



**2020**

**MIDDLESCHOOL ETHICS OLYMPIAD**

**CASES PACKAGE 13**

Welcome to the cases for the 2020 Middle School Ethics Olympiad. The Ethics Olympiad is a collaborative event which encourages students to analyse and discuss real-life, interesting, ethical issues. An Ethics Olympiad differs from debate in that students are not assigned opposing views; rather, they defend whatever position they believe is right and succeed by showing that they have thought more carefully, deeply, and perceptively the cases in question. Experience shows that this type of event encourages and helps students develop ethical awareness, critical thinking skills, civil discourse, civic engagement, and an appreciation for diverse points of view.

Thanks again for supporting this initiative. Please feel free to email us if you have any queries at; [admin@ethicsolympiad.org](mailto:admin@ethicsolympiad.org)

Teachers are encouraged to familiarise the students with these stimuli and then select 5 (or 10) students to represent their school. There are eight cases below. Students are encouraged to familiarise themselves with all the cases in their preparation for the Ethics Olympiad.

See resource kit for guidelines.

**Case 1 – Extra! Extra! Don’t Read About It!**

**Case 2 “There Must Be No Deserters” COVID-19 and the Ethics of Mass Quarantine.**

**Case 3 - Companionship or Commodification?**

**Case 4 – Belief vs. Action**

**Case 5 – Flying High**

**Case 6 – Democracy by Lot**

**Case 7 – Repatriation of Foreign Fighters/Participants (FFPs)**

**Case 8 – Campus No-Platforming**



## Case 1 - Extra! Extra! Don't Read About It!

The news can be overwhelming. Almost everyone has to take breaks from the unending cycles of breaking headlines. Erik Hagerman has gone even further: he decided to opt out altogether. After the election of Donald Trump as President of the United States, Hagerman “swore that he would avoid learning about anything that happened to America after Nov. 8, 2016.”<sup>1</sup>

Hagerman, a retired corporate executive from Nike, lives on his Ohio farm, works on art projects, and avoids the news. He’s abandoned social media. In his free time he listens to music, relaxes in coffee shops, watches Cleveland Cavaliers games (always on mute), and steers away from any conversation about politics. (He’s trained his friends, family members, and even the local baristas never to discuss politics in his presence.) Hagerman’s strategy is partly a protest, and partly an “extreme self-care plan.” “I’m emotionally healthier than I’ve ever felt,” he says.

But is Hagerman achieving peace of mind at the expense of his ethical obligations? On one hand, you might think that this is entirely Hagerman’s prerogative. It is up to him whether or not he engages in the news, particularly if it is distressing to him. After all, many of us avoid things that cause us displeasure.

On the other hand, we live in a democracy, where the policies and institutions which make up our government, and affect people around the world, depend on the actions of ordinary citizens. For a democracy to function, citizens must play an active part, and must therefore be informed about issues of political import. Abdicating this responsibility, you might think, amounts to becoming a civic deadbeat: Hagerman should endure the stress and pain of the news because it is his duty as a citizen. You don’t get to just opt out. Hagerman himself sees this side of things: “The first several months of this thing,” he admits, “I didn’t feel all that great about it. It makes me a crappy citizen.” As his blockade continued, however, Hagerman began to think somewhat differently, concluding that being a news consumer does little to enhance society, and that he could make genuinely worthwhile civic contributions by other means.

Even if Hagerman is able to screen himself off from the news in this way, others are not so lucky. Hagerman’s sister sees his blockade as an exercise in privilege: “He has the privilege of constructing a world in which very little of what he doesn’t have to deal with gets through... We all would like to construct our dream worlds. Erik is just more able to do it than others.”

### Study Questions

1. What value is there in paying attention to the news?
2. Is it ethically permissible to opt out of hearing news about political happenings?
3. Do other people have a moral duty to respect Hagerman’s “blockade”, by, for example, refraining from political talk in his presence, if he asks them to and explain why it is important to him?

