* The player lawsuits accused the NFL of hiding what it knew about the link between concussions and CTE, the degenerative brain disease found in dozens of former players after their deaths. The deal avoids the need for a trial and means the NFL may never have to disclose what it knew and when about the risks and treatment of repeated concussions.
* More than 4,500 former athletes -- some suffering from dementia, depression or Alzheimer's that they blamed on blows to the head -- had sued the league, accusing it of concealing the dangers of concussions and rushing injured players back onto the field while glorifying and profiting from the kind of bone-jarring hits that make for spectacular highlight-reel footage.
* So, is the NFL moraly correct, trying to conceal critical information about concussion affereffect from the players?
* Under the 2nd Formulation of Kantinism Categorical Imperative, NFL is the one to blame, which is to act so that you always treat both yourself and other people as ends in themselves, and never only as a means to an end. In this case, NFL is using the players as objects or commercial goods to make money out of it. So, under the rule of Kantianism, they are obviously morally incorrect.
* However, if we apply the act Utilitarianism, NFL might be doing the morally correct thing. Because the game viewers are gaining happpiness from the highlight-reel footage. And act util state that An action is right (or wrong) to the extent that it increases (or decreases) the total happiness of the affected parties. So, there are 3 total affected parties, NFL, Players, and game viewers. Both NFL and Game viewers are gaining happiness from the action while the players are the only one suffering from it. Considered the incredible amount of game viewers in the state, it can be easily estimated that the total happiness are increased, thus justfiying the action of NFL