

Student (s)	School	Coach	Case Title	Key Words	Case
Vora Wong	Victoria Shanghai Academy, Hong Kong	Jeremy Lai	Forced Labour and Fairtrade	child labour, fair trade, freedom	<p>There are many problems in the world today and forced labour is one of them. Forced Labour is a significant issue. Alas, not enough people are familiar with this problem. Below I will discuss why this issue merits more attention.</p> <p>What is forced labour? Forced labour is when workers are forced into reluctant work and receive unfair payments. In its most extreme form, it is almost slavery. When labour is forced, employees receive an incredibly small amount for their diligent work. An employer who isn't paying their workers enough is probably also breaking other laws. They wouldn't care about their employees' health and safety.</p> <p>While forced labour has decreased over the years, the International Labour Organisation estimates that 24.9 million people are still suffering from illegal exploitation. There are workers in all types of forced employment: be it hospitality, tourism or manufacturing.</p> <p>How can you help get rid of forced labour? We may not always know when a company uses forced labour. When we do discover their illegal practices, we can stop buying their products. While we may not always know how employees are being treated, a way to resolve this problem is to be an attentive consumer, for example, by purchasing Fairtrade products.</p> <p>These products ensure that workers who contributed to developing your product got paid a reasonable amount. I believe it is worth an additional few dollars. Consider how you would feel if you were in the workers' shoes! It would be awful to work hard and get nothing in return. Purchasing Fairtrade products give workers plenty of support, it ensures fairness and it will also make companies that don't believe in Fairtrade mindful of this situation. Workers will then be able to move to Fairtrade companies and finally get paid as they deserve!</p> <p>Child Labour One of the worst forms of forced labour is child labour. It destroys a child's capability to express their imagination, creativity and so much more. Children around the world deserve the same learning opportunities. As the consumer, it is your responsibility to find out if the workers are too young to be doing a certain job. If they are, you should question them. Children shouldn't be working for a myriad of hours: "A child is to learn, not to earn.</p> <p>What do workers think about the Fairtrade Foundation? A video posted by the Fairtrade Foundation shows many employees' opinions on their company. The company provides a Fairtrade premium to workers. Let's see what the workers have to say about it.</p> <p>Numerous workers think the Fairtrade Foundation is beneficial to the workers in the community. This refers to both adults and children. Instead of both roles having to work, parents can now afford a good-quality education for their children. I noticed that workers seem very appreciative of their job, they truly thank and care for the crops they grow. "This plant is part of me, it's in my heart." A man from the Fairtrade Foundation said, "This plant needs love, I care about it as if it were a person because it takes care of me as well."</p> <p>My opinions on forced labour As I have urged you, I believe that forced labour must come to an end. I acknowledge that it is good for business and is what brings affordable products into our supermarkets, but if we continue forcing workers from the less-developed countries to labour, the world will never change. If we give these workers a chance to work in Fairtrade companies, the less-developed world can become more efficient. Children will acquire access to education and will get the opportunity to positively contribute to their communities. Then, maybe the world will be equal after all.</p> <p>Concluding Paragraph I hope this case helped raise cognition about forced labour. Pass this information to those around you. Please think carefully about how workers are treated. Freedom should be something everyone ought to have. There are currently 1.5 million farmers working for the Fairtrade product, let's continue fighting for justice for those who are still under forced labour, let's make the world a rightful place. Abraham Lincoln once said, "Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves."</p>

Rachel Fysh	PLC Melbourne Victoria	Sam Haines	Ultra-Sound of Mind: Pregnancy with a Wage	surrogacy, reproductive rights, contracts	<p>Ultra-Sound of Mind: Pregnancy with a Wage</p> <p>In 1986, a woman named Mary Beth Whitehead gave birth to a girl, known anonymously as Baby M, in New Jersey. Three days after birth, Baby M was turned over to her biological father, William Stern, and his wife Elizabeth. The Sterns paid Whitehead \$10,000 as a part of a contract. Mary Beth Whitehead had been hired by the Sterns to carry William's child as a surrogate mother. Elizabeth had health conditions that she feared could harm her or a baby during pregnancy, so the couple had looked to surrogacy to start a family.</p> <p>A day after Baby M was handed over to the Sterns, Whitehead made contact with them and began demanding that the baby be given back to her. She threatened to harm herself if she was unable to see the child. The Sterns, fearing for Whitehead's safety, handed over Baby M with the understanding she would be returned within a week. Instead, Whitehead took the child and fled to Florida. A warrant was issued for her arrest, and the Sterns made contact with Whitehead via telephone. Whitehead refused to return the child and threatened to kill both herself and Baby M if she was not allowed to keep the girl.</p> <p>The ensuing custody battle made headlines, and both the situation and the concept of surrogacy was very divisive. Surrogacy was an unregulated field, despite the many agencies that had been set up to connect prospective parents with surrogates. Activists and politicians argued that women were selling babies, whilst others noted they were simply providing a similar service to sperm donation. Some surrogate mothers had questions about the agency that hired Whitehead, and compared their experience to hers; citing the rigorous counselling their agencies made them attend as proof that not enough was done to identify that Whitehead was not of sound mind. In March 1987, the court awarded custody of Baby M to the Sterns. However, Whitehead appealed to the state Supreme Court and regained her parental rights. After being referred to a family court, the Sterns were granted Baby M's custody while Whitehead gained visitation rights. In 2004, the adult Baby M, or Melissa Stern, terminated Whitehead's parental rights.</p> <p>Since this case, surrogacy is still relatively unregulated in the USA. Whilst states have laws surrounding the subject, there are no federal laws, meaning legality varies by region. Proponents of surrogacy argue that surrogacy should be considered a viable option for those looking to establish a family. Around 1 in 8 couples in America struggle to conceive children. Further, as same-sex marriage has been legalised in many countries in the 21st century, same-sex families are becoming more common. For these couples, surrogacy is often an appealing option, especially when adoption is unavailable.</p> <p>The many questions surrounding this area have only become more complex after the development of In Vitro Fertilisation (IVF), which allows for a mother to carry a baby that is not genetically hers (gestational surrogacy) as opposed to the traditional method, in which the baby is related to both the surrogate mother and the adoptive father.</p> <p>However, as with many reproductive-related dilemmas, the conversation is fiercely split. There are still many critics of surrogacy. Some religious groups argue that the involvement of a surrogate mother violates the sanctity of marriage and childbirth, whilst others consider it a form of human trafficking. The debate also includes the topic of payment; whether mothers should only be compensated for the cost of the pregnancy (e.g. ultrasounds, hospital stays) or if they should be allowed to profit from the business.</p> <p>Despite the discourse around it, as modern families start following a less traditional structure, the chances are that surrogacy is going to be making headlines more and more often.</p> <p>Discussion questions: Do surrogate mothers have a right to break a contract if they feel maternal connection prevents them from giving up their child? Will profiting from pregnancy make it equivalent to human trafficking? Does it differ morally from payment for sperm donation? Do governments have a right to regulate how people conceive? Should all surrogates have to go through an agency?</p> <p>Sources: C Haberman, New York Times. (2014). Baby M and the Question of Surrogate Motherhood. https://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/24/us/baby-m-and-the-question-of-surrogate-motherhood.html Pollitt, K. (1987, May 23). The Strange Case of Baby M. The Nation. https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/strange-case-baby-m/</p>
-------------	------------------------------	------------	---	--	--

<p>Grace Spurway</p>	<p>Rangi Ruru Girls School New Zealand</p>	<p>Jay Sloss</p>	<p>River Ethics</p>	<p>instrumental and inherent ways of valuing nature</p>	<p>The Manuherehia river is one of the most heavily depleted rivers in New Zealand. Located in the South Island's Otago, the rivers name translates "to catch birds", having once been a valued site for catching bird and river life. Most rivers course from their source with a low flow and gradually take on more water from streams and creeks along the way, reaching peak flow where they terminate into another river or the sea. The Manuherekia does the opposite, getting smaller as it makes its way to the sea. It now functions like an irrigation water race than a productive ecosystem flourishing with life.</p> <p>Author Jillian Sullivan walked the length of the river in 2021 and recounted her experience to the environment court, "walking the river gave me a deep insight into what a river is, what is meant by the life force of a river. We need to move forward with more awareness of everyone's needs, including the rivers and streams." This might seem like a local dispute between a local community and the use of its river but there is a sense in which this dispute captures long standing problems around water management in capitalist societies, like New Zealand and Australia. Karl Marx anticipated the problem volume 1 of Capital.</p> <p>The dilemma lies with the question of how much water should be in the river. It is the problem is of balancing economic interests and environmental interests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrigation Reliability: To cut off irrigation for agriculture for long periods would make some farms unviable. This is problematic if we have an economy built on consistent access to water. • Ecological Health: The environmental result of cutting off irrigation for long periods would significantly improve the rivers ecological function, as a productive freshwater ecosystem flourishing with life. <p>Part of the problem is rests with there being no space in between each option for a compromise. For example, with a river flow of 2000 litres per second, irrigation reliability is poor, and ecological health remains degraded. At 3000 litres per second, the river would return to a productive freshwater ecosystem, but farming would become unviable. It is only at the extremes of the litres per second measurement models that you get a favourable outcome for either side.</p> <p>The New Zealand Government recently introduced changes to the way it manages water. The biggest change was the introduction of a principle which stands above all else in freshwater decisions, Te Mana o Te Wai, "the mana of the water". This principle sets the hierarchy of importance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mana or health of the water 2. The health of the people 3. The ability of the people to provide for their social, economic and cultural well being <p>This policy puts the health of the river at the top of the pyramid and the economy at the bottom. Previously economic interests would be prioritized. Now, freshwater quality is first.</p> <p>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mythological and Spiritual beliefs are often more faith based than evidence based. They are not irrational as such, but non rational, i.e. they are a different mode of understanding and knowing than the knowledge gained by scientific method. And so, the question arises, why should science take into account metaphysical notions based on religious or customary knowledge? 2. Who owns the river? What morally justifies an individual or group to claim part of a river (something in the public stock of nature) as their own private property. 3. What are the interests of a thing, like a river or an economy? 4. How should we value nature? Should we value nature for its usefulness and what we can do with it (this is known as 'instrumental value'? Or should we see nature as having an 'intrinsic/inherent' values (a value that has nothing to do with the usefulness of the resource)? <p>Footnotes: https://interactives.stuff.co.nz/2022/03/manuherehia-river-more-or-less/ "...all progress in capitalistic agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the labourer, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time, is a progress towards ruining the lasting sources of that fertility." He writes about the fertility of soil, but could equally be talking about the use of freshwater in capitalistic agriculture. Intrinsic value involves historical, religious, spiritual and emotional value. Sometimes intrinsic value is not something physics that you can see and measure. Inherent value may be 'abstract' or non-physical.</p>
----------------------	--	------------------	---------------------	---	---

<p>Valarie Howe</p>	<p>Samuel Marsden Collegiate School New Zealand</p>	<p>Margaret Adeane</p>	<p>Choice or No Choice</p>	<p>COVID vaccine mandates</p>	<p>Following the COVID-19 pandemic, numerous countries have taken measures to limit the spread of the virus and protect their citizens. However, different countries have approached this by different means. Many placed limitations on the sizes of gatherings, or imposed the compulsory use of masks in public areas. Many integrated lockdowns into the COVID-19 experience and increased their hygiene efforts by substantial proportions.</p> <p>However, one course of action undergone by governments around the world was a vaccine mandate. Under this system, citizens were required to undergo a specified number of COVID-19 vaccination doses in order to engage in various activities such as to work, travel and dine (among various others). This was a method employed by the Australian state governments and New Zealand government.</p> <p>Whilst some saw this positively, others saw this as a breach of their rights.</p> <p>Photo: Getty Images</p> <p>Now, consider two women, Amelie and Arihi. Arihi is fully vaccinated. She believes that vaccination is the best device humankind can harness against the virus. She had made sure to do her fair share of research on the vaccine and had concluded that it was the most effective way of protecting not only herself, but those around her. She feels that the vaccine mandate was a necessary precaution the government had to take in order to protect their people. In fact, she volunteers her spare time to work in vaccination clinics in areas where accessibility is low.</p> <p>However, Amelie has a different view. She is currently unvaccinated by her own choice. She has made this decision after hearing the experiences of the vaccine's negative effects on some of her close friends as well as through what she has witnessed through social media. However, she is displeased that since the implementation of the vaccine mandate, she has not been able to go to the hospital, where she works as a nurse. Being the breadwinner of her family, with four other dependents, her financial situation is going downhill. She feels that the mandate was a violation of her rights to exercise the freedom of choice.</p> <p>Being a close friend of Amelie, Arihi is urging her to get vaccinated. Arihi is not only considering the risks on the health and employment of Amelie, but also the wellbeing and mobility of her family, especially since she resides with both an infant and an elderly parent.</p> <p>_____ Discussion _____</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does Amelie have the right to be upset about the vaccine mandate? If so, what gives her this right? Otherwise, why not? 2. Was it, or was it not ethical for Arihi to urge her friend Amelie to get vaccinated? If so, why? If not, what could she have done to protect her friend whilst maintaining moral integrity? 3. Should a mandate (such as the one discussed above) be considered a violation of the human right to exercise freedom of choice? Why? 4. Whose choice should determine the vaccination status of a person? Consider a child. To what extent should parental influence be placed on their vaccination? 5. Do these same principles apply to the vaccines of other illnesses (eg. HPV, Varicella, HepB)? If so, would it be virtuous to extend such mandates across New Zealand?
---------------------	---	------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--

Alexander Smith	St. Patrick's College, Tasmania	Rebecca Seward-Linger	NDIS and Sex Therapy	NDIS, Sex-work, discrimination	<p>People who live with a disability can be neglected in the world of romance, dating and sex, and are frequently denied autonomy over their bodies [1]. Those who are marginalised experience stigma and discrimination when looking for romantic relations with others. Therefore, it has been suggested that sexual services be included in the National Disability Insurance Scheme so that people with a disability are able to enjoy intimacy, sexual pleasure and release whilst expressing themselves how they see fit. The NDIS already allows for people to live a normal life and proponents of the idea believe that this should be included [2].</p> <p>If allowed, the move would mean that people with a disability could sexually express themselves as millions of other people do every day. The model would ensure sexual services to be used for enjoyment, exploration, sexual education and as a means of boosting confidence and skills in social and dating realms. Furthermore, sex workers will provide a way for people with a disability to live a more equitable life in an area of care that viewed as an essential area of health. Relationships and sex are not excluded from the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities1 [3], an important document which outlines ethical care and treatment for people with disabilities.</p> <p>However, the NDIS will only fund care that is 'reasonable and necessary', raising the question of whether or not sexual experiences are reasonable and necessary. Many are against the idea, feeling it will contribute to abuse, assaults from sex workers who are not suitable for the role, attraction to become a sex worker, mis-use of the system and possibly even people faking disability in order to obtain services2 [4]. Furthermore, others have strict religious views against the practice of sex work, and believe that public money should not be spent in such a fashion. Those with certain religious convictions feel that by allowing the NDIS to include sexwork it 'normalises' what they view as an extremist profession.</p> <p>Sex work in Australia is legal to an extent but some feel that allowing sex therapy as a disability support will open the door for an increase in the many downsides to this sort of work such as an increase in sexually transmitted infections, unintended pregnancy, stigma, violence and social and financial insecurities. Alternatively, sex work, like any other type of work, is a job and, provided it is completed with consent, should be viewed as no different to any other occupation [5]; people choose to have sex like they choose to have a haircut. By normalising and removing the stigma, better understandings of sex may be formed and people will have a stronger understandings of issues related to intercourse.</p> <p>A 2021 court case found in favour of a 40 year-old-woman who lived with multiple sclerosis and wished to have access to a sex worker [6]. Despite this, little legislation or inclusion of coverage of sexual services has been included in the NDIS and the fight continues for many in what is viewed as a hotly and contentious contemporary legal and ethical dilemma.</p> <p>Discussion Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Should sex work be available for those supported by the NDIS? 2) Is sex work moral? Why or why not? If yes, under what conditions? 3) Is sex a basic human right or a privilege extended? <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://theconversation.com/why-it-is-reasonable-and-necessary-for-the-ndis-to-support-peoples-sex-lives-138727 2. https://www.ndis.gov.au/ 3. https://www.unsw.adfa.edu.au/newsroom/news/why-it-reasonable-and-necessary-ndis-support-peoples-sex-lives-0 4. https://teamdsc.com.au/resources/sex-therapy-sex-work-and-disability 5. http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/28/a-feminists-argument-on-how-sex-work-can-benefit-women/ 6. https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2021/mar/28/stuart-robert-on-crusade-says-woman-who-hired-sex-worker-on-ndisGoo
-----------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------	--

