

Debate Training Dataset Report

Generated: 2025-02-23 07:36:51

Dataset Summary

Total Debates Processed: 60

Debate ID: AM_101

Topic: affirmativeaction

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The motion before us is this house would support affirmative action.
2. The problem that we're presented with is that across society there continues to be insufficient representation and advancement of women in major roles, particularly in major companies, political positions and so forth.
3. Therefore, one mechanism of curing this to advance women's roles to see have women act as leaders and to be included not only generally in the work force but in the highest echelons where they're where percentage wise they are far less than men, is to create some kind of mechanism to cure for past and current discrimination.
4. Through this mechanism we would have affirmative action.
5. This effectively amounts to a a requirement that the major the major sections of different departments in major companies, the heads of major the boards of major companies, of different political groups in parliament and so forth, and of major groups in society generally have a particular allotment set aside for qualified members of minorities, specifically women, and also people of color.
6. This of course would have to be on some level proportionally representational so that on some level the company that that to which this is directed can effectively look like the like the look like the work force for whom it represents.
7. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have.
8. Obviously these individuals have to be qualified for the position, but that we would give special favor to people carrying the the the statuses to deal with the fact that there's insufficient

representation due to underlying structural factors that block the advancement of women, minorities, people of color in the work force and especially in major companies. So I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important and why this is particularly true.

9. First of all, because this would solve the problem of restorative justice and correct for historical disadvantage in terms of people's ability to advance within particular companies and within the workforce, and secondly because it would generally advanced the quality in society and promote the inclusion of particular minorities, women, and people of color.

10. So firstly, why is this a form of restorative justice and how does this correct for disadvantage?

11. So effectively what affirmative action does is create a kind of leg-up for the sort of historical discrimination that women have experienced over time.

12. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that people have about women women's capabilities.

13. Even in the age of I of a sort of liberal feminist tolerance people we recognize that people tend to pass over, not recognize the capabilities or skills of of women or people of color, and see them as not always capable or less than than people who fit within the sort of stereotype of the straight white male.

14. One example of this is that is that applications for two particular jobs, both entry level and particularly further up in the in the echelons of a company get passed over if they have female names or names the belong to a particular ethnic group or or stereotypically belong to people of color and this is fundamentally not due to overt racism but through the subtle biases about the accomplishments and capabilities of people from those groups.

15. Effectively we're solving for is a kind of informal boys club in which certain biases about the way things are, the kinds of connections people have, and sort of relationships people have mean that we pass over women pass over people of color and subtly see them as less qualified or less

capable even in unintentionally and and and so effectively allow for a mechanism to account first generally for this kind of very sort of this this kind of bias or this kind of light discrimination and generally for the kinds of lack of opportunities that this kind of lack of discrimination that continues to perpetuate and makes and makes difficult in terms of people's advancement such as being passed over for promotion and so forth that we see structurally within companies and not just particularly in terms of high ranking and high level positions and so this generally acts in terms of allowing giving people a leg-up up in allowing to do this a in in in allowing people to move forward and to succeed, right?

Not only is this true in terms of acting in in terms of a in terms or principle of of of allowing for a sort of a level playing field in in in the competition for jobs, but also acts as in is a form of reparation fundamentally because women as a group have historically been discriminated against and so this is in some way not only a a a an act on the on to help particular women or particular people of color move forward within the jobs that they aspire to be in but also, is a kind of message by the government to say that what we're doing is affording a new value of inclusion and and a new importance that is not previously recognized which brings us to point two advancing equality in society so we all recognize that symbols are of are important.

16. We recognize that the fact that barack obama is the is the president of the united states and is african american reflects a symbol to other african americans about what they might be able to accomplish.

17. The same way the fact that hillary clinton might be the next president reflects the symbol to women about what they might be able to accomplish and generally sets a signal in paradigm for what's socially acceptable, and what ought to to happen socially.

18. Nonetheless, we think this is insufficient.

19. We think that for on side government we think that fundamentally the fact that the heads of major fortune five hundred companies or of other major companies that are not not in that not quite in that bracket do not have sufficient have very high representation of people of color or of women

means that there is a fundamental breakdown in the biases of society about what w-what the place of women and people of color are and therefore makes it much more difficult to break down the kinds of biases that we're trying to cure across society and not just sort of particularly for specific people within the companies that we're trying to change.

20. And so generally it's a signal about the place of of of minorities and and women of and people of color and women in the society, and this allows us to have a new signal for what is socially valuable and socially acceptable, the same way that when women began to enter the workforce this change our perceptions of what was socially socially accepted, and begins to subtly change the more the the kind of implicit norms and morality that people have, and in this way we're able to solve and change for the kinds of problems in in access that we've had in in history and so for both of those reasons we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. So effectively what affirmative action does is create a kind of leg-up for the sort of historical discrimination that women have experienced experienced over time. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that people have about women women's capabilities. Even in the age of I of a sort of liberal feminist tolerance people we recognize that people tend to pass over, not recognize the capabilities or skills of of women or people of color, and see them as not always capable or less than than people who fit within the sort of stereotype of the straight white male. One example of this is that is that applications for two particular jobs, both entry level and particularly further up in the in the echelons of a company get passed over if they have female names or names the belong to a particular ethnic group or or stereotypically belong to people of color and this is fundamentally not due to overt

racism but through the subtle biases about the accomplishments and capabilities of people from those groups. Effectively we're solving for is a kind of informal boys club in which certain biases about the way things are, the kinds of connections people have, and sort of relationships people have mean that we pass over women pass over people of color and subtly see them as less qualified or less capable even in unintentionally and and and so effectively allow for a mechanism to account first generally for this kind of very sort of this this kind of bias or this kind of light discrimination and generally for the kinds of lack of opportunities that this kind of lack of discrimination that continues to perpetuate and makes and makes difficult in terms of people's advancement such as being passed over for promotion and so forth that we see structurally within companies and not just particularly in terms of high ranking and high level positions and so this generally acts in terms of allowing giving people a leg-up up in allowing to do this a in in in allowing people to move forward and to succeed, right?

Not only is this true in terms of acting in in terms of a in terms or principle of of of allowing for a sort of a level playing field in in in the competition for jobs, but also acts as in is a form of reparation fundamentally because women as a group have historically been discriminated against and so this is in some way not only a a a an act on the on to help particular women or particular people of color move forward within the jobs that they aspire to be in but also, is a kind of message by the government to say that what we're doing is affording a new value of inclusion and and a new importance that is not previously recognized which brings us to point two advancing equality in society so we all recognize that symbols are of are important.

2. So firstly, why is this a form of restorative justice and how does this correct for disadvantage? So effectively what affirmative action does is create a kind of leg-up for the sort of historical discrimination that women have experienced experienced over time. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that

people have about women women's capabilities. Even in the age of I of a sort of liberal feminist tolerance people we recognize that people tend to pass over, not recognize the capabilities or skills of of women or people of color, and see them as not always capable or less than than people who fit within the sort of stereotype of the straight white male. One example of this is that is that applications for two particular jobs, both entry level and particularly further up in the in the echelons of a company get passed over if they have female names or names the belong to a particular ethnic group or or stereotypically belong to people of color and this is fundamentally not due to overt racism but through the subtle biases about the accomplishments and capabilities of people from those groups.

3. First of all, because because this would solve the problem of restorative justice and correct for historical disadvantage in terms of people's ability to advance within particular companies and within the workforce, and secondly because it would generally advanced the quality in society and promote the inclusion of particular minorities, women, and people of color. So firstly, why is this a form of restorative justice and how does this correct for disadvantage? So effectively what affirmative action does is create a kind of leg-up for the sort of historical discrimination that women have experienced experienced over time. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that people have about women women's capabilities. Even in the age of I of a sort of liberal feminist tolerance people we recognize that people tend to pass over, not recognize the capabilities or skills of of women or people of color, and see them as not always capable or less than than people who fit within the sort of stereotype of the straight white male.

4. Through this mechanism we would have affirmative action. This effectively amounts to a a requirement that the major the major sections of different departments in major companies, the heads of major the boards of major companies, of different political groups in parliament and so

forth, and of major groups in society generally have a particular allotment set aside for qualified members of minorities, specifically women, and also people of color. This of course would have to be on some level proportionally representational so that on some level the company that that to which this is directed can effectively look like the like the look like the work force for whom it represents. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have. Obviously these individuals have to be qualified for the position, but that we would give special favor to people carrying the the the statuses to deal with the fact that there's insufficient representation due to underlying structural factors that block the advancement of women, minorities, people of color in the work force and especially in major companies.

5. This of course would have to be on some level proportionally representational so that on some level the company that that to which this is directed can effectively look like the like the look like the work force for whom it represents. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have. Obviously these individuals have to be qualified for the position, but that we would give special favor to people carrying the the the statuses to deal with the fact that there's insufficient representation due to underlying structural factors that block the advancement of women, minorities, people of color in the work force and especially in major companies. So I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important and why this is particularly true. First of all, because because this would solve the problem of restorative justice and correct for historical disadvantage in terms of people's ability to advance within particular companies and within the workforce, and secondly because it would generally advanced the quality in society and promote the inclusion of particular minorities, women, and people of color.

6. So I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important and why this is particularly true. First of

all, because because this would solve the problem of restorative justice and correct for historical disadvantage in terms of people's ability to advance within particular companies and within the workforce, and secondly because it would generally advanced the quality in society and promote the inclusion of particular minorities, women, and people of color. So firstly, why is this a form of restorative justice and how does this correct for disadvantage? So effectively what affirmative action does is create a kind of leg-up for the sort of historical discrimination that women have experienced experienced over time. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that people have about women women's capabilities.

7. Therefore, one mechanism of curing this to advance women's roles to see have women act as leaders and to be included not only generally in the work force but in the highest echelons where they're where percentage wise they are far less than men, is to create some kind of mechanism to cure for past and current discrimination. Through this mechanism we would have affirmative action. This effectively amounts to a a requirement that the major the major sections of different departments in major companies, the heads of major the boards of major companies, of different political groups in parliament and so forth, and of major groups in society generally have a particular allotment set aside for qualified members of minorities, specifically women, and also people of color. This of course would have to be on some level proportionally representational so that on some level the company that that to which this is directed can effectively look like the like the look like the work force for whom it represents. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have.

8. This effectively amounts to a a requirement that the major the major sections of different departments in major companies, the heads of major the boards of major companies, of different

political groups in parliament and so forth, and of major groups in society generally have a particular allotment set aside for qualified members of minorities, specifically women, and also people of color. This of course would have to be on some level proportionally representational so that on some level the company that that to which this is directed can effectively look like the like the look like the work force for whom it represents. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have. Obviously these individuals have to be qualified for the position, but that we would give special favor to people carrying the the the statuses to deal with the fact that there's insufficient representation due to underlying structural factors that block the advancement of women, minorities, people of color in the work force and especially in major companies. So I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important and why this is particularly true.

9. So for example, we might require that the board of a company have fifty percent women or a third third third people of color, so forth, these are not strict these are not strict numbers but sort of guidelines for the kinds of requirements that you might have. Obviously these individuals have to be qualified for the position, but that we would give special favor to people carrying the the the statuses to deal with the fact that there's insufficient representation due to underlying structural factors that block the advancement of women, minorities, people of color in the work force and especially in major companies. So I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important and why this is particularly true. First of all, because because this would solve the problem of restorative justice and correct for historical disadvantage in terms of people's ability to advance within particular companies and within the workforce, and secondly because it would generally advanced the quality in society and promote the inclusion of particular minorities, women, and people of color. So firstly, why is this a form of restorative justice and how does this correct for disadvantage?

10. So for example, women may frequently have been passed over for certain chances that promotion, certain educational opportunities, certain different kinds of relative disadvantages they

may experience even in an age of relative equality in which their careers have not advanced because of particular subtle biases that people have about women women's capabilities. Even in the age of I of a sort of liberal feminist tolerance people we recognize that people tend to pass over, not recognize the capabilities or skills of of women or people of color, and see them as not always capable or less than than people who fit within the sort of stereotype of the straight white male. One example of this is that is that applications for two particular jobs, both entry level and particularly further up in the in the echelons of a company get passed over if they have female names or names the belong to a particular ethnic group or or stereotypically belong to people of color and this is fundamentally not due to overt racism but through the subtle biases about the accomplishments and capabilities of people from those groups. Effectively we're solving for is a kind of informal boys club in which certain biases about the way things are, the kinds of connections people have, and sort of relationships people have mean that we pass over women pass over people of color and subtly see them as less qualified or less capable even in unintentionally and and and so effectively allow for a mechanism to account first generally for this kind of very sort of this this kind of bias or this kind of light discrimination and generally for the kinds of lack of opportunities that this kind of lack of discrimination that continues to perpetuate and makes and makes difficult in terms of people's advancement such as being passed over for promotion and so forth that we see structurally within companies and not just particularly in terms of high ranking and high level positions and so this generally acts in terms of allowing giving people a leg-up up in allowing to do this a in in in allowing people to move forward and to succeed, right?

Not only is this true in terms of acting in in terms of a in terms or principle of of of allowing for a sort of a level playing field in in in the competition for jobs, but also acts as in is a form of reparation fundamentally because women as a group have historically been discriminated against and so this is in some way not only a a a an act on the on to help particular women or particular people of color move forward within the jobs that they aspire to be in but also, is a kind of message by the government to say that what we're doing is affording a new value of inclusion and and a new

importance that is not previously recognized which brings us to point two advancing equality in society so we all recognize that symbols are of are important. We recognize that the fact that barack obama is the is the president of the united states and is african american reflects a symbol to other african americans about what they might be able to accomplish.

Debate ID: AM_381

Topic: monarchy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. In this speech I'm going to argue to you that this house should abolish the monarchy the problem that we're presented with is that the monarchy specifically in a number of western countries particularly on continental Europe but notably in England and England will be talking about specifically continues to exist despite the fact that these countries are and the UK in particular is is a democratic society.
2. Having it what is in effect a non-elected official who gains their title on the basis of birth or in previous times a divine right is a is a inegalitarian, illegitimate assumption of power on the basis of the particular position that they were born into rather than some kind of reflection of the will of the people or serving a public function.
3. So in principle this is fundamentally problematic secondly, the the the burden created in terms of of the cost that it takes to upkeep the institution of the monarchy and of royalty is fundamentally problematic in terms of the kinds of fiscal burdens it takes to continue and protect those institutions and for those reasons we would get rid of the special status of people born into the royal family have them become private citizens change the holdings either to regular government functions or sell them off and fundamentally get rid of the institution of the monarchy and have parliamentary democracies function without these without without this institution without the trappings of royalty and the monarchy.
4. Give you two reasons why this is important and necessary.
5. Firstly because monarchy is fundamentally illegitimate. Particularly for democratic country and secondly because of the kinds of incentive in fiscal burdens that it presents and structural burdens that presents on on on the UK and other countries that have a monarchy.

6. So on a principled level the notion of democracy is the notion of the consent of the governed and it's a notion of moral equality.
7. That is nobody has a special moral status or rank nobody deserves to exist on a higher level than others except through earned merit except through the kinds of our productivity that they deliver for society through their voluntary choices and not through some prescribed moral status that means that the fact that you were born into a particular family doesn't make you more important than other people you're judged fundamentally in terms of your relative power but the kinds of contributions that you make the kinds of jobs that you that you might that you might hold in terms of providing a public service and so on and so forth and in particular the people who rule over other people and in in in a country and particularly in democracy ought ought to be considered within this moral framework that is they're people who have the same special have the same status as everyone else but who have chosen to work for the on the behalf of the public good and to help enact laws, protect the public interest and so on and so forth.
8. Anyone who who who who who detracts from this mission and institution that is fundamentally at odds which means that the monarchy is basically at odds with democracy because it relies on the notion of a scribed status based on an accident of birth.
9. This basically is a fundamental problem not only in principle but in terms of public perception that is the notion that in order for people in power to be legitimate they don't need to earn the public trust, they don't need to do things that are substantial in order to succeed and we don't just mean earn the public trust in the sense that people like them.
10. Lots of people in many of these countries like the queen, think the queen is nice, think the queen is a good institution, in the sense that it's morally incumbent on the public to see their public officials as having needing to exist in terms of service and not just existing in terms of some kind of figure-head status or some kinds of arbitrary representative of the notion of the public will you have to do something in order to be morally valuable as a member of government and not just claim the right to rule than to rule over people even if that rule is in the case of the modern monarchy largely

symbolic.

11. Fundamentally what this does is morally it creates a message that the kinds of contributions that you might have to make in order to win power aren't necessarily very high.

12. With this does it incentivizes public officials to associate them with the assumption of privileges without demonstrating the the the the legitimacy of assuming those privileges.

13. So what happens is you have people who are born into certain circles, or who are connected in certain ways to the queen and once they be they assume power they there is a decrease in the notion of the public perception of them having to truly represent the public and they're seen as part of a higher echelon of society that's sort of generally removed, but kind of runs things in the in the in the way that we runs things more broadly and generally in terms of a classic of technocrats and engineers who who run society for everyone.

14. This is fundamentally problematic because it decreases public pressure on seeing officials as as needing to contribute in order to be valuable.

15. And so not only on a on a principled level but not on a signaling kind of perceptual level this is fundamentally problematic for increasing pressure on public officials to actually do their jobs because if they once they join a a public system in which many members of the ruling class don't have to reflect the public will they soon become absorbed inside that system and the notion that the public has of of what government is supposed to be that is a reflection of of trying to create a certain public services and fulfil public needs is is diminished.

16. And this is fundamentally problematic still in this attitude secondly the fiscal burden.

17. So this this is is a corollary question to the general problem but fundamentally the institution of the monarchy is extremely expensive it has millions of up keeps in terms of all the buildings houses security servants all the different things that are involved to help help take care of and and defended and protect and and and up-keep the institution of the monarchy and protect and help the royal family this fiscal burden is extremely large the queen is one of the richest people in the world simply based on holdings that should legitimately be utilized and used by the people that she has simply

through an accident of history.

18. There's no good written necessary need for us to spend all this money trying to up-keep these and hold these buildings out for these people and so for those reasons it's it's

19. it's simply much better cost effective solution to privatize sell off or reuse for other government functions

20. and so so because it's illegitimate and because it costs too much money we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: AM_602

Topic: schoolvouchers

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The motion before us is that this house would create a system of school vouchers. School vouchers, fundamentally, are cash grants or subsidies to parents of children that they can then use for the purchase of education from any school which they desire. It involves getting rid of government provision or running of educational institutions and and pre-secondary and pre-college k eight through twelve schools but it maintains government funding of of education for the public. What it means fundamentally is that the government stops trying to run and design the school system but maintains people's access to education. What it does is allow people to spend money on the particular school that they want and service of their child with a minimal amount of money given by the government and any extra money that they might require being topped up privately.
2. I'm going to give you two reasons why this is important.
3. Firstly, because it allows for choice in education.
4. And secondly, because it breaks up an educational monopoly.
5. So we have a fundamental value in society, and one that the governments in liberal democracies tend to respect, which is the notion that choice is important.
6. Then the fundamental part of people's personal rights to autonomy is the ability to make such choices. One way to expand personal autonomy is to expand it in the educational sector. Under a under a state run system in which a national curriculum is designed by the state rather than chosen by the school school itself, you have a you have can you have a singular model built on one notion of how education ought to be taught, and all other alternatives are private options.
7. However, in a model with school vouchers, since every although funding is continued by the by the public, private the the private model is maintained in which people can experiment and schools

can experiment in different options.

8. This means that the market for what is available for people is greatly expanded and is greatly expanded, and educational opportunities that are personalized, that are distinct and and different are not sort of special preserve of the rich, but are available to almost everyone.

9. What this does is create special forts of personalization and schools that work for for different kinds of children with different kinds of learning aptitudes from whether depending on what their particular aptitudes is educationally, whether they have an interest in music, or have a particular learning style, learning disability whatever it happens to be.

10. It means that the educational system is not stuck in one place, and the schools can experiment.

11. Fundamentally, what this does is allow people to make choices by allowing them to choose the school that they want, and for the school to design its curriculum in the way that it wants, rather than the particular preferences of a state agency. And so this'll gives people options in the same way that they have options between what kind of food they like to buy, or anything else, or what kind of car they want, on the marketplace.

12. And this allows educational institutions to personalize this to children and allow for greater choice in schooling options that which that that should allow for greater development of children that are not stuck in one particular model of what a school should look like.

13. Secondly, this breaks an educational monopoly and allows for greater social mobility.

14. What happens fundamentally, what what the educational system is standard state educational system is a monopoly, that is it has is a single provider of a single service to which people have no other option unless they're able to go to a private school.

15. Since private schools are economically unreachable for many people they're forced to the state state system which since it it bears no competition, it's built under single model with no with no comparable price, with no comparable service at a similar price, it has no incentive to change, to improve and get better.

16. A way a system in which all schools are in which many many schools are reachable through the

state subsidy

17. but there is no state mandate for how the system should be run means that you get competition between schools.

18. This promotes greater experimentation, and competence and a focus on actually providing services that are required instead of having particular benefits captured by employees of the institution or under-funding because of different kinds of political intrigue the school is built on providing service to parents, and if the parents who are not interested in the kinds of services that are being provided or if they feel the school's incompetent they're able to leave that school because they have the monetary capacity to do so and the school is either forced to improve or close.

19. This allows for educational improvement because the incentives are focused on the school producing service for their customers, that is the children and their parents, rather than for the benefit of the public employees who who who service it, or the political coalitions that favor it and fundamentally protect the rights of children.

20. In this way it allows for improvement in service provision and allows what should be the preserve or not what what often is the preserve of the rich to the poor as well.

21. This allows for social mobility because it allows for the a a improvement in the educational system that doesn't that allows for schools and educational quality that was formally not available to people to to everyone including the very poor.

22. This means that because the schools are forced to improve it can allow for greater educational opportunities which are a fundamental component in allowing for people to move up the social ladder and to get out of poverty.

23. So because their survival beak on productivity this means that they're forced to provide a good education and therefore are better able serve the public.

24. So to sum up, two reasons why we should adopt school vouchers.

25. Firstly, because it generally allows schools to experiment and figure out what is available and to to promote the value of personal autonomy in education while while noting the fact that costs are

that that educational is a good which is highly expensive and therefore perhaps the duty of the state to subsidize.

26. However, the notion that choice is important should not be excluded from the fact that choice is for that that education's expensive which means that which means that creating a system of vouchers allows for people to choose what they want for education school specialize in change and for the lack of a national curriculum to mean that people can choose whatever they want and invest the money in the particular things that they think are good for their child rather than the decision of a particular bureaucracy.

27. Secondly, it breaks educational monopoly by forcing schools to compete.

28. When their funding is not guaranteed but rather built on the choices of parents who choose to enroll their child in that school it means that the school is forced to provide good service and and improve educationally rather than the alternative situation in which it has no incentive to change.

29. This state of affairs is likely to improve education and therefore help people help people including people at the bottom of society and people in among among the poor and the working class which means that it's likely to promote social mobility and for both of those reasons we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. One way to expand personal autonomy is to expand it in the educational sector. Under a under a state run system in which a national curriculum is designed by the state rather than chosen by the school school itself, you have a you have can you have a singular model built on one notion of how education ought to be taught, and all other alternatives are private options. However, in a model with school vouchers, since every although funding is continued by the by the public, private the the private model is maintained in which people can experiment and schools can experiment in different options. This means that the market for what is available for people is greatly expanded and is greatly expanded, and educational opportunities that are personalized, that are distinct and and different are not sort of special preserve of the rich, but are available to almost everyone. What this

does is create special forms of personalization and schools that work for different kinds of children with different kinds of learning aptitudes from whether depending on what their particular aptitudes is educationally, whether they have an interest in music, or have a particular learning style, learning disability whatever it happens to be.

2. So to sum up, two reasons why we should adopt school vouchers. Firstly, because it generally allows schools to experiment and figure out what is available and to promote the value of personal autonomy in education while noting the fact that costs are that that educational is a good which is highly expensive and therefore perhaps the duty of the state to subsidize. However, the notion that choice is important should not be excluded from the fact that choice is for that that education's expensive which means that which means that creating a system of vouchers allows for people to choose what they want for education school specialize in change and for the lack of a national curriculum to mean that people can choose whatever they want and invest the money in the particular things that they think are good for their child rather than the decision of a particular bureaucracy. Secondly, it breaks educational monopoly by forcing schools to compete. When their funding is not guaranteed but rather built on the choices of parents who choose to enroll their child in that school it means that the school is forced to provide good service and and improve educationally rather than the alternative situation in which it has no incentive to change.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_121

Topic: ban-boxing

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should ban boxing because boxing is a blood sport and it's absolutely horrible for the athletes and it's a horrible message to send for society.
2. So why is this true?
3. The first big thing is that boxing has horrific consequences on the people who participate in it. It's essentially like a modern day equivalent of gladiator battles in like the worse way possible. In the short term you see things like concussions, you see things like bones breaking in people's face, someone's eyes can get like gouged out and damage from like from like hits. There's all kinds of horrific injuries that people can obtain in the short term. A lot of those injuries specifically can also of long term impacts. Obviously you can suffer long term nerve damage, you can suffer brain damage from chronic hits. This is a big problem in sports like boxing and also football where concussions and head trauma are common.
4. And this can result in essentially dementia like traits in a horribly young age.
5. Like dementia like traits in someone's forties or fifties or even younger sometimes.
6. You can see like permanent nerve damage, permanent eye damage, damage to your senses damage to your ability to like use your mouth to eat, because your face has been like parts of your face and your jaw have been broken so many times.
7. There's all kinds of horrible horrible consequences associated with boxing, even death.
8. For like hundreds or thousands of people that can often be the case.
9. And for the for the majority of boxers, not necessarily the ones who are the people you see on television as professional boxers, but amateur boxing, olympic boxing, youth boxing groups, oftentimes you can see severe health consequences for these people as well and there's going to

be less healthcare for them.

10. There gonna be less help for them, less guidance for them to deal with the adverse consequences of boxing.

11. So really, this is absolutely horrible for a whole lot of people who participate in boxing, particularly at the lower levels of the sport, where they're just not going to get as much financial support for what they're putting their bodies through.

12. And beyond that, I also think boxing has really horrible social consequences.

13. Because as a society, when we try to tell people like " violence isn't the answer " or " we should try to strive for like peaceful resolutions to conflict ", it's a really mixed signal when you're at the same time glorifying the violence in its purest form.

14. When you think that like punching someone in the face so hard that they bleed, so much that they're in pain, so much that they get knocked out to the ground and they get a concussion from it, that we glorify that as sport, that we look at that as entertainment, I think says a lot about the innate violence, the innate horrible values that we hold as a society.

15. And that's really not something that we should be proud of.

16. It's not something that we should put on a pedestal.

17. We shouldn't violence like that on a pedestal, and we shouldn't try to appreciate violence from that.

18. When we like when the people who like commit these like violent actions get paid millions of dollars for what they do, and we look at that as entertainment, it gives a horrible message that we don't actually value peace, we don't actually value like things like that.

19. We overwhelmingly value blood we and violence, and that's I think a really horrible message to send as a society.

20. So for all those reasons ban boxing.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_1

Topic: ban-video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should ban the sale of violent video games to minors because it normalizes violence and it does so in a way that's particularly harmful because it does it to impressionable young people.
2. So let's start by talking about how this normalizes violence.
3. And I think that while it's probably unlikely that most of the time when someone picks up call of duty or grand theft auto or something like that, most people probably aren't going to emulate the actions in that game.
4. Most people aren't going to start jacking cars and beating people up or shooting people just because they saw it in a video game.
5. However, it's important to point out that first and foremost, some people could be encouraged to do this because of videogames and that's already a bad thing, but more importantly and beyond that, I think that it has a big impact in normalizing violence.
6. So if you're playing a video game in which women are regularly sexually assaulted and objectified and there's no consequences of that, if anything it's glorified, that probably makes like the young men that play it more likely to look at women as sexual objects and more likely to victim blame or not believe people when they come forward because of sexual assault or even think that it's not that bad of a thing in the first place.
7. You're more likely to back up policies that support violence whether it's like militaristic policies or like very police oriented policies because you're normalized to the violence that happens.
8. You're normalized to a lot of these bad things because since you're repeatedly exposed to those kinds of things you're more likely to see those kinds of things as like as like a problematic thing
9. and I think that's a really bad thing because when we as a society try to tell people that violence

isn't the answer, that you shouldn't try to resolve things through non-peaceful means, and yet the way in which we get our entertainment is through violence, through glorifying violence, I obviously think that that sends a horrible message to the people.

10. But second, this is compounded because we're talking about uniquely impressionable people.

11. We're talking about young people.

12. And that's a big problem because if older because we already regulate a lot of things for young people like young thing young people can't buy alcohol, young people can't go into r rated movies, like there's all kinds of ways in which we regulate things for young people by virtue of their age.

13. And that's because we want to make sure that we're teaching young people proper morals.

14. Morals that do not glorify violence, morals that make it so that people are treated with respect and dignity and things like this.

15. And I think that oftentimes video games operate in a world that's like the opposite of that.

16. And that's obviously a harmful thing because young people are more likely to be impressionable.

17. Young people are more likely to be like indoctrinated by what they see and that's a big problem.

18. So for all those reasons we should ban the sale of violent video games to minors.

Rebuttals:

1. And I think that while it's probably unlikely that most of the time when someone picks up call of duty or grand theft auto or something like that, most people probably aren't going to emulate the actions in that game. Most people aren't going to start jacking cars and beating people up or shooting people just because they saw it in a video game. However, it's important to point out that first and foremost, some people could be encouraged to do this because of videogames and that's already a bad thing, but more importantly and beyond that, I think that it has a big impact in normalizing violence. So if you're playing a video game in which women are regularly sexually assaulted and objectified and there's no consequences of that, if anything it's glorified, that probably makes like the young men that play it more likely to look at women as sexual objects and more likely to victim blame or not believe people when they come forward because of sexual assault or even

think that it's not that bad of a thing in the first place. You're more likely to back up policies that support violence whether it's like militaristic policies or like very police oriented policies because you're normalized to the violence that happens.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_21

Topic: one-child

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The one child policy brought more good than harm to china, because it was an act of necessity, and while it may not have been a perfect policy, it was necessary from a like a physical carrying capacity standpoint, an environmental and an economic standpoint.
2. So, I think that it's very important to note this necessity, because this necessity came out of the fact, that when it was instituted, china was already the biggest population in the world, with over well over a billion people living with its borders, and this creates a lot of problems.
3. First, on the like environmental physical like limitation of a carrying capacity of any given area.
4. Because, it's important to note that, human beings use a tremendous amount of resources in their lives.
5. That's why we have a lot of like environmental problems, that we have now.
6. Because human beings use a lot of natural resources, whether it's like oil or coal or gas or whatever for heating, whether it's water for drinking, land for food, or like a land for farming and for food, or precious metals for trinkets that they may like to have, or for like electronics I guess as well, like there's like endless ways in which human beings use tremendous amount of resources.
7. This is compounded by the fact that as societies go through the stages of development, as they move on from developing countries to developed countries, you only tend to see people using more and more resources.
8. So, this presents a problem, because china was already one of the biggest countries in the world, and it was already using up a tremendous amount of resources.
9. China was only going to keep using more and more resources as it got more and more developed as a nation, because its standards of living would just get higher.

10. So, this is a problem, because it would be it would be just like, without major changes, impossible for china to actually function that way.
11. You would see mass shortages of a lot of resources, mass increases in the expenses of these resources, because there be such high demands, and a lot of these things have finite like, natural, like a lot of these resources have finite natural capacities, so the supply wouldn't be able to meet the demand that an average human has.
12. So, this is why a one child policy is important, because it necessarily eh it shrinks you, it shrinks the size of the country in the long run, and it shrinks the demand and strain on these resource in the long run.
13. I also think this is good from a health standpoint, because overpopulation, especially given that a lot of the population increase in china have been on a lot of like coastal cities in china, which are many of the biggest cities in the world, this is where a lot of the population increase caprice, and there's a lot of density related problems that are health related problems, with overcrowding as well.
14. But the final thing I want to talk about is about the economic aspects of this, because I think that this was economically important as well, recognize, that by having a ever increasing population is good, as long as the economy keeps growing up, with it.
15. One of the worst things that you could have is you can be having an influx of people, in their twenties or thirties, not being able to find jobs, because there's been massive increases in the population, but there is economic slowdowns or stagnations.
16. And, this kind of thing is more evident in a lot of more developed countries, like you can look to places like japan as examples, but also obviously places like america or western europe as well, where as places become more and more developed, you tend to see economies tend to slow down more.
17. They still grow, but not as much, and this is key, because this meant that if you solve the current rate and of population growth in china continue, at the rate that it was, there simply would not have been enough jobs in order to actually maintain all these kinds of things.

18. And, this is a important, because like when this policy was enacted in like the nineteen seventies, where you can see right now china's economic growth is already slowing down, like when this was enacted you'd start to see people start to see more and more people, if it weren't enacted in their twenties or thirties, right now who would be struggling to find jobs, this creates demographic problems, it creates long term economic problems, because the worst time to have unemployment is in your twenties and thirties, that's when you're supposed to be getting out of college, starting your career and all those things.

19. This leads to a whole lot of civil unrest and long term social problems.

20. So, for all those reasons, the one child policy brought more good than harm.

Rebuttals:

1. The one child policy brought more good than harm to china, because it was an act of necessity, and while it may not have been a perfect policy, it was necessary from a like a physical carrying capacity standpoint, an environmental and an economic standpoint. So, I think that it's very important to note this necessity, because this necessity came out of the fact, that when it was instituted, china was already the biggest population in the world, with over well over a billion people living with its borders, and this creates a lot of problems. First, on the like environmental physical like limitation of a carrying capacity of any given area. Because, it's important to note that, human beings use a tremendous amount of resources in their lives. That's why we have a lot of like environmental problems, that we have now.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_482

Topic: tobacco

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should absolutely not subsidize the cultivation of tobacco because tobacco is bad and you shouldn't subsidize things that are bad.

But also because you can spend these hundreds of millions of dollars on literally anything else, literally anything else.

2. You can actually probably burn the money and it would be a whole lot better than subsidizing tobacco.

3. So, let's start by talking about why tobacco is bad and about why it's not worthy of our subsidy. So first, tobacco kills people. This is obvious. There's like endless endless scientific evidence that smoking tobacco leads to lung cancer and all other kinds of bad health problems, cancer, all other kinds of bad things associated with it. But it's also like addictive, it also costs like like tons of millions of dollars in healthcare spending that you otherwise won't have to do. All of these things like are just huge drains that tobacco has on society. It's addictive, it's like just very very bad, and it's not something that you should therefore be subsidizing the cultivation of. It's not a livelihood that you want to be propping up.

4. Its if anything, something that you want to try to minimize in importance in society.

5. But, additionally, I also think that, besides tobacco just being bad it's not like tobacco farms or tobacco corporations need you to cultivate like subsidize the cultivation of tobacco.

6. Tobacco corporations are some of the like wealthiest corporations in the world, even if like a lot of the shares of people that like, even if the percentage of people that smoke in places like america are lower, they're still high in a lot of places in europe, they're still high in a lot of places around the world even.

7. Smoking is still very common and the consumption of tobacco is still incredibly common, so these people, like tobacco corporations, have like billions of dollars to their name, like billions and billions of dollars there.

8. They do not need the like funding, they do not need tax subsidies from taxpayers in order to prop up their businesses.

9. This is absolutely ludicrous, they can figure it out on their own.

10. It's a complete waste of money, but even if tobacco wasn't bad and even if tobacco corporations couldn't find out a way to like spend all these kinds of money on their own, it's also important to note that these hundreds of millions of dollars, a lot of money that could be spent on other better things, these hundreds of millions of dollars could be spent on like green technology to like help combat global warming.

11. It could be spent on infrastructure to help make like public transportation better or to help make like to help the economy by making like transportation quicker.

12. It can be used to help with like education or even healthcare spending to combat the risks of smoking.

13. All of these are things that could be like better investments for these hundreds of millions of dollars than tobacco.

14. So all of those things are incredibly important, but I finally want to talk about the fact that like why these subsidies probably like already exist because I think that there is not really even any reason for these things to still be on the books, cause a lot of reasons why if like tobacco subsidies exist are they're like more archaic laws that existed from a time when smoking was more and more common, so like maybe like farm subsidies like it's part of like a in the united states at least part of like a new deal era like subsidy packages to make sure that the livelihoods of individual farmers were secure.

15. But, a lot of these things like principally outdated because you don't have like these small average farmers whose livelihoods you need to protect anymore.

16. You have like a much more corporatized system so this is corporate welfare, not trying to prop up the individual livelihoods of people anymore.

17. So in a lot of ways, like even the original purpose of farm of like tobacco subsidies, isn't even really one that exist anymore.

