**OPEN GRAND FINAL**

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GwJoeaCn7rE&feature=youtu.be>)

**MODERATOR OPENING (Ameera Moore)**

The motion for this final reads this house believes that the theory of communism is immoral. Before going on with the debate, first, I want to congratulate all teams for making it to this final.

**PRIME MINISTER ARGUMENT (Ateneo OV Julia Ocoma)**

Hello, could you hear me? I am just checking if I am audible.

Starting my speech, in 3... 2... 1

What does a theory of communism look like? First, it is the belief that private property is immoral, and we should abolish it, it is believed also that we should give all the money to the state and the state should redistribute it to anyone. The second is, the transition from capitalist to a communist economy requires a vanguard party that controls the redistribution we think that’s immoral too. But lastly there is a call for people like a proletariat to rise up against bourgeois, we think in opening government, we firmly believe that all of these are immoral and this is not a particular debate about particular instances where it has failed or succeeded in the past, it is about the theory and the assessment of that theory being immoral.

What are the standards of immorality? There are two things, first, the things that are most immoral are those who take away human agency that is the reason why we think sexual assault is immoral, slavery is immoral, and violence is immoral, because it takes away your capacity to live and to make free choices. The second is, when you deprive these individuals of basic needs, that is why you consider theft immoral and corruption immoral as well.

Let’s go to the first argument that we’ve already established those things. First argument is the theory of communism in the three respects I explained earlier are all immoral. Let’s go to the first one. Why is massive redistribution and everyone being equal is immoral? First, because it reinforces state enforced slavery and takes away your agency. Part of the most important freedoms that people have is their capacity to work, what they can do with their work, and what they can’t produce. This is an essential freedom because most of your working day actually the vast majority of your life is spent working so, for a state to dictate what your resources should be, what should be taken away from you, what jobs you could you take on, and what you can produce and severely limiting all of those things, it’s basically taking half or like three-fourths of your life, and we think this is extremely harmful because you are taking away that human agency first and foremost.

The second reason as to why this is immoral is, because you are using the body of that human person to produce labor without the equivalent compensation that you should be giving them. Whatever work you do you will be given the same amount of resources. Under same amount of resources, same amount of compensation, under any communist society, you are then instrumentalizing these people. The same thing we did with African Americans before, where we exploited their labor, but we only gave them the bare minimum resources which is also equal. Opposition might say, it’s good because you are giving them basic necessities right through redistribution or whatever, but just because you give them the bare minimum does not justify you exploiting them and giving them just the same equal amount without necessarily being able to compensate for more like more effort, gives you more monetary gain for example in the same way that you have in a capital society now. So, given this, let’s weigh this up then. Why is agency the most important thing as opposed to the material necessities that may come coming from opposition that can be provided by the state, it is because what a good life is, is subjective for every individual. It means that your agency to choose what a good life is for you is the most important thing as opposed to whatever material necessity could have to sustain your life.

Let’s go to the second reason that I explained earlier. The theory calls for a need for a transition, from capitalist to communist society. Why is that immoral? The reason is because you need a vanguard party that will lead the planned economy that will lead the transition. This vanguard party is likely to be a very small group of people who are likely to be abusive because they have their own self-interests to like forward humans are inherently flawed. At some point, they will make mistakes, but even if they are benevolent the theory itself which is a few people who will dictate what the society would do, not in a representative democracy again we are talking about communist state could do is actually immoral because of two things. First, it is unclear why these people have greater legitimacy over everyone especially if it is not a democratic state, why are their rights and power more important than everyone else. But secondly, putting the lives of some few people can potentially make mistakes even if they are benevolent it is very problematic, the point is we had to rely the greater mistake toward these just few people.

Let’s go to the last reason then, why the theory calls for a rising against the bourgeois and why it is this immoral. We think any call for violence or rising is immoral. The reason is the violence would inherently have to target innocent individuals. People who are part of the privileged class of the bourgeois, even it is not their fault because they were privileged again birth lottery all those things, you will have to target them make it have some form of violence targeted towards them, but it also harms the poor, because through casualties you make them rise up risk their lives and join the fight even if there are a lot of risks involved in being able to be a part of that big revolution. The weighing we think it’s not clear as to whether you will still succeed of like overthrowing capitalism. I think that’s a huge goal, it’s very difficult to do, but the harms are guaranteed. So again, the goal is speculative whatever benefit you will get is speculative but all these harms of targeting innocent individuals, of targeting the poor of making life making them risk their lives is guaranteed. Before I proceed to the next argument closing opposition.

**Question/ Response (Edinburgh A – Jason Woods)**

Even if we believe that these are all intrinsic qualities of communism, which I think, that you have just asserted you have not engaged with what the comparative is, why are people going to be less exploited in another type of system?

**PRIME MINISTER ANSWER (Ateneo OV Julia Ocoma)**

So, let’s deal with this on the second argument, I think it clashes directly. Why won’t it lead to the comparative of things? For example, like the provision of basic services and the best case of opposition. First, it is because it relies on a centrally planned government, the problem is after a certain phase it becomes unmanageable, it becomes too difficult. Everyone has different varying interest needs and demands that you have to reconcile as that communist state and the trade-offs will have to be done versus on out side where we think that having an economic free market, where you let anyone fight for their own interest. Their free choices as like in accordance their human agency. To have free reign, which has natural checks and balances like regulations competition, the impact is it leads to miscalculation of how much the state will produce, which leads to things like hunger for example insufficient basic needs. But lastly, we think private property is needed for innovation we have we are talking about life-saving for example, that can only happen if you have the incentive to create this kind of RDM, you need to create an incentive for people to use their brilliance.

