

# Toolkit for teachers and students on transdisciplinary approach to current issues

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Types of Motion and Motion Analysis</b>	<b>4</b>
The main structures and properties of a motion	4
The classification of the motions	5
Motions of facts	5
Motions of values	6
Policy of motions	6
Analysis of the motion and the building of the case	8
The key-words method	9
The stakeholders method	9
The stock issues method	10
Additional considerations	11
Values	11
Implementation in reality	11
The other side's content	11
Framing your case	12
Place and time	12
Principle motions - keywords	12
Policy motions - model	13
<b>Doing Research for a Debate</b>	<b>13</b>
Introduction	13
Teaching Issue Discovery	14
Methods for research discovery	14
Generating debate topics	15
Using the concept-stakeholder method	16
Doing the research	18
Finding and interpreting your material	18
Conclusion	19
Sources	20
Case studies of debate cases	20
This house would abolish pharmaceutical patents	20
Definition	20
Context	21
Problem	23
Arguments for Proposition	23
The existing patent structure results in high medicine prices,	23

Patents force pharmaceutical firms to focus solely on diseases that affect the rich population, ignoring diseases that affect the populations of underdeveloped nations.	27
Patents limit the people's right to access to knowledge	29
Arguments for Opposition	32
Without the earnings provided by patent monopolies, pharmaceutical R&D would halt, depriving patients of new treatments.	32
Patents boost indigenous research.	34
The patent monopoly is a beneficial monopoly for knowledge, and allows small businesses to remain independent.	35
This House opposes CO2 emission targets for developing economies	37
Definitions	37
Strategic Considerations	38
Arguments for Proposition	38
Economic development of developing countries is more important than climate protection	38
Developing countries deserve to develop as fast as possible	40
Emission targets would cause backlash from citizens of developing countries	42
Arguments for Opposition	44
Climate change should be the top priority	44
Emission targets for developing countries prevent emission "outsourcing"	47
Emission targets do not prevent economic growth	49
THBT media should focus on achievements of immigrants, rather than instances of their exclusion, suffering, or vulnerabilities.	51
Context, Definition, and Model	51
Arguments for Proposition	52
Dismantling negative stories	52
Positive Reinforcement and Integration	55
The role of the media	56
We should want more immigration	57
Arguments for Opposition	58
Obligation of the Media to Report Truthfully	58
The Risk of Selective Representation of Model Minorities	59
Potential Backlash from Audiences	61
Strategic Considerations, Language, and Ethical Considerations	61
Sources	64
This house believes that natural resources should never be owned by private actors	64
Definition	64
Context	65
Proposition Arguments	65
Private ownership of natural resources is detrimental to the environment	65
Private ownership of natural resources is immoral	66
Privatisation of natural resources harms the economic welfare of society	67
Opposition Arguments	68

## Introduction

In front of you is Result 3 of the GEASA project. This result is intended to be used as a companion by both teachers and students to better understand and apply debate methodology in class.

The first few chapters deal with some theoretical insights on how certain concepts in debating (analysing a motion, research, argument formation) can best be approached and offer practical tips for students and teachers on how to master those skills and apply them to understand the other results of this project.

A significant part of R3 comprises case studies—comprehensive collections of definitions, context, and arguments for and against four different debate motions.

On one hand, these case studies serve as examples of the outcomes that debate methodology can produce. Throughout Result, we refer to arguments, rebuttals, and complete cases. Readers can rely on Result 3 to grasp these concepts better and to improve their implementation of the lesson plans we have designed, as well as the overall pedagogical principles of this project.

Additionally, the case studies function as worksheets, they can, for example, be used for exercises on rebuttal or case analysis. We encourage teachers to get creative with them and potentially use them as resources in class. Debate in the classroom often requires a lot of preparation in order to be done well, the case studies are a way through which that preparation can be used. Debate cases do not, by any means, consist of 'perfect' arguments and analysis. Instead, since they were developed by different profiles of individuals (teachers, debate coaches, university lecturers, researchers, former debaters,...) from across Europe they are a reflection of diverse styles of argumentation used in contemporary European educational environments.

# Types of Motion and Motion Analysis

In the following pages we assume that, speaking about the debate, we will refer as a whole to regulated debate formats (such as British Parliamentary, Popper, WSDF, Lincoln-Douglas and many others), with their regulations and peculiarities. In this respect a debate is a discussion or, to use a more precise definition, an exchange of arguments, rebuttals and points of view about something that is commonly called “motion”. Therefore we can also define the motion as what the debate is about, meaning that a motion limits debaters’ chances and to go hither and thither and to avoid particular or uncomfortable issues and questions. As a rule a debate takes place between groups of people, usually called “teams”, divided in two sides; one side sustains the motion (the Proposition side) and the other one opposes the motion (the Opposition side). This means that every motion, in order to be considered a good motion, has to be debatable: in other words, a good motion has to give both teams a real chance to win the debate and it has to concern a problem that can be really discussed by two opposite positions.

Once we have clarified these basic principles, it is possible to proceed with the characteristics of a motion: in the following pages we will briefly explain its structure, its properties, its classification, its analysis and the definition of the debate case by considering the motion. Taking into consideration what has been written in the first lines, that is to say that there are many regulated debate formats, we will go on describing the general and main features that are usually common to the most of the formats.

## The main structures and properties of a motion

A motion has to be structured in a very clear way according to both the grammar and the understanding of its contents. The motion “THBT (=This House Believes That) in the European Union the most important decisions must be taken by a majority and not unanimously” possesses those two requirements: it’s grammatically correct and perfectly understandable. And it’s also debatable, because somebody could take sides with the Proposition and support the motion, and somebody else could take sides with the Opposition and oppose it. This is the main reason why it is very important to build a motion correctly: if we express it wrongly according to grammatical rules or if its message is not clear and logical, we fail to move the

starting step of a debate and so what will happen will not lead to a good and productive work for our students and for us.

There are also other reasons why a motion should be clear, especially when the debaters are beginners or very young students: it should also be always possible to build a context into which the motion could be set. That context, usually called framework, is a sort of big container in which the motion can be inserted to be debated. In the preceding motion as a framework we could imagine the present war situation between the Ukraine and Russia, or the big questions concerning immigration or other important arguments.

## The classification of the motions

There are many ways to classify the motions and each of them responds to logical and functional principles. The most common classification of the motions, shared by many regulated debate formats, divides them in three typologies. However there is one thing to clarify at the very beginning of the following explanations: the classification of the motions that will be shown is not to be taken too rigidly - thanks to practice, every debater and every coach (i.e. every teacher) will discover that this classical typology is also very useful for experts, but it is indeed very rich in various tonalities. It means that the debaters and the coaches will soon realise that it is very difficult, maybe it's better to say unlikely, that a motion only belongs to one typology. Once this general idea has been established, we can deal with the usual classical classification of the motions, that divides them in three typologies: motions of facts, motions of values, and motions of policy (policy motions).

### Motions of facts

These motions concern reality, more precisely if something is or is not, was or was not, will be or will not be: that's why they are called "motions of facts". "THBT at the end of the present century the world population will double": this is an example of motion of facts, because during the debate the Proposition should bring arguments mainly based on facts, data and scientific hypothesis to sustain the motion; on the other side the Opposition should bring arguments mainly based on facts, data and scientific hypothesis to oppose the motion. We should never forget that a debate takes place in front of one or more judges (they are usually an odd number): this means that each side can reach the purpose of winning the debate only by convincing the judge(s), but this also means that each side has to express one or more standards to make the judge(s) able to evaluate if one team has reached its own goal. In the case of the preceding motion, the Proposition could win the debate

by asserting that a particular birth rate will determine the doubling of the world population and then showing the scientific consistency of that birth rate. The Opposition could win instead by sustaining exactly the same standard, but then by asserting that the standard fixed by the Proposition (birth rate) is non scientifically proved or is unlikely. Considering what has been assumed about the motions of facts, it follows that this typology, even if it is clearly based on evidence, nevertheless requires some conditions to be properly debated.

## Motions of values

These motions concern the inherent value of something or, to express better the idea, concern the judgement upon the moral or aesthetic value of an event, a situation or a fact that has to be qualified in accordance with what is generally believed to be right or wrong, good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant. “THS (=This House Supports) the abortion as a inalienable women’s right”: this is an example of motion of values, because during the debate the Proposition should bring arguments showing that there are human, social or moral values that support the motion, such as the right to dispose of one’s own life and body and the right to decide to give birth or not to give birth a child. That side should be able to make the judge(s) see how those rights are important and how deeply they are needed in today’s world and in contemporary societies. On the contrary the Opposition should bring arguments showing that there are other values to be carefully taken into consideration by the judge(s), such as the rights of the unborn child; or it could take a different path, showing the repercussions that the adoption of the Opposition’s point of view could cause to many other similar values and so to society and to people. As it can be seen by the example provided, it is generally assumed that a motion of values possesses an object of discussion (in this case abortion as a right) and an evaluating expression connected to that object (inalienable). There are other formulas for this typology, and among them the most common are to compare things (or peoples, values, behaviours...), often perceived as opposite (ex.: “TH prefers The Odyssey to The Iliad”), or to give a judgement about something (or a person, a value, a behaviour...) expressed as absolute (ex.: “THBT the war against Iraq was evil”).

## Policy of motions

These motions concern something that should be done, usually in a particular situation.

“THW (=This House Would) accept Ukraine to become a member State of the European Union”: this is an example of policy motion, because the Proposition not only has to debate about something that should be done (i.e. a policy, and in this

case that Ukraine should enter the European Union as a member State) and about the reasons for that political choice (i.e bringing arguments about the importance for the European Union to expand to the West for economic or military purposes); but also it has to be able to imagine a contemporary realistic situation in which those choice and reasons should be set (i.e. claiming that there is a real and concrete danger that Russia is going to extend its influence to the East).

It means that, before debating a policy motion, the Proposition has to define the framework of the motion and to make explicit what huge problem (issue, question; at least one) is solved by answering “yes” to the motion. The Opposition has different burdens and as a rule it has to defend the status quo (=how things are now in the real world: in this case that the Ukraine has not to become a member State of the European Union), even if sometimes a different choice could be made: for example the Opposition could subscribe (partially or totally) to the assumption of the motion, to the framework and to the problems described by the Proposition, but could oppose the solutions offered by the Proposition, suggesting different ones to all those questions and issues and showing that the Opposition’s solutions should be preferred to the Proposition’s ones. In the case of this motion the Opposition could agree with the Proposition about the dangers caused by Russia’s expansion to the East and about the necessity of stronger economic pacts with the Ukraine, but it could argue that Ukraine’s entrance within the European Union will cause a hard war for energy that will bring more bad than good to the European Union itself. Nevertheless the Opposition should always show that the policy planned by the Proposition is not right, or that it is not feasible, or that it will cause more damages than benefits, or that the problem (issue, question) raised by the Proposition is wrong or not so relevant as to cause such huge changes in many fields, such as the political, military, economical and strategic ones. The Proposition also has another burden, because it has to suggest a plan, which is a brief but clear and logical explanation of how the team would implement the motion. The plan should be strictly connected to the framework and to the problems pinpointed, and it represents one of the basic steps of the debate, because it should be a sort of declaration of intent in which some basic procedures have to be explained. The plan should contemplate for example if there are some intermediate steps to move before reaching the final goal of the motion, or should deal with the biggest issues caused by the changes that are asked by the motion, or should consider and foresee how much time is needed to obtain those changes. With regard to our motion, the Proposition’s plan should consider for example the steps needed to make Ukraine a State member of the European Union according to the Constitution of the European Union, or how the unanimity of the State members about Ukraine’s entrance within the European Union could be obtained and so on. Challenging the Proposition’s plan and refusing it (totally or partially) by showing its inconsistency or its weak points in one of the main Opposition’s burdens.

The given explanation of the classification of the motion is brief and limited to the essential points; however now it should be clear what has been written before, namely that it is quite difficult to debate a motion belonging entirely to only one typology, because in general the values are also involved in the motions of facts and in the policy motions.

## Analysis of the motion and the building of the case

We have briefly considered the basic notions about the structure and the typology of the motions; now we can move on to another important question: how to start working with a motion and how to give a debate a correct structure.

An excellent way to kick off your preparation is to consider why the motion was chosen to be debated. Most motions don't appear out of thin air but rather are connected to some issue discussed in society.

What has been happening in the world lately? If you've been following the news, you should be aware of any significant contemporary issues. Although it might seem so from your social bubble strengthened by social media algorithms, problems are rarely one-sided. Following high-quality independent media outlets and getting your information from various sources can help you understand the stance of different interested parties towards the motion. Getting inspired by real-world arguments will make your case-building process easier.

Let's consider the following motion: "THBT by 2030 in the European Union should only be sold vehicles with electric engines". According to the typology explained before, these motions can be classified as a policy motion, but now we have to build the case, that is to say to build the whole structure that will support our interpretation of the motion, including values, plan, arguments and whatever it will take. The first thing to do is to create a framework: we could refer to the environment, to pollution, to climate changes, to the rise in Earth's temperatures. These considerations, if well expressed, are the framework: the purpose is to convince the judge(s) that there are enormous issues to face and that the answer "yes" to the motion could be a good solution to them, even if only partial. Then it is necessary to define some important words of the motion. This is a burden of the Proposition (but the Opposition could refuse the definitions given by the Proposition; in this case other definitions will be given, but only after having explained why the Proposition's ones are not acceptable). The definition must be debatable: it means that they have to be wide enough to allow the Opposition to accept them and to debate according to them. However a debate about the definitions should always be avoided. In the case of our motions the words to be absolutely defined are "vehicles" (lorry and similar means of transport should be included?) and "electric engine" (hybrids should be included?).



There are many ways to approach a motion in order to create the case, to find the right values, to create the best arguments, to imagine the most effective rebuttals. In the following very few lines we will briefly mention a few of them.

### The key-words method

When we give the definition of the most important words present in the motion, we are giving the motion an interpretation. Including or not including hybrids in the definition of “electric engines” implies an interpretation of the motion and so a particular approach to the debate, because the arguments have to be different according to our choice; the same would happen if we consider the definition of “vehicles”. Therefore, by discussing the definition of the key-words, we can keep on thinking about the arguments in favour or against the motion, to the rebuttals to the best framework to choose. The key-words can also help us on one hand to find evidence to support or to oppose the motion, on the other hand to take into consideration the issues connected to the question that we are debating. This is a good method to begin the debate with, because on the whole it’s an intuitive way to approach the motion and to brainstorm.

### The stakeholders method

Stakeholders in debating are entities (people, groups of people, organisations etc.) affected by the motion. For example, when talking about Western sanctions against undemocratic countries, relevant stakeholders could be citizens of the sanctioned country, government officials, oligarchs, Western citizens, third countries etc.

Motions are rarely ever designed in a way that affects only a few parties. Try to come up with as many stakeholders as possible and use your imagination and empathy to describe the motion's effects on their lives in various ways.

After thinking about which stakeholders are affected, you can choose one of two paths for your case. The first is called stakeholder analysis. In this case, the stakeholders themselves are your 'arguments', and you describe impacts on them explicitly. The second approach is just to take inspiration from the stakeholders and use it to develop independent arguments that look at the bigger picture and, for example, only use stakeholders as illustrations.