Swetlana Khoo	Carmel College, New Zealand	Annaliese Seedall	National Service:	National service, personal choice, duty	<p>Case</p> <p>National Service: National service is a standardised form of peacetime conscription for able-bodied men¹. There are many countries in the world today that have mandatory military service, some of which include Singapore, Vietnam, Denmark and Finland². Depending on the country, the conscription period as well as the age range differs.</p> <p>Consider the hypothetical case of Jeremy Chong, an 18 year old Singaporean national who is scheduled for enlistment at the earliest opportunity (once he turns 18 years of age). National Service (NS), is compulsory for male Singaporean citizens and permanent residents (PRs) who are above the age of 18 - this is similar to several other countries. Jeremy, however, defaulted on his military training obligations and instead flew to America without a valid exit permit and without applying for a deferment in hopes of studying medicine on the pre-med track. He justifies his actions based on his intentions of becoming a specialist in a particular field of medicine that he has not chosen, and he does not want to 'waste' time completing national service which spans 24 months when his journey through medical school will take around 10-15 years if he intends to specialise.</p> <p>Jeremy got accepted into a public university in America and subsequently enrolled in the pre-med track without the knowledge of his parents as he had told them that he was merely going on a holiday trip. After finding out his plans, Jeremy's mother tried to persuade him to return to Singapore to enlist in NS however he refused. A letter from the Central Manpower Base (CMPB) consequently arrives at Jeremy's parents' home in Singapore explaining the offences that he has committed, and Jeremy's mother told her son that he could go to jail if he continues to evade conscription. Because of this Jeremy decides to go to the student relations office at his university and explain to them his predicament. He was told that he is unable to defer his studies for 24 months or 2 years, the course of NS, and can only defer one year. If Jeremy fails to re-enrol in the course after a period of 12 months, the university will consider him withdrawn from the course and no longer a student; furthermore his fees are non-refundable. Jeremy, stuck in this dilemma, decides to finish his university studies first because he has already paid his school fees.</p> <p>After graduating from university, Jeremy returns to Singapore to enlist in NS, and calls the national service centre to inform them of his decision. CMPB advises Jeremy to report to their headquarters as soon as he touches down in Singapore. Jeremy enlists into full-time national service in the Singapore Armed Forces however his case was brought to court and Jeremy now faces a \$10,000 fine and can be jailed for up to three years for his Enlistment Act offence.</p> <p>In Singapore alone, there have been an average of 350 NS defaulters each year³. In Jeremy's case, he justifies his motives with the fact that he intends to pursue a medical career which is lengthy and he does not want to spend time undergoing basic military training when he can be working towards the career of his dreams. For many others, there are a myriad of reasons - a sense of not belonging to the nation (e.g. permanent residents who only hold passports of the country), education, work and having to support family members, etc. Along with this, females are not obligated to enlist in NS which can be good news for some but unfair (stereotypical) for others.</p> <p>Study questions: Does compulsory enlistment in national service go against human rights i.e. the right to make a choice or is this morally permissible on the basis that the vast majority of national servicemen serve their country dutifully (therefore others should follow suit) and this service is part of being a citizen in their respective nations³? How ethical is it to 'force' people to complete this duty even after considering their personal obligations/choices? Therefore should this be continued? Some believe that mandatory national service allows for maturity and character development⁴ while others think it increases violent behaviour⁵ - do you think the benefits outweigh the costs and therefore should national service be compulsory?</p> <p>¹ https://www.nam.ac.uk/explore/what-was-national-service ² https://worldpopulationreview.com/country-rankings/countries-with-mandatory-military-service ³ https://sg.news.yahoo.com/singaporean-man-jailed-7-weeks-evading-ns-3-years-121420970.html ⁴ https://www.procon.org/headlines/mandatory-national-service-top-3-pros-and-cons/ ⁵ https://voxeu.org/article/impact-mandatory-military-conscription-crime-and-labour-market</p>
---------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	-------------------	---	---

Henry Carls	St. Patrick's College, Tasmania	Rebecca Seward-Linger	The Line Between Employment and Exploitation	Employment, Exploitation, Amazonification	<p>Case</p> <p>In April 2020, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 14.7% of the United States' eligible population was unemployed [1]. At the same time, pandemic-induced lockdowns gave rise to a surge in online transactions, as people were often unable to leave their homes to purchase goods. To accommodate the growth in orders, online retail companies sought to expand their workforces, thus partially alleviating the unemployment crisis. Warehouse work has minimal prerequisites, making it an accessible option for many job seekers. The thousands of new job opportunities created by warehouse work satisfy both the necessities of the workforce and the appetites of consumers.</p> <p>Having received a monthly average of 3.68 billion visitors [2] in 2020, Amazon required a rapid workforce expansion to sustain its increasingly large operations. The online retail giant has subsequently expanded its labour force by 75%, bringing the number of worldwide Amazon employees to over 1.3 million [3]. With a starting wage of 15 dollars per hour - which is more than double the federal minimum wage in the US - warehouse work at Amazon remains an accessible option for all Americans, especially those who struggle to find employment elsewhere. Because virtually anyone is capable of filling unskilled labour roles at Amazon, the company argues that its warehouses foster a strong sense of community, with benefits that transcend financial gain [4]. Immigrants, for example, may be given the opportunity to hasten their assimilation into American society through close work with other Americans [5] - cultural and linguistic barriers are less of a concern for warehouse work, provided that the employee is able to fulfil orders.</p> <p>Whilst Amazon's workforce proliferation has assisted the global economy, it has also brought more attention to longstanding issues that involve the company's treatment of workers. Concerns over health and safety precautions in the company's order fulfilment centres predate the COVID-19 pandemic. Employees that sustain injuries endemic to Amazon's warehouses, such as broken limbs and head traumas, are rarely referred to external health institutions [6]. This stems from the company's overt (and self described) "obsession" with customer satisfaction; by keeping employees at work, there is often a greater likelihood that they can return to order fulfilment sooner due to a lack of external medical examination. Injury is not the only concern surrounding Amazon's demanding work culture - the persistent reports of delivery drivers urinating and defecating in bags to avoid "losing our jobs for too many 'undelivered packages'" [7] were verified by the publication of an email, urging workers to refrain from such acts, in 2020.</p> <p>Although the latter aspects of Amazon's employment model have been condemned by numerous organisations and individuals, many people are willing to overlook such things due to the sheer number of jobs that the company has created in the United States, as the "Amazonification of the economy" [8] has benefitted millions of people across the globe.</p> <p>Discussion Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a company is capable of creating and filling much-needed jobs, should the treatment of employees be subjected to less scrutiny in favour of economic development? 2. Are the social responsibilities of a company limited to the delivery of profits to shareholders, or should more be expected of them? 3. If consumers are concerned by reports of warehouse workers experiencing maltreatment, is there an obligation for them to stop financially supporting the suspected corporate perpetrators? <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Civilian unemployment rate, 2022, at https://www.bls.gov/charts/employment-situation/civilian-unemployment-rate.htm 2. Statista, Most visited online retail websites worldwide in 2020, by average monthly traffic, December 2020 at https://www.statista.com/statistics/274708/online-retail-and-auction-ranked-by-worldwide-audiences/ 3. Alexandre Tanzi, Amazon Boosted Workforce by 75% During Covid — And It's Still Hiring, Bloomberg, 30 October 2021, at https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-10-29/amazon-boosted-workforce-by-75-during-covid-and-is-still-hiring
-------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--	---	--

Sophie Barreto	Carmel College, New Zealand	Annaliese Seedall	Genetically Modifying Humans	Genetically modifying, Humans, Risks, Natural, Compromise	<p>There are two couples in a waiting room, they are waiting to learn about possibly having a genetically modified child. Pippa and Luke, one of the couples, have another sick child Luna. Luna has leukemia, a type of cancer of the body's blood-forming tissue, there is no cure for leukemia but to put Luna back into remission she will need a blood transfusion. Luna's doctor gave Pippa some options. Pippa could get her whole family tested to see if they match Luna's blood type or be put on the waiting list to get a stranger's blood donation. In the end, nobody in Pippa's family had the same blood type as Luna. It looked like waiting on the list with so many others waiting for a long time for a donation. When she was finally accepting their fate, she learned about another way to save her daughter. Having another child whose genes are genetically modified to have a nearly identical match to Luna. Luna would have to wait 1 year which is possible for her condition and at the rate the waiting list will take longer. And if Luna comes out of remission again and needs a transfusion Luna's sister will be there.</p> <p>Grace and Adam want a child but Grace's mother had cystic fibrosis and Adam's Uncle did too. There is a big chance that if they have a child he/she will be born with cystic fibrosis because it is possible that both Adam and Grace could pass a faulty gene to their child and if two faulty genes are in their child, that child will develop cystic fibrosis. Adam and Grace didn't want to live with their fate. So Adam did some research and found out that they can have a genetically modified child.</p> <p>But before both couples came to the clinic, they were both criticized by others. Grace and Adam shared the news of genetically modifying a baby and got multiple opinions on it. People said that their baby would never be natural or human. And they were being accused of genetically modifying their baby so that they could have a perfect baby. Meaning they would choose if their baby was a girl or boy and if they had blond hair and blue eyes but Grace and Adam never knew they could even do that. They were told that they were setting an inequality on the kids who are not designer babies.</p> <p>Pippa and Luke were told about all the risks including that their technology is not fully developed and understood and that it can bring harm to the baby and mother. There were also risks that the child would develop like antibiotic resistance, production of new toxins, and more and since this technology is new there could even be more risks that we don't know about. But the 2 couples are here at the clinic because they believe this is the best option even after all the risks. One couple is here to save another child and one couple is here to make sure their child has the best chance at life.</p> <p>Question 1 - Should genetically modifying an embryo be allowed for the public and if not open to the public, who should be accepted into being able to</p> <p>Question 2 - Is a genetically modified child natural or unnatural and why, what is your definition for something to be natural</p> <p>Question 3 - Is a genetically modified child a human being or some kind of technology or even something else and why, what is your definition of a human being</p> <p>Question 4 - For Pippa and Luke's situation does their cause outweigh the risks and why</p> <p>Question 5 - For Adam and Grace's situation, does their cause outweigh the risks, and why</p> <p>References: https://www.sites.ext.vt.edu/newsletter-archive/cses/2000-02/risks.html</p>
Julie Hui	Victoria Shanghai Academy (Hong Kong)	Jeremy Lai	The Complexities of Group Work	Group project, Unfairness, Credit	<p>Olivia is in her last year of high school. She is one of the top students in her class and is extremely hard-working. She is also very kind-hearted, but can often be overly generous. It is near the end of the school year and Olivia's Geography teacher has assigned a group project to the class to complete within two weeks. Olivia forms a group with four of her closest friends. She decides to take the initiative to lead the project, and is determined to do well as this will count towards her grade. Each group member has a role, and there is fieldwork required as well. Olivia starts working on it right away as she knows that it will require time and meticulous planning since she has other commitments at the same time. She finishes her part in a week, but it turns out that nobody has progressed and contributed to completing the project. She waits for a few days, hoping that her group mates would work on their assigned roles. However, the night before the presentation day of the Geography group project, Olivia realises that none of the group members have done much work except for her. She chases them to complete the project without much luck, so she ends up working on their parts and spends many hours finishing the project despite her busy schedule. On the presentation day, one of Olivia's group members, Josh, who has fantastic presentation skills, starts presenting but ends up speaking the entire presentation. He presents outstandingly and speaks with confidence and passion, grabbing the audiences' full attention. After the presentation, Josh is awarded the best participant award with extra commendation from the teacher. This would look good on his reports. Olivia feels frustrated that the credit was given to her friend who she knows did not contribute much except for presenting their work. It is unfair to Olivia because if she had not been so generous and helped her group mates complete the project, Josh would not have much to talk about and thus, not speak as well as he did. She worries that Josh's report will look better than hers even though the majority of the work was done by her. At the same time, Olivia knows that Josh has great presentation skills, probably better than her, so she does not want to take that credit away. If Olivia tells the teacher that she did most of the project and the others barely contributed, she feels she is being disloyal to her friends. What should Olivia do in this situation?</p> <p>Study Questions</p> <p>(1) Should Olivia be silent and let Josh take the credit? After all, he did present well.</p> <p>(2) Is Olivia being selfish and concerned only about herself and her grade?</p> <p>(3) Is it morally wrong to tell on someone, especially a friend, when you don't understand their situation fully? Perhaps, their circumstances did not allow them to contribute?</p>

Daniel Xian	Saint Kentigern College, New Zealand	Biliana Kostova	Forging New Lives	refugees, forgery [of passports], priority	<p>Every year thousands of refugees lie in a state of limbo, fleeing their country due to war, unrest, famine, and a multitude of other reasons. Especially in the tumultuous Middle East, millions flock to the borders of Europe for a new chance at life. Now possessing over 3.6 million [1] refugees and 12 million displaced peoples, it is only natural that they have turned to the prosperous west in search of better living conditions, quality of life, and safety. And despite the west's (generally) stringent measures regarding the acceptance of said refugees, many inevitably prevail and make it through to more welcoming and prosperous countries such as Germany and Sweden, whose legislation firmly supports the intake and care of refugees.</p> <p>Recently, however, there have been growing ethical concerns about the way refugees are getting into European countries. Gangs and trafficking groups have been uncovered selling fake passports to refugees – who have been more than happy to purchase them. Especially operating on the doorsteps of Europe proper, in places like Greece [2], Turkey, and Italy, this lucrative industry seeks to exploit the predicament in the Middle East by making money off the vulnerable – who are protected neither by money nor the law. This not only is a cause for alarm but also an ethical conundrum – should refugees be permitted to forge their ways out so they might live safely and securely? As immigration offices continue to fill up, increasing numbers of refugees turn to these shady dealers to avoid the traditionally dangerous land or sea routes. The proclamation that Syrians holding Syrian passports would be prioritised for refugee status in many western countries only further fuel this problem as more refugees – both Syrian and non-Syrian – buy into these markets in an effort to get to Europe faster. [3] There have been additional reports of traffickers stealing fake passports to help their own families and friends jump the border. [4]</p> <p>In countries such as Germany and Sweden, where the governments are lenient towards refugees, they are often allowed to stay, mounting tensions in the general public who seem them treating the refugees above the common people. Indeed, these have been fuelling anti-immigration and far-right sentiments [5] determined to push back the incoming tide of refugees spurred on by the status quo – most notably in the city of Chemnitz, Germany. They claim that 'this is our land', and that it shouldn't be permitted for those who 'forged and wormed their way into our society'. Angela Merkel has countered this by saying "As far as an upper limit [on refugees] is concerned, my position is clear: I will not accept it." "In many regions war and terror prevail. States disintegrate. For many years we have read about this. We have heard about it. We have seen it on TV. But we had not yet sufficiently understood that what happens in Aleppo and Mosul can affect Essen or Stuttgart. We have to face that now." [6] Similar sentiments regarding the promised free passage of refugees arise in wealthy countries such as Austria or Switzerland.</p> <p>The situation regarding faked passports is a difficult one to obtain consensus on, mostly due to the arguments regarding law vs life. Some consider illegal actions to be universally, well, illegal. Others claim humanity rests above all legal aspects, no matter the circumstances. So, what should be done?</p> <p>Discussion Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should countries like Germany and Sweden give priority to Syrian refugees in the first place? Are they just creating an incentive for a market in fake passports or is there good reason to do so? 2. Should governments prioritise the most vulnerable and in-need-of-help before their own citizens while passing legislature? 3. Can refugees truly be held accountable for forgery in trying to escape from a country where there is no safety, rights, or education? Should they be prosecuted under the law? Or is what they are doing just an urgent matter of life and death, which should reign over all other principles? 4. Are the actions of the gangs and traffickers ever justifiable, especially in light of their actions to help refugees get into more desirable countries? <p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. https://www.mei.edu/publications/addressing-refugee-crisis 2. https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-europe-34510265 3. https://www.npr.org/2015/09/10/439246957/why-syrians-are-entering-europe-with-fake-passports 4. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/08/growing-concern-over-trade-in-fake-and-stolen-syrian-passports 5. https://time.com/5380161/protests-chemnitz-germany-migration/ 6. https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/11-quotes-that-show-angela-merkel-is-a-true-global/
-------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------	--	---

