Kindly note...
The opinions expressed in these pieces are those of Halcyon Students and are in no way a reflection of the school’s stance on such issues. Additionally, all grammatical and organisational errors are retained in the pieces for the purposes of authenticity.
Halcyon MYP Year 1 (Grade 6) and MYP Year 2 (Grade 7) Current Events

Prompt:
Throughout History, individuals or groups have taken a stand against prejudice. Research one figure or group from your own home country who successfully stood up to injustice.

The students were asked to prepare a presentation on their chosen figure, using technology as the medium for delivering their research.

The figures chosen included:

- **Nelson Mandela** - South African anti-apartheid revolutionary, politician, and philanthropist.
- **Sophie Scholl** - German student and revolutionary who resisted Nazi oppression
- **Jean-Jacques Rousseau** - 18th Century Genevan philosopher and composer
- **Victor Schœlcher** - French abolitionist writer in the 19th century
- **Doreen Lawrence** - Jamaican campaigner who has fought for racial equality in the UK
- **Jacob Riis** - Danish American social reformer
- **Rosa Parkes** - African-American civil rights activist
- **Abraham Lincoln** - American President famous for the emancipation proclamation
- **Ric O'Barry** - American Animal Rights Activist
- **Frederick Douglass** - African-American social reformer, orator, writer and statesman.

Allegra Beck presents on Sophie Scholl

Chris Dunkin takes time to tell his peers about Frederick Douglass’ achievements.
Prompt:
This case brings to light the issue of media ethics. Create a list of at least ten guiding principles you think U.K Media Houses should adhere to.

Note: In doing so, you must consider the role of freedom of speech, so do not be too restrictive.

Alexi Reich responds...

Rules that U.K. Media Houses Must Abide By

1. Minors (under the age of 18) should not have their faces shown in stories that are not about them directly. If a story is about a pop star who is sixteen their face may be shown but may not be shown if their parents are the main theme of the article and the only reason the minor comes up in the article/photo is due to relation.

2. A minor under the age of twelve may not have their name published in any articles that are indirectly about them (see above) excluding birth announcements, if the parents choose to release the name. If the minor is above the age of twelve they will have the opportunity to sign allowing for their name to be used in the said article (and only that article.) in order to make sure that the minor’s names will not come up when individuals who are checking out the said minor for schools or other instances where admittance has to be granted not find that the minor is linked to any negative activity merely based on blood-based relation, an unchangeable situation

3. No social media accounts, emails or cell phones may be hacked in order to get information.

4. No bank accounts may be hacked for any purposes.

5. No addresses for homes of celebrities may be publicly released

6. No names of murderers (on a large or small scale) may be released

7. No photos of murderers may be released.

8. A victim of a crime can stay anonymous if they choose to, if the victim was killed in the incident a family member/significant others (or legal guardians in the case of a minor) is allowed to keep the identity of the victim anonymous.

9. Before any incriminating photos to do with relationships (e.g someone cheating) the significant other must be shown the information that will be released, even though they can not stop it being published they need to see the information first.

10. No paparazzi or uninvited reporters may be within 100 meters of any celebrities home.
Guiding Principles for Media Houses

1. Media houses should get the consent of a legal parent or guardian if they wish to put the name, photograph or any personal details of a minor in any newspaper, magazine, radio broadcast or television show.

2. Reporters should not breech the privacy of anyone, including celebrities, by hacking onto their phones, emails or social media accounts, or by trespassing onto private property.

3. Media houses should detail how they retrieved the information used in any article or news report in that article or news report.

4. Media houses should not publish articles about the personal and private lives of anyone in a way that could negatively affect them without their consent.

5. Media houses should only publish articles that are appropriate for their general audience. Content that is available to anyone, such as free newspapers like The Metro, shouldn't contain anything that is inappropriate for teenagers who might see them.

6. Articles about any tragedy should pay tribute to those affected by mentioning their names as a way of showing respect.

7. Articles about criminals should not include the name or a photo of the criminal unless it is important to the safety of the audience in order to avoid putting too much attention on the criminal and giving them any fame for their actions.

8. News reports about criminals should make sure to emphasize the consequences of the criminal's actions in order to deter young impressionable children from crime.