18. So for all those reasons, we should not subsidize cultivation of tobacco.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_644

Topic: year-round-schooling

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Year round schooling will bring more good than harm for two big reasons. First because it's going to help with the way in which people learn. It's going to actually help students academically and secondarily it's going to help students on a psychological level. It's going to reduce stress and it's going to lead to a more positive schooling experience for students.
2. So let's start by talking about learning and about why this is going to help people learning.
3. Recognize that the way in which it the way in which people learn best is by constant reinforcement of skills over time.
4. This is especially true for certain types of school classes like foreign language classes math classes things like that.
5. And the reason why this is important is because when you're in a lot of ways not just trying to like memorize facts but learning an entire system or like having to construct entire systems and things like that and possibly systems that you may not use all the time so while maybe you're more likely to remember some of your english lessons if use that on a daily basis, or more frequently, you're not as likely to use calculus on a daily basis so you're more likely to lose those skills if you don't practice them for an extended period of time.
6. And that extended period of time is exactly what happens when you have the incredibly long vacations that happen.
7. So this is obviously very bad because when you have these more extended vacations students do forget a whole lot of things and when they forget these things it's necessary to spend more time reviewing lessons and repeating lessons.
8. In fact reviewing and repeating may not even be the right words.

9. Relearning is probably a better way to describe it because you can forget something entirely in the course of two months and over summer
10. so therefore it's essentially just a waste of time to have to relearn these things.
11. Things that could otherwise be taught.
12. But the next way in which this is going to help is this is going to help students from the psychological perspective.
13. So most of the time a school routine can be quite rigorous.
14. You can wake up at like six o'clock in the well you have to be like wake up at six o'clock in the morning for a seven o'clock start to classes you may end classes at three PM but you probably have to do like a sport or an extra curricular or a job and then by the time that's done you probably have homework that you have to do, or a test that you have to study for and repeating that process for months on end every week is an incredibly draining and tiring process.
15. And therefore I think that people oftentimes do want more breaks like because it's not necessarily as important to have the one long break.
16. I think that people would generally find it a lot more relaxing, a lot more stressful if they could every once in awhile have those like four five day weekends, have a vacation instead of like having instead of having to do like the same week-long routines for three months in a row.
17. Having more breaks intermittently, which is going to be pretty good at reducing stress, making it so that people are better able to cope with a rather strenuous schooling system that oftentimes happens.
18. So that's very important but additionally we also think that when there is more of a why we additionally think that when you have this long vacation there's more of a pressure to use the time that you do have the like the time window that you do have much more efficiently.
19. So I think that what this does is this puts more pressure on students and the school like the teachers themselves to push students harder to make sure that they're learning more and more during this stretch of time because they know that a whole lot of this information is going to have to

get for is going to get forgotten at some point anyways

20. so they have to make sure they're like learning as much as possible and things like that.

21. So for those reasons, because it's going to make sure that students don't forget things and because it's psychologically better for students to have shorter amounts of time between breaks and a greater frequency of those breaks, since that's when you're more likely to be exhausted, you're not gonna be exhausted after a two month long break we're very proud to propose that year long schooling will do more good than harm.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_681

Topic: ip-rights

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should abolish intellectual property rights because intellectual property rights do a tremendous amount of social harm.
2. So I want to start by talking about the problem the big problem of intellectual property.
3. Because the first thing is that intellectual property is everywhere. Every time you look at a logo.
4. Every time you look at a symbol.
5. Every time you look at a song.
6. Every listen to a song anytime you watch a movie anytime you look at a work of art anytime you use any kind of product that has some kind of innovation to it so whether it's like some kind of formula in your tooth paste some kind of like algorithm in like a a phone calculator some kind of like like process that is used to create like a micro a computer chip literally like a like the patents and intellectual property and things like that are everywhere.
7. So when you're doing this what is the big problem?
8. When you have some kind of patent or when you have intellectual property over something you create a true monopoly over something.
9. If you were the an inventor of that thing and you like and whatever that means that you're have like a true monopoly over it because now you can literally take legal action against anyone who tried to create an alternative or something similar to your product.
10. And that creates a big problem because it gives you a total monopoly which means that you can charge whatever you want.
11. And oftentimes when this is something that is an innovation this means that this product can be incredibly expensive and it can be pricing out a whole lot of people.

12. The most basic example of this being present is when you look at something like the pharmaceutical industry.
13. When you look at a product that is oftentimes incredibly important and demand is incredibly inelastic because people need drop like people need medicine regardless similar to the way that like people need like technology nowadays regardless people need a whole lot of things were taught irrespective the price.
14. So that's important because that means that people can literally charge the most exorbitant prices and price out a whole lot of poor people that need it or it can make but like the public funding of something incredibly difficult to do.
15. Now that's a huge problem because this means that people truly actually get harm because of this.
16. If people have less access to technology people have less access to innovation.
17. People have less access to life saving medications or people simply get less enjoyment because they're not able to you even afford music like on a basic level.
18. Like these are kind of like really basic things that I think are like govern the way people live their lives and it's a really sad thing
19. and I think that when you don't have intellectual property rights and you allow more people actually access to good it's obviously going to do a whole lot more good to society
20. and I think that's like an incredibly important thing.
21. And intellectual property isn't like the only thing that you need to do to incentivize creation of things like you can give you like like you can do things like require the licensing of generic alternatives and give people profits for that maybe like a licensing fee or something like that.
22. And just regulate it you can give people money like based off of the social impact that they give like there's like a lot of things like social impact on the social impact investing in things like that.
23. These aren't necessarily like unheard of things that you can do.
24. There's definitely there's definitely alternatives or you can just try to foster like a more

collaborative system

25. so when you're talking about things like technology innovation for example oftentimes these things can be done with like open source alternatives and it can be done in a more collaborative sense that's going to be more accessible to people.

26. So I think that a lot of context it's not just necessarily like the like

27. oh like a dichotomy of having something verse not having something and having to deal with the like harms of intellectual property. I definitely think that there are alternatives that exist and I think that there's a whole lot of social good that comes out of a abolishing intellectual property so for those reasons we should abolish it.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DJ_841

Topic: blasphemy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should criminalize blasphemy, because it's akin to hate speech, and because it leads to public disorder, and resentment between religious groups.
2. So, let's start by talking about what exactly we're going to criminalize, because we're not going to criminalize every single kind of blasphemy.
3. So, if someone is just like an atheist, and they say: I don't believe in god, possibly in some kind of public setting, those aren't the people that we're going to prosecute, that's not the kind of things we're worried about.
4. What we're talking about are people, who are outwardly insulting people, who may say things like god is evil, god is hateful, or people who desecrate some kind of holy objects.
5. So, people who will like, for example, burn a quran, or try to like, burn like a like like burn some kind of cross, things like that, things that I think truly embody a kind of hatred for religion and god.
6. Let's start by talking about why these things are necessary.
7. First, because it's akin to hate speech.
8. So, it's generally accepted that, speech rights are obviously important, but nevertheless not absolute, and maybe not in america, but most parts of the world hate speech is banned.
9. And the reason it's banned is because, it's essentially a way to like verbalize violence against someone else.
10. In a lot of ways, it's similar to bullying, in that the point of it is, not so much to like, rationally exchange ideas, the point of it is to hurt somebody.
11. And I think, when the point of your speech is to hurt someone, very deeply, that kind of speech is obviously not something that we just have to protect, and it can be banned.

12. So, let's talk about why blasphemy needs this kind of a qualification.

13. I think it's quite obvious that it does, because no matter what your opinions on religion are, it's quite clear that there is billions of people around the world, who believe deeply in their religion, whatever it may happen to be, and that's incredibly important, because when you do something that can be deeply insulting to someone, like burn a quran, in a lot of ways, you're attacking the core of a lot of people's identity.

14. And, that is very very hurtful, it's, in a lot of ways, like you're punching someone in the face, it's very hurtful for them, and it's something that we don't have to tolerate.

15. But, the next thing that I want to talk about is about the public disorder that can happen, for these kinds of things.

16. So, in addition to a lot of places you're able to ban hate speech, because it's akin to trying to, like, harm someone emotionally, one of the other kinds of speech that we don't allow is incitement.

17. So, I think that, when you do a lot when you do a lot of the more extreme blasphemous things, one of the reasons you're often trying to do this is, because you're trying to express your hatred, and you're trying to incite a reaction.

18. So, when a pastor in gainesville florida wants to burn a quran on television, and then put the video on youtube, it's in a lot of ways the same thing like when isis decides to behead people, and then put the video on youtube.

19. They're trying to get a reaction, they're trying to incite a response, and they're trying to incite, in a lot of circumstances, some kind of a violent response.

20. So, these things are obviously very bad, and these things are bad, because they put people's lives at risk.

21. When you do something that you know is going to offend people so dearly, that these people might riot, these people might like do something like a very very bad, that's a good enough reason to say: no, you can't do it.

22. Because, in a lot of ways, you have moral culpability for the harms and the damages that are

going to happen.

23. Because it is incitement.

24. You don't have to directly say: I want to see you like a like rip this building down, or burn this building down, for it to be incitement.

25. If you create the environment, in which you're very likely going to see this consequence, that is more than sufficient.

26. So, for those reasons, we should criminalize blasphemy.

Rebuttals:

1. Let's start by talking about why these things are necessary. First, because it's akin to hate speech. So, it's generally accepted that, speech rights are obviously important, but nevertheless not absolute, and maybe not in america, but most parts of the world hate speech is banned. And the reason it's banned is because, it's essentially a way to like verbalize violence against someone else. In a lot of ways, it's similar to bullying, in that the point of it is, not so much to like, rationally exchange ideas, the point of it is to hurt somebody.

Evidence Used:

1. So, people who will like, for example, burn a quran, or try to like, burn like a like like burn some kind of cross, things like that, things that I think truly embody a kind of hatred for religion and god. Let's start by talking about why these things are necessary. First, because it's akin to hate speech. So, it's generally accepted that, speech rights are obviously important, but nevertheless not absolute, and maybe not in america, but most parts of the world hate speech is banned. And the reason it's banned is because, it's essentially a way to like verbalize violence against someone else.

2. So, if someone is just like an atheist, and they say: I don't believe in god, possibly in some kind of public setting, those aren't the people that we're going to prosecute, that's not the kind of things we're worried about. What we're talking about are people, who are outwardly insulting people, who may say things like god is evil, god is hateful, or people who desecrate some kind of holy objects.

So, people who will like, for example, burn a quran, or try to like, burn like a like like burn some kind of cross, things like that, things that I think truly embody a kind of hatred for religion and god. Let's start by talking about why these things are necessary. First, because it's akin to hate speech.

3. What we're talking about are people, who are outwardly insulting people, who may say things like god is evil, god is hateful, or people who desecrate some kind of holy objects. So, people who will like, for example, burn a quran, or try to like, burn like a like like burn some kind of cross, things like that, things that I think truly embody a kind of hatred for religion and god. Let's start by talking about why these things are necessary. First, because it's akin to hate speech. So, it's generally accepted that, speech rights are obviously important, but nevertheless not absolute, and maybe not in america, but most parts of the world hate speech is banned.

Debate ID: DJ_881

Topic: holocaust-denial

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Holocaust denial should be a criminal offense first because holocaust denial is a hate crime and hate crimes should be criminal offenses, and second because I think that holocaust denial making it a criminal offense carries a great deal of symbolic weight which is incredibly important for making a lot of vulnerable jews in places like europe, especially right now, feel a lot more secure.
2. So let's start by talking about why I think that holocaust denial just should be a crime.
3. I think that there's a reason why a lot of places in europe all in fact most western democracies, maybe not the united states because of its much stronger than most look rule rules on freedom of speech amendment protections.
4. Most places around the world have hate speech outlawed and the reason for that is because hate speech is designed to make people who live in any place uncomfortable in their own skin and feel uncomfortable going out and living their daily lives in the country.
5. That's hosts that hate speech.
6. Hateful speech is in a lot of ways an attack on someone's like identity.
7. I can hurt someone like emotionally in ways that is not so different from being physically punched in the face.
8. The way in which hate speech can truly rock your core and harm you is not something that should be understated and the reason why hate speech is outlawed.
9. So why do I think that holocaust denial is particularly a kind of hate speech that is definitely should be recognized and is definitely very pernicious, and this is true because holocaust denial is just a slap in the face to the millions of jews that were executed by a horrible regime and moreover the descendants of those people who still live in europe to those days and the people who like carry

on the like jewish legacy.

10. To deny the suffering that was a part of the holocaust, to deny the tragedy that was the holocaust, trying to wipe it off the face of history, is just try to overlook the oppression that essentially jews had to face and it's all the hardships that jews had to face and that's absolutely not something that you should do because it's just like ignoring an absolute aspect of their lives and it's really demeaning to say that the like suffering of your people isn't something that actually happens, something so blatantly factually inaccurate it's in a lot of ways an attack on jewish identity and it's attack on jews because it's a way to try to make them feel lesser.

11. It's a way to try to make them feel vulnerable again and that's absolutely not something that should be protected.

12. It's absolutely something that should be criminal.

13. But, additionally I also think that there is a huge symbolic element here

14. and I think that when a government makes holocaust denial a criminal offense, this is something that isn't going to go unnoticed and this is something that carries with it, since the force of the law has carried with this as a criminal offense, this is going to make a lot of people feel a lot safer even if this doesn't actually lead to less holocaust denial.

15. It's going to make people feel more supported by the government and people feel more comfortable with the government.

16. So first and foremost, if you like want people to stay in a lot of these countries that's necessary like a lot of jews emigrate from places like france to israel because they don't feel safe in france because of upticks in hate crimes and anti-semitic crimes, so on that level if you like want to keep jews in your country, if you want to keep a diversity religious diversity in your country, that's important.

17. But like on the basic citizen on the basic citizenship level you should be trying to afford rights to these people so they feel included, so they feel protected, and this is incredibly important because I think that symbolism matters.

18. Like when when like the confederate flag is allowed to fly outside of a state house in south carolina you don't feel accepted by that government but when that is taken down or if wouldn't it be great if the confederate flag could be something almost associated with criminal activity.

19. That would certainly make the people who have suffered you know a lot more safe and a lot more supported by the government.

20. This is a basic way in which symbolism does matter and symbolism actually affects people's lives and makes them feel safer.

21. So for all those reasons, holocaust denial should be a criminal offence.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DZ_61

Topic: doping-in-sport

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen for coming and hearing what I have to say about the motion before us today that we should allow doping in sports.
2. Now, I just want to make clear a few definitions before we go into the actual debate about what do I mean when I say doping in sport.
3. Doping is the use of performance enhancing drugs.
4. When I am talking about sports I am of course referring to competitive sports, for example the olympics or other kinds of competitions like tour de france etcetera, and we would allow the use of performance enhancing drugs, meaning medication that makes you perform better than you would have been able to naturally.
5. And why is it that we would allow doping in sport?
I'm going to make two main points.
6. First of all, that doping in sports is perfectly legitimate, and secondly, that it will create better and safer drugs that will counteract the harm benefits that we see under status quo from the use of drugs. Now, why do we believe that doping in sports is legitimate?
7. And we want to look at the place where competitive sports are right now.
8. We see that doping in a lot of ways is already part of the status quo and this comes in two ways.
9. First of all, because we already allow of the use of many other performance enhancing substances or methods in order for athletes to provide a better entertainment value and also just to perform better perform more extreme feats of sports, really defy the limitations of the human body.
10. So this includes first of all extremely rigorous training methods, right?
11. Because athletes train from extremely young ages, join competitions, their lives are regimented

in order to maximize their performance and their abilities, and we see that already this is something that is extreme that has a lot of harm benefits a lot of harm to your health as well.

12. Another way that we see this also in terms of the health the food the food supplements that you gain like for example protein powders, protein shakes, other kinds of supplements, vitamins, and so on.

13. Also all sorts of drinks and medications that you take during practices in order to numb pain or to get more adrenaline, also if during competitions if you're injured you can take certain shots and stuff like that and are not considered performance enhancing drugs at all.

14. Under status quo all of these things are allowed.

15. Now, what's not allowed is some types of drugs that are slightly more extreme and the problem with status quo is that these things already happen, right?

16. But they happen very much under the carpet so almost every person who wins in olympics, in extreme sports competitions uses some sort of performance performance enhancing drug and is simply not reported, right?

17. He's doing this illegally.

18. Some national teams even do this on a larger scale, for example the russian team that was recently caught taking drugs on a major scale and they were all disqualified from competing in the olympics.

19. So we see that the notion of olympics and competitive sports as amateurs, right, is not happening because people train all their lives.

20. We see that this arbitrary line that we set of these drugs can't be taken but all of these other measures can be taken, when in fact those measures are equally harmful to your health, we say that this as extremely arbitrary, we don't understand why it is that performance enhancing drugs are not allowed and we think that it's perfectly legitimate to use them.

21. Now, how will this create better and safer drugs?

22. And we agree that some drugs that are used nowadays are extremely harmful to a person's

health.

23. They can cause strokes, heart attacks, infertility, all different kinds all different kinds of steroids, but we think that there are two main problems in status quo that create these kinds of bad drugs.

24. First of all, the fact that these drugs are designed not only to increase your performance, but also to go undetected, right?

Because these drugs are currently illegal.

25. So a lot of different components are put in these drugs in order to make them undetectable in all sorts of tests and this this is what makes these drugs so dangerous and more dangerous at least that what they would have been if they just focused on performance enhancement.

26. So if these drugs were legal, at least the mild ones, we would be able to create drugs that don't have the added need to conceal themselves.

27. So you would have safer drugs.

28. And the second component we see that's problematic is that people are not really educated about these drugs so athletes are really, at the whims of their trainers, given all sorts of drugs that their trainers heard of, that worked for other athletes, when really every different athlete's body reacts differently, needs different drugs, different quantities, trainers are not medical professionals, they don't know necessarily what they're doing, and pharmaceutical companies can't create these drugs or supervise the drugs because they're not legal right now.

29. So we think that once these drugs are made legal, you have so much more information flooding into the market in terms of what these drugs can do how these drugs can help you how we should use them and trainers and athletes would be much better educated, and will be able to take better drugs.

30. Also now, a lot of the big pharmaceutical companies that have much more resources and much more knowledge would be able to use that knowledge and resources to create more drugs because this industry will undoubtedly become a very profitable industry for them.

31. There is already a large market for this kind of performance enhancing medication only now it's

under the under the carpet and larger companies can't afford to opt in because of the sanctions.

32. So because we believe that doping in sports is legitimate, and because we believe that it will create better and safer drugs, we beg you to propose this motion and allow for doping in sports.

33. Thank you very much

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: DZ_681

Topic: ip-rights

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen, mr speaker. The motion before us today is that this house would abolish intellectual property rights, and I am going to make three main points to you today about why we should do that.
2. First of all, because we believe that intellectual property rights are public property and should be used to advance society.
3. Secondly, that in some fields intellectual property rights hurt people's most essential rights to life, and thirdly, you can still benefit from your ideas without having intellectual property rights.
4. Before I go into these points I just want to clarify what it is that we're talking about exactly.
5. When we're talking about intellectual property rights we're talking about specific legal provisions that are given to people for their ideas.
6. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person a person patents his idea.
7. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades.
8. We would abolish this concept completely in all fields, be it music, literature, art, or even biology, techno biology, pharmaceutical companies, especially actually in these fields, and I'm going to go into my points right now.
9. So first of all, what why is it that we believe that intellectual property rights are public property in fact?
10. We acknowledge that people have a right to material property, right?
11. This is one of the most essential ideas of human society that we work harder to earn something

or to make something and then that something inherently belongs to us.

12. Now, we're not insinuating that intellectual property was not hard won and that it's not an individual achievement.

13. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open sourced because of their potential benefit to society.

14. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them.

15. We also see this for example in 3D printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves but the idea is out there.

16. And why is it that we believe that the ideas should be out there?

17. Why should they be public property?

18. Because their potential benefit is so much greater when everybody can use them, right?

19. So if there is a certain piece of music I want to use for a movie, or there is a certain artwork that I want to hang up in my house or use in some sort of publication because of the meaning that it has, we think that once you don't have to go through the whole arbitrary process of buying up those rights in and you use them instead right away in order to push for social causes, or to build on them to create to come up with more inventions to really advance society further, you can create a much greater benefit than just the individual profit that one person may make and we think in a utilitarian perspective this is better but why is it that we believe that even if, let's say intellectual property rights were somehow legitimate as a concept, we think that once they start harming people's more essential rights we think they should be stopped.

20. And the fields where this mostly happens is in the biotechnological or pharmaceutical companies.

21. Because that's where intellectual property is completely abused.

22. Say that a person discovers a gene, intellectual property rights are declared on that gene so basically a company can buy up that patent from the person that discovered the gene that's in I don't know in charge of giving you a higher like likelihood of breast cancer, and then that company basically owns a gene in everybody's body without actually creating that gene.

23. No not only that, that company alone will be able to create medicine for that certain gene or for that strand of cancer that the gene creates for decades.

24. So they would be an essential monopoly that we would not be able to break because it's legally protected and extremely overpriced medication is sold to people that they can't afford because the company can charge whatever it wants, it has absolutely no competition.

25. So because we believe that this kind of competition is necessary in this market where people's lives are at stake we need some sort of regulation of this but we need people to be able to pursue their lives.

26. This comes in a lot of other kinds of medicine genes and other kinds of genetic manipulation technologies that happen right now that company's own, that it makes absolutely no sense because if a person's actual right to life is threatened, we harm other rights that are much more essential than intellectual property.

27. For example, freedom when incarcerate people, or material property rights where we fine people, put them away we think that this is extremely legitimate to do, especially in these cases now, how is it that you can still benefit from your ideas without the the need for intellectual property rights?

28. So even if you don't have the right to the actual idea large companies would still have the advantage of resources and m and and human capital, right?

29. So they would still be able to capitalize on that idea if they make a good enough product and they would be able to compete, only now they would have more companies competing with them and the actual product would be what's going to guarantee you the profit, which is how it should

work in an actual free market.

30. Now, not only that

31. but it still incentivize people to invent because the one who comes up with the idea first is the one who's going to capitalize on it first because once you come up with an idea first do you have that extra advantage of time and resources that you can spend, before everybody else, in order to actually push that idea into a product.

32. So you do have that initial timespan of benefiting from that invention where no one else could.

33. Now, when it comes down to it yes, you'll make less profit or that profit margin will be also less, because you you have other companies benefiting from it.

34. But you're still incentivized to create a product, to invent, and you will still make a profit of it even though you're not going to make as large of a profit but we don't think that that's necessarily harmful, we're protecting the greater good of society.

35. Because of all of these reasons we beg you to abolish intellectual property rights and propose this motion.

Rebuttals:

1. This is one of the most essential ideas of human society that we work harder to earn something or to make something and then that something inherently belongs to us. Now, we're not insinuating that intellectual property was not hard won and that it's not an individual achievement. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open sourced because of their potential benefit to society. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them. We also see this for example in 3D printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves but the idea is out there.

2. So you do have that initial timespan of benefiting from that invention where no one else could. Now, when it comes down to it yes, you'll make less profit or that profit margin will be also less, because you have other companies benefiting from it. But you're still incentivized to create a product, to invent, and you will still make a profit of it even though you're not going to make as large of a profit but we don't think that that's necessarily harmful, we're protecting the greater good of society. Because of all of these reasons we beg you to abolish intellectual property rights and propose this motion.

Evidence Used:

1. Before I go into these points I just want to clarify what it is that we're talking about exactly. When we're talking about intellectual property rights we're talking about specific legal provisions that are given to people for their ideas. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person patents his idea. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades. We would abolish this concept completely in all fields, be it music, literature, art, or even biology, technology, pharmaceutical companies, especially actually in these fields, and I'm going to go into my points right now.

2. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them. We also see this for example in 3D printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves but the idea is out there. And why is it that we believe that the ideas should be out there? Why should they be public property? Because their potential benefit is so much greater when everybody can use them, right?

3. No not only that, that company alone will be able to create medicine for that certain gene or for that strand of cancer that the gene creates for decades. So they would be an essential monopoly that we would not be able to break because it's legally protected and extremely overpriced medication is sold to people that they can't afford because the company can charge whatever it wants, it has absolutely no competition. So because we believe that this kind of competition is necessary in this market where people's lives are at stake we need some sort of regulation of this but we need people to be able to pursue their lives. This comes in a lot of other kinds of medicine genes and other kinds of genetic manipulation technologies that happen right now that company's own, that it makes absolutely no sense because if a person's actual right to life is threatened, we harm other rights that are much more essential than intellectual property. For example, freedom when incarcerate people, or material property rights where we fine people, put them away we think that this is extremely legitimate to do, especially in these cases now, how is it that you can still benefit from your ideas without the the need for intellectual property rights?

4. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person a person patents his idea. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades. We would abolish this concept completely in all fields, be it music, literature, art, or even biology, techno biology, pharmaceutical companies, especially actually in these fields, and I'm going to go into my points right now. So first of all, what why is it that we believe that intellectual property rights are public property in fact? We acknowledge that people have a right to material property, right?

5. First of all, because we believe that intellectual property rights are public property and should be used to advance society. Secondly, that in some fields intellectual property rights hurt people's most essential rights to life, and thirdly, you can still benefit from your ideas without having intellectual property rights. Before I go into these points I just want to clarify what it is that we're talking about exactly. When we're talking about intellectual property rights we're talking about specific legal

provisions that are given to people for their ideas. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person patents his idea.

6. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades. We would abolish this concept completely in all fields, be it music, literature, art, or even biology, techno biology, pharmaceutical companies, especially actually in these fields, and I'm going to go into my points right now. So first of all, what why is it that we believe that intellectual property rights are public property in fact? We acknowledge that people have a right to material property, right? This is one of the most essential ideas of human society that we work harder to earn something or to make something and then that something inherently belongs to us.

7. Now, we're not insinuating that intellectual property was not hard won and that it's not an individual achievement. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open sourced because of their potential benefit to society. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them. We also see this for example in 3D printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves by the way but the idea is out there. And why is it that we believe that the ideas should be out there?

8. We acknowledge that people have a right to material property, right? This is one of the most essential ideas of human society that we work harder to earn something or to make something and then that something inherently belongs to us. Now, we're not insinuating that intellectual property was not hard won and that it's not an individual achievement. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open

sourced because of their potential benefit to society. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them.

9. For example, freedom when incarcerate people, or material property rights where we fine people, put them away we think that this is extremely legitimate to do, especially in these cases now, how is it that you can still benefit from your ideas without the the need for intellectual property rights? So even if you don't have the right to the actual idea large companies would still have the advantage of resources and m and and human capital, right? So they would still be able to capitalize on that idea if they make a good enough product and they would be able to compete, only now they would have more companies competing with them and the actual product would be what's going to guarantee you the profit, which is how it should work in an actual free market. Now, not only that but it still incentivize people to invent because the one who comes up with the idea first is the one who's going to capitalize on it first because once you come up with an idea first do you have that extra advantage of time and resources that you can spend, before everybody else, in order to actually push that idea into a product.

10. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open sourced because of their potential benefit to society. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them. We also see this for example in three d printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves by the but the idea is out there. And why is it that we believe that the ideas should be out there? Why should they be public property?

11. This is one of the most essential ideas of human society that we work harder to earn something or to make something and then that something inherently belongs to us. Now, we're not insinuating that intellectual property was not hard won and that it's not an individual achievement. However, we do see that a lot of times though our individual achievements that end up being taken away or at least given are open sourced because of their potential benefit to society. So we can see this already from, for example, natural resources that might be discovered by a private company but will not be owned by the private company, for example oil, or other kinds of energy resources that most more often than not belong to the state and are only leased out to a company in order to extract them. We also see this for example in 3D printing, actually, where a person comes up with a certain pattern to print but most of these are open sourced, so anybody can print out this pattern for free of course they would have to pay for the resources themselves but the idea is out there.

12. When we're talking about intellectual property rights we're talking about specific legal provisions that are given to people for their ideas. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person patents his idea. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades. We would abolish this concept completely in all fields, be it music, literature, art, or even biology, technology, pharmaceutical companies, especially actually in these fields, and I'm going to go into my points right now. So first of all, what why is it that we believe that intellectual property rights are public property in fact?

13. Secondly, that in some fields intellectual property rights hurt people's most essential rights to life, and thirdly, you can still benefit from your ideas without having intellectual property rights. Before I go into these points I just want to clarify what it is that we're talking about exactly. When we're talking about intellectual property rights we're talking about specific legal provisions that are given to people for their ideas. So these are protections, for example, that idea can only be made into a product for the first decade or two from the moment of invention, once a person patents his

idea. So for example, I came up with a cool invention, I register it as a patent, and then I will be the only person who can make a profit out of that patent for several decades.

Debate ID: DZ_945

Topic: circumcision

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Thank you mr speaker regarding the motion before us today this that we should oppose male infant circumcision we want to clarify exactly what it is that we're talking about before making the three following point first of all the male circumcision, infant circumcision is a barbaric practice.
2. Secondly, that there are no proven benefits to it and thirdly, that children should be allowed to make these decisions over their body as these decisions are irreversible.
3. Before that I want to just clarify what it is that we're talking about.
4. Male infant circumcision is the ceremony of the large abrahamic groups, mostly islam and judaism, severing the foreskin of the male genital organ at varying ages, usually at infancy, the child of course has no say in this and this somehow initiates the child into the religion or the faith.
5. Now, what is our problem with this practice?
6. First of all, the fact that it's a barbaric practice, right?
7. It stems from a primitive notion of sacrificing a piece of flesh from a person in order to be initiated into a faith.
8. At the time where, you know, an extreme showing of loyalty.
9. This basically mutilates the genital organ of the body, not the way that you were born or as you were intended to be.
10. It is extremely painful and bloody, it's not done by a medical medical practitioner, rather by a religious authority, oftentimes there are things that go awry with this kind of practice, and this baby is absolutely traumatized, both bodily and mentally, for absolutely no reason other than showing a commitment to a religion of some sort.
11. Now, one of the most terrible aspects of this is that oftentimes, the family is not even practicing

or strict about their religion and the baby is not going to be very strict or practicing either, so there is some sort of bias towards doing male infant circumcision, even when it's not actually necessary as there are no strong religious convictions in the family.

12. So many babies go through this without actually needing to show some sort of commitment to a faith that they're not going to be part of.

13. This is extremely equivalent to female genital mutilation where genital mutilation oftentimes signifies, you know, a young girl's transition into maturity, supposed to maintain her purity and her virginity, but it's acknowledged by the entire world as something that is completely barbaric, that is unnecessary, causes lasting damages to the girl, mentally, emotionally, physically numbs her emotional her physical enjoyment of sex, just as happens with male genital mutilation, where there is proven less enjoyment from sex from it, and we think that this is an extremely barbaric practice that should we should not practice anymore.

14. Furthermore, it has absolutely no benefit from what's it's stated to have.

15. The health benefits that some say of it having a more you know aesthetic male genital, less chances of cancer in the genital area, so on and so forth, statistically are marginal and seventy percent of the male population of the world does not undergo circumcision in infancy and of course they are completely fine.

16. But the biggest problem that we have with male genital, infant circumcision is the fact that it's not done by choice.

17. We allow parents to make all sorts of decisions for their children when it comes to their children's upbringing and we absolutely acknowledge the fact that it's natural for parents to want their children to be active parts of their community, and oftentimes we allow other kinds of practices that we don't think are you know necessarily problematic, for example dressing in a certain way, going to a certain educational establishment, growing your hair in a certain way, even tattoos or other kinds of religious marks we think that these are things that parents teach their children as part of a cultural or religious identity, and it's fine because these decisions are reversible, and children can, although it's

very difficult, later on make decisions that are contrary to this and kind of set their own life path.

18. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it.

19. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right?

20. Giving children vaccines, a lot of times you also force we don't we force parents to give children vaccines because this will promote their bodily integrity and will make them healthier to make choices after even though the child doesn't necessarily make that decision this kind of an opposite of not letting somebody harm a child's bodily integrity because you can you cannot add something that was detracted you can't grow a foreskin

21. and we think that this is a lifestyle choice that needs to come from the child if it's from a religious or cultural commitment even more it should come from the child because that committing to a whole way of life

22. and we think that the child should be the one who does this rationally when he is no longer a child rather at a mature age.

23. And because we believe that it's the barbaric practice, because we believe that has no benefits, and because we believe that it should be by choice, we beg you to oppose this motion propose this motion.

24. Thank you very much.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. But the biggest problem that we have with male genital, infant circumcision is the fact that it's not done by choice. We allow parents to make all sorts of decisions for their children when it comes to their children's upbringing and we absolutely acknowledge the fact that it's natural for parents to want their children to be active parts of their community, and oftentimes we allow other kinds of

practices that we don't think are you know necessarily problematic, for example dressing in a certain way, going to a certain educational establishment, growing your hair in a certain way, even tattoos or other kinds of religious marks we think that these are things that parents teach their children as part of a cultural or religious identity, and it's fine because these decisions are reversible, and children can, although it's very difficult, later on make decisions that are contrary to this and kind of set their own life path. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right? Giving children vaccines, a lot of times you also force we don't we force parents to give children vaccines because this will promote their bodily integrity and will make them healthier to make choices after even though the child doesn't necessarily make that decision this kind of an opposite of not letting somebody harm a child's bodily integrity because you can you cannot add something that was detracted you can't grow a foreskin

2. We allow parents to make all sorts of decisions for their children when it comes to their children's upbringing and we absolutely acknowledge the fact that it's natural for parents to want their children to be active parts of their community, and oftentimes we allow other kinds of practices that we don't think are you know necessarily problematic, for example dressing in a certain way, going to a certain educational establishment, growing your hair in a certain way, even tattoos or other kinds of religious marks we think that these are things that parents teach their children as part of a cultural or religious identity, and it's fine because these decisions are reversible, and children can, although it's very difficult, later on make decisions that are contrary to this and kind of set their own life path. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right? Giving children vaccines, a lot of times you

also force we don't we force parents to give children vaccines because this will promote their bodily integrity and will make them healthier to make choices after even though the child doesn't necessarily make that decision this kind of an opposite of not letting somebody harm a child's bodily integrity because you can you cannot add something that was detracted you can't grow a foreskin and we think that this is a lifestyle choice that needs to come from the child if it's from a religious or cultural commitment even more it should come from the child because that committing to a whole way of life

3. Furthermore, it has absolutely no benefit from what's it's stated to have. The health benefits that some say of it having a more you know aesthetic male genital, less chances of cancer in the genital area, so on and so forth, statistically are marginal and seventy percent of the male population of the world does not undergo circumcision in infancy and of course they are completely fine. But the biggest problem that we have with male genital, infant circumcision is the fact that it's not done by choice. We allow parents to make all sorts of decisions for their children when it comes to their children's upbringing and we absolutely acknowledge the fact that it's natural for parents to want their children to be active parts of their community, and oftentimes we allow other kinds of practices that we don't think are you know necessarily problematic, for example dressing in a certain way, going to a certain educational establishment, growing your hair in a certain way, even tattoos or other kinds of religious marks we think that these are things that parents teach their children as part of a cultural or religious identity, and it's fine because these decisions are reversible, and children can, although it's very difficult, later on make decisions that are contrary to this and kind of set their own life path. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it.

4. The health benefits that some say of it having a more you know aesthetic male genital, less chances of cancer in the genital area, so on and so forth, statistically are marginal and seventy percent of the male population of the world does not undergo circumcision in infancy and of course they are completely fine. But the biggest problem that we have with male genital, infant circumcision is the fact that it's not done by choice. We allow parents to make all sorts of decisions for their

children when it comes to their children's upbringing and we absolutely acknowledge the fact that it's natural for parents to want their children to be active parts of their community, and oftentimes we allow other kinds of practices that we don't think are you know necessarily problematic, for example dressing in a certain way, going to a certain educational establishment, growing your hair in a certain way, even tattoos or other kinds of religious marks we think that these are things that parents teach their children as part of a cultural or religious identity, and it's fine because these decisions are reversible, and children can, although it's very difficult, later on make decisions that are contrary to this and kind of set their own life path. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right?

5. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right? Giving children vaccines, a lot of times you also force we don't we force parents to give children vaccines because this will promote their bodily integrity and will make them healthier to make choices after even though the child doesn't necessarily make that decision this kind of an opposite of not letting somebody harm a child's bodily integrity because you can you cannot add something that was detracted you can't grow a foreskin and we think that this is a lifestyle choice that needs to come from the child if it's from a religious or cultural commitment even more it should come from the child because that committing to a whole way of life and we think that the child should be the one who does this rationally when he is no longer a child rather at a mature age. And because we believe that it's the barbaric practice, because we believe that has no benefits, and because we believe that it should be by choice, we beg you to oppose this motion propose this motion.

6. When it comes to circumcision, specifically, babies have actually no say in it. They're usually infants, eight days old, they're not aware of what's being done to them or the consequences it's

going to have even if the consequences are small, and we think that when you're making bodily decisions over a child, for example, if you take inoculation, right? Giving children vaccines, a lot of times you also force we don't we force parents to give children vaccines because this will promote their bodily integrity and will make them healthier to make choices after even though the child doesn't necessarily make that decision this kind of an opposite of not letting somebody harm a child's bodily integrity because you can you cannot add something that was detracted you can't grow a foreskin and we think that this is a lifestyle choice that needs to come from the child if it's from a religious or cultural commitment even more it should come from the child because that committing to a whole way of life and we think that the child should be the one who does this rationally when he is no longer a child rather at a mature age.