While this approach of thinking about people in groups necessarily leads to some generalisation, it is essential to acknowledge that stakeholder division is never absolute and avoid hurtful stereotypes. The general rule of thumb when talking about a particular community or minority is to imagine a member of that group being

present in the room with you and listening to your speech. If you think they might feel uncomfortable, your content or delivery needs to be adjusted.

What could happen to the car industry all over Europe if only non-electric engine vehicles would be sold by 2030? What would happen to the employees? How would they react to the new working standards and chances? Who would support the cost of the necessary industrial transition? How much would an electric car cost? More or less than what a car costs today? Would the citizens of the European Union receive more benefits or will they be damaged? How would they react to this change? All these questions involve groups of people, sometimes very large groups of people. The people that are connected in some way to the motion, expecting to receive benefits/damages or that have a say in the matter are called stakeholders. If we keep on answering these questions, we keep on building the case of the motion, on creating the arguments in favour or against the motion and finally on imagining the rebuttals to oppose the arguments. This method can also be used by beginners, especially when students are about to debate easy and basic motions; perhaps it's a little bit harder to implement when we have to debate more complex motions (like the one we are using as an example).

### The stock issues method

This method has classical origins (the theory of the status) and is intended to clarify the nature and the typology of a dispute. It is used when we are preparing to debate a motion of values or a policy motion, the more difficult to confront and to define as cases. We can find different approaches to the motion inspired by the ancient classical theories and each of them is characterised by some peculiarities. In general we can say that the stock issues method is an advanced method that is very useful to organise or to reorganise what we have found about the motion, to define more precisely the subjects of the research, to analyse those subjects more in depth and finally also to verify our argumentative line. Summing up very briefly, when we use the stock issues we ask some questions on one hand to the materials that we have found so far, and on the other hand to the structure of the ideas and of the arguments that we have organised to debate the motion. These questions concern for example the existence of the problem to be solved, the relevance and the causes of that problem (usually this is called "significance"); or the identification of some structural deficiencies in the status quo (usually this is called "pertinence"); or if the problem is solvable and if the plan is suitable for solving it. If we take into consideration our motion, the questions could be the following: Is there a consistent, huge problem that can persuade the European Union to stop selling non-electric engine vehicles? What caused the problem? It is only a matter about pollution and environment or are there also political, energetic and economic issues? Is it possible to imagine that within 8 years the European Union will convert all its car industry? What are the intermediate steps?

## Additional considerations

### Values

You can think of values as goals you try to achieve, which can be generally perceived as 'good', such as freedom, democracy or health. In debates, you will often find that your argumentation is connected to multiple values - whether explicitly or implicitly. And it works the other way around as well; you can think about some commonly used values when preparing for a debate, see if they are influenced in any way by the motion, and if so, describe the mechanism and derive your arguments from that.

It can also be helpful to think about some typical clashes between contrasting values - health vs freedom, societal security vs individual privacy etc. If you feel they are relevant to the motion, not only can it help you prepare your own arguments and anticipate what the opposite side's reaction might be.

### Implementation in reality

This strategy is applicable for practical motions that focus on the real-world impacts of a proposal and discuss if it should be implemented, supported, regretted etc. You can think about if and how the proposal was implemented in various countries or cities.

If you know about such examples - what were the results compared to the past or to other countries? If you want to use this as support for your case, justify why the policy is the main driver behind the change and not confuse correlation with causation.

If you know that the policy has not been implemented anywhere yet, what is the reason behind that? Are there any practical obstacles that prevent it from functioning correctly in reality? Answering those questions can help you get inspiration for your case and keep your feet on the ground.

### The other side's content

To get ready to clash with your opponents' case, it might be beneficial to use the techniques mentioned above to think about the other side of the motion as well. This will help you prepare for rebutting the other side further down in the debate and strengthen your arguments by addressing possible refutation before it is brought up.

## Framing your case

After you have a general understanding of the possible content of both sides of the debate, it is necessary to think more in-depth about the technicalities of the motion and the debate as such. While this is key for the proposition, which will bring the definition, framing and model in the debate, the opposition should not ignore this part either, so they know what to expect and be sure to have argumentation ready for whichever way the proposition decides to go.

## Place and time

You should aim to have your case applicable in as many scenarios as possible. The bigger the scope of your case, the stronger it will be. However, narrowing down the place or time scope of your case might sometimes provide the debate as a whole with a more reasonable framework that will allow both sides to focus on the main principles of the motion rather than edge cases.

For example, talking about legalising adoptions by same-sex couples doesn't make sense in the context of countries where homosexuality is punished by the death penalty. Therefore you should discuss the sensible boundaries of the motion before diving deeper into choosing specific arguments for your case.

## Principle motions - keywords

Principle motions that lead you to evaluate a particular phenomenon usually contain specific keywords - something is good or bad, we should oppose or support something etc. It is your job as debaters to give those abstract words a clear meaning. What does it mean for something to be good? What are the conditions that should convince us to support something? Clearing up the meaning of those words will help you determine your goal in the debate, which you will be working towards.

## Policy motions - model

Compared to principle motions, policy motions need to be proven not only to be true in principle but also to work in the real world. Therefore besides presenting why implementing the motion is a good idea, it is necessary to provide a way how it can be done - this is called a model.

Although it is not required or even possible to come up with precise technical details of the plan, most policy motions have more than one way they can be implemented in reality. E.g. for the motion TH, as the EU, would accept Ukraine as a member state, multiple big picture questions such as the timeframe or the conditions of joining influence the feasibility and outcomes of implementing the motion.

Based on your brainstorming, choose the way that suits you the most and think in detail about the most important aspects of the model. It will then be easier for everybody in the debate to imagine what the world would look like under your side. However, be careful to always stay realistic with your proposals.

# Doing Research for a Debate

## Introduction

The following pages provide teachers with the basic information they will need to teach students how to research for debates. Before we start, it is crucial to understand elements of debate and argument. We use the framework on “good” debate developed by Robert Branham:

“If debate is “the process by which opinions are advanced, supported, disputed, and defended,” the fulfilment of these actions in turn requires that the arguments of the disputants possess certain attributes. Thus, true debate depends on the presence of four characteristics of argument:

1. Development, through which arguments are advanced and supported;
2. Clash, through which arguments are properly disputed;
3. Extension, through which arguments are defended against refutation; and
4. Perspective, through which individual arguments are related to the larger question at hand.”

This understanding informs what we’re looking for during research. Research for debate is similar to research for a collegiate essay. Students are not expected to

become “little experts” on a topic. Depending on when the topic is set, students are expected to either be versed on both sides or advocate on only one side of the topic. Debate research incentivises broad interest rather than narrow expertise. And debate incentivises research in the arguments presented in sources, and students are encouraged to dissect sources they read based on the argumentation structure presented by the authors they read.

Debate is a stimulating way to explore new ideas. It can help push teachers and students toward exciting new areas of literature and thinking that they might never otherwise encounter. Through the research required to prepare for debate, students can find a world of new ideas. A well-crafted classroom debate creates a climate for interactive learning where students apply ideas and must explain their thoughts.

The first consideration in creating a strong debate is determining a debate topic. As the topic is the foundation for all the arguments that follow, an exciting debate topic will intrigue your students and get them enthused about the debate process. Much of the success of the entire project of a debate can come down to how you sell the issue and format of the debate.

If students are hooked by the ideas of a debate, then they will be interested enough to make the whole process succeed. So, spend some time working out the core issues of the debate with your students to make the process appealing.

## Teaching Issue Discovery

Teaching students how to approach the topic of debate is the skill of issue discovery. People usually are aware of their own opinions about various controversies and the reasons they hold them, but they are usually not familiar with the arguments and reasons in support of positions they do not agree with. When students become debaters, they need to take this extra step to determine the various issues within the controversy. A fundamental aspect of issue discovery, therefore, is comprehending the arguments supporting opposing sides of the debate. Students must move beyond simply advocating for their chosen position and actively engage with the reasoning behind alternative perspectives. This fosters a deeper understanding of the complexities inherent in the topic.

## Methods for research discovery

There are several strategies instructors can employ to facilitate effective issue discovery.

Formal course material: Analysing course materials, such as readings, lectures, and class discussions, that present contrasting viewpoints can be a rich source of potential issues. Encourage students to critically react to the ideas presented, identifying points of contention and areas where different approaches emerge.

Examining controversies in the (academic) field: Every academic discipline has its share of ongoing debates and controversies. Instructors with expertise in their field can guide students towards these key areas of contention. By examining the arguments of prominent scholars associated with such debates, students can gain valuable insight into the core issues at play within the discipline.

Brainstorming: Brainstorming provides a dynamic way to generate a comprehensive list of potential issues. In a small group setting, students discuss the topic freely, listing all ideas that arise. Critiques of specific ideas should be deferred until after the initial brainstorming session. The goal is to encourage a free flow of ideas, even when the flow seems to slow down. Once a comprehensive list is established, students can then analyse and categorize the ideas, identifying those that represent the most significant and unavoidable arguments within the debate topic.

Thought experiments: Thought experiments offer a unique approach to issue discovery. By encouraging students to imagine hypothetical scenarios, instructors can unveil underlying assumptions and potential consequences related to the debate topic. For example, imagine a world where animals could communicate with humans. Would this necessitate a fundamental shift in the relationship between the two species? This type of fantastical scenario can reveal key issues surrounding animal rights, communication, and interspecies interaction. Policy debate heavily utilizes thought experiments to explore potential ramifications of proposed policies. Imagine a program that significantly increased income taxes on wealthy citizens. What economic and social consequences might follow? By encouraging students to grapple with these hypothetical scenarios, instructors can guide them towards uncovering the central arguments within the policy debate.

By employing a combination of these methods, instructors can equip students with the tools necessary to effectively identify and analyse the core issues within any debate topic.

## Generating debate topics

One easy way to develop debate topics is to allow the class to participate in generating and selecting them. You will get a lot of mileage out of the debates when you use your students' ideas. This does not mean abandoning classroom topics, for you can guide the students to focus their topics on class-related issues. You might give students a homework assignment to write down three classroom subject areas

they would like to learn more about or pursue in depth. You might have a brainstorming session where your class spends a set amount of time tossing out ideas and then select exciting ideas out of that process. We suggest that you encourage your students to seek out areas with which they are not familiar—push them to take chances and learn new things rather than rework familiar material. Getting students involved by having them drive the areas of interest will ensure their involvement and make your job of instructing them easier.

Once the topic is established, guide your students through the subject matter with some analysis of the themes that you expect will emerge in the debate. Teachers can help students to discover elements of an issue that they might otherwise miss. You will want to introduce the concepts and major thinkers who write about the chosen controversy. If students are to represent a particular perspective, ask them to read a newspaper from another ideology or country. You might want to talk about terms with which the students might not be familiar. One of the easiest ways to do this is to provide the class or the debaters with a basic article that outlines what is at stake in any debate. This also offers you an opportunity to guide the debate toward your classroom topics.

Positioning students as decision makers in the world can help to create new understandings. If students feel involved and excited about the debate topic, they will reward you with powerful outputs of their own intellectual growth, sparking a dialectic relationship—launching the learning experience beyond your lesson plans and into something else. Thus, you must not only provide them with information, but also allow them to share their perspectives and views with the class. This process of discovery is vital to the success of your debates.

### Using the concept-stakeholder method

By now you've realised that the advice in this chapter does not prioritise diving into the library or internet straight away. Research for debate focuses on clarifying the questions we want to ask of research before doing the research. The final and most crucial step to analyse the topic and find the relevant question is called the concept-stakeholder method.

The concept-stakeholder method is a strategic approach used to analyse an issue by considering the different groups (stakeholders) who are impacted by the issue, defined through the central theme (concept). This method is particularly valuable in debate research and argument development because it helps you:

**Identify diverse perspectives:** By focusing on stakeholders, you gain a broader understanding of the issue by considering how it affects various groups. This can



reveal hidden angles and potential consequences that wouldn't be readily apparent otherwise.

Develop well-rounded Arguments: Analysing stakeholder interests allows you to identify potential arguments for and against your position. This helps you anticipate counterarguments and craft stronger rebuttals.

Here's how to use the concept-stakeholder method for debate:

Step 1: Define the core concepts

Start by clearly outlining the central topic of the debate. Is it a policy (e.g., mandatory paid parental leave), a technology (e.g., self-driving cars), or a social issue (e.g., standardised testing in schools)? What issues are at stake: freedom, equality, fairness? What disciplines are involved: Economics? Environment? Law?

Step 2: Brainstorm Stakeholders

Once you have the core concept, brainstorm all the groups who might be affected by it, both directly and indirectly. Stakeholders can be:

Individuals (e.g., students, parents, teachers)

Groups (e.g., environmental groups, labour unions)

Organisations (e.g., businesses, government agencies)

Expand your vision of stakeholders beyond those immediately familiar to you: People living in other countries? People from minority backgrounds? Future generations?

Step 3: Analyse Stakeholder Interests

For each stakeholder, consider their potential positions on the debate topic. How might they be affected? What are their concerns and priorities?

For example, on the topic that This House would implement Universal Basic Income (UBI)

Stakeholders: Working-class citizens, unemployed individuals, retirees, businesses, government agencies, taxpayers.

Step 4: Develop Arguments

By analysing stakeholder interests, you can identify potential arguments for and against the core concept.

Example (UBI Debate):

Arguments for UBI: Increased economic security for citizens, potential boost to the economy as people spend more, reduced poverty. (Stakeholders: Working class, unemployed)

Arguments Against UBI: Disincentivize work, increase government spending, potential tax hikes. (Stakeholders: Businesses, taxpayers)

The benefits of the Concept-Stakeholder Method for debate include the following:

Comprehensiveness: It encourages a well-rounded understanding of the issue by considering multiple perspectives.

Stronger Arguments: By anticipating stakeholder concerns, you can develop stronger arguments and address potential counterarguments more effectively.

Hidden Issues: It can help you uncover hidden consequences and potential solutions that might not be readily apparent.

## Doing the research

Many students have done research projects, but research preparation for a debate will be a new experience for them. The most obvious difference is that, unlike traditional research projects, where a student seeks to build an argument and gather information that supports his argument and avoids contrary evidence, the debate research process encourages a kind of holistic approach, where students need to pay attention to the critics of their argument because they will have to respond to those attacks. Combine this with the usual trepidation about research and you will often find students are more worried about the research process than the debate. This section offers ways you can reassure them and guide their research efforts.

Debate research differs from traditional projects. In debates, students must consider opposing viewpoints to prepare effective counter arguments. Limited research pools can be a helpful strategy for introducing students to debate research. By providing a restricted set of sources, teachers can guide discussions and ensure focused research within a limited timeframe. Think for instance of just providing a set of articles from Wikipedia, or 3-4 newspaper articles.

Successful research begins with effective keyword identification and research questions. Keywords are terms used to locate information in databases. A search engine is also a database. A well-developed keyword list allows students to efficiently find relevant sources. For research questions you can use any questions that arise from the concept-stakeholder analysis above.

## Finding and interpreting your material

Introductory articles provide a strong foundation for research. These articles offer background information and help students develop a basic understanding of the debate topic. You can find them in old-fashioned encyclopaedia, introductory textbooks, or through Wikipedia.

Holistic reading is crucial for debaters. It involves carefully analysing arguments from all perspectives, identifying key points, and evaluating supporting evidence (quotes, statistics, etc.) for potential use in the debate. Make sure students understand Branham's argumentative framework so they have a capstone to hang their research on. For research questions, consider the following list that one can use per article.

What is the selected material (newspaper article/book/video/ podcast) about?

