borders also include several that center on collective self-determination for the (potentially) receiving state. Arguments from self-determination come in various forms. Some rest on the freedom of association, some on political institution, some on nationality, and some on democracy.

There are also several arguments in favor of open borders. Carens argues that the main theories of distributive justice (liberal egalitarianism, libertarianism, and utilitarianism) all (suitably interpreted) imply a commitment to open borders. On the syllabus, reference is also made to Abizadeh's claim that democracy, properly understood, implies that potential immigrants should be enfranchised on border control question in the potentially receiving state.

It is far from necessary that the students refer to all of these arguments. It is just as good to focus on just a few and write in more detail about them. There will be a tradeoff between breadth and depth here, and there are several reasonable ways of striking a balance. Precision, reflection and argument should be rewarded. A lack thereof will result in lower grades.

It is worth noting that in one of the other lectures, the students have been exposed to general justifications for (broadly Lockean and Kantian) territorial rights, *including* rights to immigration control. It is perfectly fine, but not necessary, to draw on this part of the course.

2) "'The people' are not smart enough to rule themselves: experts should govern". Critically evaluate and discuss this statement.

This question can be tackled from the perspective of domestic and international politics. A good answer will link the topic to theories in democratic theory, contemporary justice theories, or the just war tradition. The strong intuition should reflect the facts that individuals have some moral/democratic rights to self-governance, while noting that (some) experts may have superior epistemic knowledge. The question then is how to assign relative weights between these positions in the formation of public policy at the domestic and international level.

The syllabus assigned provides much fodder on these points. It tackles foundational questions concerning: a) the nature of knowledge in public policy, b) theories of epistemic knowledge in society; c) the relationship between expert knowledge and democratic theory; d) potential justice-based claims concerning expert domination; and e) expertise in evaluating warfare/humanitarian intervention.

Strong answers will pick up on *at least one* of these strands and make reference to relevant literature in the syllabus. This could be at the level of domestic of international/transnational concerns, including: how states embed experts in decision-making; b) the grounds of expertise in theoretical terms related to justice or democracy; the relationship between experts and the legitimacy of international organizations, d) institutional authority and justice-based outcomes; or the ways experts impact decisions to go to – and/or – influence international intervention.

Students need not display knowledge of all these points. It is, however, important to explain one (or more) of these points, explain the tension between expertise and citizen rights, unpack the tension with one or more theory, and apply an argument to one or more relevant case(s)/example(s). A lack of invocation of these points will result in lower grades.

If students wish to draw on other theories – including post-structuralist ones – that is also fine, though not necessary as they have only been tangential to the course.