Debate ID: EH_101

Topic: affirmativeaction

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. For years, for decades, for centuries hegemonic groups have been oppressing minority groups, people of color, women into being less than they are, into achieving less and into gaining less.
2. That ends today.
3. We think that schools, businesses, military and government offices should all implement affirmative action policies. That means that businesses will be paid money in order to take people of color, minorities or women on at leading roles such as CEO or board of directors. That means schools will get quotas of people of color and women that they need to take in and accept into their schools. That means the military will be pushed into putting women in powerful positions within it. That means government offices will have women as councilwomen, as congresswomen and as president of the united states, hopefully, one day. All of this in order to advance these groups who for years have been oppressed.
4. Three points: one, on how this advances the group and helps them, two, on meritocracy and why these people do deserve the break that they're getting and three, on breaking stigmas why this only happens with affirmative action.
5. So, first, on how this helps: so, in order to advance in society, the first crucial step is to get your foot in the door.
6. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO.
7. First and foremost, I need to be accepted into college.
8. Once I get accepted into college, I need to be hardworking in college and I need to be able to graduate college.

9. Once I graduate college, that's not enough.

10. I need to be accepted into the company.

11. At every one of these little turns and twists there are barriers in front of people of color. They do less well with admissions officers in college, they do less well with interviewers at businesses. All of these barriers mean that they're not getting the opportunities that they deserve. We break that by incentivizing people to accept them in spite of that. That means they manage to get the foot in their door. They manage to get that first step. What happens next?

12. We say merit takes in at this point.

13. We simply don't believe that people of color or women are less good at school or are less good at doing their job well.

14. This means that once they're in the business or once they're in school, they work hard and some of them do exceptionally well and get advanced placement.

15. That mean some of them become CEOs, that means some of them become regional managers, that mean some of them become professors at university.

16. This advanced placement a, is good for these individuals but b, is good for the group as a whole because it creates role models.

17. At the point at which you see many many female professors or many many person-of-color professors, it then becomes less convincing when somebody says or thinks that women are just less good at business or less good at academia because you have more and more counterexamples.

18. That means you can disprove people who make these false claims.

19. But crucially, it also means that the young girl or the young person of color looking up and saying what do I want to do in my future, now sees more options because there are more people to whom she can relate who are in these places.

20. So that means you also entice more young people into working hard right from the get-go in order to gain these goals.

21. That means that you get more of these people where they belong, to be in important positions

within academia and within business and within government.

22. Secondly, let's talk about meritocracy. So, the obvious line is saying there are people who deserve this more.

23. We think that's false.

24. We think that a black person with a three point o GPA average worked harder than a white person with a four point o GPA average.

25. Why?

Because they were born with more privilege, they were born into a family that has taught them exactly what schooling is like because they were able to afford private tutors, because they were able to give them all of those little steps that mean that the teacher didn't mark down their grade for using a language that is acceptable within the african-american community but less acceptable within white elite society.

26. All of these things mean that as far as hardworking goes, these people deserve it at least as much, even if their grades, so to speak, don't show it.

27. Lastly, let's talk about breaking stigmas.

28. So, the next thing that always says is once this happens, I see a black woman at a head of a company

29. and I automatically assume she got there because of affirmative action.

30. This is true not only of those who actually got there because of affirmative action, but also those who would have gotten there otherwise, which means that's a net harm.

31. Two reasons that's not true: one, we don't have to tell everyone that we're using affirmative action.

32. It is quite possible to use affirmative action secretly.

33. So, even if colleges need to report it to some extent, businesses certainly don't have to report on their hiring practices and people are generally less aware of what how businesses hire and how the people in power there got to be there.

34. But more importantly, on the comparative, it is simply impossible to prove yourself at the point where you can't get your foot in the door.

35. So, fewer people are there and able to prove themselves in the first place.

36. We say at the point at which you got your foot in the door, you can actually do a good job.

37. So, even if you got there and even if it's assumed you got there only because of your color or of your gender, once you prove you can actually do it, that no longer matters and all that matters is that you do a good job.

38. Please propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. So, first, on how this helps: so, in order to advance in society, the first crucial step is to get your foot in the door. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO. First and foremost, I need to be accepted into college. Once I get accepted into college, I need to be hardworking in college and I need to be able to graduate college. Once I graduate college, that's not enough.

2. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO. First and foremost, I need to be accepted into college. Once I get accepted into college, I need to be hardworking in college and I need to be able to graduate college. Once I graduate college, that's not enough. I need to be accepted into the company.

3. All of this in order to advance these groups who for years have been oppressed. Three points: one, on how this advances the group and helps them, two, on meritocracy and why these people do deserve the break that they're getting and three, on breaking stigmas why this only happens with affirmative action. So, first, on how this helps: so, in order to advance in society, the first crucial step is to get your foot in the door. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO. First and foremost, I need to be accepted

into college.

4. Three points: one, on how this advances the group and helps them, two, on meritocracy and why these people do deserve the break that they're getting and three, on breaking stigmas why this only happens with affirmative action. So, first, on how this helps: so, in order to advance in society, the first crucial step is to get your foot in the door. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO. First and foremost, I need to be accepted into college. Once I get accepted into college, I need to be hardworking in college and I need to be able to graduate college.

5. That means government offices will have women as councilwomen, as congresswomen and as president of the united states, hopefully, one day. All of this in order to advance these groups who for years have been oppressed. Three points: one, on how this advances the group and helps them, two, on meritocracy and why these people do deserve the break that they're getting and three, on breaking stigmas why this only happens with affirmative action. So, first, on how this helps: so, in order to advance in society, the first crucial step is to get your foot in the door. So, for example, if I want to become a CEO there are a thousand little baby steps I need to take on the road to becoming CEO.

Debate ID: EH_1

Topic: ban-video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. When the mass murderer in newton was caught it was discovered that he had planned his entire murder spree on the game kindergarten killers.
2. We think it is telling that cases like this happen and we think playing violent video games pushes children towards more violence in real life.
3. Based on that metric, we'd like to ban the sale of violent video games to underage children. We're gonna talk about three things: one, on the active role children take in violent video games, two, on the reward system set up in violent video games and three, on normalization via repetition. So first, on the active role taken: this is to separate video games from things like violent movies or scary stories.
4. We think the specific problem of video games is that the violence is an action that you specifically take yourself.
5. That means that, in order to punch a hooker in GTA five, I don't sit back and watch, but rather I actively choose to press the button over and over again.
6. This means that the individual barrier between taking the action itself and just seeing it, is broken, because you do, in fact, have to make the active decision to do it, time and time again.
7. Secondly, on the reward system: the way video games work is that they compel you to commit violent acts based on a reward system.
8. That means that if you commit a violent act, you get a prize, you get points, you get levels in the game.
9. You get advancements in the storytelling, in the story line of the game.
10. This means that you are gifted every time you commit this act.

11. This conditions you over time that violence brings your rewards.
12. This is particularly problematic because there are times in real life where violence is likely to gain you rewards.
13. So, for example, if you were to push in line and show violence, you are more likely to be able to get away with cutting in line at the supermarket.
14. If you were to punch someone and ask for their milk money, you're more likely to get it, based on violence.
15. The idea that a reward system is set up for violent actions is in and of itself very problematic because it pushes children more towards violence.
16. Thirdly, there's a normalization via repetition.
17. So, when you see something time and time again, it becomes normalized in your eyes.
18. That means that, for example, when people see pornography over and over again, the sexual norms within them, within pornography are normalized for these people and they are expected.
19. They view this as what is normal to a sexual relationship.
20. The same thing is true of violence.
21. At the point at which you see violence over and over again and in fact take active part in this violence over and over again, this violence is normalized in a way that makes you believe that it is an actual part of everyday life.
22. Why is this a problem specifically for kids?
23. The way these games work is that they take life experiences that are specifically for children, disconnected.
24. So, violent video games will often be military games, they will often be driving games like GTA, sometimes they will even be games that are generally disconnected from the lived experience, meaning space pilot games, etcetera.
25. The problem with children is that they are lacking in life experience to be able to draw a line between reality and fiction.

26. So, when an adult plays a game like this, an adult is aware that this is not actually how adults behave within the real world.
27. However, when a child is, for the first time, able to access a vehicle in order to drive it around or able to quote unquote enlist in the army without undergoing any form of basic training that teaches him how to use the weapon responsibly, he is immersed in a world that is different from his lived experience and the only form of lived experience that he has is violence within this world.
28. That means that it's substantially more likely to get normalized for children because they don't have any counterfactual to balance out the violence.
29. Why is all of this so negative?
30. So, on the fringe, this is potentially something that can push psychopaths over the edge and take somebody who otherwise may have been somewhat violent or not violent at all and push them to commit mass murders.
31. We think this is unlikely to happen often, but happen sometimes then is obviously quite bad.
32. In the majority of people, we think this is likely to create a situation that pushes people toward slightly more violence in everyday life.
33. When you get cut in line for the lunch lady in school, when you get cut off on the road, these types of normalized experiences make you more likely to push back with violence and that violence more likely to escalate within the situation and for all those reasons, we think violent video games should be banned for children.

Rebuttals:

1. The problem with children is that they are lacking in life experience to be able to draw a line between reality and fiction. So, when an adult plays a game like this, an adult is aware that this is not actually how adults behave within the real world. However, when a child is, for the first time, able to access a vehicle in order to drive it around or able to quote unquote enlist in the army without undergoing any form of basic training that teaches him how to use the weapon responsibly, he is immersed in a world that is different from his lived experience and the only form of lived experience

that he has is violence within this world. That means that it's substantially more likely to get normalized for children because they don't have any counterfactual to balance out the violence. Why is all of this so negative?

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: EH_21

Topic: one-child

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. In the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, a combination of plagues, diseases and world wars wiped out a substantial part of the population, reducing childbirth to a record low in the united states.
2. As a result of that, children growing up in the thirties and forties became some of the most successful, most and most privileged people in the united states because that's how markets work: supply and demand.
3. If supply is greater than demand, the people get hurt and fail.
4. Briefly, we simply support that china continue doing what it's been doing up until now and, in broader terms, we support regulation on childbirth and places where childbirth is excessive.
5. Two arguments on this side of the house: one, on legitimacy in doing so and two, on a need for a smaller society. So first, let's talk about legitimacy in doing so.
6. The main argument heard against the one child policy is that people have a right to childbirth.
7. What's interesting to note is that the population in china has been growing by about oh point five percent every year.
8. Note that given birth rates and death rates should coincide plus or minus, if each person were having one child, that meant that birth rates would stay the same.
9. Given that children are had in couples, this means that if people were actually sticking to the one child policy, birth rates would be dropping, meaning the population size wouldn't be growing but rather dwindling.
10. So, how is it that the government doesn't allow you to have one child and yet you still are?
11. The answer is simple: it's not really a hard ban 'cause at the point at which the government says

you're fined, then not only are you fined, but you're fined at varying degrees based on how much you can afford to pay.

12. It's really just a price you need to pay to have a child.

13. It's not a hard ban.

14. It's deterring people from having children and making it clear that it costs more.

15. Opposition will say but look at poor people.

16. They can't do it, they can't afford more it's always more difficult for poor people to have children.

17. Children cost a fortune to raise, to feed, to teach, to house.

18. They cost money.

19. Poor people need to deal with that, as well, and if they can't afford to deal with children, they shouldn't bring children into the world because those children will be harmed by being poor.

20. The important thing to realize here is not only does the government have a right to do this, it is crucial that they do this.

21. There's a concept called negative externalities.

22. At the point at which a couple decide to bring a child into the world, they're creating a contract between them.

23. However, that contract that they've both agreed to has external harms to society.

24. There's another mouth to feed, another person breathing up air, another person taking up space.

25. Those negative externalities are not taken into account in the contract 'cause they're not held only by the people who signed the contract, but rather, by all of the people in society.

26. That is something that the contract owners need to pay back, in the same way that a company creating CO two emissions needs to pay taxation on those CO two emissions because the people breathing it in are people who didn't sign that contract, they need to make up for negative externalities.

27. The same is true of having more than one child.

28. If you want to have more than one child, you need to make up for negative externalities in the in

the form of a price.

29. Secondly, let's talk about a need for smaller society.

30. Two things on this: a, natural resources.

31. There's food there's water, there's land, all of these are both in limited supply and in and take up more land, so there isn't more space for people.

32. As it is, the buildings in china are built insanely high in order to house as many people as possible.

33. This mean there's overpopulation in big cities.

34. All of these people are breathing in oxygen, breathing out CO two, that creates more climate change.

35. This is a negative thing that needs to be, to some extent, taken into account.

36. Secondly, economically speaking.

37. They say we'll have a smaller and aging workforce.

38. We say that's phenomenal 'cause at the point at which you have old people who need to be taken care of and young people who need to work, that is how a market is created.

39. This means that in a society like china right now where the average person makes almost no money a month, where there are no jobs available to people, where they have to sell themselves into practical slavery in order to put some food at the table, raising the demand for a workforce while lowering the supply is the best thing that could happen to the chinese economy because it means they're finally getting paid a fair wage, finally, all of them can go out and find jobs.

40. For these reasons, please support the motion.

Rebuttals:

1. There's a concept called negative externalities. At the point at which a couple decide to bring a child into the world, they're creating a contract between them. However, that contract that they've both agreed to has external harms to society. There's another mouth to feed, another person breathing up air, another person taking up space. Those negative externalities are not taken into

account in the contract 'cause they're not held only by the people who signed the contract, but rather, by all of the people in society.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: EH_381

Topic: monarchy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The most important thing to understand in this debate is that a king or a queen, a monarch, are not a title but rather a symbol. They symbolize a unified head of state, they symbolize a representative of the people, but not of some of the people like a prime minister, but all of the people. What we say here is that this debate is not about whether such a symbol is a good symbol to have, but whether such a symbol should take the familial form of monarchy or the more inclusive form of presidency. We want to create a new symbolism because of stagnation of the monarchical symbolism created in places like england and the netherlands. We think that a system such as israel where you have an elected body which is the prime minister and the parliament, and aside from that you have a president who is elected as well every seven years from anyone, but he is elected by all the people and represents to an extent all the people. We think that is a better system. We're going to have three rationales for this: one, on democracy as a value, two, on representation of minorities and three, on reparations and reclaiming. So first let's start with democracy as a value. We would note that western liberal democracies are not the only place in which monarchs exist, and they are not the only place in which lineal families have a right to lead a country.

2. However, what sets them apart is that they often also have a republic, a people elected who rule and govern over the rest of the people.

3. At the point at which you want to point to these countries and say: what you're doing is not

4. okay you need to let the people rule themselves, we think it's problematic, to say the least, to have this coming from someone wearing a crown that she is only wearing because she was born to a certain family with a certain name.

5. We say when you recognize that democracy is a value in and of itself, and when you recognize

that is a value worth spreading, it is at the very least unhelpful and only harmful to maintain that the monarchy within your own democratic nation.

6. So that's on democracy as a value.

7. Secondly, let's talk about representation of minorities.

8. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire.

9. A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example.

10. However, there is a problem with this in that specific individuals are getting a lot of hatred and not feeling accepted within the welcoming country. We think part of this is to do with the single greatest symbolic figure of the nation being inherently detached from any and all minorities, at the point at which the king of the netherlands specifically has to be a dutch native-born individual. This creates a feeling of disdain and detachment.

11. Two ways in with this is solved through presidency.

12. One, the unlikely scenario in which a minority president is elected.

13. Wild unlikely, this is certainly not impossible and is something that is substantially more likely to happen under an election system than under one in which you are born into the part.

14. Two, and more likely, at the very least you feel a part of the process.

15. So at the point in which the president is chosen by the people or chosen by the people who are in the parliament, who are chosen by the people, the minorities at the very least feel a part of the process in which the single most important figurehead of the nation is chosen.

16. This makes them feel more included and seen as more included throughout the nation, and therefore helps representation of minorities.

17. Lastly, on reparations and reclaiming.

18. We say that most states have committed quite horrible historic grievances. Often, if not always,

these grievances have been committed by the people at the heads of the state, who tortured, who ruled over, who abused their citizens and the citizens of other nations in their plunders and in their wars. We say it is the moral responsibility of the individuals born into riches and wealth, based on these plunders, to pay their wealth as reparations to the people and to give up their seat in recognition of a reclaiming of national symbols of the people. This is their debt to the people and this is why the monarchy should not exist, and the monarchs themselves should give it up.

Rebuttals:

1. So first let's start with democracy as a value. We would note that western liberal democracies are not the only place in which monarchs exist, and they are not the only place in which lineal families have a right to lead a country. However, what sets them apart is that they often also have a republic, a people elected who rule and govern over the rest of the people. At the point at which you want to point to these countries and say: what you're doing is not okay you need to let the people rule themselves, we think it's problematic, to say the least, to have this coming from someone wearing a crown that she is only wearing because she was born to a certain family with a certain name.
2. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire. A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example. However, there is a problem with this in that specific individuals are getting a lot of hatred and not feeling accepted within the welcoming country. We think part of this is to do with the single greatest symbolic figure of the nation being inherently detached from any and all minorities, at the point at which the king of the netherlands specifically has to be a dutch native-born individual. This creates a feeling of disdain and detachment.

Evidence Used:

1. So that's on democracy as a value. Secondly, let's talk about representation of minorities. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire.

A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example. However, there is a problem with this in that specific individuals are getting a lot of hatred and not feeling accepted within the welcoming country.

2. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire. A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example. However, there is a problem with this in that specific individuals are getting a lot of hatred and not feeling accepted within the welcoming country. We think part of this is to do with the single greatest symbolic figure of the nation being inherently detached from any and all minorities, at the point at which the king of the netherlands specifically has to be a dutch native-born individual. This creates a feeling of disdain and detachment.

3. We say when you recognize that democracy is a value in and of itself, and when you recognize that is a value worth spreading, it is at the very least unhelpful and only harmful to maintain that the monarchy within your own democratic nation. So that's on democracy as a value. Secondly, let's talk about representation of minorities. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire. A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example.

4. Secondly, let's talk about representation of minorities. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire. A part of this is due to the fact that nations are becoming more and more multicultural with the ability to immigrate and emigrate from and to nation one nation to the other and to travel freely through the entire EU, for example. However, there is a problem with this in that specific individuals are getting a lot of hatred and not feeling accepted within the welcoming country. We think part of this is to do with the single greatest symbolic figure of the nation being inherently detached from any and all minorities, at the point at

which the king of the netherlands specifically has to be a dutch native-born individual.

5. okay you need to let the people rule themselves, we think it's problematic, to say the least, to have this coming from someone wearing a crown that she is only wearing because she was born to a certain family with a certain name. We say when you recognize that democracy is a value in and of itself, and when you recognize that is a value worth spreading, it is at the very least unhelpful and only harmful to maintain that the monarchy within your own democratic nation. So that's on democracy as a value. Secondly, let's talk about representation of minorities. We say in this day and age, specifically, xenophobia and hatred are spreading through europe like wildfire.

Debate ID: EH_483

Topic: freedom-of-speech

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Freedom of speech is important, to be sure, but it is not absolute. In this speech, we're going to separate freedom of speech into two realms.
2. Firstly, we're going to talk about, on an individual realm, where specific people's freedom of speech can be harmed, and why for on an individual level, freedom of speech is not and cannot be absolute.
3. Secondly, we're going to talk about a conceptual realm and explain where, conceptually, freedom of speech should and can be limited in order to protect other, more important rights. First, let's discuss the individual level. There are two problematic areas about freedom of speech. One is the issue of an absolute stage. So, one of the areas in which freedom of speech is most heatedly discussed is campaigning. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion?
4. Can I buy a second or a third newspaper?
5. We say freedom of speech must be limited here, ironically, in order to attempt to help freedom of speech.
6. At the point at which an individual is capable of buying out the entirety of the market of speech, meaning you buy all of the big newspapers, or you buy all of the campaign ad slots on TV, you are effectively silencing other speech.
7. Now this shouldn't come as a surprise.
8. At any given moment, only one person can speak at the same time in conversation.
9. On a larger scale of thing, that is true as well.
10. If I own this newspaper, if I'm letting one person write a column in it, then somebody else cannot

write that same column.

11. If I let that same person write the entirety of the newspaper or all of the newspaper, then nobody else can speak.

12. Given the fear of monopoly of opinion, we say it is legitimate to stop freedom of speech in order to help freedom of speech.

13. Now, note that this means that for the individual, freedom of speech is not absolute and that, in and of itself, is enough to win the debate.

14. Secondly, there are certain settings in which speech must be limited. So, most people say freedom of speech would include lies as well. You can basically say anything you want.

15. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president, regardless of how stupid that may be.

16. There are certain situations in which individuals cannot lie.

17. What are these?

One, we would say that politicians probably should refrain from lying while giving campaign promises.

18. So, while they do do that often and technically can do that, we say it is morally wrong and given the option, we should probably prevent that in the first place.

19. The reason for that is that that speech is actively harmful towards other people.

20. Secondly, already today, witnesses are prevented from lying. Why?

Because exercising their freedom of speech without limitation would mean that the right of a separate individual would be taken away. Now let's take that notion and expand it into conceptual limitations on freedom of speech. We say there are certain such speech that is unacceptable. There is a tradeoff in areas between speech and security and in those areas, you should not be free to speak. Two such areas: one, incitement.

21. There are two forms of incitement.

22. One is active incitement where you actively tell people, go and hurt that person.

23. Now, sometimes, it may not be a problem because sometimes you have no power but often, you have the power to move people to actually do things.
24. Given that the rationale behind freedom of speech is rooted in the power and importance of words, we say that power must be exercised with caution.
25. At the point at which that power is used to actively harm someone, then much in the way your freedom of movement is limited in that you cannot swing your fist towards my face, so so, too, is your freedom of speech limited that you cannot use it to physically harm me.
26. Second type of harm is passive harm.
27. The example of which being yelling fire in a crowded theater.
28. Even if you don't tell someone to harm someone else, the fact that you can cause that harm for no good reason is cause enough to limit.
29. The second form of limited speech is hate speech.
30. The reason is because racial slurs around society are something which large groups of people cannot feel safe in.
31. So it undermines the feeling of safety and bodily autonomy that groups of individuals have.
32. Why are these things so important that they should override the freedom of speech? We say that freedoms are derived from the ability to exercise them. At the point at which an individual loses his life, that individual loses the ability to exercise all freedoms. Given that life is the route to other freedoms, we say it should be prioritized over those freedoms. Note that this is accepted in almost all limitations on all freedoms given today. We see no reason why it shouldn't be accepted freedom of speech. Therefore, we beg you to oppose the absoluteness of freedom of speech and support the motion.

Rebuttals:

1. Secondly, already today, witnesses are prevented from lying. Why?

Because exercising their freedom of speech without limitation would mean that the right of a separate individual would be taken away. Now let's take that notion and expand it into conceptual

limitations on freedom of speech. We say there are certain such speech that is unacceptable. There is a tradeoff in areas between speech and security and in those areas, you should not be free to speak.

2. At the point at which an individual loses his life, that individual loses the ability to exercise all freedoms. Given that life is the route to other freedoms, we say it should be prioritized over those freedoms. Note that this is accepted in almost all limitations on all freedoms given today. We see no reason why it shouldn't be accepted freedom of speech. Therefore, we beg you to oppose the absoluteness of freedom of speech and support the motion.

Evidence Used:

1. Now, note that this means that for the individual, freedom of speech is not absolute and that, in and of itself, is enough to win the debate. Secondly, there are certain settings in which speech must be limited. So, most people say freedom of speech would include lies as well. You can basically say anything you want. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president, regardless of how stupid that may be.

2. You can basically say anything you want. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president, regardless of how stupid that may be. There are certain situations in which individuals cannot lie. What are these?

One, we would say that politicians probably should refrain from lying while giving campaign promises. So, while they do do that often and technically can do that, we say it is morally wrong and given the option, we should probably prevent that in the first place.

3. First, let's discuss the individual level. There are two problematic areas about freedom of speech. One is the issue of an absolute stage. So, one of the areas in which freedom of speech is most heatedly discussed is campaigning. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion?

4. So, most people say freedom of speech would include lies as well. You can basically say anything you want. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president,

regardless of how stupid that may be. There are certain situations in which individuals cannot lie.

What are these?

One, we would say that politicians probably should refrain from lying while giving campaign promises.

5. One is the issue of an absolute stage. So, one of the areas in which freedom of speech is most heatedly discussed is campaigning. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion? Can I buy a second or a third newspaper? We say freedom of speech must be limited here, ironically, in order to attempt to help freedom of speech.

6. Secondly, there are certain settings in which speech must be limited. So, most people say freedom of speech would include lies as well. You can basically say anything you want. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president, regardless of how stupid that may be. There are certain situations in which individuals cannot lie.

7. There are two problematic areas about freedom of speech. One is the issue of an absolute stage. So, one of the areas in which freedom of speech is most heatedly discussed is campaigning. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion? Can I buy a second or a third newspaper?

8. So, one of the areas in which freedom of speech is most heatedly discussed is campaigning. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion? Can I buy a second or a third newspaper? We say freedom of speech must be limited here, ironically, in order to attempt to help freedom of speech. At the point at which an individual is capable of buying out the entirety of the market of speech, meaning you buy all of the big newspapers, or you buy all of the campaign ad slots on TV, you are effectively silencing other speech.

9. Can I spend all of my money to campaign for a certain politician, for example, or ideal or notion? Can I buy a second or a third newspaper? We say freedom of speech must be limited here, ironically, in order to attempt to help freedom of speech. At the point at which an individual is capable of buying out the entirety of the market of speech, meaning you buy all of the big

newspapers, or you buy all of the campaign ad slots on TV, you are effectively silencing other speech. Now this shouldn't come as a surprise.

10. For example, you can say that donald trump is going to be an excellent president, regardless of how stupid that may be. There are certain situations in which individuals cannot lie. What are these? One, we would say that politicians probably should refrain from lying while giving campaign promises. So, while they do do that often and technically can do that, we say it is morally wrong and given the option, we should probably prevent that in the first place. The reason for that is that that speech is actively harmful towards other people.

Debate ID: EH_602

Topic: schoolvouchers

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Let's start off by talking about how the voucher system works in comparison with the system of state-funded education that we have today. So, in the most basic sense, the voucher system means the government stops spending money for you and lets you decide where to spend your tax money. You get a voucher saying here is ex money and you can use this for any form of education for your children.

2. What does that mean on the bottom line for education?

3. One, it means there is a more equal distribution of the funding for education.

4. Why?

When giving out vouchers, a state is obliged to give identical sums of money to each and every individual.

5. In comparison, when funding schools, what you end up getting is political battles in which the politically strong and big cities and richer areas get substantially more funding for their schools.

6. Now, you'll wanna say look, funding schools allows us to invest more in schools in the periphery where people need it more. That is, to an extent, true, though hypothetically can also be done with a voucher system, but the important thing to note is that that's not what actually happens. What actually happens is that the rich people and their political capital get more and the poor people get less.

7. Secondly, the voucher system adds geographic dispersion verses locality.

8. What does this mean?

9. It means that the point at which the schooling system is we build schools based on how many people live in the area and need to go to school, it also means that the state forces you to choose,

at best, from a very limited number of schools.

10. You are limited if you want to go to a state school, to schools in your direct area.

11. That means you're limited to going to school with the same people who are in your socioeconomic standing and limited social mobility that comes from this.

12. With a voucher system, you are essentially free to travel as far as you are willing to in order to get a better or more diversified education.

13. So that's the second thing that happens.

14. The third thing is that you're extending the free market.

15. In today's society, most people are not so rich that they can afford to opt into paying for a private school as opposed to receiving school entirely for free.

16. This means that even when there are people who would hypothetically be able to afford school, most people are locked into a monopoly of the state on schooling because they manage to offer a free alternative, something no one else, no business can offer.

17. At the point at which the voucher system is put in place, it means that people have a starting capital in order to pay for school.

18. This means two things: one, any person can pay a certain amount which opens up the market already and two, those who before couldn't pay a lot but were able to add some, are now able to invest some more over the voucher price in the education of their children. This means you get more schools built and you allow the free market to work in a way that says that the good schools will remain and the bad schools are likely to shut down due to lack of participation.

19. Now let's talk about three things that happen based on the voucher system.

20. One, we say you get better education.

21. So, at the point at which the free market runs its course and you get to opt into the types of schools that you want without geographic limitations and with equal distribution between social standings, we say the first thing that happens is you get better teachers, better schools, better education for the children.

22. The second thing you get is free thinking education. So, at the point at which schools are released from the claws of the government, you enable more education to be tailored to the wants and needs of students and parents. This means more things like democratic schools. This means more things like philosophical schools, more things like training schools, and at the very best, it means that the state no longer has a monopoly over controlling the narrative taught to all high school students, a power best held by many individuals and not by one body.

23. Thirdly, we say this creates an equal opportunity in education. So, we already explained why this gives substantially more access to better schools for poorer people, but it does more than that. It enables the mixing of the societies at the primary school level. This means that you have friends who are rich and poor. This means that you have friends who are of color or white. This means that you have an array of knowledge over different aspects and parts of life that allow you as a poor person to advance through social circles, up until now, a gift given only to the rich and only to the privileged. For all these reasons, we say school vouchers are a substantially better mechanism for educating and advancing and improving our young. Please support them.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: EH_61

Topic: doping-in-sport

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. When a child comes home to his mother and says mommy, I'm I'm not managing to to concentrate in school, I'm not managing to learn math and learn english, the mother doesn't say to him well, I'm sorry
2. but you'll just have to deal, do it as best you can naturally.
3. No.
4. She takes him to a doctor and she gets him ADD medication to enhance his ability to learn in class.
5. We think the same should be true about doping in sports.
6. Three arguments we're gonna give you: one, on how enhanced ability improves the sport, two, on risk and harm being a part of the game and three, on even if you don't buy all of that, why it's still better that these drugs be legal.
7. Bit of mechanism, the most popular drugs used today, those who aren't killing people, those that aren't ruining people's lives, we think they should all be made legal for the purpose of sport, we think they should still be prescription medications, you come in you show a sign that you're a card that you're an athlete and the pharmacist gives you a reasonable dose of the drug to use.
8. So, first argument on enhanced ability: so, most people don't go and watch regular people play sports.
9. I don't go out to the soccer field to watch my friends play.
10. If I go out with them it's because I want to play also.
11. I even suffer through it when I have to go out to the soccer field or the basketball court and watch my child play.

12. I barely enjoy the fact that my child is enjoying himself.

13. I certainly don't enjoy the rest of the children playing around.

14. Why?

Because they do it poorly.

15. They don't do it well, it's not impressive.

16. The reason people love sports so much is because it is exceptional to see the lines and the records which people can reach, the incredible feats that these individuals can do that I would never be able to do.

17. At the point at which doping make these people faster, makes them stronger, makes them better, it makes the sport better as well.

18. Now, they'll say ugh, it's not such a big deal.

19. So, first, it makes the sport substantially better.

20. Note the difference between people who watch triple a baseball and the major leagues.

21. Nobody goes to watch triple a baseball.

22. This in spite of the fact that these players are better than ninety-nine-point-nine percent of the world, they're phenomenal, but you only want the best of the best.

23. That's what doping gives you.

24. Secondly, they'll say it's just not that important to have sports. That may be true, but for the people who care m for the people who love sports, sporting is a religion and they want to be able to access it in the best way possible. So, it enhances the game.

25. Two, let's talk about risk and harm: they'll say you're harming your body, you're hurting yourself.

26. We're not sure about your legitimacy to destroy my autonomy to hurt myself in the first place, but, specifically within the context of sport, we say that's par for the course, right?

27. If I wake up and go to the gym eight hours a day, that is literally ripping through my muscles in the hope that they will rebuild stronger.

28. If I run track every day, I risk fractures, I risks sprains, I risk breaks, things that happen to

everyone at some point or another, all because I'm trying to improve my ability to do this sport.

29. If I ride at the tour de france or do bike-riding, the chance of me falling and literally killing myself just because I'm practicing to get better is a significant and real risk.

30. Athletes have the right to risk their physical state in order to improve their physical state and their ability to do their job and play their sport and we think that's exactly what happens with these drugs.

31. Lastly, even if all of that isn't true, even if the sport would be better without it, if these athletes really shouldn't be taking these drugs, there are three reasons we should make them legal nonetheless.

32. Before that, note it is happening anyway.

33. Ten percent are already taking these drugs and honestly, it's probably substantially more 'cause these are the ten percent willing to openly say that these take they're taking these drugs and not counting all the people caught taking these drugs.

34. Three reasons: one, these people are under enormous pressures to take these drugs.

35. At the point at which their boss is pressuring it into them, their society is pressuring them, their fans are pressuring them into doing these things because they want to see them perform better, we think it's not legitimate to call them criminals for doing what everyone around them makes them and pushes them into doing.

36. Secondly, the risk of the drugs goes significantly up at the point at which you need to purchase them on the black market.

37. When you cannot ensure that what you're getting is clean, is the good stuff, is the real stuff, when you cannot ensure that you're getting exact right medical quantities, the risks from taking these drugs goes significantly higher.

38. So, if these people are gonna take them anyway, it's best they take them from proper prescriptions from a pharmacist.

39. Thirdly, we say there's simply an issue of fairness at the point at which the willingness to break

the rules and be a criminal means that you can win the game more often.

40. It is an unfair situation where we fine people essentially for being good and listening to the rules and we think if those are the rules, they should be shifted in the instance of sports where fairness is above all else.

41. So, for all these reasons, because it makes the sport better, because harm and risk are part of being an athlete and because even if all that isn't true, it's better to take it when it's legal than when it's not and people are taking it anyway, please propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_121

Topic: ban-boxing

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Boxing is a violent activity that glorifies punching people in the face.
2. It is an activity that the government must take a strong stance against and therefore, we must ban boxing.
3. There're two groups of people who are being harmed when we allow boxing to continue.
4. First, we have the participants in the sport and second, we have the viewers.
5. When it comes to the participants, we have to start, of course, with the physical harms to their body.
6. These are people who sustain multiple fractures and bruising, multiple concussions, on a daily, weekly, monthly basis for years at a time.
7. This leads to very severe problems for their health, both in the short term and in the long term, including permanent and irreparable brain damage in many cases as a result of these of multiple concussions.
8. It means degradation of their bones: brittle bones that become harder to deal with with age and are easier to break again and again are more likely to be fractured.
9. Once they're fractured once, they they tend to fracture more often, and it becomes a war against time until their body breaks down.
10. We think that in this case, the government has a duty to protect citizens from themselves, when people are being misled by the bright lights, calling this a sport, calling this a legitimate activity, and we must ensure that they realize the real harms involved.
11. The second type of damage is relevant to both groups of people, both the participants and the audiences, and this is the psychological damage involved and the message that it sends to people

at large in society.

12. This is an extremely violent type of exercise, and it promotes violence by making it exciting and encouraging both sides to escalate the violence to any means necessary with any means necessary in order to win. Violence becomes good, it becomes fun. It becomes entertainment and something to cheer about.

13. There's an aura of legitimacy for punching someone in the face, and that is something that the government must nip in the bud.

14. It leads to a society that believes that violent abilities make you a better person, more worthy of applause, and that is a very dangerous message to send to people out who are watching.

15. We think it particularly is bad for children, obviously, and as violence becomes more and more of a problem at younger and younger ages, we have to make sure to protect the youngest people of in society.

16. And today when you turn on the television, you can see boxing.

17. You see it in movies and you see it on as a as a sport.

18. You see it even in in as as athletic events and as competitions that are that gives it this aura of legitimacy that makes people think that it is something that they can aspire to, that children go to extracurricular activities to learn this as a sport, and we think that it's extremely dangerous in the way that it encourages violent solutions to problems instead of other less violent and less problematic solutions.

19. We think that that it promotes and encourages people to choose a path that will lead to the degradation of their body.

20. In a world where violence is on the rise from younger and younger ages, it is imperative that the government take a strong stance against violent sports. We realize that there is a problem with the government stepping in and telling citizens what to do or not to do with their own bodies, but we think that this is one of the cases where there is so much fraud involved, where there is a level of misleading people into thinking that this is a sport, into thinking that this is a legitimate activity, and

into thinking that there is positive outcome from it, we think that it is enough that the government has the duty to step in and say, " actually, this is not the case. Actually, we it is so bad for you, that we are willing to ban it in order to make sure that nobody else is misled into thinking that it's a legitimate activity. "

For these reasons, we would propose banning boxing as a sport.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_1

Topic: ban-video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The gaming world and virtual reality are very powerful worlds.
2. They give us a glimpse into another self that we could be.
3. Introverts can be extroverts when they're playing games online.
4. People who feel ugly can create attractive avatars.
5. People who feel angry and have no way to vent in the real world can blow off steam by picking up a video game console and entering a fictional world.
6. The problem is, that for too many of these games that too many of these games are extremely violent and they're being marketed towards children and on this side of the house we propose a ban.
7. We should ban the sale of violent video games to minors.
8. Why?

Children are at very high risk of being influenced because they're not yet fully developed.

9. Their brain patterns, their brain function, and their value systems, their understanding of right and wrong, are not yet fully developed and we think that allowing them to purchase these games and play them distorts the development of their brain function.
10. We think that it distorts their value systems as they grow up.
11. So we're gonna talk about three main things.
12. We're gonna talk about the repetitive exposure that affects their values.
13. We're gonna talk about repetition leading to instinctive reactions, and we're going to talk about the addiction involved in the game.
14. So the repetitive positive exposure that affects their values.
15. When somebody is repeatedly exposed to things like shooting other people, beating them up,

stealing a car, or raping a woman, and in the game these are positive experiences that are rewarded with points, with extra money, with extra whatever it is within the world of the game, with advancement within the game, this kind of repetitive, positive exposure affects the value system of the child.