What prompted you to opt for that material?

What does the author(s) want to prove? (What are the burdens?)

Briefly explain the main assumptions, arguments, and ideas from the selected material.

What do you think is most important to learn from your material? Explain how you think it will benefit you?

What is the argumentation of the material? Is it easy or difficult to understand, is it clearly structured, are the assumptions clearly indicated, are the explanations topical ...?

Why is the topic current? What is the character of the topic - whether it primarily concerns domestic political issues, economic, social, women's, diplomatic, military...? Who are the most important stakeholders and how are they portrayed?

Evaluating sources is essential. Students must assess the credibility and potential bias of information sources. This includes examining author qualifications, publication dates, and the source's reputation. As students delve deeper, they may identify interesting tangents worth exploring. Encouraging students to follow these "research trails" can lead to the development of unique arguments.

Originality should remain valued, however. Students should feel empowered to present their own well-reasoned arguments, even if they haven't encountered supporting research from others. Alternative forms of evidence, like historical examples or creative works, can be powerful tools in debate.

## Conclusion

We summarise the key insights of this chapter as follows:

To find a debate topic, allow the class to participate in generating and selecting topics. Guide students to focus their topics on issues related to their interests. And encourage students to explore unfamiliar areas.

Once the topic is established, you can guide students through the subject matter with analysis of expected themes. Introduce concepts and major thinkers related to the controversy. For instance, provide students with a basic article outlining the debate. And allow students to share their perspectives and views with the class.

Unlike traditional research projects, debate research requires a holistic approach. Students need to consider opposing viewpoints. Let them broaden out in their research, but don't make them overwhelmed by researching. Give them opportunities to explore other sources of evidence and teach them the art of "enough research".

## Sources

Bell, Julian. *The Debating Book: everything you ever need to know about debating. Debating For Everyone*, 2020.

Branham, Robert James. *Debate and Critical Analysis: The Harmony of Conflict*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1991.

Freeley, Austin J., and Steinberg, David L. *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*, 12th ed. Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2009.

Snider, Alfred, and Maxwell Schnurer. *Many sides: Debate across the curriculum*. IDEA, 2002

## Case studies of debate cases

This house would abolish pharmaceutical patents

### Definition

Patents are exclusive ownership rights over intangible works of human creativity. A patent is a right granted for an invention: a product or a process that provides a new way of doing something or offers a new technical solution to a problem.

Laws of sovereign governments define and grant patents. Patents can only be used inside the borders of particular states after an application has been submitted and approved.

The granting of a patent confers an exclusive right (monopoly) on an invention, under which third parties may be prohibited from producing, using, marketing, selling, or importing the invention's object.

Patent rights are only valid for a limited time. The global standard is 20 years from the application date.

To be patentable, an invention (product or process) must be novel and inventive, described in a sufficiently clear and replicable manner, and considered industrially useful.

- novelty: the invention does not have to be described in the prior art.
- inventive step: the invention must be distinguishable from the state of the art in the opinion of a person skilled in the art;
- sufficient description: the invention must be described in such a way that it can be reproduced;
- industrial application: the invention must be used in a commercial setting.

Compliance with these requirements is determined by comparing the patent applicant's claims to the body of published literature in the field, including previously issued patents. This procedure ensures that no one can assert patent rights over something that already exists.

Furthermore, an invention must not be in violation of public order or morality. In contrast to the requirements outlined above, the ethical limits for each state may differ (for example, the use of embryonic or stem cells is prohibited or permitted with regulations specific to each nation). Patents in the chemical-pharmaceutical area might pertain to novel goods (product patent), new ways of preparing previously known products (process patent), or even techniques of using these products (use patent).

A patent does not grant permission to apply an innovation, but rather grants a monopoly on its industrial exploitation. This idea is especially obvious for pharmaceuticals, which require a specialised marketing authorization (AIC) from the appropriate authorities in order to be sold.

On the other hand, after acquiring the AIC, the patent holder is permitted not only to sell the goods, but also to ban anybody else from doing so without his permission (for example by obtaining a licence)

## Context

In Europe, Directive 98/44CE for the protection of biotechnological inventions establishes important limits to patentability in the ethical field, prohibiting the patenting of procedures for human cloning, modification of the genetic identity of animals and humans, unless these procedures in animals are accompanied by a substantial medical benefit for humans.

On a global scale, the TRIPs agreement represents a significant innovation in that it combines industrial property and copyright in a single global instrument; the former was governed by the Paris Convention and the latter by the Bern Convention. TRIPs were signed in 1995; under them, developing countries agreed to gradually implement minimum levels of protection for a variety of patentable items, including pharmaceuticals.

The transaction was fraught with controversy. Increased patent protection, combined with a growing gap in access to patented medicines (particularly HIV treatments), has created enormous tensions in global patent policy and global health.

Access to medicines is one of the issues that has grown in importance in recent years as a result of TRIPS agreements. The main question is whether patent protection in the pharmaceutical sector has a negative impact on the distribution of essential medicines to developing-country populations.

Participants at the World Trade Organization (WTO) conference in Doha in November 2001 adopted a declaration (Doha Declaration) proposing flexible solutions, implicit in the TRIPS agreement, to effectively combat diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, as well as to ensure the supply of major medicines in developing countries.

WTO member countries can, for example, grant compulsory licences for the production of patent-protected medicines under TRIPS agreements. However, this production is frequently destined solely for the domestic market, rather than for export.

On the eve of the Sixth Ministerial Conference (Hong Kong, 13-18 December 2005), WTO members agreed a change to the TRIPS Agreement on December 6, 2005, aimed at enhancing access to pharmaceuticals for poor nations. The amendment provides for the issuance of obligatory permits for the manufacturing and export of patented pharmaceuticals in countries with insufficient production capacity and public health problems.

Furthermore, the United States Constitution provides for exclusive patents and time-limited property rights granted to inventors in exchange for their publication of information on how they design and manufacture their product to mediate between the inventors' interest in maximising the return on their investment and the company's interest in disclosing product designs.



## Problem

The issue of patents, particularly on medicines, necessitates thorough study of the field's alternatives.

The disagreements centre on a variety of conceptual and pragmatic concerns. For starters, the discussion contrasts the patent system's potential incentive for research and innovation with the right to health and access to medicines for those who require them. Other concerns have been raised about the patent system's real contribution to research and innovation.

The comparison then focuses on the primary stakeholders' rights: the rights of producers - economic and specific - and the rights of consumers - health and universal.

Because of the extended period necessary for research and the pricey technology utilised, the pharmaceutical business necessitates a significant financial commitment. Furthermore, pharmaceutical research and experimental operations frequently run the danger of not hesitating in a discovery and a viable product. Pharmaceutical investments are particularly costly and dangerous for these reasons. Lenders' interests are protected by the patent system.

However, the preservation of medication intellectual property, which takes the form of a monopoly on the same by manufacturers for a period of 20 years, goes opposed to the interests of pharmaceutical end users. If, on the one hand, the specific economic interests of businesses must be preserved and fostered in order to stimulate research and innovation, the general interest in health is indisputably a fundamental right.

Access to monopoly medications is especially challenging in emerging nations and among low-income populations. In conclusion, after considering the notion of "intellectual property," the conversation should cover the following topics:

Is the patent system sufficiently responsive to the human right to health?

Is the patent system required for pharmaceutical research and development?

## Arguments for Proposition

The existing patent structure results in high medicine prices,

Access to medications, especially vital medicines, is a critical component of the right to health. The right to the best possible health is stated in the World Health Organization's (WHO) constitution as "one of the fundamental rights of every human being regardless of race, religion, political creed, economic condition, or social



status" [World Health Organization, Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946, entered into force 7 April 1948]. The existing pharmaceutical patent regulation, as well as the resulting high price of goods, effectively blocks access to them.

For two reasons, the fixed cost of developing a new product is quite expensive. It is quite costly to develop and perfect a new drug. Furthermore, research concepts might fail along the process and hence do not result in a viable product. Both of these factors add up to a research and development (R&D) cost of roughly \$500 million for a new marketable medicine. Starting manufacture of a novel drug once it has been created, on the other hand, is inexpensive.

Because of this fixed cost imbalance, pharmaceutical innovation is unsustainable in a free market system: competition among manufacturers would quickly bring the price of a new medicine down to its marginal cost of production for a long time, and the innovator would be unable to recoup R&D investments.

The traditional approach to correcting this competitive market failure is to reward inventors with patents that provide them the exclusive right to produce or distribute the goods.

As a result of this market exclusivity, the selling price is artificially high, allowing investors to recover their investment through the sale of items that are in high demand even at rates considerably above marginal cost.

The worldwide protection of property rights, based on input from pharmaceutical corporations in the most technologically sophisticated nations, has resulted in a set of policies that has had a negative impact on the health of a large portion of mankind. TRIPS permits patent holders to keep the monopoly for 20 years, but supplementary agreements allow them to make it extensible (even imperishable) and to impede generic medication development.

We quote the text of art. 7 of the TRIPs agreement which highlights its objectives:

*"The protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights should [should is a more nuanced form of shall which has a more perceptive meaning] contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology, to the mutual advantage of producers and users of technological knowledge and in a manner conducive to social and economic welfare, and to a balance of rights and obligations".*

The competing interests at risk are obvious from the wording of this regulation, but what is noteworthy to note is that the social well-being and rights of any users are placed on the same level as the interests of the producers. One should consider

whether it is morally appropriate to weigh the interests of users (in our case, patients, i.e. the human right to health) against the rights of the creator (which we know are represented by the rights of pharmaceutical companies to obtain monopoly through patent i.e. an economic right).

The moral issue with these patents is that they restrict the world's poor from receiving important pharmaceuticals, either directly or indirectly. Silvio Garattini, author of the recent book *Patenting Health: A Medicine Without a Market* (Il Mulino, Bologna 2022), highlights the patent system's inadequacies in the current context: “Patentability of pharmaceutical items was adopted in Italy in 1978, and it functioned in that setting - the framework in which policy decisions are made - because it required leverage to create a national pharmaceutical research and industry. However, as the Constitution states (see Articles 3 and 32 in this respect), the health patent is permissible when health is 'required' rather than the market, which is the situation now in a completely different context. While the patent was formerly used to advance research, firms now invest in start-ups rather than science: they acquire golden weight formulations and technologies and pass the expenses on to the patient [...] Consider the medicine sofosbuvir, which is used to treat hepatitis C. (HCV). Pharmaset spent \$ 200 million developing it, with significant public assistance. Gilead acquired Pharmaset for 10 billion, to which he had to add one billion to develop it. The treatment's price skyrocketed, and as a result of the final price in the United States, between 2.5 and 4.7 million individuals are still unable to be cured of hepatitis C, and usage of the drug is limited even in Italy. India dismissed the patent and approved the manufacturing of generic counterparts for € 500 rather than € 47,000 each cycle”.

The philosopher Thomas Pogge refined the study on the high costs of patented medications in his work *Pharmaceutical Innovation: Must We Exclude the Poor?* in his text , *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms* (Cambridge 2008): “The driving notion is that much intellectual achievement must be paid for by anybody, wherever, and that any unpaid benefit is theft, piracy, counterfeiting, or worse. Even if travel is fully free, no one is required to have a free ride, regardless of how terribly destitute the traveler is or how much they need it. Implementing this guiding principle by granting monopoly pricing power considerably raises the price of items containing intellectual property components, frequently by 10 to 30 times in the case of medicines.”

The population of underdeveloped nations suffers from unequal access to pharmaceuticals under the patent regime. This inequality is the result of the TRIPS agreement, which eliminated the diversity of national regulations.

It could be argued that poor countries voluntarily accepted this by deciding to join the WTO, but this ignores the fact that, during the TRIPS negotiations, many of these countries lacked the necessary know-how to fully comprehend what they were

signing, as well as their limited bargaining power and the fact that the WTO agreements are frequently approved by the countries' political and economic elites. In this context, international law principles are devastating for the well-being of local populations: the principle *volenti non fit iniuria* (who agrees, no harm is done) ignores the disparity between the interests of the population and those of the political elites, whereas the principle of international recognition of the people or groups who hold effective power in a country means that the power elites, who are little interested in the well-being of the population, are rewarded.

During the patent period, a pharmaceutical will be marketed at or near the profit-maximising monopoly price, which is mostly set by market demand in industrialised nations. When affluent individuals require a medicine, its price can be raised considerably above the cost of production before the significant benefits from expanding the mark up (the gap between the selling price of the good and its cost of manufacture) are compensated by losses owing to reduced sales volume. Markups of more than 1000 percent are not uncommon with patented drugs. Consider the Thai case: Sanofi-Aventis sold their cardiovascular medicine Plavix in Thailand for 70 baht (\$ 2.20) per pill.

According to the WHO, 30% of the world's population does not have regular access to current medications, with this percentage rising to more than 50% in the poorest sections of Africa and Asia. [World Health Organization (WHO), Medicines Strategy Report, 2002-2003]. The weakest socioeconomic categories in these communities suffer disproportionately from a lack of access to existing treatments. [Victoria CG, Wagstaff A, Schellenberg JA, et al., Applying an equality lens to child health and mortality: more of the same is not enough, *Lancet* 2003; 362: 233-41.]

The worldwide mortality ramifications of this public health policy failure are profound: According to one research, more than 10 million children die needlessly each year, nearly entirely in low-income or impoverished parts of middle-income nations, from a limited list of avoidable illnesses such as diarrhea, measles, malaria, and malnutrition-related causes. [Brown RE (2003). Where and why do ten million children die each year? *The Lancet* (361: 2226-34).

While conceding that tighter intellectual property restrictions stimulate pharmaceutical innovation, which benefits the poor in the long term, the positive outcomes argument ignores the reality that by the time a patent expires, some medications have already lost most of their medicinal efficacy.

It is more important and vital to select where to target our research efforts and investments without bias, examining all conceivable solutions to address global health challenges, even beyond the present market-based economic paradigm.

Recognizing that the problem of access to medicines is a global social justice issue, and having determined that the satisfaction of the right to health necessitates

effective access to essential medicines, it is undeniable that the current patent discipline limits access to medicine.

Patents force pharmaceutical firms to focus solely on diseases that affect the rich population, ignoring diseases that affect the populations of underdeveloped nations.

When inventors are rewarded with patent-protected revenues, diseases affecting the poor, no matter how common and severe, are not appealing targets for pharmaceutical R&D. This is because the demand for such a drug declines significantly as the patent holder raises the mark-up. As a result, there is little chance of generating a significant sales volume and a discernible gap between the asset's selling price and its cost of production.

Furthermore, there is the possibility that a successful research endeavour may be faced with strong demands to make the treatment accessible at a low or even no cost, forcing the inventor to abandon his R&D investment, perhaps resulting in a loss.

Given this potential, biotech and pharmaceutical companies are more likely to spend in research about minor but prevalent disorders in the rich world, such as hair loss and acne, rather than TB. The 10/90 problem refers to the fact that only 10% of all pharmaceutical research is focused on diseases that account for 90% of the GBD (Global Burden of Disease) [Drugs for Neglected Diseases Working Group, Fatal Imbalance: The Crisis in Research and Development for Drugs for Neglected Diseases, MSF, September 2001]. According to these findings, practically all diseases prevalent in low-income nations are "neglected," and the pharmaceutical industry has invested almost nothing in research and development for these ailments. For example, tropical illnesses are mentioned in barely 1% of biomedical research articles (Lanjouw and Cockburn, 2001).