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/10/style/the-man-who-knew-too-little.html>



## Case 2. “There Must Be No Deserters” COVID-19 and the Ethics of Mass Quarantine.

“There must be no deserters, or they will be nailed to the pillar of historical shame forever,” declared Sun Chunlan, the Vice Premier of the People’s Republic of China.<sup>2</sup> On January 23, 2020, Chunlan instituted a mass quarantine order in Wuhan, China—the epicenter of the COVID-19 outbreak (Secon et al., 2020). This extreme order was intended to control the spread of the novel coronavirus disease, but it had already spread to the surrounding area. Within days, all public access to the Hubei province was cut off and heavy restrictions were enforced. To prevent cross-infection within the community, citizens who had been infected or exposed were forced into hospitals and makeshift shelters to be quarantined. Citizens have been required to stay in their homes, depriving them of adequate access to food, fuel, or medication. As of April 5, 2020, there are 56 million Chinese citizens who are still languishing in isolation.

Many public health experts and policy makers worldwide question the ethics and effectiveness of these severe mass quarantines. These experts worry that Chinese officials warned the world and the citizens of Wuhan about the virus far too late for the quarantines to be effective. Roughly five million people left the city before the government established boundaries around the area, which contributed to what is now 1,273,794 confirmed cases (and counting) of COVID-19 worldwide (JHU Coronavirus Resource Center, 2020). Given that the virus has spread worldwide despite their mitigating efforts, the Chinese government’s extreme restrictions on their people appears superfluous and cruel.

Moreover, policy makers object to mass quarantines like Wuhan’s because their ethical costs exceed their practical benefits. More exactly, mass quarantines can violate individuals’ civil liberties and may constitute an over-reach of state power as they bar civilians—both the sick, the healthy, and the recovered—from leaving their homes. Notably, bioethicists at the Hastings Center take that argument further as they contend that mass quarantines disproportionately deprive those of lower socioeconomic status of their autonomy and power. Pandemics can reinforce and augment existing power dynamics, as individuals of lower socioeconomic status are less likely to have savings and more likely to lose their employment in times of crisis. Some believe if the benefits and burdens of quarantine cannot be shared proportionately by all affected parties, they cannot be ethical (Lei and Qiu, 2020)<sup>3</sup> Be that as it may, there are many who argue that mass quarantines are both practically and morally necessary. Proponents of mass quarantine, like Thomas R. Frieden, the former director to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, contend that governments should enforce isolation policies when faced with pandemics. As he explains, “anything that is done that increases social distancing can help decrease the spread of the virus” (Buckley et al., 2020). Likewise, Polly Price, a professor of law and global health at Emory University, points to the precedent of *Jacobson v. Massachusetts* in support of mass quarantines. The ruling in this court case granted the federal government the power to enforce mass quarantine as a self-defense measure when disease threatens the safety and wellbeing of American citizens (Price, 2020). Similarly, we can see Wuhan’s mass quarantine as a self-defense measure that secured the safety of its citizens who may have otherwise been infected.

Scholars that favor mass quarantine also argue that governments not only have the power to protect their citizens from pandemics with mass quarantines, but they also have a responsibility to do so. In

---

<sup>2</sup> (Wuhan Rounds Up,” 2020) <https://thehill.com/policy/international/asia-pacific/481966-china-escalates-coronavirus-lockdown-in-wuhan-with-house>

<sup>3</sup> Jason M.C., Hans / CC BY-SA 4.0 <https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/ethicsproject/>



fact, many would argue that the mass quarantines in Wuhan and the Hubei province allowed the global community more time to mobilize public health infrastructures to respond to COVID-19 (Begley, 2020). Most physicians and bioethicists who advocate for mass quarantines also believe that the broader health benefits experienced by many outweigh the temporary restriction of rights experienced by the few individuals who must be isolated (Giubilini et al., 2017). While mass quarantines certainly come with sacrifices, it is more important that they be used to protect the health of many others.

In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, mass quarantines are being tried in various forms with varying degrees of severity and success. In recent weeks, we have watched China's new case numbers (supposedly) reduce to zero, which many attribute, to their draconian approach. In the U.S., many counties and states have tried weaker restrictions with their "shelter-in-place" and "stay-at-home" orders as case numbers rapidly increase. These orders have raised serious questions about what obligations governments have to their citizens and how it can meet them without violating citizens' civil liberties during these challenging and uncertain times. Until researchers create an effective vaccine, find a cure, or better understand the pathology of COVID-19, policy makers and public health officials must continue to examine the ethics of mass quarantine and isolation policies.

