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Okay. Hello everyone and hello judges. Today's topic is government should restrict the time spent on online games. We defined that video games that are played on smartphones and on computer screens, and the time is over six hours because the minimum that likes to avoid health problem is six hours. So, we're going to define that. We have two points. The first point is causing serious health problems. Second point is more opportunities for people.

I will explain the first point: causing serious health problems. Playing too much video games will cause a serious health problems, we think. Video games makes the brain go crazy, and it will lead to studying problems too. Facing to the screen more than six hours will cause an eye problem too. You guys heard of a blue light? Maybe you guys heard of blue light on news too. That is a big damage to our eyes and our brain. Even we have a glasses that can protect blue lights, it doesn't mean 100% we can save our eyes. So, it will lead to our health problem damage and brain problems. If we played too much video games, you will be withdrawing from society, and you will not be able to go to school. So, we have trouble studying too. So it will going to cause-- it leads to brain problems. And for a specific example, in Chinese there was a person who played too much video games, like for about nine hours, and died, actually died. So, that is a specific example. And another health problem, our spine. You know we play video game-- when we play video games, our body faces like a stooped game, so it will cause to a big spine problem and--Yes, thank you. Can you clearly state that the Chinese person died because of only just video games? Maybe he ate too much--?Yes, and only video games.--only?Yeah. For nine hours. He played for more than six hours which is the minimum of the line, right? So, he played too much nine hours. So sitting position-- he played too much video games sitting position so he had a big damage from playing video games. And he died, actually died, so it's a specific example. So, we think that therefore government should restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you.

Hello everyone. We believe that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Let me rebut what the government team said. They said playing video games for more than six hours will cause a serious health. However, those problems are individual problems and not government responsibility. Sorry, no thank you. Blue light and spine problems, whatever sitting position, that's what they decided to do. That's not the Government's responsibilities. Okay.

Now next, let me explain our points. We have two points. The first point is that we have freedom to play. The second point is the culture and technologies. Okay. Now I will explain the first point, freedom to play. We all have freedom to play. Each of us does. And freedom doesn't have to be restricted by government. And whether we play games or not, that's each of us's decision. We make our own decisions by ourselves. For example, people spend too much time on online games. Some people does. And doesn't spend time on other things. However, those movements are not government's responsibilities. They take responsibility for what they do and what they do by themselves. So why does government have to spend time on those things while they have to think about their welfares and think about people that doesn't have houses? So they should think more of those serious stuff and not restricting the time spent on online games. So, it's individual's responsibility and not government's responsibility. That's why we believe that there's no clear reason that governments have to take those responsibilities. So that's why we think that government should not restrict the time spent on online games. Thank you.

Hello everyone, and today we believe that the government--Hello everyone. We are very proud to propose a motion. The government should restrict the time spent on video games. First, let me rebut opposition's first point which was freedom to play. So they said that freedom should not be restricted by government, such as playing video games. However, maybe freedom should not be restricted by the government. However, what if that freedom leads to a serious health problem, as my first speaker mentioned. Let's say if playing too much video games cause a severe eye damage to a person, and a severe spinal damage to another. And let's say a person committed suicide because they could not adapt to society like before. That will cause health insurance-- they have to reconstruct their government system. And therefore, it is the government's problem, and we should draw a line on how much video games should be allowed.

Now, let me reconstruct government's first point which was causing health problems. That video games will cause health problems. Now the opposition's attack was that the cause of the health problem is an individual matter, and it should not be a government's duty to restrict in order to avoid it. However, isn't that what governments are supposed to do? Governments are here to protect individuals, to help us have a better life. That's what government is for, and that is what governments do. Therefore, the attack does not stand, and it's actually making our point stronger.

Now, I would like to move on to government's second point which is more opportunities for people. When we adopt this motion, the government will restrict the hours for video games to six hours per day. Six hours per day. Let's take a weekend day, for example. Say, you wake up at 7:00 AM and play video games for six hours, and it's 1:00 PM. You still have a full afternoon ahead. You can use that time to study, hang out with friends, or spend time with your family. Whatever you want. Doesn't that sound like an amazing and fulfilling time? Now, what will happen if we let people play video games as long as they want? You will wake up at 6:00 AM and play video games, and you will look at the clock again, it's 7:00 PM. You've wasted your entire day playing video games. Now, you have a dry eye, your back hurts, and you're hardly even conscious because you've played too much video games. And that blue light is messing with your brain. Now, video games are fun, of course, but unless we draw a very clear line to avoid health problems, we would only cause a lot of harm. Therefore, we are very proud to propose. Thank you.