16. Courts today treat adults and children differently and why is that?

Because the brain of a child is not yet capable of fully comprehending right versus wrong and making these these decisions accordingly.

17. Here we're actively misleading them in creating a situation where their value system is growing in a world where they are positively enforced where they're getting positive enforcement for things that we deem in society to be absolutely immoral violence, sexual violence, theft and the like.

18. So we think that that is the first and perhaps one of the biggest problems that we have with violent video games.

19. The second thing we talk about is the idea of repetition leading to instinctive reactions.

20. So one of the key learning tools that we see in classrooms around the world is the idea of repetition leading to to instinctive answers.

21. So ask anyone who's had to learn the multiplication table, who's had to study music, the more you repeat something the more it becomes second nature to you.

22. Games create this repetition right you have stress levels, you have high anxiety levels when you're turning a corner in these games or when you're approaching a car or a certain situation.

23. Then you have your trigger action, you have your violence, you have your beating somebody up, you have your pulling the trigger, you have you're stealing the car, raping women.

24. This this violent reaction

25. and then you get a reward and you're flooded with a good feeling.

26. We think that this kind of repetition is going to lead to instinctive reactions in real life.

27. We think that when you're in a stressful situation in real life, when you're in an anxious situation in real life you're going to have the same types of reactions.

28. You're going to have that instinct to become more violent and we think the third thing that's very problematic and that follows from this point is the idea of an addiction.

29. Cause when you're addicted to something and that is the nature of this game, where they're luring you in and they give you this positive flood of this positive reaction, the problem is that you're going to be seeking out more and more dangerous things.

30. You're gonna be seeking out the situations where you're going to be able to react with violence and feel that power and feel that positive reaction and that is why we propose we need to ban the sale of violent video games to minors.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_381

Topic: monarchy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. The queen of england has the power to wage war, sign treaties, dissolve parliament, form governments, create lords.
2. The royal family is above the law.
3. In matters as trivial is the queen not needing a passport to travel, or not needing a license to drive a car, to matters far more serious such as the royal family being exempt for freedom of information requests.
4. The system of monarchy is archaic and it's counter to our democratic values and that is why we we should abolish the monarchy.
5. Let's talk about three main issues.
6. First is the dangers of the line of succession and how that threatens democracy. Talk about the high cost of of the monarchy. We're gonna talk about the main question of what's the point of a monarchy? Why should we keep it around?
7. So let's go back to the issue of the dangers of the line of of succession and the threat to democracy that exists.
8. Queen elizabeth is quite a benevolent queen.
9. She pays taxes although she is exempt officially as queen from doing so.
10. She hasn't dissolved parliaments just for giggles.
11. She seems to not unduly try to influence politics.
12. But the nature of a monarchy is that we have no choice in who comes next.
13. We know that there's a line of succession the cannot be tempered with.
14. Charles is next in line and when queen elizabeth dies, no one can change that other than

charles himself by abdicating.

15. What if prince charles is not as benevolent a king and queen elizabeth was a queen?

16. What if he decides to stop paying taxes?

17. What if he decides to interfere more heavily in politics which he can do not only in britain, by the way, but in other countries like australia where he can dissolve parliament in the other countries where he is influence over politics.

18. We think it's dangerous when you have a public figure who has so many powers even if they traditionally don't use them today, they have that power and when you have no when the people have no say in who comes next in line, they have no say in who is the next holder of these powers, we think that is a danger and a threat to democracy.

19. We think that it doubles that threat to democracy when they are exempt from so many laws and they are exempt from very serious things like the freedom of information act.

20. There is no transparency when it comes to the monarchy.

21. There's no transparency in the way they deal with their money, with taxpayer money.

22. There's no transparency in the way that they deal with things and they're above the law and exempt from the law and we think that that is dangerous to our democracy. It's simply incompatible with our way of life today, one that puts the people in charge.

23. Second of all, we have the issue of the high cost of the royal family.

24. There's a huge amount of money being spent on the royal family including salaries to the larger family not just the queen, to staff, official events, security, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera.

25. Reforming the costs is extremely tricky because parliament is dependent on the good will of the royal family of the queen.

26. Asking your boss to cut her own salary, or the salary of her family's, or her staff, or the number of events that she goes to, or her security, is not a particularly easy task for them to do.

27. And there we have the question what's the point of the monarchy today? Yes it's a whimsical tradition but what's really the point?

28. Why should we have a ceremonial head of state who isn't chosen by the people, who doesn't cost hundreds of millions of pounds to upkeep?
29. There is no justification for it.
30. Coupled with the high cost financially and the high cost to our democracy, we simply have to answer the question of what's the point with there is none anymore.
31. There is no point to having a queen or a king who has powers that they're not supposed to be using too much, who hold extreme amounts by huge amounts of power for parliament in the in the united kingdom and yet they're not supposed to use it.
32. We think that there's a big problem when you have this contradiction.
33. We think that there's no point to keeping the monarchy around.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_482

Topic: tobacco

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We have an absurd situation.
2. The EU and the united states spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year subsidizing tobacco cultivation.
3. Tobacco is then used to create cigarettes, a product severely regulated by the government's for safety reasons.
4. They force companies to print health warnings on the boxes of cigarettes.
5. They slap high taxes on it, and they run programs to try and discourage people from using the product, and end up spending hundreds of millions more on health care for the people who do use the product, and that's why we think that we should not subsidize the cultivation of tobacco.
6. First let's talk about the moral obligation that we have to deter citizens from smoking.
7. Well we do agree that banning should be left that banning cigarettes should be left or banning tobacco growth should be left for another debate.
8. We don't think that it's necessary to ban it.
9. What we do think is that at the very least we can all agree that governments should not actively encourage people to smoke and the fact is that when you subsidize the growth of the the cultivation of the of the main ingredient in cigarettes, that is exactly what you are doing.
10. It's sends a very clear message that the tobacco industry is an important industry.
11. It is a beneficial industry. It is an industry that is worth supporting and that other people should support and the only other way to support the tobacco industry is to buy cigarettes.
12. The main product that is being that is that tobacco is used for and we think, ladies and gentlemen, that we would all agree that encouraging people to support the tobacco industry by

buying cigarettes is not something that any government is interested in.

13. Let me ask the more general question of when do we subsidize something and does tobacco fall into the criteria that that is set up.

14. We only subsidized things when it is a product that is so important that the market cannot be trusted to ensure production and fair access to all, meaning we can't trust that the private industry is going to produce enough of it, that the prices might not be fair, or that their production will somehow not be not be of of good enough quality for people to enjoy.

15. How silly is it to think that this is the case here.

16. How silly is it to think that tobacco is something where the government should step in to make sure that there's fair access to all, to make sure that the prices aren't too high, to make sure that there is a good enough quality tobacco for everyone to enjoy.

17. Subsidies must be limited only to the most essential goods and to make sure that people have access to things like clean water, fruits and vegetables, that type of thing is the only place where governments should even consider subsidizing something subsidizing a product.

18. So what we think, ladies and gentleman, is that the government has a moral obligation to deter citizens from smoking and to do that they have to stop the subsidization of the tobacco industry. We think that in in purely economical sense it makes it there's no reason to subsidize the tobacco industry. We don't think that it makes sense. It's not an essential good. It is not something where the government should be interfering in the free market. We think that there is no good reason for the government to spend our hard earned money, our tax dollars, on subsidizing a dangerous plant that is used in the production of a deadly product that kills hundreds of thousands of people every year and for these reasons, we absolutely should not subsidize the cultivation of tobacco.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_701

Topic: endangered-species

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Endangered species are plants or animals at risk of going extinct.
2. Sometimes the cause is unrelated to man but often hunting, land development, and human changes to local environments are the causes of the impending extinction.
3. That is why we should protect endangered species.
4. Let me talk first about the moral obligation that we have to the animal and plant world.
5. Both because we are a moral people and because we have a moral obligation as the perpetrators of the crime in most cases, we are obligated to conserve these species.
6. Let's remember that we are capable of helping.
7. There are ways that we can protect endangered species, be they plants, be they animals.
8. We have lots of different ways, including limiting certain land development in certain areas, protecting species by bringing them in in guarded environments and then releasing them back into the wild, limiting hunting, things like that.
9. And we are a moral people as a whole.
10. We created morality and we have an obligation to ourselves to be good people and to help others when we are able, and that does include other species - those who we use when we need to, but we should be benevolent in cases where we can be.
11. Moreover since we are the cause of most of the damage to the plants and animals, and they are now largely dependent on us in terms of maintaining the environment, we have an obligation to them in that sense.
12. In the sense that we've created dependency on humans and we now need to take care of them.
13. But let's be honest, because morality is important but we are very selfish people.

14. And we need to look at our interests as well.

15. And is it in our interest?

16. It absolutely is in our interest to to preserve endangered species.

17. First of all, because the loss of animals and plants means a loss of medicines.

18. Whether it's a unique compound found in a plant or the venom mused from arachnids and sneaks to cure certain diseases, or or the organs that are similar similar enough to humans to be used in research.

19. So much of our health and so much of the research into health areas is dependent on a thriving ecosystem.

20. We think it's vastly important, when we wanna when we wanna keep inventing drugs and finding new drugs and being able to produce drugs and being able to cure diseases, it is it is of vital importance that we keep every single species that we possibly can in order to investigate them.

21. Because the answers are generally found in plants and animals.

22. That's where we get our healing powers from.

23. And then we have to say what is the ecological value, right?

24. Or in the sing song words of disney - the circle of life. Because it's easy to think about the the loss of animals and plants as and dismiss it and say: " it's just one plant. Who cares? Or it's three plants.

25. Who cares?

26. "

But it's not.

27. Because when you lose one plant or when you lose one animal, it creates a chain reaction that affects the rest of the environment.

28. It creates a chain reaction that could lead to the extinction of three or four or five more species in that area that are dependent on that specific animal, or bug, or plant that they were eating in in order to survive.

29. And so when you have these kinds of of links, this chain reaction that you that can be set off when one animal or one plant goes extinct, we think we have an even greater interest in ensuring that there is as little damage as possible to these animals and that nothing goes extinct.

30. That we preserve every species that we possibly can.

31. It is in our own best interest and it is our moral obligation to protect endangered species ladies and gentlemen. And so we must invest in this. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_841

Topic: blasphemy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Freedom of religion and freedom from religion are too important flip sides of the same coin.
2. We need to respect both and strike a balance between them.
3. While in the past blasphemy laws may have been used as an overzealous tool by religious leaders, today there is real concern on the part of religious people, strict adherence to organized religion, in democratic countries.
4. They feel discriminated against, marginalized and threatened.
5. That is why we should criminalize blasphemy.
6. Make it illegal to preach or publicly speak in an insulting and derogatory way about organized religion or god.
7. Let's talk about hate speech because that's essentially what we have here.
8. Even when it is not directly inciting to violence, hate speech laws exist in many places around the world.
9. Why?
10. Because linking offensive speech or negative attributes with certain groups through language changes the way we see this group and can far too easily, and often does lead to violence, which of course is something that cannot be tolerated in any democratic society.
11. What blasphemy does is link people who adhere to organized religion into one group that can be ridiculed, looked down upon and treated as less than.
12. Hate speech is dangerous, and often a thinly veiled attempt at incitement to violence.
13. While blasphemy is often directed at god, the context is almost always linked with those who adhere strictly to religions, and they are the ones who feel threatened by this speech and truly feel

that there is a threat upon them.

14. And that is the next point that we need to discuss.

15. The question of how do we determine when speech is offensive to the extent that we need to take action, to the extent that it is hate speech?

16. We think, ladies and gentleman, that it's not enough to just be it's not enough to only look at the speech that is being said, the words that are being spoken, but the way they make the people who hear them feel.

17. And we think that when groups feel threatened to the extent that they feel that they are in true physical danger, we think that that is when we need to take action.

18. We think that in today's society, particularly in the days of where where so many groups are turning against each other in the united states, where we see so much strife, where we see so many political groups turning against each other, when we see so many minorities being treated badly, we think we need to take special care to look to these minorities and and talk to them and realize what affects them.

19. We think, ladies and gentleman, that if you look towards organized religion, if you look towards religious groups and you ask them whether or not they feel threatened, they do.

20. They feel threatened by groups that discuss religion in a cavalier way, in a way that that that is insulting, in a way that that is derogatory.

21. We think that they feel threatened by that because they're not sure what's gonna happen next.

22. Because we live in a time where it can very easily lead to violence.

23. And so in the question of freedom of speech versus protection of citizens, we say in the same way that we wouldn't allow hate speech against african americans or native americans, rather minority groups, we must recognize organized religion as a group that is being targeted with hate speech disguised as blasphemy. And for this reason we must we must make blasphemy, we must outlaw blasphemy and criminalize it. Thank you very much.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: HE_881

Topic: holocaust-denial

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Six million jews were burned, shot, beaten and starved to death during the holocaust.
2. That number doesn't even take into account the number of homosexuals, roma, communists and mentally handicapped people subjected to the same fates.
3. Holocaust denial is a growing trend that asserts that the holocaust is a jewish conspiracy manufactured to justify the creation of the state of israel or to to extract restitution funds from germany. Deniers will often try to focus on one specific fact about the holocaust and try to disprove or minimize it, and feel the by doing so they've proven the whole thing to be a myth. We believe that this kind of speech is hateful and and, it is hateful and therefore and dangerous and therefore holocaust denial should be a criminal offense. First of all, we think that this is direct incitement to violence. Anyone listening to a holocaust denier is hearing a message loud and clear: the jews are lying.
4. The jews are perpetrating a massive conspiracy.
5. The jews are stealing money from germany in the form of reparations for something that never happened.
6. And if jews do all those things, they are dangerous.
7. The conclusion is forgone.
8. There is no other take away other than to think that we are that we need to get revenge on the jews, protect ourselves against the jews.
9. Violence against jewish people is absolutely imminent after speeches such as these.
10. This is exactly the definition of hate speech.
11. It is speech that is targeting a specific group and opens the door to violence against them.

12. Second of all we think that there is a huge danger of proliferation.
13. There is absolutely no question that the holocaust happened.
14. There is no question.
15. It is of the utmost importance that we never forget what happened and what true evil looks like.
16. Because if we forget what it looks like, if we forget how we got to a place where entire countries were willing to turn over their jewish communities and their homosexuals and their roma and allow them to be driven, taken away to death camps and burned in ovens, we think that we are doomed to repeat ourselves if we forget that.
17. So the fear is that too many of these holocaust deniers have an aura of academia.
18. They they present their work work as fact. And in some cases they are mistaken by people who are not aware enough, who don't know how to how to distinguish between fact and fiction, who don't realize that these people are not experts in their field and have an agenda. They are being tricked. There's a fraud being perpetrated against the public by these people.
19. Today, especially with the internet, these holocaust deniers can reach wide audiences.
20. There's a dangerous spread of misinformation going on, that would change the course of that would change history and allow us to forget what was done, or worse or alongside blaming the jewish people for conspiracy and allow this to happen again out of fear from the jews.
21. We think that generally speaking we let people say what they want.
22. We let stupid people say what they want, we let wrong people say what they want.
23. But when it comes to dangerous speech, when it comes to a dangerous group of people saying a dangerous statement over and over again, trying to persuade people that there's a group of people perpetrating fraud that is not being that never been perpetrated.
24. We think that when there is a danger to a specific group, ad in this case the jewish people, when there's a danger to the course of history, when people are trying to change what happened, we think, ladies and gentlemen, that we have to stop that speech and that is why we must criminalize holocaust denial.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. They they present their work work as fact. And in some cases they are mistaken by people who are not aware enough, who don't know how to how to distinguish between fact and fiction, who don't realize that these people are not experts in their field and have an agenda. They are being tricked. There's a fraud being perpetrated against the public by these people. Today, especially with the internet, these holocaust deniers can reach wide audiences.

2. And in some cases they are mistaken by people who are not aware enough, who don't know how to how to distinguish between fact and fiction, who don't realize that these people are not experts in their field and have an agenda. They are being tricked. There's a fraud being perpetrated against the public by these people. Today, especially with the internet, these holocaust deniers can reach wide audiences. There's a dangerous spread of misinformation going on, that would change the course of that would change history and allow us to forget what was done, or worse or alongside blaming the jewish people for conspiracy and allow this to happen again out of fear from the jews.

Debate ID: JL_101

Topic: affirmativeaction

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should support affirmative action. By this we mean to say, preferable status for disprivileged people in selection processes for education, government, and similar sectors.
2. I'm going to advance two lines of argumentation for affirmative action this evening.
3. The first is about why we think this is principally just.
4. To begin, we think that there is a duty to correct for past wrongs.
5. Recognize that, oftentimes, groups who are disprivileged are in this situation because of past wrongs committed by majority groups.
6. For instance, consider the status of first nations people people in canada who have historically been denied access to opportunities, forced to live in disadvantageous areas, etcetera.
7. These people, through no fault of their own, therefore were born into disadvantageous circumstances and were unable to access the same privileges and advantages as white canadians.
8. We think therefore that there is a duty to correct for this past wrong since it is the responsibility of a government and a people who still exist in canada today.
9. The next principled argument that we'd like to advance is that it is just to allocate based on need.
10. In other words, we think that it's very likely that government and other agencies discriminate against first nations people and other disprivileged people without realizing that they do so, creating more of a need for protection among these groups.
11. Therefore, we think we ought allocate representation to these groups because they have more need for protection from the types of institutions where we would see this sort of preferential status for these disprivileged people.
12. The last argument that I'd like to advance under this principled argument is why we think that

all-male or all-white groups are unfair for future people.

13. In other words, we think that they create an environment where bias is normal.

14. Consider that for hundreds of years universities were all male, and at that time nobody thought that it was unusual that these universities were all male or that women ought be included.

15. We think that it is very possible that when an entire organization is made up of privileged people that it seems entirely natural that this organization be made up of privileged people.

16. There's no one present, after all, to challenge the narrative that these people deserve to be the only ones involved.

17. We think that when you begin to see, for instance, women involved in universities, that people realize that this isn't the case and ought not be the case and that unfairness is exposed for what it is.

18. This happens better if we have affirmative action because it is easier to include minority groups or women in these institutions.

19. Therefore, we think that future biases will be better realized.

20. Why is this such an important thing?

21. If you care about the rights of future people who are disprivileged right now, or children who are going to be born in the future, we think that they probably have a right to grow up in a world where they have access to equal opportunity, and that in order to create such a world, we may need to take steps now to equalize past inequalities and to make right past wrongs.

22. So with those points in mind, I'd like to talk a little bit about pragmatic reasons for affirmative action.

23. Broadly speaking, we think that minority representation is a good thing in groups like congress or universities.

24. In order to reach this type of minority representation, we first need a tipping point of people who were involved in these groups this is true for a couple of reasons.

25. One, we think that once these minority groups are represented in congress, it's likely that there will be future representation.

26. Members of a group, once they have experience in how to be a participant in these systems, will be more able to help other people in their communities to participate and ultimately increase representation in that way.

27. And two, we think that the situation will be normalized for these minorities are represented, there'll be less resentment towards them, and society will be more tolerant of their participation in things like government and higher education.

28. So in other words, the only way to ever access minority representation is to have affirmative action in the status quo.

29. This is the least restrictive means that we can impose since essentially what we're telling universities and government is that they need to include people, not which individuals to include.

30. Therefore, we think that this is a good metric to use since it helps broad groups rather than individuals.

31. We don't think that this falls vulnerable to the types of corruption or other complaints that some people may have against including particular individuals since it affects broad groups.

32. The next thing I'd like to talk about here is the outcomes for disadvantaged groups and why they're better if they have more representation in colleges and government.

33. So recognize, first of all, that people can better advocate for themselves if they have access to things like government and universities.

34. But on top of that, that the need for affirmative action is reduced in the future if we have institute this policy.

35. In other words, if people are allowed to access things like higher education, like positions in government, they will be better able to advocate for themselves and to achieve equality in society and for these reasons, not need affirmative action in the future.

36. In other words, the quality of life will be higher for people who are part of these groups if we have affirmative action now.

37. The last thing I'd like to talk about is a brief response to people who might think that affirmative

action is inherently unfair.

38. I'd like to ask that these people consider the invisible structural biases that disprivileged people face every day.

39. It's easy for say, a white american or a white canadian, to be ignorant of the structural biases that face indigenous people because we aren't confronted with them every day.

40. Even if we see them on CNN occasionally, they don't affect our day-to-day decision-making the way they would for an indigenous person.

41. We think that since there's no way to force majority groups to confront these problems directly, the best way we can correct for this is to allow indigenous people to advocate for themselves.

42. And if you want to see less affirmative action, instituting affirmative action in the status quo will create more equality, which will lead to less demand for affirmative action in the future.

43. So if you think affirmative action is principally unjust, you tolerate it now so that there is less need for it in the future.

44. For all of these reasons, I'm proud to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. Consider that for hundreds of years universities were all male, and at that time nobody thought that it was unusual that these universities were all male or that women ought be included. We think that it is very possible that when an entire organization is made up of privileged people that it seems entirely natural that this organization be made up of privileged people. There's no one present, after all, to challenge the narrative that these people deserve to be the only ones involved. We think that when you begin to see, for instance, women involved in universities, that people realize that this isn't the case and ought not be the case and that unfairness is exposed for what it is. This happens better if we have affirmative action because it is easier to include minority groups or women in these institutions.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: JL_121

Topic: ban-boxing

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should ban boxing. So by this we mean olympic boxing should no longer be an olympic sport.
2. We think that amateur boxing clubs should be closed down by local governments, and we think that pro boxing in the US and in other countries should be stopped.
3. We're going to present two broad lines of argument about this.
4. The first is why we think that governments uniquely need to step in to end boxing, and the other is why we think it would be a better world if boxing were banned.
5. So in terms of the duties of governments, we think that while by and large, states should let people live as free a life as they can, sometimes paternalism is necessary.
6. So we think that there are two cases when that's especially true.
7. So when there is unequal access to information, we think that the government needs to intervene to help people who have access to less information.
8. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is.
9. They probably don't know that over a thousand people have died in recent years due to boxing.
10. We tell you that at that point, it's clear that the government, which has perfect access to information compared to ordinary people, needs to step in.
11. We'd also like to point out that many people who get involved in boxing probably come from more low income backgrounds, where they have less access to education and are less aware of the risks and might easily be lured into the sport because of the promise of prize money and fame and other things that people would seek out.
12. We tell you that at the point where people don't have the ability to make a rational decision

because they don't have enough information to weigh the pros against the cons, we tell you that the government clearly needs to step in to protect people from themselves.

13. But we also tell you that the government should intervene when there are third party harms to someone's actions, and we think that boxing has several.

14. So first of all, we tell you that boxing creates harmful norms in communities.

15. We tell you that boxing creates the idea that fighting is something to be glorified, that we should be paying people to engage in fights and other harmful behavior.

16. We think that at that point, and I'll talk more about that in a minute, we think at that point that the government needs to get involved, to step in to prevent this behavior which is harmful to other people.

17. Any behavior which encourages someone to be antisocial, which encourages violent behavior, we think ultimately the state has a clear interest in regulating and preventing that for the good of everyone who might be a victim of that violence or who might be harmed by that behavior.

18. And we're going to say that boxing is fundamentally different than other sports.

19. It might be true that rugby or american football lead to some people being injured, but the purpose of those sports is not to injure your opponent whereas in boxing, necessarily you're trying to harm your opponent.

20. Even in wrestling, it's possible to have a very successful wrestling match where no one is hurt in any way because you'll play holds, and that someone taps out.

21. In boxing, the only way to win is to hit your opponent, and knockouts are usually the way that you seek to win.

22. So at that point, we tell you this is extremely dangerous, you know, obviously losing consciousness is bad for you, but also fundamentally different from any other type of sport. So we think the state can intervene here without damaging sport as a whole. Our second point is what we think the world would be like in a world where boxing were banned. We think it would be better on several levels. First of all, we think that boxing feeds into a toxic culture of violence.

23. I'd like to point out that floyd mayweather, one of the most popular boxers in the world right now, is also a terrible human being by almost any metric.

24. He beat his girlfriend and did all these other really terrible things.

25. Now, when athletes in other sports do this, they're normally censored.

26. You see people like michael vick become public enemies for mistreating animals, etcetera.

27. But floyd mayweather has remained very popular, and I think in large part that's due to the culture that boxing creates.

28. Necessarily, when you set up a sport where in order to be successful, you need to be violent and aggressive, it seems that you create a culture where violence and aggressiveness are rewarded.

29. So we think that people like floyd mayweather, who we don't really want to have in society, are being enabled and encouraged even produced by the culture that surrounds boxing.

30. So we think that stepping in to end boxing would ultimately reduce that violent culture and lead to less celebration of this behavior, and not normalize young people to the idea that that type of behavior is okay.

31. Because we think that by tolerating boxing now, you ultimately tell young people that this type of behavior is acceptable and therefore, ensure that it'll be perpetuated in the future.

32. But I'd also like to point out that we wouldn't tolerate the idea of boxing anywhere else in society.

33. So, in general, fighting is illegal between two adults.

34. If you get into a fight in public, the police will break it up in most countries.

35. If you get into a fight in private, it's expected that other people will intervene.

36. We don't see why it's consistent to allow people to agree to fight in a tiny boxing ring as opposed to anywhere else in society.

37. We think that at the point where fighting is seen as something that is inherently wrong, we need to be principally consistent and not pay people millions of dollars for fighting when we wouldn't let that do them let them do that anywhere else.

38. Most other sports promote admirable behavior, like teamwork and engaging in it with a team to achieve a common goal, and sportsmanship, and all of these other behaviors that we just don't see in boxing.

39. What we do see is the promotion of behavior that wouldn't be accepted in any other sphere.

40. So for these reasons, we think it's clear that we should ban boxing and that governments have a duty to ban boxing. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. So in terms of the duties of governments, we think that while by and large, states should let people live as free a life as they can, sometimes paternalism is necessary. So we think that there are two cases when that's especially true. So when there is unequal access to information, we think that the government needs to intervene to help people who have access to less information. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is. They probably don't know that over a thousand people have died in recent years due to boxing.

2. So we think that there are two cases when that's especially true. So when there is unequal access to information, we think that the government needs to intervene to help people who have access to less information. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is. They probably don't know that over a thousand people have died in recent years due to boxing. We tell you that at that point, it's clear that the government, which has perfect access to information compared to ordinary people, needs to step in.

3. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is. They probably don't know that over a thousand people have died in recent years due to boxing. We tell you that at that point, it's clear that the government, which has perfect access to information compared to ordinary people, needs to step in. We'd also like to point out that

many people who get involved in boxing probably come from more low income backgrounds, where they have less access to education and are less aware of the risks and might easily be lured into the sport because of the promise of prize money and fame and other things that people would seek out. We tell you that at the point where people don't have the ability to make a rational decision because they don't have enough information to weigh the pros against the cons, we tell you that the government clearly needs to step in to protect people from themselves.

4. The first is why we think that governments uniquely need to step in to end boxing, and the other is why we think it would be a better world if boxing were banned. So in terms of the duties of governments, we think that while by and large, states should let people live as free a life as they can, sometimes paternalism is necessary. So we think that there are two cases when that's especially true. So when there is unequal access to information, we think that the government needs to intervene to help people who have access to less information. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is.

5. So when there is unequal access to information, we think that the government needs to intervene to help people who have access to less information. We think that, in particular, young people who are getting involved in boxing probably don't realize how risky the sport is. They probably don't know that over a thousand people have died in recent years due to boxing. We tell you that at that point, it's clear that the government, which has perfect access to information compared to ordinary people, needs to step in. We'd also like to point out that many people who get involved in boxing probably come from more low income backgrounds, where they have less access to education and are less aware of the risks and might easily be lured into the sport because of the promise of prize money and fame and other things that people would seek out.

Debate ID: JL_181

Topic: multiculturalism

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should embrace multiculturalism.
2. By this we mean that, in principle, it is better for people who have moved to a new country to retain part of their traditional culture, rather than to fully integrate.
3. So by this we mean for people to continue to use their native language, prepare their native food, practice their native religion, rather than adopting the language and customs of their new home entirely, at the expense of their old customs and traditions.
4. So we're going to present you with two lines of argumentation.
5. The first is about socialization and why we think it's broadly a good thing.
6. Our first claim is that diverse cosmopolitan communities are, broadly speaking, more tolerant.
7. We think that when people live around people who are different from themselves, when they're forced to empathize with other people, when they have to engage with people across a language barrier, when they have to respect other people's religions because they live along side them and they see these people every day, that ultimately that's going to lead to less bigotry.
8. Now it's probably true that there's going to be a transition period as an area becomes more multicultural, when you're going to have some backlash, and we think that's unavoidable.
9. But we think that, in the long term, what you're going to see is that people who grow up in this area now will be more accepting of those who are different from themselves.
10. We tell you that people who grow up in an area where everyone is like them, looks like them, talks like them, thinks like them, simply experience fewer challenges to their world view, which makes it more difficult for them to understand potential shortcomings to their world view and their traditional opinions.

11. So we think that ultimately, multiculturalism is better for everyone and will lead to less bigotry.
12. But aside from that, we tell you that people are going to be more willing to tolerate new immigrants if recent immigrants to their country maintain some of their original customs.
13. So recognize that when you arrive in a new country, you probably speak a little bit of the language, but you don't know as much about it as someone who was born there.
14. We think it's really helpful for people moving to a new country to be able to access a community that has some things in common with their home country and some things in common with the new country.
15. A good example of this would be chinatowns in any major western city.
16. So, when a lot of people move to a new country from china, they move into an area where there's a lot of chinese people, and this community can help them to learn the language because there's a lot of people who speak whatever chinese dialect these people speak.
17. They can help them to get jobs so that they can start supporting themselves right away in their new country.
18. They can help them get support during the really difficult and trying experience of moving to a new place, and we think that all of those are really valuable.
19. So we think that ultimately, you're going to have immigration on either side of this debate, but on our side life is much easier for new immigrants.
20. The other side might try to get up here and say that people won't learn the new language of their country and won't bother to integrate at all if you have this multiculturalism, but we tell you that this simply isn't true.
21. People move to a new country because they want economic opportunity, and obviously that's going to be linked to learning the new language and learning about their new country.
22. And even if they continue to use their traditional language at home, we just don't see why that's a problem.
23. It's not like just because someone lives in britain, they have to speak english in their house.

24. We just don't see why that's necessarily something that's required for people to be productive members of british society or in any other western country for that matter.
25. But on top of this, we think that this is uniquely better for the children of immigrants.
26. So we tell you that being a first-generation english person or a first-generation american is a really difficult experience for a lot of people.
27. Many people feel like they're not really part of their home community, and they're not really part of their new community.
28. So, for instance, like pakistani people who have moved to britain, many of their children feel like they're not really pakistani or not really british.
29. So, first of all, we tell you this probably isn't true.
30. But we tell you that it's really beneficial for these people to have a sense of identity that isn't inherently linked to participating in just british culture or just pakistani culture.
31. Having something that represents their own experience, which is a melting pot of both cultures, we think is really valuable, and that it's important for society to celebrate that because it's no less valid than anyone else's experience.
32. We think that this is a group of people who disproportionately contribute to society.
33. A lot of the children of immigrants go on to be much more successful, on average, than the children of people who were originally from that country.
34. So we tell you that we need to celebrate their experience and facilitate their ability to go on and participate more highly in society and self-actualize.
35. But we also tell you that cultural heritage is a right.
36. People shouldn't have to give up their traditional cultural heritage just because they have to move to a new country.
37. In particular, we tell you that many people have to leave their home country because of things that are completely out of their control.
38. So, india is a much poorer country than britain, for instance, and many people can't find

employment in india so they move to britain.

39. We tell you, though, that it's not entirely the fault of people living in india that their country is so poor, that perhaps the fact that they've been mistreated historically by the british and by western countries means that the country never had an equal opportunity to be successful.

40. At that point, we think that it's entirely just for people to move to a wealthier country, even if the circumstances are out of their control.

41. We don't think that people should be punished, therefore, for something that isn't in their control.

42. We don't think that people should be punished by being forced not to experience the cultural heritage they would have had if they would have remained in their own country.

43. In particular, we don't think it's mutually exclusive to enjoy the cultural heritage of your home country and the cultural heritage of a new country.

44. We think that, if anything, the fusion of these two can be really productive and create really unique experiences that are good for everyone.

45. Our last point here is that we think bilingualism is just preferable to being monolingual.

46. Bilingual people tend to have higher IQs, think more quickly and do better in school than monolingual people. And most bilingual people in countries like the US or britain are the children of immigrants, and they speak the language of their parents. So we tell you that at that point, clearly there is a demonstrable advantage to their parents maintaining part of their original culture in the form of language. So for all these reasons, we think that we should embrace multiculturalism. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

1. They can help them get support during the really difficult and trying experience of moving to a new place, and we think that all of those are really valuable. So we think that ultimately, you're going to have immigration on either side of this debate, but on our side life is much easier for new immigrants. The other side might try to get up here and say that people won't learn the new language of their country and won't bother to integrate at all if you have this multiculturalism, but we

tell you that this simply isn't true. People move to a new country because they want economic opportunity, and obviously that's going to be linked to learning the new language and learning about their new country. And even if they continue to use their traditional language at home, we just don't see why that's a problem.

Evidence Used:

1. We don't think that people should be punished, therefore, for something that isn't in their control. We don't think that people should be punished by being forced not to experience the cultural heritage they would have had if they would have remained in their own country. In particular, we don't think it's mutually exclusive to enjoy the cultural heritage of your home country and the cultural heritage of a new country. We think that, if anything, the fusion of these two can be really productive and create really unique experiences that are good for everyone. Our last point here is that we think bilingualism is just preferable to being monolingual.

2. We don't think that people should be punished by being forced not to experience the cultural heritage they would have had if they would have remained in their own country. In particular, we don't think it's mutually exclusive to enjoy the cultural heritage of your home country and the cultural heritage of a new country. We think that, if anything, the fusion of these two can be really productive and create really unique experiences that are good for everyone. Our last point here is that we think bilingualism is just preferable to being monolingual. Bilingual people tend to have higher IQs, think more quickly and do better in school than monolingual people.

3. In particular, we don't think it's mutually exclusive to enjoy the cultural heritage of your home country and the cultural heritage of a new country. We think that, if anything, the fusion of these two can be really productive and create really unique experiences that are good for everyone. Our last point here is that we think bilingualism is just preferable to being monolingual. Bilingual people tend to have higher IQs, think more quickly and do better in school than monolingual people. And most bilingual people in countries like the US or Britain are the children of immigrants, and they speak the language of their parents.

4. At that point, we think that it's entirely just for people to move to a wealthier country, even if the circumstances are out of their control. We don't think that people should be punished, therefore, for something that isn't in their control. We don't think that people should be punished by being forced not to experience the cultural heritage they would have had if they would have remained in their own country. In particular, we don't think it's mutually exclusive to enjoy the cultural heritage of your home country and the cultural heritage of a new country. We think that, if anything, the fusion of these two can be really productive and create really unique experiences that are good for everyone.

Debate ID: JL_21

Topic: one-child

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We support the one-child policy of the people's republic of china.
2. So by this we mean that we should restore the policy to stricter enforcement and that it should have stronger deterrents.
3. So the one-child policy basically says that people who live in most of china's provinces, especially han chinese people ethnically, are only allowed to have one child per family or else, they face fines that are graded by income.
4. So on our side, we want to restore this policy because it's recently been weakened by the communist party, and we also think that there should be higher fines and more deterrence for families that violate the policy.
5. So our first argument, we have three, is about why this is better for children.
6. So recognize that people in china have relatively small incomes compared to people in the US or britain or other western countries, and your share of the pie is even smaller if it's subdivided more.
7. So basically, incomes in china are growing, but if you keep dividing up people's resources between two, three, four children, then each child is actually receiving a relatively small investment and this is bad for a few reasons.
8. With the one-child policy, we can access more education, parents can easily afford to send one child to university or to high school when they couldn't afford to send two or three children.
9. We tell you, therefore, that you're more likely to get educated people.
10. We also tell you that more jobs are likely to be be available.
11. Just because your family has two or three children, doesn't mean that the economy is able to create two or three jobs.

12. So we tell you that, ultimately, it's more likely that these children will have access to good, high-paying jobs that'll give them good quality of life on our side.
13. We also tell you that they're likely to be healthier because more money can be invested in their health and their well-being.
14. They're more likely to see a doctor and things like that.
15. And so we tell you, overall, that these children will have a higher quality of life with the one-child policy than they would otherwise and that that, in and of itself, is enough reason for the chinese to strengthen this policy.
16. Our next argument is that this will be better for the chinese economy.
17. So china doesn't have a problem with manpower. They already have the largest population.
18. What they need are educated workers.
19. Basically, more middle-class workers is better than more rural low-income workers.
20. So right now, the one-child policy creates a situation where even a low-income rural family can now afford to send their one child to high school so that they can get a better job and become middle class.
21. Ultimately, we tell you that this is better for the economy because those people can then go on to work in more productive jobs, and not just work in a factory or work on a farm, and that this is the future of chinese growth.
22. China is already an industrial and agricultural superpower.
23. What they need to do now is grow in the service sector and grow in high tech and other sectors that right now are dominated by the US and western countries.
24. We tell you that they can do that better with the one-child policy.
25. And we also tell you that china's historical overpopulation strains their economy.
26. Basically if you have too many people, then when food and other goods become more expensive, everyone is strained because things are stretched more thinly, there's more demand for goods, so ultimately they're going to be more expensive in times of need.