### **Discussion Questions:**

1. What values are in conflict over Wuhan and the Hubei's mass quarantine order? What is worrisome about this order?
2. Are there any circumstances under which mass quarantine would be morally permissible or required?
3. How should governments weigh violations of individual liberties against protecting the health and well-being of others during a health crisis?
4. Are there ethical limits to how long mass quarantines can or should be in effect?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://mediaethicsinitiativeorg.files.wordpress.com/2020/04/7-mass-quarantine-case-study.pdf>



### Case 3 - Companionship or Commodification?

Allison has spent her college years volunteering at a local organization that trains service dogs. As a volunteer, she socializes the dogs she is assigned to care for, provides them basic training, and then teaches more complicated skills that are necessary for service dogs to perform. She has occasionally even brought her service-puppies-in-training to class with her so they could practice certain skills—especially learning to be extremely obedient and well-mannered. When they graduate the program, these dogs (which were all bred to perform years of rigorous service work) are paired with owners who needed their assistance. These dogs go on to become integral parts of their owners' lives, enabling these people to participate in society in ways that would otherwise be incredibly difficult.

Allison recognizes the important role that service animals play in their owners' lives. However, she is not sure what to think about the increased use of so-called Emotional Support Animals (ESAs, for short). As the name suggests, these animals are meant to help people with special needs that arise out of emotional and mental health conditions—such as anxiety, PTSD, depression, or panic attacks. Much like service dogs, when a dog is certified as an ESA, this provides its owner with several public benefits. For example, landlords (including public housing officials) cannot prohibit renters from having ESAs. These animals can also come inside businesses, grocery stores, restaurants, and shops, and can even accompany their owners on flights.

Allison's main complaint is that while ESAs sometimes undergo training, it is more common that their owners purchase certifications online. To her, these animals are primarily pets, rather than service dogs. Given that these dogs rarely have thorough training, they sometimes behave poorly in these situations—barking, defecating, or being destructive. The worry, then, is that these untrained assistance dogs are giving a bad name to well-trained working dogs like the ones Allison has worked with. They also undercut the hard work people like Allison put into training the dogs to be competent, integrated parts of public life. Moreover, it seems to Allison that people are increasingly making use of the ESA certification out of convenience, rather than need. Given this, she is worried that service dog owners with impairments or disabilities are met with more doubt and scrutiny about the legitimacy of their dog and their condition.

On the other hand, Allison recognizes that she might be making snap judgments about ESA owners. Many people have invisible disabilities, and the emotional support these dogs provide can be truly imperative to their owners' wellbeing. The increased presence of ESAs might even help raise awareness of and destigmatize such disabilities. Just because these animals aren't officially trained doesn't mean they can't perform a meaningful service worth recognizing.

#### Study Questions

1. Is the distinction between service dogs and ESAs a meaningful distinction to make?
2. What type of training, if any, should dogs be required to have in order to be certified as ESAs? What are the key moral considerations that should shape our answer to this question?
3. What standards should be used to determine whether someone is in need of special accommodation or assistance? What are the key moral considerations that should shape our answer to this question?



## 4. Belief vs. Action

Some of Kayla's students have just asked her to be the adviser of their Environmental Club. Kayla is not surprised; she regularly teaches an Environmental Ethics class and incorporates environmental issues in many of her other classes. She also proudly displays environmental stickers on her car, laptop, and office door. She has invited quite a few environmental speakers to campus and helped organized many environmental events.

And yet she sometimes feels like a fraud. If students knew how she lives her daily life, they'd be shocked. She believes in biking and walking, but she rarely does either. In fact, with three kids at home, Kayla and her husband own not one, but two minivans. This way, either one of them can pick up the kids from school and take them (along with their sports equipment and musical instruments) to their after-school activities. Her house, purchased when they were expecting their third child, is very comfortable, but it's also large and energy inefficient. Her yard is big grass lawn which is not environmentally friendly;<sup>5</sup> she'd love to replace it with a big vegetable patch but hasn't got around to it. Kayla also knows that refraining from eating meat and dairy is one of the most effective ways to reduce her negative impact on the Earth.<sup>6</sup> But her husband and kids love these products, and it's difficult for the family to cook two separate meals. Being pressed for time and money also leads them to buy more packaged stuff, more disposable items, and new items rather than used ones. And of course, having three biological children isn't exactly environmentally friendly: for example, while recycling saves 0.21 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent per year and living car-free saves 2.4 tons, having one fewer child saves 58.6 tons.<sup>7</sup> In short, Kayla feels that she is not living up to her principles. She's not even sure if she can call herself an environmentalist. Surely an essential part of being an environmentalist is living like one.