Tom Edwards	St Andrews College, New Zealand	Ellen Hampson	The Fifth Industrial Revolution	Neurotechnology, Privacy, Bodily Autonomy	<p>The first industrial revolution brought us the steam engine, the second electricity, the third the internet and the fourth artificial intelligence. In society we potentially sit on the edge of the fifth industrial revolution – neurotechnology.</p> <p>Neurotechnology encompasses any method or device that uses electrical signals to monitor or modulate neurological systems. It involves the use of a device that hooks into a user's neurological system. The way these devices connect into a user's neurological system vary. Some devices are invasive, involving the implanting of a device directly into the user's brain and other are non-invasive making use of magnetic fields to gain access. Once the device has access to the user's neurological system, it sends and receives electrical brain impulses. External devices are then able to read the users thoughts and have complete control of the user's body by modulating their neurological system. Due to neurotechnology's ability to control and read a user's brain participants no longer have bodily autonomy and privacy of their own brain.</p> <p>Current industry leader in Neurotechnology is Elon Musk's company Neuralink, which in 2021 successfully enabled a monkey to play the computer game Pong with its mind by inserting a Bluetooth chip into the monkey's brain. Following the experiment Neuralink underwent heavy criticism for carrying out 'invasive brain experiments' on animals (a). Other prominent neurotechnology companies such as BrainCo have opted for less invasive neurotechnology developing a headband that provides users feedback on how to improve their mental state by reading brain impulses.</p> <p>As we approach this fifth industrial revolution discourse has heated up surrounding the ethics and morality of neurotechnology.</p> <p>Supporters of neurotechnology point to its life changing implications for the disabled. For example, a blind person could see again by using a prosthetic eye that would transform visual imagery from a camera into electrical impulses that would stimulate the neurological system similarly to electric impulses from an eye. Neurotechnology also has promising applications in addressing paralysis, dementia and Parkinson's disease, alongside common mental health conditions such as anxiety, depression, and addiction.</p> <p>Critics of neurotechnology point to the lack of bodily autonomy and privacy once a device is installed. They suggest this enables a dystopian world, where oppressive governments use the technology to crack down on dissent by monitoring the populations thoughts allowing them to persecute anyone who opposes them. Others claim corporations could not be trusted to respect the bodily autonomy and privacy of others, suggesting they would use the devices to run inescapable adverts inside a person's head and sell peoples brain data – similar to Facebook selling users' data. Some point to the danger of hackers, being able to hack into a person's neurotechnological devices and gain physical control over that individual.</p> <p>Perhaps the most heavily debated aspect of neurotechnology is its ability to fundamentally change who we are as human beings. Neurotechnology has the capability to radically enhance our cognitive ability enabling us to have access to any information instantly and solve complex equations in seconds. Additionally, it would allow us to control all electronic devices with our mind. Allowing a person to turn on and off a TV without moving a muscle.</p> <p>Critiques suggest that the radical change neurotechnology provides to who we are is the very reason we shouldn't use it. Ethicist Bill McKibben argues that human life would be meaningless if all cognitive challenges could be easily overcome through neurotechnology (b). Others suggest that altering the way our neurological systems work, would cause a major shift in our identity. This is because it would reshape our cognitive systems causing us to think and experience senses entirely differently. This would cause us to perceive the world around us in a completely radical and different way.</p> <p>The fifth industrial revolution begs to ask the question – how far is too far with the advancement of technology?</p> <p>(1) Should neurotechnology ever be available for the public to use freely? Under what circumstances would it be morally permissible to use? (2) Could an individual morally ever give informed consent to a procedure that would no longer allow them to have bodily autonomy and privacy of their own brain? (3) Should a hacker gain access to another person's neurotechnological device and use it to make that person commit a crime, who should have the moral blame? The hacked or the hacker?</p> <p>References: (a) https://edition.cnn.com/2022/02/17/business/elon-musk-neuralink-animal-cruelty-intl-scli/index.html</p>
-------------	---------------------------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---	---

<p>Preet Bal</p>	<p>Middleton Grange School, , New Zealand</p>	<p>Nicole Bailey</p>	<p>Disenfranchisement of Inmates</p>	<p>Purpose of prison, inmates, disenfranchisement</p>	<p>Voting is often recalled as any citizen's right and responsibility towards their country. It enables citizens to have a say in their own future. All eligible citizens are encouraged to vote for the betterment of their country. However, when considering inmates, many people think they should be excluded from the voting list. It is believed that letting prisoners vote would partially defeat the purpose of incarceration- to take freedom away for a certain period from those who have misused it. [1]</p> <p>In many countries such as Australia, France, Greece, and Poland, the law only allows selected inmates to be disenfranchised. Contrastingly, countries such as New Zealand, Argentina, India, Russia, and the United Kingdom, completely ban prisoners from voting. Alternatively, countries such as Norway, Canada, Austria, Denmark, and South Africa [2], give all their prisoners the right to vote.</p> <p>When talking about the disenfranchisement of inmates, their rights as a citizen is a commonly mentioned topic. The felons will still be living in their country once they come out of jail, and hence would want to have their input into their future. "I want to have a say in my own future." [3] is how Foster Bates, a resident of Maine State Prison, United States, accused of rape and murder, has put it. It is even suggested that inmates allowed to vote in prison integrate into society with more ease, being less likely to become re-incarcerated. In many countries, prisoners take up a decent amount of the country's population- enough to make a significant difference during the voting and election period. Another potentially positive side of allowing inmates to vote would be that a country would have a broader range of opinions. This may conceivably lead to a more accurate overall standpoint of the nation based on its culture, morals, and views on a particular issue.</p> <p>However, there are some possible downsides to prisoners being able to vote. Voting, in general, is meant to collect a wide range of opinions to further improve a nation. Based on this fact, it may seem reasonable also to include prisoners. Nevertheless, it is often questioned how people such as offenders, assaulters, murderers, and rapists can promote beneficial and constructive views towards their nation amid their filthy actions that initially undermined the country. If all of the incarcerated population votes, then citizens who are not incarcerated may not be fully confident in the country's final decision.</p> <p>The average minimum voting age is 18 years. [4] You will not see this age being dropped any lower than, if anything, 16 years. The genuine reason behind this is that younger children are not fully mature yet. Their views and opinions, particularly on a national importance level, are not considered that valuable and reliable. It is viewed by some people that prisoners should not be included in the voting list for the same reason that children (under usually 16 or 18) are also not included. The common reason between the two is that, to an extent, both their views are unreliable and unhelpful due to either their mentality or past actions.</p> <p>Discussion questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you think inmates are worthy enough to choose a country's leaders and laws? Explain. 2. If disenfranchisement really does assist in making prison tougher, giving less privileges and freedom to prisoners, should they still be disenfranchised? Why/why not, and is it ethically ok to do so? 3. The views of ineligible children to vote are considered perhaps unreliable, whereas prisoners' views are also considered unreliable and 'unhelpful' due to their mentality and past actions, making them commit a crime. Having common characteristics with ineligible children to vote, does this justify that inmates should also be ineligible to vote? <p>1. Gauke, David, Purpose of Prison, (22/04/2022), https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prisons-reform-speech</p> <p>2. ProCon.Org, International Comparison of Felon Voting Laws, (22/04/2022), https://felonvoting.procon.org/international-comparison-of-felon-voting-laws/</p> <p>3. Bates, Foster, Why Shouldn't Prisoners be Voters?, (23/04/2022), https://www.newyorker.com/news/the-future-of-democracy/why-shouldnt-prisoners-be-voters</p> <p>4. Omondi, Sharon, Legal Voting Age by Country, (24/04/2022), https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/legal-voting-age-by-country.html</p>
------------------	---	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---

Arjuna Shandavi	Hillmorton High School , New Zealand	Andrea Hotter	If You Give The World A Canvas	internet, online social experiments, reddit	<p>In 2017 and again in 2022, the popular online Social News website Reddit ran an online collaborative social experiment called r/place. In r/place, users had the ability to place down a coloured pixel on a large canvas with a cooldown timer of between five to 20 minutes. Individual communities, known as subreddits, banded together to create artwork that reflected themselves, as well users-made non-subreddit groups, who banded together to make internet culture references.</p> <p>During the 2022 r/place event, numerous live streamers on the popular video live streaming website Twitch, used the manpower of their viewers to build gargantuan versions of their logos, build obscene artworks, and target and attack notable artworks on the canvas, in order to get a crude laugh or two from their viewers, and to just disturb the natural flow of the subreddit. One notable streamer who did such things was Canadian Félix Lengyel, more commonly known as xQc, who had his followers build not one, but two versions of his logo, and destroyed numerous artworks on the canvas including a tribute to the popular children's show, 'My Little Pony'. XQc justified these actions by claiming that 'their just pixels' and even went as far as naming one of his live streams of the event 'Watch As Nerds Lose Their Marbles Over Pixels'.</p> <p>The administrators and moderators of r/place responded to the actions of xQc and other streamers by censoring several artworks that were made by their viewers, and by banning many of their viewers who tried to rebuild the artworks, for 15 years. These actions earned considerable backlash from internet celebrities and reddit users alike who believed such actions didn't live up to the ideals of r/place, with comments like "if you give the world a canvas, what do you expect it to create" being made. Furthermore, many people thought it was unfair to ban users for so long simply because they contributed to such artworks, and that r/place was becoming too restricted and controlled by the moderators, with some posts on the subreddit getting taken down for pointing out and criticizing the mods, which garnered even more backlash.</p> <p>On the other hand, numerous posts in the r/place subreddit, contained insults aimed at streamers, and xQc himself said that he had received more death threats in one hour of being involved in the event, than he had in the past six years. Several reddit users also reported getting Dms (Direct Messages) from other users that included death threats, among other things, simply for placing pixels on other communities' art.</p> <p>Study Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is it ever morally permissible to destroy artwork or things that took hours to make, simply because it's just "art"?2. Is it ever morally permissible to send death threats to other people, simply for doing things that you don't like?3. Are the actions that the administrators and moderators of r/place took justifiable? Why or why not? <p>References:</p> <p>https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2022/04/04/reddit-place-internet-communities/ https://www.reddit.com/r/place/?cx=988&cy=1800&px=199&ts=1649112460185 https://firstsportz.com/r-place-explained-and-xqc-getting-hate-for-r-place/</p>
-----------------	--------------------------------------	---------------	--------------------------------	---	---

Nicole Wong	Kristin School , New Zealand	Brenda Thorrington	Cheating in Competition: Dance or Disqualify?	ballot-rigging, collective punishment, dance competition	<p>It is the last day of the International Dance Prix, and although hundreds of teams wait nervously for prize-giving, Belle and her teammates are optimistic. Belle was runner-up in the junior category last year and is rumoured to have done exceptionally well this year. She is extremely happy with her performance and truly felt that her hours of practising every day were finally going to pay off. At the prize-giving ceremony, Belle is announced as the winner of the junior category, and Lisa, a high-performing senior at her studio wins the overall prize by popular vote. As the winner of the junior category, Belle was successful in securing the highest marks for both performance and technique. On the other hand, Lisa won the overall prize through a voting system, where each audience member can submit up to five votes for their favourite dancers. However, shortly after prize-giving, the adjudicating panel pulled the team aside. It turns out that Lisa only won the overall prize because of ballot-rigging. According to the International Dance Prix protocol, any misconduct or poor sportsmanship can be punishable through the suspension of the respective dance studio as a whole - upon the discretion of the adjudicating panel.</p> <p>Unfortunately for Lisa, she played no part in the vote-rigging scheme and only tried to convince the dance studio to avoid such plots when she was notified about it. In fact, it was the team managers who had conspired to change the ballots whilst all other dancers were also unaware. This was to boost the dance studio's reputation; specifically, for resources and connections to the professional field for dancers alongside some personal benefits of increased revenue. At first, the team managers denied committing such acts - but later confessed after the panel explained that they had empirical evidence. It is probable that there will be harsh consequences for the whole studio.</p> <p>Despite this, the head judge of the adjudicating panel, Josh, is unsure about how the dance studio should be punished. Whilst the result of the competition is clearly unfair, he is conflicted as to whether or not it is justified to punish all dancers of the studio.</p> <p>Josh feels uneasy about suspending Lisa from participating in future competitions as she arguably did nothing wrong. Lisa was not responsible for engineering the ballot-rigging. Moreover, she had tried to prevent the managers from ballot-rigging in the first place, although they did not listen to her attempts. It is likely that she was not in an ideal position to object, surrounded by adults who decide the success of her career. Josh recognises that Lisa may have felt obligated to listen to the team managers, and standing up to their ideas was a valiant effort. In addition, if the whole studio is banned from participation, dancers like Belle who won through pure skill will also be punished for something that barely concerns them. This seems particularly unfair to many innocent dancers.</p> <p>On the other hand, Josh feels that he is morally obligated to suspend the dance studio from further participation. Firstly, the ballot-rigging harmed other honest competitors who were unable to be rewarded for their efforts. Furthermore, even if the dancers themselves did not directly cheat, they are still indirectly involved. Lisa's achievement reflects the team managers' motives regardless of whether or not she intended for such things to happen. Though she had objected, just by participating in the Prix with the knowledge that the voting system was rigged, she allowed other participants to lose out. Finally, if the studio is not suspended, an unhealthy precedent could be set for the dance community; it is likely that if the misconduct has no consequences, then more participants will acknowledge cheating as a valid option.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Would it be morally permissible to punish individual dancers like Belle or Lisa based on the actions of a larger dance institution that they are part of? (2) When is collective punishment justified? Give parameters to explain your stance. (3) Does the fact that Lisa tried to protest against the ballot-rigging excuse her from the consequences of the studio's actions and her eventual compliance? Why or why not? <p>References:</p> <p>https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1155&context=etd https://theconversation.com/group-punishment-doesnt-fix-behaviour-it-just-makes-kids-hate-school-120219 https://iep.utm.edu/m-p-puni/</p>
-------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	--	--	--

