



The Ethics Cup

2023 Regionals Case Set

Case Authors: Joe Slater, Luca Stroppa, and the members of the Parr Centre at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Special thanks for to the National High School Ethics Bowl. Please do not reproduce without giving credit as appropriate.

Centre for Ethics,
Philosophy and
Public Affairs



University of
St Andrews

FOUNDED
1413

1. Competing Parents

Adrea Patel¹ recently gave birth to two babies via in vitro fertilization (IVF). Some time after the birth, she discovered that neither of the babies were related to her—or to each other. The lack of genetic relation was made clear to her because the babies' physiological racial identity markers appeared to be different from Adrea and her husband (both of whom are of Indian descent). As it turns out, nine months earlier, three unrelated couples had gone to the same fertility centre for IVF treatment and assistance getting pregnant. There was a mix-up at the clinic and instead of embryos genetically related to her, Adrea was implanted with embryos from the other two couples. One of the babies was genetically related to Anni and Ashot Manukyan, who had not been able to get pregnant successfully. When the Manukyans found out about the mix-up and the subsequent birth of a baby genetically related to them they sued Adrea for custody. Eventually, a judge ruled in favor of the genetic parents—the Manukyans—and awarded them custody. In fact, the Patels were ordered to relinquish custody of both babies. According to the judge in their case, the genetic relation was important to the decision, but so was the fact that the Manukyans had intended to be parents.²

In another such mix-up, Susan Buchweitz, who had previously been unable to get pregnant, decided to have a child using an egg donor and a sperm donor, both of whom she chose with the utmost care. The same day that she went to the fertility clinic to get the embryo implanted, Sean Cook and his wife were also there to get an embryo implanted that was created from an anonymous egg donor and Sean's sperm. After a year, Susan discovered that the wrong embryo had been implanted and her child was genetically related to Sean. After Sean sued for custody, a judge granted him (although not his wife, who was not genetically related to the child) partial custody. As a result, Susan had to send her child to a stranger's house several days a week and had to consult with Sean about major life decisions like what school the child would attend and whether or not she could move house.³

The judges in Adrea and Susan's cases deferred to genetic claims of parenthood. But critics might make note of the gestational burden of carrying these pregnancies to term and the deep bond formed between mothers and children in their first weeks of life.

Study Questions

1. How should we weigh competing claims for parenthood (e.g., genetic, gestational, social)?
2. Should the intention of becoming a parent be relevant to questions about custody?
3. How should we balance the needs of the child against the needs of those who want custody over them in situations like these?

¹ All names included in this case are pseudonyms, as those involved have chosen to remain anonymous.

² <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2019/07/ivf-embryo-mix-up-parenthood/593725/>
<https://www.usatoday.com/story/life/parenting/2019/07/10/ivf-mix-up-second-couple-involved-alleged-baby-mix-up-sues-clinic/1694269001/>

³ https://www.bionews.org.uk/page_89371

2. Disgraced Artists

The National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. decided to indefinitely postpone a Chuck Close exhibition after the artist was accused of making lewd comments to and asking invasive questions about potential portrait models. This led people to question “whether the work of [...] artists accused of questionable conduct needs to be revisited or recontextualized.”⁴ Similar questions have been asked about a range of prominent members of the entertainment industry—from Harvey Weinstein and Kevin Spacey to Louis C. K. and Bill Cosby—whose careers were extinguished by sexual harassment and assault accusations even before a courtroom determined guilt.

What role do those who curate the art play in determining an answer to this question? Amidst the accusations levied against Close, the National Gallery decided to postpone its exhibit indefinitely, but the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts opted to leave its exhibition featuring the artist open, altering it to become a space of dialogue.⁵ Netflix went ahead with the final season of *House of Cards* without its main actor Kevin Spacey, but viewers can watch the previous five seasons of his portrayal of Frank Underwood without any asterisk affixed to the series or warning that the star might have been sexually predatory.

Some are more willing than others to separate the art from the artist, at least in certain cases. Jock Reynolds, the director of the Yale University Art Gallery, told *The New York Times*: “Pablo Picasso was one of the worst offenders of the 20th century in terms of his history with women. Are we going to take his work out of the galleries? At some point you have to ask yourself, is the art going to stand alone as something that needs to be seen?”⁶

Some argue that separating the art would mean, in Close’s case, not trying to better understand his art by looking for a connection between his alleged harassment of potential portrait models and the genre-defining portraiture he created. As Amanda Hess notes, “If a piece of art is truly spoiled by an understanding of the conditions under which it is made, then perhaps the artist was not quite as exceptional as we had thought.” Perhaps the asterisk helps the viewer to truly appreciate the artist’s art.