If communism doesn’t provide them with this incentive because you are just giving them same monetary pay, the same resources regardless of how much work you put into, whatever thing you are investing in, we don’t get this kind of innovation, which leads to foreseeable outcomes of not having enough medicine or for our ever growing number of diseases, not having enough technological solutions like climate change, not having enough resources for the kinds of hunger, famine, and poverty that exists at present right now. This is important, because our problems evolve as life as contrast over time and continuous to grow bigger and bigger, but our capacity to be able to help or to able to override that time lag, right? It’s something that is less or it’s not that big. So, they are given this leaving a vast majority of people, the people who are most vulnerable and we think that a communist state the theory of communism is therefore immoral. For all those reasons and more I am very proud to open this debate. Thank you.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. I now welcome to leader of opposition.

**LEADER OF OPPOSITION ARGUMENT (Amna Amin)**

Without a theory of communism, the poor will continue to grow and suffer without a means of escape. The rich will be trapped under the assumption that material wealth means that they are better, while they remain corrupted in spirit and in their morality. I think before we get into the nitty-gritty of things it’s important to clarify in the debate what the theory of communism is, because I think the OG is mistaken in a lot of ways. First, I think that the theory demands that people get their basic needs provided despite whatever effort they are able to put into, if you are disabled for instance or are not able to work as much you still get your basic needs provided to you. Second, I think communism often emphasizes the labor theory of value, which means the value of goods and material things in society are dependent on the labor of the person who puts into it. The people who make the goods are the ones who put the value into it, not the people who just like sell them or control the means of production.

I think it thirdly it rejects the idea that one person should own the means of production, because that means they get an unequal amount of bargaining power in society and get to control the lives of other people to a greater degree. I think lastly, a huge theory within communism is this idea that history ultimately leads to communism. Unlike a lot of other theories, it does not explicitly endorse violence, in fact, it just says that the tides will inevitably turn because the society and the way that we are working the world simply cannot continue to operate in a way that makes the poor suffer. It’s notable to say that in the communist manifesto, it never explicitly says how we are going to see the tides like these tides change etc. This means, you don’t get this like extreme violence that we hear from OG or like this vanguard party is like the thing that needs to usher in this change, I think they are probably just referring to Londonize, that’s an entirely different debate. Maybe they feel like they’d be more likely to win it, but just not what we are debating today.

Now I am going to talk a bit more about what we think that determines morality, because I feel like that has been severely under-covered. Under any definition communism and the theory that it presents ought to be defined as moral, first, I think we often think that things that are premised on the idea of fairness are what is moral. I think we often define fairness as things that making you are only rewarded and punished for things that are explicit with leave within your control and that you are not punished in a way or rewarded in a way that has significant damages on your ability to have good future outcomes. We probably think it’s unfair to punish someone and completely prevent them from ever being rehabilitated or battering themselves or trying to do good in the future.

Secondly, oftentimes when we are talking about a theory we ought to talk about the theory itself and not that theory could be implemented considering that oftentimes, like any theory can be manipulated and then implemented in bad ways with people who have bad intentions. So, for all instances like religion, often manipulated in ways to get people to do bad actions, even though like the premises of religion itself not that bad. Therefore, we should only be talking about the theory not just like how it has been implemented in the past how it will be implemented in the future and how it’s like impossible. I think it’s also examples of how it has been implemented in good ways like a lot of smaller communities often do based on communist principles like smaller states are totally capable of making it. So, you have central planning without corruption.

We also think there are two major theories of morality. The first is. the idea of Unitarianism which we think ultimately communism able to achieve the best outcomes for the most amount of people. This is particularly true when you think about principles regarding diminishing marginal returns. When everyone is put at more of an equal level playing field rather than like some people getting extreme goods, you actually get better results in terms of not engaging with diminishing marginal returns, because like a rich person gaining a lot more doesn’t really mean much, because the already have a lot. Whereas, like making it so that like the poor and everyone is on the same equal playing field, probably does mean that people’s utility is impacted to a greater degree. Even you use deontological principals in equality that you are probably again like better able to achieve morality under this principle of communism because like communism basically is the like best political theory for equality.

Concerning that people are now able to live with similar amount of goods, going with the specifics of what, why we think each aspect of communist theory is specifically moral first. I think the idea that you get what you need and you are provided the basic goods, no matter what effort you able to put inside it is just overall a good think, it natural lottery idea. Most things are out of control and therefore fairness ought to determine thar you are still provided with basic goods. This is especially true in the idea that, essentially like we live in a deterministic universe. This also rebuts the claim that we get from OG that nobody will ever be incentivized to do things like innovate or get like doctors, to make medicines. People often get satisfaction and will continue to better their selves despite the ability to gain things like material goods that just say, like we are all debating despite there is not like a huge martial good that we are getting at the end of this round. We are all probably still want to get the one, that doctors want to save lives and we will probably be looking for the medicine even If they don’t get like extreme amounts of material goods from these things. I therefore think you are so likely to get things innovation just because people want to better themselves.

**Question/ Response (Oxford 1 – Aniket Chakravorty)**

Something like John rules suggests everyone should have a baseline, but then we will say that there is allows to be inequality within that’s not communism, that’s something that we can still have on our side.

**LEADER OPPOSITION ANSWER (Amna Amin)**

I think the problem with these theories is that first often the inequalities that you are still presenting are often determined by things outside of people’s control. I don’t necessarily control my natural innate born ability to be intelligent therefore I think it’s unfair that I get better things inside you just because I have that inherent inequality. I think communism still allows people to be unequal in this sense, that like you can still be smarter like develop medicines. You are just not given more materials goods as a result of things that are outside of your control, I think that’s principally a good thing. I also think it’s just generally bad to want human beings to suffer as a result of things that are outside of their control like this idea of punishment is really damaging society prevents people from advancing the long term, it also has trickle-down effects on their family. If you are punished or not able to gain material wealth because of your inner like inequalities, it also prevents like your future generations for gain wealth because we have a lot of like generational wealth inequality.

