

Case Studies

The purpose of case studies is to give students an opportunity to apply the theoretical and practical tools they are learning in their ethics courses. The wise use of case studies is also a powerful tool to teach and practice logic and reasoning skills in the context of moral decision-making. When done thoughtfully, case studies can help students increase their empathy for others and even uncover their own unexamined assumptions, implicit biases, and harmful stereotypes.

Case studies can be effectively used to generate class discussions, or as content for individual or group projects and presentations. They can be used to provide topics for research papers. Case studies are also effectively used to set up in-class debates between students. Perhaps more importantly, case studies can teach students collaborative ways to find creative solutions to moral issues and create greater human flourishing in both the present and future.

The following case studies are supplied by the Parr Center for Ethics at UNC.

Pride, Inc.

In the summer of 2019, in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall riots, WorldPride was held in New York City, in conjunction with the city's own annual Pride festival. It would become the biggest LGBT event in history, attracting roughly 4 million attendees. Despite this seeming success, however, some members of the LGBTQ+ community boycotted the event, organizing an alternative pride celebration which they dubbed the Reclaim Pride Coalition (RPC). The alternative event gathered 45,000 attendees. RPC's stated mission is to "march against the exploitation of our communities for profit and against corporate and state pink-washing, as displayed in Pride celebrations worldwide, including the NYC Pride Parade."¹ "Pink-washing" describes marketing or promotional strategies undertaken by companies or states in order to obscure their negative behavior where LGBTQ+ rights and issues are concerned. As Pride festivals have continued to become more mainstream, they have received increasing levels of corporate sponsorship with each passing year. Many events, once considered a form of countercultural resistance against legal LGBTQ+ discrimination, are now comprised of floats, booths, promotions, and targeted product placements from mega-corporations like CapitalOne, Walmart, Verizon, etc.²

Those who are concerned about the greater corporatization of Pride events often argue that corporations only participate in this form of advocacy in order to sell more of their own products (often in specially-promoted and rainbow-themed varieties³). Furthermore, many critics argue that the same corporations joining in on Pride celebrations simultaneously fund anti-LGBTQ+ causes. For example, in the same year that Adidas featured a thematic merchandise line called "Pride Pack," they were a major sponsor for the World Cup in Russia, a country with wantonly discriminatory and harmful anti-LGBTQ+ laws. Conflicts of interest like these lead many to believe that corporate support is largely aimed at the bottom line. While some companies promise to donate some portion of the proceeds from Pride products to LGBTQ+ charities, many

companies often obscure what that portion is and where it goes. Additionally, critics worry that corporate sponsorship encourages “slacktivism,” where the general population feel as though they are contributing to the cause by purchasing these products while it remains unclear whether these efforts contribute to any substantive changes for LGBTQ+ people.

On the other hand, some Pride officials say that corporate sponsorship is necessary in providing supplies, equipment rentals, insurance, security, and other important services for their events.⁴ Sponsorship also lightens the financial burden on advocacy groups and community nonprofits, who often struggle with ballooning costs. Moreover, others have argued that the corporatization of the LGBTQ+ movement isn’t a problem and is actually a necessary step in its advancement. As Harvard scholar Michael Bronski contends: “what we’re seeing in terms of corporatization and consumer influence is... a completely logical outcome of a gay rights movement that was predicated on a series of reforms... all [geared toward] acceptance... Full citizenship in America has always been predicated on the ability to consume. So why would it be different for LGBTQ people?”⁵

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What role, if any, should private corporations play in social justice movements? Why? ^[1]_[SEP]
2. Is purchasing or promoting popular Pride-themed products sufficient to make one an ally to the LGBTQ+ community? Why or why not? ^[1]_[SEP]

1 <https://reclaimpridenyc.org/why-we-march> ^[1]_[SEP]2

<https://www.vox.com/2018/6/25/17476850/pride-month-lgbtq-corporate-explained> ^[1]_[SEP]3

