

**ON KOSKO'S ACCOUNT OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION**

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF D.  
Phil

*CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY, POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT*

By Serhiy Pukas

***Supervisors:***

János Kis  
Nenad Dimitrijevic  
Laszlo Kontler

Budapest, 2005

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My supervisor, Janos Kis, was the person who invited and encouraged me to write a dissertation. My chosen topic was the problem of political obligation. As a true teacher and friend, Janos guided me through my first stages. Only he and Heaven know how floundering those first steps were. At the critical moment Janos gave me a present - a copy of Klosko's *The Principle of Fairness and Political Obligations*. First I continued to struggle towards formulating a unified Dworkinian-Waldronian theory of political obligation. But at some moment it dawned on me that many ideas of mine were directly applicable to Klosko's rendering of the fairness principle. Soon I discovered how much I could say about Klosko's theory and this theory became the focal point of my thesis.

The debt I owe to Janos Kis is limitless. I hope my further work in political philosophy will constitute a kind of repayment: with deep appreciation I will try to faithfully follow his directives and suggestions.

Special acknowledgments go to Nenad Dimitrijevic, without whose generous help, insightful suggestions, and useful guidelines this dissertation would never have come to light. I am happy I encountered him on my path of life. People such like Nenad give us an example which we should aspire to reach.

My work would have been in much worse shape if I had not received discerning comments from Laszlo Kontler, Lorand Ambrus-Lakatos, Andras Bragyova, Judit Sandor, and Alexander Astrov. To all of them I express my profound gratitude.

I have had a privilege to meet and work with Govert den Hartogh, Gijs van Donselaar and Dorota Mokrosinska at the University of Amsterdam. I thank them all for their genial support, critical remarks, and cordial exhortations.

I am grateful to my colleagues and friends Andras Miklos, Attila Tanyi, Ruzja Smilova, Greg Bognar and Neven Petrovic for their helpful comments on parts of the manuscript. Thanks are also due to Carol Harrington for helping me edit the text.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to George Klosko, without whose theory this thesis would, of course, not have been written. I truly appreciated his perceptive criticism at the final stage of writing. Few scholars of his caliber ever condescend to read writings produced by such beginners as I am. It is really kind of him that he has become interested in my work and has invariably been supportive of my endeavors.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	2
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION .....	6
SECTION 1.1. WHAT THE DISSERTATION IS ABOUT .....	6
SECTION 1.2. MORAL DUTIES AND OBLIGATIONS .....	9
SECTION 1.3. THE STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION .....	15
<b>PART I. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS</b>	
CHAPTER 2. DELINEATING POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS .....	19
SECTION 2.1. DEFINITION .....	19
SECTION 2.2. THE CORRELATIVITY THESIS .....	20
SECTION 2.3. WHOM ARE POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS OWED TO? .....	23
SECTION 2.4. CONTENT-INDEPENDENCE .....	24
SECTION 2.5. THE PARTICULARITY REQUIREMENT .....	29
SECTION 2.6. THE GENERALITY REQUIREMENT .....	31
SECTION 2.7. STRINGENCY OF POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS .....	31
SECTION 2.8. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PEOPLE .....	32
SECTION 2.9. CONFLICT BETWEEN MORAL AND PRUDENTIAL REASONS .....	33
SECTION 2.10. THE PRIMA FACIE NATURE OF POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS .....	35
SECTION 2.11. THE MEANING OF 'POLITICAL' .....	37
SECTION 2.12. THE CONSENT THEORY .....	40
SECTION 2.13. VOLUNTARINESS .....	44
SECTION 2.14. CONCLUSIONS .....	45
<b>PART II. KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT AND THE OBJECTIONS IT CAN WITHSTAND</b>	
CHAPTER 3. KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT OF THE FAIRNESS PRINCIPLE .....	46
SECTION 3.1. INTRODUCTION .....	46
SECTION 3.2. WHAT IS KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT ABOUT? .....	47
SECTION 3.3. THE CONDITION OF ACCEPTANCE .....	49
SECTION 3.4. FREE-RIDING .....	49
SECTION 3.5. THE LIMITING ARGUMENT .....	50
SECTION 3.6. SCHEMES THAT SATISFY THE ACCEPTANCE CONDITION .....	51
SECTION 3.7. KLOSKO'S CONTENTION .....	53
SECTION 3.8. PRESUMPTIVELY BENEFICIAL GOODS .....	56
SECTION 3.9. WELLMAN'S OBJECTION .....	57
SECTION 3.10. THE APPEAL OF THE NOTION OF PRESUMPTIVE GOODS .....	60
SECTION 3.11. NOZICK'S OBJECTION .....	62
SECTION 3.12. REBUTTAL OF NOZICK'S OBJECTION .....	64
SECTION 3.13. KLOSKO'S COUNTER-OBJECTION TO NOZICK'S CONCLUSIONS .....	66
SECTION 3.14. TAKING STOCK .....	67
SECTION 3.15. ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT .....	68
CHAPTER 4. OBJECTIONS TO KLOSKO'S THEORY: THE FIRST CONDITION OBJECTION .....	70
SECTION 4.1. OBJECTIONS TO KLOSKO'S THEORY .....	70
SECTION 4.2. WOLFF'S OBJECTION .....	73
SECTION 4.3. THE FIRST REASON .....	75
SECTION 4.4. THE SECOND REASON .....	76
SECTION 4.5. THE ENFORCEABILITY REASON .....	81
SECTION 4.6. THE FIRST CONDITION OBJECTION .....	83
SECTION 4.7. SUMMARY .....	84
CHAPTER 5. THE DISCRETIONARY GOOD OBJECTION .....	85
SECTION 5.1. WHY BOTHER ABOUT DISCRETIONARY GOODS? .....	85
SECTION 5.2. MEETING THE DISCRETIONARY GOOD CHALLENGE .....	86
SECTION 5.3. WHAT I WILL DO NEXT .....	88