I secondly think things like the labor theory of value are just good, because the alternative to the labor theory of value is things like speculation. People just get like the value or are determined to like provide value just on their ability to speculate which is literally totally out of their control. I think putting things under the value of people who contribute to it and put in the most strenuous work is the least elitist thing to do. That controlling the means of production that giving it to everyone is the most moral thing to do, this matter because without giving the means of production to just one person it often lets them control other parts of society like the government. It makes them have all the bargaining power inside which literally makes every other human being the world treated like a war curse and an animal. I think human beings are capable of much more than that we should allow them to self-actualize and have parking power within their own lives.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. I now welcome the deputy prime minister here.

**DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER (Ateneo OV Ignacio)**

Hello am I audible? Okay

Starting my speech in 3, 2, 1, go

So, at the end of this first exchange we now have three standards to judge this debate on. The first is the concept of fairness and provided and secondly is the concept of agency and the concept of the provision of basic needs which we provided which I will assess right now. Specifically, it's not to say that communism is worse than any other political outcome. It is our political system it's just to say that communism is immoral, it is possible that multiple systems are immoral, it's possible even if one system is less bad than another system that both are equally immoral. The same way with when you can have two very bad boyfriends even if one potential boyfriend might be marginally better than the other, that's important because no matter what closing opposition says about. Why capitalism might be immoral, or any other form of current systems are immoral? Does it disprove the claim that this system is immoral? And therefore, we still take it a bit assuming they are trying to prove that under the rest of the house.

So, firstly on the issue of fairness is what they tried to bring up. They say the problem right now is that people are born the birth lottery of different needs and different resources and therefore a purely meritocratic system which only allocates based on how much you contribute to society is unfair. I might probably agree with this, but that's not what communism asks for notably any moral reasonably will still believe that some degree of agency is should be a prerequisite or a determination of your material condition. For example, if a person even in the communist society does a crime for example sorry if a person does a crime even if you believe a communist framework presumably, you'll still deprive them of the rights of property, you'll put them in jail they'll deprive them of the right to liberty. Which recognizes that it's absurd to just think that there's no moral agency of any individual and your choices are your actions are. Somewhat a determinant of the material conditions that you provide importantly also coming from leader proposition. They can see that their site will also have some degree of inequality with respect to the intelligence people have.

With no real moral distinction about, why material inequality is different from the inequality you get from your intelligence, your looks, or whatever other facet within society? Which implies that it is perfectly fair for you to give some wealth to people based on the amount of contribution and effort they have. It does not mean it's the only caught metric, but it should be a balance of your current needs, but also the amount of conditions that you have under their sign the question. Now, is does communism account for that? We would suggest it does not because, while communism recognizes a problem which is marital full meritocracy is a problem it. It’s also over corrects for it and therefore becomes equally unfair because even if you contribute to society given, if you're a struggling poor individual comes from a poor background and you work your way all the way to the top, you will still have the same competition as a person who's incredibly lazy and given all the potential circumstances or all the potential privileges.

In life, that means that you're still equally unfair or even more unfair because you're inherently taking away any potential choice of agency and therefore, you're allocating only based on some arbitrary equality which we would suggest is problematic. Secondly, it suggests that to a degree to believe that meritocracy is unparalleled, only cares about agency to adequately believe that communism, only cares about the current humanity that you are in right now and there's no ability for you to differentiate yourself and any other individual means. That they're far more likely that inherently an unfair system already the next thing we have learnt have to talk about is agency. Noticeably they barely responded to this case they just said that the vanguard party system and that the violence is not an inherent part of communism. Even if you believe that it does not take away the central planning argument which is to say the very fact that people can determine what people should work on, what how much they should produce, and what are the outcomes of a particular society in any community society. That's inherently how the community works the entire society determines what your job is and what private property is inherently immoral, because it takes away your agency as a human being to determine your work.

We explained to you why this principle is important because even if some people are poor on their dance of the house that's less important because its only why material conditions are the most important. Facet of your life which you've told, and it allows people to have the subjective decision. To make that, what's happening it's not true, that violence and divine party are not part of the communist like ideology it's important for you to have. Even answer to how you transition from capitalist and that's why the vanguard party is an essential feature of that, it's not the communist ideology will be not actionable. Secondly, the point about violence is like talked about by Marx, right? The fact that he wants to board Jose to risen and like lose their chains so, you can't just claim and assert that it's not inherently part. You have engaged with that on the desk of the house. Before moving on, let's take closing opposition.

**Question/ Response (Edinburgh A – Jason Woods)**

Yeah, so even if you are correct and morality does not exist. In a vacuum the problem is your case is contingent on the practical effects of this fury meaning that you need to engage in comparative analysis with. What the alternatives would be in order to prove that your harms are illegitimate?

**DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER (Ateneo OV Ignacio)**

No, no, it's not contingent on the practical effects, if the theory dictates that you should take away the ability. For people to choose what they produce, and the state should determine that regardless of how that's applied in practice. That's already immoral already, right? Regardless of what efficiently produced, the fact that you take away people's ability to choose what they work which is half their lives so, you're basically subjecting half their lives to slavery. That's the immoral outcome, that we're trying to fight for today's debate regardless of how it is practically applied. That means even if you provide them with all their basic needs and services, which he gave you the parallel example of like slaves in America for example, where they were given their basic needs in some instances, we would consider that

still immoral because the provision of basic needs is not enough to repartee the taking away of agency. Which is the supreme good relative to any other utilitarian benefit which requires you to will it to be valuable. In the very first place then I talk about the provision of goods and services, so they claim that redistribution works and it's a good thing because we're able to provide basic needs to everyone.