[https://www.newsweek.com/these-30-brands-are-celebrating-pride-giving-back-lgbt-community-](https://www.newsweek.com/these-30-brands-are-celebrating-pride-giving-back-lgbt-community-1441707)

1441707 4 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/20/nyregion/nyc-pride-march.html> ^[1]_[SEP]5

<https://www.them.us/story/corporate-pride>

Nandi’s Choice

Nandi is a newly married young man living in India who comes from a financially modest background. A month after his wedding, Nandi and his wife receive two pieces of important news. First, they learn that they have a child on the way. Second, Nandi learns that he has received a scholarship to pursue a college education at a prestigious university in the United States. After discussing his options with his wife and his parents, he decides to seize the opportunity and move with his wife to America. They promise, however, that they will return home to his family after Nandi receives his Bachelor’s Degree.

While living in America, Nandi, his wife, and their daughter begin to assimilate to American culture. After four years of hard work, Nandi is presented with another opportunity—a place in one of the best Ph.D. programs in the world with the promise of full funding and the prospect of a successful and lucrative career upon completion. Given this life-changing opportunity, Nandi decides to postpone fulfilling the promise that he made to his family to return home until he completes his Ph.D. As time goes by, four years becomes five, five becomes six, and six

becomes seven. After seven years away from home, Nandi receives a call from his mother with the news that his father has passed away. He immediately books a flight home with his wife and daughter to see the rest of his family.

It is Indian tradition that, when a father dies, his eldest son must complete his final rites. Moreover, it is expected that the eldest son will support his mother and welcome her into his home. Nandi's mother, however, refuses to leave her four daughters (Nandi's younger sisters) and the country that she has lived in her entire life. She adds that Nandi's promise to return home is three years overdue, and she urges him to stay in India rather than returning to the United States to complete his Ph.D. His mother worries that if he does not, she will have no one to live with and support her, and she will grow old without ever getting to know her granddaughter.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Does Nandi have an obligation to abandon pursuit of his Ph.D. for the sake of his mother and Indian tradition? [L]
[SEP]
2. What are the relevant factors Nandi should consider when making his decision? [L]
[SEP]
3. Does the fact that Nandi has a daughter who has spent the first seven years of her life in America make an important difference to how you consider this case? [L]
[SEP]

Universal Basic Income

The idea of a universal basic income (UBI) policy has been proposed in many different forms. At its most basic, it consists in a guaranteed stipend provided by the state to its citizenry.¹ Proposals for UBI have recently regained political traction as economies face a new kind of industrial revolution, which continues to change the labor market landscape at unprecedented rates. Proponents of UBI proposals often argue that with work automation cutting entire labor markets, new jobs cannot be created quickly enough to replace those lost and that laid off workers cannot gain the new skills necessary to make them competitive in the new job landscape while looking for a new position. In the United States, a proposal for UBI has been most notably defended by now-former Democratic presidential candidate Andrew Yang. Yang's proposal would guarantee an unrestricted \$1,000 monthly stipend, which he calls a "Freedom Dividend," to every U.S. citizen over 18 years of age. To support the proposal, Yang contends that 1 in 3 Americans is at risk of losing their job within 12 years, and that UBI would give them a chance to both remain afloat and gain the skills necessary to reenter the job market without being haunted by the fear of absolute poverty.² This proposal would be paid for by assessing a new value-added tax, and would replace some existing social welfare programs with UBI by giving program recipients a choice between the two plans.

