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The government must be the only actor who forecasts disasters, especially because Japanese people have inherent fear and panic about disasters. And if other sources do so, there will be chaos. And that's why we beg to propose. So before moving on to our points, I would like to state our definition. As in single source, we mean one organization will release the forecast on different media. And that one organization will be the government. So we have two models for today. First of all, the single source will be NHK or any national channel in each country. And second of all, we will broadcast the likelihood of disasters or how to prevent any further chaos. So our first point for today is prevent confusion, and our second speaker will be talking about our second point, which is unnecessary death.

Now, moving on to our first point which is prevent confusion. I would like to analyze two things. First, the status quo. And second, what will happen in the [after-plan?]. In the status quo, private programs has incentive to make it interesting about disaster, for disaster forecast. This is because they're profit-seeking, and the more people watch their program, the more chance they will gain money from commercial, right? And that's why they make documentaries and programs that stimulate fear intentionally. For example, they say that [dairy?] products will be all sold out during a disaster or they say that thousands of people will die, the National Diet will collapse and stuff like that. So because people are already scared of disasters, and they want to know everything, right, because they're so scared of disasters, the media escalates these information and tries-- I'll take you later. They tries to escalate these information and exaggerate these information or make it wrong in some cases. So as a result of that, the people will try to buy all the toilet papers, food, and water. And it creates this confusion because everyone wants to ensure the safety based on these wrong or exaggerated information. Yes?So if the citizens judge that media or institution is unreliable, won't the profit of those institutions decrease?We don't think that the people are capable of capable of judging if a source is reliable, especially if it's about disasters because they're in a state of panic or they have immense fear. So now moving on to, what are the harms of the status quo? It creates confusion within society. There are four specific harms. First of all, there will be a lack of necessities. As I told you, people will want to buy all the toilet paper and food and water in order to ensure their safety. However, there is a limit to all this stuff. So [foreign] sale or what happen during the oil shock in Japan, everyone will want to buy these products. And therefore, some people might break into other people's houses, right, in order to ensure their safety, especially because they're so panicking and they're scared. And also, families will be separated, right, because of these wrong information from other sources. They don't know how to act or will be confused. And children will not be able to eat properly. We think that this is a very severe situation.Now, moving on to our second and last analysis. What will happen in the [after-plan?]? Now, people will be safe. This is because they will know how to act and control their mind. This is because it's based from a single source which is the government which is very trustworthy, and they will be not confused by a lot of various information which can be wrong and exaggerated. So in conclusion, because we want to prevent confusion and ensure safety, we beg to propose. Thank you.

Thank you. We are opposing this motion. First of all, we opposition side believe that taking this motion will lead to worse situations, more deaths in case of disasters. That's why we are very proud to oppose this motion. First, let me rebut some of the points. First, they said Japanese people inherently feels scared in case of disaster, but this is not true because Japanese people are rather used to having disasters because Japan is a country in which many disaster occur, unfortunately. And next, the diversity of-- sorry. How diversity of-- sorry. When it comes to the incentives of the institutions, when the public think that the institution is not reliable, in the long run, they will not use that source because safety, [the correctness?]-- yes?How will these people know that the media is not unreliable?Yes. In case like typhoon, after typhoon passed by, you can judge whether the predicted typhoon route was true or not. So it is very obvious that they can know whether the institution is correct or not.

Now, let me move on to our points. Our first point is protecting human lives, and our second point is how diversity of disaster medias lead to better courage. This will be explained by our second speaker. Now, let me explain my first point. I would like to analysis two things, incentives for institutions and, the second, how it would be dangerous if a single source of disaster prediction is wrong. When it is only the single source that provides informations of, predictions of the disaster, because as they said, they are profit-seekers, they don't have incentives to improve the--[inaudible].Sorry. Improve the quality of their predicting. On the contrary, when it comes to multiples, there are a lot of institutions which is about the disaster. So in order to attract a lot of customers, the institutions try to improve the quality of their--[inaudible].--analysis. Sorry. And in my second analysis, when it comes to the single source of disaster, if that is wrong such as predicting where the typhoon goes is very difficult even in today's science. It is very likely that one single source is wrong, and many people will be affected by that single source, and they will all eventually die. In the typhoon [16 or 20?] typhoon this year, it was a total disaster, but a lot of people were able to compare the sources and choose rationally which is better, which should be followed. So multiple is more likely to save a lot of people's lives. That's why we are very proud to oppose this motion. Thank you.

