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[inaudible]. Okay, so [inaudible]. So hello, everyone. So today's topic is government should restrict the time spent on online games. And we don't actually have definition worldwide, and online games is all online games. So our team's [inaudible] is to protect gamers, and we have two points. The first is the effect of online. Second is the government's role.

So before moving on to our arguments, first, I like to explain the problems of status quo. So first, I want to explain the uniqueness of online games. What is unique of online games is that everyone can do it, and they can do whenever you want. And most importantly, it gives a full sense of having a social life, because everyone can connect with your online friends. Right? So the problem is, you tend to stay inside a house because of its addictiveness--[inaudible].No, thank you. And by both mentally and physically. So mentally addictiveness is that you lose [crosstalk]. No, thank you. You lose the opportunity to develop your communication skills and physically, so you're confined indoors looking at the screen. So you lose a time of sleeping like that and--[inaudible].Yes.So [inaudible], so we can connect online people [inaudible]. What is the uniqueness of that imaging?Okay, I'll explain that later. And really, that we can split into two cases. First are the kids' cases, and second is adult cases. So kids, you hide and play from parents. Kids have to play at midnight, right? So the effect is that you lose concentration at studying or they don't go to school, and they don't play with your friends because you can play with onlines. No, thank you. And also, you can play games during this class like that. And kids are developing physically and mentally, right? No, thank you. So by not taking [inaudible], it is harmful. And for adults, when they go to job, they will cause a lack of face-to-face communication. And also, they can't concentrate into jobs.And why taking this motion is better is that by after taking this motion, it will encourage them to do other things. For example, playing with friends or concentrating on jobs. And what is important is we are not banning it. We are just limiting the time. So we still allow them to play online games for entertainment, for example, when they have a stress like that, while maintaining social life. So for these reasons, we think that we should take this motion. Thank you.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. First, I [inaudible]. And [inaudible], this is online games communication is about for people, but they didn't [inaudible] their uniqueness. There are [inaudible]. So why only online games? It is very weird point. Second, they said communication skill will be losed, but it is very [inaudible]. Firstly, they didn't explain the effort or the process about it. And secondly, if we use online games, we can communicate unknown people. So it improve our skills, so it is very [inaudible]. Thirdly, they cared about addiction. But people agree that addiction, even there are some harmful [crosstalk]. So it is rational choice. No, thank you. So it is very [inaudible]. And [inaudible] is very few, majority will not [inaudible]. So--On that point, sir?Okay.If the majority are playing to a controllable degree, we're happy to let those people play to a controllable degree. It's the people who are playing 24/7 that we need to limit, and that's what the motion is for.But they have [inaudible] about it, if there are some harms. So the person who did play is [inaudible] agree about it. So it is rational choice.

Then I explain, in terms of our point. Our third point is like to play online games, and our second point is for [inaudible] company. [inaudible] first point and [inaudible] the skill of making game is progressing, and many people do it. Many people get [inaudible] online, and many people make fun by online games. For example, there are very [inaudible] character online games or some people buy goods about it. Also me, I bought goods there. So it is a reason for leaving. And second, there are poor gamers which are online game program--[inaudible].No, thank you. There are skills which teaches about games and such people [inaudible] money or [inaudible]. For example, Shadow [inaudible], it is one type of company. It gives players money, and players get money and they leave. And other example, YouTuber, they reporting playing games, and they get advertisement money from YouTube and they leave. So it is very important, not from the beginning [inaudible] to [inaudible] play game, and there are no harms for other people. So it is very important. And after [inaudible], and it [inaudible] also laugh, also jokes. So if without money, people can leave. So it is very important point. So I [inaudible]. Thank you.

We completely agree that for some people, online games are a reason for living, that it is a career. But we don't think that it's absolutely necessary for them to play 10, 20 hours a day in order to get these benefits out of playing online games, right? What we support is a system that restricts the time, to discourage unhealthy lifestyles, as opposed to just playing the video games as a hobby. We're completely fine with doing that.

So let's move on to our reconstruction. They first said that against our point about SNS-- or they asked what is the distinction between SNS and video games? We're happy to limit SNS as well. We see the same harms in that. But even if it's not, we see that games are extremely friendly toward people like in children who are more interested in playing video games than perhaps, going on SNS and sharing cute pictures or things like that. Especially, it's extremely harmful for children as opposed to adults who are generally the part target of SNS. And secondly, they said addiction. Against the point about addiction, they said, "Limit and not ban." We're happy to let people play a healthy level of video games. We don't see what's the problem with their whole thing. And the same for what they said in their points. They said that it's a reason for living, and that pro-gamers make a living out of it. No, it can be done within a limited time frame. Even if it can't, it still encourages people, like yourself, to live a healthier life. Because when we have pro-gamers streaming games until 2:00 AM, people are going to watch that. And we want to discourage that type of activity. Because these pro gamers are more often than not, basically like the stars of the gaming community. And if these people are playing a healthy level of video games, I'm sure that people who are listening to them will play a healthy level of video games as well.

But they asked us the question, "Why does the government have to step in? Why is that we can't leave them to their freedom of choice?" So that's what I'll explain, the government's role. Of course, we recognize the importance of autonomy, but we'll also recognize that in many cases, we already do limit the freedom of people under two circumstances. One, if it's harmful. And two, if it takes rationality away. An example of this is tobacco. It's harmful because it causes physical effects like lung cancer, and it is addictive because there's a physical reaction that comes with it.

Now, let's take a look at online games. One, it's harmful, just as the previous speaker mentioned. But not only for yourself, right? Adults playing online will lose time spent on work. There's an opportunity cost that begins there. But also, as she said, there's a very clear harm that's coming with people playing video games until the middle of the night, not focusing on their school studies at all. Two, is it addictive? Yes, we think it is. Because a) these video games are designed specifically to hook the player and not let go. [inaudible] works when you beat a level. Companies have an incentive to addict players and not let them do anything else. They're designed to be addictive. Obviously, they are addictive, considering all the people that play these video games in the [inaudible].