Many economists support, or have supported UBI, including staunch anti-welfare advocates like Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman. Hayek argued that a minimum income floor was a necessary condition for modern life, while Friedman proposed a 'negative income tax', providing enough to survive on but low enough to serve as an incentive to strive for more. Both of these economists, as well as those who follow their schools of thought, believed that UBI should

completely replace social welfare program, unlike many of the plans until now implemented.³

Perhaps the best known among UBI policy experimentation is a pilot program conducted in Finland between January 2017 and December 2018. The Finnish government supplied unemployed citizens with the equivalent of \$634/month, with the objective of determining whether such a safeguard would help recipients find jobs. The results were notably inconclusive: The unemployment rate was the same as the control group that did not receive the cash transfer, but the beneficiaries *did* show a marked increase in happiness. Critics of the program argue that its goal was skewed to begin with, but its results remain valid.⁴ The long-term effects of UBI also remain unproven, as most experiments undertaken thus far last no longer than the one conducted in Finland.

Both critics and proponents of UBI make arguments based on fairness as well. Proponents argue that a minimum income, or, more specifically, an unconditional one, would provide a basic level of autonomy for every individual in society to pursue their goals without the fear of poverty, and even provide a safety net to take more economic risks. Critics, on the other hand, argue that society's allocating unconditional income to people who make no effort to receive it is fundamentally unfair to those who produce the economic value from which the funds for UBI would be redistributed.⁵

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Is an unconditionally-guaranteed income unfair to those who have been economically successful? Why or why not? ^[1]_[SEP]
2. Would specifying conditions for UBI make a moral difference in terms of fairness? If so, what conditions should be implemented? ^[1]_[SEP]

1 <https://basicincome.org/basic-income/history/>^[1]_[SEP] 2 <https://www.yang2020.com/what-is-freedom-dividend-faq/>^[1]_[SEP] 3 <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-02-19/universal-basic-income-wasn-t-invented-by-today-s-democrats> 4 <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-47169549>^[1]_[SEP] 5 <https://www.pressenza.com/2018/07/philippe-van-parijs-the-biggest-objection-to-a-basic-income-is-moral/>

Working While Sick

Nearly 43 million private sector workers in the US hold jobs that do not offer paid sick leave. The majority of these workers are employed in the service sector, where interactions with customers form a key part of their jobs.

Kate, a server at a fast food restaurant called Blake's Burgers, is one of these workers. In the past, her bosses encouraged her to take the day off when she was sick, because coming in would put the health of her coworkers and customers at risk. Recently, however, the company cut her hours, and Kate could no longer afford to take a day off without pay.

A few months after the company cut her hours, Kate caught the flu and was unsure what to do. If

she stayed home, she would lose the pay that she desperately needed, and run the risk of losing her job. She had been working for Blake's Burgers for many years, and she thought it was unfair that she could be fired for taking an action that would ultimately help the business.

On the other hand, going to work would pose a number of threats. Since Kate was likely contagious, she could get her coworkers sick, thereby confronting them with the same dilemma she faced now. Because her job involves handling food, she could also get her customers sick. Not only would this harm those customers, but it could have a negative effect on the business as a whole. After all, if people became sick from eating at Blake's Burgers, they would be more likely to avoid the establishment in the future, urge their friends to do the same, and ultimately harm the company's business.

On a national scale, the impact of Kate's dilemma is huge: The Center for American Progress estimates that unhealthy workers cost employers some \$160 billion a year in lost productivity. In addition, a substantial trend of workers continuing to perform their duties while sick is particularly concerning during moments of crisis and concern for public health, such as the currently developing COVID-19 "Coronavirus" outbreak across the United States and the world.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Is Kate morally permitted to work while sick, given that she needs the money and needs to keep her job? Why or why not? ^[1]_[SEP]
2. What, if anything, would change if Kate was a single mother whose children depend on her making money and keeping her job as well? ^[1]_[SEP]
3. What, if anything, would change if Kate interacted with coworkers but not customers at work? ^[1]_[SEP]

"Just" Discrimination?