Ryan Nguyen	Canley Vale High School NSW	Rhianna Kalemien	Another Chance	Medicine, family, job	<p>Joey's medical practices at the renowned city hospital have been praised by many doctors over the country. Her unique medical approach to recognising and treating illnesses over the past 12 years has finally allowed her to be promoted to an Attending Physician, where she is now responsible for running the emergency room and making major decisions that would alter the lives of many patients.</p> <p>In the midst of the hospital's afternoon chaos, a stretcher is rolled into the Emergency Room, carrying a bloodied victim of a fatal highway accident. Joey is immediately put on the case and rolls her unconscious patient to the nearby bed. Following an external examination, Joey gives the 'all-clear' for any bleeding, breathing a sigh of relief before ordering internal screening tests for her patient. However, she notices that her unconscious patient seems familiar. She looks like her mother, Jane.</p> <p>Upon the completion of the tests, internal bleeding and other injuries are ruled out, and thus her body is healthy. She remains unconscious however, and Joey starts to suspect extensive brain injury — even brain death. In every suspected brain death case, patients are usually subjected to 6 hours of tests, where 6 tests are completed twice. If they fail to respond to any of these tests, they are pronounced legally dead and the chance of regaining their consciousness is impossible.</p> <p>As duty calls, Joey is forced to leave to manage the emergency room, therefore leaving the survival of her mother to two ill-experienced doctors. These doctors begin performing the tests which would finally conclude whether or not Jane has sustained an injury that ultimately resulted in the death of her brain stem.</p> <p>5 hours and 30 minutes into the series of tests, she has so far failed to respond to any of the tests. Suddenly, Jane's heart flatlines as the doctors prepare for the final test. Joey is notified of the 'Code Blue' and rushes into the room, where the two doctors are standing by. As per universal protocol, patients with suspected brain death are labelled 'DNR' (Do Not Resuscitate), regardless of their progression on the tests. This is due to the extensive use of hospital equipment and resources. Joey however, sternly commands the doctors to begin resuscitating her mother, hence breaking hospital protocol and possibly jeopardising her medical career.</p> <p>Joey, being the Attending Physician, makes the other doctors follow her orders, where the Code Blue team, alongside with the only defibrillator, is rerouted from another patient, who is going into cardiac arrest, to Jane.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Should a doctor's personal relations with the patient affect the extent of their care for the patient? 2) Since victims have 6 hours of tests before they're determined legally dead, are they entitled to the full 6 hours, and hence be resuscitated in order for the tests to continue? 3) Does the expense of hospital resources outweigh the slim chances of giving someone another shot at life? Why/why not? 4) Should Joey be charged for medical malpractice for trying to save someone with a lower chance of survival rather than someone with a greater chance of survival— simply because she's her mother?
-------------	-----------------------------	------------------	----------------	-----------------------	---

<p>Sofia Apostolidis</p>	<p>Canley Vale High School NSW</p>	<p>Rhianna Kalemien</p>	<p>Maya's Justice</p>	<p>Justice, karma, bullying</p>	<p>Maya has been a victim of bullying for a few years since attending high school. She has experienced many forms of bullying, including physical, emotional and social harassment. She has kept this a secret from everyone she knows, including her family, friends, and teachers. Her bullies were Justin and Rebecca — a popular couple who acted kind around teachers, but were cruel to Maya who they deemed “uncool”. Even though Maya had been tormented for so long, she had never known why they harassed her so much. Every day she lived in fear of getting beat up or yelled at, and it has affected Maya’s mental wellbeing greatly.</p> <p>Recently, however, the teachers and principal at her school were made aware of the situation when a student witnessed Maya being harassed in the bathrooms. Justin and Rebecca were punished harshly and suspended for a week. Whilst they did not disclose the names of the perpetrators or the victim, rumours spread quickly and soon everyone in the school was aware of Justin and Rebecca’s actions towards Maya.</p> <p>Since their return, Justin and Rebecca have been labelled as the “outcasts”. Many of her classmates have confronted the both of them, often resulting in verbal harassment and even escalating to physical violence in a select few situations. All of Maya’s friends have spread outlandish and embarrassing rumours, some of which had supposedly gotten both Justin and Rebecca in a great deal of trouble with not only their parents, but the police as well.</p> <p>The teachers and faculty have also been relatively indifferent to the treatment of Justin and Rebecca after their suspension. Sometimes, Maya notices that the both of them are often scolded for simple mistakes during lessons— for whispering in class even when they weren’t or for dozing off when they blinked for just too long. The teachers have also seemed to turn a blind eye to the obvious treatment that they face during lunch, recess and after school.</p> <p>Maya has not corrected any of her friends, classmates, and teachers’ behaviour since Justin and Rebecca’s return to school. She believes that they deserve it for their actions towards her, even if it is a little extreme. After all, what goes around comes around.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is Maya’s attitude towards the treatment of Justin and Rebecca justified? Why or why not? 2. Are sentiments such as “what goes around comes around” true? Use your own knowledge to support your argument. 3. Is “karma” a reasonable explanation for the poor treatment of bad people? Why or why not? Explain your answer in detail.
<p>Yu Zhi Lim</p>	<p>Hwa Chong International School Singapore</p>	<p>Gerilynne Lee</p>	<p>Casualties caused by robots</p>	<p>robots, technology, casualties, school, money, compensation</p>	<p>Robots are programmed by humans. Robots have no emotional feelings. They are simply programmed to do a certain task, which they would execute. Who is to blame in an event where a robot injures or kills a person by accident?</p> <p>The scenario:</p> <p>Bob Middle School has always been a safe place, and a conducive environment for learning. It is a very technology-enabled school where technology underpins and enhances the learning environment. iPads are given to students and teachers to facilitate teaching and learning, interactive whiteboards are installed in each classroom and there are even robot relief teachers. Robot cleaners are employed to maintain the school’s cleanliness. There has never been a case of malfunctioning software or gadget since the introduction and installation of these technological enhancements. It was also the principal’s intention to bring such robots into the school, as he wished for a more fun and interactive learning environment, with convenience everywhere. The robot cleaners are manufactured and bought from Mr. Tan, an expert in robotic engineering. He is well known for his advanced robots who perform their jobs flawlessly, time and time again. The robot cleaner is more advanced than the usual robot cleaners commonly seen at homes. This robot cleaner is able to sweep up trash as big as a football, and shred it into smaller pieces before storing the remnants in its storage compartment.</p> <p>One day, three boys are playing soccer in the school courtyard. One of the boys kicks the soccer ball too far, so it ends up in the area where a robot cleaner is cleaning. Unbeknownst to the students, the robot is malfunctioning due to some unknown error and as such, the robot sweeps the ball into its shredding compartment. However, the ball gets stuck at the opening. Seeing this opportunity to retrieve the ball, the boy extends his hand into the opening to try to push the ball out. Tragedy strikes as the robot resumes working and starts to shred his arm with its sharp razor blades and powerful engine, leaving nothing but bits and pieces of skin and bones, and splattered blood everywhere. The boy faints and is sent to the hospital. The principal is in shock when he gets wind of this terrible news. He cannot believe it. The robot has broken the first law in the Three Laws of Robotics, which is a robot may not injure a human being or, through inaction, allow a human being to come to harm. More importantly, the parents of the boy with the mangled arm are distraught and furious. They want to seek compensation from the school.</p> <p>Here are some discussion questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who should be held responsible for this accident? The programmer, the robot, the principal or the victim? 2. Is it morally permissible to use robots as killing machines in wars without the robots having any control as to what they are doing? 3. Should the robots be destroyed if they have committed a crime? <p>Reference:</p> <p>Three Laws of Robots. In Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_Laws_of_Robotics</p>

Wendy Nguyen	Canley Vale High School NSW	Rhianna Kalemen	Because I was Hungry	theft, money, friendship	<p>Evelyn and Jade are close friends of three years. They go to the same high school and are both in the same class. Jade is a very good student, always showing respect for her peers and teachers. She is also a very kind and hardworking person. She regularly helps others out through kind gestures such as offering to carry heavy things for other students. For this reason, she feels a significant amount of pressure from her parents and teachers to do well.</p> <p>However, Jade's parents are struggling financially and are unable to fully provide for her. To save money for her family, she did not take public transport and has to walk 40 minutes to school every day. Evelyn, on multiple occasions, would buy things for Jade as she felt bad for her friend. Jade would always show her gratitude towards Evelyn, making sure to pay her back every time. Jade would also often starve at school because she could not afford to buy lunch. Despite this, she never complained about her family situation but instead, she would talk about how she was incredibly appreciative of her parents.</p> <p>One day, during class, Evelyn witnesses Jade looking into another classmate's bag. To her surprise, Jade grabs a wallet out of the bag and takes a \$10 note without anyone else realising. She quickly places the money inside her pocket and walks away. Evelyn did not want to call out Jade and get her into trouble so she decided to try and talk to her after class.</p> <p>After the bell rings for lunch, she follows Jade who dashes quickly outside and sees that she is lining up at the canteen to buy lunch. She figured that her friend was hungry, however, she knew that stealing was wrong. After Jade buys lunch, Evelyn goes to her and tells her that she should tell the classmate that she took their money and return it. Jade asks Evelyn to not tell anyone, and that she only stole the money because she was very hungry. She tells her that she would get into a lot of trouble and is afraid to disappoint her parents and teachers. Jade finally promises that she would never steal ever again. Evelyn was hesitant but decided to not tell anyone. Evelyn felt horrible for not telling on Jade but she believed that she would never steal again.</p> <p>Three days later though, Evelyn sees Jade stealing \$5 from the same classmate again. She felt extremely disappointed in her friend but at the same time, she didn't want to get her into trouble. Like last time, she waits for the bell for lunch to ring and follows Jade to the canteen. Unexpectedly, she sees Jade give all the money to her brother so he could buy lunch. Even though Jade stole the money, she gave everything to her brother who was also very hungry and kept none of it.</p> <p>Discussion Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What should Evelyn do? Should she tell a teacher or the classmate that Jade stole their money, knowing that she would get into a lot of trouble? 2. Should Jade receive any consequences? If so, what? 3. Are there any instances where stealing is justified? Does this apply to Jade's case? Explain your answer.
--------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	--------------------------	---

<p>Jiwon Shin</p>	<p>Stamford American International School Singapore</p>	<p>Amy Gilliland</p>	<p>Friend or Identity</p>	<p>Friendship, Identity, Asian Hate</p>	<p>Ella is a teenage girl who lives in the city of San Francisco, California, with her two parents. Her father was born in the US, and his great-grandparents immigrated to the United States from Ireland a century ago. Her mother, on the other side, is from a Chinese immigrant family, whose parents immigrated from China a few decades ago. Although Ella's mother is Chinese, because she grew up in the United States, her identity is heavily influenced by American culture.</p> <p>Ella has two best friends in school, Dahlia and Jessica. Dahlia comes from an Italian-American family, while Jessica also has a Chinese mother and an American dad.</p> <p>As COVID-19 started from the Chinese city of Wuhan, which quickly spread to the US, many citizens developed the concept of "Asian Hate", rooting from the misbelief that Asian people are the cause of COVID-19. Asian hate involved racial slurs or violence directed towards the Asian community. Many of the Asian communities experienced its impact on a day-to-day basis, having to face with racial slurs and verbal abuse that were often regarded as a "joke". Many who practiced and acted upon the idea of Asian Hate were unaware of the boundary between a joke and abuse, and a seemingly small joke developed to serious physical violence, and even death.</p> <p>The idea of Asian hate soon spread across different social media platforms. As the idea developed into a "trend", a majority of the people in her school, without much thought, took on the idea, thinking that it is cool, and started to develop hate on Asian people in their school. Dahlia, who has always wanted to be popular, started looking down on Ella, Jessica, and the whole Asian community. Whenever she caught Ella and Jessica coughing, or taking their mask off during PE lessons, she acted as if the two were diagnosed with COVID-19, and told them to "go back to their countries". When Ella and Jessica brought homemade Chinese lunches to school, Dahlia found an opportunity to verbally abuse them by saying, "You should stop eating bats, and eat normal food like the rest of us." The whole class snickered at the two girls who ran out, humiliated.</p> <p>When Ella and Jessica couldn't stand Dahlia's mistreatment any longer, they tried to hold a conversation with Dahlia on the problem. They trusted Dahlia to realize how offensive her behaviors are, and that she should stop it immediately. Despite their efforts, Dahlia's response was both disappointing and hurtful, telling the two to stop influencing her with the wrong ideas. She told them, "If doing this means that I can be recognized among the other students, then I don't see the point of stopping my actions. Everyone does it anyway, you know?" Instead of apologizing, her friend even demanded the two to take a side. She told them that choosing to support the Asian community is a betrayal to the country that they are born in. Both Ella as well as Jessica, who are part Asian part American, were torn apart. If they chose to stand up for their Asian side, they felt like they would betray their friend and half of their identity, and would be cast out by their classmates. However, if they chose to stand with Dahlia, they would be betraying their own mother.</p> <p>Written by Jiwon Shin, Gracelyn Yu, Angelyn Yu, Ziyou Wang, Vaanya Vatsyayan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is Dahlia's choice of "following the trend" a moral action? 2. Is it morally correct for Ella and Jessica to even consider standing against the heritage of their parents to fit in within their peers? 3. Is Dahlia's demanding on Ella and Jessica to "take a side" a moral action?
-------------------	---	----------------------	---------------------------	---	--

William Kheav	Canley Vale High School NSW	Rhianna Kalemien	Un-named	<p>euthanasia, caregiver burden, death</p>	<p>Following a grave head-on car accident, your wife of 34 years was hospitalised in critical condition. After nearly succumbing to her injuries with numerous threats of flatlining, your wife finally rose from her seven-month-long comatose state; however, it quickly became apparent that she sustained numerous life-changing injuries.</p> <p>The doctors believe she has suffered severe traumatic brain injuries and dire spinal cord injuries. An intricate diagnosis details the following about your wife's condition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Paraplegia, meaning she is incapable of walking and thus reliant on a wheelchair to move * Significantly degraded cognitive abilities said to be below that of a five-year-old * Diminished fine motor skills, said to also be below that of a five-year-old * Concentration difficulties * Potential long-term and/or short-term memory impairment * No longer has the capacity to care for herself and their affairs; future independence is next to nil. For the foreseeable future, the patient must rely on another individual to survive. <p>Doctors believe your wife's condition will likely not improve, if at all; however, they warn you that traumatic brain injury can be unpredictable at times. Even so, the severity of the injuries puts the chance of recovery at a very slim 2%. The slim chances of recovery are further exacerbated by the lack of treatment options.</p> <p>Having exhausted all the possible opportunities, the doctors are left with no choice but to allow your wife to return home despite her state. You are assigned the legal guardian of your wife. Unfortunately, your wife's extensive injuries have racked up quite the medical bill, leaving you to deal with a hefty financial bill. Paying off the medical bills puts you in near debt, causing stress and leaving you unable to afford a carer for your wife.</p> <p>Consequently, you are forced to juggle between caring for your wife and the rest of your life. As much as you wish to care for her full time, your full-time job is the only thing keeping you afloat. Bathroom, showering, feeding her, legal decisions on her behalf—everything becomes your responsibility. However, given your long-lasting 34 years of marriage, memories, devotion, loyalty and love for your wife, you figure you owe her this much and are happy to make such sacrifices. You hope that with time, your wife may return to her former self. After 5 years though, this hope begins to gradually slip. Far too frequently, the woman you fell in love with 39 years ago disappears. Your wife is apathetic, fails to recognise you, is unable to recall events of significance and has a substantially unfamiliar personality. Seldomly, your "old" wife reappears. She returns exactly to her former self; she interacts with her surroundings, recognises you, is able to recall crucial memories and retains her familiar personality. However, following these moments, she always relapses into an extended period of catatonia, which diminishes any spark of hope. At the same time, these welcoming moments gradually increase in length as the years go on. Despite this "unexpected but positive behaviour", doctors still place her chance of recovery at a measly 2%.</p> <p>Caring for your wife all those years has had an insidious effect on both your mental and physical health. It is mentally tormenting to receive a brief glimpse of your old wife, only for it to be ripped away from you callously. Not only that but, your life is now ruled by working a full-time job and being the sole carer of your wife, which has led to acute amounts of stress and burnout. You have little time to invest into actually living and enjoying your life. At this point, caring for your wife has turned into a burden. You wish you could place her under hospital care or an institution, but your financial predicament has left you stranded.</p> <p>Your inability to cope with the situation has led to the growth of resentment and a desire to be relieved of your duties. However, the only tangible way to achieve this causes your mind to stray toward the doctor's original recommendation. "An alternative to caring for her is to euthanise her. It is legal in this circumstance, but the decision is up to her legal guardian—you".</p> <p>Is it time to let go? Discussion Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When it comes to preserving the life of another individual, how much is too much? Is there even a "too much"? 2. Is it fair for you to feel resentful of the situation? 3. Would you choose to euthanise your wife or continue caring for her despite the burden of doing so? Does your wife's inability to decide for herself influence your choice?
---------------	-----------------------------	------------------	----------	--	--