Study Questions

1. If it is possible to celebrate the art without excusing the transgressions of the artist: How? If it is not, what should become of the art?
2. Suppose the work is historically transformative and has produced an immeasurable amount of good for humanity—akin to a revolutionary advancement in technology or medicine. Does celebrating that art nevertheless amount to excusing the (possibly unrelated) transgression(s) of the artist?⁷

⁴ <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/28/arts/design/chuck-close-exhibit-harassment-accusations.html>

⁵ <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2018/feb/15/chuck-close-art-sexual-harassment-pafa>

⁶ <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/10/arts/sexual-harassment-art-hollywood.html>

⁷ <https://www.prindlepost.org/2018/11/is-it-okay-to-wear-a-house-of-cards-t-shirt/>

3. Encrypted Messaging

Message encryption is a technology that promises us that our personal devices are entirely private. At the same time, tech companies are struggling with the demands of governments to give access to the data circulating on our phones.

U.S. law enforcement officials have frequently submitted legal orders to major tech companies such as Apple, Google, and Microsoft to hand over the contents of messages, photos, and files on consumers' phones for criminal investigations. Yet not all data on our phones is so easily accessible. In the interest of protecting user privacy, and perhaps out of concern for governmental abuse, software developers created “end-to-end” encrypted chat apps (e.g., WhatsApp and Snapchat). These apps secure and hide the contents of a message until it reaches the other user’s phone. Only the two end users hold the decryption key. As a result, the phone-maker does not have the ability to hand over data because it was never readable on their servers in the first place.

In the debate leading up to the passing of the Investigatory Powers Act 2016, Prime Minister David Cameron spoke of a need to (in effect) ban end-to-end encryption, as it could be used by terrorists to plot in secret. More recently, attention has turned to the use of encrypted chats to facilitate child trafficking and child pornography.

In the spring of 2021, Apple disturbed the waters of this uneasy truce over encrypted communication. The tech giant partnered with the (U.S.) National Center for Missing & Exploited Children to formulate a way to scan the hard drives of iPhones for known “Child Sexual Abuse Material” (CSAM). This practice, first employed in limited contexts by the FBI, converts each known image of CSAM in its database into a unique numerical identifier. Meanwhile, every iPhone will regularly run the same algorithm—behind the scenes—to likewise convert files and photos on phones into numeric values. If there is a numeric match between the CSAM database and a file on a user’s phone, it raises a red flag to Apple that the phone owner is in possession of problematic material.

Apple insists that its software and algorithm does not “see” user images. Instead, the algorithm blindly converts images to numerical values (called a “hash”) and then simply looks for matches between user files and hashes in the criminal database. Thus, according to Apple, parents who take pictures of their infant children taking a bath, for instance, have nothing to worry about, because such pictures will not correspond to any pattern of known CSAM.

Study Questions

1. The same messaging encryption which lets investigative journalists communicate safely is also employed by violent criminals and terrorist actors. Are the good uses of such technology worth the cost in malicious uses?
2. Is it the proper place of government to make a judgment about the above question and issue legislation accordingly?
3. Where there is no legal regulation, do tech companies have a moral duty to self-regulate (in the area of message encryption) for the sake of public safety?

4. Ghosting

Imani is a first-year university student. She wants to meet people or maybe start dating someone new. So she downloads a few dating apps over the weekend and starts swiping. A week or so later, she's decided that online dating isn't a good fit for her. She's overwhelmed with classwork and wants to make sure that she's prioritizing her well-being. In addition, she's tired of the way that many men treat her online; sometimes they're demeaning or make inappropriate jokes, some send unsolicited explicit pictures, and some just talk about themselves and don't think to ask her any questions. In the week she's been active online, she's made a bunch of matches on her different profiles. She's started conversations with a handful of guys already and sees a stream of unread messages every time she logs in.