Caster Semenya, a 28-year-old female Olympic gold medal runner from South Africa, is facing a new hurdle, testosterone regulation. She, along with a handful of other female athletes have intersex characteristics due to a medical condition called hyperandrogenism. This condition has many characteristics, but one is of particular interest: high levels of hormones such as testosterone. Testosterone occurs naturally in both men and women and is associated with neuromuscular function and "explosive power" such as that needed for some athletic endeavors. As a result of Semenya's high testosterone level, the International Association of Athletics Federations (IAAF) has passed a regulation requiring female athletes to reduce these levels to a range closer to that typically seen in females and maintain those levels for at least six months prior to certain international competitions. Semenya and Athletics South Africa each filed a request for arbitration with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), however the CAS, in a press release dated May 1, 2019, announced that it has dismissed these requests, albeit with some reservations that leave the matter open for future action.

It's not surprising to see Olympic-class athletes with extraordinary physical abilities—after all, that is what athletic competitions are about—so it may seem odd to say that someone is naturally

too physically able. In the past, questions have been raised regarding transgender athletes and whether they should compete according to the sex they were assigned at birth or according to the sex with which they identify, but hyperandrogenism is different. Semenya is not a transgender person; she is trying to compete according to the sex she was assigned at birth: female. Additionally, Semenya has been competing against world class female athletes for many years, and though she may be one of the world's best runners, she is not undefeated.

Semenya is now the center of a worldwide legal and ethical debate, which raises the question: Is it fair for her to compete as a woman? Many say this debate is discriminatory and sexist. Others ask what is the point of world-class athletes competing if those who are among the "best" must be subjected to criticism for being an extraordinary athlete. One argument focuses on the importance of preserving a fair and equitable competition for women by supporting efforts to regulate her testosterone levels. But Semenya herself believes this whole investigative and legal process is discriminatory and abusive as she is now "destroyed" both "physically and mentally."

In its press release, the CAS said the regulations "are discriminatory but the majority of the Panel found that, on the basis of the evidence submitted by the parties, such discrimination is a necessary, reasonable and proportionate means of achieving the IAAF's aim of preserving the integrity of female athletics in the Restricted Events."

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Is it permissible for the IAAF to ask Semenya to alter her body chemistry in order to compete? Is it fair? Why or why not? ^[L]_[SEP]
2. Does it matter, morally, that Semenya's increased testosterone levels are the product of a naturally occurring condition (as opposed to, for example, artificial hormone treatments)? Why or why not? ^[L]_[SEP]

¹ An earlier version of this case originally appeared in the 2020 APPE Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl Nationals Case Set. Many thanks to the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE) and IEB for allowing us to use it! For more information, please visit: <http://appe-ethics.org/ethics-bowl/>

To Forgive or Not to Forgive?

Many people believe that the United States has a student debt crisis. Student loan debt is higher than it has ever been across all demographics and ages, with around 44 million American borrowers owing a collective \$1.5 trillion. Many of these borrowers are struggling to keep up with their loan payments. As a result, more than 10 percent of student loan balances are currently considered seriously delinquent (the borrower has fallen more than 90 days behind in their payments) or in default.¹

In the lead-up to the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election, several candidates have proposed policies to address the student debt crisis. Perhaps most notably, Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, both Democratic contenders for the Presidency, have advanced ambitious student debt

forgiveness plans. Both of these plans seek the widespread cancellation of outstanding loan balances and are projected to have high costs as a result. The Warren plan would cancel up to \$50,000 in debt for every person with household income under \$100,000, and provide substantial (though less) debt cancellation for those with household incomes between \$100,000 and \$250,000.² This approach would fully eliminate the debt of up to 75% of borrowers, and provide some relief for over 40 million Americans. Bernie Sanders' plan takes things a step further, seeking to make total debt forgiveness available to all of the nation's federal and private student loan borrowers.