I want to point out that even if there's a burden to prove a counter model theory like socialism, theories like the welfare state already sufficiently account for the basic needs of a lot of people. It's only why I must go beyond that social standard or why you must go beyond the welfare state standard under inside of the house. Secondly, note that the entire principle of free distribution part work assumes a benevolent group of individuals and assumes for example that these people are competent enough to potentially account for the different needs and interests of different people. Noticeably, any person who reasonably assumes that is probably naive and negligent with the very fact that giving a lot of power to very small number of people who don't really know what they're doing or you're not certain whether or not they're doing good. So, even if it sometimes can be properly applied the fact that on balance it's likely not to be the case means that this theory is problematic to a degree that's applied under their sign. They say there will still be incentives for innovation regardless that was another point you need the consolidation of wealth to act on that incentive to innovate right. But secondly, the incentive at best is retroactive because people will have to face problems that's why they feel desire to deal with them but not proactive which capitalism or

private property your conception of private property provides, because you want to make more money and therefore, you have an active search for potential problems in the future. That's why do we get able to believe that they're able to provide in the short run in the long run it's unclear how they continuously provide the basic needs and services of these individuals. At the end of this debate on these three grounds, we take it and us are very proud to win, thank you.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. I now welcome the deputy leader of opposition. You're here.

**DEPUTY LEADER OF OPPOSITION (PDP1 Jane Mentzinger)**

Um okay, awesome. Can everyone hear me?

Okay. Three, two, one.

I don't think OG sufficiently deals with their burden in the round which is to explain why a theory like is immoral. First, let's just go into to clarify some things why it is true that we think fairness is the most important moral principle. Especially with regards to material goods not as like regards to who you are as a person which is always just a version of diversity not equality. We think all like most morality is premised on equality, why I think there's the idea that nothing makes me inherently better than other people? This is means that, these ideas force inequality and unfairness is bad, which is to say like most theories of morality. Don't say that you can treat certain people like way worse because they like don't deserve these things in general. We think the idea of trying to punish people is bad. OG tries to bring up the idea of sending people to jail. I don't think this is particularly moral, I think the reason we ought to send people to jail is to help them get better and become a better person. I don't think we should be vindictive with our punishment and hope that other people should suffer. This is not a justification for morality, it is a justification for changing our criminal system even in a communist world I think this is good.

I think we also secondly need equality of opportunity to get equality of opportunity. We need material goods so; I think for any idea of like self-actualization or the ability to access these types of things. This is important; this means material inequality is much worse than other forms of inequality because we can one, we can do something to prevent it. Sure, some people are taller and some people are shorter and maybe we should redistribute height if we could but we can't do that we can make it so that people have equal opportunities and we can make it, so the shelves are lower so short people can reach them too. I think this is more important because it allows them to access the things that they would have the ability to do if not for the actions of other people which I think is necessary for moral good. Second, why do we get better agency OG claims that we don't respond. To this, the reason we think agency is important we think we just access it much better. First, I think it is like we do to a degree link it is acceptable to take away some amount of agency like. We prevent people from murdering others or yelling fire in a theater in order to maximize the good of people and allow them to access their agency.

We think this standard is what like makes everyone able to access their ability and so they aren't unfairly like oppressed by others. We think in systems of capitalism or in systems that are not communism you, even if you are like making people work then you are allowing them to access the basic goods, they need to provide their life. We think this is necessary it is not oftentimes we think that like basic security ought to be protected. I have a right not to be harmed by others, but I think the idea that I shouldn't be harmed by others by the fact that they control all the food and therefore, like their refusal to give me any is directly harming me as well. This is a moral principle that most people agree with overall so, I think this is quite important that we do these things but second, I think also the theory of communism is just perhaps premised on a view about people that we don't agree with but it's not more immoral. Like the people think that people will naturally work and naturally do these things, so the theory of communism says that even if there is some transition, they'll say that it's more like an objective view of what will happen, not like what is necessary to happen.

They believe it will be voluntarily done that people will do these things and I think like maybe you disagree with that being true, but I don't think it makes the theory immoral. Moreover, I think there are cases where at least on a small scale this type of behavior does work for example if you look to like kibbutz's in Israel where they like voluntarily work together and they're able to do it if it is a small community even if you can't do it on a large scale. So, I think it's just like the premise that this is forced is also just simply untrue. Then I think it's just the like agency is like the OG argument. Is it's like central planning is bad, I think like the alter one the alternative is that one person controls the mean the production and your death and like and completely your destiny and controls all part of your day this is much worse because they don't have benevolent like they only care about themselves at least. With some form of government, they care about you to some extent they want you to do better. I also just think in general work like should not define people and it shouldn't be the thing that controls your life.

With without communism the poor simply become workhorses and spend 12 hours of their day on work that they're not able to like better themselves. The idea that just creating more material goods is the goal, I think is generally bad. Finally, on this point of agency think you are only able to self-actualize, when you have choices and I think choices furthermore re simply the basis of humanity. They are makeups different from animals who run on instinct, it means, respect the human mind of all people, it's the idea that like you are not able to do these things and you are only forced to just work these long hours. Moreover, I think part of the problem is, that oftentimes in these capital societies. We don't ever give people choices, because we punish them for being poor and make them worse off like it's very expensive to be poor because very expensive you must pay. If you get evicted these types of things which means you're never able to access any of these self-choices that they get. I will take a point from closing, if they have one, yeah so Marx himself observed the tendency of capitalism to moderate and pass things that case towards workers. Surely that means you don't get the horrific explosive capitalism. I don't think it moderates all that well, like maybe Mark said it but I don't think that like is realistic because it changes the theory of communism.