Gajendra Gautama	Stamford American International School Singapore	Amy Gilliland	The Moral Case on School Textbook Purchase	Family, Socioeconomic Status, Education	<p>Students in your neighbourhood are looking forward to your new classes. As students, you're required to bring the newest edition textbooks to each of your classes, and without them, it's almost impossible to catch up with the other students. Teachers make constant references to them in class and often assign the practice questions in those textbooks for students' homework. Unfortunately, because of the school's financial situation, the textbooks aren't provided for free so students are required to purchase them with their own money at a separate shop or online. Yet, with each class needing its own unique textbook for just one year, and with some classes needing an extra textbook or workbook, it becomes quite expensive. There are two ways to get these books. The first way is to buy them digitally. The second way is to purchase a physical copy of the textbook. The first is more convenient as students don't need to slave away everyday carrying stacks of books across their classes. However, it requires an online subscription to a website and the price itself is much higher than the physical copy. The physical copy is sold by a local bookstore near your neighbourhood. The bookstore has fallen on tough times due to the Covid-19 Pandemic and there's a substantial possibility that it might go under.</p> <p>James comes from a poorer background and isn't as well-off as you or the rest of your peers in the school. To make matters worse, he has been having a rough time at home. Despite his parents working extremely hard to support their family of five, the family is currently having heavy financial troubles, being barely able to pay rent on their apartment and keep him in school. His parents are refusing to buy textbooks for him, which makes James even more stressed, as he can't afford to get left behind in class. James is an extremely diligent and industrious student and is hoping to acquire a scholarship by performing well academically.</p> <p>In addition to being a diligent student, James is economically diligent as he has been saving up money he earned from jobs he took up in the past. He also inherited money from his beloved uncle's death. He has saved enough money to buy himself physical copies of some of the textbooks he needs in school. He considered buying those textbooks but he wants to use his money for other things also important to him e.g he wants to get his little sister a bicycle for her birthday. Furthermore, he promised his now deceased uncle that he would invest his money he gained from his inheritance into stock-trading.</p> <p>As for the textbooks themselves, they are overpriced and the company behind them is infamous for unethical business practices. For instance, the company has been known to plagiarise texts from other creators but have been legally able to get away with it because the original creators did not have any intellectual rights over their texts. Unfortunately, James can't just go and buy cheaper textbooks from a different company as these specific textbooks are the ones that are expected and demanded by the school.</p> <p>Considering James' poor financial situation, and the fact that the textbook company isn't the most moral organisation, James is considering pirating textbooks off the internet in order to keep up with his classes and perform well academically. But making this decision, James has to consider many factors. Firstly, he has to consider the fact that, if he decided to pirate textbooks, he would be contributing to the ruin of his neighbourhood's local bookstore. However, if he decided to buy the textbooks legitimately, he would be breaking his promise to his dead uncle and neglecting his little sister.</p> <p>Written by Gajendra Gautama, Johanna Isabel Que, Tijana Trivunovic, Arjan Singh Gujral, Diego Nusiner</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Is it morally correct for the school to only allow textbooks from a certain brand in the scenario? Why or Why not? 2) Is it moral for his parents to refuse buying textbooks for James? 3) Explain, with an ethical point-of-view, of the consequences that James would have to face for his decisions.
------------------	--	---------------	--	---	--

Caelle Dunne-Vidulich	Queenwood School for Girls NSW	Lye Chan Long	Freedom to die	suicide, morality, rights	<p>Suicide has been a controversial topic for many years. People have talked about the control we have over our bodies and our duties as humans. Religious, cultural and historic factors have all played into how people view suicide and the different reasons and factors that affect a decision like that.</p> <p>There have been many cultures where suicide has been not only a moral action, but it was honourable. In Japan, samurai could take their own life in an honourable way called seppuku or hara-kiri where they would use a short sword to cut open their abdomen. They would do this to pay for crimes, show loyalty, avoid capture, or reclaim lost honour, and was seen throughout society as normal.</p> <p>In most modern societies suicide has negative connotations and often is related to mental illness. If you go into school and your friend tells you their dad's sister just committed suicide you don't rejoice, you act sombre and tell them you're sorry. But why is this the reaction? Why is suicide often considered a bad thing?</p> <p>Early Christians believed that suicide was an inexcusable sin, saying that God said "Thou shalt not kill", though modern Christians believe it's still wrong and a sin, but it may not be unforgivable. Some argue that Jesus committed suicide, they say that Jesus was God manifested into a human and that he could do things like walk on water and heal the blind, he could have made an army to kill every last Roman, he could have saved himself but instead, he committed suicide for our sins.</p> <p>Thomas Aquinas (philosopher born in 1225) agreed with the early Christian arguments and went even further by talking about our control over our own bodies. He said that we don't have full ownership over our bodies, we possess them and use them, but god owns them so committing suicide is wrong as you are killing something that is not your own and that it was going against the divine order. David Hume then argues back that if God has a divine plan then if something like someone killing themselves is not supposed to be in that plan then why doesn't God just stop it. Furthermore, he says that if we don't own our bodies and interfering with death goes against god then he asks if you were sick and you had medicine to cure yourself you should obviously be allowed to take that medicine if it prevents you from dying but doesn't that go against the argument against suicide. He even goes as far as to say that we don't know what this divine order is and therefore how can we use it to decide whether anything is moral or not.</p> <p>Plato believed that suicide was never morally right. He argued that we have a duty that the gods put us here to do and that relieving ourselves from that duty is cowardly or lazy. People have gone further when applying this argument by saying that we have a duty to not just different religious gods but even society and the government, society provides us with benefits such as resources, safety, and security and we have a duty to work and contribute to society for as long as possible. Arguments against this often say that well when you get to older age or have a disability and working becomes painful are you still obligated to keep working to give back until your very last breath and if you don't it makes you a bad person.</p> <p>Apart from euthanasia of a terminally ill person or suicide due to mental illness what makes people consider this action immoral?</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is suicide a moral action? If not is there ever an okay situation where it would be okay? 2. Do we own our own bodies? To what extent do we have control over them? 3. Do we have a right to choose how and/or when we die? 4. If a perfectly healthy and right-minded individual had done all they wanted to in life and wanted to kill themselves, do they have that right? And is it wrong for them to do so?
-----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------	----------------	---------------------------	--

Linda Pham	Selwyn College , New Zealand	Aliesha Simmons	Desensitization of Tragedy	media, desensitization, inaction	<p>It is well known that mainstream media tend to have a negative bias when it comes to what they choose to cover. For instance, with the recent covid pandemic, it was reported by the New York Times that, "About 87 percent of Covid coverage in national U.S. media last year [2020] was negative. The share was 51 percent in international media, 53 percent in U.S. regional media and 64 percent in scientific journals." [1] Constantly, it seems, we are bombarded with death tolls and casualties from wars, protests, natural disasters, crime and accidents. Not only can this have negative effects on a person's mental health [2] [3], but it can also play to immune us to tragedies.</p> <p>One of the instances where this has occurred is through our perception of climate change. Countless articles that emphasize our lack of progress in reducing global emissions or the tremendous consequences that we could face have also helped build a sense of hopelessness and inevitable doom - especially in today's youth. [4] [5]</p> <p>Psychic numbing is a psychological phenomenon that describes how as the number of people suffering increases, our compassion and empathy decreases. This concept is well encapsulated in Joseph Stalin's quote, "a single death is a tragedy, a million deaths are a statistic". Often in the media, we can see the phenomenon at play. Headlining articles that constantly cite how millions of people were displaced by wars, hundreds who had to evacuate from floods and even dozens who died from mass shootings all, although factually accurate, add to numb people to sad news. [6]</p> <p>This desensitization to violence and tragedy can encourage inaction as people feel that their personal actions would have no effect on something so major or inevitable. "If I look at the mass I will never act. If I look at the one, I will." as said by Mother Teresa. [7] The news' main purpose has always been to inform the public about affairs or events to help people better understand the world around them. Is it time we consider whether pure factual reporting is enough to achieve this goal?</p> <p>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the media have a responsibility to care about how its audience would react to otherwise factual reporting? 2. Is it possible for news sites to provide an accurate portrayal of what is happening around the world (i.e. objective reality)? How should they select what gets reported? 3. Knowing the effects of psychic numbing and the mental downside of constantly consuming media, is willful ignorance an ethical solution a viewer/reader can take? <p>1. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/03/24/briefing/boulder-shooting-george-segal-astrazeneca.html</p> <p>2. https://www.verywellmind.com/is-watching-the-news-bad-for-mental-health-4802320</p> <p>3. https://time.com/5125894/is-reading-news-bad-for-you/</p> <p>4. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LxgMdjyw8uw</p> <p>5. https://www.npr.org/2021/09/14/1037023551/climate-change-children-young-adults-anxious-worried-study</p> <p>6. https://www.arithmeticofcompassion.org/psychic-numbing</p> <p>7. https://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2007/11/slovic</p>
------------	------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

Linda Pham	Selwyn College, New Zealand	Alisha Simmons	Cancel Culture	cancel culture, accountability, punishment	<p>'Cancel Culture' is a modern term often used to describe mass cancellation of influential figures such as politicians, celebrities, comedians and CEOs after they have said or done something viewed as morally wrong. However, in recent years subjects that are open to "cancellation" can be movies, TV shows and regular people. The aim of "cancelling" is to exert social pressure, such as through boycotting and public shaming, on a person or organization that can lead to social as well as career repercussions. Social media platforms, particularly Twitter, have served to further amplify the impact of 'Cancel Culture' - causing it to be more prevalent in mainstream media.</p> <p>In 2021, model and TV personality, Chrissy Teigen received backlash after Courtney Stodden, an American media personality, came out about the bullying they received from Teigen when they were only a teenager. Stodden, who first rose to fame due to their marriage to their 51 year old agent when they were 16, talked about how Chrissy Teigen would write mean tweets to them as well as send private messages telling them to "kill" themselves. The ensuing public backlash also caused other alleged instances of Teigen's history of cyberbullying to resurface. The scandal caused Chrissy Teigen to temporarily leave Twitter, have her line of cookware taken from Target and drop out of her Netflix show. Teigen also released two public apologies stating, "There is simply no excuse for my past horrible tweets. My targets didn't deserve them. No one does..." She also states, "I'm in the process of privately reaching out to the people I insulted." However, many who came out about Teigan's past bullying have said they have not heard from her privately, including Stodden. [1]</p> <p>In August 2020, Gregory Patton, a professor at the University of Southern California, became embroiled in a scandal after several black students reported him saying the N-word multiple times during an online class. It was a class about communication and Professor Patton was giving examples of filler words such as 'err' or 'umm'. In the class, he also gives the example of how the most common Chinese filler word is 'that' which is pronounced "ne-ga" (nèige). Black students who were in the class went on to write, "The way we heard it in class was indicative of a much more hurtful word with tremendous implications for the Black community". This along with several complaints caused Patton to be temporarily replaced until further investigation by USC. Many people and previous alumni came out to defend Patton saying, "We unanimously recognize Prof. Patton's use of 'na ge' as an accurate rendition of common Chinese use". After investigation, it was concluded that Professor Patton "did not violate the university's policy," and he has returned to his regular teaching schedule. [2] People who are in support of 'Cancel Culture' think of it as placing accountability on powerful organizations and people that otherwise would get away with it. Some say that a better label for this rising movement should be "consequence culture". The term became more popular as movements such as the #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter also took hold. Those in favour view 'Cancel Culture' as a way to give a voice to victims who would often go ignored and unheard. As Aja Romano from Vox writes "[cancel culture stems from] collectivized demands for more accountability from social systems that have long failed marginalized people and communities." [3]</p> <p>Critics of 'Cancel Culture' say that it is an unproductive method that does not allow for open discourse. Many say it is "censorship" and "infringement on free speech", even referring to it as "mob rule". Others who take a less offensive approach argue that it creates a culture that does not encourage forgiveness or compassion. Plenty of celebrities, who are on the receiving end of 'Cancel Culture', have also talked about how "toxic" 'Cancel Culture' is. J.K Rowling has been "cancelled" after publicly declaring that transwomen are not women on social media. The ensuing backlash has made her write, "Perhaps... the best way to prove your movement isn't a threat to women, is to stop stalking, harassing and threatening us." [4] after revealing that she has gotten death threats after her home address was posted online.</p> <p>It is also argued that 'Cancel Culture' actually brings no significant change long-term. [5]</p> <p>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is placing public pressure on (powerful) individuals and organizations an effective way to hold accountability? 2. Should you separate someone's work/ achievements from someone's actions/ beliefs? Or to what extent? 3. Is targeting someone's career a fair way of bringing out justice/ punishment? <p>1. https://www.usmagazine.com/celebrity-news/pictures/chrissy-teigen-bullying-backlash-complete-timeline/the-aftermath/ 2. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/09/08/professor-suspended-saying-chinese-word-sounds-english-slur 3. https://www.vox.com/22384308/cancel-culture-free-speech-accountability-debate 4. https://www.straitstimes.com/life/arts/harry-potter-author-jk-rowling-reveals-death-threats-over-transgender-row 5. https://www.newstatesman.com/science-tech/2020/07/cancel-culture-does-not-exist</p>
------------	-----------------------------	----------------	----------------	--	---