Waiting in the wings, of course, are questions about how to finance such ambitious policy proposals. Both candidates have argued that a tax increase is the ideal way to fund student debt relief. Warren proposes to fund her relief program with an "ultra-millionaire tax" that would include a 2% annual tax on families with at least \$50 million in net worth. Sanders plans to fund his program with a new tax on financial transactions, which would include a 0.5% fee on all stock trades, a 0.1% fee on all bond trades and a 0.005% fee on all derivatives trades.³

While most candidates for high office recognize the depth and severity of the debt crisis, other candidates have been more measured in their approach to relief, ranging from the lowering of education costs, the expansion of federal Pell Grant programs, making public colleges "debt-free," and making improvements to existing public service forgiveness programs.

Proponents of debt forgiveness argue that higher education is a public good which it is in the country's interest to subsidize. Moreover, forgiving student debt would strengthen the middle class by unburdening a generation of Americans—especially those from working class backgrounds—thereby enabling them to more fully participate in the economy. Some critics of debt forgiveness fear that this is a problematic fix that does not address the root causes of the student debt crisis.⁴ Additionally, many critics believe that these proposals are unfair. Some people point out, for example, that such plans would help many students who are on their way to becoming well-paid professionals (e.g., doctors, lawyers, etc.), and who might not need this assistance. Others point out that people who took out student loans promised to pay them back, and so using taxpayer money to forgive their loans is unfair to those who are student-debt-free because they chose to avoid taking out loans in the first place, or because they worked hard to pay their student loans off.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. What, morally speaking, are the potential costs of the high levels of student loan debt in the U.S.? What, morally speaking, are the potential costs and benefits of these proposals to forgive this debt?
2. Are these student loan forgiveness policies unfair to people who do not currently have this type of debt? Why or why not?
3. Should access to higher education be guaranteed to all? Should it be free?

df_{SEP}2 <https://medium.com/@teamwarren/im-calling-for-something-truly-transformational-universal-free-public-college-and-cancellation-of-a246cd0f910f> 3
<https://berniesanders.com/issues/college-for-all/>_{SEP}4
<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/26/us/warren-student-loans-college.html>

Project Prevention

Project Prevention is a North Carolina-based nonprofit that attempts to prevent people with addictions from having children.¹ To do this, Project Prevention pays people with drug addictions \$300 to volunteer for long-term or permanent birth control. Ultimately, approximately two-thirds of participants agree to use forms of long-term birth control, such as 5-year IUDs, with the remaining third opting for sterilization.² According to Barbara Harris, who founded the controversial organization, the goals are to stop people from having children that they are not in a position to adequately care for, and to reduce the number of babies born with drug-related defects. Ultimately, according to Harris, this program helps people with addictions get their lives back on track while protecting innocent children from the various harms associated with parents' drug use or from being caught up in the foster care system.

Critics say Project Prevention is manipulative, taking advantage of people who are not in a position to make rational, informed decisions about what reproductive choices they may want to make in the future. For this reason, it seems problematic to encourage them to undergo sterilization. Moreover, according to critics, despite Harris's claim about wanting to help these individuals, this program doesn't do anything to address the real problem: their addiction. Additionally, critics argue, this program is based on and reinforces problematic stereotypes about people suffering from drug addiction. According to National Advocates for Pregnant Women, Project Prevention "perpetuates the myth that drug-using parents have a disproportionate number of children."³ Harris's language reinforces this perception, as she routinely describes addicted women as "having litters of children". Critics also argue that Project Prevention's rhetoric—such as the motto "Don't let pregnancy get in the way of your crack habit"⁴—increases the stigmatization of drug use and addiction, and conveys the message that women who use drugs do not deserve to have children.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Does a sexually-active person who uses drugs have a special moral obligation that a non-drug user does not have to use effective birth control? Why or why not?
2. What are the ethical considerations that may count for, and against, offering people with addiction financial incentives not to have children?
3. Suppose that a doctor learns that their patient is being paid by Project Prevention to undergo sterilization. Does that give the doctor a reason not to perform the procedure? Why or why not? If it depends, what does it depend on?

