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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is disaster forecasts should be issued from a single source. We will first define this motion. We define that the government will establish headquarters to report about those disasters region by region and then other media should report about it. So we have two points. First, toughness for life. Toughness for life. Second, toughness for disaster. Toughness for disaster.

I'll explain our first point, toughness for life. Disaster is a very serious problem for many people and it causes death for many people. It is a very important thing. So the reported thing about it is a very important thing, so it must be the correct information. It must not be a lie. And currently, there are many sources of information, and it causes confusion.Point of information?Yes.Thank you. Oh, [inaudible], sorry. So about disaster forecasting, there is no tool to get completely correct information since it is unpredictable for humankind. So what do you think about the correctness of the disaster forecast?Okay. The information is very difficult, as you said, but it is possible to predict the thing that is most easy to occur. So we think that we should report those information. Now, the internet is very popular, right? So most people gain information from the internet, from SNS like Twitter. And Twitter, people who use Twitter like to criticize and spread information that are not true. So this is a very big problem. And this causes fake news spread, and if this system was issued, it is the government's job to report all the information. So the TVs and radios won't report much because they can't be responsible enough for those information that they report. So, many people on the internet, they don't have to be responsible to tell about those information. So many people use the internet to gain those information. So, for example, if there's news on Twitter that a volcano will erupt in five minutes, many people will be in a panic, right? So many people will try to escape--[POI?]?Yes?Do we believe there's such news or people will say that just as an exaggeration because it's also a source that came from an anonymous person? How do you think about that?Yeah, but maybe they pretend that they are the source of the truth information, right? So the fake news can be spread to many people and it is very serious. So if the source of information is very-- there are so many, they may cause many confusion. So it is important to the government to establish those headquarters and the reliability of those information. So we strongly believe that disaster forecasts should be issued from a single source. Thank you. [applause]

So, ladies and gentlemen, we, the opposition strongly believe disaster forecasting should not be issued from a single source. So I will do two things, rebuttal and construction. First, rebuttals. Oh, thank you. So rebuttal against their first point. Their first point. So they say they can prevent confusion about broadcasting. I have two rebuttals. First is about, they say that Twitter pretend-- I'm sorry, Twitter tends to criticize or [retell?] a lot of information and it causes serious confusion in today's society. So I have two responses on here. First is about why this is really bad. I mean, the people, because they fear the disasters. So, for example, if a typhoon is coming to Japan and some people say typhoon is really bad and some people typhoon is really not harmful, people tend to believe in the people who say typhoon is really dangerous, it can cause serious problems since people really fear the disasters. So on Twitter, sometimes people exaggerate information. However, still, people can escape from serious problems. And also, they never explained, why do we have to burn-- or why do we have to integrate the source information to headquarters? Simply they explained about the harm on Twitter. They never explained why do we have to ban any private sector information sources or any other kinds of things. And before I move on to construction, if you have a point, I'll take.

Okay. So let me move on to construction. We have two points. The first point is to save lives, so protect lives. The second point is to interrupt achievement of research. So the first point, protect lives. So the disaster forecasting about disasters, there are two uniqueness. First, is disaster can take life, as they explained. The second uniqueness, it's totally unpredictable. Think of [inaudible], think of a typhoon. We can know like [Hector's path goes?] or something but we cannot predict how it's harmful to the real society. In a single source, this has two uniqueness. The first is it has authority. Think of NHK. If NHK says something, we unconditionally believe in NHK information because it is really official and it is the only authority. So the single authority is really dangerous. The second is about mistakes. Even professors, even researchers can mistake about disaster forecasting because this is-- for example, the--Point of information?No, I will take it later. So, for example, in 1914, Sakurajima eruption. So Sakurajima was an island but Sakurajima became connected to Kagoshima. And in 1914, the [shoreline?]-- or the officials said there is no harm-- I mean, not likely to erupt Sakurajima. So even if it erupts, it has minimal effects. What happened? Sakurajima erupted, really has strong powers and it killed many people. This obviously shows the dangerosity of a single information source. So after plan, since it's really difficult to get different perspectives from the private sector or Twitter, it's really difficult to get information from different perspectives. So today, the world, hopefully, we can get a lot of information from the radio and also Twitter. So it's really beneficial for people to escape from the--Point of information.I will take it later. It's really beneficial for people to escape from the disaster. That's why we need to oppose this motion and the impact of this motion. Yes?How will people in times of disaster check which information is true or which is not true?So, judges? Okay. So, as I told you, people sometimes tend to exaggerate information. I mean, a single source has a unique bad point. I mean, a single source can make also mistakes and also can cause people unconditionally believe in a single source after we take this motion. There is no process of judging or something after we take this motion. That's why this motion is really dangerous, and we need to protect lives from the disaster. Thanks. [applause]