I think we have very exploitative tendencies because the idea of like capitalism is based on inherent self-interest whereas, the theory of communism is based on the idea that we ought to care about others and the well-being of others so, I don't think that's true. It does tend towards these very abusive thoughts a couple of things in this round first, OG gives many arguments to whether something is moral or immoral. I think their arguments are mostly outcome-based but, actually sufficiently fulfills their burden in the round like, like I don't know why it but, I also think communism theory suggests that people have a natural desire to work and discover and become better people they basically say agency is important but we think, we access this much better if the goal is the ability to make choices that you desire and the ability to do things that you care about. This is only met if you have your needs met and the fact that you are voluntarily working.

I think there are a few things what it takes for a theory to be moral first, it supports a system that is more morally on the alternatives. Basically, I think OG trying to try to say that there's just simply no morality because everything is immoral, I think if that's the case we ought to develop the idea that some things are more moral than others and that theory is going to be more moral. Second, I think it's something that respects the inherent dignity of people, I think people have an inherent dignity that makes them different from humans. Anything that violates that dignity is immoral their ability to control their own lives their ability to control, the means of production their abilities have necessities met are premised on that. As opening opposition team tell you, why three tenets of communism are inherently moral and why this is better than any alternatives, we think, under multiple theories of morality both utilitarianism and deontology and a principle of fairness, we explain to you why this is most important for all those reasons so proud to oppose.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. Now, just out of closing half, I invite member of government here.

**MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT (Oxford1 Sharon Chau)**

Am I audible? Awesome.

My speech will start in three, two, one

What is communism the theory of communism says that basically capitalism is inherently exploitative, you then have a vanguard party and a dictatorship of the proletariat

but ultimately this leads to the abolition of the state. We think the reason we can take this debate is because opening governments never deal with the end state instead, they only talk about the process of transformation and we think this is not what this debate is about. This debate is about the end state when we are able to achieve this communist utopia without any of the practical concerns and we think we should be debating whether this end state is preferable and whether this theory is justified or whether it's immoral, with that said we're going to bring you three things. First, why you get other critiques and the amelioration of the worst excesses of capitalism on our side? Second, how communism makes us deny fundamental parts of our human nature and why this is immoral? And third, why property is inherently a good thing even in the best case of communism where the state is abolished rebuttals are going to be integrated?

First argument why do we get critiques and the amelioration of the worst excesses of capitalism on our side several reasons. First, we think people were critiquing capitalism even before communism happened so for example even Adam Smith had lots of critiques of capitalism, within his writing this is likely to continue even without communism second we're moving away from the Chicago School of economics and the unbridled capitalism that opposition wants to push onto us especially after the 2008 financial crisis. We realized that just capitalism without any checks and balances is incredibly harmful. Thirdly there are lots of empirical examples of how we have been shifting away and how we have been dealing with the worst excesses of capitalism. For example, the existence of the welfare state how most countries currently provide things like universal health care to its citizens, how there is increased safety nets for everyone especially in countries like Scandinavian countries. In this system most basic needs are provided for even under the current system of capitalism why are these three reasons important. We think this this is important, because we must come prove the comparative and have demanded the comparative is not this unchecked capitalism, which means that communism is a much more palatable option if the society is all right under capitalism.

We think that the opportunity cost of communism and transition risk of failure means the trade-off is much higher and it's immoral to propagate the theory of communism that's why we think this argument fills the gap that's missing in OG second argument. So, we think communism denies this because it suggests that people should be equal and you should be unable to rise through society opening analysis on the inherent harms of inequality, proves exactly this argument so we think that also humans are relational right we measure ourselves relative to each other and our current base point. That's why people are often unhappy even though living standards have risen across centuries because we are comparing ourselves to other people and we think that we would have been happy to make the final for example in our case but now we really want to win however this ability to measure ourselves and gain this happiness to each other no longer exists in the final version of communism, because it aims to deny people. This is inequality and the ability to compare yourself to other people because it's seen as something that's bad thirdly, we think that humans are believers in free will.

We think that people feel like protagonists in their life story who want to do things. However, the communist system forces people to deny things and even reject their own experiences what happens under communism is that access to people's preferences are diminished. So, the thing that's the end goal of communism and liberalism as mill describes is basically this thing namely that there's a society of experimental individuals who basically find their own method of flourishing the difference. However, is the method communism saying that people don't understand their preferences things, like false consciousness and they need to be coerced into revolution by the vanguard of the proletariat? We think this is terrible, the old case is that basic needs being met is enough for happiness and satisfaction in your life. However, we think this is a necessary but not enough condition especially as we've proven to you how the current system. Most people's basic needs are basically already met so, the benefits are not exclusive to their side.

We think, in order to get happiness, you need a sense of agency and freedom, which underlies this what this means is, if something means that people are forced to act against their own will we think that is bad. So, comparing this to opening government, they say that agency is important, but we don't think they are able to prove. Why it is, we think the reason is that people are willing to trade off utility in order to get to other higher goals so, for example protesters in Hongkong, my home city, people are willing to trade off material benefits to themselves to achieve something higher than themselves. This matter, because morality is basically just a series of intuition pumps to determine what people really think and to build claims from them, but most people don't intuition punk communism. Therefore, we think that this proves how we can provide agency and how it's a good thing before moving on to my last argument.

**Question/ Response (Amna Amin)**

The problem with capitalist states making concessions and giving some degree of welfare is that it only temporarily calms the masses and allows the rich to consolidate their power more and that's can huge thing in the long term the only way to stop perpetual suffering for the worse off is through communism as a result.

**MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT (Oxford1 Sharon Chau)**

Okay, we don't think there's anything inherently wrong with the rich being like getting richer or becoming happier if the basic needs of certain people are fulfilled. We think if we're able to prove that everyone's basic needs are going to be fulfilled, there's no reason to drag everyone down to this level and prevent other people from gaining more happiness. Third arguments, why is private property an inherently good thing even in the best case of communism when the state is abolished? First, we think private property is a principled right and all rights are spatial rights. So, what this means is, your right to shelter or your right to use anything is contingent on the fact that you own that thing and you have the space to do that private property means. You have something to the exclusion of everything else and we think that communism opposing this denies you, there are all other rights which are spatial in nature you need exclusive access to things in order to do these basic functions and therefore, we think we need private property.

