The Fourth Amendment provides that the right of people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects should not be violated. In Olmstead’s case, the Fourth Amendment is interpreted to protect only four things: persons, houses, papers and effects, which is inappropriate. For example, Phone lines are not included in the four things that can be protected, because they are not Olmstead’s property or effects. The Katz v. case appends the Olmstead decision, and the Fourth Amendment is interpreted to protect people right, not places, against unreasonable searches and seizures. The interpretation of the Fourth Amendment is different in the two cases is different because the first one emphasizes the particular four things listed, while the second emphasizes the right of people to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures. The Katz’s case interprets that the Fourth Amendment protects more than that in Olmstead’s case.

The overall conclusion is that the education data market is noxious in some cases and not others. The first example is Mount Saint Mary’s University. The university collects and counts student grades and conducts surveys on students. It calculates that they may not graduate or drop out and asks them to leave early. Although there is no problem with university rankings, it does hurt students. In a way, this is unethical. The second example is Roberts University, which cooperates with an off-campus company to provide students with sports bracelets and sell the collected data to the company for statistics. This school violated the privacy of students and earned unethical income. In this case, the education data market is a harmful market. However, some schools have made it clear that they will collect data from students. Students will provide bracelets to student athletes after they voluntarily provide data and obtain their consent. The school also shows that these data are only used to monitor the physical health of athletes. In this case, it can be said that the education data market is not a noxious market.

Indictment is a formal accusation against an individual suspected of committing a crime. Indictments are usually needed for felony crimes, and the prosecutor must present their case in front of a grand jury in order to get an indictment. Sanctions are to penalizing or disciplining someone or something. There are several ways to use data, psychological characteristics, social media, and algorithmic systems, all of which drag down legitimacy, leading to misleading and rumors. This includes fake user groups in real life, these groups guide people to think, expand existing contradictions, such as LGBTQ and colored groups, arouse strong emotions, and make false claims. Echo chambers and filtering bubbles are, to a certain extent, a phenomenon that does not accept other information, but only accepts the information they agree with. But the echo chamber is more exaggerated, because it fundamentally negates other sources. The above-mentioned characteristics of misinformation and rumors have led people to participate more and more in these topics. As a result, due to a series of big data algorithms such as Google, more similar articles or information are displayed. Coincidentally, this information is often more credible and more provocative than true information. Autonomy is the basis of political legitimacy. But wrong information and algorithms can cause citizens to lose their autonomy, thereby undermining political legitimacy. Applying rights based theory on the question "Are sanctions morally justified in response to disinformation campaigns that undermine election integrity?". The stakeholders are electors, candidates and people who spread the disinformation campaigns. The right of electors is voting, the right of candidates is to be voted fairly, and the right of people is spread things. Spreading disinformation infringings candidates’ rights. The action to avoid infringing the relevant stakeholders’ rights is to prohibit false propaganda affecting election integrity. Therefore, I suggest that companies, the government and some media should control the dissemination of news, selectively disseminate news in consideration of the consequences, and control the spread of news that will have a negative impact. At the same time, the public should also learn to receive information selectively, knowing that information can be unreliable.