Kremer and Glennerster use World Forum for Medical Research figures from 2002 that show that just 10% of \$70 billion in yearly global investment on public and commercial medical research is used to address medical and health problems that affect 90% of the world's population.

According to the World Health Organization, there are only three "neglected" diseases: African trypanosomiasis, leishmaniasis, and Chagas disease. [WHO-IFPMA Round Table, July 2001, Working paper on priority infectious illnesses requiring increased R&D].

Patrice Trouiller examined pharmaceutical research and development outcomes during the last 25 years, as well as current governmental and corporate initiatives aimed at rectifying the imbalance in research and development that leaves diseases that mostly affect the poor world largely neglected. He gathered information by

searching Medline and the databases of the US Food and Drug Administration and the European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products, and he assessed current governmental and commercial activities by reviewing recently published research. He discovered that just 16 of the 1393 novel chemical entities released between 1975 and 1999 were for tropical illnesses and TB. [ Drug development for neglected diseases: a deficient market and a public-health policy failure, "Lancet" 2002;359(9324):2188-94]

Even for ailments that affect both developed and developing nations (such as cancer), the features of developing countries render goods created for developed markets inappropriate. Developing nations, for example, have inadequate infrastructure and require vaccines that can resist disruptions in refrigerated supply chains and have a long shelf life. They also require goods that do not necessitate constant medical care. While Europe has 39 competent doctors per 10,000 people and the US has 27, Sub-Saharan Africa has only one (World Bank, 2008).

In the case of rare illnesses, the insufficiency of market processes alone in driving pharmaceutical development is striking. These are illnesses that impact a limited number of people. A pathology is considered uncommon in the European Union if it is seen in no more than 5 out of 10,000 people on average. However, with over 7,000 disorders of this sort already identified, the overall number of persons afflicted is far from insignificant.

Due to the low prevalence of rare diseases, the potential market for linked treatments is insufficient to entice pharmaceutical corporations to fund the essential research and development operations. The lack of economic incentives may not only impede the commencement of research specifically targeted to the development of such medications. No firm would be willing to take on this task. It is no accident that these medications are usually referred to as orphan pharmaceuticals.

"Can we accept that the dearth of effective drugs for diseases that mainly affect the poor is simply the sad but inevitable consequence of a global market economy? Or is it a massive public health failure, and a failure to direct economic development for the benefit of society?", in our opinion, according to E. Torrelee, Department of Immunology, Parasitology and Ultrastructure, University Brussels "An urgent reorientation of priorities in drug development and health policy is needed. The pharmaceutical industry must contribute to this effort, but national and international policies need to direct the global economy to address the true health needs of society. This requires political will, a strong commitment to prioritise health considerations over economic interests, and the enforcement of regulations and other mechanisms to stimulate essential drug development."(Drugs for neglected diseases: a failure of the market and a public health failure?, "TMIH", 6, Issue11, November 2001).

Patents limit the people's right to access to knowledge

We might speak of an inventor's intrinsic right to govern the use of his creation, but this raises major concerns.

The intellectual property defence argument may be traced back to the philosopher John Locke.

According to Locke, people who manufacture something with components that he lawfully owns by putting up their work end up owning the result and having the right to veto its use by others. Furthermore, according to Locke's idea, appropriation is justified provided there is enough for others and no one can appropriate more than what he can genuinely utilise. When applied to the instance of the patent system, all elements of the theory might should be questioned.

In the case of patents, the first consideration is how much labour is required in medication research and development. Most (80 % per FDA) patented drugs are "me-too" (A drug that is structurally very similar to already known drugs, with only minor differences) The development of these does not require intense work (in an intellectual creative sense).

When Robert Nozick says, "A medical researcher does not make the position of others worse because he would deprive them of something he has seized," he is referring to Locke. "Others can easily obtain the identical ingredients they have taken; the researcher's appropriation or purchase of chemicals did not make them rare enough to breach the Lockean clause".

However, such logic does not imply that the researcher has a right of veto over others' use of comparable substances in their rightful possession to replicate his discovery.

Nozick's argument, according to Pogge, has "no foundation within his own theory. That an acquisition does not worsen the conditions of others is a necessary but not sufficient condition to affirm its validity. He does not explain in any way how someone can become the owner of a genre, he does not explain how someone can acquire veto powers over what others can achieve with other elements that they legitimately possess."

Furthermore, the premise that the researcher does not damage others is not always correct: if he claims not only a sample of a medication, but the entire genre of a given treatment, he would end up generating scarcity, breaking the Lockean clause. (not leaving enough excellent and equal commodities for others).

"According to Nozick, the researcher has this freedom since it does not hurt others and does not produce scarcity," Pogge adds. If this is true for the researcher Nozick mentions (the one who claims only medication - the sample he created with his proprietary ingredients), it is inaccurate for the researcher who claims the type of medicine. The latter researcher hurts others by denying them the ability to discover medicine without having to prove it independently, and generates scarcity by claiming exclusive rights to provide others access to specified uses of chemicals held by them."

Specific quantities of drug (samples) can be considered exclusive property only if and to the degree that this property preserves others' freedom to make medications of the same sort (if in a position to do so). Whoever exclusively appropriates a given sort of material breaches the Lockean clause by failing to leave adequate and equally excellent products for others.

Furthermore, Locke's no-waste principle is violated: one component of the patent system that might cause waste is the fact that, in its current form, the system does not require patent holders to commercialise their innovation. If something is not used by those who have appropriated it while others require it - and medications are examples of items that are sometimes desperately required by a large number of people - the waste is magnified.

According to the distributive justice argument, innovators should be compensated for doing a societal benefit. People who have not committed time or money in creating an innovation, known as free riders, should not be permitted to compete with the creator under normal market conditions. As a result, the corporation should award the inventors exclusive rights.

This is an issue with pharmaceutical patents.

First, the question arises as to whether justice does not also necessitate equitable access to pharmaceuticals, which is hampered by the patent system's operation. Another point of contention here is whether it is reasonable to reward innovators with patents that allow them to pick who may lawfully use their creation. To put it another way, does the premise that justice necessitates the reward of innovators imply that inventors must be awarded exclusive property rights over their inventions? Hettinger correctly points out that this is not the case.

"The error is to conflate the generated item that qualifies a person for a reward with what that award should be." The sole conceivable prize is not ownership rights to the developed thing. Compensation, prizes, recognition, appreciation, acclaim, security, authority, prestige, and public financial assistance are all options" (E. Hettinger. Justifying Intellectual Property. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 1989; 18: 41.)

What about the justice of awarding private property rights to the findings of R&D, which is mostly sponsored by the government?

It is difficult to argue that this natural right should favour pharmaceutical companies as the sole recipients of intellectual property rights, given that their products rely heavily on basic research conducted at universities and public institutions funded by governments and foundations that enjoy tax breaks, not to mention the wider reliance on the surrounding social structure and previous centuries of human intellectual endeavour.

In the United States, for example, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which is supported by the federal government, is a significant benefactor of the pharmaceutical sector. This year, the NIH will spend \$ 23 billion on research, and other public organisations are also investing in health-related research. Much of this research directly benefits the industry. According to the NIH, 55% of the research initiatives that led to the discovery and development of the top five best-selling pharmaceuticals in 1995 were carried out by researchers whose work was sponsored by taxpayers (National Institutes of Health. 2000. NIH Contributions to Pharmaceutical Development, administrative document, Cited in: Public Citizen. 2002. America's Other Drug Problem: A Briefing Book on the Rx Drug Debate. Washington, DC. Public Citizen: 51.)

Another issue with justifying medicine patents for equitable considerations is whether excessive benefits should be given to innovators. Many branded pharmaceutical firms work tirelessly to extend the period of their patents' protection, and they frequently succeed. This process, known as 'patent evergreening,' impedes generic medication makers (products equivalent to branded drugs, which can be placed on the market after the patent expires).

Of course, the public pays twice: consumers must continue to pay artificially high medication prices, in addition to the expenditures of a legal system that firms utilise to postpone competition.

To summarise, even if such a right to the preservation of innovations existed, it would be impossible to argue that it is so vital that, in order to respect it, the poor's right to life should be limited. Pharmaceutical patents are not justified by the philosophy upon which they are built since this system creates scarcity and deprives others of a good. The most obvious challenge is explaining how "the inventive invention of a physical thing must impose property rights on the innovator not only on this sample object, but on all products of its sort."

Finally, in certain circumstances, there is no labour on the part of the researcher to justify the appropriation of the veto right on the output, and in many cases, research investment is backed by public funds.



## Arguments for Opposition

Without the earnings provided by patent monopolies, pharmaceutical R&D would halt, depriving patients of new treatments.

It's the so-called "incentive to develop and innovate" argument: without patents, rivals can copy inventions. As a result, the price must be dropped, and the investor has little chance of recouping his money, let alone profiting. As a result, the incentive to develop and innovate is diminished. A "special" incentive is required to get enough individuals to invest in research and development.

The first important thing to remember is that pharmaceutical research and development is extremely expensive. According to one well regarded research, the average cost of developing a promising chemical into a viable pharmaceutical product is \$ 802 million. These expenses are spread out over a long period of time: it takes an average of 12.8 years to develop a pharmaceutical product from the initial synthesis of a novel chemical compound to government approval for a new medicine, so the patent may have expired by the time the items are authorised and available on the market.

The entire yearly investment on pharmaceutical research and development in the United States exceeds \$ 65 billion, much exceeding the expenditure of public monies on medical scientific research.

Because of the high cost and uncertainty of the drug development process, drug firms must obtain big returns on every successful medicine to compensate for failures along the way.

Pharmaceutical firms would have little motivation to produce new pharmaceuticals if they did not have a legal right to the financial return on their research results, and society would lose the new and better therapies these businesses would discover.

According to attorney Peter Feldschreiber, drug R&D "is a high-risk investment for the pharmaceutical corporation." The pharmaceutical patent system was developed and is used to assist corporations in protecting their investments and recovering the expenses of discovering, developing, and commercialising new pharmaceuticals, hence encouraging future drug research and development and innovation.

In the absence of patent protection or regulatory barriers to imitation, imitators could spend a few million dollars on product formulation, process development, and clinical trials (usually on 24 human subjects) required to demonstrate therapeutic equivalence and compete with the company that incurred enormous costs of discovery and clinical testing.

Innovation, as a technological advancement, must be safeguarded from "copying" through the use of legislatively devised legal tools. The patent for innovation is one

of the most efficient weapons for this. In truth, copying is legal in the absence of a patent.

The simple protection provided by the crime of unfair competition, as defined by Art. 2598 of the Civil Code, provides for the demonstration of an effective competitive relationship on the market or a product confusion that causes damage to the competitor (for customer diversion), all of which are not always easy to prove. Patents and trademarks, on the other hand, have far more protection.

Because technological innovation has been identified as a critical competitive component in market globalisation, its protection through unique patents has become a requirement that Western corporations cannot do without.

How much pharmaceutical research and development would take place if patent rights were weakened? Would the increased degree of research and development result in fewer effective new medications for illness treatment? Would a reduction in future illness treatments compensate for improved access to already existing pharmaceuticals if the amount of research and development was reduced and fewer new therapies were developed?

The pharmaceutical sector is one field where the standard "incentive theory" of patents holds true. As a result, it is evident that abolishing or reducing patent protection in this sector would drastically diminish the volume of R&D and, as a result, the availability of new drugs.

Tightening intellectual property restrictions stimulates pharmaceutical innovation, which benefits the poor in the long term. The 20-year wait placed on them will stay constant in comparison to affluent people's access, but it will be less than what the poor would have had if the pre-TRIPS rule had been maintained. Assume that strengthening intellectual property restrictions causes a 20% increase in pharmaceutical innovation. If such is the case, the next 100 years will see pharmaceutical innovation on par with the previous 120 years of the pre-TRIPS era. Despite the 20-year wait, the poor will be in better shape after 120 years than they would have been under the pre-TRIPS regime.

Patent monopolies, according to Paul Herrling, Professor of Drug Discovery Science at the University of Basel and head of corporate research at Novartis, are crucial for stimulating innovation and do not impede access to medicines in underdeveloped nations. He points out that the majority of the pharmaceuticals on the World Health Organization's list of essential drugs are already off-patent. Furthermore, she claims that medicine corporations such as Novartis have donation programs and that they seldom try to pursue patents that are infringed in poor nations.

However, Herrling claims that in intellectual property issues in impoverished nations, pharma businesses are frequently depicted negatively, whereas nonprofits prefer to assert moral norms. "There is a very strong psychological reason for claiming to be defending the poor," he argues.

Furthermore, patent coverage benefits on several levels. The implementation of the WTO-TRIPs agreement will provide the following advantages: (1) encouraging local drug research, which would result in novel treatments that address country-specific requirements (for example, illnesses); (2) industrialised nations making significant new drugs available in developing countries; and (3) enticing international investment in the pharmaceutical business.

Patents boost indigenous research.

Lack of robust patent protection may have short-term benefits, but it will be negative in the long run since such a system will never create treatments that satisfy the unique requirements of the country in question.

A patent may help a firm thrive by capitalising on the market potential of its ideas. Patents promote domestic industry growth by allowing domestic firms to seek foreign investment and develop products for export. Profits from patent exploitation can be reinvested in more research and development, stimulating commercial and industrial expansion.

Finally, international corporations would not want to invest in medication development that only benefits a tiny number of individuals, such as those suffering from "orphan illnesses" such as Lou Gehrig's disease or Tourette syndrome. An "orphan illness" affects only roughly 200,000 individuals in the United States, which firms see as a limited market given the amount of research required to create prescription medications. The US government enacted the Orphan Drug Act to encourage the development of these treatments, which provides businesses seven years of commercial exclusivity for the treatment of certain rare disorders. An orphan medicine, like a patent-protected treatment, can be priced at any time throughout the seven-year period because there is no competition or regulatory constraints.

We present a legal example from India that demonstrates the importance of patent protection.

Since 2005, India has issued drug patents in order to comply with the TRIPs (Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) agreement of the World Trade Organization.

"The TRIPs agreement provides a great deal of freedom," says Dr. Joel Lexchin of York University's School of Health Policy and Management in Toronto, Ontario.

"According to Indian patent law, in order to obtain a patent for a new version of a chemical, it must demonstrate a significant new therapeutic benefit. This was effectively the crux of the legal case."

The legal argument revolved around whether a more readily absorbed form of Novartis' profitable anticancer treatment Gleevec (imatinib mesylate), known as Glivec in some countries, was a significant enough advance over the original molecule to be called a new invention. The Supreme Court of India concluded that it was not, citing a provision in the country's patent legislation requiring new copies of existing medications to be more effective in obtaining protection. Critics argue that Indian law is overly rigid and out of line with the rest of the world.

"This is a patent legislation designed perfectly to the demands of generic businesses, allowing them to imitate other people's research as rapidly as possible," says Paul Herrling, chair of the Novartis Institute for Tropical Diseases' board of directors in Singapore. "Indian generic firms, or the 'copying industry' as I refer to them, make their money by duplicating copyrighted goods and selling them to the rest of the globe. Then they sell it for a lesser price, either in India or in other countries with weak patent protection".

The patent monopoly is a beneficial monopoly for knowledge, and allows small businesses to remain independent.

This is the so-called "disclosure incentive" argument, which states that the patent system encourages innovators to publicise their innovations rather than keep them hidden.