Gabriel Wong	Christian Brothers' Highschool Lewisham NSW	Szilvia Soter	The Art of Cultural Appropriation	culture, art, appropriation.	<p>The modern world is shifting towards a more multicultural society where racism is being controlled more than ever before. This influence has made its way into the world of the arts, setting a scene for greater expression of culture and emotion. These new conditions have brought to light past and present cultural appropriation in the arts. Cultural appropriation is when an individual or a group, typically in a majority, adopts cultural elements of a minority. It is frequently associated with copyright since people who culturally appropriate often do not acknowledge the original creator or their culture. It is to be noted that cultural appropriation is not inherently an unethical act but, it frequently leads to conflict because it can reawaken racist ideas by diminishing the cultural identity of a group.</p> <p>Historically, cultural art has been integrated into various works. Henri Matisse, a French artist, was known to have been inspired by cloths from the Democratic Republic of Congo, influencing the jagged lines used in his famous work "Red Interior Still Life on a Blue Table". This style similarly inspired Pablo Picasso to repaint "Les Femmes d'Alger (O. J. R. Version O)", adding mask-like features to the artwork, mimicking the headwear of many cultures across Africa.</p> <p>The fame of these artworks has assisted in the recognition of various cultural groups around Africa and has boosted their local economies through tourism. These artworks have also strengthened the connection between African nations and the rest of the world, promoting peace and trade. Contrarily, although these pieces do not explicitly belittle African culture, there is conflict surrounding the lack of explicit acknowledgement of the original artists' culture, developing an underlying notion of cultural inferiority. In these cases, the culturally appropriating artist's intentions have been largely ignored.</p> <p>There is still controversy in culturally appropriated works where the original artists are acknowledged. In Australia, the art of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders has been heavily subjected to appropriation. Australian tourist hotspots commonly sell culturally appropriated Aboriginal dot paintings, didgeridoos and clapsticks. These locations acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as the traditional owners of the land and market the souvenirs as Aboriginal art. Members of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community have stated that "it's really hurtful" to culturally appropriate their works, particularly because art is a major component of their culture.</p> <p>On the other hand, the exposure of these artworks has contributed to the image of Australia being more closely associated to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. This has exposed the systemic racism embedded in Australia and has sparked action to rectify the past. Moreover, some of the profit from the sale of appropriated art goes into maintaining nature reserves and the land of the Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders, allowing them to return to their traditional way of life in some areas of Australia.</p> <p>In this case, copyright laws have been unable to act due to the wavering legal definition of cultural appropriation.</p> <p>Cultural appropriation in the arts is negatively viewed in society as it has been associated with forgery and racism in recent years. Conversely, the influences of culture on various artforms have allowed for a widespread artistic scene in the contemporary era.</p> <p>Discussion Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it ethical for artist to appropriate cultural arts? 2. Do the artists' intentions contribute to the morality of cultural appropriation in the arts? 3. Is it moral to illegalise cultural appropriation in the arts? <p>Sources:</p> <p>https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2021/jun/14/masks-monsters-masterpieces-yinka-shonibare-picasso-africa https://www.abc.net.au/triplej/programs/hack/cultural-appropriation-in-indigenous-art/13370598</p>
--------------	---	---------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------	--

<p>Marcus Ke & Daniel Carter</p>	<p>Newington College NSW</p>	<p>Andrew Costantino</p>	<p>The Spermutations of Anonymous Donations</p>	<p>Sperm donations, right of privacy, right of knowledge</p>	<p>Should sperm donations be anonymous? Or should donors reveal information about themselves? In the rapidly progressing field of assisted reproductive technology, sperm donations are just another way for people to produce a child. But as these sperm donations expand in popularity, so do the grey areas from what is moral to what is unjust.</p> <p>Sperm donations provide the opportunity for people to have children if they otherwise cannot. Often these people can include single women, heterosexual couples where the male is infertile, gay or lesbian couples. For many of these people, having a child is outside of reality. However, understanding and social acceptance of sperm donations have expanded, resulting in its popularity extending from being a niche to being the method of reproduction for 30,000-60,000 children in the US alone per year. (The Atlantic)</p> <p>The law has dealt with these advances in varying degrees of competence. The Assisted Reproductive Treatment Further Amendment Act In Victoria, Australia, jolted the world into awareness of the advancements in sperm donations in 2004. The Act enabled recipients of the donations to have access to information, such as medical history, physical characteristics (such as ethnicity and height) and occupation of their donors. Those who had already been conceived through sperm donations now had the right to examine information about their, previously anonymous, donor. There has yet to be a single law that encompasses the United States; however, many support the Uniform Parentage Act, which sets the grounds that when a donor presents the sperm to a consenting couple, the donor is not acknowledged as a parent. Rather, all legal fraternity rights are given to the co-parent of the married couple. In the United Kingdom, those who request access to information, especially if they have been conceived through the donor or are parents of a conceived child, are granted permission to view their medical history etc. One person's sperm donation can be used amongst a limit of ten families; however, there is no current maximum for how many children are allowed to be conceived in each family.</p> <p>These case studies represent two different ideologies: the right to privacy and anonymity against the right to knowledge of the receiver and their lineage. One on hand, the donor is typically seeking the right to privacy. First of all, donors often fear that their offspring or recipients of the sperm will approach them later on in life asking for financial aid because they are technically related by blood. Because in many countries there is a blurred line of claims between the biological relationship of the donor and the parental side of the co-parent, this can often be decidedly confusing. In addition, a major reason donor's want anonymity is because they fear their public image being tarnished if found to be a donor. There is already some negative stigma around sperm donations and donors can be worried about the impact on their personal lives. Furthermore, the donors had entered into a contract of anonymity. After all, if a conceived child was to learn of their biological parent, this would be breaching the original contract. In actual fact, these donors would most likely not have signed up for such an agreement if their anonymity was compromised.</p> <p>On the other hand, the recipient - and often child - wishes to know who the donor is for their own interest and pursuit of being comfortable with who they are. This is a natural response. It is also important to ensure that recipients are not partnering with a close relative, and they may need detailed access to family medical history for this. Another point to note is the legitimacy of the right of knowing their biological connections? Furthermore, they have been entered into a contract from birth. Yet the conceived child who emerges from the contractual agreement did not in any way partake or consent in this decision or agreement. Should they be bound by a contract that they did not consent to? Or does a right to life precede the right to consent?</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you believe any of the legislation – Australia, US, UK - are moral? What do you think would be an ideal ethical legislation for anonymous sperm donations? 2. Do people who are born as a result of sperm donation have an unconditional right to know their biological parent? 3. Should contracts that prioritize anonymity be respected even if they contravene one's right to know their biological lineage? 4. Is the right to know your biological parent, even if they are not your legal guardian, an inalienable human right? <p>https://www.abc.net.au/religion/incommensurable-rights-the-dilemma-of-sperm-donor-anonymity/10097112#:~:text=Therightsofdonors,ofgameteswasstrictlyprohibited</p> <p>https://web.stanford.edu/class/siw198q/websites/reprotech/NewWaysofMakingBabies/spermeth.htm#:~:text=Theidentityofthedonor,offspringproducedbyhissperm</p> <p>https://academic.oup.com/lawfam/article/33/3/277/5575251</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2826462/</p> <p>https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-06-15/second-generation-children-conceived-from-sperm-donors/11174198?nw=0&r=HtmlFragment</p>
--------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--	--

Rosanna Cartwright	Santa Sabina College NSW	Rachele Rugiero	A Nation of Disinformation	Disinformation, journalist censorship, social media	<p>People in the Philippines spend over 10 hours a day online, more than any other country in the world [1]. In a country where the online 'reality' can be the only one that counts, the role of the media is increasingly coming into question.</p> <p>Since 2016, Filipino President Duterte has pursued a so-called "war on drugs" that targets citizens living in impoverished areas. All media coverage of the "war on drugs" has been heavily censored and many journalists have been killed or imprisoned on false charges [2]. This led to the UN Human Rights Council passing an October 2020 resolution which called for the Philippines to "ensure accountability for human rights violations and abuses", including a death toll of 112 journalists, recorded by the UNESCO Observatory of Killed Journalists [3]. Most surprisingly, President Duterte's approval rating currently sits at 91% in the Philippines, despite his ineffective response to COVID-19, the collapse of the free media and human rights abuses occurring all over the country [4].</p> <p>This is due to the large influence of the media and widespread disinformation. Commenting on the influence of social media, Maria Ressa says, "In a country with weak institutions, social media networks and the internet are the way things move" [5]. Ressa is a Filipino journalist, 2018 Time Person of the Year and the 2021 Nobel Peace Prize recipient, who has been subjected to politically motivated prosecution since 2017 [6]. Her local reputation has suffered due to Duterte's popularity, with his supporters controlling the narrative about Ressa on social media.</p> <p>Part of Duterte's attempts to debilitate the Philippines' critical media outlets and censor journalists such as Ressa, involves the creation of hundreds of "troll farms" [7]. A 2016 report by Ressa's news website Rappler, titled "Propaganda War: Weaponizing the Internet", reveals that Duterte and his supporters were mobilising armies of paid trolls to silence critics, intimidate opponents and spread disinformation online [8]. Ross Tapsell, researcher at the Australian National University states, "When a newspaper writes an unflattering story about Duterte or a government project or policy, the trolls will bombard the comments section" and "post hundreds of comments attacking the journalist [...] in order to hijack or co-opt the discourse around it" [9]. The practice of "troll-farming" is particularly prevalent on Facebook, the most dominant platform in the Philippines, with 96% of internet users accessing it [10]. Rappler's report also revealed that a pro-Duterte network of over 200 fake Facebook and Instagram accounts were influencing millions of Filipinos [11]. This kind of orchestrated disinformation is what Facebook has dubbed "coordinated inauthentic behaviour", and several fake accounts were removed in late 2018 [12]. Katie Harbath, Facebook's former Public Policy Director for Global Elections, described the Philippines as "patient zero" in the "global disinformation epidemic" [13].</p> <p>Another tactic used by Duterte is the FUD Strategy - Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt [14]. This disinformation strategy spreads negative or false information to promote fear, infringing on freedom of speech by banning certain political views. The 2021 Philippine Human Rights Act by US Congress has explicitly requested the "effective protection" of "journalists" [15]. However, this has had little effect on the treatment of journalists and has done nothing to stop the spread of disinformation in the Philippines.</p> <p>Evidently, the spread of disinformation in the Philippines, combined with the suppression of journalists' freedom of speech, has created a nation of disinformation. Overall, limited responses by social media platforms and international organisations have thus far proven ineffective in combating disinformation under President Duterte.</p> <p>Discussion questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) With reference to this case, discuss ethical considerations in favour of freedom of speech and ethical considerations against freedom of speech. 2) What should be done, if anything, to protect the rights and freedoms of journalists? 3) Do social media platforms have an ethical obligation to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) stay neutral on political matters? b) monitor and remove hate speech? 4) Could spreading disinformation ever be ethical and, if so, in what circumstances? <p>References:</p> <p>[1] <https://www.statista.com/statistics/803812/daily-time-spent-using-online-media-by-activityphilippines/>;</p> <p><https://www.smh.com.au/world/asia/she-just-keeps-on-going-duterte-critic-maria-ressa-s-fig-ht-for-press-freedom-20210809-p58h3j.html>.</p> <p>[2] <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/philippines>.</p> <p>[3] <https://en.unesco.org/themes/safety-journalists/observatory/country/223790>.</p>
--------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	---	--

Anita Avia	St Margarets College , New Zealand	Amanda Surridge	Kids getting older younger	Childhood, Maturity, Social Construct	<p>Have you noticed that nowadays it's hard to recognise how old a child is? Sometimes even telling the difference between a 9 year old and a 12 year old is difficult. This isn't a unique observation but rather is the result of a phenomenon known as KGOY (kids getting older younger). This describes the idea that over generations kids are maturing at an earlier age.</p> <p>KGOY stems from the idea that children are targeted and exposed to content that had previously been designed for older audience. Creating a desire amongst young people to appear and act older. It is perpetuated by social media and marketing that creates content targeted at youth in order to attract a larger audience.</p> <p>For example in 2003 Vogue magazine created Teen Vogue magazine which was advertised towards children from the age of 10 to 16. Teen Vogue features young celebrities who usually grow up to feature on the front cover of the Vogue magazine. Spreads from its magazine typically contain make-up products the reader can use to achieve the pictured celebrity's look as well as life advice from someone as young as thirteen! It can be argued that magazines such as Teen Vogue portray the illusion that these young people have everything figured out before they even start high school. Outside of magazine articles, we often congratulate people for being 'wise beyond their years', promoting the idea within young people that success can be achieved through maturity at an early age.</p> <p>The effects of KGOY are becoming more and more evident. An old interview of popular actor and rapper Jaden Smith has resurfaced and gone viral. In the clip Smith tells the interviewer he's grateful he grew up around more adults than children his own age, because it meant that he learnt more from older people. He recalled how when he was younger everyone his own age was crazy and unfocused, explaining that when around kids as old as him he thought "Dude oh my god can we talk about the political and economical state of the world right now?"</p> <p>While this clip has gone viral for Smith's supposedly absurd childhood experience this perfectly outlines another effect of KGOY, the changing of values in children. Youth who look up to and respect older people's opinions and beliefs now want to emulate these mannerisms in their own life. Some theorists who might also argue that 'knowledge is power' view this as a positive effect, that this pattern is the foundation for progress between generations. They believe experiencing mature content at a younger age helps spark curiosity, teaches kids new concepts and therefore expands their wider world view. KGOY means younger generations are talking, thinking and acting more maturely than is expected at their age and are beginning to place higher value on more sophisticated problems.</p> <p>It's easy to see the effects of KGOY in our present society, but many wonder how it will continue to grow and shape the children of our future. Since the growth of awareness around this phenomenon experts have since referred to KGOY as the "death of childhood". It can be argued that there is a lack of appreciation for childhood and that nowadays kids don't want to just be kids. As the trend of early maturity continues to increase, some KGOY theorists question if one day childhood will be unrecognisable.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Does KGOY help or harm an individual child? Why?</p> <p>Although KGOY is evidently shortening childhood, is it justified if it's producing more responsible, well informed and impassioned people at an earlier point in their life? Explain</p> <p>At what time is it appropriate to expose children to the severity of worldly problems? Is there a way of balancing the preservation of childhood with the responsibilities and burdens of adolescence?</p> <p>Do brands have a moral duty to market their products in a certain way to avoid KGOY? How might this be achieved?</p> <p>How can we decide what an appropriate age group to market a certain product towards is?</p> <p>https://www.kaleidoscopetd.com/kgoy/ https://studybreaks.com/tvfilm/kgoy-social-media/ https://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2006/12/24/Blame-it-on-KGOY-Kids-Getting-Older-Younger-but-toys-are-passe/stories/200612240253 https://michaeltchong.com/kgoy/</p>
------------	------------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

Hirundi Indrasiri	Aitken College VIC	Mary-Anne DiMartino	Why should you adopt a pet?		<p>Many parents do not get their children pets, because of some stupid reason. However, having a pet can be really beneficial for children. Pets can teach kids things, they can give kids a sense of meaning and pets can reduce social anxiety and stress.</p> <p>Firstly, pets can teach valuable life lessons. These life lessons include trust, responsibility and patience. Learning these skills from a young age can really benefit kids in the future. It will also help them to become a better person in society. For instance, if children are able to feed, care and take the time to bond with their furry friend, they will better be able to deal with their adult responsibilities. Learning organisation and time management skills with a puppy can certainly train children for going to work on time, paying bills and keeping promises! Parents, isn't this what you want for your kids? Therefore, by having a pet kids can learn these life lessons quicker.</p> <p>Secondly, pets provide kids with a sense of purpose. Kids having a sense of purpose will guarantee a good physical and mental wellbeing. Not only this, but kids having a pet will have better mental health, they will sleep better and also they are much, much happier than kids who don't have a pet. When children are having to go to school, do their homework and take care of their family chores, a dog offers the opportunity to unwind and relax with their loved dog. Thus, children will find their purpose faster with the help of a pet. After all, a man's best friend is a dog!</p> <p>Finally, pets can reduce mental conditions. Research has shown that by having a pet, post traumatic disorder symptoms can reduce by 84%. It is also shown that 97% of pet owners have an improved mental health. Another study also found that 98% of all pet owners have reported having a better mood. Having an improved mental health can prevent people from getting mental conditions like anxiety, ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder) and depression. Hence why having a pet can reduce the risk of developing serious mental conditions.</p> <p>In conclusion, having a pet can bring hope and joy to a child's life. Pets can teach important lessons to kids, they can also give a child a sense of purpose and finally they can help prevent kids from developing medical conditions. Therefore, all parents should buy their child a pet.</p>
-------------------	--------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	--	---