Imani decides to talk about it with her best friend, Jake. She tells him that she just wants a clean break, but she's conflicted. It would feel like a relief to go in and delete all her profiles in a few clicks, and she's sure she doesn't want a relationship with any of these guys. Moreover, she doesn't feel up to the task of messaging everyone she's connected with to explain what's up with her before going offline (she hasn't met anyone in person yet). But that would mean ghosting those people, and she's been ghosted before and knows how bad it feels. It usually leaves her wondering if she did anything wrong or if she's an interesting person to talk to.

Jake tells her not to worry. He's dated online for a while now, and he ghosts girls all the time. Sometimes it's because he's overwhelmed or busy, sometimes it's because he feels like there's just not a connection, and sometimes he just is interested in another match more. He tells her that he basically ghosts everyone who he's never met and doesn't click with, and even some people who he has met in person. "So don't sweat it, just ghost them all," Jake says.

After talking with Jake, Imani can't decide what to do. On the one hand, she didn't find what she was looking for with anyone—and felt upset by a bunch of the people she did match with. But on the other hand, there's three people she can think of who seemed really kind and thoughtful, and she can see herself interested in people like them in the future. She's just not sure that Jake's reasons seem like good ones for her to follow.

Study Questions

1. Is there a moral difference between what Jake has done and what Imani wants to do? Does it matter that Imani is often treated poorly and disrespectfully, while Jake often ghosts because it's convenient?
2. More broadly, how do gender norms and dynamics affect the way that individuals should approach dating? Do the same rules apply to everyone? Or is it permissible for some people to behave in certain ways while it would be impermissible for others to do the same?
3. Under what circumstances is it morally permissible to ghost someone?

5. Marital Name Change

The institution of marriage—a widespread and enduring practice across many cultures—retains traditions that some people consider sexist, such as the expectation that women assume their husband’s last name. About 90% of women who are married to men in the U.K. take their husband’s surname; in the U.S., the number is around 70%.⁸ In Japan, where married couples are legally required to share the same name, the wife takes the husband's name 96% of the time.

In 1981, Québec adopted a new policy: when applying for a driver’s license or signing a contract, married women must use the surname they were given at birth. In other words, women cannot use their husband’s last name. In social situations, however, women are free to use whichever last name they prefer.⁹ Still enforced today, this statute was originally enacted to eliminate the social pressure women felt to take their husbands' last name. Proponents of the statute argue that it protects women’s identities and furthers gender equality. One woman said: “It is for me an indication that I belong to myself.”¹⁰ Others saw this law as important because it underscored Québec’s dedication to protecting women's rights as a matter of law.

However, some argue that not allowing women to decide their name for themselves is just as paternalistic as requiring it. On this view, empowering women means letting them decide whether or not they want to participate in the tradition. Other women are offended by the state's implication that if they take their husband's last name they lose some facet of their personal identity. Indeed, many women want to be able to identify as part of a single family unit with their spouses and with their children, who are often given their father’s last name by default. Others are upset that the government is regulating such a personal part of their life.

These days, an increasing proportion of couples are choosing to create a double-barrelled surname or a new combined surname upon marriage to express their new status as a family unit.

Study Questions

1. Political philosophers often draw a distinction between the public sphere and the private sphere, saying that the public sphere is a proper domain for legal regulation, whereas people should be left mostly to do as they please in their private lives. Are the choices newly wedded couples make about their surnames the sort of private matter that’s an improper object of legal regulation?
2. Would a Québécoise woman be right to feel offended by the law in question?
3. Do ordinary members of the public have any responsibility to do something about the pressure women feel to take their husband’s surname when getting married

⁸ <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200921-why-do-women-still-change-their-names>

⁹ <https://www.justice.gouv.qc.ca/en/couples-and-families/marriage-civil-union-and-de-facto-union/marriage/married-name/>

¹⁰ <https://globalnews.ca/news/2404384/does-Quebecs-ban-on-married-names-infringe-on-womens-rights/>

6. Objectivity in Journalism

On May 19, 2021, journalist Emily Wilder, who is Jewish, was fired from the *Associated Press* after three weeks on the job after right-wing media sources began publicizing her involvement in pro-Palestine activism at university and drew attention to tweets she had made about the topic.^{11,12} In late May 2021, Alexis Johnson, who is Black, was told by her employer, the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, that she would not be allowed to cover the Black Lives Matter movement because she had demonstrated bias in a tweet that she had posted the day before.¹³ And Felicia Sonmez was banned in 2018 from reporting on cases dealing with rape and sexual assault at her job at the *Washington Post* after she wrote about her experience as a survivor of sexual violence.¹⁴