<i>SECTION 5.4. THE INDIRECT ARGUMENT</i> .....	89
<i>SECTION 5.5. 'NON-TRANSITIVITY OF OBLIGATIONS' OBJECTION</i> .....	91
<i>SECTION 5.6. THE INSTITUTIONAL ARGUMENT</i> .....	95
<i>SECTION 5.7. THE BAD HABIT ARGUMENT</i> .....	101
<i>SECTION 5.8. AN INTERMEDIATE SUMMING-UP</i> .....	104
<i>SECTION 5.9. THE PACKAGE ARGUMENT</i> .....	106
CHAPTER 6. SIMMONS'S OBJECTIONS .....	111
<i>SECTION 6.1. INTRODUCTION</i> .....	111
<i>SECTION 6.2. CONGRUENCE IN UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE FAIR PLAY PRINCIPLE</i> .....	112
<i>SECTION 6.3. THE FIRST OBJECTION (A STATE IS NOT A COOPERATIVE COMMUNITY)</i> .....	113
<i>SECTION 6.4. THE EMPIRICAL MATTER</i> .....	118
<i>SECTION 6.5. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RULES</i> .....	119
<i>SECTION 6.6. FORCED COOPERATION</i> .....	122
<i>SECTION 6.7. THE SECOND OBJECTION (FRESH WATER IS A PRESUMPTIVE GOOD)</i> .....	126
<i>SECTION 6.8. THE THIRD OBJECTION (COERCIVE PROHIBITION OF ALTERNATIVE PROVISION)</i> ....	130
<i>SECTION 6.9. THE FOURTH OBJECTION (OPTIONAL GOODS?)</i> .....	133
CHAPTER 7. THE PRESUMPTIVELY BENEFICIAL GOOD OBJECTION .....	137
<i>SECTION 7.1. SPECIFYING WHAT I AM UP TO</i> .....	137
<i>SECTION 7.2. THE NEED INTERPRETATION</i> .....	138
<i>SECTION 7.3. NEEDS AND WANTS</i> .....	139
<i>SECTION 7.4. MORAL REASONS INVOLVED IN THE NEED INTERPRETATION</i> .....	140
<i>SECTION 7.5. THE PREFERENCE INTERPRETATION</i> .....	141
<i>SECTION 7.6. KIS'S CONCLUSION</i> .....	146
<i>SECTION 7.7. REMARKS AVAILABLE TO KLOSKO</i> .....	146
<i>SECTION 7.8. KIS'S ANSWER TO THE SECOND REMARK</i> .....	148
<i>SECTION 7.9. TIGHTENING THE DEFINITION OF PRESUMPTIVE GOODS</i> .....	149
<i>SECTION 7.10. TAKING STOCK</i> .....	150
CHAPTER 8. THE PARTICULARITY OBJECTION .....	152
<i>SECTION 8.1. THE PARTICULARITY REQUIREMENT</i> .....	152
<i>SECTION 8.2. OBLIGATIONS ARE PARTICULAR MORAL REQUIREMENTS</i> .....	153
<i>SECTION 8.3. THE FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS CLAIM</i> .....	154