Secondly, some private property is acquired justly, and we think even if we only prove some is acquired justly, if opposition wants to deny everyone the right to own private property, this is immoral. So, we think that in an abstract exchange between you and me if we both have the things that the other person wants. We're allowed to sell to each other, so this is an instance where private property is acquired justly. We think even though some private property is unjustly acquired this is not important because of all these reasons we are so proud to propose.

**MODERATOR** **(Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. I now welcome the member of opposition, here.

**MEMBER OF OPPOSITION (Edinburgh A Cerys Walsh)**

Am I audible now? Okay, perfect.

Starting speech in, three, two, one

I'm going to do a few things in the speech but first, I’m going to talk a bit about what the theory of communism is and what probably the burden on opposition side is likely to be because, I don't think anyone's really addressed this to any like reasonable degree communism proposes. The capitalist structures harm the proletariat, but it also proposes that capitalism is inevitably unsustainable and will eventually devolve into communism. Unavoidably, over time through some sort of revolution, I think what this means is that the theory primarily acts to critique capitalist structures and is not always prescriptive. This means that like it's not exactly saying that, we should revolt violently. See the history of like the union movement in the UK, which simply seeks to use communist theory to mitigate the harms of capitalism. I think then any material harms of a system following communist theoretical frameworks must be weighed against regimes, established by most likely competing political extremists in a comparative way because the theory itself isn't is the debate so, while its contribution to a given regime, is probably fair game for government side the full extent of harms must be weighed against the reasonable alternative.

I think this means that like the harms under like the user must be weighed against harms of likely other states emerging. If communism was not the theoretical framework, I think we take OG at us be at their best then and we account for the worst-case scenarios. with societies. Adopt authoritarian communism overall likely societies in which the material needs of. Citizens are threatened and citizens feel alienated and exploited to a degree in which they make the personal calculus the violent revolution and its associated threats is worth the comparative benefit of a regime change to a communist system. Nothing that this often looks like societies that already remove freedom and are authoritarian in some way already this could look like Cyrus Russia, which is or other like monarchy like the Paris commune this could look like right-wing dictatorships. Often a result of imperialism in the first place for example like South America in the 50s was largely one run by corrupt authoritarian right-wing governments and all their policies were essentially dictated by three American Banana companies.

The reason why they decided to have socialist revolutions in the first place what is the comparative then largely societies in which citizens are generally happy. Liberal democracies are incredibly unlikely to pursue violent revolution and establishment of authoritarian communist state because firstly citizens are more risk averse. When they have more to lose secondarily alienation only occurs when agency is removed to a huge degree which is a necessary precursor to this kind of revolution. Lastly, most residents of liberal democracies highly value concepts of opposition to political violence and maintaining civility and individual choice largely through voting. I think this means that only already awful societies will enact authoritarian communism, why is this better than the alternative? Well firstly, society is likely to enact full state communism have an alternative that is from the perspective of the citizens

worse for their material conditions. Why they revolted in the first place this looks like historical alternatives to not being a liberal democracy. But some other authoritarian group that fills the power vacuum after overthrowing desire something like this and probably has terrible outcomes.

For things like the life standard of citizens or something like object monarchy, which removes all the agency that we're told, is so good from opening government because the necessarily alternative to communism isn't capitalism it could be something else. I think also noting that you don't access any benefits that were talked about in opening government, a worker agency or innovation because these aren't accessed in any authoritarian regime. Like you don't have much agency if you live in in Nazi Germany. I think, we have a relative conservation of preferences on our side then secondarily, I think this acts as a proportional mitigation of prior injustices in so far as individuals feel their material.

I think this is morally analogous to self-defense, they are legitimate and enacting harm to reduce their own suffering we allow them to access a means to fight back. I think we access reduction of harm; we better fulfill their state the state duty to protect the material interests of citizens and I think we better access preferences. Okay, then why is this theory good in other contexts not in revolutionary conditions communism is a highly persuasive critical framework? That appeals to people's one wants to simplify a chaotic world to an explainable series of class conflicts. Secondarily, appeals to the feeling of alienation felt by those who feel exploited and misunderstood. And lastly, providing catharsis to those harmed by those systems especially noting the appeal of this analysis often appeals to people's historical and equal capital distribution. Things like therefore, the black panthers often use communist frameworks in activist material critiquing racism. This persuasiveness means that we access important benefits largely like circulate through things but also through places like universities which are often hopes of activism and hopes of political advocacy.

I think we get a few benefits from this the first is the one to mitigate the harms of capitalism that already exists pointed out convincingly by communism. The first is through like things like labor organization, we're able to appeal to the problems of workers really direct any or anger away that was like directed towards things like false consciousness and towards youthful outlets like legislation and union movements. I think therefore, the union movement started in like the UK in the first place which is where mark's primarily rose to prominence. We get better material conditions for workers, this is how we got things like the five-day work week, this is how we eliminated things like child labor, this is the reason why we all aren't all working 12-hour days in the status quo. Before I move on, I will take a note from opening.

**RESPONSE FROM ATENIO OV**

So, this is an argument to explain why the theoretical framework might be potentially used not why the theory of communism which is different from the theoretical framework of Marxism is applied and how it's applied in its useful theory.