Hello. Okay. What do you want in the disaster? Definitely, you want reliability. So not only many choices, but you want one thing you can trust. Okay. This is the most important point of the debate. Okay. Today's topic is disaster forecasts should be issued from a single source. We strongly believe this motion is true. Okay. I will reconstruct our first point. They said that there's no perfect correct information. There's no perfect correct information, so only single source, it's very dangerous. But it is not true because, of course, there is no perfect information, but there is definitely more correct information, more correct information, relatively correct information. So, for example, which do you want? Information from specialists, information from specialists or information from the man, general man living far from the distance [inaudible]. So we definitely want--POI?No, thank you. We definitely want the information from specialists because they know more about the disaster, right? So a typhoon, and earthquake, and a volcano is very researched well, so specialists can have a lot of information. So we want--Point of information?Okay.Thank you. So what do you think about even specialists have different perspectives on disaster forecasting? So, for example, a typhoon, some professors and researchers even have different perspectives on disaster forecasting. And what do you think about the correctness of information from a single source?Okay. So, firstly, we still believe that SNS is very dangerous because, of course, professors have different opinions, but they have--Point of information?No, thank you. They have researched. So their arguments are more correct than other general people's opinions, so we [leave this, too?]. Okay. Then also, the fact is that people don't trust SNS, so it is not harmful. But it is not true because people are in a panic. People are in panic, so they want something to believe. So they tend to believe the wrong information even if it is not true. Okay.

Then I will rebut their first point. They said that the official source is too strong. But in my experience about it, this is not true because the official source is not too strong in the status quo even though, okay? They also said that too many information--POI?No. Many information sources is very beneficial. But it is not true because people cannot judge. So, as I said, people are in a panic, so they want something to believe. So they tend to think, "Only wrong information or not wrong information?" So people cannot judge because they're in a panic.

Okay. So that's my first-- or second argument. Toughness for disaster. Toughness for disaster, this is about mass media. In the status quo, mass media will paralyze. Authority will paralyze. NSK will paralyze in two ways-- no, in three ways. First, TV studio, and radio is not special to disaster. So they don't have any cost to protect from the disaster. And second, in the disaster, many people access the server of the internet mass media, so the message will be blocked. For example, the network server was crashed and we could not access information in the Great East Japan earthquake. And third, some TVs are business, so some TV and radio have great authority. So they don't want to be criticized after the disaster, so they avoid reporting even though they have some information. So this is a serious problem. And this will cause two serious problems. First, no information, and in the status quo, each mass media and each TV have cause to protect from the [crosstalk]--Point of information?No, thank you. So they cannot prepare for enough. And second, people must rely on SNS. As the first speaker said, it's very dangerous because there are a lot of rumors and there are a lot of lies. And after the plan, we can set up very strong special facilities and special servers and strong reliability facilities. So we strongly believe that our arguments are superior. Thank you. [applause]

In my speech, I'm going to first attack their first and second point, then reconstruct our first point and go into our second point. In their first point, they talk about toughness for life. Two rebuttals. Firstly, these fake newsmakers don't make fake news. It is because they don't want to be punished by the police. So in the current situation, like there was the example of a lion coming out in the Kyushu earthquake, those people got punished because of the police.Point of information?Yes.How do you explain that now, the status quo, they are-- on fake news, so [inaudible] fake news, right?I'm going to explain later, okay? So because of that, they don't want this false position and also, they don't want to be arrested. They are not going to post. And even if they post those-- on a very rare case they post the fake news, they cannot-- these readers of SNS are going to check the news because if we have really serious, like impossible things in front of you, we have to check a lot of more information. That is what they really first do. And they're going to watch TV--POI?No, thank you. Because of that reason, they cannot believe this fake news.

Okay. Next, let me attack their second point. Their second point was about disaster. In their argument, they talk about that many sources are going to not tell about that information. But they're actually admitting that many information sources are more better in the current situation, and that can also save their lives. Okay, so in this point, they are actually contradicting their argument--POI?--and their argument doesn't sell. No, thank you. Sorry. And secondly-- yes, no, thank you. Sorry.

