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Preliminaries

The starting point of the paper is the frequent ascription of moral duties to states, especially in the context of problems of global justice. It is widely assumed that industrialized or wealthy countries in particular have a moral obligation or duties of justice to shoulder (financial) burdens of poverty reduction or climate change adaptation and mitigation. But can collectives such as states actually hold moral duties? If answering this affirmatively: what does it actually mean to say that a state has moral obligations or duties of justice? In this paper I argue that states can be considered collective (institutional) agents which can hold moral duties. If a collective (for example a state) holds moral duties this entails duties for its individual members. I show how depending on their position within the collective these duties differ.

At this point, it is important to clarify my use of the term moral duty or moral obligation. In moral philosophy, there exists an extensive debate about collective moral responsibility (E.g. French 1979 & 1984, Held 1970, May 1987 & 1992, S. Miller 2001, D. Miller 2004), which also covers the problem of collective moral agency. This debate often lacks a clear distinction between retrospective responsibility and prospective responsibility. Yet the debate mainly focuses on retrospective responsibility, that is, it focuses on assigning accountability for outcomes if these have not been brought about by an individual agent, but by group agents such as organizations and corporations. In this paper, I am not concerned with the question of (retrospective) collective moral responsibility, but with the question of (prospective) collective responsibility, meaning collective moral duties, or collective moral obligations. While the former refers to a collective agent’s accountability for certain outcomes of actions or omissions in the past on the basis of which blame or praise can be ascribed, and is in this sense retrospective, the latter refers to moral imperatives. On the other hand, to have a moral duty or a moral obligation means that one is morally required to act in a certain way. In contrast to responsibility, the allocation of duties is prospective in character. While the problem of collective responsibility in the retrospective sense has been examined in great detail over many decades, there are few contributions so far to the field of collective moral duties (the exceptions being Cripps 2010, May 1992, Murphy 2003, Schlothöffer 2009, Schwenkenheuer 2011, Wringe 2005, Young 2006) which is why it will concern us in this paper.

Obviously, the bigger and the more complex the problem, the greater is the demand for collective action and the more convincing is the claim that corresponding moral duties are collective in character. This applies above all to moral duties of a global dimension. Many philosophers argue that citizens of wealthier or industrialized countries have positive duties to assist citizens of poorer countries and, possibly duties to save the lives of persons who because of the economic and political situation in these countries are in danger of dying from disease, undernourishment or starvation. In this paper I simply assume that such (cosmopolitan) moral duties can be successfully established. That is, I take it for granted that we do not only have obligations towards those in our proximity, such as family members, friends, and compatriots, but also towards people living far away (though these duties may be significantly diminished in contrast to the duties towards those who are close to us). However, while some cosmopolitans, such as Peter Singer, ascribe such moral duties (mostly) to individuals, this paper explores the possibility of ascribing these duties to collectives, in particular to states.

1. States as Holders of Collective Duties

A number of authors (among them Erskine 2001 & 2010, D. Miller 2004, Runciman 2004, Wringe 2010) have argued in favour of considering states moral agents and potential holders of moral duties, invoking different criteria for moral agency. In the following I will look at one of these accounts endorsed by Toni Erskine. I will point out one problem with her approach and suggest a possible amendment.

According to Erskine, a ‘collectivity’ is a candidate for moral agency if it has a) An identity that is more than the sum of the identities of its constitutive parts and, therefore, does not rely on a determinate membership; b) A decision-making structure; c) An executive function linked to the decision-making structure; d) An identity over time; e) A conception of itself as a unit.

She considers collectives possessing these characteristics ‘institutional moral agents’. (Erskine 2010, 264f). It is important to note that to Erskine the morally

---

1 One might distinguish moral obligations or duties from forward-looking, hence prospective, moral responsibility, as for example Iris Young does (Young 2004: 379). She argues that “responsibility differs from duty in being more outcome oriented” and in allowing for (more) discretion. I agree that such a distinction can be made, yet I will not resort to it here but simply use duty and obligation in this wider sense as relating to outcomes and not only prescribing particular actions.

2 I will use the terms ‘duty’ and ‘obligation’ synonymously.

3 See for example Singer (2009) The life you can save: acting now to end world poverty. Random House. Admittedly, Singer has also argued repeatedly for the necessity of institutional changes and does not only advocate for individual action. Yet, I think it is fair to say that he particularly emphasizes individual action and individual duties to combat the problem of world poverty.
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 responsible agent is the collectivity: “[...] prescriptions for action might be misdirected if they are targeted at the group’s component membership rather than at the institution itself.” (Erskine 2001, 73).

Erskine’s ascription of (a particular kind of) moral agency to the above characterized kind of institutional agents is convincing. If a collective can act as a group – including forming collective goals (that are the goals of their action as a collective, not of individual actions) and acting according to these goals – it should be considered capable of collective action. If it furthermore possesses procedures or mechanisms of moral reflection and the ability to act upon the results of such moral reasoning, it can be considered (a particular kind of) moral agent. The kind of moral agency collective agents have may well differ from the kind of moral agency we ascribed to individual persons. In particular ‘moral emotions’ – such as shame, guilt, and empathy – are missing in collective agents. However, the (limited) moral agency collective agents can hold suffices to (at least) ascribe moral duties to them.

Even though I agree with Erskine’s argument by and large, there are two problematic points. First, I hold that a collective can have some form of moral agency and thus moral duties even if it does not meet all the conditions Erskine lists. Second, it remains unclear what it means to say that a collective is itself holding a moral duty as opposed to its members. As to the first problem, it can be argued that groups without the above listed characteristics that Erskine defends can be collective agents and have moral obligations. This criticism is not actually decisive for the issue of states as holders of moral duties, which is why I will not pursue it here.