However, Kayla also thinks that it's morally permissible—even praiseworthy—to convince other people to adopt more environmentally friendly practices, even if you don't do that in your own life. After all, we don't expect everyone who advocates for sports or arts in schools to be an athlete or an artist.

Furthermore, Kayla tries to remind herself that advocacy work is also important and might be even more important than personal choices. Her classes, the events she organizes, and even her posts on social media might do more good than the changes she could make in her personal life. Advising the Environmental Club would enable her to do even more good and inspire many more students to advocate for environmental issues and make a difference. Disclosing how she actually lives feels more honest, but it might undermine her work, making people take her arguments less seriously. So, while she's not 100% sure of herself, Kayla plans to accept the students' invitation and to continue advocating for the environmental causes she believes in.

### Study Questions

1. Did Kayla make the right decision in agreeing to advise the Environmental Club?
2. Does Kayla have a duty to tell her students that she engages in a variety of environmentally irresponsible actions in her personal life?
3. How does Kayla compare with Angela, who does no advocacy work but lives an environmentally friendly life?

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://earther.com/lawns-are-an-ecological-disaster-1826070720>

<sup>6</sup> [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/may/31/avoiding-meat-and-dairy-is-single-biggest-way-to-reduce-your-impact-on-earth?CMP=Share\\_iOSApp\\_Other](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/may/31/avoiding-meat-and-dairy-is-single-biggest-way-to-reduce-your-impact-on-earth?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other)

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jul/12/want-to-fight-climate-change-have-fewer-children>



## Case 5 - Flying High

From a personal standpoint, there are excellent reasons to incorporate travel into one's life. First of all, many people simply enjoy it. For many people, flying to faraway destinations is a fun and exhilarating way to spend one's vacation. For others, first-hand exposure to other cultures is a significant source of personal growth. Many people also travel to see friends and family who live across the country or around the world. And for some people, flying to and fro is simply part of the job. Travel can have a number of important benefits. Psychological research suggests that those who focus on experiences instead of material objects tend to be happier.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, traveling abroad is a great opportunity for learning, for cultural immersion, and for self-knowledge. It can even be life-changing. At many universities, academic advisers encourage students to travel abroad in order to expand their perspectives on the world, open their minds, and create wonderful long-lasting memories.

Yet taking a long flight is, perhaps, an individual's single largest contribution to climate change. According to one estimate, one passenger's share of emissions on a 2,500-mile flight melts 32 square feet of Arctic summer sea ice cover.<sup>9</sup> Taking one round-trip flight between New York and California generates about 20 percent of the greenhouse gases that one's car emits over an entire year.<sup>10</sup> And the problem is likely to increase over time, as passenger numbers are predicted to double to 8.2 billion by 2037.<sup>11</sup> For these reasons, people are increasingly deciding to limit unnecessary air travel. In some parts of Europe, this anti-flying movement is taking off. In Sweden, new words, such as "flygskam" (flying shame) and "smygflyga" (flying in secret) are being coined to express some of these anti-flying sentiments.<sup>12</sup> Out of a concern for her carbon footprint, teen climate activist Greta Thunberg decided to travel from Sweden to North America by boat rather than plane, in order to attend the United Nations Climate Action Summit.<sup>13</sup>

But even if air travel contributes to greenhouse gas emissions, many people do not see anything wrong with flying. Some might argue that climate change is a systemic problem that people have little individual influence over. On this line of thinking, even if someone decides to completely give up flying, this is not going to have any significant long-term impact on climate change. If so, one might argue that individuals do not have a moral duty to give up the benefits that air travel can bring to their lives.

### Study Questions

1. What moral obligations, if any, do individuals have to reduce their carbon footprint?
2. Do the personal benefits of air travel outweigh its environmental costs?
3. Under what circumstances, if any, should people feel guilty about flying for personal enjoyment? What, if anything, would make such guilt appropriate?