Selwyn Giddy	Covenant Christian School, Gordon, ACT	Jocelyn James	What should we do with Kant?	Immanuel Kant, racism, anti-racism	<p>In recent years, a multitude of anti-racist actions have sparked controversy across the globe. After the 2020 death of George Floyd, US protesters destroyed or defaced monuments to Confederate soldiers [1]; in the UK, the destruction of slave trader Edward Colston's monument [2] has led to an attempt to topple many other statues of racists [3]; in Australia, statues of alleged white supremacists such as Captain James Cook have been defaced and graffitied [4]. These cases of monument destroying or defacing are mere samples of many anti-racist actions taken throughout recent anti-racist movements, actions which range from banning books to cancelling social media personalities, and which provoke much controversy. Whilst some praise such actions as promoting equality, others view them as harmful attempts to rewrite history.</p> <p>Yet while this movement sparks plenty of controversy in and of itself, it raises even more questions when applied to some whose monuments are not mere physical statues but are lasting impacts on thought, philosophy, literature, and culture. An example of this is the hugely influential German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), whose ideas and writings had a profound impact on Western philosophy in general and Deontological ethics in particular [5]. His work has greatly influenced philosophy, but has been criticised for the racist assertions it contains. As Daniel-Pascal Zorn quotes in his article Kant: A Racist?, Kant made multiple highly racist claims, such as that "blacks" have "by nature no feeling that rises above the ridiculous" [6], and that Native Americans are "incapable of all culture" [7].</p> <p>These words are greatly disquieting coming from a thinker whose work has formed the basis of much of ethics, and call for an evaluation of racism in historical figures with a heavy influence on us today. If monuments, not to the racism of historical greats, but to their potentially non-racist works and achievements can be legitimately torn down, should we be "tearing down" (censoring or banning) the intellectual work of thinkers such as Kant? If we can tear down statues, should we likewise tear down words? What should we do with Kant?</p> <p>Discussion Questions</p> <p>Should Kant's racist views in any way discredit his achievements as a philosopher and ethicist, in the way that the racist behaviour or beliefs of others (eg. Captain Cook) have led to the demolition/destruction of monuments to their own achievements? If so, how? Should people stop using his philosophical or ethical frameworks because of his racist words?</p> <p>Is destroying statues a morally acceptable way of dealing with historical figures we consider racist? Why or why not?</p> <p>What about censoring or banning books? Is this morally acceptable if the authors were racist? Why or why not? How is this different to destroying statues?</p> <p>References</p> <p>[1] Juanola, M. P. 2022. 'St Kilda's Captain Cook statue doused in red paint in Australia Day protest'. The Age. 26 January, viewed 28 April 2022.</p> <p>[2] Ibid.</p> <p>[3] Topple the Racists. A crowdsourced map of UK statues and monuments that celebrate slavery and racism. Topple the Racists. viewed 28 April 2022.</p> <p>[4] Juanola, M. P. 2022. 'St Kilda's Captain Cook statue doused in red paint in Australia Day protest'. The Age. 26 January, viewed 28 April 2022.</p> <p>[5] Duignan, B. 2022. Immanuel Kant. Encyclopedia Britannica. viewed 28 April 2022.</p> <p>[6] Kant, I. Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime, eds. Patrick Frierson and Paul Guyer. Cambridge University Press. quoted in Zorn, P. 2020. Kant: A Racist? Public History Weekly. viewed 28 April.</p> <p>[7] Kant, I. 1788. On the use of teleological principles in philosophy, AA VIII, 176. quoted in Zorn, P. 2020. Kant: A Racist? Public History Weekly. viewed 28 April.</p>
--------------	--	---------------	------------------------------	------------------------------------	---

<p>Anastasia Bradley</p>	<p>Upper Hutt College. New Zealand</p>	<p>Amy Perkins</p>	<p>Covid-19- Lockdowns or Traffic Lights</p>	<p>Covid, lockdowns, death, sickness, hospitals.</p>	<p>Since 2020, Covid has been a major problem for countries all over the world. To deal with the virus, most countries implemented lockdowns, ensuring their citizens were safe inside their homes. This worked better in some countries than others. However, in recent months, some countries have scrapped lockdowns, instead trying to implement strict rules around vaccines and mask wearing, allowing people to try and "get back to normal."</p> <p>In New Zealand, the Covid Alert Levels were switched out for the Covid-19 Protection Framework (also known as the Traffic Lights.) In the alert level system, the government would insert lockdowns into areas that were having high numbers of Covid cases, and the level that we were on would dictate what restrictions we had. For example, in level 2, we had to wear masks in public areas, and only a certain number of people were allowed in a place at a time. The Traffic Light system is very similar, except it has no lockdowns, meaning that in Red (the highest level), the restrictions surround masks, restrictions on the amount of people allowed into an area, and vaccine passes.</p> <p>The change was made because of the outbreak of the Omicron variant of Covid-19. Cases were expected to rise by a significant amount, and the government introduced it to help the health system cope. It should also be noted that towards the end of the lockdown, people were starting to disobey the rules, and several arrests were made. It had been a long two years of restricted life, and people were beginning to tire of it. If the lockdowns were brought back, what point would there be if no one cared about them?</p> <p>Removing lockdowns meant people were allowed a taste of the old normal, and there was a need for a new system to help hospitals cope with what would soon be hundreds of sick people a day. So in this way, the Traffic Lights are a really good thing. But if we were still in lockdown, wouldn't the case numbers be significantly lower? Of course they would still be high, with the higher transmission of the Omicron variant, but they would likely be a little bit lower. Lower cases means lower hospitalisations and, hopefully, less death. Because that should be the most important thing. One person saved is one hundred people relieved of the harshest burden of all- the loss of a loved one.</p> <p>Another thing to consider is the people who need to go to the hospital for other reasons, instead of Covid. Since the pandemic started, and especially since the Omicron outbreak, there have been large waiting lists for non-Covid related surgeries. Would a lockdown help people that need treatment for other medical issues get into hospital quicker? Or would it have no effect? It is important to consider other parts of the world than just the healthcare needs people with Covid have.</p> <p>One of the long term aims with Covid is herd immunity. This means that enough people will have gotten the virus and become immune to it, and it will be virtually eradicated, even with those who haven't got it. But a few years after the pandemic began, we are seeing that immunity only lasts about three months, even with vaccines and boosters. And even if we keep trying to reach herd immunity, surely people will die. Does the risk of death outway the need to try and protect as many people as possible, even if just for a short while?</p> <p>Finding a way to protect people from a virus that is always changing is an incredibly difficult challenge. Along with these issues here, there are so many other things to worry about, including Kiwis stuck overseas, and economic issues. Choosing whether or not to go into lockdown becomes harder and harder overtime, and the New Zealand government has done the best it can.</p> <p>Questions: Would a lockdown help people with non-Covid medical needs get into hospital quicker? Is a lockdown worth it if some people don't follow it? Does the risk of death outway the need to protect as many people as possible?</p> <p>References: COVID-19 Protection Framework (traffic lights) Life at Red Unite against COVID-19 History of the COVID-19 Alert System</p>
--------------------------	--	--------------------	--	--	--

Deoram Nataraja	Hwa Chong International School(Singapore)	Joyce Lim	Un-named	<p>Elvis and Jeff attend a prestigious private high school in an affluent suburb. Both Elvis and Jeff were as different as chalk and cheese. Elvis was an A student who has been awarded a scholarship to study at the school. His working class parents would not be able to afford the expensive tuition fees at this elite school where many students will be accepted into top universities. Surrounded by peers who were as smart or even smarter than him, who had more financial resources than him, Elvis's self-esteem was affected. One of these students who consistently chiseled away at Elvis's self-esteem was Jeff. He was one of the many smart and rich students with well-connected parents that populate the school. Both Elvis and Jeff were classmates and Jeff did not like Elvis the moment he saw him. Jeff often made disparaging remarks about Elvis social status like, "How would Elvis know how to play polo? His working class parents will not be able to afford riding classes." Hurtful remarks like this drew laughter from the rest of the class and infuriated Elvis. He vowed to get back at Jeff one day.</p> <p>The opportunity to get even with Jeff presented itself during lunch break. They were the last students in the queue for food. Jeff was glued to his smartphone playing a video game and was totally oblivious to the fact that Elvis was behind him. When it was Jeff's turn, he ordered so much food that there was no space for him to put his smartphone on the tray. Jeff did not like to slip his smartphone into his pockets as that was how he lost his previous one. Jeff turned around and saw Elvis and told him brusquely, "Look after my phone!" before walking away with the tray of food to join his friends at their table.</p> <p>Elvis was simmering like hot lava in a volcano that was about to erupt. Why didn't he say no immediately! Or even come up with an excuse? Being given marching orders was demeaning and insulting. Just then, the animation on the screen caught Elvis's attention. He inched closer to steal a quick glance. The other players in the multi-player role-playing game were awaiting Jeff's instruction to attack an enemy's fortress. A victory will win the team immunity shields and unique items. Elvis casted a sweeping glance upwards to check for surveillance cameras. He was in a blind spot. He lifted his finger and hesitated. Driven by pent-up emotions of anger and vengeance, his first instinct was to hit the leave button on the screen to force the team to abandon the mission, destroying the team's chances of securing a prized loot. Or he could take over the role of team leader from Jeff in the online game and guide the team to success. They were so close. Or should he suffer in silence and do what he was told to just look after the phone?</p> <p>Study Questions:</p> <p>(1) Would it be morally permissible for Elvis to touch the smartphone of Jeff? Why or why not?</p> <p>(2) Does the fact that Elvis and Jeff are not good friends influence the ethical analysis of whether Elvis' tampering of Jeff's smartphone is morally permissible? Explain.</p> <p>(3) Is it ever morally permissible to break the rules in order to get even with a classmate?</p>
-----------------	---	-----------	----------	---

<p>Isabella Thompson</p>	<p>Albany Senior High School New Zealand</p>	<p>Rachael Ouwejan</p>	<p>Moral Meat</p>	<p>Meat, Vegetarianism, Death,</p>	<p>Discussions of veganism, vegetarianism, and the ethics of meat consumption have characterized much of the social milieu of the 2010s and 20s. Discussions of forced farming, ethical hunting practices, and climate change have made the moral question of meat consumption a murky and unappealing topic. However, if we strip back all of the caged animals and poaching we find ourselves looking at the key points of conflict: the suffering and death of animals.</p> <p>Scientists have recently observed that animals like crows and elephants engage in death rituals: leaving gifts and tending to their dead. In a 2006 study, it was found that parades of Elephants will visit a dead member of their species, brushing the body with their trunks and remaining close to the carcass for extended periods- up to several days- despite the looming threat of scavengers. This suggests that these otherwise primal species possess an understanding of death we did not previously consider.</p> <p>However, other animals seem to show no regard for suffering or the pain of death. Many farm animals, such as cattle, show indifference toward dead bodies and often accidentally kill their own through smothering or trampling. Wild animals, such as Hyenas, may even actively slaughter their young or eat the carcasses of their own. The discrepancies in animals' existential intelligence raise questions about where the line sits regarding meat consumption. If our intelligence is what separates us from animals, but some share intelligence with us regarding death, can we allow ourselves to ethically consume the meat of these species? Conversely, how does our own understanding of death in relation to less intelligent species factor into the morality of our meat consumption?</p> <p>A lion (who cannibalizes just as hyenas do) is not aware of death in the same moral sense as humans when it kills a Zebra. But when we humans kill a cow, we are aware of the suffering it will experience and ultimately, its death. It can also be argued that a crow, who exhibits an understanding of life and death, has some similar understanding that they are eating a dead animal when they consume the flesh of a carcass. Is it unethical, then, to disregard our understanding of death and suffering when eating meat? Or permissible due to the meat source being unintelligent?</p> <p>"Ethically they had arrived at the conclusion that man's supremacy over lower animals meant not that the former should prey upon the latter, but that the higher should protect the lower, and that there should be mutual aid between the two as between man and man." - Mahatma Gandhi</p> <p>existential omnivores and carnivores exist in nature, does that make us just another part of the food chain, ethical or not? How might the idea of consuming food that is intelligent, or consuming food as an intelligent species affect the ethics of eating meat?</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Does our understanding of death and morality, something that many animals do not possess, justify our eating a 'less intelligent' species? Or does being a 'more intelligent' species instead imbue us with an obligation not to murder other species for meat knowing that they will suffer and die in a way that many other animals do not understand? -Is a reciprocal understanding of death between humans and animals (such as between elephants and humans) cause for not eating that particular animal? -Does the presence of omnivores and carnivores who seemingly possess an understanding of death in the wild (such as crows) justify humans eating animals without moral judgment? Or does this instead permit us to make moral judgments about certain animals for disregarding their knowledge of death when they knowingly murder other animals for food? -Is there ever a case for disregarding the morality of meat consumption for a wider moral purpose or for survival, seeing as humans are past the point of needing meat for survival? Must we consider animals in utilitarian equations, especially if they are existentially intelligent? <p>Sources:</p> <p>Douglas-Hamilton, I., Bhalla, S., Wittemyer, G., & Vollrath, F. (2006). Behavioural reactions of elephants towards a dying and deceased matriarch. Elsevier.</p> <p>Marshall-Chalmers, A. (2020). Crow Funerals and What We Can Learn From Them - Bay Nature. Retrieved from https://baynature.org/2020/10/29/flying-in-for-the-crow-funeral/#~:text=Acrowfuneralcanhappen,occurinacitypark.</p> <p>Monsó, S., & Dresser, S. (2021). Animals wrestle with the concept of death and mortality. Retrieved from https://aeon.co/essays/animals-wrestle-with-the-concept-of-death-and-mortality</p>
--------------------------	--	------------------------	-------------------	------------------------------------	---

Sarah-Rose Crowskey	St Cuthbert's College New Zealand	Rachel Renner	A Universal Database	<p>deontology, utilitarian, civil liberty, justice, ethical, greater good, discrimination, self-ownership, privacy, DNA, genetics, national security, freedom, individual</p>	<p>proven to be a highly accurate, valuable and reliable tool to fight against crime with over 60 countries operating on some level of a DNA database.[1] However, many people are concerned about its ethical implications on privacy, security, self-ownership and individual rights. The main contention regarding the use of a universal DNA database is whether or not a universal breach of privacy is justified in the name of a greater good to society.</p> <p>In 2012, the United Kingdom Protection of Freedoms Bill aimed to redress the balance between the state's duty to protect the public and an individual's right to privacy. As a result 1,766,000 DNA profiles taken from innocent adults and children were deleted from the database.[2] It had been argued that the DNA database was morally unjust because it was a breach of individual rights and wrong to subject the innocent to the same practice as criminals. Individuals on the database may be seen as potential offenders, rather than law-abiding citizens. It has been argued that if the database is universalised, extended beyond just convicted criminals, that everyone would be seen unjustly as possible suspects – guilty, until proven innocent.</p> <p>The implementation of a universal DNA database– a system, compulsory by definition to include every citizen's genetic information– would breach the rights of individuals. The justice system fundamentally relies on upholding and respecting individuals rights and liberties. The ownership of self is a sacred protection. "Every man has a Property in his own Person. This no Body has any Right but himself," argued John Locke in the name of self-ownership, the sovereignty of the individual.[3] The information contained in our DNA is limitless – information from our hair colour to genetic diseases to personality traits can be identified in our genetic information.[4] Concerns have also emerged in regards to where this data should be held and which people or organisations should have access.</p> <p>Conversely, those who campaign for the use of a universal database believe that although it may demand giving up a degree of liberty from human beings, we would end up significantly improving the justice system for all. The DNA database system would provide all people with the benefits of a morally egalitarian and non-discriminatory justice system – and thus ultimately protect higher liberties. Many argue that these benefits are therefore a sufficient justification for this compulsory inclusion.</p> <p>Having an universal DNA database, one that would include everyone's genetic records, could eliminate current ethnic and gender discrimination. Currently, the alternatives to a universal database are deeply flawed and systemically failing those most vulnerable and marginalised in society. If not universalised, the data is usually still collected but only from DNA dragnets, which is the practice that sees the collection of DNA from segments of a population that fit certain socio-economic descriptions and live in certain areas.[5] These select groups of people are disproportionately minorities and they are disproportionately targeted. Additionally, when these select groups refuse for their genetic material to be collected, it is often seized by warrants and taken from them. Alternatives to a universal DNA database that we currently rely on are and susceptible to unjust, discriminatory practises.</p> <p>These discriminatory practices deny people an equal moral status. A universal database ensures all are subject to the same enforcement equally.</p> <p>DNA analysis has proven to be remarkably accurate. The Department of Justice reviewed 28 cases in which people wrongly convicted of sexual assault were later exonerated by DNA evidence.[6] Where alternative options are subjective, and leave room for bias and discrimination, science can unveil the curtains of truth without the veils of human prejudice with its exponential growth in recent years and highly reliable results.</p> <p>For the benefit of living in a better society, we often forgo some of our rights. This exists all the time such as with jury duty or eminent domain, where we agree to serve and forgo some of our individual liberties for the good of society. We forgo countless rights everyday, often unconsciously, for the sake of reaping the benefits of a society in which all citizens contractually agree to do things for a greater good.[7] In the current COVID environment, we have given up the right to visit our grandparents in a retirement home or to attend a family wedding or the right not to wear a facemask. We do all of these things as good moral citizens for the benefit of greater society despite their infringement on our individual liberty.</p> <p>Justice may not be the pursuit of perfection. People have conceded that the universal DNA database would infringe on our rights to some degree, but many argue that it should still be implemented as we mustn't think of the notions of ethics and justice in the abstract, but how it will impact people in reality – an operable sense of justice. How we can shape the real in light of the ideal. In light of alternatives, if no DNA database means that we use discriminatory methods, then using the universal DNA database could be argued to be the most utilitarian decision despite its infringement on individual rights. A decision in the best interest of all citizens.</p>
---------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	----------------------	---	---