Some people see these actions by news organizations as justified measures to protect the objectivity of the reporting in question. Objectivity is impossible when the person reporting has made it clear that they have strong personal views on the matter. One might argue that they should also prize the *appearance* of objectivity, as the *Washington Post* seemed to in Sonmez's case. "The reason I've repeatedly been given by senior editors," she said in a tweet, "is that they are worried about the 'appearance of a conflict of interest' if they allow me to write on sexual assault. They've told me they don't believe there's an actual conflict, or even that my writing would be biased in any way."¹⁵

However, most reporters have opinions about the things they report on. It is inconsistent and irresponsible, one might argue, only to prevent those who are public about their opinions (or, in the case of Sonmez, their experiences) from reporting on controversial issues. It may also constitute discrimination.¹⁶ What is better, say critics of objectivity, is to report the facts while also acknowledging one's (limited and biased) point of view. This is a sign of humility, and it may also have the benefit of leading to more ethical reporting standards. Perhaps shrugging off the myth of objectivity would release journalists from lending undue credence, in the name of remaining neutral, to what they take to be morally problematic stances.¹⁷

Study Questions

1. Is reporting better, all else being equal, when done by someone who has no opinion on the issue on which they're reporting?
2. Is it important for those who consume journalism to have information about the person doing the reporting? If so, why, and what information? If not, why not?
3. Is it morally permissible for a media outlet to restrict the activities of an unbiased reporter in order to protect its reputation for objectivity?

¹¹ <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/25/business/media/emily-wilder-associated-press-ap.html?searchResultPosition=2>

¹² <https://www.mediaite.com/news/associated-press-reporter-out-after-conservatives-flag-pro-palestine-activism-in-college/>

¹³ <https://www.thecut.com/2020/06/black-reporter-barred-from-covering-blm-protests-over-bias.html>

¹⁴ <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/mar/30/washington-post-felicia-sonmez-sexual-assault-sexism>

¹⁵ <https://twitter.com/feliciasonmez/status/1376274971207602184>

¹⁶ <https://lawandcrime.com/high-profile/washington-post-reporter-sues-the-newsroom-and-marty-baron-for-discrimination-claiming-she-was-punished-after-sexual-assault-disclosure/>

¹⁷ <https://medium.com/@lewispants/objectivity-is-dead-and-im-okay-with-it-7fd2b4b5c58f>

7. Research Behind a Paywall

Alexandra Elbakyan, a graduate student from Kazakhstan, has attracted international praise—and a slew of lawsuits—for her creation of a website called Sci-Hub, which illegally hosts and distributes millions of research papers for free. Sci-Hub allows users to upload articles from scientific journals that can be downloaded by anyone.

Under current publishing conventions, university libraries negotiate expensive contracts with publishing companies like Elsevier and Wiley-Blackwell for access to the journals they publish. If researchers are not connected to a university, or are members of one that cannot afford to pay, they must pay an individual fee to access an article.¹⁸ These costs for researchers can add up quickly, but Sci-Hub allows readers to bypass publisher paywalls and go directly to the research they are looking for.

Supporters of Sci-Hub argue that free access to research democratizes education and levels the playing field for scholars who do not work for well-resourced universities. They argue, in addition, that the public is entitled to the fruits of research that was funded out of people's taxes, as much research is. According to Michael Eisen, a scientist at University of California, Berkeley, free access also speeds up scientific discoveries.¹⁹ In addition, some Sci-Hub defenders complain that publishing companies like Elsevier operate with profit margins of over 30 percent while the scientists who produce the research do not receive a cut of the profits. Elbakyan herself claims that Sci-Hub “never received any complaints from authors or researchers.”

Publishing companies have been quick to file lawsuits against Elbakyan and Sci-Hub, claiming that no matter her intentions, this website breaks the law and encourages users to steal their intellectual property. Alicia Wise, an employee at Elsevier, argues that defenders of Sci-Hub get things wrong: “as if somehow stealing content is justifiable if it's seen as expensive...It's not as if you'd walk into a grocery store and feel vindicated about stealing an organic chocolate bar as long as you left the Kit-Kat bar on the shelf.” Publishing companies also argue that they perform a valuable service for the academy and the public, and that sites like Sci-Hub undermine their ability to publish high-quality science.