27. Now, thankfully right now, we haven't seen those times of need in china but should they arise in the future, it would be much worse with overpopulation than without overpopulation.
28. So for these reasons, because it's better for the chinese economy, we should support the one-child or one-child policy.
29. Our last argument is about broader stability in china.
30. So the biggest problem that a country can have, broadly speaking, or one of them at least, is lots of young men without jobs.
31. If you look in chinese history, one reason why there was so much turmoil in the nineteen sixties was that there were lots of young people who didn't have jobs, who didn't have a lot of opportunity because of overpopulation, who were willing to go and become red guards and do all the terrible things that happen during the cultural revolution, because they had no other opportunity.
32. To look a little closer to the present, the arab spring and all the violence that's happened in syria and elsewhere in the middle east has largely been driven by the presence of lots of young men without economic opportunity.
33. Basically, a militant is an unemployed young man with a gun in his hands.
34. On our side, when there are there's less of this surplus of young people, we tell you that there's less likely to be this kind of violence, because young people who have jobs and education are more likely to be happy, more likely to be content, less likely to have time to be radical and ultimately, are less of a threat to society.
35. But we also tell you that a strong economy leads to more trade, which leads to less conflict.
36. So think about china and japan. Historically, they're enemies. There were lots of wars between them in the early twentieth century. One reason why it's very difficult to imagine a large-scale war between china and japan now is that was they trade so much.
37. China is japan's largest trade partner, and japan is china's second-largest trade partner.
38. They need each other more right now.
39. As long as japan and china both have strong economies and trade continues, there will never be

conflict, and the same holds true for china and the US, china and russia, china and india.

40. China is ultimately less likely to have international conflict if their economy grows and they have more trade which, as I've already told you, is more likely to happen with the one-child policy than without it.

41. The other thing I'd like to point out is I'm sure the other team is going to say that this is bad for elderly people because there's fewer young people to take care of them.

42. But if the economy grows, that's good for everyone, because pensions grow.

43. Recognize that everyone in china has a government pension managed by the communist party and by the government and ultimately, if the economy is growing, then pensions are going to grow because they're invested in the economy, and this will lead to more security for everyone.

44. It's the same basic scheme as social security in america where if the economy grows, social security does better.

45. So for all these reasons, because it's better for children, because it's better for the economy, and because it creates more peace and stability in china, we support the one-child policy.

46. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: JL_381

Topic: monarchy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should abolish the monarchy.
2. By a monarchy, we mean a government with authority vested in a single figure, such as a king or queen.
3. And when we debate about this motion, we mean both absolute and constitutional monarchies, that is to say, countries like saudi arabia where the king exercises actual power and countries like britain, where the queen is largely a figurehead.
4. That said, we have four arguments.
5. The first is about structures of inequality.
6. We think that if all people are created equal, then there cannot possibly be monarchs.
7. Recognize that monarchs are necessarily set above other people at the point where they have sovereign power invested in their person, rather than invested in a state.
8. We tell you that this is inconsistent with the UN declaration of human rights which states that all people are created equal or are deserving of equal rights, and that certainly, this is incompatible with the notion that some people have sovereign privilege comparable to that of a state.
9. This is also one of the principles underlying liberalism, the idea that people have equal rights and equal worth.
10. We tell you that at the point where states that are not liberal are often pressured by the international community to become liberal, and at the point where many countries with monarchies, such as denmark or the united kingdom, are, in fact, liberal, this is inconsistent with those principles or the principles that most people would prefer that they adopt.
11. The last idea here is that if everyone is of equal moral worth, as many philosophers believe and

as many people believe, many religious traditions teach us, that all people must be equal.

12. And fundamentally, the idea of having a monarch who is invested with sovereign power and deserving of more privilege than everyone else seems to imply that they're of more moral worth than other people.

13. At that point, we ought abolish monarchy to ensure that all people are in fact treated and seen as equals.

14. The second argument is about religious tolerance.

15. Often monarchs are seen to rule by divine right. This excludes people from other religious traditions than the one that enshrines the monarch.

16. Oftentimes this isn't a religious tradition which is a majority in the country, or it excludes religious traditions that have become common in a country since the time when the monarchy was first formed.

17. This normalizes preferential treatment for a state or other religion.

18. We tell you that we think that this is unfortunate since all people are seen to have equal right to practice their religion, and many people would feel as though they didn't have that right at the point where they had a monarch who was seen as as legitimized through a certain religious tradition and celebrated by the state.

19. But even if this religion isn't oppressive now, it is a symbol past oppression that shouldn't be celebrated.

20. Recognize that while anglicans are not committing atrocities against catholics any longer, it is still the case that the monarchy committed horrible atrocities against catholics in the past and that celebrating the monarchy is celebrating the institution that did terrible things to people during the colonial period in ireland, and we don't think that something worthy of celebration.

21. We think, if anything, it excludes people who are descended from the victims of those atrocities.

22. But in some cases, even today, this is explicit bias as in a country like abu dhabi, where the emir is explicitly a muslim ruler, we tell you that this delegitimizes the idea that abu dhabi is a pluralistic,

multicultural society, and that being such a society would, broadly speaking, be advantageous for any country.

23. At the point where it lets you attract more people who are like expats, people with lots of skills to offer your country, these people all feel alienated if they don't participate in your religion.

24. The third argument that we'd like to advance is about the receipt of public funds.

25. Recognize that in many countries, like Britain, taxpayers fund palaces and there is a huge opportunity cost to this. Money that goes towards funding Buckingham Palace and other residences of the royal family, many of which are not open to the public, could be spent on other things, such as national health and education. We tell you that there is no world in which an extremely wealthy private individual deserves to receive state funds more than needy people.

26. We tell you that at that point, it is a misallocation of funds to have a monarchy.

27. But on top of that, things like protection and official travel are all extremely expensive for the public and offer no service in return.

28. Perhaps having the queen travel to the United States offers some diplomatic service, but there's no reason to assume that the queen wouldn't continue to offer the service if the monarchy were abolished and she were merely an influential private figure.

29. In addition, states often have non-monarchs as the head of government or head of state.

30. We don't see why that person couldn't fill similar functions at a much lower cost, while providing other services as well, such as the prime minister in the United Kingdom.

31. The last argument that I'd like to advance is about perceptions or the optics of having a monarchy.

32. First what we tell you that this can cause your country to appear backwards.

33. Maybe this isn't a consideration as much for Britain and similar countries, but for developing countries that have a monarchy, such as perhaps Malaysia, it does appear as though these countries are not as far down some sort of hypothetical arc of development as republics.

34. We don't think that this is necessarily fair, but we think that that perception exists in the minds of

many business people or leaders of other countries and might harm your country in international dealings.

35. We also think that you're likely to build resentment among republicans and other people in your country who are opposed to the monarchy and that this is likely to cause political disagreement over an issue that ultimately should not be dividing people in your country when it has very little practical benefit.

36. We also tell you about foreign entanglement.

37. At the point where many monarchs are marrying monarchs of other countries or have family in other countries who are also extremely influential citizens, we tell you that this is likely to cause political difficulties when there is some disagreement between your countries and you have monarchs who are entangled in the conflict.

38. Which leads nicely into the final point I'd like to make about the political fallout of monarchy.

39. So recognize that monarchs can often serve as an embarrassment for government as well as an asset.

40. For instance, queen elizabeth recently made a pro-brexit remark: I don't see why britain should be part of the EU, she said at a dinner party.

41. Word of this got out to the press.

42. This was a huge mess for the government to clean up.

43. They spent thousands of pounds, presumably, getting articles put in newspapers in the UK telling people that the queen was neutral on the issue.

44. Of course, everyone now knew that she wasn't neutral on the issue, and this makes it more difficult for the government to campaign against brexit or for other policies hypothetically on which the queen might take an issue.

45. We tell you that this is an unfortunate political mess that could be avoided by abolishing the monarchy.

46. Proud to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. We also think that you're likely to build resentment among republicans and other people in your country who are opposed to the monarchy and that this is likely to cause political disagreement over an issue that ultimately should not be dividing people in your country when it has very little practical benefit. We also tell you about foreign entanglement. At the point where many monarchs are marrying monarchs of other countries or have family in other countries who are also extremely influential citizens, we tell you that this is likely to cause political difficulties when there is some disagreement between your countries and you have monarchs who are entangled in the conflict. Which leads nicely into the final point I'd like to make about the political fallout of monarchy. So recognize that monarchs can often serve as an embarrassment for government as well as an asset.
2. Maybe this isn't a consideration as much for Britain and similar countries, but for developing countries that have a monarchy, such as perhaps Malaysia, it does appear as though these countries are not as far down some sort of hypothetical arc of development as republics. We don't think that this is necessarily fair, but we think that that perception exists in the minds of many business people or leaders of other countries and might harm your country in international dealings. We also think that you're likely to build resentment among republicans and other people in your country who are opposed to the monarchy and that this is likely to cause political disagreement over an issue that ultimately should not be dividing people in your country when it has very little practical benefit. We also tell you about foreign entanglement. At the point where many monarchs are marrying monarchs of other countries or have family in other countries who are also extremely influential citizens, we tell you that this is likely to cause political difficulties when there is some disagreement between your countries and you have monarchs who are entangled in the conflict.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: JL_483

Topic: freedom-of-speech

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Freedom of speech is not absolute. So by that we mean that on our side of the house we're going to defend a world where people still have the right to speak their mind and to express themselves, but where it's subject to limitations in comparison with other rights.
2. So our first argument is about weighing rights, and our second argument is about uniquely harmful speech.
3. So weighing rights.
4. If you consider why people enter into society in the first place, why they follow the law, why they pay their taxes, we think that ultimately people want to be safe, to have their health protected, their family protected, they want to be able to provide for themselves, and they want to be able to access their goals in life, whatever those may be.
5. We think that freedom of speech is really important to facilitating those goals, but that it's never the most important right facilitating those goals.
6. We think that for instance, people have to have the right to life in order to access any other right, so the right to life obviously precedes the right to freedom of speech, and we think that property rights, similarly, are probably more important than the right to expression.
7. This is why even in the united states, where freedom of speech protections are much stronger than they are in countries like britain, france and germany, we still see limitations on inciting violence or damaging property, etcetera, through speech.
8. We see that even in the most liberal of societies for in terms of freedom of speech, you would have to do this.
9. Even if you had an ideal world where everyone had total freedom of speech, this would lead to

harmful outcomes because people would be threatened, people would probably be called to terrible things, and ultimately, this would be regrettable.

10. So we ought prevent that from happening by limiting the right to freedom of speech, therefore making it not absolute.

11. But on top of that, we tell you that oftentimes the harms of absolute freedom of speech would fall on less fortunate groups.

12. We think that for instance, people who are less able to defend themselves due to numbers, or because they're excluded from the public sphere, would be less able to defend themselves against harmful speech.

13. We think that things like hate speech, therefore, need to be prevented.

14. If you have groups who cannot speak up for themselves, or people who are being uniquely targeted, and this is having lots of harms for their quality of life and their safety, ultimately, we think the government needs to step in.

15. And it's clear that since this right to freedom of speech would infringe upon other people's right to life, that cannot therefore be an absolute right and that governments ought not treated as an absolute right.

16. Our second point is about times when speech is uniquely dangerous.

17. So I think that this is especially true for countries that are going through some sort of regime change, or countries that have just gone through a traumatic national experience.

18. So if you think about west germany in the nineteen fifties, they had, broadly speaking, some freedom of speech.

19. Things like free press, people were allowed to criticize the government of course, but it was illegal to do things like talk about nazism in a positive way, or display nazi symbols, etcetera.

20. But I don't think anyone would say that that was a bad thing.

21. Remember that all the people who worked in the nazi government still lived in west germany in those days, and we think that by preventing people from showing support for nazism, it became

much more difficult for them to be a resurgence in far right politics in germany in the twentieth century, and ultimately this probably led to germany becoming a very multicultural, accepting society, instead of the kind of harsh and cruel society that existed in the nineteen thirties.

22. We think that germany is better off today because the right to freedom of speech wasn't treated as absolute, but was seen as facilitative to other rights, and something that is preceded by other rights like the right to live in a safe civil society.

23. We also tell you that some speech is uniquely misleading and harmful for that reason.

24. So consider things like lies in the media.

25. In venezuela, for instance as an example, it's a country with limited freedom of speech, but where the media is relatively independent from the government.

26. And in the early two thousands the media was telling lots of lies about the government, and lying about things that the united states was doing in order to get people to try to overthrow the government because it was unfavorable to the kind of elites who owned media companies, and this led to a lot of violence, and many people died as a result.

27. So we think that it's clear that allowing freedom of speech when it leads to violence in the public sphere is going to be harmful, and that lying in the media is one example of this.

28. We think that books, or media that lie about the government's intentions or lie about private citizens intentions probably can be limited if it's going to lead to violence as a result.

29. We also tell you that things like libel and slander have no place in civil society.

30. So basically if you're professional or if you're a private citizen, you rely on your reputation a great deal in order to do business and to interact with society.

31. We think that it's necessary to limit freedom of speech to prevent other people from lying or divulging private information, or otherwise going out of their way to harm you unfairly to limit your access to civil society.

32. We see that almost every country today has laws against libel and slander, and we think that the fact that it's widely agreed upon that that is an acceptable form of speech proves that freedom of

speech cannot be absolute.

33. If you had absolute freedom of speech then it would be perfectly legal, say you're a plumber, to go and say that the other plumber in your town murders babies and then hides them what he's doing plumbing jobs.

34. But obviously no one wants to live in that kind of world because it would limit our access to things that are more important than freedom of speech.

35. So for that reason we think freedom of speech is not absolute.

36. For the over arching principle that freedom of speech is facilitative towards our goals, but not a goal in itself, and that it can actually inhibit access to our goals, we think that freedom of speech cannot be absolute. For these reasons I encourage a pro vote thank you.

Rebuttals:

1. We think that freedom of speech is really important to facilitating those goals, but that it's never the most important right facilitating those goals. We think that for instance, people have to have the right to life in order to access any other right, so the right to life obviously precedes the right to freedom of speech, and we think that property rights, similarly, are probably more important than the right to expression. This is why even in the united states, where freedom of speech protections are much stronger than they are in countries like britain, france and germany, we still see limitations on inciting violence or damaging property, etcetera, through speech. We see that even in the most liberal of societies for in terms of freedom of speech, you would have to do this. Even if you had an ideal world where everyone had total freedom of speech, this would lead to harmful outcomes because people would be threatened, people would probably be called to terrible things, and ultimately, this would be regrettable.

2. Freedom of speech is not absolute. So by that we mean that on our side of the house we're going to defend a world where people still have the right to speak their mind and to express themselves, but where it's subject to limitations in comparison with other rights. So our first argument is about weighing rights, and our second argument is about uniquely harmful speech. So weighing rights.

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: JL_602

Topic: schoolvouchers

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should embrace school vouchers.
2. By this we mean a system in which parents receive a voucher which is usable at any school, public, private, parochial or secular, which would be equal in value to the cost of attending a local public school.
3. So, in other words, if I live in a town and there is a public school, the voucher I receive would be equal in value to the cost of a student attending that public school.
4. This has been implemented in some of the united states and also in certain european municipalities and was the subject of a referendum in britain.
5. We tell you that one form this could take would be a tax rebate.
6. In the united states, parents can receive a tax credit if they have children below a certain age.
7. We think that this might work in a similar way in terms of people receiving a break on their taxes, rather than receiving a direct cash transfer.
8. So, with that in mind, I have three arguments about a better education, about the rights of parents and about what is best for the children.
9. So, in terms of better education we tell you that on our side of the house, schools can no longer be complacent.
10. Right now, schools know that they will receive students whether or not they offer a high quality of service.
11. But by implementing this policy, if schools do a poor job educating students, then they will receive fewer students, access fewer vouchers and have less funding.
12. We tell you that schools will not want this because they want to have more funding for things like

athletics and music programs, etcetera, that cost lots of money.

13. So, when schools have to compete, they will be more likely to actually implement, like, new forms of educational policy.

14. So we think that we better reward innovation.

15. In other words, if there are new teaching techniques or continuing education that's available for educators, schools will now be rewarded for encouraging their teachers to pursue those things and for like hiring people who'll be able to implement these new types of education.

16. But on top of that, we think that state schools are often overcrowded, particularly in low income areas.

17. We think that one of the largest barriers facing students in these schools is a lack of attention from teachers.

18. So, if you have fewer students in public schools because now more people can afford private schools, we think that students will get more one-on-one time and have better access to education because they'll actually get the attention they need to learn.

19. We also tell you that you'll get better education because you'll get more community investment in schools.

20. By this we mean that parents will be more likely to invest their time in a school if they're giving up this voucher which represents a tax credit, rather than if the money is automatically taken out and they never see it directly.

21. We tell you that when people feel like they're paying for something they feel a sense of ownership and this will be more obvious on our side of the house when you have to turn over a voucher rather than just having the school exist and be funded by taxes in the abstract.

22. I'm sure that the other team is going to get up here and say that schools would be underfunded on our side of the house, but we think that the lack of overcrowding will offset the lower funding that schools will receive and ultimately, students will be better off for this reason.

23. Our second point is about the rights of parents.

24. We tell you that right now in the status quo, only wealthy families have the ability to choose where to send their children to school.

25. In other words, if you want to send your kids to a parochial school, you could only afford to do that if you have a lot of money.

26. We think that it's unfair if you have to pay for public school even if your children aren't educated there.

27. Recognize that right now in countries like the US and Britain, whether or not your children go to state-provided schools, you're still paying taxes that fund those schools.

28. We think that it is wrong to force parents to pay for a service that they're not receiving and also that it's wrong that only wealthy parents can afford different types of schools.

29. We think that by giving this voucher, parents would be able to afford to send their children to parochial schools, or even if not every parent could, many more parents would be able to do so, so society would be comparatively better-off with respect to the rights of parents. We think it's also important that parents have a tremendous right to choose what is best for their children. We allow parents to do things like name their children, decide where their children grow up, decide if their children play sports or if they do boy or girl scouts. Ultimately, we see that parents are allowed to make lots of decisions.

30. Why should they not then be able to make a decision about where their children go to school?

31. We think that this is principally inconsistent and that opposition, in order to win the debate, will need to explain why choosing where your children go to school is meaningfully distinct from all of the other important choices parents make.

32. We think that parents deserve to be able to do what is best for their children and that ultimately, parents know what is best for their children more than anyone else since they spend so much more time with them and since they're more invested in them than any other actor, which leads nicely into our third argument about what is ultimately best for the children attending these schools: we think that the most important issue in this debate is what is best for the children who are being educated.

33. So, the worst case for these children, if we were to implement vouchers, is that they would go to the same school but it will be less crowded.

34. So, even in the worst case they receive more individual attention, as I mentioned earlier, so, they're still better-off than they are right now in the status quo.

35. But in the best case, these children are able to go to a better school.

36. For instance, if you had a special-needs child who needed to go to a school that the state wouldn't fund but that, at the same time, would be really beneficial for this child to learn, they would be much better-off on our side of the house.

37. We see that in the status quo most states provide for things like schools for the deaf but don't provide schools for, like, autistic children and other groups that might need special attention.

38. They require them to go to school with the general public when these students may not be well served there.

39. On our side of the house, it would be possible for more schools to open that could uniquely serve these groups of students because the vouchers would be available as funding and these students would be better off because they would get the kind of unique attention that they need in order to thrive and grow.

40. So, because we get better education, because we better uphold the rights of parents principally, and because we get better outcomes for students, particularly special-needs students, I think it's clear that we should embrace school vouchers.

41. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: JL_61

Topic: doping-in-sport

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should allow doping in sports. So by this we mean steroids, human growth hormone, and other similar drugs should be allowed in pro and amateur sports. So we're okay with this and things like the world cup, the premier league, the olympics, the NBA, any kind of major sport, whether it's pro or amateur, any kind of doping technique that is deemed safe by doctors for people. So we assume that we're going to allow doping that's overseen by the kind of trainers who are already administering these drugs in the status quo illicitly. So our first argument is that banning doesn't work.
2. So there are new drugs developed every year.
3. Recognize that there are lots of different hormones and other chemicals that athletes can use to gain an advantage.
4. It's not as though we can test just for testosterone or just for one other drug and then solve the doping problem.
5. One reason why it's been such a pervasive problem in sports is that new doping techniques are discovered all the time, and the regulatory agencies just cannot keep up with the athletes themselves, because there's such an incentive for people to go ahead and take this risk and dope.
6. We also tell you that doctors and drug companies are complicit.
7. Drug companies are putting out new drugs that they know can be used by athletes to be taken advantage of in doping, and doctors who work for these athletes have a huge incentive to keep their jobs, to prescribe these drugs, and to help them get them and take them even if they're not actually permitted.
8. Serena williams, earlier this year, was found to be taking a drug that was actually banned by the

women's tennis association, but her doctor prescribe it to her, and there was a long controversy about whether or not she legitimately needed it.

9. Look, everyone has a lot of respect for serena.

10. No one wants to believe she was doping.

11. More on that in just a minute, but the point is that her doctor actually gave her these drugs, so there's no way to separate the medical need from just the doping itself.

12. So what we think you should do is regulate and promote safety and information, not fear, and that this would be better for athletes and ultimately, better for the sports if you didn't have people putting themselves at risk by actually taking these drugs.

13. So next, our second argument is that doping is not inherently bad.

14. Basically, the only reason doping is bad is because right now it's against the rules for major sports, so athletes have to cheat in order to take advantage of doping.

15. If we made it okay within the rules, then athletes wouldn't be doing anything wrong and doping would no longer be a bad thing.

16. There's nothing inherently wrong with doping.

17. There's nothing that's evil about taking human growth hormone or anything else. You're not hurting other people, you're not undermining the sport, more on this in just a second. So we think that actually you should allow it, and then these people wouldn't be doing anything wrong.

18. So, why don't we think this actually hurts sports?

19. So first of all, athletes still work really hard.

20. Even athletes who take advantage of these drugs are still getting up at five in the morning to train.

21. They're still running.

22. They're still going to the gym.

23. They're still the absolute best because if everyone is doping, then the people who went out and get to become these famous athletes are still people who are the most gifted.

24. So we think that natural gifts don't go away, and hard work doesn't go away.
25. One of the most celebrated things about sports is that the kind of hard work people put in is so inspiring to others, and we think that that doesn't change even if doping is made legal.
26. So we should allow it, and people will still love sports.
27. We tell you another reason why this is complained about is that some people think that viewers would be turned off from sports because of doping.
28. But that doesn't seem to necessarily be true, right?
29. Barry bonds was a really famous american baseball player who got caught doping, and people loved watching barry bonds play.
30. Before they knew he was doping, people thought that he was just an amazing player and they really admired him.
31. And even after he was found out, a lot of people thought that major league baseball should have let him keep playing because they wanted to keep seeing what new amazing things barry bonds was going to do.
32. People want to watch good baseball, people want to watch good sports.
33. They don't really care about whether or not someone has been doping or not.
34. The only reason right now some people might think that players like barry bonds should get kicked out of the league is because they're cheating under the rules.
35. So if you change the rules and it was no longer cheating, we think that the main objection that people have would actually be taken away, and everyone be free to just enjoy baseball or other sports.
36. But on top of this, we tell you that the quality of competition would actually be higher.
37. Basically, if you let people achieve peak performance by using these drugs, then whatever sport you're talking about is going to be better.
38. Players will run faster, jump higher, hit the ball harder, do everything better than they would have without these drugs.

39. So we think, therefore, if you care about the quality of sport, you should actually want players to be taking these performance-enhancing drugs, you should actually be in favor of doping.
40. The last thing I'm gonna talk about here is why I think that anti-doping campaigns actually ruin sports.
41. And the example I want to use is lance armstrong.
42. Look, if you're my age or maybe a little older, lance armstrong was probably a hero to you growing up.
43. Everything that he did, winning the tour de france, beating cancer, was so impressive.
44. He was a role model for young people around the world and older people, I'm sure too, people who are going through cancer, everybody could look up to lance armstrong.
45. So unfortunately, it came out that lance armstrong had been doping, and a lot of people lost interest in cycling, a lot of people thought that their hero had been undermined and probably became more cynical about the value of sports and promoting role models and things like that.
46. So we think that this anti-doping campaign actually did more harm than lance armstrong taking some hormones ever did.
47. Look, at the end of the day, lance armstrong won a race because he took some human growth hormone or some other doping techniques.
48. We tell you that the harm of telling the entire world that he was a cheater actually was much greater than the harm of him doing this.
49. So we think that at the end of the day, if there hadn't been this anti-doping campaign, if it had just been okay for him to take these hormones, to dope, that it would have been better for everyone involved.
50. Everyone could have continued to a like take advantage of the enjoyment that they got from his achievements and the inspiration he created around the world.
51. So for these reasons, we think that it's clear that we should allow doping in sports. Thank you.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: SF_101

Topic: affirmativeaction

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We have a problem in our society today that we still have racism, we still have discrimination.
2. And this is a problem not only because it's morally wrong, but because it prevents people from having the same opportunities as others in our society, something that we believe as a that as a free, democratic country we should not prevent from anyone.
3. One of the ways to fight this racism is affirmative action.
4. Now, there are many different types of affirmative action, so rather than trying to defend one of them, I'm going to defend the idea as whole and why we think that affirmative action, whether it be quotas, whether it be any type of other situation in which we we provide the provide affirmative action, will all be beneficial.
5. Three points today: one is to understand why we have a responsibility to do something.
6. Second of all is to understand why this helps us fight the type of discrimination which creates the lack of opportunity for people and thirdly, why we think this is the only effective way to do this. So on to the first point, why do we have a responsibility?
7. We say that our societal infrastructure, our government, our society are the ones who caused the damage to these people.
8. We are the reason which people are being discriminated against and therefore have less opportunities.
9. Why is that true?
10. One, we'd say many of these things were set in law where women were not allowed to vote when men went out to vote or slavery laws or any other laws regarding the america community in america.

11. We'd say this has to do with budget concerns where where immigrants are given less budgets than than than locals.
12. We'd say there are many different examples where we see that there are different infrastructures for people of for different minorities.
13. All of these reasons create less situations for people and increases the amount of discrimination that we have towards them.
14. So, we'd say that this means two things that are critical for us in this discussion: one is that means we have a responsibility and we have to protect them, but
15. second and moreover it means that it is okay to harm the people who will not be getting the jobs that other that the minorities and or any other people who towards them we will be doing affirmative action, it is legitimate for them to lose their jobs for them because they have so far enjoyed and have benefited at the expense of the people who have been disenfranchised by society, therefore it is legitimate to harm them and any case regarding that is irrelevant.
16. So, that is why we have a responsibility and it is morally okay to harm other people to do so.
17. Why where do we think we see this where do we think this discrimination comes from and why do we think we can combat discrimination by affirmative action?
18. Two main reasons: one is sorry, two main types of discrimination: one is we'd say that there is just like direct discrimination as in people who are racist, people who are sexist, people who are xenophobic and so on and so forth, and the second type is people who don't do it consciously, people who do it subconsciously, and this would be considered the second wave of discrimination where people don't realize but if they're a man, they prefer other men to other women and so on and so forth.
19. Why do we think we help prevent both types of these discrimination?
20. So, regarding the first type, we'd say that they just don't have a choice.
21. I can not want to to hire a woman or hire an african-american or any type of other minority, but I will have to do that by law and therefore, even if I am inherently racist, I don't have a choice

22. but but to harm them.

23. But that is the more superficial level.

24. Why we think this is more important regarding both of these types is that once I have to hire them, once they're working amongst me, once they're part of my business, I see that the difference that I think that exists doesn't really exist.

25. I realize that there is a lot of similarities between between me and between them

26. and I think I realize that they are just as capable of doing the job as anyone else is capable of doing the job.

27. So, this regards the racists who are inherently racist by just putting facts in their face, showing them that they are completely wrong, but regarding the the subliminal racism, as one would put it, it also deals with them because it it takes it from the subliminal and puts it in their actual conscious and allows them to see that what they thought is wrong and therefore change the way that they think regarding even the subliminal messages.

28. So, that is why we think that this helps fight discrimination and therefore will create more opportunities for people in the future, helping solve the problem as a whole.

29. But why do we think this is actually the only way to do that?

30. We'd say that the main reason for that is because people tend to hire, tend to promote, tend to like people who remind them of themselves.

31. This can happen on a more superficial level of I like the college that I went to and so I'll probably hire someone who went to the same college me, but also, someone who looks like, me someone who has a similar background than me.

32. Why is this true?

Because people tend to believe that they are good, that what they did is right, that their that their path towards their career, that their education, that their background, that their family history, that their religion is something that is that is good and therefore, if the other person sitting in front of me has that, then he is probably like me and then therefore, he will probably be good.

33. We'd say that usually, you cannot find that in people of minorities, whether it be they are a separate sex, they are a separate religion, they're a different color than you

34. and so you don't find the similarities in the other person which is probably why you don't hire them.

35. So, why do we think that this will solve the problem?

36. One, because because of this way people think, then it won't happen in and of itself and we have to have take active action to force people to hire other people because otherwise they will keep hiring people like themselves.

37. And more than that, once we have hired people who do think the same way, if I am now an african-american woman, then I will probably look to promote an african-american woman, which means once we have people in the system, minorities in the system who have used affirmative action, they will be able to help people who be able to help people in similar situations like them without affirmative action, simply because they want to hire them the same way that a white man would want to hire a white man.

38. So, because we have an obligation to help them, because we think this helps fight discrimination and finally, because we think this is the only way to do it because it won't happen in and of itself and this is the only way to get to promote people within a system, we think that affirmative action should be implemented in our society.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: SF_21

Topic: one-child

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. In a society with such a huge population, which has therefore huge damages coming from the size of this population, we think is justified to limit the amount of children that are born into the society and therefore we support the one child policy of the people's republic of china.
2. Three points for you today on side proposition.
3. One in to understand what exactly the damage is, second of all to understand when we limit people in our society and why we think this fulfills the criteria.
4. And finally, we'll address the interest of the child and why we think that is the most important thing, and why we think the it is in the child's best interest for this policy to go.
5. So what exactly is a problem with a huge with such a big population?
6. Say there are three main aspects of it.
7. One is the environmental side of it, right?
8. When there are so many people in in a country, it has an effect on waste, it has an effect on different resources, and it has a huge environmental impact on the society of all of this all its citizens, and eventually also outside the country itself, but mainly with in the country itself.
9. Second of all we'd say there's a social issue that needs to be dealt with here that the fact that the population is so big has a huge effect of that as well.
10. And third, it has an effect on the economy as well, on the work working force and on the economy as a whole.
11. We'd say that these these are three huge damages that make a big big difference in the in a society when there are so many people, and it is a substantial damage that needs to be dealt with, right?

12. There is usually not so much conflict regarding how big the problem is, just how we should fix it, which is then leads me to my second point.
13. How exactly we should fix it.
14. So they ask the question of when exactly do we limit people rights in our society and based on social contract and things like that, it is generally accepted that we do limit people's rights when it is when there is a grave damage to the rest of society, when something that you do has an effect on everyone else.
15. We'd say that having an extra a child more than more than one child has an effect on everyone around you, right?
16. Not only the actual child that you bring into the world, but the fact that you make it a norm that more people have more children and therefore you in some ways encourage other people's people have more children, and therefore you are an active part of the problem of causing the damage, and therefore it is right for us to prevent you from doing so, right?
17. And the point comes up in saying but there are some fundamental rights which we don't limit, such as the right to parenthood.
18. So we'd say two things.
19. We'd say three things.
20. One, there is no such thing as an absolute right, there all rights in our society which we limit if it is right in comparison to the damage, and as we've shown you this is a huge damage and so we think that that forces the criterion.
21. And we'd say specifically to this right to parenthood, or the right to want to be a parent, we'd say another two more things.
22. One is that we think that it is not a complete right, right?
23. It's not an absolute right in the sense that we also limit but even when we accept that it is an important right and we allow them to have children, we'll still take them away if you have mistreated a child, if we think you're an incapable of being a parent.

24. The right to parenthood is always limited by the best interests of the child, and as we'll show you the third point, the best interests of the child is to go ahead with this policy.

25. The third and most important to note is the fact that we are not we are not not allowing people to have the right to parenthood, we're still allowing it to be parents, we are limiting the amount of children that you have and we think any of these rights would allow you to have as many children as want, but rather to be a parent, and so we think that there isn't such a damage to the individual liberty here definitely not in comparison to the grave damages at which we have already explained and agreed upon so we say that this under the criteria of when we are allowed to limit people, and therefore it is a justified thing it we should support a one child policy.

26. Moving on to the third point about the best interest of the child.

27. We'd say that when everything when we regard children matters, it always we have to look at the child's best interests, right?

28. How do we see that in our society today?

29. We'd say that the only reason that parents have any power over their children, the only reason they get to make decisions is because we accept as a society that they probably know the child the best, and they are best, most relevant people make to decisions for them.

30. However, there are some decisions that we don't let parents make because we think that because we look out for the best interests of the child, such as education when a a parent doesn't have an option whether they want to or not educate their child, they have to do so.

31. We also say that when parents are incompetent we take them away, again, because we we care about the right to parenthood, but we care about it less than the child's best interest, and therefore we'll take a child away if he's being mistreated.

32. Why is it relevant to this to our case today?

33. Because we we'd say that what we're doing with this policy is disincentivizing you.

34. I won't banning you completely from doing it, because eventually you can pay the fine if you want to add its proportional to your income, but we're disincentivizing you from having another child.

35. Why is that a good thing to do?

Because we'd say that by because by having another child you are bringing a child into the world, into a world which, as we've shown in the beginning, you will if you have the child other people be encouraged to do so, you're bringing him into the world which is a worse one where there are grave problems caused by his existence, and therefore he will suffer from them.

36. This is bad for one, the child that your first child that you had already lives in the world

37. and then you are actively making his life worse by having another child and therefore you are not looking out for his best interests, and second of all, for the child which you bring to the world, and we'd say that's not that bringing a child into the world into a world which is problematic, which is which of his own existence create a damage, is a negative thing.

38. So we to tell you that there is a grave damage, we explain to you why we think is a legitimate place to restrict parents, and we'd say on top of that, we have to look out for the best interests of the child, and the best interest of the child is to have this policy.

39. For all these reasons we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. How do we see that in our society today? We'd say that the only reason that parents have any power over their children, the only reason they get to make decisions is because we accept as a society that they probably know the child the best, and they are best, most relevant people make to decisions for them. However, there are some decisions that we don't let parents make because we think that because we look out for the best interests of the child, such as education when a a parent doesn't have an option whether they want to or not educate theor child, they have to do so. We also say that when parents are incompetent we take them away, again, because we we care about the right to parenthood, but we care about it lets than the child's best interest, and therefore we'll take a child away if he's being mistreated. Why is it relevant to this to our case today?

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: SF_483

Topic: freedom-of-speech

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Freedom of speech is a very important right in our society, however, it is not an absolute right.
2. Why is that?
3. We have two main points for you today: first of all, we explain that why there is no such thing as an absolute right in our society, and second of all, why specifically we think freedom of speech has grave and extremely dangerous damages which we have to prevent and therefore, we have to limit freedom of speech which we deem it not absolute.
4. So, regarding the first point why there is no such thing as an absolute right.
5. We'd say in our society, what we do the whole time is try and balance between different people's interests and their rights.
6. A very obvious example for this would be the speed limit, right?
7. Setting a speed limit at a hundred kilometers per hour, for instance, would limit people's freedom of movement, right?
8. However, if we were to lower the speed limit even further, if we put it on sixty or fifty, we may be able to save more lives on this on the road.
9. What that means is that we have some sort of a balance between the freedom of movement and the right to life.
10. Now, if the right to life which would the most basic and fundamental right is would be absolute, then we would therefore probably not allow anyone to drive on the road because we think that the right to life is so important and if we allow people to go on ten, twenty, thirty kilometers per hour, probably more people will die.
11. But we don't do that.

12. We see that there are other interests that we have to balance between the freedom of movement and the right to life. We'd say that everything we do in our society is always this balance.

13. Why do we do this balance?

14. Why do we have the legitimacy to do this balance and to restrict certain rights and deem them not absolute?

15. It's because that is the basis of our society, right?

16. When we all when when we sign the the social contract, what we're basically saying is yes, I have rights that are a hundred percent guaranteed to me.

17. Potentially, I could have an absolute right to life, I potentially could have the absolute right to freedom of speech and so on, but I am willing to limit that because it is in my best interest for the government to intervene and create some sort of a balance because not having this infrastructure not having some form of balance makes the world a more dangerous place for me to live.