We think that [as side?] government, we can solve everything the opposition wants to do and on top of that provide reliability towards our citizens. For these reasons, proud to propose. So firstly, refutation. One point of refutation. They talked about how, because it's only one source, this source doesn't have the incentive to provide the correct information. First of all, I'd like to say that it's the government providing this information, right? They have the incentive to protect the citizens. And obviously, since they want to be voted again in, they have the incentive to make sure that everyone is safe, to make sure that they're protected and they provide the best information possible. And on top of this, we say that, just because you have multiple sources, doesn't mean you have all the necessary information, right? We say that, even though you only have one source, you can have multiple researchers behind this one source. You can gather all the people behind it. And on top of this, because it's the government taking action, they enough money. They have enough connections to be able to gather all the researchers to provide the most reliable information possible.

Moving on to reconstructions. They said that the people are not likely to watch unreliable sources. Three things to say to this. Firstly, we say that Japanese people have the absolute fear that they're going to die during [foreign], etc. And so they have the incentive to learn even more information, as much as they can so that they know what to do in case an earthquake happens. And so they even watch things that aren't as reliable as they say. And we say that it's really hard to draw the line between reliable and unreliable because it's obviously something on the news, and you can't exactly decide what's good and bad because you're not a scientist. Second answer. We say that it's not just Japanese people. It's uninformed people such as people living in the south-- people living in Southeast Asia who don't necessarily understand how disasters work that are going to be watching the news. These people don't understand how disasters work, so they'll believe everything that they watch. An example of this is, during the Sumatra earthquake, people thought it was a good idea to go run to the beach because they felt that, well, tsunamis aren't that bad. It's just a big splash. And so a lot of people died because of the wrong provided on these other sources. Third response. We think that this confusion has already happened in Japan. To give an example, in October, there was a large typhoon that hit Tokyo. And a lot of people in the main city area decided to buy up all the food and caused a lot of confusion in main areas like Shibuya, Setagaya, [Chūō?], etc. And so we think that this case also applies to Japanese people.

Now moving on to my point for today. Unnecessary death. We think that diverse media doesn't always mean it's just fearful ideas being posted. It's also interesting things that are being posted as well. So some cases would be filming a disaster, like an action movie. Some TV outlets decide to broadcast about typhoon riding and how it's fun to be in a typhoon or to be in a hurricane because you can be swept away by the wind. And this kind of interesting thing is posted on the media. An example of this. During the 3/11 earthquake in Japan, there was a tsunami that hit Japan, right? And in Hawaii, it was broadcasted that a tsunami was likely to hit Hawaii as well. And they broadcasted the tsunami as a large surf wave that you can ride and have fun on. This led to a man dying in Hawaii because he thought it was a good idea to go surfing on a tsunami. We think that, because of this wrong source being posted online, people are dying because they do not understand and cannot make the right choices. Now, we want people to be safe and calm in cases of disasters, and we want to prevent secondary harms being caused by these different outlets. And so we think that the motion provides safe and reliable information on all media outlets. We can provide uniqueness of all social media platforms while assuring reliability. For these reasons, proud to propose.

Okay. So thank you. First, let me rebut to just some points. So first, to their first argument, they said, "The citizens can go panic because they're very scary for [inaudible] disaster, so it is very likely that they panic during multiple informations and they contradict each other." But actually, in Japan, [inaudible] has prepared against [inaudible] disasters, so they have their own methods toward disasters. Some only rely on government informations and some with rely on only third-party informations. By their experience, maybe government may mistake one time and it has had harm for some citizens. And so the citizens may [unrely?] such government informations, so they rely on third-party--[inaudible] information.Yes?Don't you think that this one source will become more reliable because all the researchers will gather to this one source?Okay. So they think one information sources can be better, but we don't think so because there is private [inaudible] years ago because the system of it was so big, so unclear. And so citizens wanted that to be private because there were problems.

