

Sample arguments for the motion.

This House would ban smoking completely.

Structure/Teamwork

-Consistency in points,
Signposts, role division

Dynamism

(Response/Linkage)

-Make clash and relevant
Issues through debate.
-Clarify clash and issues.

Persuasion/Expression

-choice of words,
speech organisation

This House would ban smoking completely.

Background: In recent years, banning or restricting smoking in public places has become common among developed countries. Among them, the US and the UK have implemented stricter controls on cigarettes, such as banning e-cigarettes and restricting the sale of regular cigarettes. However, would a complete ban on cigarettes lead to better control of smoking for individuals and society?

Reference : ●idebate.net This house would ban smoking in public spaces
<https://idebate.net/this-house-would-ban-smoking-in-public-spaces~b839/>
 ●BBC News Japan: 英下院、たばこ販売禁止法案を可決 2009年以降生まれを対象に(April, 2024)
<https://www.bbc.com/japanese/articles/cpeqj83798no>
 ●BBC News UK: MPs back smoking ban for those born after 2009(April, 2024) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-68824493>
 ●現代ビジネス 免疫学の権威が明かす長寿の秘訣! 「ストレスフリーな“不良生活”が一番です」(March, 2016)
<https://gendai.media/articles/-/48280?imp=0>

Proposition

Stance: We should protect citizens' health with strict rules and a complete ban on cigarettes for the sake of both individuals and society.

Opposition

Stance: We should respect the rights of smokers while also protecting the environment and the health of society.

1. Health problems
(Claim)
 -We should protect citizens' health by banning smoking completely in public and private spaces.
(Reason)
 -The use of cigarettes causes severe damage to the lung and circulatory systems, leading to serious conditions such as lung cancer and heart disease. Smoking remains a major public health problem, affecting not only smokers but also the people around them.
(Example)
 -(1) UK: tobacco use is the single biggest preventable cause of death, killing 80,000 people every year.
 (2) Second hand-smoking in private:
 When smoking inside the house, children and non-smoking family are hard to escape indoors and may be affected by chemical, toxic substances.

1. Freedom of choice
(Claim)
 -Smoking rights should be respected as long as smokers care for the people around them.
(Reason)
 -Smoking is an important personal choice for people to pursue their quality of life and daily enjoyment. As long as individuals and society address the issue of second-hand harm, there is no reason to remove people's rights.
(Example)
 -The United Nations statement: Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family.
 -Similarly, we do not completely ban car use despite the risk of accidents, because society values convenience and quality of life.

This House would ban smoking completely.

Background: In recent years, banning or restricting smoking in public places has become common among developed countries. Among them, the US and the UK have implemented stricter controls on cigarettes, such as banning e-cigarettes and restricting the sale of regular cigarettes. However, would a complete ban on cigarettes lead to better control of smoking for individuals and society?

Reference : ●idebate.net This house would ban smoking in public spaces

<https://idebate.net/this-house-would-ban-smoking-in-public-spaces~b839/>

●BBC News Japan: 英下院、たばこ販売禁止法案を可決 2009年以降生まれを対象に(April, 2024)

<https://www.bbc.com/japanese/articles/cpeqj83798no>

●BBC News UK: MPs back smoking ban for those born after 2009(April, 2024) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-68824493>

●現代ビジネス 免疫学の権威が明かす長寿の秘訣! 「ストレスフリーな“不良生活”が一番です」(March, 2016)

<https://gendai.media/articles/-/48280?imp=0>

Proposition

Stance: We should protect citizens' health with strict rules and a complete ban on cigarettes for the sake of both individuals and society.

2. Governmental Interference

(Claim)

-The government should manage social problems by restricting activities related to citizens' addictive habits.

(Reason)

-Addictive and unhealthy habits cannot easily be overcome by individuals themselves and often cause significant harm to society as a whole.

(Example)

-Substances and habits such as drug use, alcohol consumption, and smoking create strong dependency and are very difficult for individuals to avoid. Therefore, the government has a legitimate reason to regulate or restrict these activities to protect public health and social stability.

Opposition

Stance: We should respect the rights of smokers while also protecting the environment and the health of society.

2. Economic damages

(Claim)

-Banning smoking completely would severely damage tax revenue.

(Reason)

-The government receives significant revenue from taxes paid on cigarettes, which helps fund social welfare and other public policies.

-Banning smoking leads to the bankruptcy of cigarette companies, and worsens the overall economy. Therefore, the government would lose a valuable source of tax revenue as a result of this policy.

(Example)

-According to estimates by researchers at Oxford University, the NHS (National Health Service in the UK) costs approximately 5 billion pounds (960 billion yen) per year, while tax revenue from cigarette sales nearly twice as much – about 10 billion pounds (1.9 trillion yen) annually. Therefore, governments that implement smoking bans risk significant financial losses.

This House would ban smoking completely.