18. So, we'd say the basis of our society is to is to have a balancing between rights which is only achieved if every right is not absolute which therefore helps us understand that freedom of speech is not absolute.

19. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute?

20. What are the such what are the grave damages that we get from freedom of speech? We'd say there are three types of damages which we can get from freedom of speech. The first one is the fact that there can be a direct damage from the speech itself, right?

21. The the easiest example for this would be defamation, right?

22. Saying slanderous things against someone in public.

23. Now, it would seem that I should have the right to say whatever I want to say but we have to notice that we limit people's rights when there is damage to another person or to the general population.

24. In this case, we'd say that everyone also has a right to a good name, we have everyone has a right of part of their self-determination and their self identity is to not be accused of things by

someone else, not to be slandered by someone else

25. and we'd say the so the first damage is actually your speech itself causing direct damage to someone else.

26. Second would be that the information that you bring out through your speech could be dangerous, right?

27. We see this usually in cases of censorship, it has to do with intelligence, also national security, but also with other things on the internet, that the that the speech which you choose to give can be used in a dangerous manner, it could cause a danger to people's lives, it could cause grave damage to our society and therefore, again, it needs to be limited because one person's right has to be weighed against the general population.

28. And finally, we'd say there's another type of damage that can occur from speech which is the speech encouraging other people to cause damage.

29. Again, the easiest examples for this would be either hate speech or incitement where the speech which you choose to to to use actually encourages people to go out and do things which are damaging to other people.

30. They have a direct causal link to the damage which will occur in the future in society.

31. Now, it's important to note that when we do this balancing between the the right the the sorry, freedom of speech and right to the population, we're not limiting what the person believes or what he knows or what he chooses as his ideals or what he chooses to believe in.

32. We're simply limiting his ability to express that, right?

33. We're not changing what you think, would just limiting your ability to express that when again, this is weighed against the grave damages which we just explained.

34. Therefore, because of these grave damages and because the limitation is not so terrible, we think it cannot be absolute.

35. So, we tell you two things in this speech: one is that there is no such thing as an absolute right.

36. We always limit certain rights when we see it to be fit and second, we explained to you why

specifically the of speech has to be limited because of the grave damages the three different types of damages which it could bring with it to our society.

37. For all these reasons, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. A very obvious example for this would be the speed limit, right? Setting a speed limit at a hundred kilometers per hour, for instance, would limit people's freedom of movement, right? However, if we were to lower the speed limit even further, if we put it on sixty or fifty, we may be able to save more lives on this on the road. What that means is that we have some sort of a balance between the freedom of movement and the right to life. Now, if the right to life which would be the most basic and fundamental right is would be absolute, then we would therefore probably not allow anyone to drive on the road because we think that the right to life is so important and if we allow people to go on ten, twenty, thirty kilometers per hour, probably more people will die.

2. Freedom of speech is a very important right in our society, however, it is not an absolute right. Why is that? We have two main points for you today: first of all, we explain that why there is no such thing as an absolute right in our society, and second of all, why specifically we think freedom of speech has grave and extremely dangerous damages which we have to prevent and therefore, we have to limit freedom of speech which we deem it not absolute.

3. We're simply limiting his ability to express that, right? We're not changing what you think, would just limiting your ability to express that when again, this is weighed against the grave damages which we just explained. Therefore, because of these grave damages and because the limitation is not so terrible, we think it cannot be absolute. So, we tell you two things in this speech: one is that there is no such thing as an absolute right. We always limit certain rights when we see it to be fit and second, we explained to you why specifically the of speech has to be limited because of the grave damages the three different types of damages which it could bring with it to our society.

Evidence Used:

1. When we all when when we sign the the social contract, what we're basically saying is yes, I have rights that are a hundred percent guaranteed to me. Potentially, I could have an absolute right to life, I potentially could have the absolute right to freedom of speech and so on, but I am willing to limit that because it is in my best interest for the government to intervene and create some sort of a balance because not having this infrastructure not having some form of balance makes the world a more dangerous place for me to live. So, we'd say the basis of our society is to is to have a balancing between rights which is only achieved if every right is not absolute which therefore helps us understand that freedom of speech is not absolute. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute? What are the such what are the grave damages that we get from freedom of speech?

2. So, we'd say the basis of our society is to is to have a balancing between rights which is only achieved if every right is not absolute which therefore helps us understand that freedom of speech is not absolute. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute? What are the such what are the grave damages that we get from freedom of speech? We'd say there are three types of damages which we can get from freedom of speech. The first one is the fact that there can be a direct damage from the speech itself, right?

3. It's because that is the basis of our society, right? When we all when when we sign the the social contract, what we're basically saying is yes, I have rights that are a hundred percent guaranteed to me. Potentially, I could have an absolute right to life, I potentially could have the absolute right to freedom of speech and so on, but I am willing to limit that because it is in my best interest for the government to intervene and create some sort of a balance because not having this infrastructure not having some form of balance makes the world a more dangerous place for me to live. So, we'd say the basis of our society is to is to have a balancing between rights which is only achieved if every right is not absolute which therefore helps us understand that freedom of speech is not absolute. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute?

4. Potentially, I could have an absolute right to life, I potentially could have the absolute right to

freedom of speech and so on, but I am willing to limit that because it is in my best interest for the government to intervene and create some sort of a balance because not having this infrastructure not having some form of balance makes the world a more dangerous place for me to live. So, we'd say the basis of our society is to have a balancing between rights which is only achieved if every right is not absolute which therefore helps us understand that freedom of speech is not absolute. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute? What are the such what are the grave damages that we get from freedom of speech? We'd say there are three types of damages which we can get from freedom of speech.

5. But what why, specifically, do we think that the freedom of speech can never be absolute? What are the such what are the grave damages that we get from freedom of speech? We'd say there are three types of damages which we can get from freedom of speech. The first one is the fact that there can be a direct damage from the speech itself, right? The the easiest example for this would be defamation, right?

Debate ID: SF_602

Topic: schoolvouchers

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Every person in our society has the right to try and embetter themselves, to try and embetter their position in life, in other words, social mobility.
2. The way we choose to promote social mobility in our society is through education because we believe it is the most base is the most basic tool you need in order to achieve social mobility.
3. That's why schools' most basic idea, the the its main focus is to give the right tools for social mobility.
4. We believe that that adopting vouchers for in schools would increase social mobility. And why is that? We think that there is a problem today in our schools.
5. We say that there is lack of equality in our schools.
6. There's a lack of equality that come the main part of it is that there are different infrastructure, different funding for different schools which then allow different extracurricular activities in those school and extra classes or different options in within those schools.
7. It also then creates another inequality, which is then there are better teachers want to go to these better schools where there is more funding and more infrastructure because they prefer to teach there and they'll probably get a a higher salary.
8. We say that that means that there are schools which are getting less funding, less better teachers and the students that go there aren't given the enough tools or the right tools in order for them to achieve social mobility.
9. Why does this happen?
10. This happens because either in specific areas, taxpayers pay more money, therefore, there is more money going into municipal areas and therefore, into the schools.

11. But it also happens for political reasons.

12. When we try and allocate funds, it happens according to political interests.

13. And we say that usually the people who have more money, have more political power to be to use in order to embetter themselves.

14. So, again, they disenfranchise people who, to begin with, are paying less tax money so there's less money to go around and receiving even less of it because of political issues.

15. Why do we think this this will change, two main if we adopt vouchers?

16. Two main reasons: one, we'll see we'll discuss how we think this will affect schools themselves, and second of all, we'll we'll explain why specifically we think this embetters the situation.

17. The people who today aren't getting the best out of schools and aren't receiving the best education that they could, and therefore it is impairing their their social mobility. So how do we think this affects schools?

18. We think that basically this creates a free market.

19. It creates competition between schools.

20. Usually what happens in a free market is people try and be the best, try to provide the best products, because they want people to purchase it from them.

21. We say that this will defect to schools.

22. One, it gives the schools who today don't get very much funding the interest to try and embetter themselves because they know and now they are competing for other people.

23. So they will try and improve their curriculum, they will try and improve their facilities because they they know that if they do so, they will get more students and therefore, more funding.

24. So we help the schools that today aren't in very good situations.

25. But we say that we even help the schools who are already getting a lot of funding, and why is that?

26. We say that when you know that the society that the society that comes to your schools are already people who come with political power, who already come with money, you don't have much

of an interest to continue and developing yourself because you're kind of guaranteed the money.

27. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them.

28. We say that what this does is create better systems and better schools, because we are continuously trying to improve.

29. We will try and attract the best schools.

30. We will try and attract the best message.

31. We will try and attract the best best lessons and so on and so forth, making more schools better and better equipped to provide to provide their students with the tools, the social mobility.

32. We think that competition does that in the best way and the way to create competition within schools is to do this through school vouchers.

33. Moving on to the second point explaining why we think this will be specifically better for those who are disenfranchised today in society, as we recognize them to be the most important people in the debate.

34. Because even if the schools are not perfect in the higher echelons of society, but they're quite good and they give you tools that you need that would make you less important to us in this debate.

35. Why is it help the minorities?

36. We say two things.

37. One, because even in those in those neighborhoods now the schools are better because they will be receiving more funding than they are today because each student is now worth the same amount of money, and the fact that your parents come from money or the fact that you go to live in a specific neighborhood or your parents have more political power doesn't mean that you're worth more than every other student so their schools will automatically be better.

38. But we say this also helps integration.

39. What do we mean by integration?

40. We say that today because the the the schools in not such good neighborhoods are not as good, then the then the chances of someone from a good neighborhood going to that school is extremely low.

41. But tomorrow, when when we have this competition, we have different schools trying to embetter themselves, there is a higher chance of people being willing to go cross the neighborhoods to the other to to the other schools and try and create more integration within society because those schools could be even better than the ones in their neighborhood.

42. Why is that important?

Because we say that integration and creating relationships with people who are from outside your neighborhood, and increasing your circle and people who are in many cases more fortunate than you and will therefore have more opportunities in the future for many different reasons, we say that creating integration helps, again, social mobility for you because they now look differently at your neighborhood because they went to a school in your neighborhood, because they now look differently at someone of your race, or someone of your color, someone of your religion, because they had more chances to get to know you in in school.

43. We see that all of these things lead to better social mobility because you had the better education allowing you to go to college and getting into better places, but also because we have created more integration within society, allowing people to to help promote each other and get to know each other and therefore, give more opportunities to each other, all creating more social mobility.

44. What we say is that we create, through competition, better schools because they have more of an interest to continue in improving to get more and more clients, if you will.

45. But more than that we say that, through that, we are creating more social mobility because of the connections that we make and because of the better education.

46. For all these reasons, we think we should embrace school vouchers.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. But we say that we even help the schools who are already getting a lot of funding, and why is that? We say that when you know that the society that the society that comes to your schools are already people who come with political power, who already come with money, you don't have much of an interest to continue and developing yourself because you're kind of guaranteed the money. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them. We say that what this does is create better systems and better schools, because we are continuously trying to improve. We will try and attract the best schools.

2. When we try and allocate funds, it happens according to political interests. And we say that usually the people who have more money, have more political power to be to use in order to embetter themselves. So, again, they disenfranchise people who, to begin with, are paying less tax money so there's less money to go around and receiving even less of it because of political issues. Why do we think this this will change, two main if we adopt vouchers? Two main reasons: one, we'll see we'll discuss how we think this will affect schools themselves, and second of all, we'll we'll explain why specifically we think this embetters the situation.

3. So we help the schools that today aren't in very good situations. But we say that we even help the schools who are already getting a lot of funding, and why is that? We say that when you know that the society that the society that comes to your schools are already people who come with political power, who already come with money, you don't have much of an interest to continue and developing yourself because you're kind of guaranteed the money. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them. We say that what this does is create better systems and better schools, because we are continuously trying to improve.

4. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them. We say that what this does is create better systems and better schools, because we are continuously trying to improve. We will try and attract the best schools. We will try and attract the best message. We will try and attract the best best lessons and so on and so forth, making more schools better and better equipped to provide to provide their students with the tools, the social mobility.

5. But it also happens for political reasons. When we try and allocate funds, it happens according to political interests. And we say that usually the people who have more money, have more political power to be to use in order to embetter themselves. So, again, they disenfranchise people who, to begin with, are paying less tax money so there's less money to go around and receiving even less of it because of political issues. Why do we think this this will change, two main if we adopt vouchers?

6. We say that when you know that the society that the society that comes to your schools are already people who come with political power, who already come with money, you don't have much of an interest to continue and developing yourself because you're kind of guaranteed the money. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them. We say that what this does is create better systems and better schools, because we are continuously trying to improve. We will try and attract the best schools. We will try and attract the best message.

7. So they will try and improve their curriculum, they will try and improve their facilities because they they know that if they do so, they will get more students and therefore, more funding. So we help the schools that today aren't in very good situations. But we say that we even help the schools who are already getting a lot of funding, and why is that? We say that when you know that the society that the society that comes to your schools are already people who come with political power, who already come with money, you don't have much of an interest to continue and developing yourself

because you're kind of guaranteed the money. We say that these schools as well will have more of an interest to continue in improving tomorrow, again, because we create this competition for every single student because they only get the funding according to students that come to them.

Debate ID: SF_945

Topic: circumcision

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should oppose male infant circumcision. The government has a responsibility to protect those who cannot protect themselves.
2. Maybe the biggest group which would fall under that criteria are infants, children as well, who cannot take care of themselves.
3. Government takes upon itself the the responsibility to make sure that no harm is done to them.
4. The way it chooses to do this is to give power to parents because we generally believe that parents know best what is good for their children.
5. However, we understand that that is not completely and always true and therefore, there are some cases in which the government gives itself the prerogative to continue and intervene and make sure that the best child's interest is still being served, right?
6. We see that by forcing some form of education, forcing some cases of healthcare and so on and so forth. The government allows itself to continue and intervene. We'd say that it does this in cases where they think the parent may act irrationally. No one is saying that this parent might not love his child.
7. We say that sometimes you can be blinded.
8. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief.
9. But since we don't want to impose or enforce this religion upon the child, we don't allow religious beliefs to be enforced upon children where it can be extremely damaging to them, right?
10. Otherwise we would allow female circumcision or any other law that could be hurtful to infants or

to anyone in our society.

11. We say that times in which we don't allow parents to do something is when it falls under one of two criterion: one, abuse, two, neglect.

12. What we say is that infant circumcision falls under abuse because it is use of of sorry, it's causing harm, it's an extremely painful procedure done toward someone in in where we are not allowed to cause such pain, that is the definition of abuse, and we think that this falls under the criteria definitely when it is not something that is necessary for this child for his life.

13. So we say that this falls under the criterion of abuse.

14. The question could be asked why is this in any case different from any other medical decision made by a parent?

15. So we say to this a few things.

16. In order for a decision to be made in a religious in a, sorry, in a medical context by a parent, it has to be one it has to be all three things: one, it has to be proven scientifically to definitely improve this child's health, right?

17. If we're going to do something that is extremely dangerous to this child, we have to know that it's going to have a positive effect.

18. We'd say that that is not the case with male circumcision.

19. There is some research to show that it may have a benefit, but not necessarily.

20. Second of all, we'd say the benefit has to be a substantial benefit, right?

21. Putting someone through excruciating pain by mutilating him just to cause him maybe a potential eh a potential benefit isn't something that we believe is legitimate.

22. And finally and most critically, it has to be something that is that needs to happen right now, right?

Something that if you don't do at that point could have damage from now on to the future, right?

23. That's why we allow kids to be vaccinated and so on and so forth.

24. What we say is that that is not relevant in the case of circumcision because this becomes a

irrelevant question in someone's life, right?

25. This the health issues that which have to do with circumcision become more relevant much later in this child's life, later in their life, where the child could be could it could be consulted in this decision, or can even be at an age when a child is able to make that decision on his own.

26. We'd say that when it's not something that is definitely important and something that isn't extremely urgent, we should allow this decision to be made by the child, and that's what makes this different from any other medical decision that the parents get to do.

27. And finally regarding this question of well, religious beliefs, and so on and so forth.

28. So we'd just like to reiterate that parents have the right to impose religion upon their children up until the level in which it is damaging to those children.

29. When we think that some things are going too far, we don't allow them to happen.

30. This is true generally to any type of religion, right, not only the way we practice it with children.

31. But when religious laws become abusive to specific people or become discriminatory to specific people or become damaging in any other way to those people, we don't allow it in our society, and we don't think that, therefore, the fact that circumcision is a religious procedure and this may hurt religious freedom is a legitimate reason to cause pain to an infant who cannot take care of himself.

32. And so we'd say because we only allow parents to do whatever they want unless it falls under the criteria of neglect or abuse, and because this falls under the criteria of abuse, as we've shown, and why and because this is different from any other medical procedure because it's not urgent, it's hasn't been proven, and the child could decide to do this in a later age

33. and it wouldn't have a negative effect on his health, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. Government takes upon itself the the responsibility to make sure that no harm is done to them. The way it chooses to do this is to give power to parents because we generally believe that parents know best what is good for their children. However, we understand that that is not completely and always true and therefore, there are some cases in which the government gives itself the

prerogative to continue and intervene and make sure that the best child's interest is still being served, right? We see that by forcing some form of education, forcing some cases of healthcare and so on and so forth. The government allows itself to continue and intervene.

Evidence Used:

1. We say that sometimes you can be blinded. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief. But since we don't want to impose or enforce this religion upon the child, we don't allow religious beliefs to be enforced upon children where it can be extremely damaging to them, right? Otherwise we would allow female circumcision or any other law that could be hurtful to infants or to anyone in our society. We say that times in which we don't allow parents to do something is when it falls under one of two criterion: one, abuse, two, neglect.

2. No one is saying that this parent might not love his child. We say that sometimes you can be blinded. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief. But since we don't want to impose or enforce this religion upon the child, we don't allow religious beliefs to be enforced upon children where it can be extremely damaging to them, right? Otherwise we would allow female circumcision or any other law that could be hurtful to infants or to anyone in our society.

3. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief. But since we don't want to impose or enforce this religion upon the child, we don't allow religious beliefs to be enforced upon children where it can be extremely damaging to them, right? Otherwise we would allow female circumcision or any other law that could be hurtful to infants or to anyone in our society. We say that times in which we don't allow parents to do something is when it falls under one of two criterion: one, abuse, two, neglect. What we say is

that infant circumcision falls under abuse because it is use of of sorry, it's causing harm, it's an extremely painful procedure done toward someone in in where we are not allowed to cause such pain, that is the definition of abuse, and we think that this falls under the criteria definitely when it is not something that is necessary for this child for his life.

4. We'd say that it does this in cases where they think the parent may act irrationally. No one is saying that this parent might not love his child. We say that sometimes you can be blinded. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief. But since we don't want to impose or enforce this religion upon the child, we don't allow religious beliefs to be enforced upon children where it can be extremely damaging to them, right?

5. The government allows itself to continue and intervene. We'd say that it does this in cases where they think the parent may act irrationally. No one is saying that this parent might not love his child. We say that sometimes you can be blinded. One of the things in which you can be blinded is by your religion, is by your faith, in which something may not be in the child's best interest according to to secular belief, but it might be according to religious belief.

Debate ID: SN_101

Topic: affirmativeaction

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We are seeking to address today a history of wrongdoing and prejudice on a societal level that, first of all, tarnishes our history and, second of all, the consequences of which are still being felt today and that is why we should support affirmative action.
2. And when we say support affirmative action, we mean that we should encourage institutions that recruit to use either quotas or slightly lower entry requirements for minorities and people from affected communities.
3. The reason that we should support affirmative action is twofold: first of all, because we believe that it is a form of reparations to compensate for wrongdoings against minority communities in the past and second of all, because we believe it fixes a modern market failure.
4. So, to get into our first point here, it's pretty well recognized on a societal level that we we historically have mistreated certain demographics.
5. For the sake of simplicity and familiarity, we're gonna use the united states an example here.
6. It is well known that in the history of the united states african americans were mistreated and denied equal opportunity.
7. There was the period of slavery, you know, these are sort of unjustifiable things and relics of our history that while however ugly they may be, we have to grapple with them today.
8. And and there's the fact in basically every society, women have, for the most part, been treated as second-class citizens, denied the right to vote, denied the right to own property, etcetera.
9. And we say that these obviously clash with our modern understanding of of morality and ethics and and our valuation of sort of all humans as equal
10. and and so we say that while we, as society, as modern society are not necessarily we're not

exactly at fault for these past transgressions because we were not the ones who chose to engage in them.

11. Obviously, you know, you and I did not own slaves in the eighteen-sixties, but, we are responsible for addressing the consequences of this history of discrimination for two reasons: first of all, because we benefited.

12. People who make up the the people who are members of the majority demographic, members of the majority tend to be better-off than people from minority groups simply because of a historical preference.

13. And so, you know, my father and my grandfather and my great grandfather benefited from a lot of this discrimination and therefore that makes my life better today because they passed down their their wealth and knowledge to me.

14. But second of all, because we say that we say that we are responsible because the consequences of this injustice still exist today and we are responsible for today's society.

15. How does this how do the consequences how are they expressed in today's society?

16. First of all, you know, many minorities their living situation is is has is greatly influenced by the fact that their parents and grandparents and the generations that came before them experienced discrimination.

17. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an underprivileged community in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today.

18. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her

teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice.

19. And we say that these are things that exist in modern society and they must be addressed by us today.

20. So, the second reason that we believe that we should support affirmative action is because it fixes a modern market failure.

21. So besides this whole idea of, you know, the historical transgressions and making up for it and and, you know, giving a leg up to the people that suffered for it, we also know that it's a simple fact of human psychology that human beings, to this day, are still, you know, whether they know it or not, maybe even on a subconscious level, experience experience, you know, racism and prejudice.

22. A recent study showed that between two equally qualified candidates applying for a job, recruiters were far more likely, overall, to choose an individual from the majority group, rather than from a minority group.

23. The study was conducted where they made a series of resumes and gave, you know, two copies of the same resume exactly to one they gave a very obviously african-american name and to the other one they gave a very obviously white-american name and they found that the white the the resumes with the white-american names were far more likely to get callbacks and to get hired, even for the same interview.

24. And this shows a a an underlying prejudice and it may be even on a subconscious level.

25. Interestingly, the study showed that even people from minority groups themselves, recruiters from minority groups themselves, were likely to engage in this exact same kind of discrimination.

26. And so, we say that we must codify and require, you know, people to to to to give equal opportunity to minority groups to compensate for our natural bias, our natural racism that there's

nothing, you know, we can really do about.

27. The the it's hard to sort of address this subconscious bias and so we have to make it a law, we have to make it, you know, a sort of a a protocol in order to make sure that we we are not affected by it because, you know, we recruit in order to find the best candidate and we shouldn't be we shouldn't be influenced by our underlying irrational biases, you know?

28. And there's a reason we recruit to find the best candidate, because the best candidate is likely to do the best work or to be the best student and to create the most, you know, utility for society and leads to a better society, overall.

29. So, we, on a societal level, have an interest in correcting this market failure and in reducing the influence of of irrational biases on the part of recruiters.

30. And so, because we say that we owe mistreated demographics a certain form of reparations and because we believe that we should fix this modern market failure, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. For the sake of simplicity and familiarity, we're gonna use the united states an example here. It is well known that in the history of the united states african americans were mistreated and denied equal opportunity. There was the period of slavery, you know, these are sort of unjustifiable things and relics of our history that while however ugly they may be, we have to grapple with them today. And and there's the fact in basically every society, women have, for the most part, been treated as second-class citizens, denied the right to vote, denied the right to own property, etcetera. And we say that these obviously clash with our modern understanding of of morality and ethics and and our valuation of sort of all humans as equal

Evidence Used:

1. First of all, you know, many minorities their living situation is is has is greatly influenced by the fact that their parents and grandparents and the generations that came before them experienced discrimination. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an

underprivileged community in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice. And we say that these are things that exist in modern society and they must be addressed by us today. So, the second reason that we believe that we should support affirmative action is because it fixes a modern market failure.

2. But second of all, because we say that we say that we are responsible because the consequences of this injustice still exist today and we are responsible for today's society. How does this how do the consequences how are they expressed in today's society? First of all, you know, many minorities their living situation is is has is greatly influenced by the fact that their parents and grandparents and the generations that came before them experienced discrimination. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an underprivileged community in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way

up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice.

3. And so, you know, my father and my grandfather and my great grandfather benefited from a lot of this discrimination and therefore that makes my life better today because they passed down their wealth and knowledge to me. But second of all, because we say that we say that we are responsible because the consequences of this injustice still exist today and we are responsible for today's society. How does this how do the consequences how are they expressed in today's society? First of all, you know, many minorities their living situation is is has is greatly influenced by the fact that their parents and grandparents and the generations that came before them experienced discrimination. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an underprivileged community in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today.

4. How does this how do the consequences how are they expressed in today's society? First of all, you know, many minorities their living situation is is has is greatly influenced by the fact that their parents and grandparents and the generations that came before them experienced discrimination. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an underprivileged community

in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice. And we say that these are things that exist in modern society and they must be addressed by us today.

5. For example, you know, an african american kid who is born today in an underprivileged community in, say, inner city chicago, it's very likely that he was born into that situation, into poverty in the first place because his his father and great grandfather and and and to generations back were denied education, were passed over for jobs, were exploited, were discriminated against on on a governmental level, on an institutional level because of the color of their skin and so the fact that this kid is poor today and has to work, you know, a job while he's in high school in order to pay the bills and has to work his way up, is a is a consequence of the historical discrimination and should be addressed today. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice. And we say that these are things that exist in

modern society and they must be addressed by us today. So, the second reason that we believe that we should support affirmative action is because it fixes a modern market failure. So besides this whole idea of, you know, the historical transgressions and making up for it and and, you know, giving a leg up to the people that suffered for it, we also know that it's a simple fact of human psychology that human beings, to this day, are still, you know, whether they know it or not, maybe even on a subconscious level, experience experience, you know, racism and prejudice.

6. Another example, you know, a girl in school today, in her math class, that is ignored by her teacher, who was raised in an era where they were taught that men are better at math than women, you know, she may be ignored in favor of her male classmates and gets less attention from her teacher and therefore is more likely to do worse on tests and get worse grades and is therefore less likely to get accepted to, for example, her dream university because of that discrimination, because of the history of prejudice. And we say that these are things that exist in modern society and they must be addressed by us today. So, the second reason that we believe that we should support affirmative action is because it fixes a modern market failure. So besides this whole idea of, you know, the historical transgressions and making up for it and and, you know, giving a leg up to the people that suffered for it, we also know that it's a simple fact of human psychology that human beings, to this day, are still, you know, whether they know it or not, maybe even on a subconscious level, experience experience, you know, racism and prejudice. A recent study showed that between two equally qualified candidates applying for a job, recruiters were far more likely, overall, to choose an individual from the majority group, rather than from a minority group.

Debate ID: SN_1

Topic: video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. In this speech we're gonna talk about why we should ban violent video games.
2. And to clarify the problem that we're trying to solve here is not the fact that violent video games are distasteful or offensive but rather that in developed western world countries, children spend on average more than six hours per week playing video games and video games are uniquely effective at teaching and in particular violent video games are uniquely effective at teaching violent antisocial and anti-empathetic behaviors.
3. Now before we get any further to clarify exactly what we're talking about, we're talking about banning video games in which realistic violence is central to the gameplay or that feature explicit photorealistic cutscenes that display graphic violence.
4. And to explain our position on this issue we're going to talk about two different issues.
5. First, the fact that video games are uniquely effective teaching tools. And second, the fact that by its very nature, the regulation system under the status quo is ineffective at preventing children from accessing these video games, and therefore that a ban is the only reasonable way to expect to achieve any sort of concrete results. So to get into the first point, gonna talk about the the the the nature of video games and why they're so effective at teaching behavior.
6. Now, in this generation, children's begin playing video games at an extremely young age.
7. It's part of the core curriculum in education in many preschools and kindergartens around the the the modern developed world.
8. And this is an age obviously when these children are malleable and they're still learning appropriate human behaviors.
9. And naturally the mechanism by which children learn is by observing others and through

reinforcement, through either through positive encouragement for for good behavior.

10. This is the natural sort of mechanism by which human beings learn how to act in a social society.

11. The problem is that violent video games they masquerade as real-life lessons.

12. Nowadays video games involve they contain lifelike graphics, and we're not talking about something like pac man here, we're talking about photorealistic graphics all the way down to the tiniest facial features and facial tics and expressions and to extremely graphic displays of blood et cetera.

13. Now because of their realism, it's very easy for these video games to be confused with real life.

14. And another feature of the violent video games is because violence is sort of the central component of gameplay, in particular in shooting games, etcetera, there the lesson that is being taught sort of subconsciously is that violence is the solution to every problem.

15. Throughout the entire course of the game every problem that the player faces is solved with a gun.

16. And in contrast to violent movies or other media, in order to progress in these violent games, the player himself actually has to press the buttons, actually has to execute the actions in order to in order to see the results and in order to progress through the game. For example one of the most controversial scenes in video games in in recent memory is a " call of duty " game from a few years ago in which one of the levels involved involved walking through an airport and mowing down civilians, simulating a terrorist attack from the perspective of a terrorist.

17. And players actually had to walk through the airport and pull the trigger, shooting women and children, mowing people down.

18. And then, in order to encourage this kind of behavior, all of these video games contain within themselves a system of rewards and achievements and progress, which is to say the positive the positive encouragement that is central to how human beings learn.

19. So this, what we have here is the exact mechanism by which human beings, by our very nature,

learn behaviors in a social environment, and it's being copycatted by these violent video games, except the difference is that the gravity and seriousness of the actions the violence the the there's no discussion of sort of the ramifications of these actions as they relate to real life.

20. And instead, because it's a video game, everything is sort of replaced with simply digital encouragement, rewards, access to new levels, to new guns.

21. And so, we could see that the the behaviors that are taught by these by these video games are sort of only shown to be positive things which to adult eyes may not be very confusing but to children's eyes can be easily confused for real life lessons.

22. Now in addition to the violence, these games also tend to exaggerate and glorify a sort of machismo in violence.

23. This includes the treatment of women as sex objects.

24. One of the more successful games in the last ten years was the " god of war " series which involved literally having sex with prostitutes as a mini-game.

25. And so to reiterate, the problem here is not that these are distasteful and people may find them disgusting, but that they are extremely effective teaching tools.

26. And that and this brings us to our second point, the current system of regulation is by its nature ineffective.

27. Nowadays, in modern gaming consoles and computer gaming, anyone can go online and buy from amazon or download.

28. All you need is a credit card which and the credit card number is usually stored on the system for which the purchases are being made.

29. So basically children have access to these video games and the ability to purchase them without any sort of parental supervision.

30. And furthermore, furthermore, most parents are considerably less educated about video games and video game ratings than their children are.

31. So it makes it very easy for children to, you know, to go behind parents back and sort of sort of

get access to it ever they want to without any sort of parental supervision.

32. So because of the nature of digital media and it's the ease of access to this sort of digital media, it's by its very nature regulation is extremely challenging and and ineffective.

33. So basically, in conclusion, we as a society ban things because we are willing to to limit people's freedom and forego the benefits of these things in order to protect something, in order to because we believe that the danger they cause outweighs the benefits and the the personal freedoms that we're limiting here.

34. And in this case this perfectly fits the criteria, because what we're talking about is the education of the next generation.

35. We're talking about the education of children and the the benefits that we're foregoing is access to these violent video games which for the most part are mindless entertainment that contributes very little in a in a meaningful way, either artistically or otherwise.

36. And so for these reasons, we we should ban violent video games.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: SN_21

Topic: one-child

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. As the largest country in the world in terms of population, china faces a unique problem in that allowing its population to grow at the natural rate would have disastrous effects for the nation, for the land, for the people, and so we believe that we should support the one child policy in the people's republic of china.
2. And we propose simply an adherence to the one child policy that was already in place up until recently they switch to a two two child policy with an added bit of mechanism in which we give a tax incentive or sort of a tax break for families that have a female child in order to help to offset the economic costs that are incurred by families that have a female child instead of a male child.
3. Now, this is not, of course, a normative judgment of one gender or preference for one child over the other, but simply a recognition of the cultural realities in china and the fact that in chinese culture the when when children come of marrying age the tradition is for the female child the female, the wife to join the husband's family and and so many chinese people are reluctant to have just one female child because it means that they will not have a child to take care of them later in their life because she joins the husband's family.
4. So in order to offset this and offset the potential for a gender imbalance that arises as a result of preference for male children under the one child policy we we propose this tax incentive so that parents will not be destitute later in life without having a child to look after them.
5. So given that this is the main issue with the one child policy we're gonna talk now about the two main points why we believe that it is worthwhile to continue this policy of of population growth control.
6. First of all, we're going to talk about why the unchecked population growth rate would be simply

unsustainable for china, and second of all we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate limitation.

7. Now, to get into our first point.

8. China, at the moment, stands with a population of around one and a half billion people, making it considerably larger than even the second largest country, and much much larger than basically every other country in the world in terms of population.

9. And when one considers the fact that china still has a primarily agrarian economy with most people still engaging in subsistence farming we see that there is an issue an issue that has a multi faceted issue to sustain a a a population that would grow at the natural rate.

10. They're simply, first of all, they're simply not producing enough.

11. Not enough food, not enough energy, especially when one takes into consideration the fact that people consume more than ever nowadays with china in china with many people moving to urban environments and and using modern modern technologies and and being in modern environments, people tend to consume more more food more energy more electricity than ever before, more natural resources than ever before on an individual basis, and while it is true that in the last several decades china has undergone an industrial evolution and and therefore been more become more efficient and more productive, the fact remains that since so much of the economy still lives in rural areas and since so many of the people of china since china has not yet become productive enough to to support such a population

12. it we we have to take sort of extraneous measures here to to limit the population growth.

13. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and and the use of a natural resources in a way that is is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to

sort of first world status and and catch china up with the rest of the developed world.

14. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth.

15. Now, briefly we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate policy in terms of the limitation of personal freedoms.

16. Now, we believe that it is legitimate for governments to limit freedoms when the when that behavior when the behavior that they're limiting harms others, and in this situation, when we talk about families having more than one child, having more than one child harms others by placing excessive stress on society and the environment, and so therefore, by our own guidelines and definitions of when it's okay to limit behavior this fits our criteria

17. and and therefore it's legitimate.

18. So we say that because the unchecked population growth rate would be unsustainable for china, and because it is a legitimate behavior given the circumstances, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. So in order to offset this and offset the potential for a gender imbalance that arises as a result of preference for male children under the one child policy we we propose this tax incentive so that parents will not be destitute later in life without having a child to look after them. So given that this is the main issue with the one child policy we're gonna talk now about the two main points why we believe that it is worthwhile to continue this policy of of population growth control. First of all, we're going to talk about why the unchecked population growth rate would be simply unsustainable for

china, and second of all we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate limitation. Now, to get into our first point. China, at the moment, stands with a population of around one and a half billion people, making it considerably larger than even the second largest country, and much much larger than basically every other country in the world in terms of population.

2. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and and the use of a natural resources in a way that is is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and and catch china up with the rest of the developed world. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth. Now, briefly we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate policy in terms of the limitation of personal freedoms. Now, we believe that it is legitimate for governments to limit freedoms when the when that behavior when the behavior that they're limiting harms others, and in this situation, when we talk about families having more than one child, having more than one child harms others by placing excessive stress on society and the environment, and so therefore, by our own guidelines and definitions of when it's okay to limit behavior this fits our criteria and and therefore it's legitimate.

Evidence Used:

1. Not enough food, not enough energy, especially when one takes into consideration the fact that people consume more than ever nowadays with china in china with many people moving to urban environments and and using modern modern technologies and and being in modern environments, people tend to consume more more food more energy more electricity than ever before, more natural resources than ever before on an individual basis, and while it is true that in the last several decades china has undergone an industrial evolution and and therefore been more become more efficient and more productive, the fact remains that since so much of the economy still lives in rural areas and since so many of the people of china since china has not yet become productive enough to to support such a population it we we have to take sort of extraneous measures here to to limit the population growth. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and and the use of a natural resources in a way that is is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and and catch china up with the rest of the developed world. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth. Now, briefly we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate policy in terms of the limitation of personal freedoms.

2. And when one considers the fact that china still has a primarily agrarian economy with most people still engaging in subsistence farming we see that there is an issue an issue that has a multi faceted issue to sustain a a a population that would grow at the natural rate. They're simply, first of all, they're simply not producing enough. Not enough food, not enough energy, especially when one takes into consideration the fact that people consume more than ever nowadays with china in china with many people moving to urban environments and and using modern modern technologies and and being in modern environments, people tend to consume more more food more energy more electricity than ever before, more natural resources than ever before on an individual basis, and while it is true that in the last several decades china has undergone an industrial evolution and and therefore been more become more efficient and more productive, the fact remains that since so much of the economy still lives in rural areas and since so many of the people of china since china has not yet become productive enough to to support such a population it we we have to take sort of extraneous measures here to to limit the population growth. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and and the use of a natural resources in a way that is is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and and catch china up with the rest of the developed world.

