

Several political philosophers have developed so-called third-wave theories of global justice that provide alternatives to the “first-wave” globalist and “second-wave” statist theories. The 3rd Wave theories are *pluralistic* as they aim at justifying a plurality of context-specific principles of justice. The contexts to which the third-wave theories’ principles apply include not just either the state or the world at large, but also the transnational relations that are characteristic of present-day globalization. This paper critically assesses the class of *disaggregated* third-wave theories, according to which we should only justify principles of justice for various kinds of sub-global contexts of justice, and refrain from defending principles of justice that apply to their shared background conditions. This paper criticizes the disaggregated third-wave because if one does not justify as to how these background conditions should be regulated, then the realization of the principles that are justified for sub-global contexts of justice can give rise to problematic side effects that effectively undermine the plausibility of these principles. Therefore the paper suggests a third-wave approach that justifies not only context-specific principles for sub-global contexts of justice, but also an account of global background justice.