Study Questions

1. Is it morally permissible for researchers to download articles from Sci-Hub? Does it depend on their ability to pay?
2. Is it morally permissible for researchers to upload their articles to Sci-Hub if those articles are behind a paywall?
3. Some will argue that Sci-Hub is less morally objectionable than websites that allow users to illegally download music or movies. Is it?

¹⁸ <https://ed.stanford.edu/in-the-media/sci-hub-research-piracy-and-public-good-op-ed-john-willinsky>

¹⁹ <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/13/opinion/sunday/should-all-research-papers-be-free.html>

8. Vegetarianism and Family

For the first thirty years of her life Ellen loved eating meat. However, after learning about the cruelty involved in factory farming she became vegetarian.

Ellen was happy with her decision until the Christmas holidays approached. Tradition is important in her Italian family: her parents always serve lasagne with meat sauce, made according to her grandmother's recipe, which Ellen knows she doesn't want to eat. To prevent a rift with her parents, Ellen called home a few weeks beforehand to explain her new diet to her parents and to ask if they can prepare the sauce without meat.

The conversation didn't go well. Ginny, Ellen's mom, felt personally attacked. Cooking with Ellen had always been one of her favourite mother-daughter activities and so she viewed Ellen's decision to become vegetarian as a rejection of her childhood and as a criticism of her parents' values.

When her family gathers for the holiday meal, Ellen immediately sees that the lasagne contains meat. She asks if she can have some pasta and tomato sauce instead. Ginny becomes very upset, accusing Ellen of rejecting an important family tradition and ruining the meal for everyone. Tension floods the room.

Ellen feels terribly guilty. She treasures her family and its traditions—in fact, in past years, she helped her parents prepare the meat sauce. But now she is convinced that eating meat is unethical. Despite her best intentions—the fact that she proactively alerted her family to her new diet and explained her reasons for change—her vegetarianism has become an emotional flashpoint for her family.

Ellen wants to help her parents understand the unethical practices of factory farming, and to live what she considers a more ethical lifestyle. But, at the same time, she doesn't want to impose her choices on them or stoke the already high tension.

Study Questions

1. If Ginny is not vegetarian, is she still obligated to adapt family meals to ensure they align with her daughter's values (if her daughter tells her about those values)?
2. Is it possible, and proper, to uphold family traditions when those traditions involve an unethical practice?
3. Would it have been morally permissible for Ellen to keep quiet about her new diet and the reasons for it in order to protect the holiday meal and her relationship with her family?

9. Incest and the Law

In the UK it is illegal to have a sexual relationship with a parent, grandparent, child (including adopted child), grandchild, brother, sister, half-brother, half-sister, uncle, aunt, nephew or niece, even if both parties are consenting adults.²⁰ People related in these ways are also prevented from marrying.

Part of the justification for laws of this sort is that children conceived by parents who are closely genetically related are at higher risk of certain genetic diseases. However, in same-sex siblings, this risk is not present. This risk is also eliminated if one of the individuals has been sterilised (e.g., via vasectomy or tubal ligation) or gone through menopause. If these laws are justified by the potential harm to any resulting offspring, this would also seem to provide some motivation for laws prohibiting individuals with harmful genetic disorders from engaging in sexual relationships. Thus it has been suggested that laws against incest are dated, and rooted in taboo.²¹

On the other hand, we may want to legislate against incest because of the potential for abuse. Particularly when children are growing up, they may be coerced into damaging relationships. Grooming may be psychologically damaging even if a sexual relationship does not commence until both parties are adults; laws against incestual relationships provide some safeguard against this. However, another complication comes in the case of siblings who have grown up separately, but meet later in life. In those relationships, the risks of grooming seem to be no higher than when non-genetically-related people meet as adults.

Study Questions

1. Are laws against marriage of same-sex adult siblings justified?
2. If the law was changed so that same-sex adult siblings could marry, would considerations of fairness mean that brother-sister marriages should also be permitted?
3. If you favour a policy to decriminalise incest, what safeguards would you recommend to minimise the risk of abuse? If you favour the status quo, how can you defend this in cases of relatives meeting in later life where there is no possibility of procreation?

²⁰ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/42/part/1/crossheading/sex-with-an-adult-relative>

²¹ E.g., <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/german-ethics-council-calls-for-incest-between-siblings-to-be-legalised-by-government-9753506.html>,
<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/apr/15/law-against-incest>.