3. They're simply, first of all, they're simply not producing enough. Not enough food, not enough energy, especially when one takes into consideration the fact that people consume more than ever nowadays with china in china with many people moving to urban environments and and using modern modern technologies and and being in modern environments, people tend to consume more more food more energy more electricity than ever before, more natural resources than ever before

on an individual basis, and while it is true that in the last several decades china has undergone an industrial evolution and and therefore been more become more efficient and more productive, the fact remains that since so much of the economy still lives in rural areas and since so many of the people of china since china has not yet become productive enough to to support such a population it we we have to take sort of extraneous measures here to to limit the population growth. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and and the use of a natural resources in a way that is is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and and catch china up with the rest of the developed world. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth.

4. it we we have to take sort of extraneous measures here to to limit the population growth. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and and therefore allow a a certain level

of carbon emissions for example, and the use of a natural resources in a way that is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and catch china up with the rest of the developed world. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth. Now, briefly we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate policy in terms of the limitation of personal freedoms. Now, we believe that it is legitimate for governments to limit freedoms when the when that behavior when the behavior that they're limiting harms others, and in this situation, when we talk about families having more than one child, having more than one child harms others by placing excessive stress on society and the environment, and so therefore, by our own guidelines and definitions of when it's okay to limit behavior this fits our criteria

5. This is especially important also when we consider the fact that the the the gains that china has made in terms of productivity have come largely through the switching over to industrial factories and the use of technologies that have environmental side effects that are detrimental to the to the land and the environment in china especially when considering the fact that in order to facilitate this rapid economic growth china's had to relax economic standards and therefore allow a a certain level of carbon emissions for example, and the use of a natural resources in a way that is not sustainable for the long term but was necessary in the short term in order to propel china to sort of first world status and catch china up with the rest of the developed world. So given that china is still not productive enough and given that the environmental standards had to be relaxed in order to in order to make way for china's economic growth, and given that even with the current

population whose whose whose growth is checked with their already serious environmental issues such as the fact that cities are choked with smog, people have to wear masks in order to to breathe clearly, a lot of the local local environments have been have been contaminated to the point of no longer being usable, keeping with all of these things in mind, the only way to insure that china remains sort of a a a a livable environment for the population is to limit the the population growth. Now, briefly we're going to talk about why this is a legitimate policy in terms of the limitation of personal freedoms. Now, we believe that it is legitimate for governments to limit freedoms when the when that behavior when the behavior that they're limiting harms others, and in this situation, when we talk about families having more than one child, having more than one child harms others by placing excessive stress on society and the environment, and so therefore, by our own guidelines and definitions of when it's okay to limit behavior this fits our criteria and and therefore it's legitimate.

Debate ID: SN_483

Topic: freedom-of-speech

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Although the freedom of speech is one of the most basic tenets of a free and open society and the most critical components of a functioning democracy, we recognize that there are certain situations in which freedom of speech certain kinds of speech are not constructive and do not contribute to the public discourse in any way and are instead, the opposite.
2. They are destructive, they cause they actively cause harm to other individuals and therefore must be limited, which is why we believe that the freedom of speech is not absolute.
3. We're gonna talk about two main points here. First of all to clarify what we mean by freedom of speech is not absolute. We believe that there are certain instances where censorship is legitimate and the freedom of speech should be limited, and we're gonna talk about two main points here.
4. First of all, the fact that we're going to explain the the idea behind why words have the power to cause harm, and second of all, we're going to give some examples of when speech should be limited that clearly convey our point here.
5. First of all, a little bit of explanation about what what we're talking about, what sorts of free speech and and why they have the power to cause harm.
6. Because, of course, we understand that the people the proponents of absolute free speech say that speech is nothing more than the expression of opinions, it's nothing more than words, words can't harm, they're just vocal noises.
7. There's nothing dangerous about that and people should have the ability to do to to say and to say whatever they want to because at any any time it begins to be limited, then we are suppressing people, and taking away people's rights, and making a return in the direction of sort of a fascistic controlling government.

8. But when we talk about limiting free speech, we're not talking about the expression of opinions or criticisms.
9. We're not talking about the discussion of new ideas.
10. What we're talking about is the fact that words are tools to communicate a message and they vary in terms of their content, in terms of their volume, the number of people they reach, in terms of the frequent frequency with which they are uttered.
11. And all of these things, when pushed to an extreme, can potentially be dangerous because human beings are social creatures and therefore, words are not just words in a vacuum.
12. They're not just noises with no consequence.
13. Words often inspire action, and they often inspire feelings in other human beings.
14. Words can lead people to do terrible things or words can lead people to feel terrible things.
15. And we're not talking here about just hurt feelings or or a bruised ego, but we're talking about actual fear for one's personal safety and well-being.
16. And we say that in instances like this it is legitimate to limit people's free speech, to protect the bodily integrity of others as well as the psychological integrity.
17. And now to give some concrete substance about what we're talking about here, we're gonna give some examples of times when freedom of speech should absolutely be limited, when it causes far more harm than good.
18. First of all is the most classic example of limitation of free speech, which is the idea of someone yelling fire in a crowded theater.
19. Now of course the idea behind this is that yelling fire in a crowded theater causes public panic, and then has the potential to cause bodily harm as people stampede towards the exit, concerned for their safety.
20. People end up getting trampled or or crushed by by the crowd, all for the sake of one individual's right to express himself and shout fire.
21. We say that the bodily harm of these people outweighs the the right for this individual to express

themselves and so this is clearly a case when this person's speech should be limited, and somebody who does yell fire in a crowded theater, under the status quo in most western liberal democracies, will be prosecuted in a court of law.

22. Another example of freedom of speech that ought to be limited: when people engage in inciteful speech on a public platform, and when we say inciteful we we don't we do not mean full of intelligent insights, we mean inciting violent behavior.

23. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country.

24. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited.

25. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words.

26. Another example: harassment.

27. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction.

28. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online.

29. People released her home address to the public and incited people to go visit her and attack her and again, freedom of speech that should be limited.

30. The final example is consideration of the ramifications of certain kinds of dishonesty, slander, libel, the potential for people to ruin somebody's reputation just with a word.

31. Or the idea of dishonest product labeling.

32. The idea saying a bottle contains medicine when it actually contains water or, for example,

omitting the fact that a product contains peanuts, potentially being dangerous for people with allergies.

All of these are clear examples where the right to freedom of expression are not that important and instead the right to protect the bodily integrity of the people that will suffer the consequences of the speech should be prioritized.

33. So because we say that words have the power to cause harm, and because there are numerous examples of why words do cause harm in the real world, we beg to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. People end up getting trampled or or crushed by by the crowd, all for the sake of one individual's right to express himself and shout fire. We say that the bodily harm of these people outweighs the the right for this individual to express themselves and so this is clearly a case when this person's speech should be limited, and somebody who does yell fire in a crowded theater, under the status quo in most western liberal democracies, will be prosecuted in a court of law. Another example of freedom of speech that ought to be limited: when people engage in inciteful speech on a public platform, and when we say inciteful we we don't we do not mean full of intelligent insights, we mean inciting violent behavior. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited.

2. Another example: harassment. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online. People released her

home address to the public and incited people to go visit her and attack her and again, freedom of speech that should be limited. The final example is consideration of the ramifications of certain kinds of dishonesty, slander, libel, the potential for people to ruin somebody's reputation just with a word.

3. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online. People released her home address to the public and incited people to go visit her and attack her and again, freedom of speech that should be limited. The final example is consideration of the ramifications of certain kinds of dishonesty, slander, libel, the potential for people to ruin somebody's reputation just with a word. Or the idea of dishonest product labeling. The idea saying a bottle contains medicine when it actually contains water or, for example, omitting the fact that a product contains peanuts, potentially being dangerous for people with allergies.

All of these are clear examples where the right to freedom of expression are not that important and instead the right to protect the bodily integrity of the people that will suffer the consequences of the speech should be prioritized.

4. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words. Another example: harassment. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online. People released her home address to the public and incited people to go visit her and attack her and again, freedom of speech that should be limited.

5. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals

or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words. Another example: harassment. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online.

6. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words. Another example: harassment. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction.

7. This is particular particularly relevant in the online era when, for example, there was a a woman who was the head of PR for actually for a a famous PR firm, named justine sacco, who released a a sort of distasteful tweet, a a joke online, that gained traction. A lot of people saw it and she ended up experiencing months of harassment online. People released her home address to the public and incited people to go visit her and attack her and again, freedom of speech that should be limited. The final example is consideration of the ramifications of certain kinds of dishonesty, slander, libel, the potential for people to ruin somebody's reputation just with a word. Or the idea of dishonest product labeling.

8. Now of course the idea behind this is that yelling fire in a crowded theater causes public panic,

and then has the potential to cause bodily harm as people stampede towards the exit, concerned for their safety. People end up getting trampled or or crushed by by the crowd, all for the sake of one individual's right to express himself and shout fire. We say that the bodily harm of these people outweighs the the right for this individual to express themselves and so this is clearly a case when this person's speech should be limited, and somebody who does yell fire in a crowded theater, under the status quo in most western liberal democracies, will be prosecuted in a court of law. Another example of freedom of speech that ought to be limited: when people engage in inciteful speech on a public platform, and when we say inciteful we we don't we do not mean full of intelligent insights, we mean inciting violent behavior. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country.

9. Another example of freedom of speech that ought to be limited: when people engage in inciteful speech on a public platform, and when we say inciteful we we don't we do not mean full of intelligent insights, we mean inciting violent behavior. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words. Another example: harassment.

10. We say that the bodily harm of these people outweighs the the right for this individual to express themselves and so this is clearly a case when this person's speech should be limited, and somebody who does yell fire in a crowded theater, under the status quo in most western liberal

democracies, will be prosecuted in a court of law. Another example of freedom of speech that ought to be limited: when people engage in inciteful speech on a public platform, and when we say inciteful we we don't we do not mean full of intelligent insights, we mean inciting violent behavior. For example, in in the post nine eleven era in the united states, many political pundits were very critical of islam as a whole and muslims and saying that muslims were conspiring against the united states, and there was a a sharp spike in the amount of violence to muslims across the country. Many mosques were attacked, especially in new york, and we say this sort of behavior also should be limited. When people when people say to their audience, when people announce in a public forum that people should go out and attack muslims or or attack another group of individuals or when they incite violence against people, we say here that their speech should be limited because, again, they they have no rights to cause such harm to other people's bodily integrity with their words.

Debate ID: SN_61

Topic: doping-in-sport

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. When we consider the fact that the use of performance enhancing drugs in sports is an offense that is incredibly subjective in nature, and we also consider the sheer amount of time effort and money that is wasted every year on testing athletes and funding organizations that drug test competitors, becomes very clear that we should allow a doping in sports.
2. And when we talk about doping we're talking about the use of basically any performance enhancing drugs such as testosterone, human growth hormone, etcetera.
3. Now we're not fighting to make illegal drugs legal, but we are saying that we should remove any and all penalties that are imposed by sporting organizations on athletes that have been that have tested positive for the use of of such drugs.
4. And the reason we believe that we should engage in in this motion that we should pass this motion is because first of all, it's good for sports, second of all, because athletes should be free to do what they want to with their bodies, and third of all, because as we've seen in recent years, there's simply no way to stop it and because most of the harms of doping arise from our failure to accept it as a fact of reality we're better served by simply accepting the fact that it doping occurs when will always occur.
5. Now, why do we say that doping is good for sports?
6. So, counter intuitively here, we say that sports are spectator events.
7. Fundamentally, sports are about the the this the spectacle, the fact that there are viewers most sports people generally don't consider to be worth playing unless it's televised, unless it's seen by people.
8. People rarely play on unless they're people rarely engage in their sport unless it's on a stage.

9. Especially when we're talking about professional leagues such as the NFL, the NBA, when we're talking about things like the olympics, and part of the reason we say that they're spectator offenses because first of all, so much effort goes into televising it

10. but

11. and but that is a result of the fact that most of these sports are can only exist because they are funded by spectators, they're funded by the people who wish to see the sports, which is what allows them to flourish in the first place.

12. And all of these sort of consideration and elevation that athletes enjoy to superstar status comes as a result of the fact that they're not just engaging in their sport, they're not just practicing their craft, they're doing so on a stage in front of people.

13. That's what sports is all about now, we say that doping is good for sports as a spectator event because people, spectators, the fans, are only really interested in seeing the highest level of competition.

14. We know that this is the case because people watch the NFL and the NBA far more than they watch college football or college basketball, and they watch college football and college basketball far far more than they watch high school football or high school basketball, and the same goes for basically every other sport because people are interested in seeing the spectacle of the human body pushed to the limits and the ultimate in what humanity is capable of.

15. And so because PED's improve athletes, they improve the quality of the competition, and therefore they provide a better show for spectators, which draws more viewers and draws more attention from around the world, and therefore thereby pumping more money into the sport and and and bring more fame and recognition and appreciation of athletes, which thereby draws even more people to the sport, both as spectators and as future players.

16. So we say that PED's improve the quality of the competition and therefore they improve the sport as a spectator event, and also improve the quality of lives of the the athletes themselves because they get more money for their efforts, more fame, more recognition etcetera.

17. Now, getting into our second point here, the other reason we believe the PED's should be allowed in sports it's because athletes have bodily autonomy and should be free to do what they want to with their bodies.

18. They already, first of all, make incredible sacrifices for success.

19. Anybody who competes on an international level, on the global stage and basically any sport, be it gymnastics, or football, or soccer, or at the olympics for any event, makes incredible sacrifices in terms of time, usually in terms of money too, for all the people that don't end up making it and in terms of their their personal relationships they're making incredible sacrifices in order to achieve a level of proficiency in talent and skill to compete on such a level.

20. We said that they should be they are allowed to do this, they they choose to do this of their own volition and they should be allowed to and they should be allowed just like that with PED's to use performance enhancing drugs, even if they may be unhealthy or even if they may be risky, because it's a sacrifice that they're clearly willing to make for the sake of being competitive at an international level.

21. And furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in conferring an unfair advantage, quote unquote, because you know we've seen over the course of time that every time a new tactic is employed by athletes people call it unfair at first.

22. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner.

23. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport.

24. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by by athletes to be competitive at the highest level.

25. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and

there are many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym.

26. And we say these are legitimate course of action, and people should be allowed to treat their bodies to push their bodies to the limit and do things that it would be traditionally considered unhealthy.

27. And a the last point that we want to make is that there's no way to stop the use of performance enhancing drugs and we're better served by accepting it.

28. We're it we can never stop it because basically, there's always new drugs being invented constantly for to allow for the enhancement of performance and and our testing methods are in perfect, they're costly, they're a waste of time and effort, sports end up having to ban their biggest stars and the biggest attractions, the people that draw the biggest crowds, and and and and in the end non doping athletes lose out because out of trying to follow the rules and do the right things they ended up losing the competitive advantage.

29. And if we were to just accept and embrace it, basically all would be okay because the damages are not from doping itself but from fighting it so hard.

30. So because we say it's good for the sport, because we say athletes should be free to do what they want to with their bodies, and because we say that there's no way to stop it anyway, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. They already, first of all, make incredible sacrifices for success. Anybody who competes on an international level, on the global stage and basically any sport, be it gymnastics, or football, or soccer, or at the olympics for any event, makes incredible sacrifices in terms of time, usually in

terms of money too, for all the people that don't end up making it and in terms of their their personal relationships they're making incredible sacrifices in order to achieve a level of proficiency in talent and skill to compete on such a level. We said that they should be they are allowed to do this, they they choose to do this of their own volition and they should be allowed to and they should be allowed just like that with PED's to use performance enhancing drugs, even if they may be unhealthy or even if they may be risky, because it's a sacrifice that they're clearly willing to make for the sake of being competitive at an international level. And furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in conferring an unfair advantage, quote unquote, because you know we've seen over the course of time that every time a new tactic is employed by athletes people call it unfair at first. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner.

2. And furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in conferring an unfair advantage, quote unquote, because you know we've seen over the course of time that every time a new tactic is employed by athletes people call it unfair at first. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by by athletes to be competitive at the highest level. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and there are many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym.

3. We said that they should be they are allowed to do this, they they choose to do this of their own

volition and they should be allowed to and they should be allowed just like that with PED's to use performance enhancing drugs, even if they may be unhealthy or even if they may be risky, because it's a sacrifice that they're clearly willing to make for the sake of being competitive at an international level. And furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in conferring an unfair advantage, quote unquote, because you know we've seen over the course of time that every time a new tactic is employed by athletes people call it unfair at first. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by by athletes to be competitive at the highest level.

4. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and there are many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym. And we say these are legitimate course of action, and people should be allowed to treat their bodies to push their bodies to the limit and do things that it would be traditionally considered unhealthy. And a the last point that we want to make is that there's no way to stop the use of performance enhancing drugs and we're better served by accepting it. We're it we can never stop it because basically, there's always new drugs being invented constantly for to allow for the enhancement of performance and and our testing methods are in perfect, they're costly, they're a waste of time and effort, sports end up having to ban their biggest stars and the biggest attractions, the people that draw the biggest crowds, and and and and in the end non doping athletes lose out because out of trying to follow the rules and do the right

things they ended up losing the competitive advantage. And if we were to just accept and embrace it, basically all would be okay because the damages are not from doping itself but from fighting it so hard.

5. Anybody who competes on an international level, on the global stage and basically any sport, be it gymnastics, or football, or soccer, or at the olympics for any event, makes incredible sacrifices in terms of time, usually in terms of money too, for all the people that don't end up making it and in terms of their their personal relationships they're making incredible sacrifices in order to achieve a level of proficiency in talent and skill to compete on such a level. We said that they should be they are allowed to do this, they they choose to do this of their own volition and they should be allowed to and they should be allowed just like that with PED's to use performance enhancing drugs, even if they may be unhealthy or even if they may be risky, because it's a sacrifice that they're clearly willing to make for the sake of being competitive at an international level. And furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in conferring an unfair advantage, quote unquote, because you know we've seen over the course of time that every time a new tactic is employed by athletes people call it unfair at first. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport.

6. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by by athletes to be competitive at the highest level. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and there are

many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym. And we say these are legitimate course of action, and people should be allowed to treat their bodies to push their bodies to the limit and do things that it would be traditionally considered unhealthy. And a the last point that we want to make is that there's no way to stop the use of performance enhancing drugs and we're better served by accepting it.

7. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by by athletes to be competitive at the highest level. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and there are many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym. And we say these are legitimate course of action, and people should be allowed to treat their bodies to push their bodies to the limit and do things that it would be traditionally considered unhealthy. And a the last point that we want to make is that there's no way to stop the use of performance enhancing drugs and we're better served by accepting it. We're it we can never stop it because basically, there's always new drugs being invented constantly for to allow for the enhancement of performance and and our testing methods are in perfect, they're costly, they're a waste of time and effort, sports end up having to ban their biggest stars and the biggest attractions, the people that draw the biggest crowds, and and and and in the end non doping athletes lose out because out of trying to follow the rules and do the right things they ended up losing the competitive advantage.

8. For example, the first olympic high jumper that jumped backwards over the bar as opposed to forwards was called a cheater because he was doing things in a non traditional manner. And the first football team for example to prepare for a game by watching footage of the opposing team and learning their tactics and strategies were called cheaters, but now both of these things are common

practice and used by everybody that competes in these sports because it's not an unfair advantage, it's simply the evolution of the sport. Furthermore, we say that PED's are not unique in being an unhealthy sacrifice made by athletes to be competitive at the highest level. For example, gymnasts that compete at the olympics often train ten hours or more a day, and there are many cases of young girls who are overtraining so much to prepare for a competition that they stop getting their period and they experience all sorts of bodily injuries and harms and you know boxers who who to prepare and get ready for a fight spar twenty rounds in a row and get concussions from taking such beatings in the gym. And we say these are legitimate course of action, and people should be allowed to treat their bodies to push their bodies to the limit and do things that it would be traditionally considered unhealthy.

Debate ID: TL_121

Topic: ban-boxing

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should ban boxing.
2. At the beginning of this this debate, we think there's something important to recognize about boxing, which is that oftentimes, when we consider whether or not we should ban something, there are often reforms that can be associated with whatever we are considering banning, that could alleviate much of the harm that arises from the thing that is being banned.
3. But when it comes to boxing, we simply don't think that it is possible to reform it, to the point where it isn't simply a blood sport, where at, its very basis, boxing is this thing, in which we pay to see two people beat themselves up, to see them brutalize each other, and we get this this pleasure, this visceral pleasure from seeing this type of bloody violence.
4. We think that at its heart, that is what boxing is, and we think that in any other context, we wouldn't view boxing as a sport, but as a crime.
5. We think that just because two people may be able to consent into going into a boxing match, it doesn't mean that the signals, the social implications of boxing, don't have reverberations that are unjust, and it doesn't mean that those people can immediately consent into these things. So, this is what we're going to talk about, we're going to talk about harms to the self, to boxers themselves, and we're going to talk about the bad social impacts from boxing.
6. So firstly, on the boxers themselves.
7. Boxing as a sport is one of the most dangerous sports that exist.
8. Concussions and brain damage are incredibly common, arising from boxing.
9. People oftentimes suffer from long term brain damage, because of the damages they take during boxing.

10. Concussions concussions are likely going to arise, when people are hitting each other in the head, on a near daily basis, for training and these types of things.
11. We think that it's simply likely that this physical toll, on a regular basis, is going to arrive in long term harm.
12. So, we don't think people are capable of internalizing it.
13. Because people can't internalize, they can't fully fathom the harms that they're taking upon themselves, we don't think it's actually possible for them to consent in a meaningful way, because they can't properly weigh the gains that they could potentially get from boxing, against those long term harms, and we think in these instances, the government or the state is justifying in banning people from taking these actions.
14. We don't think you can we think you can restrict the action, as long as you're doing it for the long term good of individuals, who otherwise wouldn't be able to take these things into account.
15. As far as the bad social impacts, we think that, what you're essentially doing with boxing is paying people to beat each other up.
16. We think that this is obviously, firstly, a horrible use of capital.
17. We think that, even if that amount of money is a small amount of money, it could be used for almost anything else, in a productive social manner, that isn't being used for boxing.
18. We think anything else you put it towards is likely going to be a social net gain, compared to boxing.
19. We also think it desensitizes people to violence.
20. In a world, in which we are constantly we are constantly observing violence, whether it's in the news, or in our media, we think that we're already desensitized to it to such a great degree, that we shouldn't continue to desensitize ourselves, by paying people to brutalize each other.
21. We think that it's unjust for society, to present these norms to individuals, and to present these opportunities to individuals, that prey against our visceral desires, that we think that this is something that people recognize as bad, that they recognize as problematic, but we viscerally act

against those rational ideas.

22. We think, that we should legislate based on the rational ideas that we hold.

23. Recognizing that boxing is, in and of itself, a violence that people commit against each other, that it incentivize people to harm each other, it incentivize people to get into this sport, to harm others and to harm themselves, it makes those people more violent, and it makes our society more accepting of violence in the long run.

24. For all these reasons, we should ban boxing.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_181

Topic: multiculturalism

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Multiculturalism brings more good than harm.
2. When we're talking about multiculturalism what we mean is to have a diverse set of cultures interacting with each other and existing, and co-existing in one proximate location.
3. This doesn't necessarily mean that these cultures are blending together in any particular way
4. but it's just that these cultures are able to coincide and to exist with one another. What this is, this could be compared to societies in which there's a monoculture or one prevailing social idea of how to live, or the types of food, all the things that wrapped up in what cultural reasons. So, we're going to talk about two things: we're talk about culture as an expression of the self and culture as an expression of society. So firstly, we think that culture is incredibly important to one's expression of the self.
5. We would say that society constructs the self.
6. That individuals are not blank slates from tabula rasa monoliths that walk through society and make themselves, but rather they are created by the society that they are born in.
7. They learn from the culture that surrounds them and their tastes are attracted to that which their cultures bred them to be attracted to.
8. So, individuals have particular desires for things that their culture dictates them to have.
9. Whether this is a desire to live a particular type of lifestyle or to live an active or not active lifestyle whether to pursue particular types of sports or foods or things like that.
10. We think that all of these, and a variety of other preferences, are embodied within the culture that one has.
11. So multiculturalism allows for better expression of the self and more self fulfillment.

12. This is for two reasons: firstly, the diversity of cultures when it exists allows for people who do not feel safe or connected to their particular culture to find other expressions and other outlets for the things that they care about.

13. It allows them to explore and to learn more about what the world has to offer.

14. About the many variety of ways in which the individuals may live, and from there to find one that is more fulfilling.

15. It means that individuals that feel trapped within their communities have an outlet in which they can express that anxiety and from there we think multiculturalism allows for a diverse group of people to live simultaneously without having to impede each other's desires.

16. We also think that more cultures build more diverse people.

17. So even if people don't feel excluded from their own culture, we think that when individuals get the type of cultural education that comes with living amongst a variety of cultures, they're able to better understand their own culture they're better to able understand their own habits their own practices, and they're more able to critically examine those things, which means that when they're problematic they're more likely to turn away from them which we think is good broadly, but it also means that they can take other cultures into their own life and become more diverse and well rounded individuals which again leads for more avenues of self expression.

18. Secondly, multiculturalism in society.

19. We think, firstly, that when you have a multicultural a multicultural society it makes it easier for other microcultures and smaller subsets of cultures to develop.

20. This, again, we think is preferable because in a society in which more cultural exploration is encouraged, it ensures that more people are able to express themselves in the way they want and not be demonized for how they express themselves, which we think is ultimately an expression of freedom and good within society.

21. We also think it leads to more accepting citizens.

22. So, even if you do not have the cultural beliefs or the cultural practices of your neighbor, when

you're able to interact with those people and see them as human, and ensures that you don't just view culture as a monolith but as something that people take part in.

23. It ensures that you have more tolerant human beings broadly, because it means that individuals are able to understand that other cultures are not threats to their own, that other cultures don't impede their ability to live, and from there we think it leads to a more accepting society broadly.

24. When you are able to live side by side with other cultures, when you're able to live in a society in which you're not directly tied to the culture that you've been born into and you live in a multicultural society, we think that you breed a better social background and a better blending of cultures that helps people and helps maintain society.

25. And for that reason we think multiculturalism brings more good than harm.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_1

Topic: ban-video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should ban the sale of violent video games to minors.
2. So, what this would look like in reality is that, there would be age checks that ensure that, individuals, who are below a certain age, cannot buy video games, there already rating system, so we would say any video game that has intense violence would receive an m rating, and that people below the age of eighteen will not be able to buy these things, you would also be fined, or possibly punish to imprisoned for a short period of time, if you were to then give these video games to minors, so if you're a parent, and you give this video game to your child, you could face financial, or other types of repercussions.
3. Okay, so, two main arguments: the first is that youth is is immensely impressionable, and we need to prevent this impression from being attached to them, and the second is that youth are not full agents, and therefore it is fair to restrict them, when it gives them a different benefit.
4. Okay, so firstly on why youth is impressionable.
5. We think that, even though these violent video games are unlikely to lead to these types lead to these people like actually creating and committing crimes in the future.
6. What we think these things do is desensitize youth to the violence that exists around them.
7. And especially at a point, in which these people are very young, if they already become desensitized to these things, while they're young, we think they're unlikely to try and respond to them passionately and politically in the future.
8. And this is crucial, because we think that, if you don't have a politically active group, if you don't have a group of young people that see violence, and see the problems in the world, as something that need to be solved, as something that isn't normal and okay, that, what would likely happen is

that, these people are less likely to be politically active, and motivated to change these things in the future.

9. We think, early in collocation, at such a young age, below eighteen, while eighteen may be an arbitrary line, we think that allowing people to have these things, at such an early age, is almost certainly going to result in long term ramifications, and it's possible that people, who see this type of violence, become so desensitized that they commit those crimes in the future.

10. Even if this is a marginal chance of happening, we think that these crimes can often be so heinous, murder, and other types of assault, that people learn from violent video games that normal like shootings and things like this, we think that, you shouldn't take these risks, especially because there's no positive benefit gained from allowing these people to have access to these video games, and as I'll explain in a moment, they're not full agents, and therefore restricting their rights is not a moral harm.

11. So, they're not full agents for a few reasons, which are crucial.

12. The first is that, simply legally, they're not recognized as full adults. Under the law, which is the legal and moral system that states act under, these people are not fully autonomous individuals, and we recognize that by not allowing them to do things, like drink, vote, and otherwise interact with society in the same way that adults are able to.

13. We think under this legal system, given that there are certain risks that come from desensitizing these individuals, we think that, it is simply in line, with the logic of our legal system, to restrict them from being able to do this.

14. Furthermore, it's clear that individuals become more autonomous, and more able to make choices with age.

15. The further they've been socialized, the more they've been able to gain independence, in slow steps, from the time that they're born, to the time they leave their parent's house, are able to otherwise be independent at age eighteen.

16. We think that, there are significant social steps that these individuals go through, in which they

gain autonomy, and they gain agency.

17. We don't think that people are simply born with these capabilities, but rather learn these capabilities through their socialization.

18. Given that these individual simply haven't been exposed to the world, in a way in which they can differentiate between the violence that exists in these video games, and the type of violence that's occurring, and how these things are distinct from the real world, we think that these individuals should not be exposed to these types of things.

19. So and finally, we think that the state has an obligation to correct for bad parents.

20. We think that, parents are not innately gifted with the ability to parent, and that sometimes they raise their children in improper ways.

21. Given that these types of video games are likely to desensitize their children, which, as I've already explained, is a crucial harm moving forward, we think that it's clear that, the state has an obligation to act, in this instance, in line with the legal code that already exists, and we should ban the sale of violent video games to minors.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_482

Topic: tobacco

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should not subsidize the cultivation of tobacco.
2. So at the very start of this debate we just want to make it incredibly clear that to subsidize any sort of product is to use public funds, to use money that's been taken through people via taxation and spend it on some other good.
3. Normally when we do this there some some there's some sort of social benefit that is associated with the subsidy.
4. Whether it's cleaning up pollution and having more green technology, or whether it's allowing new businesses to thrive that can provide good things for the market, new markets opening et cetera.
5. Tobacco does none of these things. All the scientific effects of tobacco show that it is a detriment to your health. That smoking tobacco can cause cancer. It can lead to addiction.
6. It can lead to gum disease.
7. It can deteriorate your health and a number of cosmetic and non cosmetic ways that can be incredibly detrimental, and to subsidize tobacco only through public funds is to use public funds in a way to hurt the public.
8. It's like if you're going to use public funds to further police communities in a militaristic way.
9. To have military rule over society.
10. Now obviously this isn't this is not the same degree of that, but we think that it's similar in kind and that it's using public funds to harm the public.
11. So we think that is the first reason why this is simply unacceptable.
12. The second reason is that we think that it kind of that undermines the whole point of a subsidy to subsidize the tobacco industry.

13. Recognize that the tobacco industry has existed for hundreds of years and is a multinational multi billion dollar corporate system.
14. The corporations that fund tobacco camel, marlboro, these types of companies have immense amounts of funds at their availability. They can lobby congress people. They can get meetings with these people. They have huge money to use on campaigns to try and get people elected that are going to be favorable to their point of view.
15. We simply don't think that tobacco is a product that needs to be subsidized.
16. Besides the fact that tobacco is overtly harmful to people, these corporations have the money to cultivate this and do it in a way that won't undercut their bottom line.
17. Tobacco cultivation is not an incredibly expensive process and because these corporations already have massive revenue sources coming in not just from america but largely from developing countries in which tobacco smoking and cigarette smoking is at an incredibly high level, we think that there's no reason why the government should step in to make a multibillion dollar corporation even more profitable, to put more pockets in the money put more money in the pockets of CEOs whose job it is is to grow a crop that will hurt people.
18. We think that's wrong.
19. And finally our last point is just about trade offs.
20. Recognized that what money is fungible.
21. If you were to subsidize tobacco in the cultivation of tobacco you wouldn't have that money to use in other types of subsidies.
22. You couldn't subsidize say the things we were talking about earlier, green technology or things of that nature.
23. We think that subsidizing almost anything else would be preferable to subsidizing the cultivation of tobacco.
24. Even if you were going to subsidize something that wasn't overtly a public good, even if you're going to subsidize something that was a specifically private interest, at least when you subsidize

private interests that aren't multibillion dollar corporations, you're doing something that is actually beneficial to the market.

25. You're opening new markets.

26. You're creating new opportunities and new competition.

27. Subsidizing tobacco does none of that in the competitive market.

28. It doesn't enhance the market in any way and it only serves to increase the wealth of a few select people.

29. Because tobacco is harmful, it's an unnecessary subsidy, and the money would be better spent anywhere almost anywhere else.

30. We should not subsidize the cultivation of tobacco.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_681

Topic: ip-rights

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should abolish intellectual property rights. What we think this looks like in practice is removing the ability for people to patent things, the ability for people to take ownership over things like entertainment media that is created other types of intellectual property, anything that is the creation of the mind or anything that has been derived from an idea that you had. We don't think that people should have ownership over these things. So firstly, why do we think that these ideas cannot be owned in a very fundamental manner? We think that all ideas are the result of human history.
2. That all creation and all things that are created have only been able to be derived because of human advancement.
3. The ability for you to create some new technology in the present relies on centuries of societal, social, and economic as well as scientific progress that made modern technology and modern creation possible.
4. It also all ideas that all people have rely on educational system that's created by the society they find themselves in, one that educates them and provides them with the tools that allow them to treat these types of things, to create what is currently intellectual property.
5. We also think that many of these things come over the course of collaboration, tacit collaboration and direct collaboration and therefore we don't think that it is fair to give any one person ownership because all ideas are grown out of the community.
6. No person independently created any of their intellectual property.
7. We don't think that it is proper like property that you can own physical property that people should have ownership over these things because they were spawn not by a market but by society and by people.

8. So given that we think it is principally more just that intellectual property rights be abolished and that these things are principally unjustified.
9. What do we think are three tangible gains from abolishing intellectual property rights?
10. The first is increased innovation and second followed closely is increased knowledge.
11. They go hand in hand.
12. When you don't have intellectual property rights it means that ownership of ideas, things like scientific discoveries, things like technological innovations, these types of things aren't protected by IP laws which means the information about them is much more freely available.
13. This means that people are more capable of learning about these types of things and they're more capable of incorporating different ideas into their own technology, into their own creations, into their own growth.
14. What do we think this means? We think it means that you get longer and broader innovation in the long term.
15. In the short term, we think that people are more likely to collaborate.
16. People are less likely to be secretive about ideas which means we think that we can falsify like bad ideas quickly.
17. We think that technology is more efficient right off the start because we think that people are less likely or less incentivized to quickly bring ideas to market so that they can patent use types of things and we think that long term you get a society that has greater innovation because you're more able to synthesize ideas that that otherwise would've been blocked by intellectual property protection.
18. So the second big gain that we think you get from abolishing intellectual property rights is breaking down unfair monopolies.
19. So a major issue on which this exists is pharmaceuticals.
20. In the status quo, pharmaceutical companies are able to bring pills to market and charge exorbitant prices because they have long term control over the pharmaceutical because you can't

make any sort of copy of that pharmaceutical for twenty years after its been patented.

21. The problem with this is that in this market and in many other markets this massively drives up consumer prices because it creates overt monopolies.

22. If you abolish intellectual property rights and you allow for fair competition to take place in the market in which you don't just get the first movers advantage by having the idea first, or finishing the technology first, but rather you're forced to compete with every other entity in the market that is capable of producing these things.

23. We think you get these types of material products on a better scale.

24. We think you get them cheaper and you get a more efficiently than before because we think intellectual property is principally unjust and there are massive social gains from abolishing it.

25. We should abolish intellectual property rights.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_701

Topic: endangered-species

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should protect endangered species.
2. So, when we're talking about protecting endangered species, we think of a few things in particular.
3. Firstly, we would obviously institute prohibitions on hunting, so if an animal is on the endangered species list, we would say that there should be laws against being able to hunt that animal, and of course very stiff penalties that come with breaking those laws, to ensure that if they are broken that there's deterrence against people doing it in the future.
4. We would also have investments in reservations and sanctuaries in order to ensure that for animals, especially those where their environments are being continually destroyed by globalization, by industrialization and by climate change, that there are sanctuaries guaranteed for these animals so they can live in their natural environments, where they're able to grow and be healthy and actually live in the way where they are naturally meant to be, and this could include investing in having large swaths of land in order to invest in preserving these animals' environments.
5. Okay.
6. So firstly, we would say that animals should be given human rights.
7. We think that rights need to be objective in order for them to be enforceable.
8. What we think the reason for this is that if rights are based on arbitrary standards, for example if I arbitrarily decide that animals should be excluded because they're not human, allowing for arbitrary distinctions in who can and cannot serve rights, opens the door for allowing any sort of arbitrary distinction.
9. It can allow for arbitrary distinctions based on race, on gender, on other types of things that are

immutable to an individual, in the same way that the species that an animal is is immutable to what it is.

10. And given that this is the case, we think that having arbitrary system of rights, non-objective systems of rights, ultimately lead to people that we care about or should care about being harmed.

11. In order to avoid this, we think that an objective way to look at rights is through rights being the system to avoid pleasure and pain.

12. We think that ultimately rights exist for those two primary purposes.

13. If you ask why people should be given the right to life, why they should be given the right to bodily autonomy, the answer is ultimately that it having those types of rights is likely to minimize the pain that that person experiences and maximize their pleasure.