Pharmaceutical patents allow the dissemination of knowledge since it reveals how the innovation is implemented and can act as a stimulant to other rivals. As a result, it has become one of the primary diffusion platforms for technological growth.

One of the prerequisites for patentability is that the applicant disclose the invention in sufficient detail in the application forms. It is said that the patent system disseminates technological information, allowing for technological advancement and, as a result, economic growth.

The substance of the innovation becomes the heritage of the community with the publication of the patent application, following an 18-month period of secrecy, and so becomes the beginning point for the creation of additional ideas.

Patents encourage knowledge sharing by requiring the patented innovation's details to be made public in return for the exclusive right to utilise the invention. The patent system's disclosure requirements are founded on the premise that "scientific and technical openness helps the growth of society more than confidentiality and secrecy." Patents decrease duplication of research efforts and enable researchers to

expand on existing ideas by fostering information exchange. A patented product can be studied by researchers in order to enhance it. Access to patented innovations can enable research that would otherwise be impossible.

Patents enable the flow of information through licensing agreements. Licensing overseas corporations to exploit locally generated ideas gives innovators with a return on investment as well as access to global markets. Licensing local firms to create foreign-developed technologies helps improve community skills and knowledge.

Modern genetic engineering, and biotechnology in general, have created an opportunity for tiny, research-intensive start-up firms. Many of these businesses are based on university research, and many of them were started by individual university scientists from diverse life science departments.

Many academics regard the current biotech sector as a perfect illustration of how tiny, research-intensive firms may carve out a significant position in industries dominated by huge vertically integrated corporations.

Looking at the pharmaceutical sector through this lens reveals a purpose for patent protection that extends beyond the motivation to develop and sell marketable treatments. Patents enable small enterprises to stay self-sufficient.

Patent protection enables a small business to concentrate in a technologically difficult sector while incorporating its product into the broader operations of a much bigger business. Thus, patents serve a dual purpose in the business: they safeguard general R&D incentives while also influencing how the sector is organised, specifically by increasing the likelihood that a small specialised company would be able to open a shop and remain independent.

## This House opposes CO2 emission targets for developing economies

### Definitions

Since the term 'developing economies' is frequently used, it does not need much clarification, and a precise definition is unnecessary. One of the following definitions could be used. Generally, countries with lower HDI, low (negative, stagnating, slow) economic growth, and low per capita income compared to developed countries. According to the World Bank: "low to middle-income countries". Mainly in the Global South (parts of Africa, Asia, and Latin America) but not exclusively.

Developing countries can be characterised as more dependent on fossil fuels since they are more inclined toward agriculture-based production and heavy industrialisation rather than business and service (that consume less energy). Low on technology and having poor infrastructure.

On a more general note, the term "developing" is problematic by itself because it implies a subordinate position of states termed as "developing" and reinstates the existing power relations.

Some countries with rapid economic growth are also in this group - the so-called "emerging economies".

Since the proposition in this debate 'opposes' emission targets, they do not have the burden to precisely define which specific CO2 targets they mean or how they would be enforced. Instead, the debate should be about targets in general. They are welcomed, however, to bring some examples of possible targets.

From now on, targets are assumed to be binding in this text. This allows for a more reasonable debate, as a violation of such targets could be enforced.

Non-binding targets, such as those set by the Paris agreement, could also be debated. However, showing their impacts on either side of the House would be more cumbersome, as the countries could simply bypass the targets with little consequences. In that case, the framing of the debate and some analysis would have to be slightly altered; but the core of the debate would remain the same nonetheless.

Whichever way you decide to go with your case, it is necessary to explain it properly in your definition. Only then can both parties properly clash and prevent ambiguity. A possible definition could look like this:

CO2 emission targets aim to reduce CO2 emissions, e.g. by using green (renewable) energy sources (energy diversification) or cutting energy consumption (energy efficiency). Targets, such as those defined in The Paris Agreement, should be binding and enforceable, e.g. by being tied to developing aid.

### Strategic Considerations

The proposition needs to support neither status quo nor CO2 emission targets; they can defend a world with alternative climate protection measures instead. These measures can include, for example, investments in green technologies in developing countries paid by developed countries or stricter climate protection policies in developed countries only. If the proposition defines the targets as binding, their case can even support voluntary targets without contradicting the motion. Note that this strategy can be risky, as it can lead to contradiction easily and even provoke a definition clash from the opposition if explained poorly. However, this should not be used as a specific model to build the debate around but instead as a part of framing that shows that a world without CO2 emission targets does not mean a world without climate protection.

### Arguments for Proposition

Economic development of developing countries is more important than climate protection

This argument consists of two logical sections.

Firstly, we explain how fighting climate change is just a proxy for preventing human suffering. Secondly, we argue that emission targets would cause more people to suffer by slowing down economic growth, thereby defeating the objective of climate protection. The reason why we protect the climate is primarily to prevent human harm. Climate change-induced air and water pollution, rising sea levels, droughts, famines etc., can be significantly harmful to human health and the economy.

Human action is the cause of much of the climate changes, and these, in turn, affect human life - that is why we need to take appropriate measures to fight climate change. However, the fight against climate change is not a value in and of itself, but rather a proxy means to prevent human suffering and improve human well-being for all - developed and developing countries.

If climate change did not harm humans in any way, there would be virtually no reason to fight against it and limit our development.

Therefore, the main goal we should aim to achieve in this debate is not to prevent climate change as such but to maximise human life quality.

However, CO2 emission targets for developing countries would do more harm than good to their development and well-being. Namely, developing countries already face poverty or low per capita income and are unlikely to be able to implement drastic climate-protective measures due to a lack of resources (both financial and human). Additionally, developing countries are burdened by high population growth rates and high rates of unemployment.

Developing countries should therefore primarily focus on these issues. E.g., a non-ecological solution should be prioritised if it helps the country fight poverty more effectively compared to a green solution.

Redistributing funds to implement CO2 emission targets would affect other sectors (education, health and social system) that are crucial to tackle the problem of under-development, slow down population growth and reduce unemployment. Such a redistribution does not also take into account the limited endowment of developing countries with resources. For example, they could not build coal-powered power plants, even if the country had large coal reserves.

Overall, developing countries face many immediate challenges. By having to focus on another one, reducing CO2 emissions, less money and resources would be available to fight these issues which directly affect the everyday quality of life of millions of people.

In general, developing countries are also highly dependent on the primary sector (agriculture) of economic production and on the export of primary commodities, all of which are “major polluters”.

Although the goal for the economic transformation of developing countries might be to reduce this dependency or make their economy more sustainable, it is not achievable in a short period.

CO2 reduction targets would, therefore, negatively affect and reduce their production volume and lower their already low economic growth. If the developing countries are supposed to combat climate change effectively, (obligatory) emission targets are not the solution, because in the short term there is no alternative to major polluters. In the past century, rapid economic growth and industrialisation raised billions of people out of poverty and increased their quality of life. This was only possible because there were no limitations on how they developed.

There is a clear correlation between the industrialisation of a country and its citizens' life quality - access to electricity, clean water, healthcare, education etc.



The more a country is industrialised, the better the quality of life. Citizens of most industrialised countries are doing comparatively much better than previous generations, and the overall long-term trend is positive. For example, China, the fastest-growing economy in the world for the last 25 years, grew exponentially and substantially decreased its poverty (by lifting 600 million people out of poverty). This was thanks to its quick and heavy industrialisation, regardless of the effects of such development on the environment.

However, if we impose limits on how countries can industrialise, this process will likely be slower or more expensive than if we let them develop freely the way currently developed countries have. Not allowing all developing countries to do the same and choose their own development path will most likely increase poverty and lower the quality of life. Since hundreds of millions of people still live in extreme poverty today, mostly in developing countries, this also goes against the SDGs and their main objective of ending poverty in all its forms.

Emission targets will therefore slow (or even stop altogether) economic growth and the industrialisation progress of developing countries. Compared to the negative effects of climate change, this will affect developing countries (and their people) far worse in terms of their quality of life. Looking at China (but also other emerging economies such as Taiwan, Indonesia, Thailand, Singapore, Malaysia etc.):

Although it struggles with poor air quality, floods, droughts, and rising sea levels, its citizens, in general, live better lives than they had in the pre-industrialized phase when the environment was cleaner but without the benefits of economic growth and development.

Comparatively, it is more beneficial for these countries to develop even at the cost of harming the environment. Not only does it provide the citizens with better life quality, but it also helps them to use their newly acquired resources to fight the effect climate change has on their lives.

For developing countries, economic growth and development remain the main instruments of addressing poverty and poor quality of life; therefore, fighting climate change is not a priority and should not be imposed in the form of (obligatory) emission targets.

Developing countries deserve to develop as fast as possible

This argument consists of three main parts. Firstly, we will show why economic development has been unjust to developing countries. Secondly, we will argue why all countries deserve to have equal opportunities to develop. Lastly, we will explain why this means that developing countries are entitled to fast development, and how development would be hindered by emission targets.

Developed countries are rich today mainly due to previous and current exploitation of developing countries. This injustice manifests itself in two ways.

Historical factors.

The majority of countries that we consider rich and developed today gained this advantage by abusing their power to exploit other parts of the world. Processes such as colonialism and slavery and robbing developing countries of their natural resources and human capital not only unjustly provided developed countries with an advantage but also caused harm to developing countries both on an individual and global level.

This exploitation stopped mere decades ago, so its effects on concerned countries persist today.

Contemporary factors.

By engaging in neocolonialism, multinational corporations based in developed countries influence developing countries in multiple negative ways. Although they can improve people's life quality in the process, e.g. by building infrastructure, this is merely a side effect, as the main driving force behind their actions is still profit. Because companies move their manufacturing to developing countries to save money, they push on their local contractors to minimise the costs. This is not only problematic because workers often have to work long shifts for low salaries, but it also leads to not following safety standards which can result in accidents, such as the Rana Plaza factory collapse with over a thousand casualties.

Often, through corrupting local unstable governments, corporations can monopolise the natural resources of developing countries and once again acquire them without properly giving back to the local communities.

Even if we ignore direct exploitation, the mere fact that life quality drastically varies across the globe is unjust. No one chooses their birthplace; therefore, the situation into which people are born is completely arbitrary. At the same time, the wealth and quality of life enjoyed by citizens of developed countries are not due to their merit but rather because of their luck in the "birth lottery".

The historical circumstances and properly functioning systems that allow or prevent individuals from achieving good life quality are not in the control of any individual. For this reason, it is unjust for people in developing countries to suffer while people in developed countries live mostly in abundance.

Therefore, our primary goal should be to improve the quality of life of people around the globe to ensure that reasonable life standards can be achieved regardless of where people live.

The fastest way to develop their economies, therefore increase living standards, is by using all available energy sources - including fossil fuels, dirty technology etc. As was already explained in the first argument, setting emission targets would at least significantly hinder if not prevent economic growth of developing countries. Renewable energy sources are still more expensive. It is difficult and expensive even for developed countries to decarbonise their economies, let alone developing countries that often do not even have the money to fulfil their citizens' basic needs. Furthermore, developing countries lack the knowledge and human resources to use the latest state-of-the-art technologies. But developing countries should have equal opportunities for their development by using fossil fuels and dirty technology (industry) and not be forced to jump from agro and pre-industrial level to service provision and high technology. It would be hypocritical for developed countries to ask otherwise after they have abused both the planet and other regions to get to their current position.

If we want to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide, developed countries should take all responsibility while letting developing countries develop for multiple reasons. They profited from unjust systems, as was shown before. Therefore even if fighting climate change would require their citizens to lose some of the privilege and wealth they have, it would still be moral as it is unjustly acquired and undeserved. Developing countries can only marginally contribute to GHG emission reduction. Per capita, developed countries are by far the biggest emitters, so cutting their emissions is not only the easiest option, but it is also the most effective one.

Developing countries should not be subject to CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets, as they deserve to develop faster and in the same manner as the developed countries did. The alternative, besides being less practical overall, is also morally unacceptable.

Emission targets would cause backlash from citizens of developing countries

Compared to developed countries, climate change is not a political priority in developing countries.

Citizens of developing countries are less likely to care about climate change in the first place for multiple reasons. As developing countries are poorer by definition, both their citizens and the countries as such face important existential problems, such as security, health services, job stability, poor infrastructure or low living standards. With climate change being a somewhat abstract problem that will manifest itself mostly in the long-term future, it cannot be a priority. Generally, citizens of developing

countries have worse access to quality education and media that are often the source of climate-related information for people of developed countries.

People in developing countries have lower incomes compared to developed countries. This means that citizens travel less, can afford to buy fewer things, and live more frugal lives overall. This leads to their per-capita carbon footprint being significantly lower compared to developed countries.

Furthermore, because of this, the demand for green politics is lower.

Politicians have less incentive to run campaigns on environmental topics because it would not help them win elections. It is more strategic for them to focus on the issues mentioned above, such as the economy. This means that people hear less about climate change from the media and public discourse overall. Therefore since climate change is not a part of their everyday lives, it is more difficult to pay attention to it.

Because citizens are not that concerned about climate change, setting CO2 emission targets that could harm the economy could be easily used as an argument by populists or fundamentalists for particular political or religious objectives.

In developing countries with high poverty rates and overall poor socio-economic conditions where people are much more existentially dependent on their jobs, the possibility to abuse this topic for pre-election fear mongering is large.

Even if the emission targets would not harm the economy in reality, it would still be possible to use this narrative to make people emotional and get their votes.

This can be seen with other topics where politicians invent or exaggerate issues to hide real problems of their countries, e.g. Modi in India targeting the Muslim minority. In developed countries already fighting climate change and considering setting emission targets, this backlash has already started forming, e.g. against the Green Deal in the EU.

Because climate change protection is largely a policy of the West, this in and of itself can create resistance against such politics. The West would likely be the one monitoring whether these countries fulfil their targets or at least supporting them in doing so.

There is negative sentiment against the West in many developing countries already due to historical and contemporary reasons, such as colonialism and neocolonialism. Politicians could further use this sentiment to rally people against the emission targets, framing them as West-imposed against the real will of the citizens. Furthermore, since developing countries are often young democracies, they are generally more prone to the threat of populism.

Their institutions that serve to control politicians, such as independent courts, are weaker and less established. Independent media questioning politicians and making

them accountable are not as developed. There is not a long tradition of ordinary citizens controlling who rules their country. Overall, it is likely that a large number of developing countries would elect populist leaders on the basis of their resistance to emission targets.

In the long run, this could lead to the countries abandoning climate protection treaties and their targets altogether, rendering the emission targets a “dead letter”. We could see this, e.g. in the US leaving the Paris Agreement under the Trump administration.

An important part of his campaign was climate change denial and opposition against climate protective regulations. This harmed the global efforts to address climate change, as it cannot be done effectively without the cooperation of one of the main polluters.

Other countries could easily follow this precedent and start cancelling regulations and leaving international treaties. Even today, many countries already oppose emission targets despite their insignificance.

E.g. agreements to reduce coal usage had to be significantly weakened due to the demands of China. With stronger emission targets, the incentive to get rid of them would be even larger, which might even endanger the climate change regulations that are in place now.

Forcing developing countries to implement CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets could contribute to climate-change denialism as a means to avoid such measures and detach climate change from human action once again. Supporting education and awareness raising, in the long run, is more sustainable and viable for developing countries compared to strict targets with high short-term costs.