**MEMBER OPPOSITION ANSWER**

The theory of communism and the theoretical framework of communism are one and the same. They are initially linked; you must use the theoretical framework of communism to advocate for communism. I'm explaining to you why in societies that a communist revolution will literally never have, it is useful for this theoretical framework to be circulated because it helps get other benefits even because these societies are never going to turn into the USSR. I think then also in another activism you're able to view inequalities in more tangible way through unequal distribution of capital. This provides a valuable framework to pursue things like decolonization things like anti-racism, because you can point to the tangible harms and historical harms that have been perpetrated traded against these groups. I think we also provide just general levels of catharsis and a sense of meaning to those who suffer under systems of capitalism but lastly, we provide a justification that can be co-opted by less radical

left-leaning ideologies. There is a clear path of like mutation into other ideologies that lends greatly to the palatability of the fundamental ideas of economic equality and reparative material justice even if we never get Marxist politicians. I think that this is a comparative benefit on our side, I think for all these reasons I'm so proud to oppose.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. Now, just out of closing half, I invite member of government here.

**MEMBER OF GOVERNMENT WHIP (Oxford1 Anket Chakravorty)**

Starting, in three, two, one.

I have three observations to make about this debate. Before I go into its team by team observation one, is just a clarification of what morality is, we say you probably don't have access to objective morality, you don't know what god wants to do or it's really hard to find out. So, the way that we build morality is based on what people think by asking them a series of intuition pumps and using that to lead to outcomes if lots of people share those things, then those are things that you probably consider to be moral. It probably is on those grounds

and the nature of what communism is what we're discussing, which is to say, it's not it's the specific thing about capitalism inevitably leads towards crisis. That's why you need some degree of revolution either led by a vanguard, although Marx and she said it just happened naturally and so that leads to an outcome namely the state gets control of things eventually for it to be democratized. It's not the tangential things about the theory of potential theoretical frameworks that result from communism.

We're not necessarily talking about the Hamburg or the Frankfurt school here, we're just talking about these specific things that are key towards communism itself. I don't think this debate is about the other things that communism has led to which is what closing opposition hinged their extension on, this is a value judgement debate specifically about the theory of communism itself and whether or not, that's something that's moral immoral. I think that we prove that it's immoral. Firstly, wearing against opening government, I think the problem with OG is that their characterization in most of their case is contingent upon a very specific. Reading of communism that in the opening opposition, I think even Jason identifies in the POI about the vanguard and so on, I think that Sharon's harms particularly in her second argument about why private property is inherently immoral are a lot more important here, because they're just even in the ideal state of communism. The end state of communism is one where there's no state, there's no private property everyone's, just kind of living, kind of in existence. I think that Sharon explains why that end state is necessarily harmful, because private property itself is something that's quite good.

The spatial analysis that Sharon gives you is really important, and I just want to briefly cover it, because I didn't really get our response from CEO, which is that in order to actually do particular actions like in order to sleep somewhere or do anything like that you need to own the ground under. Which it occurs you need to own like the bed to do or own the shelter

that goes on so on that can only happen with private property when you have exclusive access to these things that can't happen under the communist. The second thing is, that we actually

demonstrate why communism is likely to infringe upon people's agency and what agency specifically masks in the round because if the framing, I said at the top of my speech is true which is that morality is basically what people think it is and Sharon explains to you, because communism infringes them on key aspects of human nature. That probably means that communism itself is immoral because lots of people think that proves opening government's key mech key benefit which is that communism infringes upon agency. I think Sharon able to fill in those links and so, we probably take over them.

Secondly, in terms of closing opposition, the first thing I want to know is that it's incredibly hard to just do things like counter factual history and make bold claims about our there was a banana republic or whatever. So, this is the likely alternative I would point out. For instance, like the us only did that out of fear of communism which presumably might not happen outside the house, but this debate is not saying communism like this house would prefer communism not to exist. That case, the government case is saying communism has existed is this a moral thing or is this not we tell you that it isn't. I think a lot of closing opposition's harms are basically based on a reality where communism wouldn't exist rather than actual moral judgments on the nature of communism itself. They say about communism enable these critiques of capitalism which is important and opening government opening opposition kind of say this too, I think there are other potential frameworks that already critique capitalism.

French revolution for instance, I think people just generally like feel that massive degrees of inequality is quite bad especially if people are working quite hard and I don't think

that's something necessarily unique towards communism. I think it can exist in other instances and indeed that's what Sharon's first extension proves. But thirdly, on the stuff they say about this being an important theoretical framework, I think that like again these theoretical frameworks can exist on our side of house and the debate isn't specifically about this. I would also suggest that communism detracts forwards from improving life because it creates this moral like idealist scenario of what people should settle for rather than get making them happy with what they have. Secondly, on a finally on opening, no matter how much they lean to a welfare state in the short term, it always allows the rich to control them. It means of production despite their selfish motivations and thus immorally control the destinies of the masses, denying their ability to have agency, or even control property which you want to talk about like people are able to do in small companies communities like kibbutz.

It's like a small-scale thing, or whatever, but secondly, why is rich people earning a means of production if they compensate their workers fairly and those workers can buy things? Why is it an inherent long or inherent exploitation? This is precisely the problem with communism right, that tells people to deny the existence of their own preferences and instead advocate for some Marxist like utopia, whereby workers don't know what they want and so, we need to force them into doing what they want. I think it already proves why capitalism can moderate and other moral critiques of capitalism exist so for instance rules criticizes these things along the same lines. I don't think this justifies absolute equality, it probably just justifies like inequality of starting point or a quality of opportunity as walls would suggest, but also crucially. It's unclear why their arbitrary state is better than the initial state that exists under capitalism, because their state is arbitrary too right you're arbitrarily taking everything and just giving it to every single person in equal proportions and it's unclear why that arbitrary thing is better than the initially arbitrary thing, which is capitalism that exists. I also think finally that OMO's conception of happiness is quite poor. It just says that you need material needs but why it's not that it's all about agency and your ability to aspire to do things

that's what communism prevents, that's why it's immoral. Proud to propose.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

I thank the speaker. And now for the final speaker opposition wait, here.

**FINAL SPEAKER OPPOSITION WHIP (Edinburgh A – Jason Woods)**

Could I check if I'm audible.

