

CONCERN DEBATES

League Phase Motions 2020-21

On September 25th 2015, 193 countries adopted a set of goals to end poverty and hunger, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all, as part of a new sustainable development agenda. Each goal has specific targets to be achieved by the year 2030.

When launching the 17 Goals the then UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon stated that "...this can be the first generation to witness a world without extreme poverty, where all people – not only the powerful and the privileged – can participate and contribute equally, free of discrimination and want."

For the goals to be reached, everyone needs to do their part: governments, the private sector, civil society and 'ordinary' people.

This year, once again our Concern Debate motions highlight some of the individual goals and the challenges that we must face (and the debates we must have) if the goals are to be achieved.

THE GLOBAL GOALS

For Sustainable Development



Before you ask 'Who is the WHO?' we are, in this motion, debating the effectiveness of the World Health Organisation (WHO) and its response to the global Covid-19 pandemic. The WHO was established in 1948 ...for the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible levels of health. One of the functions of the WHO is to prepare for local and global health emergencies by identifying, mitigating and managing risks. On 30 January, 2020, the WHO declared the Covid-19 outbreak a Public Health Emergency of International Concern and warned all countries to prepare.

Warned all countries to prepare. Over the course of the next number of months the WHO was criticised for acting too slowly and for being too trusting of China, while defenders of the WHO say that the organisation has only limited powers over individual countries and that given the scale and speed at how quickly the virus spread, the WHO had done its very best. So...was it irresponsible and unfair to criticise the WHO as it responded to the biggest pandemic in 100 years, or were critics just hiding some of their own failings...*Debate It!*

MOTION 1 Theme: WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION

"Criticism of the WHO over its handling of Covid-19, is irresponsible and unfair"

PROPOSITION:

https://time.com/5824322/who-coronavirus-response-maria-van-kerkhove/ https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-52506844

https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/apr/17/trump-world-health-organization-reforms-china https://theglobalobservatory.org/2020/04/how-has-who-responded-to-covid-19-pandemic/ https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-52294623

https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/global-criticism-grows-trump-move-end-who-funding-amid-pandemic-n1184146

OPPOSITION:

https://www.theguardian.com/news/2020/apr/10/world-health-organization-who-v-coronavirus-why-it-cant-handle-pandemic

https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/08/world/asia/trump-who-coronavirus-china.html

https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2020-04-24/its-time-independent-coronavirus-review

https://www.newstatesman.com/world/asia/2020/04/how-world-health-organisation-s-failure-challenge-china-over-coronavirus-cost-us

https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2020/may/comment-coronavirus-failure-global-governance-now-world-needs-radical-transformation

https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/07/trump-blames-who-for-getting-coronavirus-pandemic-wrong-threatens-to-withhold-funding.html







The world reacted with horror to the killing of George Floyd, a 46 year old black man by a Minneapolis police officer on May 25th, 2020. People of all colours took to the streets in protest in the United States and around the world. Spokespersons decried the killing of yet another unarmed black man at the hands of the police. For those who took to the streets and for millions of others around the world watching on, these demonstrations seemed different, they were more than just protest...they were about social unrest and a call for radical change. On social



media, TV and print there were calls to confront once and for all the systemic racism in our institutions, our history and society. There are those who say that sadly we have been here so many times before and that while there is lots of talk and 'hand wringing', nothing really will change over the long term, while others strongly believe that this time political, corporate and cultural leaders are ready to confront the challenges of racism and inequality in our world. So...this time, after the killing of George Floyd, will things be different? ...**Debate It!**

NOTE TO TEACHERS: This debate is about change and equality. It is based on the fact that racism is obscene, that it must be eliminated and consigned to history. Both sides of the motion should take this as their starting point. It is not contested. What is contested is the speed and depth of how that change will occur and whether George Floyd's death will have any lasting impact or will be just 'a moment of outrage'. Please ensure that your students, regardless of which side of the motion they are on, do not present any arguments that in any way could be construed as defending racism. It is indefensible!