## Arguments for Opposition

Climate change should be the top priority

Even though it is clear that the quality of life of people in developing countries is crucial in this debate, it cannot be achieved without strict climate protection. The effects of climate change present the most severe existential crisis for humanity worldwide.

Negative effects of climate change have substantially increased in the last decade and have negative consequences for humans in multiple ways.  
Weather conditions.

Climate change is connected to extreme weather conditions, such as cyclones, flooding or earthquakes, becoming more frequent and powerful. This is only exacerbated by rising sea levels which affect coastal areas where most of the population lives.

Rising temperatures cause more frequent droughts and diminishing rivers, leading to water scarcity. This can already be seen in places like the southwest US, with the effects likely worsening in drier and less developed countries.

People's health and lives.

Besides being inconvenient, weather conditions significantly affect people's health. Hundreds of thousands of people are already dying annually due to climate change's effects. Millions more have health issues connected to the worsening climate, such as respiratory problems linked to air pollution or heatstrokes caused by rising temperatures.

Economic output

Because people need to focus more on mitigating the negative effects of climate change, society as a whole is less productive, and there is a negative effect on economic output. This reduces economic growth and the quality of life.

For example, in China, the negative role of global warming is estimated at a 0.78% decrease in GDP for each 1 °C increase in temperature, which is the equivalent of 241.7 billion USD.

Not meeting the demands of high(er)population growth rates.

With changing climate and biosystems, crops become less fertile and resistant to pests because they grow in an increasingly different environment than the one they have adapted to. This, combined with water scarcity, leads to less food production on the same amount of farmland. Therefore, food prices increase, and given high population rates (higher demand for food), famines and malnutrition become more frequent. All of these consequences are not only problems in and of themselves but can also lead to secondary effects.

Migration.

Because living in certain areas becomes more difficult or even unbearable, people are forced to migrate to a more acceptable place with less severe living conditions. According to UNHCR, each year, natural disasters force 21.5 million people from their homes, and this number is likely to grow as the planet gets warmer and the effects more severe.

In the next 30 years, UNIPCC estimates that 143 million people will likely be affected due to rising seas, drought, temperatures and other climate catastrophes. Most of them will be from developing countries.

This will cause not only social tensions in countries which people will migrate to but further exacerbate the development and growth of countries that people migrate from due to brain drain and rising costs of damage control and reconstruction.

Conflicts.

As water and food become more scarce and large parts of territory become practically unusable, wars over resources will become more common. Especially in developing countries, where social and ethnic tensions are not uncommon, this can easily trigger violent conflicts, causing innocent people to lose their homes or lives. Moreover, developing countries will be disproportionately hit by these effects for multiple reasons.

Since these countries have less money by definition, it is more difficult for them to afford investments in climate change mitigating measures, such as installing air conditioners or building tsunami barriers. Rebuilding the infrastructure after it has been destroyed also becomes more difficult.

Their infrastructure and public services are comparatively less invested in, making it more difficult for first responders to assist people in areas hit by natural disasters. People living in developing countries have lower income, which makes them more dependent on their place of residence and makes it more difficult to move e.g. to escape rising sea levels.

Developing countries are often located in regions which are already being hit by natural disasters such as cyclones or earthquakes even without climate change exacerbating it. Furthermore, the population is usually concentrated in coastal areas, which are hit the hardest by natural phenomena.

Economies of developing countries are mostly dependent on primary production, which is heavily influenced by climate and weather conditions, compared to more service-based economies of developed countries.

Therefore the negative effects on their economies are expected to be even higher compared to developed countries.

These consequences are only going to get worse in the future. We can see the effects of climate change becoming more visible every year. Since worldwide emissions have not peaked yet, the above-mentioned issues are only going to get more severe in the following years.

Furthermore, if we do not drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions and slow down the process of climate change, the effects will become more drastic and less reversible. On the other hand, if we allow developing countries to go through fossil-fuel-based industrialisation to develop, they are likely to become the biggest polluters and further exacerbate the issue.

Unless everyone contributes, it is unlikely that we will be able to slow down climate change and reduce its negative effects, in particular for economies and societies in developing countries.

In contrast, setting CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets worldwide, including in developing countries, will lead to lower GHG emissions. This can alleviate the effects of climate change and prevent a worldwide catastrophe.

Even if the targets harm the economic growth of developing countries, they are a better alternative for the lives of their citizens and the whole planet compared to the worse effects of climate change.

Emission targets for developing countries prevent emission "outsourcing"

The situation of CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets for developed countries does not depend on the targets set for developing countries - it is symmetrical on both sides of the House.

In a world without CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets for developing countries, developed countries would still set and try to fulfil their own targets.

Developed countries have high enough standards of living and social states so that their citizens care less about existential issues or economic growth and can focus more on more abstract issues such as climate change.

This makes climate change a major political issue in most of the developed countries, and there is mostly a wide consensus on developed countries' obligation to tackle this issue. However, not setting CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets in developing countries would make these measures of developed countries less effective because of emission outsourcing.

Companies are trying hard to prevent or bypass environmental protection measures. The world's five largest oil and gas corporations spend nearly \$200 million yearly lobbying to block climate-protective legislation.

A number of car manufacturers have been trying to trick emission testing laboratories to get their vehicles approved without having to reduce emissions.



Overall, trying to avoid environmental regulations seems to be more profitable for companies than following them. If there are no emission targets in developing countries, these companies can move their manufacturing or energy production there.

This would make them escape the climate regulations of developed countries, reducing the impact these regulations have on protecting the climate. Although some emissions inherently cannot be outsourced, such as those from transportation, a large portion of industrial processes is independent of their location due to global shipping getting cheaper because of globalisation.

Although developed countries would look like they reduced their emissions because the polluters would no longer be operating inside of their borders, these emissions would, in fact, just move to a different place. A similar situation has already happened in other areas, such as workers' protection and fair wage.

After Western countries started enforcing stricter labour regulations, leading to more expensive manufacturing, a lot of production moved to countries without these safety mechanisms, e.g. China.

When these countries implemented their own work safety regulations, the factories just moved to a different place with looser regulations again, such as Bangladesh. These countries now do not even have a choice to implement effective regulations because the manufacturers can blackmail them by threatening to move to a different country again if they do so.

If a measure is applied only locally, it cannot fix the problem globally since corporations will find a different location to continue their practices at rather than conforming to the new requirements.

This would make the climate situation worse for the whole world for two reasons:

Developed countries would have less incentive to improve.

Although the issue would not really be solved, developed countries would appear to have significantly reduced their emissions anyway. This would put the focus and blame mostly on developing countries and would not incentivise developed countries to tackle the issue as much, e.g. by investing in green technologies.

Since mostly just developed countries have the means and motivation to pioneer green technologies today, this progress in innovations could be slowed down worldwide. Borders do not matter for climate change. Even if developed countries stopped producing greenhouse gases altogether, the climate would still be harmed

by emissions from developing countries. Emissions in any place affect the planet worldwide.

Therefore a decrease in emissions from developed countries would be useless if it was followed by an increase in emissions from developing countries, as the sum of emissions would not decrease much.

Hence, not installing emission targets in developing countries would not only lead to developing countries emitting more but companies from developed countries as well.

On the other hand, installing CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets worldwide would prevent this problem.

If there were no place to move to because CO<sub>2</sub> emission targets would apply to every country, producers would have to be held accountable and truly reduce their emissions, e.g. by investing in green technologies.

In conclusion, to really make sure humanity as a whole reduces emissions, not just moves them to a different place, emission targets need to be effective worldwide.

Emission targets do not prevent economic growth

Even though industrialisation based on fossil fuel usage has been the main driver of fast economic development and growth in the past, the political, economic and social context that enabled such rapid growth has changed significantly.

Firstly and most importantly, fossil-based technologies exacerbate the effects of climate change. This makes it not only morally opposable but also practically questionable since their usage will induce disasters that will be costly to cope with, as mentioned in the first argument already.

Fossil fuels are not a viable energy source for the future. Since these resources are not renewable on a human timescale, we will run out of them sooner or later. Although new sources are being found, this trend cannot last forever, and once the supply starts getting lower, the price will increase, making fossil fuel usage economically unfeasible.

Authoritative regimes, such as Russia, Venezuela or countries in the Middle East, control a large portion of fossil fuel sources. This is problematic for two reasons.

By buying these commodities, the money that is paid supports these regimes, which often openly violate human rights and oppose humanistic and democratic values. Since these regimes often have their own geopolitical interests, they can use fossil fuels as a lever for negotiation or even blackmailing, as we can see, e.g. with Russia putting pressure on Europe by reducing natural gas deliveries.

Because of the problems mentioned above, new investments in fossil fuel technologies that could help them become more efficient or cheaper are limited, as the energy source is largely viewed as obsolete.

CO2 emission targets that will lead to the usage of greener technology are therefore necessary for developing countries to avoid such high costs of climate change and make their economies prepared for the future.

While it is true that developing countries need to build essential infrastructure (railways, roads, bridges, airports) and promote investment in businesses (factories, services, etc.) in order to develop, none of this is inherently dependent on fossil fuels.

The same effect can be achieved by using green technologies.

For example, whether their electricity comes from coal or nuclear power plants does not matter for factories or households. Although adopting green technologies (which would lower GHG emissions and allow for targets to be met) in developing countries depends on the availability of green technologies and the know-how, the prices of green technology have been drastically falling.

For example, the price of energy generated by solar photovoltaic modules has reduced over 6 fold in the last 10 years and over 21 fold in the last 30 years. Furthermore, as the process of decarbonisation in developed countries goes hand in hand with investments in green technologies, these prices are likely to only decrease in the future - as opposed to fossil fuels.

Developing countries should therefore choose green growth over industrialisation-driven growth, i.e. they should foster economic growth and development while ensuring that natural assets continue to provide the resources and environmental services on which their well-being relies.

Not only are green technologies feasible, but they are also preferable for developing countries. Fossil fuel-dependent technologies will likely become more expensive than their clean alternatives in the future for three reasons.

One of the green growth principles is using the country's resources more efficiently. Green technologies, therefore, consume less energy and resources, making their operation cheaper. Input costs are likely only to increase for fossil fuel technologies, e.g. oil, gas, and diesel prices will become higher as these commodities become more scarce.

Fossil fuel technologies are more complex overall, e.g. combustion engines are more complex and require more "moving parts" compared to their electrical counterparts.

Solar and wind power stations can be cheaper and faster to build than gas or coal power plants (source?) because they are not as massive and do not require a large initial investment.

This means that once green technology becomes the norm, it will be cheaper than fossil fuel technology today. The world generally agrees that fossil fuel usage should be phased out, and green technology is the only way forward.

That is why developing countries should use this window of opportunity and ensure they are not left behind in the green transition. Developing countries should attract investors or receive subsidies from developed countries as compensation, mitigating the difference between the prices of dirty and clean technologies today.

Instead of investing in dirty industrialisation with questionable usability in the future, resources should be spent on developing and adopting green technologies, education (to develop human resources and its own know-how) and awareness-rising.

Economic growth and a higher quality of life can only be achieved with CO2 emission targets, as fossil-fuel-led industrialisation is not only economically not viable but also environmentally harmful.

THBT media should focus on achievements of immigrants, rather than instances of their exclusion, suffering, or vulnerabilities.

### Context, Definition, and Model

The motion raises an essential discussion about the role and impact of media portrayal of immigrants. The crux of the debate centres around the question: Should the media change its current narrative lens towards immigrants from highlighting the negatives to focusing on the positives?

For the purposes of this debate, "media " encompasses newspapers, magazines, television, radio, and digital outlets (online news portals) who have as a direct purpose the production of news. "Immigrants" refer to individuals who have moved to another country, intending to settle there either temporarily or permanently. The motion is deliberately broad in the definition of 'immigrant'. Who is seen as an immigrant is an important topic for debate, and is a selection choice made in the media. Think of the difference between an "expat" (often someone who works in a high-skill job with good pay with a university degree, frequently from a white or majority ethnicity), "immigrant" (vague, but can include 'gastarbeiter', someone who

performs blue-collar work on temporary visa), and “refugee” (someone who does not migrate for economic but for political reason, such as escaping persecution). Moreover, it is important to consider that there are both documented and undocumented immigrants, who live in vastly different worlds, with undocumented immigrants often lacking access to state services or legal employment. Finally, it is important to recognise that there are immigrants who migrate for non-economic or educational reasons, such as family reunification. This group, although present, is unlikely to have a big effect on the debate.

Another important conceptual tool to ponder is negativity bias and the possible intersection with immigration status. Negativity bias is the tendency in media to prioritise negative and sensationalism topics, such as deaths by violence or deaths overall. A colloquial expression “if it bleeds, it leads” is used to describe the tendency of the media to centre reporting about negative or violent stories. The expression refers to the habit of TV and newspaper outlets to cover violent acts in great detail as main stories, eschewing other possible editorial choices. The possible intersection with immigrant status may be that an immigrant being negatively involved in a situation may make the news item more ‘newsworthy’ to begin with, which can be the source of or reinforce negative stereotypes.

The debate can be placeset in all parts of the world with a large immigrant population. The dynamics may play out differently in parts of the world where the dominant immigrant is the expat or where international tourism affects local communities. It can also play out differently if the largest group of immigrants is of the same ethnicity as a large pre-existing minority group. Think of countries such as Singapore, Hong Kong, Vietnam, and Thailand as examples of countries where local contexts offer differing narrative burdens to Western countries. Also think of the different ways in which stories would be framed in South Africa with relation to immigrants from other Southern African states such as Namibia and Zimbabwe.

A model is not needed as the motion is about changing the direction of focus and does not imply a new system or mechanism to implement it.

## Arguments for Proposition

### Dismantling negative stories

This argument can be best captured as two arguments in one: 1) why negative media stories generate unfair media stereotypes. 2) why this policy will help dismantle negative stereotypes. As they follow the same area of contention, the argument is portrayed as one large argument here.

Claim: Negative stories unfairly harm immigrant communities

Context: The issue of immigration has become increasingly salient in recent years, particularly in Europe and the U.S. As global migration patterns shift, often due to ageing populations, economic opportunities due to globalisation, conflict, economic instability, and climate change, many nations grapple with the economic, social, and cultural impacts of an increasing immigrant population. The media plays a crucial role in shaping the discourse around immigration, with its portrayal significantly impacting public opinion and, subsequently, public policy.

In terms of media reporting on immigrants, there's a growing body of research pointing towards a bias in media coverage. A study by Dixon & Williams (2015), for example, showed that media in the U.S. often overrepresented immigrants as lawbreakers. Similarly, Bleich et al. (2015) found that immigrants were disproportionately associated with negative news in European media. Such reporting fuels negative stereotypes and fosters an environment of fear and hostility.

A counter in this debate, as you will see in opposition, is that the motion doesn't necessarily include only stories about immigrants having problems adjusting into their host societies. Analysis as to why this is the type of media story most likely to occur would be useful. Additionally, analysis as to why even portraying 'humane' suffering leads to negative stereotypes of immigrants as 'helpless victims' can also help argue against this counter-narrative from opposition.

## Analysis

We first need to understand why the media reports negatively on immigrants. There are several theories to explain why media reporting on immigrants tends to be biased.

**Commercial Interests:** Many news outlets operate within a competitive commercial environment. Sensational stories that feed into the public's fears or biases can attract more viewers or readers, boosting ratings and revenues. Negative stories about immigrants can provide such sensational content, leading to a skew in the reporting.