Okay, speech starting in three, two, one

There are two tiers of impact in which Cairo's extension wants us to debate. The first is, a free principle moral framework from which Cairo’s applies as to why communism is moral one. Unlike any other critiques of communism, is a uniquely proportional means of mitigating prior injustice that grants people who have been exploited and act to self-defense. Basic necessities note that things like the state of nature or Adam Smith's critique of communism necessarily are insufficient to mitigate the injustices that have occurred against people who have had their labor and property stripped from them by the bourgeois and subsequently withheld. Subsequently the only way in which we can proportionally mitigate this injustice is by granting these people the property and the labor that has been stripped from them again and ensuring that. There is a base level ceiling by which nobody is ever able to inflict this injustice again. Second moral framework the ability for individuals to access catharsis what does this look like, I think what this looks like is the specific language surrounding communist.

Theory being unique language that enables ability individuals to articulate their experience enables them to relate themselves to the society that oppresses them and grants

them the catharsis of knowing. Just what injustice is happening to them noting that any action which they take to mitigate that injustice is contingent on the information that they possess of knowing that that injustice is occurring in the first place and so far as communism grants, that it illuminates the struggle that these people are occurring and subsequently has to be considered moral. Thirdly, I think communism is the only means of guaranteeing the state duty of ensuring that everybody has necessities. The point of the state deprived of as autonomy and makes us see certain rights to it, we necessarily take a contract with the state whereby they must provide a degree of necessities for us in order to benefit from the state and so far the state is unable to provide us necessities like housing to participate whenever it's to any meaningful extent. It necessarily fails an activity under the moral frameworks of mitigating injustice of the state being legitimate on.

I think it's a lazy response from closing government to say that there is no such thing as objective morality and so far, as I have done the analysis specifically moral frameworks, we should care about too specific other strata of the information as to why we win this debate. Which is on the fact that the theory of communism has also done things, therefore if we are

trying to adjudicate the morality and the theoretical effects of it, we must consider what the world would not look like had and not existed in order to evaluate this subsequently. Cairo wins this in two key respects first the tangential effects of communist fury and so far, as it grants, the language to workers illuminates some of the struggles that they have and tells them that they can construct things, like unions. In order to try and mitigate against the struggles that they are encountering in society, the reason why this is specifically important is because opening government try and stand over the counter factual as to where they are going to access democratic socialism.

Note that the specific persuasive unique nature of communist theory but, closing government ignored and the way it took place in universities where it was able to distribute academic material to workers and was able to specifically weaponize the radical young left means that it is able to uniquely spread all of this information and engage in all the practical changes the question that you have to ask is, has this theory not existed what occurs on the comparative on the comparative? The thing that opening government do have to contend with at the point that all our material, as to why this is immoral is specifically rooted in the practical. it's necessarily contingent on them having to stand over some sort of counterfactual the problem, with the counterfactual and why it is necessarily going to be worse? In these states, because they want to do something to redress for material conditions. The question is, what note that at the point that societies necessarily must have a binding narrative at the point that they are trying to forge themselves in a post-revolution state?

I will post it to you, that they would default to a worse narrative than the narrative of being equal. To all men under a communist framework and they probably engage in like chauvinistic nationalism, meaning that on both a moral framework in terms of all of the injustices that we are able to mitigate against and a consequentialist framework in terms of all the tangentially related injustices. In terms of our actual ability to improve people's material condition and in terms of stemming the awful counterfactuals that would occur as a result of this we are going to win this debate subsequently. The reason why we can take this above opening opposition is, first, providing you a comparative practical moralistic framework and proving that there is worse harm that would be committed to have this theory not existed. Secondarily, weighing our moral framework beyond opening opposition simply saying that this is what people often define as being moral proving there are cosmic injustices, that are being committed that we can mitigate against.

I'm going to do two additional things in this speech. One, I'm going to briefly put closing government out of this debate, two I'm going to respond to opening government and solve this long diagonal. Before that, I want to make one note about preferences in this debate, the problem is any material regarding agency is contingent on people being able to access for preferences. Two reasons why this can't happen under capitalism are, one people are deprived of the capital and the skills which they need in order to be able to access for preferences and so far as if you do not have your basic livelihood you are unable to ever access all of these things. But secondly and even more importantly, your conception of preferences is contingent on the access you have to information and so far as capitalist structures will necessarily always have things like advertising slogans and which enable you to have your brain washed by this.

We feel like you have access to preferences unclear, why that's different than accessing them and secondarily even if preferences are not accessed on either side, we guarantee people's material condition. Cool, I’ve taken out closing government's counter factual regarding critiques briefly why property is always going to be immoral. I have a point that I can exist under capitalism and acquire a multitude of property and be a lazy landholder. Specifically, deprive other people of property, I think this is specifically when I'm committing an act of harm and even if some property is legitimately occurred, I think at the point of earth the capacity for property to be illegitimately occurred it is a structure that should not exist cool the reason. Then why we can take it over opening government is twofold one? I think we can specifically prove that we are able to specifically prove that and so far, as we rely on instrumental benefits regarding innovation and access to the value of labor. They must contend that the material condition and prosperity should be valued given that our comparative takes him over best and explains why things are going to be worse in their world.

Meaning that we are comparatively able to not only access the practical benefits of agency and improvement to societal structures but also all of the principal benefits that they necessarily have to concede they lose regarding the ability for people to know what's happened to them. Regarding the ability for people to mitigate against all these systemic injustices of colonialism and exploitation, we necessarily win, and all the frameworks provided in this debate. Mic drop seal.

**MODERATOR (Ameera Moore)**

Right, I thank all speakers. I thank all teams, thank you very much again. I believe that all debaters may exit the room while the judges stay here for deliberation. After the life has gone off, thanks so much everybody. Thanks everyone.