14. Animals are capable of experiencing pain and pleasure in deep ways.

15. There the stimulus of pain and pleasure somewhere in animals as it is to humans, and they can be knowledgeable of the pain they are facing, they can even come to fear that pain in the future.

16. There are also, if you don't think that the pain pleasure principle is important and you would base it on things like consciousness, animals are often capable of building communities, having empathy, collective learning, and other human traits.

17. So we think that animals, based on objective standards which everyone who choose to use, deserve to have right.

18. So, we and so the second reason that we think we should protect endangered species, aside from the fact that they have rights and they need to be those rights need to be preserved through protections, is that we are responsible for them being endangered in most instances.

19. Human expansion and industrial development cleared whole ecosystems and crowded out other species.

20. It led to massive declines in species on a global level, and on top of that, things like climate change that led to increased drought, increased environmental disasters, different weather patterns and migrations of animals en masse, all of these things led to the endangerment of thousands of

different types of animal species across the globe.

21. Given that human activity is intrinsically linked with the fact that these animals are endangered, with the fact that the species is suffering at the hands of humankind, we think we have an obligation to act to help them.

22. Given that we as a species, we as a collective, have benefited from the things that brought so much harm to these animals, we have an obligation to ensure that we don't benefit of obvious rights violations.

23. The rights violation of having your homes destroyed, of being put in immense pain and facing death, simply because of the fact that your environment has been eroded. We don't think that this is just and we think it violates the rights that these animals ought have. And for these reasons, we should protect endangered species.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_841

Topic: blasphemy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should criminalize blasphemy. So to be abundantly clear in this debate we wanna make a distinction between criticism of religion and blasphemy and blaspheme. So we think that blasphemy is not necessarily criticizing religion but it's denouncing the fact that the religion exists.
2. Denouncing the beliefs and denouncing holders of those views, and saying that the religion itself is fundamentally problematic.
3. That the religion itself is fundamentally a bad thing.
4. It's not necessarily saying that certain tenants of religion may be problematic or that certain tenants religion, we don't wanna prohibit theological discussion because we think that faith only grows with more theological discussion, but essentially critical views, views that are critical of the holding of religion itself, we would criminalize those views.
5. Okay.
6. So, two reasons why we think that blasphemy needs to be prohibited: the first is we're going to talk about the purpose of faith and why it's so crucial.
7. Recognize that faith, no matter what faith one may hold, is essentially it means of achieving spiritual peace.
8. We recognize the world that we live in is essentially a nihilist world.
9. There is no, from any sort of natural way, meaning derived upon our existence which means that nature and the state of existence, biology, science, are never going to be enough to dictate answers to questions that exist such as why should we be here, why should we exist and what good acts should I serve?
10. We think that religion is able to fill that void within humanity.

11. When people are able to have a faith and are able to hold their faith, they're able to come to some sort of peace about these questions.
12. Faith dictates to individuals what is morally right and wrong, which helps to answer quandaries that simply do not have a right answer in an objective sense.
13. It also allows for people to have an understanding of how they should live their life, what the purpose of their life is, and more importantly at the end of it, it gives them a sense of security over the after life.
14. The most tantalizing and curious thing about human life itself is death, is what happens after death and religion allows for people to come to peace with that.
15. We think without religion people have much less security in their being and security in their life which makes them ultimately more nihilist in their existence and more depressed in their existence.
16. So we think that religion plays a crucial role in the ability for people to have utility in their lives. To fulfill themselves in a meaningful way outside of just the physical world. We don't think that religion itself is an exclusive ideology.
17. So we don't think that religion itself necessarily excludes logic and understanding of things outside of the world.
18. For example, the pope came out and said that evolution can be concurrent with god.
19. Its way that we come to understand god.
20. So we don't think that religion itself excludes people from having critical thinking, it only allows them to answer questions that are beyond the scope of their critical thinking.
21. So with that in mind, we think that blasphemy is essentially hate speech. Blasphemy is not just a criticism, but hate. For example, when you see people like richard dawkins who demonize all religions as hateful, as problematic, as trying to spew anger at the world, which is simply not how religion actually functions. They take extremism and they take extremist views and they perpetuate those as the mainstream, and it criticizes people for things that are beyond their control. We think that this is unfair and we think it's essentially an attack on the person in the same way that people

are attacked for their immutable characteristics.

22. Whether it be gender or whether it be race.

23. People can also be attacked for the religious views they hold and in many ways these religious views aren't things that you choose.

24. It's something that comes to you from a sign of god when it comes to you through a a deeply developed faith that you've had since you're very youngest point, since you were a child and in this way it's something that is very hard to discard through voluntary effort.

25. So we think that essentially when you blaspheme, when you say hatred towards religion in general, when you say hatred and you spew hatred about religion you're attacking a person's individual self.

26. People shouldn't have to experience hatred simply because their religion may be illogical, or because people that practice their religion do bad things in other areas.

27. We don't think that people who are muslim should face the wrath that is attacked and sent towards extremists and we don't think that this should be the case for any other religion.

28. While criticism is good for public discourse and theological discussion is important, we don't think blasphemy serves any public good and for this reason we should criminalize blasphemy.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: TL_881

Topic: holocaust-denial

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Holocaust denial should be a criminal offense.
2. Now obviously in this debate we're not talking about holding beliefs about holocaust denial but rather about propagating or promulgating those beliefs throughout society.
3. Whether this is publicly saying these things, publishing things that preach these types of ideas etcetera.
4. We said we would ban and criminalize those types of things.
5. So first, we think we need to talk about when we restrict speech, because we think we do it all the time the status quo for justifiable reasons.
6. So firstly, we restrict speech when it is harmful to people's identity.
7. So this is distinct from speech that simply makes someone feel uncomfortable, or makes someone feel sad, but rather this is speech that directly targets individuals because of an irrevocable or unchangeable aspect of who they are.
8. So things like hate crimes, things like racist slurs against minority communities in the united states which are criminalize, things like taking action that specifically target minority and discriminated against communities, so we restrict these things in the status quo because we don't think you have a right to spread those types of hated words.
9. We think the freedom of speech exists in order to ensure that we can have an open marketplace of ideas that allows for increased discourse and increased self expression, but when you when you spread these types of ideas things, like holocaust denial, you raised the experiences of an entire group of people, of the jewish population, and an experience that shaped their identity as a culture that is something that was an attack on their existence and is something that is a turning point in

human history and that needs to be recognized.

10. We think that spreading these types of ideas undermines their identity and also serves to undermine the marketplace of ideas, the ability for people to express themselves which means that this is an instance in which you can criminalize and therefore restrict speech.

11. The second reason that we can restrict speech is when it encourages bad social behavior.

12. So recognized that holocaust denial doesn't exist in a vacuum.

13. Those that deny the holocaust are also often parts of things neo-nazi and fascist organizations and things that spread and preach anti-semitism.

14. We think that all of these ideas are unacceptable within our society.

15. To continue to demonized a group of people no matter what group of people, whether they be minority group or whether they be a jewish community we think is unacceptable within our society.

16. All these people have the equal right to live a peaceful and prosperous life as anyone else and to and to have holocaust denial and to continue from there to preach things like harm against the jewish people and to because of holocaust denial said that they're liars about these types of things, that there's a vast jewish conspiracy which is what comes along with things like this, we think that that is unacceptable and only breeds more violence against this group of people that has already suffered far too much violence over the course of their history.

17. So the second reason that we think that we should that in this particular instance we should make holocaust denial a criminal offense is because to deny the holocaust into a race history creates a slippery slope in which we begin to forget the lessons of the holocaust.

18. We think that the holocaust is a turning point in human history not because it was a genocide but because it was a nearly universally recognized and condemned genocide.

19. It set an idea of what is unacceptable within a society and we think that to undermine the holocaust by denying its existence undermines the prohibitions that we have as societies on that idea and while genocide has occurred since the holocaust and will likely occur again, we think that mass demonization of the holocaust gives us reason to interfere in and break sovereign states

sovereignty and ensure that people are going to be protected and we think that that is of the utmost importance that we do not allow the holocaust or instances of genocide to occur in the future and as this undermines our ability to do that and also violates the entire reason we have freedom of speech by harming other individuals we think that holocaust denial should be a criminal offense.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: YB_121

Topic: ban-boxing

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. When a bunch of rich, white men sit down and for their personal amusement watch two men, probably men of color, in a ring, beat each other up until one of them can no longer stand, this is, by all accounts, nothing short of a modern-day coliseum with modern-day gladiators, and there is no more room in the twenty first century for such things.
2. I'm going to have two points in the speech.
3. First point about the tracking of black youth to become boxers, and the second point about what's so wrong about that. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community. The suburban neighborhoods are cramped full of boxing gyms. This is no accident. This happens for a simple reason: a wealthier mom will never allow her child to go and train in a sport that is considered risky and dangerous, where he might suffer injuries or get beat up.
4. She will make sure that her child goes to things that are considered more luxurious and more expensive and more safe.
5. But for lower class families that live in these ghettos, where the parents both work around the clock and don't have exactly the time or the money to send their children to the best outdoor activities, boxing can be very tempting and very alluring for these children.
6. For one thing, it's way cheaper to exercise in a boxing gym than other activities but moreover, it allows these children to a: take out aggressions that they've developed over time because of their poor life circumstances, and b: it sells them a dream that this is their ticket out, that this is the way to become successful, famous and rich, with role models such as mike tyson or joe frazier or floyd mayweather, all very famous and rich, black boxers that have started out rough in life.

7. These children believe that this is what they should put their time and effort in, and not in their education or in other things.

8. Now why is that so problematic? Hey, it worked for Mike Tyson, right? Well, here's the problem: a, this is a very dangerous sport, obviously.

9. A few succeed, yes, but a lot of them get injured in the process and don't succeed.

10. We are talking about short-term injuries and we are talking about long-term damages to many, many boxers that suffer brain damage over time from all the beatings that they got or body or suffered body injuries as well.

11. B, it makes it a lot harder for these youth for this youth to be integrated into higher classes of society in other places.

12. Why?

Because when you're a boxer and occasionally, you show up with your face all smashed where we or with your teeth broken in, then it's very likely that you'll get kicked out of school or that you won't be able to secure yourself a very good job.

13. So, boxing actually interferes with a very few serious opportunities that these children have eh might have.

14. But perhaps the worst of all, c, the tickets to the boxing eh to the boxing venues are very expensive.

15. This means that the audience that comes and watch this are, as I said, usually rich men.

16. Now, what's special about boxing and separates it from other sports events, like basketball or even football, which also are very physical is that boxing is all about beating each other up.

17. It's all about knocking the other guy out literally. There are no other rules or or or games to play.

18. You don't need to put the ball inside the basket, you need to knock the other guy out.

19. You need to to beat the crap out of him.

20. Now, there is something very symbolic and humiliating about being in a ring and having a lot of rich guys cheering for you when you try to knock the other guy out and he tries to knock you out.

21. It doesn't matter how much money you make out of this, this harms your personal dignity.
22. It also erases the humaneness of the audience watching, because we should never be amused by two people that beat each other up.
23. And what's even worse, this has a negative effect on the status of the black community as a whole.
24. Just like we consider prostitution to be something that is degrading to women all over, in the exact same way, the mere concept of having black gladiators today is detrimental for the black community's struggle for equal status.
25. For all of these reasons, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. When a bunch of rich, white men sit down and for their personal amusement watch two men, probably men of color, in a ring, beat each other up until one of them can no longer stand, this is, by all accounts, nothing short of a modern-day coliseum with modern-day gladiators, and there is no more room in the twenty first century for such things. I'm going to have two points in the speech. First point about the tracking of black youth to become boxers, and the second point about what's so wrong about that. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community. The suburban neighborhoods are cramped fill of boxing gyms.
2. I'm going to have two points in the speech. First point about the tracking of black youth to become boxers, and the second point about what's so wrong about that. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community. The suburban neighborhoods are cramped fill of boxing gyms. This is no accident.
3. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community. The suburban neighborhoods are cramped fill of boxing

gyms. This is no accident. This happens for a simple reason: a wealthier mom will never allow her child to go and train in a sport that is considered risky and dangerous, where he might suffer injuries or get beat up. She will make sure that her child goes to things that are considered more luxurious and more expensive and more safe.

4. When a bunch of rich, white men sit down and for their personal amusement watch two men, probably men of color, in a ring, beat each other up until one of them can no longer stand, this is, by all accounts, nothing short of a modern-day coliseum with modern-day gladiators, and there is no more room in the twenty first century for such things. I'm going to have two points in the speech. First point about the tracking of black youth to become boxers, and the second point about what's so wrong about that. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community.

5. First point about the tracking of black youth to become boxers, and the second point about what's so wrong about that. So first point: an amazing percentage of professional boxers come from minority populations and specifically, from the black community. The suburban neighborhoods are cramped full of boxing gyms. This is no accident. This happens for a simple reason: a wealthier mom will never allow her child to go and train in a sport that is considered risky and dangerous, where he might suffer injuries or get beat up.

Debate ID: YB_1

Topic: ban-video-games

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. When a ten year old child plays without any supervision in a game where he needs to run down old people and beat women up in order to score points, there is something seriously wrong and even dangerous about this.
2. I'm going to have two points as prime minister.
3. The first, what things are we allowed to ban in general, and secondly, the dangers the dangerous effects of violent video games, specifically. First point.
4. So allegedly we are talking about a private product that doesn't directly harm anyone.
5. Why are we justified in banning it?
6. Thing is, as soon as we have good reason to believe that a certain product holds a dangerous effect for society we are very much legitimate in either limiting it, as we do with alcohol, where we don't allow the sale of alcohol to certain age groups or in certain places or in certain hours, or even banning it altogether like we do with drugs.
7. It is not only our responsibility as a government to retroactively punish someone after doing something wrong, but is also obviously our responsibility to protect our society and to try and do our best to prevent bad things from happening to begin with.
8. Therefore, we have a responsibility of trying trying to ban as much things that we think might have a detrimental effect of on society.
9. We do this all the time, there is nothing new about this. Moving on to the second point. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games. So firstly, let's let's analyze the target audience these games are aimed at.
10. Obviously, we are talking about young children.

11. Moreover that average age of kids playing this games keeps getting lower and lower.
12. When five year old children watch their brothers playing these games they want to play them too.
13. Now, what we need to understand is that everyone has violent impulses or violent urges, all of us do.
14. This is exactly the reason violent video games thrill us so much, and are so successful.
15. Society teaches us, when we grow up, to suppress these urges by giving sanctions in violent behavior and rewards for kind behavior.
16. In these games, the incentives are completely completely reversed from what we're trying to teach our children.
17. You're getting rewarded for violent behavior, you're getting sanctioned for kind behavior.
18. Thing is, as I've said in the beginning, children are playing this, and they are completely unsupervised because their parents are buying these games in order for them to be a substitute for a baby sitter.
19. When the children are playing these games, the parents can go off to work or go off do whatever they want to do, and they think that their children are perfectly safe.
20. But in the meanwhile, their children are learning about the world, and the incentives that they're getting are completely reversed from what we're actually trying to teach them, and we what from the person that we want them to become now, combine that with the fact that they the children are sitting for hours and hours and teaching this, and with the fact that these games are getting more and more advanced, and making you feel like you're actually in the game yourself, we have today great graphics in the game.
21. We have to they first person perspectives where you're feel that you're actually in the game.
22. And and the last point to add there is that the violence is a race to the bottom in these games, it keeps getting more graphic and more and more violent because the games need to continue on selling, and the companies that make these games need to make them more and more thrilling.

23. But the threshold for what's considered thrilling among young children keeps getting higher and higher, because if everyone can beat up other people, then now we need to start beating up children maybe.

24. We're doing more and more obscene things in order for this to be considered thrilling.

25. So we have a race to the bottom of violence.

26. Combine all of the things that we've just analyzed, and what you get as a result is, in the worse case scenario, it might lead to people that are actually violent.

27. It might lead to young children that are expressing violent behavior that they learned in these video games in the school yard, and it's going to be increasingly harder to teach them to change their ways when the incentives that they're learning in these games are completely reversed.

28. This is already enough of a reason to ban these games.

29. But even if we look at not the worst case scenario, but the more likely scenarios, we're getting more and more children with a bad temper.

30. It will resort to anger to resolve their problems.

31. These video games have a counter influence on the education that the parents give their children or that the state wants to provide for these children.

32. So because we are perfectly within our rights to ban something when we consider it to have a bad effect on society, and because we have seen that there is plenty of reason to believe that these video games indeed hold a dangerous effect for society, we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. It is not only our responsibility as a government to retroactively punish someone after doing something wrong, but is also obviously our responsibility to protect our society and to try and do our best to prevent bad things from happening to begin with. Therefore, we have a responsibility of trying trying to ban as much things that we think might have a detrimental effect of on society. We

do this all the time, there is nothing new about this. Moving on to the second point. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games.

2. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games. So firstly, let's let's analyze the target audience these games are aimed at. Obviously, we are talking about young children. Moreover that average age of kids playing this games keeps getting lower and lower. When five year old children watch their brothers playing these games they want to play them too.

3. We do this all the time, there is nothing new about this. Moving on to the second point. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games. So firstly, let's let's analyze the target audience these games are aimed at. Obviously, we are talking about young children.

4. Therefore, we have a responsibility of trying trying to ban as much things that we think might have a detrimental effect of on society. We do this all the time, there is nothing new about this. Moving on to the second point. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games. So firstly, let's let's analyze the target audience these games are aimed at.

5. Moving on to the second point. Specifically, about the dangerous effects of violent video games. So firstly, let's let's analyze the target audience these games are aimed at. Obviously, we are talking about young children. Moreover that average age of kids playing this games keeps getting lower and lower.

Debate ID: YB_381

Topic: monarchy

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We need to abolish the monarchy.
2. Before we begin we need to clarify something because there are many different models and types of monarchies in the world, starting from models where the monarch is a de facto ruler with absolute authority on all of the political decisions being made, like in saudi arabia or qatar, to models where the monarch is more of a diplomatic symbolic figure with hardly any authority when it comes to policy, like in great britain.
3. For the purposes of this debate, all of these models, we will argue, need to give way in favor of a democratic republic.
4. Of course, the more authorities that the monarch holds, the bigger our problem becomes. We'll have two points in the debate. First, we're going to explain the rationale of why we had monarchs to begin with, and why this rationale is no longer valid today, and the second point, in the second point we will discuss the harms of a monarchy on under all models. So, first point.
5. It used to be that monarchs all had absolute authorities, and the legitimacy for their rule was that they managed to persuade the people that they had a divine the right to rule.
6. The royal families were nearly god like, and this is why the title passes on and is hereditary, and passes on from father to child.
7. Now, the rationale behind it, as put forth by political philosopher thomas hobbes, was that we needed someone that one ruler above everyone else in order for there to be order in the street.
8. Otherwise, we would have anarchy.
9. If no one was there to give out rules and enforce them and punish someone if he harmed me, then everyone would do as he pleases, and this is bad for everyone.

10. Therefore, it's best to just sacrifice some of our liberties to a single ruler that will create order in the streets.

11. But as time went by, and the more the citizens became aware of their own rights and started demanding things from their kings, the authorities of their of the monarchs dwindled down and brought us to the development of a democratic republics.

12. And now there are plenty of examples of states that have no king but there is still not an anarchy in the streets, and all that is needed in order for that to happen is a functioning government, a parliament that makes laws, and the courts to to enforce them.

13. This thus, the old logic and rationale behind having a monarch is no longer valid today.

14. The new rationale given sometimes, especially in great britain, is that we are talking about an institution that is ingrained in the tradition of the people and in their culture and history, and all of that is very true.

15. But nostalgia and romanticism can only get you so far.

16. This is exactly what museums are for.

17. We're not saying that we should just forget about our history, but just like viking culture is a very important part of the nordic countries' history, this does not mean that they should go out and ravage the seas today.

18. We should put that behind if we don't have a stronger logic behind that.

19. Now, the monarchy comes at a very high price, and we need to consider whether it is worth it, just in favor of nostalgia.

20. This brings me to my second point, where I will discuss the harms of the monarchy.

21. Along the years, there have been good kings and there have been bad kings, but the biggest problem is that the people have no control over what their king does, except maybe for violent revolutions when they try to remove the king, and this is of course something that we would like to prevent in the future.

22. Now, because the title passes on through heritance, the king needn't worry about his seat, and

can pretty much do whatever he pleases, even if it comes at the expense of his citizens.

23. In absolute monarchies models this is true to this very day.

24. On top of that, having grown up in a palace his entire life, even if the king wishes to do well, most of the times he is not fully aware and isn't really connected to the average citizens if he rules over, and doesn't know what they need.

25. Now, this is the first problem that democracies come to fix.

26. Even elected governments, of course there are good governments and bad governments, but the head of state always knows that if he is not doing a good job and he's not pleasing his people, then he would be removed from office.

27. And this is the biggest check and balance on the power of the government.

28. That's important.

29. But even in constitutional monarchies, where the king is not a political leader, like in the UK, there still is a very high price to pay for monarchy.

30. Firstly, money.

31. It costs a lot of money to maintain buckingham palace, or the lavish lifestyles of the royal family.

32. Of course, there is also security costs and costs of expeditions abroad, and all of these things.

33. Now, this all comes from the taxpayer's pay roll and this is the taxpayer that did not elect this monarch to begin with.

34. This is not legitimate.

35. Moreover, there is something wrong about still having a class citizens like royal families. This fixates the class system of old age, and we think that all of these, all of these reasons are more than enough to abolish all models of monarchies.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

Debate ID: YB_483

Topic: freedom-of-speech

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. Rights and freedoms, in general, and the freedom of speech, in particular, are necessary to every enlightened and free society, and they should be zealously protected. But there comes a point at which people are abusing those freedoms and liberties, the point at which people use them as a bulletproof shield that allows them to harm and terrorize others. This is not what freedom of speech is meant for, and this should be the point in which it stops. It seems fairly obvious and agreed upon that some specific forms of expression such as direct incitements to commit felonies or exposing state secrets are things that exceeded the protection of the freedom of speech. And so in order to make this debate more fair and interesting, we're going to focus on an issue that sadly is becoming more and more relevant today, and it is hateful expression. This includes comments that are grotesquely racist, sexist, anti-semitic, homophobic, islamophobic.
2. This includes waving symbols that are controversial, such as waving nazi flags or confederate flags, etcetera.
3. We are going to argue that such intolerant exhibits shouldn't be met with tolerance and that there is a justification to censor them.
4. Seeing as this is an analysis debate, it is less important how we mean to implement this concept, but just to give us a taste this means, for instance, demanding that social networks, such as facebook, more actively censor expressions that have been classified as offensive.
5. So what we're going to do in the speech is explain how this concept coexists with the two different rationales given to the freedom of speech.
6. First it is important to understand that unlike what many people think, rights and even the most fundamental ones are a new thing.

7. They weren't always so taken for granted.
8. They only exist several centuries at best, and they're always meant to serve a certain purpose.
9. Now there are two different sets of rationales given to specifically the freedom of speech.
10. Let's deal with the first.
11. So the first rationale is an instrumental one.
12. It says that allowing people free expression is meant first and foremost to allow a living discourse of ideas that will eventually make sure that no idea is being taken taken for granted and that no ideas are being forcefully silenced by the government or anyone else and thus, society can move forward and progress.
13. But certainly not every type of expression is moving society forward.
14. What happens when free speech is threatening to take society backwards?
15. If the instrumental purpose of freedom of speech is progress, then it makes no sense to allow speech that brings upon the opposite.
16. In cases of incendiary comments that are playing on people's fears and reigniting old social problems that society is still licking its wounds from, and sometimes might even bring indirectly to actual violence, like we see for instance in donald donald trump's rallies, there is no way of seeing this as something that is strengthening society.
17. And so, the very purpose that brought us to constituting the freedom of speech to begin with should bring us now to prevent these like speech these expressions from ever taking place.
18. Now the second rationale is very different.
19. It doesn't see speech as an instrumental thing, but but rather says that allowing a person to speak his mind is something that is inherently good.
20. It doesn't matter what results from it.
21. Thought expresses our freedom and independence, and there is no point to thinking something if you cannot share that thought with other people.
22. And so in order to respect one's humanity, we must allow him to express his thoughts.

23. However, what if by merely expressing myself, I am taking away from other people's dignity by using the n word, by throwing a sexual comment to a girl.
24. At that instance I've taken away a part of that person's respect and dignity.
25. And so again the same logic that has brought us to support the freedom of speech allows us to limit it in particular cases in order not to reach a logical contradiction.
26. And so freedom of of speech cannot be absolute by its very definition.
27. Lastly, I'd just like to preemptively respond to opposition possibly going up and saying, yeah, but if we limit the speech of people, then certain opinions will keep being heard in closed forums and so on and so forth, and then they'll get intensified and whatnot.
28. So the first response is: pay attention that this is a practical attack that doesn't address the actual principle.
29. That is the main thing in this analysis debate, but in order to still answer that claim, it is true that we cannot prevent certain opinions from being heard in certain forums, but this is not a reason to allow them to be heard everywhere because this creates a normalization and and so, a race to the bottom.
30. What sounded abhorrent yesterday, no longer sounds this way today.
31. And, again, donald trump's campaign is a living testament to that. And so we say that some opinions are meant to be kept in closed forums. We are very proud to propose.

Rebuttals:

1. Thought expresses our freedom and independence, and there is no point to thinking something if you cannot share that thought with other people. And so in order to respect one's humanity, we must allow him to express his thoughts. However, what if by merely expressing myself, I am taking away from other people's dignity by using the n word, by throwing a sexual comment to a girl. At that instance I've taken away a part of that person's respect and dignity. And so again the same logic that has brought us to support the freedom of speech allows us to limit it in particular cases in order not to reach a logical contradiction.

Evidence Used:

1. Rights and freedoms, in general, and the freedom of speech, in particular, are necessary to every enlightened and free society, and they should be zealously protected. But there comes a point at which people are abusing those freedoms and liberties, the point at which people use them as a bulletproof shield that allows them to harm and terrorize others. This is not what freedom of speech is meant for, and this should be the point in which it stops. It seems fairly obvious and agreed upon that some specific forms of expression such as direct incitements to commit felonies or exposing state secrets are things that exceeded the protection of the freedom of speech. And so in order to make this debate more fair and interesting, we're going to focus on an issue that sadly is becoming more and more relevant today, and it is hateful expression.

Debate ID: YB_602

Topic: schoolvouchers

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. We should embrace school vouchers.
2. It is a widely known fact that opening up a market for competition does wonders to improve the quality of the product.
3. Now, even though we don't tend to think of it as such, education is just as much a product is anything else, and there's no reason to believe that it's going to be any different if we open up the education market for competition.
4. Two points in this speech.
5. Point number one, how school vouchers will help create a more just allocation of resources and reduce the amount of inequality that exists within the school system today.
6. And second point, about diversifying the curriculums and contents so such that it will fit the needs of the students more than it does today.
7. First point.
8. There is a very serious problem of inequality in the level of education that children receive.
9. Students that live in city centers get funded by the state sometimes as much as three times the amount of students that live in more rural or marginal areas.
10. This means that they enjoy better facilities, better teachers, and all kinds of special programs that other students do not enjoy.
11. The reason this happens is that the municipal authorities in those cities have a lot of power, a lot of friends in high places and connections with all the states officials that are in charge of funding, and the situation that has developed as a consequence is that in the city centers, you get very famous, successful schools with great reputations, and this way they're they're able to continue

squeezing more and more money because they can show off with all of their achievements and high level of their students, while other schools just cannot do that.

12. And so the cycle continues.

13. Now, seeing as we see social mobility is one of the most important goals of the education system, this is a serious problem.

14. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools.

15. And that's great news because now the better teachers don't have to move to the city centers to teach there because they get higher salaries, and we we are able to gradually balance out the playing field.

16. The second point I want to make is about diversity.

17. The government and the ministry of education today hold a monopoly over the education market, not only with when it comes to resource allocation, but also with regards to the content that is passed on in the schools.

18. Not only do they get to determine the final exams that all all students must pass, they are also very much involved and have almost complete control over the entire teaching programs, and this happens because the institutions are so financially dependent on the government funding.

19. This leads to a unification of the contents passed on in schools and different schools now compete with one another and try to attract students mainly based on a superficial differences and things such as appearance, and not based on the content that they're offering.

20. Now, we believe that this is a shame because different children have different needs when it comes to education and there is absolutely no way that having just one universal learning program is going to fit everyone's needs.

21. With a voucher system, we are enabling the schools to have more independence and more control over the contents in the programs that they're offering.

22. And what is likely to happen is that schools are going to specialize in different fields, offering a larger variety to the students that go and study there.
23. Some some institutions will specialize in sports.
24. Some in science. Some in computers. Some in humanities, and etcetera, etcetera. A little bit like we see with institutions of higher education in the universities. That is exactly the beauty of a free market.
25. The more a certain school can adapt itself to the to the wills and the needs of the students, the more successful he'll become.
26. And this variety will help children find the schools that are best suited for them, and might make them actually enjoy coming to school and to learn, and this is a win for everybody.
27. So to sum it up, we've seeing that the voucher system can help deal with the inherent problem that we have with inequality in the education system as it is today, and can also help improve the quality and diversify the contents of our education system.
28. For all of these reasons we beg you to propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. This means that they enjoy better facilities, better teachers, and all kinds of special programs that other students do not enjoy. The reason this happens is that the municipal authorities in those cities have a lot of power, a lot of friends in high places and connections with all the states officials that are in charge of funding, and the situation that has developed as a consequence is that in the city centers, you get very famous, successful schools with great reputations, and this way they're they're able to continue squeezing more and more money because they can show off with all of their achievements and high level of their students, while other schools just cannot do that. And so the cycle continues. Now, seeing as we see social mobility is one of the most important goals of the education system, this is a serious problem. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets

solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools.

2. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools. And that's great news because now the better teachers don't have to move to the city centers to teach there because they get higher salaries, and we we are able to gradually balance out the playing field. The second point I want to make is about diversity. The government and the ministry of education today hold a monopoly over the education market, not only with when it comes to resource allocation, but also with regards to the content that is passed on in the schools. Not only do they get to determine the final exams that all all students must pass, they are also very much involved and have almost complete control over the entire teaching programs, and this happens because the institutions are so financially dependent on the government funding.

3. Now, seeing as we see social mobility is one of the most important goals of the education system, this is a serious problem. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools. And that's great news because now the better teachers don't have to move to the city centers to teach there because they get higher salaries, and we we are able to gradually balance out the playing field. The second point I want to make is about diversity. The government and the ministry of education today hold a monopoly over the education market, not only with when it comes to resource allocation, but also with regards to the content that is passed on in the schools.

4. The reason this happens is that the municipal authorities in those cities have a lot of power, a lot of friends in high places and connections with all the states officials that are in charge of funding, and the situation that has developed as a consequence is that in the city centers, you get very famous, successful schools with great reputations, and this way they're they're able to continue

squeezing more and more money because they can show off with all of their achievements and high level of their students, while other schools just cannot do that. And so the cycle continues. Now, seeing as we see social mobility is one of the most important goals of the education system, this is a serious problem. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools. And that's great news because now the better teachers don't have to move to the city centers to teach there because they get higher salaries, and we we are able to gradually balance out the playing field.

5. And so the cycle continues. Now, seeing as we see social mobility is one of the most important goals of the education system, this is a serious problem. With vouchers with a voucher system, this problem gets solved because the funding is now operating according to market forces, there is no more reason for peripheral schools to get less funding or lower budget than other schools. And that's great news because now the better teachers don't have to move to the city centers to teach there because they get higher salaries, and we we are able to gradually balance out the playing field. The second point I want to make is about diversity.

Debate ID: YB_61

Topic: doping-in-sport

Stance: pro

Main Arguments:

1. In this debate, we're dealing with a question that could change the face of sports as we know it.
2. To properly answer it, we have to, first of all, ask what is the ultimate goal of sports?
3. From this we can derive what are its most important attributes and see whether the use of doping defeats the purpose of sport or rather serves it.
4. To clarify, we will stand for the legalization of performance enhancing drugs that aren't psychoactive or physically addictive, namely, steroids and the likes of it.
5. In the first argument, we'll lay the core of our case and explain how doping is part of the natural evolution of sport.
6. In the second argument, we're going to counter some classic opp.
7. Arguments and discuss the other effects of legalizing doping.
8. Let's go to the first argument: we believe that sports is a lot like art.
9. The main reason we care so much about sports is that it gives us inspiration.
10. Professional athletes serve as an example and a reminder for what beautiful things can be achieved when combining talent with hard work and discipline.
11. Therefore, the most important quality sports needs to entail in order to fulfill their purpose is first and foremost to be thrilling and moving and fun to watch.
12. True enough, there are also other elements that are fundamental to sports.
13. For example, the competition element that symbolizes, like, a friendly rivalry.
14. But the competition itself also eventually serves the higher purpose of inspiration 'cause it helps push the athletes themselves to their limits and also to create more interest and emotional attachment for the audience.

15. It's much like musical competitions, like the eurovision or reality TV shows like america's got talent.

16. The competition is merely a means to make the music more appealing to larger audiences.

17. We believe that the competition alone could never cut it if the sport itself isn't and inspiring, hence the difference between exciting sports like football or basketball that are so popular and sports like, say, badminton that are significantly less thrilling and, as a result, less popular.

18. And so, the most valuable trait a sport needs to possess in order to achieve its purpose is to be a beautiful and intriguing spectacle.

19. Why is this so important?

Because it's not easy to maintain a thrilled audience for very long.

20. People lose interest in new fashions very quickly and in order to survive the crowds modern age short attention span, sports, as all things, have to keep changing and evolving.

21. For that to happen, it is imperative that new records keep getting set all the time.

22. No one will be interested in the olympic games if they would believe that no record can be beat, that the best is already behind them.

23. Notice how people keep drawing comparisons like is lebron bigger than jordan, and all of these things.

24. So, how is it possible that new records keep getting set all the time?

25. Well, it's mostly due to technology advancements.

26. We kept making better running shoes so usain bolt is able to outrun his predecessors. Better swimwear and swim gear so now we get michael phelps doing the amazing things he does. But there eventually will come a limit to this and we are reaching this limit. Doping is exactly the thing that can take us to the next level. Think about how many artists, like musicians, filmmakers, plastic artists feared the rise of technology and computers and that it will take over the art world. It is eventually the ones that were smart enough to embrace it and use it as part of their art that survive the test of time. The same thing needs to happen to happen with sports. Now, let's counter some

classic opp.

Arguments.

27. So, some might be worried about the negative health effects of using these substances.

28. To them we say that being a professional athlete is, surprisingly, probably one of the least healthy things one can choose to do with incredibly high risk of getting injured.

29. So, if they're really worried about the athlete's health, they might they might as well ban sports altogether.

30. Some argue that sports is all about being natural and that it's the artificialness of these drugs that defeats the purpose of sports.

31. To them we say that for decades now, if not more, there's been nothing natural about the way professional athletes prepare for their competitions.

32. They go on elaborate diets, they use all kinds of incredibly strong food supplements.

33. In fact, we urge opposition to explain what's the big difference between protein supplements and steroids. We don't think that one exists. Some argue that different levels of accessibility to these drugs can harm the fairness of the competition. For one thing, differences in budget are severely harming the fairness in the status quo.

34. There isn't a really good way around that.

35. Better-funded sports clubs get better athletes, better trainers, better equipment, etcetera.

36. Now, the second answer to this particular line of argumentation is that we believe legalization will, if anything, have the opposite effect.

37. Today, many athletes still use doping illegally, case in point, the story of the russian delegation to the twenty-sixteen olympic games, only that the richer and better connected clubs or countries, if we're talking about international competitions, are more easily able to get away with it while others aren't.

38. Making it legal and accessible can help level the playing the field.

39. For all of these reasons, please propose.

Rebuttals:

Evidence Used:

1. The main reason we care so much about sports is that it gives us inspiration. Professional athletes serve as an example and a reminder for what beautiful things can be achieved when combining talent with hard work and discipline. Therefore, the most important quality sports needs to entail in order to fulfill their purpose is first and foremost to be thrilling and moving and fun to watch. True enough, there are also other elements that are fundamental to sports. For example, the competition element that symbolizes, like, a friendly rivalry.
2. Therefore, the most important quality sports needs to entail in order to fulfill their purpose is first and foremost to be thrilling and moving and fun to watch. True enough, there are also other elements that are fundamental to sports. For example, the competition element that symbolizes, like, a friendly rivalry. But the competition itself also eventually serves the higher purpose of inspiration 'cause it helps push the athletes themselves to their limits and also to create more interest and emotional attachment for the audience. It's much like musical competitions, like the eurovision or reality TV shows like america's got talent.
3. Professional athletes serve as an example and a reminder for what beautiful things can be achieved when combining talent with hard work and discipline. Therefore, the most important quality sports needs to entail in order to fulfill their purpose is first and foremost to be thrilling and moving and fun to watch. True enough, there are also other elements that are fundamental to sports. For example, the competition element that symbolizes, like, a friendly rivalry. But the competition itself also eventually serves the higher purpose of inspiration 'cause it helps push the athletes themselves to their limits and also to create more interest and emotional attachment for the audience.