9. Media Houses should make sure to show both sides to an argument that doesn't necessarily have a right and wrong or is opinionated.

10. Newspapers or magazines should not have graphic or inappropriate images on the front page that could be seen by people who might not even want to read it.
Prompt:
David Cameron’s claim that immigration was ‘reasonable’ struck a new tone. Is it good for a leader to admit to a change of view when the facts change, or a weakness?

Dylan Holmes responds…

A leader is often seen as a person who can make no errors whatsoever, because the smallest error can affect millions of people across the country. Wouldn't it be better for a leader to admit that they made a mistake, rather than staying set in their ways and continuing to make bad decisions just so they don't have to look weak?

David Cameron admitted his mistake on immigration, he expected over four thousand migrants from Romania and Bulgaria but only twenty five people arrived at the border. When questioned David Cameron said that the amount of immigrants arriving was reasonable. This admission of a mistake may have made him seem foolish but the idea of many migrants coming to the country was expected by many people. The amount of people that did arrive in the country surprised many people, however no other people were made to look weak by admitting their mistake, so why should leaders?

A leader admitting their mistakes can also be a bad thing in some circumstances. One example of this is if in a war if a leader admitted they were the reason why many people died. This might have a negative effect on peoples trust for their leader. However someone could argue that this is still a good thing because people following the leader do have reason to distrust their leader.
Charlie Sears responds…

I change my mind quite frequently. Usually because the significance of the subject isn't too important nor are my opinions valued by thousands of people. However, I believe that when a powerful leader changes their mind because the ‘facts have changed,’ there must be some criterion met for why they did so.

It is indeed a very controversial subject and depends highly on the situation and point of view. In the case that David Cameron changed his statement about immigration after being proved wrong about some statistics, then there are two ways to see it.

1. It made him look weak because he overestimated the situation, making him look unprofessional. He then also changed his mind after he had been proven wrong, furthermore making him look weaker.

2. He was being cautious, a valuable characteristic of a strong leader. He also adapted to the situation afterwards, ready and prepared if any other situations like this were to occur in the future.

Personally, I agree with viewpoint number two. This is because I prefer to look at the situation in a more positive light. In any other situations such as this the result would be the same; They had the wrong idea and now they have the right one. The outcome of the situation is what really matters, because that is probably what will affect (or not affect) you most. Really, a sign of ‘weakness’ would be if the leader kept the same viewpoint after the situation proved them wrong. Not only is that an act of weakness but also a sign of stubbornness, in most cases it is most likely a disadvantage to have a stubborn leader.

To conclude, as long as a leader changes their view for the better, there is no reason to complain about the outcome. If leaders didn’t change their minds, they will never learn anything new to teach their country, and to quote John F. Kennedy: “Leadership and learning are inseparable to each other.”

Bibliography:

**Bonus: Daphni Linenberg responds…**

David Cameron had a strict approach to immigration when immigrants were to arrive in the UK. Cameron had wanted immigrants to live the same way that British citizens do. When a British citizen is hurt, they do not have health insurance, but they are allowed to go into a hospital and leave without paying. An immigrant would have to pay a hospital because they are not from this country. David Cameron was right in changing his viewpoints when the facts had changed, but it could show a sign of weakness.

A leader of a nation should be able to have an opinion to what they think is right. Cameron had changed his viewpoint as soon as the facts had changed. It was predicted that over 4,000 people would arrive to the UK in the new year, only 25 people had arrived. This shows that everything that David Cameron believed would happen, did not happen. It does not show a sign of weakness, it shows a sign of strength. If Cameron had not admitted that he was wrong, the people would think he were a fool. Admitting to your mistakes are one of the factors of showing you are a leader, and if you make many mistakes repetitively, you are just a fool. You do not make mistakes and keep repeating them because you should have learnt from them before.

In conclusion, it is alright for a leader to change his/her viewpoints after the facts have changed if you have admitted that what you believed in before was or may have been wrong. As stated before, over 4,000 people were believed to arrive in the UK after the new year, yet only 25 people had arrived. In my opinion, immigrants should have the same rights as any citizen should have in a country. For example, if an immigrant in Britain had arrived, they should be allowed to have the same rights as any other British citizen should have.