Okay. Thank you. Today's topic is about whether government should restrict the time spent on online games or not. We on the opposition believe that it's not the government's duty to restrict the time spent on online games. First of all, let me rebut your two points. The first point was serious health problems. And you had an example. For example, your back hurts, or you have eye damage because of blue light. And the eye glasses doesn't protect you 100% from blue light, so we do understand that. And your mind might go crazy, and you're going to have serious health problems. I know that. And there are some examples in China as you said. A guy who played nine hours and died. We do understand that. But why do you say that it is still the government's responsibility? We believe that it is the individual's responsibility because those serious health problems are-- because health is ours. It's our own responsibility to manage their life and manage their time. How they spend their whole day, and how they deal with online games. Online games are fun, and it's our freedom to play. And we believe that it's not the government's responsibility to restrict them. And how many people do you actually see around you that are addicted to online games and actually die? How many people do you know that?I first knew the news in China but I don't see-- my family don't die because of that. How many people actually die in Japan because of online games? There is no proof. So our point is superior. And also you said that there is more opportunity if the government restrict the time. However, if the government is here for helping us, actually helping us, then why don't they get a shelter for people who suffered on March 11, the earthquake? Or why don't they get enough education for those children who cannot attend school?

So I'll move onto my second point. Our second point is Japanese culture and technology. For example, online games are developed because of application makers and so many phone and PC companies. And those companies cannot develop if the government restricts the time because users cannot download enough games to play. And then if there's less people who download the games, then are the company going to continue making games and make profit? The answer is no. Also, as for our Japanese culture, recently Ego and Shogi-- it's a Japanese culture, and it's really popular all over the world. And so many people in America, for example, play games online with Japanese people, actually in daytime.And if you restrict, there's time difference. And then how are you going to communicate, and how are you going to play games with those people in different countries? Online games, it is online. As the word online means, it's online. So the whole globe is communicating with each other. No thank you. So if the government's going to restrict the time, then how are those cultures and how is those technologies, for example artificial intelligence, going to develop from now on? The present world, there's so many technologies, but it is not enough. And online games can develop furthermore, and culture can be preserved furthermore. So what is the point for the government to restrict? Thank you.

Hello, everyone. Today so far we've been talking whether or not governments should restrict spent on online games. We, on opposition team, strongly believe that governments should not restrict the spent of online games. Let me summarize today's debate. There are two clash points. First, health. And second, culture growth. As for the first point, health, the government idea was that playing video games too much causes serious health problems, such as eye disease. And as they said, the brain will be crazy. But we do understand that. But again, the reason that has to be government's responsibility is not clear. And we think governments should do other things except for restricting the time spent on online games. Therefore, health problem is not a problem. Again, playing games is an individual decision, and governments shouldn't restrict the time spent on online games. Let's move on to the second point, culture growth. As for our second point, the government idea was that after taking this plan, people have more opportunity to communicate with other people and do other things except we're playing games to just joining society. But, remember, world is changing. Now in the world, there's lots of communication by chatting by the online games. And that culture will more and more increasing. And that is the big changing that happens today in the world. Therefore, governments should not restrict time spent on online games. Thank you for listening [applause].

Thank you, judge. As for the [inaudible] speech, I will be summarizing this debate from two aspects. I would like to give [inaudible] to the second point through the first aspect that follows. The first point is the status quo of video games. The government side and the opposition side takes a very different look at the current status quo of video games. However, while the opposing side emphasizes how video game technology helps culture grow, the government side does not ignore this merit of video games. The government side wants the video game culture to grow as much as the opposition side. Although limiting the time to six hours is a likely decrease of profit, minus images to our video games like they will make you dumber or only being angry. With the government side restricting time spent, the video game industry will have a more positive image and freedom to act. Therefore, what the opposition side wants to do can be achieved through the benefit of this motion. No thank you. Thus, the government side's argument stands stronger. Moving on. The second point is the freedom to play.The government side is not saying that video games are bad and that video games should be banned. What we are proposing is that in the extreme cases, video games are most definitely hazardous. And that given the chance to prevent such cases of how video-- cases, the government should act. The first point gave specific reason, actual cases, of how video games are bad for you. The second point even broadened our argument, pointing out that more opportunities will arise from previous game junkies. The opposition side's first point focused on this freedom, saying that people have freedom to play. The government side does not want to take away freedom of choice for people. It is merely ensuring that that choice does not harm people greatly. Therefore, the government side's definition and point is consistent and clearly not a goal. The government side thinks of people's--Do you want--?No thank you. Sorry. The government side thinks of the people's health. Video games should merely be plus, a hobby, in people's lives [applause]. Ensuring that people are healthy should be on top of government's list. So it is the government's responsibility to restrict time spent playing. For these reasons, we beg to propose. Thank you for listening [applause].