<p>Claire Tsz Yan Cheng</p>	<p>St. Mark's School Hong Kong</p>	<p>Wai Ling Lam</p>	<p>Un-named</p>	<p>vigilantism, moral killing, crime fighting</p>	<p>The movie Nobody (released in 2021; directed by Ilya Naishuller) opens in an interrogation room, where protagonist Hutch Mansell sits nonchalantly, claiming he is a 'nobody'. A few days back, there was a break-in in Hutch's house, but he had decided to let the robbers go. After the break-in, though, Hutch's daughter threw a tantrum upon finding out her kitty cat bracelet had gone missing. He figured the robbers might have taken it. Hutch, who was formerly a topnotch hitman, obtained a gun and tracked the robbers down. He knocked them out and threatened them, but then realized they were parents of a sick baby. Frightened, the robbers insisted that they did not have the bracelet. Out of sympathy, Hutch left in anger.</p> <p>On his way back, Hutch helped a lonely young girl on a bus. She was attacked by a drunken crew, one member of which (Terry) was the brother of Russian mobster Yulian Kuznetsov. In the meantime, Yulian was at a nightclub, discussing with associates their shared fortune called The Obshak. A shareholder doubted Yulian's ability because of his irresponsibility and his addictive penchants. To emphasize his authority, Yulian slit the shareholder's throat with a martini glass mercilessly. The mobsters then toasted his death since it meant an increased amount of money. Yulian was then called to the hospital, where he found a wounded Terry, whose brain was permanently damaged. The incident prompted Yulian to go on a desperate hunt for Hutch, hoping to take revenge.</p> <p>While attempting to protect his family, Hutch fought Yulian's crew. He gathered the bodies of the gunmen to the basement and set the house aflame. He then located the Obshak and burnt all their illegal money. Meanwhile, he visited Yulian's nightclub and revealed that he had destroyed the Obshak. Hutch then tricked Yulian and his henchmen into going to a warehouse, where Hutch's father and brother were ready to fight aside with him. Eventually, Yulian and his crew were killed. The scene immediately jumps back in the interrogation room, where Hutch only tells the FBI agents he is a 'nobody'. The two agents then receive phone calls, and the scene ends when Hutch is released.</p> <p>In the movie, Hutch is a vigilante whose intentions are altruistic, but his actions are not without wrongdoings. Principally, the motivation of his hunting down the robbers is selfish and biased - the emotional act of his daughter. Would it have been fair if Hutch had killed the robbers who had merely taken a kitty cat bracelet? But Hutch could have killed them if he had not seen the sick baby. Some may argue that Hutch, as a vigilante, is just a criminal punishing another criminal based on an emotional incentive, which is not well justified. By the same token, Hutch is not in a legitimate position to punish Yulian's mobster gang. He is not even a policeman! Well, the offender of killing a man (Yulian in this case) can be punished by Death Penalty in the US. But does Hutch have the right to administer the trial in the warehouse based on his own judgement?</p> <p>That said, Hutch does what he does to make the world a better place, eliminating multiple criminals. He exercises justice, instead of turning a blind eye to the harassment of the girl on the bus and the other illegitimate acts. Imagine yourself in Hutch's shoes. Would you, assuming you have the ability to, have done the same to save the young girl, and to fight the crew that is coming after you? After all, Hutch does do the FBI a favor by going after the violent and dangerous mobster who has been on the loose. The FBI agents would probably have done the exact same thing, be it to shoot or even to kill Yulian, in order to subdue him.</p> <p>Vigilantes can save lives like the police, but they also make a place dangerous to live in.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Should vigilantism be legalized? (2) Does the fighting of crimes make the act of killing morally permissible? (3) How can vigilantes and police coexist and work together in fighting crimes? (4) Evaluate the advantages and drawbacks of the existence of vigilantes (e.g. Hutch, Spiderman, etc.) in any modern society. <p>References: Naishuller, Ilya. (Director). (2021). Nobody [Film]. Universal Pictures.</p>
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------	---	--

<p>Oi Lam Esther Luk</p>	<p>St. Mark's School Hong Kong</p>	<p>Wai Ling Lam</p>	<p>Un-named</p>	<p>arranged marriage, filial piety, personal freedom</p>	<p>When Rachel got back home, her parents asked her to sit down on the couch for a talk. The last time this happened was to talk about her college decisions. Rachel was confused, she thought there was some serious catastrophe going on in the household. Then, her mom said, 'Rachel my darling, you'll turn 30 soon, it's so hard to find a good husband on the market once you've got to that age. I know my friend's son is interested in you, would you... perhaps try hanging out with him and see how it goes?'. A sudden realization struck Rachel - Her 30th birthday is coming up next week. Being unmarried in her 30s is traditionally considered as inappropriate; by that age, she should've had children of her own. But deep down she knew her parents wanted her to be happy, to have a family that can support her financially in the long run. She knows clearly the repercussions of disobedience, that is to witness the disappointment and despair from her parents. Since she was a kid, she has been obligated to fulfil her duties as a daughter, listening to whatever opinion her mother offers. She doesn't want to let her mom down, as she always has, thus agreeing to fulfil her request.</p> <p>After a few meetings with this son of her mother's friend, Ed, her mother approached Rachel after her long day of work. This time, she asked her the details of her dates with Ed and her feelings towards him. She doesn't hate him, nor does she have affection for him, it's along the lines of a normal man in his 30s. In fact, everything in the dates were smooth, no conflicts at all. Her mother seems to be overjoyed about the update, 'when will you marry him? Better hurry up then, I'm so excited for you!' 'You know, I've been talking to my friend about the marriage between both of you, Ed agreed to it already, what are your thoughts, darling?' Rachel smiled, 'Ok, Ma.' It wasn't the first time her mom had arranged matters for her, and she has learnt to satisfy and obey her parents in her upbringing. Although it seems to be the best for her future, she doesn't want to upset her parents, whom have raised her materially throughout her lifetime.</p> <p>Fast forward to a month later, that is the day of the wedding; Rachel could see the tears of joy streaming down from the eyes of her mother. It was finally her big day. After the wedding, Ed and Rachel went back to their new home, he told Rachel to follow him to the bedroom; all of a sudden, he started to take off his clothes and kiss her. However, Rachel doesn't want to engage in the activity, she didn't voice out her opinion as she thought it is her duty as a married wife.</p> <p>(1) Is filial piety an obligation to be prioritized over personal freedom of choice/autonomy? (2) Is it morally-correct to comply with societal expectations when disobedience may emotionally harm others? (3) Should we obey our parents in every circumstance possible, as a gesture to repay our gratitude to the effort/investments in raising us? Is that an ethical approach in doing so? (4) Is copulation without mutual consent ethical after an arranged marriage?</p>
<p>Ki On Wong</p>	<p>St. Mark's School Hong Kong</p>	<p>Wai Ling Lam</p>	<p>Un-named</p>	<p>dilemmas, secrets, friends</p>	<p>Aurelia and Thora have been best friends since their playful childhood times. They attend the same secondary school together. This year, to their delight, they are assigned to the same class. However, as they became more intimate with each other, Thora's recent erratic behaviors have led Aurelia to be skeptical. Thora often falls asleep in class, and snuffles frequently. She even undergoes a perceivable and sudden weight loss. It almost seems like she is suffering from anorexia nervosa.</p> <p>When Thora retched in the toilet, Aurelia couldn't stand to sit back anymore. She tightened her grip on Thora's shoulder. 'Hey, are you ok? You seemed out of form recently.' Aurelia asked with perceivable concern. Thora clutched onto the washbasin, her eyes staring hollowly. Abruptly, she turned to face Aurelia, seeming determined. Thora smirked and uttered 'I'll tell you something exciting. Promise me that you don't reveal it to anyone else!' Aurelia didn't think much 'Okay, go on.' However, the secret was not something she would expect. 'Aurelia, I've been taking drugs.' Thora confessed with a shrug, as if she was proud of her abomination. Aurelia was stunned 'L...N-No, this can't happen! I-I should report to the teachers!' She was ready to take off when Thora grabbed her with strength 'No, you can't! You promised!' Aurelia's dearest friend now looked indescribably heinous. Aurelia now faces a dilemma of reporting her wrongful friend or keeping her promise.</p> <p>On one hand, it is no doubt that Aurelia should report Thora's case to the school, according to the regulations. She must obey the school rules. Otherwise, she might be penalized along with Thora for being an accomplice. After all, it's everyone's responsibility to report rule violations. Besides, Aurelia believes that under teachers' surveillance, Thora can get rid of drugs as soon as possible. 'There's not a drug on Earth that can make life meaningful.' After Thora confessed, Aurelia had only one thing on her mind – help Thora to overcome her drug addiction. Compared to keeping it a secret, it is certain that disclosing Thora would better convey to her the menace of drugs, urging Thora to quit drugs. Also, once reported, Thora would definitely receive more assistance from everyone to recover.</p> <p>On the other hand, Aurelia promised Thora to keep the secret. Although her mind tells her to disclose Thora, her heart reminds her to remember what she herself said. There's no way she could take her words back. As the saying goes, 'A promise made must be a promise kept.' Breaking her promise would be totally unfair to Thora. It may even threaten their long-lasting friendship. On top of that, we should be compassionate towards an addicted friend. Aurelia considered that she should perhaps listen to Thora when she is struggling. At this critical moment, Aurelia should give Thora a shoulder and be her support, instead of criticizing her. In this way, Aurelia could gain trust. Later, she could eventually learn the reason for Thora's addiction, potentially fostering Thora's recovery.</p> <p>1) Is it morally acceptable for Aurelia to conceal the secret in order to help Thora? 2) What should we do if speaking up or fighting for justice threatens our friends? 3) If life forces us to face dilemmas, when either choice will violate our core values, obligations, and commitments, how should we choose?</p>

Sarah-Rose Crowsley	St Cuthbert's College New Zealand	Rachel Renner	An Epidemic of Strikes	<p>strikes, civil duty, justified harm, social responsibility,</p>	<p>a registered nurse. I'm choosing not to re-register... after 30 years. [1] She has been a leading voice in the recent New Zealand nurse strike amid the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic exacerbated the institutional failures of the healthcare system and worsened the strains on healthcare workers. Feeling understaffed, undercompensated, and undervalued - nurses all over the world just like Amanda abandoned post in order to take to the streets to demand more pay, improved working conditions and an increase in patient-nurse ratio.</p> <p>Healthcare workers internationally have been struggling immensely with the outbreak of COVID. With their physical, emotional and mental health severely strained. The influx of patients meant that hospitals were overwhelmed for months and the frontline nurses had to work extensively long hours.[2] Nurses had to face the dire consequences that COVID has inflicted on communities first-hand. As a consequence of the nurses being overburdened, they felt unable to accommodate and care for their patients properly. They could not keep up with the work, and overwhelmed, they could not fulfil their roles. The guilt and loss incurred deeply affected their mental and emotional wellbeing. The tireless hours and chronic nurse shortages entrenched their physical health. Although they are arguably obliged to this duty, they should not be in a position to oblige to such conditions.</p> <p>The right to strike is both of historical and contemporaneous significance. Firstly, it allows for workers in society to ensure they are not coerced employees by either circumstance or force. Secondly, industrial action enables these workers to assert bargaining power to protect and reclaim their individual rights, many considering it a fundamental right whose derogation would be inimical to the proper functioning of collective bargaining powers in democratic societies. [3]That the suppression of a strike would therefore be unjustified in a democracy. This rights-based approach to the issue of strikes would suggest that even though the intention to bring about better healthcare for society at large is a major ethical duty, that there is an equally compelling moral duty to protect individual rights. Protection of individual rights in employment helps to ensure that no group is unfairly discriminated against in any circumstance such as the protection of people's health during COVID. That healthcare workers are not means to an end, these individuals must be treated as ends in themselves, and should not have their rights and freedoms curtailed for the good of society.</p> <p>These healthcare workers left, conveying their immense importance to the very fabric of our society, but this value was made known by their allowing such chaos and hurt to happen without them. In-hospital mortality increased by 19.4 percent, and hospital readmissions increased by 6.5 percent for patients admitted during a strike. [4]The majority of strikes inflict the most harm upon the most vulnerable in society; those in hospitals where workers struggle and patients who are already in difficult conditions. The impact of healthcare workers strikes globally appears more severe in developing countries challenged by worse socio-economic circumstances, embedded infrastructural deficiencies, and lack of viable alternative means of obtaining healthcare. [5]Another element to the harm is that in the short-term, the social and civil responsibility of the workers is neglected. Their duty to society is abandoned, and the impact of this and the societal perception of nurses is often diminished as they are seen in a negative light.</p> <p>"If we're not safe, you're not safe," protested thousands of nurses on strike internationally. They have acknowledged the inherent harm that a strike would cause but decided to strike despite this. They fought for the future of nursing, and thus, believed that allowing the harms that were inherent to striking were justified in their cause. One can argue based on utilitarian principles that the short-term suffering induced by strikes can be mitigated by the long-term benefits such as the improvement of healthcare services for the greatest number of people over time.[6] Even if the immediate gains are improved wages and conditions of employment for nurses alone, in the long-term these will translate into better healthcare service delivery to the local community and wider society altogether. [7]The inherent harms that these nurse strikes incur are undeniable, but the question is whether or not they are justified in the pursuit of both protecting the rights of healthcare workers and the future of our health services.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>If it is believed that a strike is a fundamental right for citizens in a democracy, is it justified to infringe on the rights of these healthcare workers for the benefit of health services to greater society?</p> <p>Are the harms inflicted upon patients and communities during a strike justified in the fight for long-term benefits for healthcare services and the protecting of workers rights?</p> <p>Are strikes effective in highlighting the value and importance of the striking group in society, or conversely, do they diminish the striking group's reputation and societal perception?</p> <p>1. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/health/125386822/nurse-says-she-is-so-burnt-out-shes-leaving-the-profession-the-day-after-the-</p>
---------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------	------------------------	--	--