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Hello, everyone. Today's topic is government should restrict that time spent on online games. We define that online games is a video games you play with other people online. Restrict means to [inaudible], the time means two or three months of [inaudible]. We have two points. The first point is efficient use of time, the second point is [inaudible] government looks to create more active society.

I'll explain the first point, efficient use of time. In the [inaudible], online games have dependence because this game is played with other people. We think I want to [inaudible], so they use time for games. For example, like drugs. They have dependence. But the game, we can get only fun. But on the other hands, sports or studying, or something can give other ability too. Sports can get strengths and study can get academic ability. These are the abilities to succeed in society. To get ability and succeed in society. We have to restrict time spent on online games. So if we take this [inaudible], we can use time more efficient, and people can get jobs-- get skills and society will become better. Therefore, we [inaudible] that government should restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you. [applause]

Thank you, chairperson. Let me start my speech with the opposition said that the government should not restrict time spent on online games. I have three attack points for their first point. First place, the only limit online games. Why do they limit all online games? Why they don't limit all the games like PS or Wii or something like that? So they don't have any uniqueness at all. And the second attack point is that they say the game is not efficient, but how can you say that game is not efficient when [inaudible] for their [inaudible]? For example, like people who enjoy games and they release stress by playing online games. How can they say this is not efficient for those people? So their first point is not great. And third of attack point is that they pointed out that online games are addictive, but that is not true because-- that is not [inaudible] because-- I will give you an example. Think about the tobacco or alcohol, this is also addictive, right? But government don't limit the amount of people drink. So this is very similar situation because game is also addictive, they say. So their first point is not great.

Okay, I'll move onto our first point. Our first point is about freedom to play online games-- freedom to play online games. There are many people who enjoy play games and I think almost all people install online games on their smartphones. However, and some release stress by playing online games. So after taking this motion--Sir.No thank you. People restrict the time spent on online games. So that means they cannot play by the satisfied with online games. And also they cannot release stress like that. And this is very serious situation, right? The situation where the government can restrict the freedom is very limited because freedom should be restricted without any harm. In this case-- with any harm to others. So in this case, just playing games doesn't harm to others. So that freedom should not be restricted. [applause]

Now I begin my speech. So, [inaudible] we the government, said that we should restrict the time spent on online games. First, I'd like to make some rebuttals to their first point, which was freedom to play online games. Yes, freedom is very important. I agree on that point. However, the government does have the right to restrict freedom if-- there are some cases where the government can't restrict freedom, just like in drugs, like our first speaker said. Drugs are restricted because they are harmful substances. And in this case, like our first speaker showed, there is addiction in online video games. Noo, thank you. And the first speaker of the opposition side said, "Why online games? Why not just normal games like PS and things like that?" However, online games have real people going against them. And people spend money just to win on online games. So there is more addiction, and there is more time consuming because they want to win against real people in online games. So that will give uniqueness to this plan. And also they say that—

now, I'll make some reconstructions to our first point. They said that it is not efficient. They asked us why isn't efficient because it relieves stress and things like that. However, like our first speaker said, there are better ways to do things like relieving stress or thinking logically, like doing sports, studying, doing debate like right now. I'm releasing a lot of stress right now. There are other ways to do this.Point [inaudible].And also-- no, thank you. How do online games relieve stress? They had no explanation on this point. So I don't think that we can take this rebuttal. And also, they said that it's not addictive at all. They said it's not addictive. And then they went on to explain about tobacco and alcohol. They are not limited. Like I said with drugs, they are limited because there is harm. So the government does have the right to limit things that can be harmful to peoples' bodies or minds. So we do have the right to limit things. So their first point doesn't stand.Okay, so you're saying that drugs and-- sorry, online games are equal, but don't you think that drug users can harm others because their personality will be [inaudible].Okay, okay. But there are drugs don't affect the mind, but are still banned. I can't think of one off the top of my head. But there are drugs that don't harm others but are limited. So I think that that point doesn't stand.

And now moving on to my second point, which is fulfills the government's role to create a more active society. So in the status quo, like we said in our first point, online games take up too much time over our modern lives. So playing online games has next no benefit at all, except for that maybe relieves stress, maybe gives you pleasure. But you can do that with other things, like I said, debate. For example, logical thinking can be done through a debate. So doing things like studying, debating, and playing sports is a lot more important for people and especially students. And the government is not fulfilling it's duty right now to make a better, more active society. So if we leave this problem alone, this society will become a less active society due to the increasing population of online gamers and the present situation. And this is bad because the economy and the interest in politics would decline overall if they keep playing video games and not show any interest towards economy or politics. So after the plan, however, the amount of time spent on online games will become less. And there will be a more active society because the gamers will have to find something else to do. And it will be the cause of more communication between people, more interest towards politics, more interest towards the economy, more interest towards studying itself, or debating, or playing sports. And this is important because it can lead to better health. It can lead to a better mind. And overall, the government needs to fulfill its role to make a better society to create more opportunities to become better as human overall. Thank you. [applause]