MOTION 2 Theme: EQUALITY, RACISM

"This time, after the death of George Floyd, 'things' will be different"

PROPOSITION:

https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/04/opinion/george-floyd-ferguson.html?smid=em-share https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/10/george-floyd-protests-what-happens-next https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/05/george-floyd-rage-slavery-killing-us-police-stateprotest?CMP=Share_AndroidApp_Gmail

https://www.gq-magazine.co.uk/politics/article/george-floyd-black-lives-matter

https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-52969905

https://news.sky.com/story/george-floyd-death-theres-no-way-us-politicians-can-fudge-the-race-issue-now-12004425 https://www.economist.com/international/2020/06/08/how-george-floyds-death-reverberates-around-the-world https://www.ted.com/talks/dr_phillip_atiba_goff_rashad_robinson_dr_bernice_king_anthony_d_romero_the_path_to_ ending_systemic_racism_in_the_us?referrer=playlist-talks_to_help_you_understand_r

OPPOSITION:

https://www.theguardian.com/news/audio/2020/jun/03/death-george-floyd-will-anything-change https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-integrationist/202005/racism-and-violence-are-not-newand-wont-change-until-we-do

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/jun/11/black-lives-matter-racism-bristol-colston https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-06-09/will-george-floyds-death-mark-a-turning-point-in-the-us/12334542 https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/06/orlando-patterson-explains-why-america-cant-escape-its-racist-roots/ https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/05/30/violence-minneapolis-is-rooted-history-racist-policing-america/ https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/06/opinion/sunday/george-floyd-structural-racism.html?smid=em-share







Each January in Davos, Switzerland, the world's wealthy and powerful gather to discuss the global economy. To coincide with the meeting Oxfam puts out an annual report to remind those attending just how unequal our world is and what those with wealth and power can do about it. The 2020 report has some frightening findings, among them are the fact that the world's 2,153 billionaires have more wealth than the 4.6 billion people who make up 60% of the world's planet and that the 22 richest men in the world have more wealth than all of the women in Africa.

In seeking the nomination as the Democratic Party candidate for the President of the United States, Bernie Sanders said that 'billionaires should not exist' because our broken economies are lining the pockets of billionaires and big business at the expense of ordinary people, particularly poor women and girls. There are those who will argue that not all billionaires are 'money hungry monsters'; look at Bill Gates, Warren Buffet and George Soros who not only generate thousands of jobs and pay taxes, but give millions to good causes. So...to tackle wealth inequality should governments prevent people from becoming billionaires? ...**Debate It!**

MOTION 3 Theme: WEALTH INEQUALITY

"To tackle income inequality, billionaires should not exist"

PROPOSITION:

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/nov/01/viral-billionaires-super-rich-exist https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/billionaires-tax-the-rich_n_5c51ea30e4b0ca92c6dcafc6?r i18n=true

https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=148463746152219

https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2019/11/07/have-billionaires-accumulated-their-wealth-illegitimately

https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/24/bernie-sanders-proposes-wealth-tax-after-plan-from-elizabeth-warren.html https://www.currentaffairs.org/2017/06/its-basically-just-immoral-to-be-rich

OPPOSITION:

https://eu.rgj.com/story/opinion/voices/2020/01/28/billionaires-who-give-back-deserve-ourappreciation-jill-derby/4594765002/

https://www.cnbc.com/2019/12/31/what-billionaires-said-about-wealth-inequality-and-capitalism-in-2019.html

https://theweek.com/articles/819262/why-america-needs-more-billionaires

https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/billionaires-are-good

https://news.sky.com/video/are-billionaires-good-for-the-uk-11877466

https://fee.org/articles/why-billionaires-are-good-for-us/









Climate Change is one of the greatest challenges of our time. Fossil fuels comprise 80 per cent of current global primary energy demand which is the source of approximately two thirds of global CO₂ emissions. If we are to maintain access to energy for quality of life and for economic development what clean energy alternatives will take the place of fossil fuels? Great strides have been taken over the past few decades in solar, wind and wave technologies, however these alone are not sufficient to meet anywhere near our current energy needs. Which leads us to the 'elephant in the room'; nuclear energy.