10. The John Stuart Mill Cup

The Ethics Cup first took place in 2018, but was then called the John Stuart Mill Cup. John Stuart Mill was a philosopher in the 19th century, famous as a defender of utilitarianism. He also served as the rector to the University of St Andrews from 1865 to 1868. Mill was a famous public intellectual, whose work on moral and political philosophy is widely read to this day; his books *On Liberty* and *Utilitarianism* regularly feature as essential reading for undergraduate philosophy courses. As well as an intellectual, Mill was also an activist and an MP. In his youth he was reportedly arrested for distributing information about contraception. He spoke in Parliament defending voting rights for women,²² later publishing his thoughts on this matter in *The Subjection of Women* (1869).²³ A noted campaigner for abolition of slavery, Mill chaired the Jamaica Committee, which aimed to prosecute Governor Eyre of Jamaica, who used excessive and deadly force in suppressing an uprising at Morant Bay in 1865. This pitted Mill against many prominent intellectuals, including his contemporary (and sometimes friend), Thomas Carlyle. Mill received assassination threats for his position, which was seen by many as overly sympathetic towards the Black Jamaicans.

While Mill had many admirable qualities, some of his views are now recognised as mistaken and racist. For instance, in *On Liberty*, while he defended a liberal democratic state, he argued that this did not apply to “barbarians” who were “unfit for representative government”. Infamously, Mill considered India unsuitable for democracy, and is seen by some as an apologist for the British Empire for defending this kind of view.

In light of worries about these attitudes, the John Stuart Mill Cup was renamed in 2021.

Study Questions

1. Very few would dispute that Mill did some very good things, yet he did harbour views we now recognise as racist. When we consider naming an event, building or room, should racist views disqualify an individual from consideration?
2. Should the John Stuart Mill Cup have been renamed?
3. Given that troubling information about a person can always come out, is the practice of naming things after historically important individuals morally risky? If so, what should we do to address that risk?

²² One such speech is recorded in Hansard, available here: <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1867-05-20/debates/c38e8bdb-704c-4952-9375-e33d7967a5a4/Clauses34ProgressMay17?highlight=%22conceding%20to%22#contribution-b39e743f-6b70-45e4-82c4-8ac642f8fd18>

²³ Full text available here: <https://www.utilitarianism.net/books/the-subjection-of-women-john-stuart-mill/1>

11. Pet Problems

Pets are extremely popular: in the UK, more than 60% of households owned a pet in 2021/2022.²⁴ Some families are particularly affectionate towards their pets and treat them with the care and respect others would reserve for a child. Some of these affectionate families have very clear preference as to breed and therefore always get their pets from a breeder rather than from an animal shelter.

However, some breeds have been selected to have genetic features that are damaging for the health of the animal. For example, the characteristic pushed-in face of pugs and bulldogs makes it very difficult for them to breathe with their nose. The condition can be incompatible with sleep, as dogs sleep with their mouth closed.²⁵ Another example is the Cavalier King Charles spaniel: 70% of these purebreds are affected by canine syringomyelia, a genetic illness that causes severe pain to the neck and shoulders.²⁶

The more these families buy from breeders, the more animals with severe disabilities of this kind will be created. However, since these families really care about these animals, the animals they buy are still very likely have a life that is, all things considered, good for them. In fact, these purebred animals would simply not exist if affectionate families were not so passionate about these breeds of animal.

Study Questions

1. Should breeding animals of a breed that is beset by severe genetic disabilities be illegal?
2. While this sort of breeding remains legal is it morally permissible to purchase, from a breeder, an animal of a breed that is beset by severe genetic disabilities if one intends to keep the animal as a pet?
3. Researchers might be interested in purchasing (or even breeding) animals of a breed that is beset by severe genetic disabilities with the goal of reducing the harms their disabilities cause. Is it morally permissible to purchase or breed severely disabled animals for this kind of scientific experimentation?

²⁴ <https://www.statista.com/statistics/308235/estimated-pet-ownership-in-the-united-kingdom-uk/>

²⁵ <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2019/feb/27/this-is-a-calamity-the-surgeons-keeping-pugs-and-bulldogs-alive>

²⁶ <https://www.ufaw.org.uk/dogs/cavalier-king-charles-spaniel-syringomyelia>