<i>SECTION 8.4. THE COHERENCE METHOD AND KLOSKO'S LINE OF REASONING</i> .....	157
<i>SECTION 8.5. A REMINDER OF THE POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS WE ARE AFTER</i> .....	159
<i>SECTION 8.6. KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT AND THE PARTICULARITY TEST</i> .....	160
<i>SECTION 8.7. THE APPLICATION CONDITION IS 'TOO EASILY' SATISFIED</i> .....	162
<i>SECTION 8.8. THE MASON OBJECTIONS</i> .....	167
<i>SECTION 8.9. THE SPILL-OVER BENEFIT OBJECTION</i> .....	170
<i>SECTION 8.10. PARTICULARITY IS PREDICATED ON NECESSITY</i> .....	174
<i>SECTION 8.11. SUMMING UP</i> .....	176
<b>PART III. THE OBJECTION FROM REDISTRIBUTION AND HOW KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT CAN BE REVISED</b>	
CHAPTER 9. THE OBJECTION FROM REDISTRIBUTION .....	177
<i>SECTION 9.1. FOREWORD</i> .....	177
<i>SECTION 9.2. A SHORT DESCRIPTION</i> .....	177
<i>SECTION 9.3. KLOSKO ANTICIPATES THE OBJECTION</i> .....	181
<i>SECTION 9.4. NO PRESUMPTIVE GOODS WITHOUT REDISTRIBUTIVE MEASURES</i> .....	184
<i>SECTION 9.5. THE SCHEME IS TO BE FAIR</i> .....	186
<i>SECTION 9.6. INTERDEPENDENT AND UNILATERAL REASONS</i> .....	186
<i>SECTION 9.7. PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS</i> .....	189
<i>SECTION 9.8. THE PRECEDENCE AND OPTIONS RULES</i> .....	190
<i>SECTION 9.9. CONDITION (III) AND DISCRETIONARY GOODS</i> .....	191
<i>SECTION 9.10. THE OBJECTION FROM REDISTRIBUTION REMAINS UNCHALLENGED</i> .....	192
CHAPTER 10. HOW KLOSKO'S ACCOUNT MAY BE ENHANCED .....	194

<i>SECTION 10.1. THE OPENING STATEMENT</i> .....	194
<i>SECTION 10.2. THREE GROUPS OF BENEFITS</i> .....	194
<i>SECTION 10.3. THE DISTINCTIVE ROLE OF ESSENTIAL BENEFITS</i> .....	195
<i>SECTION 10.4. A SERIES OF EXAMPLES</i> .....	196
<i>SECTION 10.5. WHY OBEY?</i> .....	202
<i>SECTION 10.6. WHY SHOULD EVERYBODY CONTRIBUTE?</i> .....	209
<i>SECTION 10.7. ARE MORAL BENEFITS PRESUMPTIVE OR DISCRETIONARY GOODS?</i> .....	211
CHAPTER 11. CONCLUSIONS .....	213
REFERENCES .....	216