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/10/buy-experiences/381132/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/03/travel/traveling-climate-change.html>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/27/climate/airplane-pollution-global-warming.html>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.airlines.iata.org/news/passenger-numbers-to-hit-82bn-by-2037-iata-report>

<sup>12</sup> <https://skift.com/2019/05/28/the-anti-flying-movement-is-slowly-starting-to-hurt-european-airlines/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.npr.org/2019/08/28/754818342/teen-climate-activist-greta-thunberg-arrives-in-new-york-after-sailing-the-atlan>



## Case 6 – Democracy by Lot

East Belgium is the smallest legislative unit in Europe. The region only has 76,000 inhabitants but nevertheless has its own parliament (comparable to other regional parliaments in larger states, for example the ones in Scotland and Wales). Who becomes an MP is determined by recurring elections. From September 2019 onwards, however, the East Belgian Parliament will hand over some of its powers to “the first permanent citizens’ assembly in the world.”<sup>11</sup> The key feature of this citizen assembly is that its 24 members will be chosen at random from the population. Anyone above the age of 16 might be selected to serve an 18-month term in the assembly (all residents are eligible; being Belgian is not a prerequisite). The citizen assembly will run parallel to the Parliament, and will be able to put any topic it deems important onto the political agenda. If a proposal wins the support of 80% of the assembly’s members, parliament will be obliged to consider it. Supporters of this reform celebrate it as nothing less than a blueprint for the democracy of the future.<sup>12</sup> Elections, they argue, produce a “natural aristocracy” that is increasingly detached from the rest of the population. Growing dissatisfaction with existing democratic institutions across Western democracies pays witness to this widening gap. Selecting decision-makers by lot is supposed to ensure that political decisions are truly representative of what the people want. Critics hold that randomly selected citizens lack the expertise to engage in political decision-making and worry that they cannot be held accountable to the public in the way elected representatives can be.<sup>13</sup>

### Study Questions

1. What are the potential benefits of selecting political representatives by lot rather than electing them? What are the potential hazards, and do the benefits outweigh the problems?
2. Is it a good idea to split the legislative into an elected and a randomly selected chamber, as in the Belgian example? Or is it in any case better to have either a fully elected or a randomly selected legislature?

11 <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/belgiums-experiment-in-a-new-kind-of-democracy>

12 <https://www.economist.com/europe/2019/10/03/a-belgian-experiment-that-aristotle-would-have-approved-of>

13 <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/belgiums-experiment-in-a-new-kind-of-democracy>



## Case 7 – Repatriation of Foreign Fighters/Participants (FFPs)

Repatriation of Foreign Fighters/Participants (FFPs) It is estimated that over 40,000 citizens from over 100 countries travelled to Iraq and Syria between 2011-2016 to join the group variously known as ISIL/ISIS/Islamic State/Daesh ('IS').<sup>14</sup> While many served as fighters, others worked in administrative (e.g., tax collection, municipal services) and domestic roles. Since the territorial defeat of IS in 2019, thousands of FFPs are being held in prison facilities in Iraq and Syria. Several governments have expressed reluctance to repatriate FFPs, partly based on security concerns, but also due to widespread public opposition; for example, a survey in France found that 89% of respondents opposed repatriation of fighters and 67% opposed repatriation of fighters' children.<sup>15</sup> Also, many people hold that fighting for IS means giving up the right to citizenship in one's country of origin. International and domestic courts have provided mixed rulings on states' legal obligations regarding repatriation, in part due to the lack of clear legal frameworks for addressing terrorism-related offenses.<sup>16</sup> A variety of legal, pragmatic, and moral arguments for repatriation have been provided. For example, that citizenship is unconditional; that domestic criminal justice systems in Western countries are better equipped to discriminate between types of offenses and facilitate monitoring and deradicalization; that leaving FFPs in the Middle East burdens certain countries there with potentially dangerous actors and inadequate resources to deal with them.<sup>17</sup>

### Study Questions

1. Which should have priority: The interests of domestic populations in not being exposed to potential security risks if FFPs are repatriated or the interests of FFPs in being repatriated and deradicalized?
2. Which should have priority: The interests of domestic populations in not being exposed to potential security risks if FFPs are repatriated or the interests of the Iraqi and Syrian people in avoiding the potential security risks of FFPs not being repatriated?