Next, let me go to our reconstruction of our first point. To our first point, they say more correct information is important. However, this is not true because if we make it a single source, and if some people, not authority are for telling this, authority is going to be really big because, for example, NHK is going to be bigger or maybe some other-- so those kinds of things are going to be bigger. So that causes a serious problem because even if there's good information in the downside of people, but the upside of the people cannot understand. Because, for example, in the [inaudible] earthquake, even if there was a trace of the big earthquake in the past, they cannot inform that information to the top. And because of these reasons, their argument doesn't stand.

Okay. Next, let me go to our second point. Our second point is interrupting advances of research. In the current situation, like there is a business kind of thing or maybe research in the universities. So because of these reasons, there is an incentive for this forecasting because they can earn money by business. For example, many people want to save their homes or maybe save their place by this information. And there is kind of big business coming out. These are made by maybe universities or maybe [inaudible] companies. But [after this plan?], there is simply none of them of these actions. Why is this important? Because in the long term perspective, we cannot advance technology for this disaster forecasting. Like there is no like idea of how to prepare for this. And the government has actually the duty to save people from these things. So because of these reasons, we are proud to oppose. Thank you. [applause]

The government side has been continually saying that these people on Twitter are giving out fake news and everything like that. But we believe after we get this plan, if there was even fake news that an authority gave, there is no choice but for people to follow that fake news. But on the present situation, on the status quo, we have the choice to look at some other new source and check if the news is correct or not. However, if we take this plan--Point of information?No, thank you. For us to check if this is true or not. So now, let me summarize this way. So their first point was about the fact that they will be more correct and people will [inaudible] saving. First of all, the only explanation that they gave us was about Twitter. On the definition, they talked about how they're going to ban all media from giving out forecast. And we believe that they have not proven the point why it has to be all media. It could just be Twitter. Why does this have to be all media? And we believe that by giving these TV, the public sector TV channels the ability to forecast these things, we believe that it will give us more benefits. On their second point, they were talking about how-- since they don't have the incentive to give out the correct information because they don't want to be criticized. However, we believe that private TV shows also have specialists and they're talking about integration. But if we integrate, like we said, there are people with different perspectives. So we believe that this constant conversation will not even go as fast. We believe that we can--Point of information?No, thank you. We believe that we cannot achieve the perfect correctness and we will just deteriorate the correctness of the forecast. On our side of the house, we spoke about how having these abilities to check if the information is correct from several forecasts allows us to protect our lives and also leads us in the long term to the advancement of these forecasting abilities. So, in the current situation, we are not able to forecast correctly--Point of information?Yes.So, in the [inaudible], having a lot of perspectives is okay. But in a disaster, how can people just so many perspectives without knowledge about-- special knowledge-- without special knowledge?So, we believe that since there are many sources, people are able to think that, "Okay, this source is correct," and so choose their sources that they believe is correct and protect their lives in the way that they think is correct. And the same goes, it's impossible to forecast. However, if we [oppose?], we believe that we can save these people's lives and therefore we are proud to oppose. Thank you. [applause]

Hello, everyone. We strongly believe that disaster forecasts should be issued from a single source. And let me revert to the opposition's second point. They said that it's going to interrupt the achievement of the research. However, it's never going to interrupt any research and technology innovation because we're just eliminating information sources. And we're not really talking about the research system and technology.Point of information?Yes.So the government side has repeatedly said the government side would have headquarters, right?Yeah.How would the headquarters choose professors or researchers from all over the country? We believe that the organizations have different researchers and have different opinions for disaster forecasting to actually more good knowing or good understanding about disaster and also disaster forecasting. What do you think about that?We mentioned about the government headquarters, something like that. But we think more like we're going to unite many organizations that we have right now because there are many organizations for forecast.Point of information?No, thank you.

And the most important point on this debate is, what kind of information do you want when you face a big natural disaster? We strongly believe that we, or the people - no, thank you - really need correct accurate information. On this point, they said that people want to get information from many sources and that's really accurate. However, we strongly believe that those people have no ability to judge the correct information from SNS.POI?What?So as I told you about the example of Sakurajima, even authorities, even professors, even professionals can make mistakes about disaster forecasting. Could you tell me about the government's side description on this point?Yeah, I know that. And the thing is, I want you to think, which is better? There's no information that you're going to involved in disaster or you're going to be involved in disaster a little bit but because of the specialized information. Which is better? We explained Osaka north earthquake, and during the earthquake, many people made rumors, stupid rumors on Twitter or SNS. And that was a big obstacle for us for evacuation. And also, no TV program said any drastic idea about what's going to happen next. They mentioned about what's happened in the earthquake but they never said anything about prediction. I know there's no perfect predictions at all, but we strongly believe that having predictions from specialists is better than getting information from general people. Thank you. [applause]