You have a choice between the following two topics. For each topic, you are to make normative arguments based on considerations of justice, morality, or ethics, without appealing to moral authorities to resolve the issues. The arguments, of course, will depend on proper consideration of the relevant facts:

A. The U.S. Senate has passed a bill on immigration reform, The “Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act,” or S. 744. The House of Representatives is currently working on its own immigration bills. The Senate bill includes allowing both the continued enforcement of national borders and a path for permanent residency and citizenship for some undocumented residents. In this paper you will consider whether or not the Senate bill is morally justifiable. You can focus on either the continued enforcement of borders or the path to permanent residence or you can include both. The paper will have four parts:

1. An introduction in which you give a summary of the relevant provisions of S. 744 (do not discuss parts of the bill that are irrelevant to your paper), state the issue that you will discuss, state the position that you will take on the issue, and give the reader an overview of the rest of the paper. You must do some research on S. 744 for this part of the paper and you must cite to the sources you use for your summary of the relevant provisions of the bill.
2. The strongest moral argument you can make in favor of the relevant provisions of S. 744. You should refer to at least one of the authors we have read in this course in making this argument.
3. The strongest moral argument you can make against that relevant provisions of S. 744. Again, you must refer to at least one of the authors we have read in this course.
4. A conclusion in which you explain your position, and reply to whichever of the previous arguments that your position conflicts with. Your goal is not to defeat your opponent, but only to explain why your position is a reasonable one in light of that opponent’s argument. Remember that a significant part of your grade will be based on the strength of the argument you make against your position.

B. Some theorists suggest that there should be a democratically elected world government with global jurisdiction and with global enforcement power. Singer and Held make proposals of this kind, though their proposals differ from each other. This paper will consider whether or not some version of a democratically elected world government is morally justifiable. It will have four parts:

1. An introduction in which you briefly summarize the position that you will defend in your paper. Your position should be either to support or oppose some kind of world government with global jurisdiction and with global enforcement power.
2. The strongest argument you can make in favor of some kind of world government with global jurisdiction and global enforcement power. You must describe the form of world government in enough detail that the reader will know what kind of institution you are discussing. In making this argument, you must refer to at least one of
the authors we have read in this course.

(3) The strongest argument you can make in opposition to a world government with global jurisdiction and global enforcement power. In making this argument, you must refer to at least one of the authors we have read in this course.

(4) A conclusion in which you explain your position and reply to whichever of the previous arguments your position conflicts with. Your goal is not to defeat your opponent, but only to explain why your position is a reasonable one in light of the opponent’s argument. Remember that a significant part of your grade will be based on the strength of the argument that you make against your position.