Background: In recent years, banning or restricting smoking in public places has become common among developed countries. Among them, the US and the UK have implemented stricter controls on cigarettes, such as banning e-cigarettes and restricting the sale of regular cigarettes. However, would a complete ban on cigarettes lead to better control of smoking for individuals and society?

Reference : ●idebate.net This house would ban smoking in public spaces

<https://idebate.net/this-house-would-ban-smoking-in-public-spaces~b839/>

●BBC News Japan: 英下院、たばこ販売禁止法案を可決 2009年以降生まれを対象に(April, 2024)

<https://www.bbc.com/japanese/articles/cpeqj83798no>

●BBC News UK: MPs back smoking ban for those born after 2009(April, 2024) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-68824493>

●現代ビジネス 免疫学の権威が明かす長寿の秘訣!「ストレスフリーな“不良生活”が一番です」(March, 2016)

<https://gendai.media/articles/-/48280?imp=0>

Proposition

Stance: We should protect citizens' health with strict rules and a complete ban on cigarettes for the sake of both individuals and society.

3. Healthcare costs

(Claim)

-We should promote healthier lives and reduce healthcare costs.

(Reason)

-Healthcare costs affect not only individual smokers and the people around them. Reducing healthcare costs for the government is critical.

Banning smoking leads to a dramatic decrease in the number of potential lung cancer patients and government expenditure.

(Example)

-A study in Arizona (US) found that the cost of hospital admissions related to smoking-related illnesses decreased following the implementation of a statewide smoking ban.

Opposition

Stance: We should respect the rights of smokers while also protecting the environment and the health of society.

3. Black market

(Claim)

-Enforcement of a complete ban brings about worse situations.

(Reason)

-People would not be able to transition to a rational, non-addictive lifestyle. Moreover, excessively strict control requires more human resources and incurs higher costs.

(Example)

-During the Prohibition era in the 1920s in the US, the ban led to the expansion of the black market, which resulted in low quality products, loss of control, and severe alcohol addiction. Therefore, complete ban is quite difficult and make the situation worse.

This House would ban smoking completely.

Comments/Questions after debate.

(Questions)

Q. This may not be directly connected to the motion, but how should we e-cigarettes in the debate?

A. There are two things to consider:

- Firstly, you can analyse regular cigarettes and e-cigarettes – their differences and characteristics.
- Secondly, consider the new or different influences caused by e-cigarettes.

Example:

- E-cigarettes are handy and easy to smoke, even on the street.
 - > This may lead to illegal smoking (e.g. smoking while hiding) and illegal disposal (since e-cigarettes are small and easy to discard improperly)

Reference : ●BBC News Japan:サンフランシスコ、電子たばこの販売禁止へ 米国初 (June, 2019)

<https://www.bbc.com/japanese/48767763>

●BBC News: San Francisco becomes first US city to ban e-cigarettes (June, 2019)

<https://www.bbc.com/news/business-48752929>

Q. When we think about 'benefits and costs' in a debate; How can we develop an argument without showing numbers or Statistics?

A. Just presenting numbers does not automatically make your argument persuasive. You can try a few things instead:

1. (1) Describe the situation or structure using an illustration.

(2) Compare, for example:

- (a) The immediate impact or influences (now)
- (b) The long-term effects (whether the situation gets better or worse over time)

2. Identifying the 'target':

- WHO? (e.g. patients, total population)
- WHAT? (e.g. healthcare costs, budget impact)

3. Consider different viewpoints:

- For example, argue "for the sake of innocent people."
- If direct comparison is difficult, clarify and compare different 'stances' or 'value priorities.'

This House would ban smoking completely.

Comments/Questions after debate.

(Questions)

Q. I understand the example of effective use of generative AI for grammar checking. But using AI is not allowed during debate?

A. No. AI cannot be used during the debate round. However, you can use AI tools for researching or preparing before and after the round.

Q. No one would deny that cigarettes are bad, and the Government side takes advantage of that fact. When the Opposition faces a hard situation from the beginning, how should we deal with the position?

A. There are couple of things you can consider:

1. (1) Question or doubt the premise at the beginning.

(2) Introduce and compare other characters or actors (different perspectives).

2. In a debate, it is common for the Opposition to face a disadvantage early on.

-> Focus on arguments about freedom of choice or question why the Government has the authority to ban or restrict personal decisions.

- Emphasise "the priority of values in liberal democratic countries."

This House would ban smoking completely.

Reference – YouTube movies (Viewpoints)

BBC Learning English: Banning smoking for life: BBC News Review (April, 2024)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xQUGHztqbcS>

Sky News: UK: How would a smoking ban work? (September, 2023)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KoHO1yp3nK8>

CNA Insider: Should Smoking At Home Be Banned? (January, 2022)

SBS The Feed: Inside Australia's black market tobacco trade (November, 2024)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1OZ5PVUwJSA&t=388s>