<sup>14</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/ran\\_br\\_a4\\_m10\\_en.pdf#page=17](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/ran_br_a4_m10_en.pdf#page=17)

<sup>15</sup> <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/09/15/they-left-to-join-isis-now-europe-is-leaving-their-citizens-to-die-in-iraq/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.clingendael.org/publication/debate-around-returning-foreign-fighters-netherlands>

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/beyond\\_good\\_and\\_evil\\_why\\_europe\\_should\\_bring\\_isis\\_foreign\\_fighters\\_home](https://www.ecfr.eu/publications/summary/beyond_good_and_evil_why_europe_should_bring_isis_foreign_fighters_home)



## Case 8 – Campus No-Platforming

In recent years university campuses have experienced a surge of no-platforming, which is when a person who otherwise would have been invited to give a speech on campus is barred (usually via a student union policy) from being invited or is invited but then, because of student protests, uninvited or physically prevented from actually delivering the speech. The National Union of Students, a confederation of about 600 students' unions, has since 1974 advocated a limited form of no-platforming as a matter of official policy.<sup>18</sup> There is little debate over whether no-platforming is acceptable when the speaker in question is likely to speak in a way that directly incites violence or hatred (against, e.g., women, trans people, people of colour, or Jews). But the practice of no-platforming has spread well beyond this limited remit—with Peter Tatchell, Germain Greer, and Julie Bindel among those recently no-platformed—and therefore new questions are being asked regarding both the effectiveness and the ethics of this broader use of it. In this broader guise, no-platforming is a way of preventing the airing of views that are “dangerous or unacceptable”.<sup>19</sup> Some argue that the very act of a university inviting a person to air their views on a certain topic confers some credibility on those views and that this counts in favour of no-platforming people whose views are dangerous or unacceptable.<sup>20</sup> On the other side, no-platforming opponents argue that the only way to defeat dangerous or unacceptable views is to argue against them, and that by no-platforming a speaker the speaker's opponents pass up a great opportunity to make an argument against their view in a highly visible way.<sup>21</sup> As to the ethics, some argue that no-platforming is an infringement of freedom of speech, and in fact the Equality and Human Rights Commission has issued guidance warning against placing bans against the airing of certain political views.<sup>22</sup> Meanwhile, some advocates of no-platforming argue that pushing for a certain speaker to not be allowed to speak is itself an exercise of freedom of speech,<sup>23</sup> while others maintain that no one has a right to be invited to give a speech.

### Study Questions

1. Is no-platforming an effective way to impede the spread of dangerous and unacceptable views?
2. Is no-platforming an ethically acceptable way to impede the spread of dangerous and unacceptable views?
3. Are there important ethical considerations regarding no-platforming not mentioned above? If so, do they argue in favour of or against no-platforming?

18. <https://www.nusconnect.org.uk/resources/nus-no-platform-policy-f22f>

19. <https://aeon.co/ideas/why-no-platforming-is-sometimes-a-justifiable-position>

20. See note 2; also <https://theboar.org/2019/11/no-platforming/>

21. <https://www.newstatesman.com/2019/01/i-was-no-platformed-here-s-why-it-s-counterproductive>

22. <https://equalityhumanrights.com/en/publication-download/freedom-expression-guide-higher-educationproviders-and-students-unions-england>

23. <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/if-you-dont-like-no-platforming-maybe-its-you-whos-the-specialsnowflake-a6884026.html>



## **Acknowledgments –**

Case 1,6,7,8 - This case was published by the Centre for Ethics and Philosophy at St Andrews University for the John Stuart Mill Cup. For more information about the John Stuart Mill Cup visit <http://millcup.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Case 2 Was re-published with permission from Media Ethics Initiative- Promoting Reflection on Media Ethics <https://mediaethicsinitiative.org/>

Case 3,4 & 5 - These cases are published by the 2019 National High School Ethics Bowl Case Writing Committee under a CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license at the University of North Carolina. For more information about the National High School Ethics Bowl visit <http://nhseb.unc.edu>