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Cyber lesson plan for Ethics Bowl.

**Goals**- Further understanding of Ethics Bowl Format

 Apply ethical education to relevant world issues

Have students develop a nuanced understanding of the issues surrounding privacy/security.

**Methodology**

Students be split into two groups to research the prompt in teams. They will spend half an

hour researching, followed by half an hour of debate, following the format described below.

#  “Each match will begin with a coin toss. The team that wins the coin toss may elect to present first (designated as Team A) or to have the other team present first (in this situation, the winner of the coin toss is then designated as Team B). To open the first half of the match, copies of the first case and question will be distributed to the judges and teams. The moderator will then read the question…

# …Team A will then have up to two minutes to confer, after which any member(s) of Team A may speak for up to five minutes (total) in response to the moderator’s question, based on the team’s research and critical analysis. This is known as the Presentation period. Team A must address and answer the moderator’s question during the Presentation period.

# Next Team B will have up to one minute to confer, after which Team B may speak for up to three minutes in response to Team A’s presentation. This is known as the Commentary period.

# Team A will then have up to one minute to confer, followed by three minutes to respond to Team B’s challenge. This is known as the Response period.” (<https://nhseb.unc.edu/files/2012/04/NHSEB-2015-16-Rules-Procedures-and-Guidelines.pdf>)

**Prompt**

The United States of America was founded on the principle of liberty, and as a nation we hold liberty in the highest regard. We are also a nation that is currently involved in multiple armed conflicts, and as such we are a nation that needs heightened security (sometimes at the expense of liberty) to keep foreign aggressors at bay. Prior to June 2015 the national security agency was collecting bulk meta-data (data about data) about citizen’s phone calls. This allowed them to see how long everyone’s phone calls were and who they were calling. Privacy advocates were notable angered when this information was released, and pushed for the creation of the FREEDOM Act, which curtailed the National Security Agency’s (NSA) right to collection of meta-data.

 Proponents of the Freedom act upheld the idea of an individual’s right to privacy, citing the 4th amendment as backing. The 4th amendment protects American citizens against unlawful searches and seizures, requiring government officials to procure a warrant from the courts to search a person’s personal belongings. They also believe firmly in the ideal of “innocent until proven guilty,” saying that unless there is just cause to suspect a citizen of illegal activity, that citizen should be assumed innocent- and should not be subject to intervention in any way from law enforcement. An individual’s right to privacy can only be breached when there are endangering other’s right to security.

 Opponents of the Freedom act upheld the idea of security being a more important right than the right to privacy. They claim that waiting until there is just cause for collection of data on a citizen means running the risk of the damage already being done. By the time there is just cause to suspect someone of terrorism the risk of a terrorist action actually occurring is raised substantially. Programs like the NSA have a primary purpose of protecting the population, even if to do so means infringing on privacy.

**Study Questions**

1. Do we have a moral obligation to give up our right to privacy if it means reducing the risk of terrorist attacks?
2. Do government agencies (put into place from a democratic government) have the moral right to make that decision for their citizens?
3. As a nation is it more important that we uphold the philosophical values that we were based on (i.e. liberty, privacy etc.) or that we protect ourselves and citizens? If a constitutional amendment is reducing the safety of our citizens, are we morally obligated to change it?