The second suggested improvement brings us closer to the very heart of the question what it means for a state – or a collective in general – to be a moral agent. Erksine’s account does not clarify what it means to say that the collective duties are duties of the collective itself rather than a duty of its members. This claim generates a somewhat artificial distinction between a collective and its members. If a collective’s duties were entirely distinct from those of its members, we would face a gap in moral accountability and in moral motivation. If a collective could hold moral duties in a way that results in no moral duties for its individual members, this would leave us with no one to hold accountable and with no agent who could feel morally motivated to put things right. I agree with Erskine that the collective duty should attach to the collective, and not its members. But I argue that such collective duties necessarily entail corresponding moral duties for its members. The collective, it appears, can only hold moral duties because it is capable of collective action, i.e. more than just aggregate actions, and because it consists of individual members who hold corresponding individual (contributory) duties.

It is important to note that what is being said here about collective moral duties may not be valid for (retrospective) collective moral responsibility. If retrospectively establishing responsibility and accountability for a particular outcome that has been brought about by collective action, it may well be that the responsibility attaches to the collective itself and does not entail partial (retrospective) responsibility for its members. This is, however, a different problem and will not be discussed here. At this point I will instead turn to one of the issues Erskine does not cover, namely the link between duty-holding collectives and the individuals who constitute the collective.

2. Differing contributory duties

As previously indicated, moral duties or duties of justice ascribed to states are not independent of moral duties of the individuals represented by these institutions or the individuals constituting this state or its institutions, i.e. its citizens, officials, public servants, etc. And finally, it is individuals who must bring about the outcome that the duty refers to, and it is individual agents who must be blamed if that outcome is not achieved. Moral duties held by a collective – for example a state – entail moral duties for individuals that are part of that collective, both occupants of institutional roles (such as politicians) and persons with no institutional role. I call these entailed duties contributory duties. Role occupants have been assigned particular (professional) duties to discharge those collective moral duties. Professional duties entail contributory moral duties, but the latter may extend beyond the former. Also, individuals with no institutional role may well hold contributory duties with regard to a collective duty of their state. I suggest three criteria for determining the magnitude of an individual agent’s or sub-group’s contributory duty to a collective duty: capacity, moral correlation, and commitments of oneself and other agents:

**Capacity:** The first criterion that influences how much an agent within a collective must contribute to the collective duty is the agent’s capacity. The capacity can depend on how much power or influence over the outcome the agent has. But it also depends simply on the agent’s abilities. The more power or influence an individual agent has or the more she is capable of discharging a duty due to her particular abilities, the larger her contributory duty. This criterion clearly establishes stronger contributory duties for those members of a collective who hold an institutional role. This does not mean that those individuals who are decision makers or functionaries in corporate or institutional structures have to draw on their own financial resources to discharge a moral duty of compensation, for example. But it is they who have to trigger institutional responses to the duty and who have to ensure that these responses satisfy the respective moral demands.5

---

4 It could, however, have interesting implications for the question whether or not the international community or groups of states can hold moral duties.

5 Iris Marion Young in her 2006 article “Responsibility and global justice: a social connection model” lists “power” as one of the factors along which individuals should decide over the magnitude of their duties. The problem with how this factor is framed in Young’s approach is that on the one hand it appears to serve to determine which agents political campaigners should focus on in order to bring about changes, but on the other hand it has been introduced as determining how an agent should decide for herself about possible engagement in combating injustices. However, in the context of this section, it is only useful to understand it in this second sense.
In this paper I have shown that states can be considered moral agents in the global sphere and can hold moral obligations. To say that a state has a moral duty ultimately means that its members, politicians, public servants and ordinary citizens have duties to contribute, achieve individual and collective outcomes, and their commitments he can make to the other contributing individual agents he has made.

However, this means that its members, politicians, public servants and ordinary citizens, have duties to contribute to achieving the collective outcome, his or her moral correlation to the problem that generated the moral duty, and the individual capacities of its members to influence the collective outcome. The second criterion that influences the magnitude of the moral correlation of the agent to the problem is whether the agent has a moral duty, and the other contributing individual agents have made.

The first concerns the external conditions that have to be in place for an agent to be ascribed moral duties. As Erskine in her 2001 “States and Quasi-States” article rightly pointed out, some states are so restricted in their actions, that they lack capacities to comply with moral demands. They need to weigh competing claims against each other and decide which obligation they spend their energy on. It will then be another matter to determine whether or not a particular state has done enough to address a certain duty.

Furthermore, just like with any other moral agent, states have limited capacities to comply with moral demands. They need to weigh competing claims against each other and decide which obligation they spend their energy on. It will then be another matter to determine whether or not a particular state has done enough to address a certain duty.

Another concern is that of competing duties and how to establish which one to give priority. I cannot go into detail on the question here, but in the context of collective obligations it is worth mentioning a suggestion made by Iris Marion Young in her 2003 article “Responsibility and Social Connection” in the issue of the virtue of the moral agent. Young argues that the relative priority with which people make competing claims to moral demands, Young argues that the relative priority with which people make competing claims to moral demands is a matter of debate whether or not a particular duty has been fulfilled. This is not the case when one has unmet moral duties. However, if the agent has unmet moral duties, then the question of priority arises. Young argues that the relative priority with which people make competing claims to moral demands is a matter of debate whether or not a particular duty has been fulfilled. This is not the case when one has unmet moral duties.
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