Flying High

From a personal standpoint, there are excellent reasons to incorporate travel into one's life. First of all, many people simply enjoy it. For many people, flying to faraway destinations is a fun and exhilarating way to spend one's vacation. For others, first-hand exposure to other cultures is a significant source of personal growth. Many people also travel to see friends and family who live across the country or around the world. And for some people, flying to and fro is simply part of the job. Travel can have a number of important benefits. Psychological research suggests that those who focus on experiences instead of material objects tend to be happier.¹ Additionally, traveling abroad is a great opportunity for learning, for cultural immersion, and for self-knowledge. It can even be life-changing. At many universities, academic advisers encourage students to travel abroad in order to expand their perspectives on the world, open their minds, and create wonderful long-lasting memories.

Yet taking a long flight is, perhaps, an individual's single largest contribution to climate change. According to one estimate, one passenger's share of emissions on a 2,500-mile flight melts 32 square feet of Arctic summer sea ice cover.² Taking one round-trip flight between New York and California generates about 20 percent of the greenhouse gases that one's car emits over an entire year.³ And the problem is likely to increase over time, as passenger numbers are predicted to double to 8.2 billion by 2037.⁴ For these reasons, people are increasingly deciding to limit unnecessary air travel. In some parts of Europe, this anti-flying movement is taking off. In Sweden, new words, such as "flygskam" (flying shame) and "smygflyga" (flying in secret) are being coined to express some of these anti-flying sentiments.⁵ Out of a concern for her carbon footprint, teen climate activist Greta Thunberg decided to travel from Sweden to North America by boat rather than plane, in order to attend the United Nations Climate Action Summit.⁶

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

STUDY QUESTIONS

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

¹ <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/10/buy-experiences/381132/>²

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/03/travel/traveling-climate-change.html>³

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/27/climate/airplane-pollution-global-warming.html>⁴

<https://www.airlines.iata.org/news/passenger-numbers-to-hit-82bn-by-2037-iata-report>⁵

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

airlines/16 https://www.npr.org/2019/08/28/754818342/teen-climate-activist-greta-thunberg-arrives-in-new-york-after-sailing-the-atlan

(You can find many other case studies that have been prepared for both the Collegiate Ethics Bowl and High School Ethics Bowl at the following sites:

Parr Center for Ethics, UNC: <https://nhseb.unc.edu/case-archive/>

Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE): <https://www.appe-ethics.org/cases-rules-and-guidelines>)

Below is a template that I have successfully used to prepare students to compete in the Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl. It can be used to help students think through case studies and prepare and make effective presentations. The template helps students analyze the case and suggest possible courses of action by identifying the morally relevant facts, stakeholders, and ethical issues involved in the case. Of course, there are many different approaches to analyzing cases, and this is just one suggestion. An excellent article on using case studies is “Creative Case Studies in Ethics” by Michael Strawser, in *Teaching Ethics* 11.1 (Fall 2010).

Ethical Case Analysis

Here are some definitions to help us see the moral dimensions of our experience of being human and to help us understand where we have obligations and what we ought specifically to do in any particular situation.

Moral Patient: Any being who deserves moral consideration, and so whose welfare counts when it comes to ethical decision-making.

Moral Welfare: The preservation and extension in a positive way the life of the moral patient. To do so essentially means to guarantee to each moral patient safety, security, respect, and meaningful freedom.

Moral Stakeholder: A moral patient whose welfare will be benefited or harmed in this specific case.

Moral Agent: Any moral patient who can have moral obligations, can give consent, and can make moral choices.

Moral Community: The community of all moral patients.

Moral Issue: Two conditions constitute a moral issue: one, where the action or inaction of a moral agent will either benefit or harm the moral welfare of a moral patient. Two, the moral patient has an interest in having its existence preserved and extended in a positive way.