**Media Ownership:** The political leanings of media owners can influence the portrayal of immigrants. Media outlets owned by individuals or groups with anti-immigration stances may be more likely to portray immigrants negatively, as they align their reporting with their owners' views.

**Agenda Setting:** Media play a significant role in shaping the public agenda. They are then also often driven by the agenda they formulate. This means that picking up on negative stories surrounding immigration, means that the media is then beholden to this frame and reproduces it, for instance by reporting on the controversy that media outlets generated by reporting on negative media stories.

Cultural Bias: Media content is often a reflection of cultural biases prevalent in society. Given there's an underlying bias against immigrants in society, this can seep into media narratives, reinforcing existing prejudices.

Sourcing Practices: Journalists often rely on official sources like government reports or statements. If these sources carry anti-immigrant sentiments, they can influence the tone and content of media reporting.

Counter-argument: one can argue that the facts underpinning poor performance by immigrants are accurate, and the media is portraying the situation accurately. As a counter to this observation, it's important to recognise that the sources mentioned above take such poor performance into account when analysing the negativity bias. It is also important to be able to discuss whether the causes for any perceived poor performance are due to socio-economic factors, suggested 'cultural values', or anti-immigration hostility.

A case study is the response in The Netherlands to an essay by former centre-left politician Paul Scheffer "the multicultural drama", published in 2000 in the newspaper NRC. Strong responses to the essay created its own media dynamic. The essay was then captured by political elements, including populist politician Pim Fortuyn, who led the first breakthrough of far-right populism in Dutch politics.

We then need to analyse how these negative portrayals impact anti-immigrant attitudes. The first mechanism is that existing anti-immigrant attitudes get amplified due to confirmation bias. The second mechanism is that the media persuades some people to adopt a more anti-immigrant stance, for instance because many people are inclined to find media figures persuasive. The third mechanism is that the media forces politicians to respond to these negative stories. Politicians have incentives to not appear 'soft' in the face of negative stories. This then leads to them proposing policies that are negative for immigrant communities.

The impact of this problem is three-fold:

The negative media attention leads to negative attitudes in wider society, which then reduces tolerance for immigrants. On a day-to-day level this may mean stereotyping and discrimination, for instance in the workplace or in schools.

The media attention encourages politicians to create harsher policies that can harm immigrant communities, such as restrictive entry policies and harsh policing laws.

Immigrant communities themselves may react in negative ways. They may feel scapegoated, and be less willing to interact with the wider community. There may be intra-community tensions. Immigrant communities are also a diverse block, and it

can mean that there are tensions between different communities, with certain groups blaming others for the negative stereotyping.

Moreover, as these stereotypes in the media are based on a distorted worldview, it is untruthful and unfair to portray these communities as such.

Link: In conclusion, the media's role in shaping narratives about immigrants cannot be underestimated. Given the current negative bias in media portrayal of immigrants in Europe and the U.S., we need to dismantle these harmful, unfair, and inaccurate stereotypes.

#### Positive Reinforcement and Integration

Claim: Positive media portrayal of immigrant achievements can serve as a powerful instrument to dismantle dominant negative stereotypes and facilitate immigrant well-being.

Statement: Positive media portrayal can facilitate the social integration of immigrants.

Analysis: As analysed in the previous argument, the media plays a pivotal role in shaping public perception. By focusing on the achievements of immigrants, the media can create a positive narrative, fostering a sense of belonging and acceptance amongst the native population.

It does so through connecting immigrants through positive frames that help humanise them within the dominant group, by expressing similarities in life experiences, and by tying the immigrant stories to popular narratives. Moreover, the policy can show more realistic facts and statistics that show successes of immigration.

Counter-argument: Critics may argue that a singular focus on success stories could lead to the stereotype of immigrants as overachievers, sparking resentment among the native population. This can lead to the problem of the "model minority", such as Asian-Americans.

Counter-counter-argument: While it's essential to avoid the pitfall of creating a new stereotype, sharing diverse success stories from different fields and socio-economic backgrounds can help dispel this concern. By portraying a realistic spectrum of immigrant experiences, the media can foster a more nuanced understanding of immigrants as ordinary people with their unique achievements and challenges. Moreover, these stories will take place within the context where negative attitudes already exist. Such course correction is unlikely to be that sharp. It took



Asian-Americans nearly five decades to shake off aspersions that existed during the Second World War.

Impact: By counteracting negative stereotypes, positive media portrayal can influence public sentiment, fostering more inclusive attitudes towards immigrants. This can lead to more cohesive societies and better integration of immigrants. Moreover, it can also inform policy-making, encouraging policies that reflect the diverse realities of immigration, rather than being driven by misconceptions and fear.

The role of the media

Statement: The role of media in providing an objective and neutral perspective is crucial for a balanced representation of immigrants, and this includes sharing success stories of immigrants.

Context: The media has two important roles it plays. Firstly, it holds power accountable. Secondly, it provides an accurate window to the world to enhance people's decision-making. Falling prey to negative stereotyping distorts the role of the media.

Analysis:

The function of the media is to inform the public about various societal elements and realities. This includes the diverse experiences of different groups in society, such as immigrants. Reporting solely on the negative aspects of immigration does not reflect this reality. Like any group, immigrants' experiences are complex and diverse, ranging from hardships to notable accomplishments. By overlooking the positive aspects, the media fails in providing a comprehensive picture. Moreover, immigrants are performing admirably across a host of statistics. Every next generation, no matter which group you look at, performs better than their parents. Certain immigrant communities even outshine host communities in education and economic performance.

The media gets certain powers to carry out its task. It gets special protections, such as freedom of press laws. They don't have to divulge sources in court cases. We do this, because we assign this importance to the media – but rights confer duties as well. These duties aren't just felt through laws – the media also operates with their own ethics codes, such as bans on taking gifts from interviewees. Moreover, we assign a certain societal power to the media, as the public in large takes their information from media and imbues them with a certain level of respect.

In this scenario, the media is abusing its power if it selectively reports on the immigrant experience. This is an unfair use of the media's legal and social power. This is a balance that should be corrected.

Counter-argument: the media should indeed report responsibly. This requires media neutrality. They should therefore report on the negative situations that surround immigrants, as this offers the fullest picture of what is going on in society.

Counter-counter argument: this is untrue if we can prove that a) the facts don't support that immigrants deserve to be portrayed negatively, b) prior media distortions have created a negative picture that needs to be actively distorted.

We should want more immigration

Claim: immigration is a net good that we should want more of. Media reporting that is supportive of immigrant stories is important to build public trust for more expansive and inclusive immigrant policies.

### Analysis

Immigration is important for a number of reasons. It increases a country's economy through adding to its skilled workforce, often in areas where there is a large demand for extra labour, such as in healthcare (think Filipino's in the UK), industry (think Indian knowledge worker in the tech sectors of Silicon Valley or the semiconductor industry in Eindhoven), and construction (think Polish and Romanian migration to Northwestern Europe). It adds to a country's cultural capital and sharing of norms.

Counter-claim: immigration comes with a large cost as well, and not all immigration stories are success stories. Immigrants add to pressure on local services, for instance by increasing demand in overheated housing markets. And immigrants are often overrepresented in crime statistics.

Counter-counter claim: many of these costs are transitional, that is to say that you can plan for them effectively. For instance by building more housing. Overrepresentation of immigrants' in crime statistics often falls away if you take their socio-economic background into account.

Positive stories can inspire better immigration policies. Politicians often react to public sentiment. If the media projects immigrants positively, it can influence public sentiment, and thus, political decisions. Canada's immigration policy is often cited as an example where positive narratives have shaped a more accepting approach to immigration, tying Canadian national identity into a 'nation of immigrants'. This has given Canadian politicians the political capital to build a more inclusive immigration policy. Better immigration policies mean more opportunities for skilled immigrants, economic growth, and mutual cultural exchange.

Impact: This media reporting leads to a stronger and more inclusive society.

## Arguments for Opposition

### Obligation of the Media to Report Truthfully

Statement: Media has an inherent obligation to report truthfully, which includes covering instances of immigrant exclusion, suffering, or vulnerabilities.

Context: We agree with the proposition: the media serves as a vital cog in the machinery of a democratic society. Its role extends beyond the provision of news and information—it shapes public discourse, influences policy decisions, and acts as a watchdog against the powerful, ensuring accountability and transparency. To perform this role effectively, it must adhere to the principles of journalistic integrity, which include accuracy, fairness, and balance.

Importantly, where we disagree with proposition is the characterization of the negative side. Showcasing negative stories of the immigrant experience is not telling that immigrants are all jobless criminals – it is sharing their suffering, the hard paths they faced on their journey to their host country, labour discrimination, discriminatory practices at the border, and so forth

This clash on context is important for both teams to analyse. The most successful analysis would look at why the media has structural reasons to prioritise one or both sets of context, and analyse which type of context is most likely to activate audiences.

### Analysis:

Negative stories about immigrants often hold a basis in fact. Immigrants often face challenges such as exploitation, social exclusion, and discrimination. Instances of language barriers, lack of access to public services, or racial profiling are common experiences for many immigrants. Media coverage of these stories is not an act of discrimination but an acknowledgement of these lived realities.

or downplaying these negative stories undermines the media's duty to present a truthful and comprehensive picture. While it's true that success stories can inspire and uplift, instances of suffering or exclusion provide critical insights into systemic issues that need addressing. These stories, though uncomfortable, are part of the immigrant experience. For instance, the reporting on the conditions of immigrants in detention centres at the U.S. southern border influenced public opinion and led to calls for policy changes against the Obama and Biden administrations.

The portrayal of immigrant suffering can also inspire empathy and understanding from the public, leading to a more inclusive society. Media coverage of the Syrian refugee crisis, for instance, played a significant role in humanising the issue and mobilising international support. In fact, portraying the plight of refugees as too positive can incur a backlash effect. In Denmark refugees from Syria were seen as “too wealthy”, which led to a policy where refugees needed to hand over jewellery and family heirlooms to ‘pay for their stay’.

A possible but more risky analytical line is to support reporting on difficulties in immigration communities, such as difficulties in finding work and struggles with criminality figures. The stance you need to adopt here is that A) these aspects are harmful for these individuals and often the damaging effects are felt by immigrants, B) that local community leaders often want action to be taken, and are frustrated by officials unwilling to take action for fear of feeding into far-right narratives, and C) a version of the third argument surrounding majority backlash.

Impact: If the media fulfils its obligation to report truthfully, it can facilitate more informed public discourse on immigration. By presenting both the achievements and struggles of immigrants, the media can contribute to shaping immigration policies that are more reflective of reality and more effective in addressing the challenges immigrants face. In addition, a balanced portrayal of immigrant stories can also contribute to a more empathetic and inclusive society by humanising immigrants and promoting understanding of their experiences.

#### The Risk of Selective Representation of Model Minorities

Statement: Focusing solely on immigrant achievements can lead to the selective representation of 'model minorities,' reinforcing stereotypes and perpetuating inequities.

Context: The term 'model minority' refers to a demographic group whose members are perceived as achieving a higher degree of socioeconomic success than the population average. This success is typically attributed to strong work ethics, a high value placed on education, and tight-knit family structures. The best-known stereotypical examples are Asian “tiger moms’, as popularised by Amy Chua in her book “Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother”. While seemingly positive, the model minority myth can create harmful expectations and overlook systemic issues.

Analysis:

By emphasising success stories, the media could inadvertently promote the notion of model minorities—specific immigrant groups that are presented as consistently successful and thriving. This can create an unrepresentative portrayal of the

immigrant experience, focusing on those who have overcome adversity to achieve extraordinary success, while neglecting the vast majority who face ongoing struggles. The media is likely to selectively engage in these stereotypes for a few reasons.

Availability of sources in the media. Journalists are often members of a well-educated class, which means it is more likely that they have connections with members of model minorities rather than with more disenfranchised communities.

Ease of finding success stories is higher in well-connected communities. It also is less likely to challenge existing narratives, which can lead to a backlash from readers, which media outlets are likely to want to avoid.

The model minority concept can further exacerbate societal stereotypes, placing undue pressure on individuals from these communities to conform to these expectations. For instance, Asian-Americans are often labelled as a model minority in the U.S., which has led to expectations of universal high achievement within this demographic, neglecting the diversity and individuality of experiences within this group.

The focus on achievements can obscure the systemic challenges that immigrants face. By highlighting individual success stories, the media might unintentionally reinforce the idea that success is purely a matter of individual effort, ignoring the structural barriers that many immigrants face. This can divert attention from necessary systemic changes, such as improved access to education and health care, fair employment practices, and equitable immigration policies.

This selective representation can also lead to unequal media coverage among different immigrant communities, contributing to a skewed perception of these communities. For instance, if the media were to concentrate on successful stories of one particular immigrant group, it could create a perception that this group is 'more successful' or 'better integrated' than others, potentially stoking divisions and resentment among different immigrant groups.

Impact: The selective representation of model minorities can have harmful societal implications. It can perpetuate stereotypes, mask systemic issues, and foster divisions among different immigrant communities. It might also alienate immigrants who do not conform to these success narratives, making them feel overlooked and undervalued.

## Potential Backlash from Audiences

**Statement:** Focusing solely on the achievements of immigrants can lead to a backlash from the audience, particularly those who believe the media is not fully representing the complexity of immigration issues.

**Context:** Public trust in media is vital for its role as an information provider and societal watchdog. This trust can be jeopardised if the media is perceived as presenting a selective or biased perspective. In recent years, trust in the media has been in decline, more people are voting for radical-right parties, and a non-insignificant amount of the public is more vulnerable believing fake news or conspiracy theories.

**Analysis:** If media focuses predominantly on immigrant achievements, some audiences may perceive this as a strategic avoidance or minimization of the challenges that come with immigration. They may suspect that the media is selectively reporting to promote a certain agenda, which can lead to scepticism and reduced trust in the media. This mistrust can undermine the credibility of the media and its capacity to facilitate informed public discourse.

Moreover, by overlooking the hardships and systemic issues immigrants often face, the media could be indirectly contributing to the sentiment that immigrants 'have it easy,' further fueling social divisions and misunderstandings. For example, in areas where immigration is a contentious issue, such selective reporting could unintentionally intensify hostility towards immigrants, seen as beneficiaries of undue positive coverage.

Even without taking these harms as possible, it is likely that a large set of the population will simply discount the information presented by the media as irrelevant or untrue, and move to more biased sources, including accounts on social media. This will not engender the change that proposition will want to see.

**Impact:** This backlash can polarise public opinion, leading to a more divided society. It can also hinder efforts towards more balanced immigration policies, as the debate becomes driven by perceptions and mistrust rather than comprehensive understanding. It also further entrenches this debate into issues of distrust in elites.

## Strategic Considerations, Language, and Ethical Considerations

Debaters should bear in mind the nuances of the motion. It is not advocating for ignoring the challenges immigrants face but emphasising their achievements. This subtle distinction will be a vital strategic point in the debate.

Language should be used carefully. Labelling immigrants can create stereotypes, so it's crucial to refer to immigrants as individuals with their unique stories.

From an ethical standpoint, the debate should consider media ethics concerning truthfulness, objectivity, and balanced reporting.

The following terms are loaded with ideological assumptions, and should be carefully applied and contextualised in a debate.

**Immigrants:** This term refers to individuals who have moved to another country with the intention to settle there. However, it's often used broadly and can homogenise a diverse group of individuals with different reasons for migrating, different legal statuses, and different cultural backgrounds. It's also often associated with negative stereotypes, partly due to some media narratives and political discourses.