But secondly, a unique characteristic of connecting people online. Because it creates this false delusion of you being connected to other people, having a social life. And we think that this type of thing is extremely harmful. Because we see it in tobacco, and the status quo is limited by age. It's limited throughout education because people tell you that smoking is bad. It's limited through economic reasons, like payments. But none of these apply to video games. Video games are for children. There is no education against video games, and video games are extremely cheap. That makes it extremely accessible and takes away all the incentive not to play video games. We think that this is an extremely harmful situation that we need to change. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairperson. Hello, everyone. Firstly, I'll [inaudible] their first point. They said effect of online, but it is not so important because I have three rebuttal for their first point. First, it is their will. So why it is, but there are many people who live by online games, and online games is part of their lives [crosstalk]. No, thank you. So if we limit the time of online games, it means still that their--Ma'am.Sorry. No, thank you. Their purpose to live. So it is rather for their harm, mental harm. So their first point is not more important. And second, they said about kids. But parents can limit and watch, because they live together--Information.Sorry. No, thank you. So it is not so important. And third, about the adult, why only limit the time they will be able to communicate with other people? So their first point is not so important.[inaudible] information.Sorry. No, thank you.

I rebut their second point. They said government role, but online games is not harmful for people because even addiction will happen. It is completely their own responsibility, and they agree. Sorry. No, thank you. They agree with the addiction. So it is not so important, and there are no harm for other people. So government must not limit the time spent on online games. They reconstruct our--On that point.Sorry. No, thank you.

They reconstruct our first point. About this, their rebuttal is not so important because [inaudible] by game is a need to practice because our are money buy it-- their money buy it.On that point.Sorry. No, thank you. As a result practice, they can't win the game. And if they can't win-- without win, they can't leave. So our first point is so important.

Then I will explain our second point companies have.Ma'am.Sorry. No, thank you. I show you from two aspects. First, profit and companies live by game players charge and advertisement. By long time playing, company can get benefit because players see advertisements long time, and players think, "I want to play more. I want to become strong," so they charge. And second. If government limits time, a company will have to make games suited that limit. For example, player will be able to play a game until the limit. So company can't make game freely. So it is harmful company they're able to oppose. Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, first, I'd like talk about whether should have the right of playing freely or not, ladies and gentlemen. Firstly, I'd like to check the argument. So this about they will surely get mental or physical harm or they will be addicted. However, it is not true or not important or not unique because from the beginning, we have our [inaudible]. So we can start our people--Sir.No thank you. People who meet our satisfaction or our favor, right? So we can start to meet, and we can communicate with such people. So that's why it is not the uniqueness. So moreover, this motion just limits the time, just limits the time. So government can't prohibit a communicating, right? So that's why the communication will surely continue after the fact. So that's why they are arguing with you. More about that, government don't decides the timetable. Government just limit time - no thank you - just limit time. So that's why if the government limits time, the people will happen to play game still meanwhile. So that is why that the limiting time can be reason for not playing in meantime. Moreover, the other person clearly says they compare the importance of they playing game or studying. So they decided. Otherwise, that it is not so important, and there are other disagreements.So even though originally ordinary games had to be their game, the video games can be addiction. So we can [inaudible]. That's why it is not so unique. And moreover, the government law is not limit time. Government law is how to teach how to control our time and teach the importance of our lives, right? So otherwise, informs everybody that the government law is not limit. So sometimes the government can teach us our to control our time some more. So that's why, as others said before, that if it clear harmful for our physical or mental, we agree about this one. And the government can teach us how dangerous it is. And moreover, we agree it, so that we have the right to play out freely. So that's why our argument is completely [inaudible]. We strongly support this motion. Thank you.

So from the beginning, Team Government has been for a society where people can pursue their right to play video games to the extent that it remains as entertainment as a hobby, not to the extent that it becomes an addiction that is harmful to these players. That is the stance coming from Team Government. That is why we have won this debate. So moving on, let me quickly refute to their second argument about the industry. Now, I'd like to refute this from two levels. One, we have to understand here that these industries are incentivized to use the addiction that they cause to gain money from these players. We have to say that on that stance. We take the people over these money-milking companies. Perhaps, protect the people first in order to make sure that these people are safe. But on the second level, we also understand here that when these industries are the sole reason of the health deprivation or the communication deprivation of these people, we have step in and take a measure there, but we're not completely taking away the entire profit. So we are still allowing these companies to make use of the limited time these gamers have, but at the same time, keeping these people safe.

So moving on to clash point for today, what is best for these gamers? Now, we've heard basically three things from Team Opposition: one, communication with others; two, they agree to be home when they play; and three, people leave when they take money from the price. But we've basically agreed and conceded to all of these. But we say that rather than defending a benefit, it's actually a harm, and we've presented to you that. For example, communication. We say that it's a false sense of communication, because there's a difference between communicating with an online player and communicating with people in real life, people who you know the background of. There's a difference between being face-to-face with them. We say that in that case, it's best for these people to be able to experience that by going outside and not being cooped up in their house [crosstalk]. But also, no thank you, when they say they agree to the harm, we say that addiction clouds their decision.So in that case, the government has to step in to make the best choice for the people. And also, people live for it. Sure, they do. We agree to that. But at the same time, if they still want to continue to live and be paid for it, if these people are being forced to play to the extent that they are sleep deprived because other people play to that extent-- if we take this away and limit the time, they will also be healthy. We say that from these points, the benefits they prevented aren't actually benefits. So if you think about the health and the mental state of these players, vote Team Government. Thank you.