For many environmentalists concerned with climate change, nuclear energy is today's 'Devil's excrement'. They condemn it for its production and use of radioactive fuels and for the problem of disposing of its waste. Like solar, wind and wave, great strides have been made in nuclear energy in recent decades too. Pro-nuclear lobbyists argue that nuclear power releases less radiation into the environment than any other major energy source and that nuclear waste is more a political than technological problem. So...can a case be made that nuclear power is essential for a green energy future? *Debate It!*

MOTION 4 Theme: CLIMATE CHANGE

"Nuclear Power is essential for a clean energy future"

PROPOSITION:

https://www.energy.gov/ne/articles/3-reasons-why-nuclear-clean-and-sustainable https://www.nei.org/fundamentals/nuclear-provides-carbon-free-energy https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214993714000050 https://cen.acs.org/energy/nuclear-power/nuclear-power-help-save-us/97/i37 https://www.wired.co.uk/article/nuclear-energy-electricity-uk-renewables https://www.renewableresourcescoalition.org/nuclear-energy-advantages/

OPPOSITION:

https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/sep/20/nuclear-is-not-the-way-to-a-clean-energy-future

https://www.leonardodicaprio.org/the-7-reasons-why-nuclear-energy-is-not-the-answer-to-solve-climate-change/

https://www.greenpeace.org.uk/challenges/nuclear-power/

https://www.ecowatch.com/nuclear-power-cannot-rival-renewable-energy-2644813982. html?rebelltitem=1#rebelltitem1

https://www.goodenergy.co.uk/blog/2016/10/19/disadvantages-nuclear-energy/

https://sciencing.com/disadvantages-nuclear-energy-4578885.html









If Boris Johnson has his way he will 'get Brexit done' by the end of 2020. It will be a new beginning for the UK in its relations with the wider world as they will no longer be part of the European Union bound by trade, immigration and other rules, but free to negotiate or renegotiate deals with new or existing partners. Africa is the 'coming continent'; its population is predicted to double to 2 billion people in the coming decades.

Between 2014 and 2018 Britain's direct investment in the continent was \$17 billion, well below China's \$72 billion, France's \$34 billion and the United States' \$32 billion. Africa provides a huge opportunity for the UK to maintain its global economic standing. One in four consumers worldwide will be African by 2050, while eight of the world's fastest growing economies are in Africa. Proponents of closer ties with Africa like former Prime Minister Tony Blair emphasise the 'transformative' power of private investment that business and government trade deals will bring. Opponents however argue that the deals proposed by Mr Blair and even Mr Johnson will not serve Africa but will do more to serve the commercial

interests of Britain...So the question becomes not, will Africa be good for Brexit?, but, will Brexit be good for Africa...Debate It!

MOTION 5

Theme: AFRICA-BREXIT

"Brexit will be good for Africa"

PROPOSITION:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hai2mQyR-SE

https://www.dw.com/en/why-brexit-is-a-turning-point-for-europe-africa-relations/a-52177939

https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/07/brexit-is-an-opportunity-for-africa/

https://edition.cnn.com/2020/01/31/business/brexit-uk-africa-intl/index.html

https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28528/how-britain-post-brexit-can-promote-better-trade-anddevelopment-in-africa

https://www.forbes.com/sites/korihale/2020/02/04/how-africa-became-the-billion-dollar-brexitwinner/#3fff74ab25ca

OPPOSITION:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hai2mQyR-SE https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/africa-benefit-brexit-200102081337546.html https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/august-2016/africa-after-brexit https://theconversation.com/uk-africa-trade-and-investment-who-benefits-130404 https://www.newvision.co.ug/news/1498527/brexit-opportunity-african-countries https://qz.com/africa/715710/brexit-could-be-terrible-for-africas-largest-economies/