**Expats:** Short for "expatriates," this term typically refers to professionals or skilled workers living temporarily in a country other than their home country. However, there's often a racial or economic bias associated with the term, as it's predominantly used for Western white-collar workers and rarely for low-income migrant workers or individuals from certain regions. This creates a divide and perpetuates stereotypes about immigrants.

**Refugees:** Refugees are people who have fled war, violence, conflict or persecution, and have crossed an international border to find safety in another country. Sometimes, the terms 'refugees' and 'migrants' are used interchangeably, which can lead to confusion and misunderstanding. The distinction is important because these two groups are protected by different bodies of international law and are entitled to different assistance and protection measures.

**Host communities:** This term refers to the local community that receives refugees or immigrants. However, it can sometimes imply a one-way relationship, as though the 'hosts' are only giving, and the newcomers are only receiving. This can overlook the reciprocal benefits and contributions that immigrants and refugees often bring to their new communities.

**Illegal/Undocumented immigrants:** Referring to immigrants as "illegal" can imply criminality and dehumanise them. The term "undocumented" is more ethically appropriate, as it indicates a lack of legal documentation without criminalising the person.

**Economic Migrants:** This term refers to people who migrate primarily for economic reasons, such as seeking better job opportunities or improved living conditions. However, it's often used pejoratively or in a way that undermines the legitimate reasons people have for moving to seek a better life. The line between economic migrants and refugees can also be blurry, as many people flee their home countries due to a combination of factors that might include economic hardship, conflict, and persecution.

## Literature

The debate builds on media influence theories like the Agenda Setting Theory, the Spiral of Silence, and the Framing Theory, showing how media can shape public opinion.

Academic literature, such as "Media and Migration" by Kunz, M., et al. (2011), provides comprehensive insights into the media-immigration nexus. Scholars like Entman and Rojecki (2000) have extensively discussed media framing of non-white people, underlining the implications of media portrayal on public sentiment and policy-making.

## Stereotypes and Media Framing

Entman and Rojecki (2000) identified media framing as a powerful tool that shapes the narrative around immigrants. They found that the media often framed immigrants, particularly those of colour, in negative contexts—often associating them with crime, economic burdens, or cultural threats. Similarly, a study by Bleich et al. (2015) on media coverage in Europe found that immigrants were disproportionately associated with negative news.

News outlets like The Guardian and Al Jazeera have reported extensively on the bias and negative stereotypes in media coverage of immigrants. They highlighted how negative depictions contribute to a skewed public perception, reinforcing stereotypes and fear.

## Influence on Public Opinion and Policy

The influence of media narratives on policy-making has been widely studied. According to a report by Migration Policy Institute (2018), public opinion shaped by media narratives and far-right political actors can exert substantial pressure on policy-making, sometimes leading to restrictive immigration policies.

## Selective Representation and "Model Minority" Myth

The issue of selective representation and its impact has also been widely discussed. Literature often points to the "model minority" myth as an example. This stereotype, which typically applies to Asian immigrants in the U.S., portrays them as uniformly successful due to their hard work and high moral standards. While seemingly positive, scholars like Wu (2014) argue that this narrative oversimplifies and misrepresents the diverse experiences of these communities, often masking systemic issues and fostering resentment.

## Media as a Tool for Change



In contrast, there is a growing body of literature advocating for a shift in media representation of immigrants. For instance, Ramasubramanian (2011) suggests that media can be a powerful tool to counter stereotypes, promote empathy, and encourage integration by exposing audiences to positive, individual-level stories about immigrants – but also that the reverse holds true.

## Sources

"Race: What It's Like To Grow Up As A Member Of 'Model Minority'." (December 21, 2020). All Things Considered (NPR). Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2020/12/21/948873834/what-its-like-to-grow-up-as-a-member-of-model-minority>

Akkerman, T. (2018, July). The Impact of Populist Radical-Right Parties on Immigration Policy Agendas: A Look at the Netherlands. Migration Policy Report.

Bleich, E., Bloemraad, I., & De Graauw, E. (2015). Migrants, minorities and the media: Information, representations and participation in the public sphere. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(6), 857-873.

Dixon, T. L., & Williams, M. L. (2015). The changing misrepresentation of race and crime on network and cable news. *Journal of Communication*, 65(1), 24-39.

Eberl, J.-M., Meltzer, C. E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., & Lind, F. (2018). The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: a literature review. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 207-223

Entman, R. M., & Rojecki, A. (2000). *The black image in the white mind: Media and race in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Scheffer, P. (2000, January 29). Het Multiculturele Drama. *NRC Handelsblad*.

Ramasubramanian, S. (2011). The impact of stereotypical versus counter-stereotypical media exemplars on racial attitudes, causal attributions, and support for affirmative action. *Communication Research*, 38(4), 497-516.

Wu, F. H. (2014). The model minority: Asian American 'success' as a race relations failure. *Yellow: Race in America Beyond Black and White*, 39-77.

This house believes that natural resources should never be owned by private actors

## Definition

Natural resources – materials from the Earth that are used to support life and meet people's needs – in the context of this debate mean forests, rivers, seas, as well as oil, gas, and mineral reserves on the planet. For example, the Amazon rainforest is a natural resource, as is the Grasberg mine, the world's largest reserve of gold and copper.

Private actors are defined either as individuals, groups of individuals (excluding political communities), or private companies. In the vast majority of relevant cases, 'private actors' who own natural resources are private companies. When natural resources are not owned by private actors, they are owned by states or other, smaller political entities, by no-one or by public companies.

## Context

This motion is not a policy motion, so we are not actually implementing any actual measures (no nationalisation or something similar), we are just discussing whether or not natural resources should or should not be owned by private actors.

## Proposition Arguments

Private ownership of natural resources is detrimental to the environment

The primary motivation of private actors for the extraction of natural resources is profit. In most cases, we are talking about companies: investors have invested in those companies and they expect a return on their investment. The way in which natural resources are managed by private companies differs in how non-private entities do it in several different ways:

- 1) Natural resources, when owned by private actors, are always commodified. If a natural resource is owned by a private entity, it is likely that the private entity will try to gain some kind of benefit from that natural resource - this can mean cutting down the forest, mining ores or extracting oil. In the best case, a private entity will just 'hold' the natural resources, but even in this case, this would only be them speculating that in the future, the natural resources could be sold for a higher price to a private entity that would want to exploit it.

By comparison, if a resource is owned by a non-private actor, a decision on what to do with that resource can be based on non-economic logic: a forest can be kept untouched because the local population finds joy in that or a sea source of oil might be left unexplored because the local community cares immensely about the well-being of fish in the area. The economic importance of a natural resource might be of zero-significance to a non-private actor, but for a private actor, economics is usually all that matters.

Exploitation in natural resources means, in the vast majority of the cases, puts a significant environment on the environment - cutting down forests reduces the quality of air and contributes to global warming, intensive mining operations often make the the surrounding environment severely degraded and uninhabitable, and many extracting most kinds of natural resources opens the doors to accidents, such as oil spills or fires.

As private entities seek to maximise profit almost at any cost, they are much more likely to neglect safety measures and precautions that make accidents more likely as well as just blatantly refuse to follow environmental regulations, something that is much less likely to happen when natural resources are controlled by non-private actors.

Deepwater Horizon oil spill, an environmental disaster which occurred in the Mexican Gulf in 2010 is one of the examples of the catastrophe that unchecked drive for profit can lead to.

- 2) In cases where natural resources are developed, no-private actors are likely to do a better job when it comes to the protection of the environment. This is because they are almost always required to take into account the broader effect of their actions - for example, a private entity does not care what happens to the quality of the soil after a mine is made fully functional in a certain area or how the quality of drinking water will be impacted. It cares about the mine and the profit it can make. In comparison, if the mine is owned by a local community, all these 'negative externalities' are much more likely to be considered. The same logic holds true when a particular natural resource is controlled by a seemingly distant government - the same government, even in the worst case, at least partly depends on popular support in order to rule, perhaps it even depends on votes from the people living in the affected area.

As a degraded environment is something people generally don't like, communal ownership of natural resources likely means that the environment will be more looked after than in the case of private ownership.

This argument shows that private actors are significantly more likely to harm the environment, and the impact of this argument is immense. A lot of the harm done to the environment is of the kind that affects everyone (global warming) and is thus of great importance, but the impacts are also more dispersed, as exploitation of different natural resources causes direct and specific harms to the population living in the area affected, greatly impacting their health, well-being, and as a consequence their ability to live happily and in peace.

Private ownership of natural resources is immoral

Natural resources were not created by an individual or a group of individuals, they have been here since forever and for the vast majority of humankind's existence, they were part of 'the common'. Unlike products, artisan or agricultural, natural resources were not created or enhanced by any individual, they are nature's creation. When society privatises natural resources, it infringes on everyone else's right to property, as everyone has an equal claim to natural resources.

Without doubt, even when natural resources are owned by a local community or a state consortium, they are to an extent alienated from everyone else. However, the scale of harm

is much lower, as public forms of ownership are often just vehicles through which the concept of common ownership is exercised. On the other hand, private ownership of natural resources is exclusive in its nature – when you privatise something, you remove the ownership from ‘the common’, to ‘the individual’.

It is also true that a community can make a decision to sell or cede the ownership of a natural resource to a private entity. This decision can seem to be fully informed and sometimes even in the interest of the community making it. However, this does not mean that it is immoral, as such a decision is not taken only on behalf of the actual decision-makers, but also on behalf of those who did not participate in the decision-making process. Additionally, natural resources, when privatised, are alienated from all those who are yet to benefit from them or who also have a right to them - the unborn. Lastly, no matter how democratic or well thought a democratic decision is, some matters should fall outside the scope of democratic decision making. Just like it is unacceptable that any democratic body decides on limiting basic human rights, it is unacceptable that anyone decided to alienate natural resources from their rightful owners, the people.

#### Privatisation of natural resources harms the economic welfare of society

Natural resources are often a significant source of a nation's wealth, often acting as a force that produces and sustains growth, affecting the living standard of the population and reducing poverty. Mining of minerals and coal constitutes as much as 48% of Tajikistan's GDP and many developing countries heavily depend on exploiting one form of natural resources or another for their economic growth.

Natural resources being as important as they are, should not be gambled away and given to private hands because of the following reasons:

1. Private ownership of natural resources creates private profits. Natural resources are very often finite resources (oil, minerals, ores,...) with a consistent or consistently growing base for demand. This means that very often, exploitation of natural resources is extremely profitable. When natural resources are privatised, any profit made from the exploitation of those resources goes to the owners. It is true that taxes are often paid on the income and the owners have to pay the workers and sometimes buy equipment locally, but this is often dwarfed by the profits those companies are making. Importantly, when natural resources are privatised, they are often sold to owners from the developed world. This is particularly important when privatisation happens in the developing world, as this can lead to a significant outflow of capital from the country. An estimated 60 billion USD of capital flows out of Africa every year and this is significantly more than the entire aid coming in combined.

Some could argue that private ownership of natural resources reduces the risks of corruption and thus makes the companies in question more economically sustainable. However, this criticism is often based on the assumption that private companies can magically escape corruption and that no measures can be taken to fight it. But even in the worst case, if we concede that corruption in the management of publicly owned companies is ripe, most often the corruption is small scale and

localised and 'gains' from corruption are kept inside the local environment and this is still comparatively better than profits pouring from some of the world's poorest countries to the richest. And publicly known companies are known to be extremely successful as well - as the case of Saudi Aramco, the world's second largest company by revenue (as of 2022) shows.

2. Private owners might often, in their pursuit of higher profits, also over-exploit certain resources and focus on the short term benefits at the expense of making those resources useless in the long run. Two factors impact this phenomenon: the pressure from the shareholders to get a return on their investments, as well as the limited span of lives - when ownership is private, it is owned by actual individuals who want to get most out of it in the scope of their lifetime. By comparison, collective forms of ownership remove the component of mortality, making management of natural resources significantly more long-term. Apart from economic harms, overexploitation can also lead to very concrete environmental harms, such as water shortages, loss of forest cover and the extinction of species, as already shown in a previous argument.

## Opposition Arguments

### Private ownership of natural resources fosters economic growth and welfare

Natural resources on their own bring very little tangible benefits to the communities that surround them. An ore deposit is only useful if it creates jobs for the community, and reserves of oil underground have zero implications on life above the ground if they are left untouched. It is the exploitation or development of natural resources that creates value and with it welfare for the society.

Although natural resources can be efficiently managed by communities, often communal forms of ownership fare much worse than private ones. Several reasons account for that:

1. The incentive to create a successful business model is extremely high when it comes to private owners. Private actors are usually companies and those companies are owned by shareholders. By buying the shares, the shareholders have made an investment in the company and they expect a return on investment. This means that they are likely to exert pressure on the management of the company: to make sure that the work process is as smooth as possible, that unnecessary costs are cut, that all the supplies are bought at competitive prices. In the case of private actors, this incentive to pressure the management is stronger than in the case of public ownership, as unlike in the latter case, owners' own money and resources are at stake.
2. Additionally, even when management of private companies fails (and to be fair, this is not a rare occurrence), this is not the end of the world - in fact, it is a boon, as this means that they are outcompeted by other, more efficient companies who take their spot. This does not happen in the case of communal forms of ownership, since even inefficient operations are often propped up by the society, this is most evidently manifested by states subsidising publicly owned natural resource firms, who often

also monopolise the market, further reducing the incentive on the management to optimise production.

3. The selfish incentives of private actors are likely to lead to sustainable development of resources (in order to keep profiting in the long run) as well as to fostering good relations with local communities (as possible protests or punitive governmental action is harmful for business). So although there is no denying that some privately owned mining, oil extraction and other similar companies have abysmal worker rights and environment records, these companies are outliers against the general business logic which typically tries to run sustainable and workers friendly businesses. Additionally, malpractices are common in non-privately owned natural resource management firms - often they are even more serious and can be rooted in practices that markets tend to correct (i. e. discrimination of a specific ethnic group).

Additionally, the worst excesses of the private market can be regulated by states – countries can set environmental and labour standards, so if the negative externalities caused by private actors become too significant, states have mechanisms to address them, even in cases where the ownership over natural resources is private.

All of these factors contribute to the effective management of natural resources. This is not a benefit by itself, but the implications of it are: jobs are being created and sustained, taxes can fund the expansion of the state's services, and supplementary businesses are created. All of these benefits are particularly important for the world's least developed countries who sometimes own a plethora of precious natural resources – it would be a tragedy not to let the productive forces of private capital to utilise those resources and bring progress to the addicted communities.

Private ownership of natural resources is a basic right

Individuals have an unalienable right to life, property, and liberty. John Locke included property amongst unalienable rights because property can also be seen as an extension to humans. Individuals, when they enhance a value of a certain property, they put a part of themselves 'into' it and to an extent, that property becomes a part of them. Private property is thus an extension of individuals' bodily autonomy. This logic applies to natural resources in specific as well, as many mineral deposits, mines, or even rivers were made valuable through either the discovery or hard work of specific individuals. They took risks in 'bringing that resource to life' and therefore they deserve to be pertinent in the ownership of it.

Moreover, private ownership is also necessary for individuals to exercise their liberty fully. If people are unable to own property, they are unable to fight possible injustices caused by governments and are able to make independent decisions, because they have something they can lean upon. This logic is widely applicable to all property, but natural resources are no different here.