Five Step Process to Evaluate Case Studies

Name of Case:

I. Get the Facts: What are the three most relevant facts of the case? Which facts might need to be researched?

Fact 1:

Fact 2:

Fact 3:

Facts to be researched:

II. Identify the Stakeholders: What individuals and groups have an important stake in the outcome? Find three key stakeholders. Generally, there are two obvious stakeholders with an obvious conflict, but think outside the box for the other potential group or individual with a stake or interest in the successful resolution of the issue. Do some have a greater stake because they have a special need or because we have special obligations to them? List the stakeholders and identify any with a privileged position. Identify the “stake” each stakeholder has in the outcome.

Stakeholder 1:

What they need, their stake in the outcome:

Stakeholder 2:

What they need, their stake in the outcome:

Stakeholder 3:

What they need, their stake in the outcome:

III. Identify the Moral Issue:

What’s wrong?

Where is the conflict or clash of needs and/or interests?

What needs to be decided?

IV. Identify some approaches:

What are three possible options for acting? What are three pros and three cons for each option?

Option 1:

Pros

Cons

Option 2:

Pros

Cons

Option 3:

Pros

Cons

If you showed your list of options to persons on each side of the problem, what would they say?

If you showed your list of options to someone you respect, what would that person say?

V. Answer the question. What is the right thing to do?

Run the approaches through the following moral criteria to see which one is the most morally praiseworthy response. Some principles may be more relevant than others. Use the most applicable moral principles (Note you may choose to use in place of or in addition the moral theories learned in class).

The best moral approach to this case will satisfy the basic ethical requirements of respect, fairness, nonmaleficence, beneficence, and care.

Principle of Respect: (Think Kant)

The moral value for respect: Every person is a person of intrinsic, equal, and unconditional moral worth, with the ability to act as a rational moral agent.

The moral principle of respect states that we must treat each person as an end in themselves. We must honor the autonomy of each person—we should not interfere with anyone's freedom or right of self-determination unless to protect others. This requires the moral duties of honesty, promise keeping, nonmaleficence, beneficence, self-care, and any other duty that is required by treating others as ends-in-themselves.

Principle of Fairness (Think Rawls)

The moral value for fairness: Every person is deserving of having enough of the earth's resources to live a life of human flourishing; a life that is safe, secure, respected, and meaningfully free. (Equity not equality) (This value rests on the value for respect.)

The principle of fairness states that we should treat everyone equally and impartially according to some universal and impersonal standard and any unequal treatment must be defended by appeal to some acceptable moral reason like the benefit of the least advantaged, or to restore equity between persons (the stakeholders).

Principle of Nonmaleficence (Think Utilitarianism)

The moral value for nonmaleficence: All persons are of equal moral value and deserve to be free from pain and suffering.

The principle of nonmaleficence states that we should act in ways that do not inflict suffering or cause harm to others. In particular we should not cause avoidable or intentional harm.

Principle of Beneficence (Think Utilitarianism)

The moral value for beneficence: All persons are of equal moral value and deserve to be free to experience happiness and the free pursuit of their preferences.

The principle of beneficence states that we should act in ways that ensure that the happiness and preference acquisition of all persons are maximized and outweighs any bad that might result and in ways that do not cause harm to others. (Happiness and preference acquisition could be defined as increasing the safety, security, respect, and freedom of all persons.)

Principle of Care: (Think Ethics of Care)

The moral value of care: All persons deserve to be valued for who they are and free from coercion, manipulation, and violence, and free to be part of caring relationships of their choice.

The moral principle of care states that we should act in ways that cultivate trust between all the stakeholders, encourage cooperation, and minimize as much as possible resentment and the potential for further conflict, while giving priority to those closest to us in relational proximity.

Answer:

According to the principle of respect, the best response would be:

According to the principle of nonmaleficence, the best response would be:

According to the principle of beneficence, the best response would be:

According to the principle of fairness, the best response would be:

According to the principle of care, the best response would be:

Overall, the best response would be:

VI. **Objections & Refutations:** What might someone reasonable say against our solution?

How would we respond to that objection?

Objection:

Refutation:

Objection:

Refutation: