

PWSC 7.0

[Check-Ins](#)

[Results](#)

[Motions](#)

[Standings](#)

[Login](#)

## **Motions**

### **Quarterfinals**

The motion for this round has not been released.

### **Round 5**

THBT governments in the developing world should limit migration to megacities (e.g., Delhi, Lagos, Jakarta)

### **Round 4**

THP a world in which humanity becomes aware that we are living in a simulation.

### **Round 3**

THS the widespread use of geo-engineering as a means to tackle the effects of climate change

### **Round 2**

THS the widespread use of geo-engineering as a means to tackle the effects of climate change

### **Round 1**

THBT schools should predominantly teach national literature instead of world literature.

## **Counterfactual World (What happens if we reject techno-optimist narratives)**

In our world, the *dominant cultural story* is not “tech will save us,” but:

### **1. Collective responsibility narrative**

- People, governments, and corporations accept that *behavioral, regulatory, and structural change* must be done now – not deferred.
- Example: stronger carbon taxes, direct investment in renewables, cutting consumption instead of gambling on future carbon-capture.

### **2. Funding redistribution**

- Instead of venture capital hype, more public and private resources flow to **basic, inclusive solutions**:
  - decentralized renewable grids,
  - universal internet and electricity access,
  - stronger welfare and education.

### 3. Trust and accountability

- By not promising miracles, governments and scientists maintain **realistic trust**. Citizens see consistent small wins instead of spectacular failed promises.

### 4. Equity focus

- Narratives emphasize *scaling up existing, accessible tech* (like solar cookers, vaccines, clean water systems) rather than futuristic but exclusionary projects.
- This means the Global South benefits earlier and more broadly.

---

## Comparative

- In **their world** (techno-optimism): crises worsen due to delay, inequality deepens, and trust collapses when hype fails.
- In **our world** (realism + collective responsibility): we get earlier action, fairer distribution, and more reliable solutions — even if they're less flashy.

---

Do you want me to now **write a model 1st Proposition speech** (about 7 minutes) that fully integrates this mechanization + counterfactual, so you can practice it directly in debate?

You said:

YES

ChatGPT said:

Great — here's a **full 1st Proposition speech** (about 7 minutes), structured, persuasive, and including both **mechanization** and the **counterfactual**. You can read it straight in a debate, or trim/expand depending on time.

---

## 1st Proposition Speech: *This House Opposes Techno-Optimist Narratives*

### 1. Setup & Framing

Honourable chair, members of the House, this debate is not about whether technology itself is good or bad. Of course, technology has brought us vaccines, smartphones, renewable energy, and more.

What we are opposing today is the **narrative of techno-optimism**: the story that tells us “don't worry — the future will be saved by technology.” This is not neutral. Narratives shape where we invest money, what policies we pass, and how people behave.

So the question is: should we continue to rely on a story that assumes technology will rescue us? Or should we reject it, and instead tell a story of collective responsibility and realistic solutions?

We on Proposition say: we must oppose techno-optimist narratives.

---

### 2. Counterfactual World (Our Positive Vision)

In our world, the dominant cultural narrative is **not** “tech will save us.” Instead, we emphasize:

1. **Collective responsibility** — that governments, corporations, and citizens must take hard action *now*, through regulation, behavior change, and investment.

2. **Practical allocation of resources** — money goes into proven, inclusive solutions like renewable grids, healthcare, education, and welfare, instead of speculative futuristic projects.
3. **Realistic trust** — governments and scientists tell the truth about limits and timelines, building steady confidence instead of hype followed by disappointment.
4. **Equity and inclusion** — solutions scale to everyone, not just to the rich or the Global North.

This is the world we defend.

---

### 3. Argument 1: Policy Complacency

- **Mechanism:** When leaders believe in techno-optimism, they postpone difficult decisions. Instead of regulating polluters, they wait for carbon-capture machines. Instead of reducing consumption, they promise future green tech.
  - **Impact:** We lose the most valuable resource we have — time. Climate deadlines, healthcare crises, and poverty cannot wait decades.
  - **Comparative:** In our world, governments are forced to act now — cutting emissions, regulating industries, and investing in social programs. That makes us safer and more resilient.
- 

### 4. Argument 2: Misallocation of Resources

- **Mechanism:** Narratives drive where money flows. Techno-optimism channels billions into flashy projects — space tourism, Neuralink, flying taxis — while billions of people still lack electricity and basic healthcare.

- **Impact:** This widens inequality. Those who need development solutions the most are excluded, while elites gamble on speculative futures.
  - **Comparative:** Our world directs investment into inclusive, accessible solutions. Decentralized solar grids in Africa or Southeast Asia lift millions out of energy poverty faster than waiting for futuristic nuclear fusion.
- 

## 5. Argument 3: Erosion of Public Trust

- **Mechanism:** Techno-optimist promises consistently underdeliver. Geoengineering, AI in education, miracle cures — they are always “ten years away.” When people see these failures, they lose faith in both science and governance.
  - **Impact:** This feeds conspiracy theories and resistance to even real technology, like vaccines.
  - **Comparative:** In our world, promises are realistic, wins are incremental, and public trust in institutions grows stronger.
- 

## 6. Argument 4: Structural Injustice

- **Mechanism:** Techno-optimist narratives assume everyone will benefit, but access is always unequal. The Global North gets new technologies first, while billions remain excluded.
- **Example:** Electric vehicles or AI-based healthcare reach wealthy societies decades before rural villages without internet.
- **Impact:** This entrenches a two-speed world — technological haves and have-nots.
- **Comparative:** Our world builds fairness by focusing on scalable, low-tech solutions that immediately include the marginalized.

---

## 7. Conclusion

Members of the House, techno-optimist narratives are not harmless stories. They delay urgent action, misdirect scarce resources, undermine public trust, and deepen inequality.

Our counterfactual is not anti-technology. It is a world where technology is used as a tool – but never as a crutch, never as an excuse to avoid responsibility.

In short: if we want faster, fairer, and more reliable progress, we must oppose techno-optimist narratives.

I beg to propose.

### 1. THBT it is in the interest of China to gradually abandon the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).

- **Definition:** Whether China should slowly stop its global infrastructure project (BRI).
- **Stakeholders:** Chinese government, Chinese citizens, partner countries, global economy.
- **Theme:** National interest vs. global influence.
- **Type:** *Geopolitics / Economic policy.*
- **Context:** BRI involves lending, infrastructure building, but also debt traps and backlash abroad.

---

### 2. THBT it is in the interest of the human race to extensively explore space.

- **Definition:** Should humanity invest heavily in space exploration programs?

- **Stakeholders:** All humans (present + future), governments, private space companies, scientists.
  - **Theme:** Human survival vs. Earth-based priorities.
  - **Type:** *Science & Technology / Global ethics.*
  - **Context:** Climate change, limited Earth resources, rise of private space programs (e.g. SpaceX, NASA).
- 

### 3. THBT it is in the interest of the Democratic Party to aggressively fund radical GOP candidates.

- **Definition:** Should Democrats help extreme Republicans win primaries to beat them later?
  - **Stakeholders:** Democratic Party, Republican Party, US voters, US democracy.
  - **Theme:** Short-term political advantage vs. long-term stability.
  - **Type:** *Domestic politics (US) / Elections strategy.*
  - **Context:** In recent US elections, Democrats funded far-right Republicans to make general elections easier.
- 

### 4. THBT major tourist destinations should significantly limit the number of tourists that can visit.

- **Definition:** Limit access to iconic sites (Eiffel Tower, Pyramids, etc.).
- **Stakeholders:** Tourists, local communities, governments, tourism industry, cultural/environmental heritage.

- **Theme:** Conservation vs. accessibility.
  - **Type:** *Environment / Cultural policy.*
  - **Context:** Overtourism causes environmental damage, crowding, and cultural loss.
- 

## 5. THBT parents should have a vote on behalf of their children.

- **Definition:** Parents cast proxy votes equal to number of kids they have.
  - **Stakeholders:** Parents, children, voters, governments, political parties.
  - **Theme:** Representation vs. fairness in democracy.
  - **Type:** *Political philosophy / Electoral reform.*
  - **Context:** Debate on whether democracy underrepresents young people's interests.
- 

## 6. THBT parents should not teach children about their own conceptions of the afterlife.

- **Definition:** Parents should not pass down personal/religious beliefs about afterlife to kids.
- **Stakeholders:** Parents, children, religious institutions, society.
- **Theme:** Freedom of religion vs. child autonomy.
- **Type:** *Ethics / Religion & family.*
- **Context:** Controversy about indoctrination and children's right to form independent beliefs.



---

## 7. THBT religions should promise reward in the afterlife as opposed to promising material reward in this life.

- **Definition:** Religious teachings should focus on spiritual/afterlife rewards, not earthly/material gains.
- **Stakeholders:** Religious leaders, followers, broader society.
- **Theme:** Spiritual integrity vs. material exploitation.
- **Type:** *Religion / Moral philosophy.*
- **Context:** Some modern movements promise wealth/health now; others stress afterlife salvation.

---

## 8. THBT social media journalism has done more harm than good.

- **Definition:** The rise of news on social platforms (Twitter, TikTok, etc.) is more harmful than beneficial.
- **Stakeholders:** Journalists, social media companies, the public, democratic institutions.
- **Theme:** Free access vs. misinformation/polarization.
- **Type:** *Media / Technology & society.*
- **Context:** Fake news, echo chambers, but also citizen journalism and broader access to news.

---

👉 Do you want me to also create a **summary table** (all 8 motions in one view: definition | stakeholders | theme | type | context) so it's easy to revise before a debate?

Here's a **compact debate prep table** for all 8 motions – with **Definition, Stakeholders, Theme, Type, Context** side-by-side so you can revise quickly:

Motion	Definition	Stakeholders	Theme	Type	Context
<b>China &amp; BRI</b>	Should China slowly stop its Belt and Road initiative?	Chinese gov & citizens, partner countries, global economy	national interest vs. global influence	geopolitics / economic policy	BRI = global infrastructure plan; debt & backlash abroad
<b>Human race &amp; space</b>	Should humanity invest heavily in space exploration?	All humans, governments, private space firms, scientists	human survival vs. Earth priorities	Science & Tech / Global ethics	limited Earth resources, climate crisis, rise of NASA/SpaceX
<b>Democrats and radical GOP</b>	Should Democrats help extreme Republicans win primaries?	Democrats, Republicans, US voters, democracy	short-term wins vs. long-term risks	domestic politics / election strategy	2020–2022 US elections saw Democrats funding far-right GOP
<b>Limit tourists</b>	Should iconic sites cap visitor numbers?	Tourists, locals, govts, tourism sector, heritage	conservation vs. access	Environment / Cultural policy	overtourism harms heritage (Eiffel Tower, pyramids, etc.)
<b>Parents vote for kids</b>	Should parents cast proxy vote for children?	Parents, children, states, parties	representation vs. fairness	political philosophy / electoral reform	young under-represented in democracy debates
<b>Parents &amp; afterlife</b>	Should parents avoid teaching kids their afterlife beliefs?	Parents, children, religions, society	freedom of religion vs. child autonomy	ethics / religion & family	debate on indoctrination vs. free choice

<b>religion</b>	should religion	religious	spiritual integrity	religion / Mor	prosperity gospel
<b>reward type</b>	promise	eaders,	s. material	hilosophy	s. traditional
	fterlife reward	ollowers, societ	xploitation		alvation
	ot material				eachings
	ains?				

<b>social media</b>	has social	ournalists,	ree access vs.	edia / Tech	ake news, echo
<b>journalism</b>	edia news	latforms, public	information	ociety	hambers vs.
	one more	emocracy			itizen journalism
	arm than				
	ood?				