And we think--[inaudible].Sorry. This is era of democracy and economy, so if there is incentive of money for the institution, such institutions surely have a motivation to improve their quality and interface and specialization to all the citizens[inaudible].Sorry. Okay. And also, what about government? Also don't prepare for the disaster. They said citizens are not prepared for the disasters, and we think governments are also not prepared for the disaster [inaudible] like global organization should have a wide-- should have a wide incentive to make forecast to all the disaster, and that is what I say--[inaudible].--because they have experience and-- sorry. And government don't have experience.

And now, let me reconstruct our first argument. We talking about uncertainty of one's information. And so, I explain the reason. So first, there is no only proper information for all the citizens. Some are engaging in school or some special jobs, so they need particular information, maybe for the children, maybe for the [challenged?] people, maybe for the sick people, maybe some are in hospital. So there is no such only proper information. All's for all citizens.[inaudible].Sorry. So people should have incentives to make specialized information for the citizens, so that's why they-- so that's why it should be multiple.

And let me explain our second points briefly. So let me [categorize?] three types of citizens. As I said, there is who rely on government. And there will be lack of mutual development leads to-- and there is lack of mutual development. And that leads to less quality of information. And second who rely on third party, they will start not rely on government, and it is so risky that they going to lost-- they're going to lose the preparedness toward disaster, and that is why they're risky. So therefore, we are against this motion. Thank you.

We think that being prepared is better than doing nothing. And we should save lives. We should maximize the number of lives of being saved. That is why we are very proud to oppose. So firstly, I like to-- so in my summary speech, I would like to compare our arguments from two-- looking at two actors. First is about the institutions that issues the forecast. And second is the viewers that watch those forecasts. So for the first institutions. They say that the government will issue those informations. And since the government has incentive to save citizens, the government can save those people. However, as our first speaker explained, since there is only a single source, by multiple sources, not only public organizations, but also private organizations can compete accuracy in order to get more--[inaudible].No, thank you. To get more viewers. So we think that the accuracy is higher if there is a multiple source. But even if we concede that those [foreign] or those organizations have the incentive, their accuracy is really doubtful because even in the current science technology, we cannot completely predict the place where the typhoon goes.[inaudible].No, thank you. And since some medias are specialized in delivering information toward certain citizens like people working at late night, we believe that those institutions have methods, have knowledges to accurately deliver the information toward those people. We think that we can-- by multiple sources, we can save more people. And for the point of views, we think that what they have said, like the people surfing on that tsunami, we think that is a really rare case because we experience multiple times of disaster, so we can judge what is the correct information or not. So for example, they mentioned the problem of buying extra supplies. We think that we should save the lives. Saving the lives is more important because those lives were able to be saved if there are multiple sources. So we think that in order to maximize the people being saved from the disasters, we are very proud to oppose this motion. Thank you.

People easily get panicked, especially when natural disaster occurs because their lives are at risk. When fake news or overly exaggerate information spreads here, it is particularly dangerous because massive population will be influenced by this. And opposition sides' burden of proof is why democracy and freedom of these institutions overweighs people's safety. So moving on to the refutation, towards the second speaker. So the speaker mentioned how trust on the government will be lost. However, we believe that it is not true because there will be more researches in those institutions so the quality will rise. And also, government has the incentive to research more even if it's not enough right now because they want to save more people and gain more votes next time. And even if that happens, even if trust on the government are lost, it is much better than having too much information spread in the world and creating confusion as the first speaker has said.

So moving on to the clash point. Which side can ensure the accuracy of information? Opposition side has said that each institution provide different source-- in opposition side's world--[inaudible].--each institution will provide different sources. However, we say that this leads to confusion because some information might be accurate, but some are not. And some information might be true, but overly exaggerated. So this will stimulate people into fear, and this will create chaos in the society. So for example, there'll be confusion in Fukushima. And a lot of fake news will spread, and people went to wrong to evacuate. Therefore, a lot of lives were lost. And on the other hand, in our world, single accurate information run by a government will be spread. Right? As a result, obviously, it is more reliable because government side has the incentive to save people. And they're responsible for it, right? However, we believe that private institution have incentive to gain viewers or to gain attention. However, they don't care if people are saved or not because what they want is money and to gain more viewers. So we believe that by having this motion, there will be more reliable sources and there will be less confusion when a natural disaster happens. Therefore, we beg to propose. Thank you.