

THBT energy security is a legitimate reason for war

By Charlie Sanjaya

Date : 23 November 2014
Participants : Yos Rizal (PM) Fitriana P (LO)
 Olivia M (DPM) M.Anwari (DLO)
 Yos Rizal (MG) Fitriana P (MO)
 Olivia M (GW) M. Anwari (OW)

Debaters, I have to admit that the debate was an interesting debate where I could spot interesting arguments which were backed up with deep analysis and also strong responses from one to another. However there were also several instances where there were lack of role fulfillment coming from several teams, hung cases, and lack of comparison in responding to other teams' arguments. Therefore I can only categorize this debate as an average to below average debate.

As for the result, I believe this debate ended up as an opening debate with the first rank went to the opening government, second to opening opposition, third to closing opposition and last to the closing government.

First, what makes the opening government ranked higher than the opening opposition? The role fulfillment of setting up the debate, opening government was good, the analysis of how the problem would arise and the interest of the actors involved there, like the interest of countries facing energy crisis and also the condition in which International Court could exclude the war of energy as war crime is explained clearly and I could understand what is it that they want to do and why they want to do it. In the end, I think the stance opening opposition want to assume was also clear, however it was not done as good as the opening government. There are cases of hung case that made some important analysis like the idea of cooperation UN has to uphold and also conscription which would eventually make civilian as victim in a long war were established in the later speaker. So I have to admit that the set up was more problematic in opening opposition.

Another reason is that the response coming from government was also better than the opening opposition. If I compare the response opening government could deliver with what opening opposition gave, I believe OG has a more effective response than OO. OO's response to OG's mechanism is that civilian would be involved with guirella and war kills soldier so there's human right violation too. This response was lacking the analysis of the situation of country encountering crisis and also different characterization of military personnel and civilian which has been pointed out by OG's deputy null the effect of said responses. I also recognize how OO established an analysis of how UN should not legitimize a war that came from inability of a country to manage itself and also how legitimizing energy to start a war will not promote cooperation. However that responses were not able to be responded by OG so I couldn't put that into a consideration to compare OG and OO.

Now what makes OO able to triumph over all closing teams? If I compare OO with CG which has a role to rebutt the arguments from OO, I think it's pretty clear that their rebuttal was not enough to topple down OO's argument. I believe the response by answering that a reason to opt out and that start a war is more sustainable is not enough to answer the argument that in the end there would be an all out war to defend resource especially in the face of the energy scarcity. A response saying that UN has a value of sustainability is also hard to be accepted without comparation with the analysis

from OO that war in the end is not sustainable and a development of alternative energy would be hampered with legitimization of war for energy. With this analysis, I believe OO should be placed higher than CG. OO is above CO mainly because their role fulfillment is better, there might be problem of hung cases in OO, but CO is worse because I don't see any extension, which is one vital role from CO, to be presented at the debate, so compared with OO who at least offered the value of UN they want to uphold and strong rebuttal of effectivity from OG's mechanism, CO should be placed lower than OO.

Lastly is the reason why CO is better than CG. Both team has their share of strong and weak point if we compare both of them head to head. CO was bad at fulfilling their role to extend the case, while CG has their own extension by analyzing the image countries have to maintain. However, CO was superior in concluding the debate than CG. It was definitely a close margin they have here but I believe CO should be credited more for their accomplishment to conclude this debate. Their analysis about the bad situation for either winning or losing countries were spot on and decrease the merit of CG extension. What makes them also superior in concluding the debate was because they also complement an analysis of UN itself as the actor who made the policy with deeper analysis of how this proposal would promote bullying, I feel this is something important that's missing from CG considering the dynamic of the debate at this point. So I decided that despite its problem with role fulfillment, CO deserved to be placed higher than CG.

That's all from me, if you feel there's something missing or could be improved from my adjudication, by all means I'll look forward to hear your feedback. Thanks for reading!