First of all, let me [inaudible] our first argument. So first argument, the attacked our points by saying there are other ways to get the refresh. However, they don't know about online players. They just play online games for hours and hours because it is very fun and it is very helpful for them to concentrate on their-- they don't want concentrate on studying or working. And it can be very easy for them to against stress. So they don't know about them if they don't-- what is the best way for them to get stressed? Yes?Don't you think that after this [inaudible], they will be able to find something else? Because they are focused on online gaming right now too much. So they will maybe after the [inaudible], they will be able to find something else.Okay, but do you think that the game players are having fun to having a debate or something? So it is very hard for them to look for other things to concentrate. However, game is very fun and their freedom should not be infringed by the government. They do not have the right to do so. And also, there is a strong addictiveness.

Let me talk to your first point, which is [inaudible]. Because drugs are something that may cause others to-- that make people to attack others and make-- morality is going to down. However, [inaudible] has very strong addictiveness, and-- no, as well as playing games. They know its addictiveness before they play. The contract [inaudible], they have to read a contract, they can spend the money and all that, or they can't do-- so they know the danger. So in this case, freedom should be protected.

And now, let me attack your third point, which is that they're going to less be interested in politics or other social problems. However, this is not important because if you play even games, you can be interested in politics. Like, oh, why can't they do both things at the same time? So their argument is lacking a process.

So now, let me move on to our second point. Second point is [inaudible] harm [inaudible]. So, for example, [inaudible] like game player professionals-- professional game players is appearing from the [inaudible]. They are making out of the-- they are making a living out of playing games. And also there are YouTubers who play long games and make a living out of it. Because they just happened to be [inaudible], and good at playing games. They are not good at even playing sports. They are good at playing games. And they are making a Strongpoint-- they are using Strongpoint to making a living out of it. This freedom can't be infringed. And also, there are people that work on the weekdays and who are looking to forward to having fun on the weekdays, playing like three hours, four hours, eight hours. And also, there are players who want to defeat the boss. So anyway, why no one know the best way for them to get destressed? Why can't we do this? Thank you.

We think that the restrictions on the time spent on playing games is the excessive intervention by the government. Why this is the case? We have clearly explained that the human right can be accepted as long as it doesn't harm any other citizens, right? And they said, that online games are equal to drugs, but as I said earlier, drug users can harm others. So this is basically different. In terms of analogy, our analogy [inaudible] like tobacco or alcohol. Some citizens pay money to access to those-- yeah. They drink alcohol or smoke. That is a kind of lifestyle and government is supporting that kind of lifestyle. That is because it doesn't hurt-- it is kind of us-- there are the responsibility of each individual. And also, so it doesn't harm any other citizens. So we think that same goes for the use of online games. So we think that there is a kind of lifestyle that can be accepted by the government. And surely, we clearly show the victims who will be deprived of their rights, right? Like people who make a living by playing games for a long time. And also people who relieve their stress. They said that there are other ways to relieve stress. That is right. We can say to this point. But like our second speaker said, why the government has to decide what citizens use to relieve their stress, right? The citizens must have the right to find what is best for them and enjoy doing-- playing video games in some cases. So we think that that is kind of excessive intervention by the government. So we think that if we take this motion, some people who really need to play games, or some people who are-- yeah, who are enriching their lives by playing video games, will be significantly deprived of their right. And even if the plan leads to better social progression, we do not believe it is the proper way to deprive citizens of their rights. So we think that for these reasons it is unjust to take this motion. And that is why we believe that we have won this round. Thank you [applause].

Hello, everyone. We believe that we should restrict the time spent on online games. First, let me rebut what the opposition side said. They said people will lose their work and won't be able to make a living. However, there's people have their jobs in the first place because people are addicted and they can also make a living out of something else like the game. And so they're [inaudible] doesn't stand.

And let me summarize to this debate. The most important point things is citizens better life and better society. And on this point, we explained how online games are harmful and how it is not necessary [inaudible]. As our first speaker said, we can get just satisfaction by playing video games. And through sports or studying, we can get strength or academic ability or something like that. And it can get better things like this. And leaves the better society and better place. And on this point, they said why only online? Why only online? But well, we proved the online games or have more addictive-- is more addictive. And why online games are not efficient. They asked why online games are not efficient or something like that, and we explained it. There are better ways to have less stress, yeah, like studying or playing sports. So our point stays [inaudible]. So our point still stands. And for these reasons, their first point of freedom does not stand because-- because also there is harm to others indirectly by not contributing to society. Yeah. We proved online games are harmful. And so it is out of freedom [inaudible]. Okay.So do you say that [inaudible]?Yeah, sorry. Thank you [applause].