

Before I move on and explained my decision on this debate, I'd like to give my general comments. First of all, I don't think this is a good debate. Until the end of the debate I was left with no understanding on how this facebook works. Some explanation regarding that point conflicting with each other, making me confused on what can you actually do to another account on facebook. Some arguments also have not been developed enough even when it's actually potential, the engagement to important points brought by your opponent also has been lacking. I think this debate can actually went better than this.

As for the decision of the debate, I give the first place to closing opposition, second to opening opposition, third to opening government and fourth to closing government. First of all, why did closing government got fourth and unable to get higher position? I see that closing government has tried to give distinct argument with their opening by explaining about how untrustworthy the information in facebook is especially when there is only a few experts there. However, I can't understand how unfriending people can lead people to go trusty news outlet. I also don't see why they claim that only proffessor and people with scientific background can differentiate false post or not, especially when opening has characterized that it's baseless story that was posted and hate speech. Their argument about why advicing and commenting said post due to the nature of fanatic people is good, that answers opposition's argument about how advicing is better than unfriending and something opening has never explained. They also brought the argument that high frequence of information could lead people to believe that information even when it's false. Still, that argument is a little bit underdeveloped and being explained late in whip.

Opening Government is also lacking in role fulfillment, their lack of explanation on option people have in facebook led to ambiguous discussion about function of blocking, reporting and others later in the debate. Their arguments are also problematic like closing government, their argument about avoiding black campaign somehow not in line with their characteristic of black campaign which is baseless, mocking and has no valid supporting fact. That led me to question, If before they regarded that as offensive and wrong, how could they believe said information later? What I think is good from opening government is their argument about showing stance on ethical value by unfriending is clear and I can understand that point well. Ultimately in the end I think opening government is slightly better in terms of their contribution on the debate. Both team's responses to tho opposition case is lacking, opening government didn't do a good response to the case of social consequence of unfriending people and closing government doesn't engage to the closing opposition case as well which I think is their important job in the debate. However, I value opening's argument better because of how understandable it is and I can't value closing's argument better than opening because the ones that are understandable came late and still simplistic.

Now why Opening Government got third and Opening Opposition got second? Both of the team has problems of setting up this debate. While I have told that Opening Government didn't do a really good job explaining status quo, I believe it's also Opening Opposition duty to clarify if there's something they saw unfit in set up. I give the winning to Opening Opposition because their counter proposal of suggesting people who posted offensive views on facebook. Their argument about keeping the relationship especially if the people are families and how suggesting will also help those people stop spreading offensive views is more persuasive than opening government's proposal who just want to

make stance and claimed to be one step closer in norms of ethic. The benefit from the opening opposition is more tangible for me therefore they are in second.

Lastly is Closing Government, I believe they deserved to get 1st because they successfully expand the perspective of this motion into broader view. I believe their idea of how debating and discussing about opposing ideas is actually natural and made a good practice of democracy is good, that decreases the persuasiveness of how offensive views are really bad from government. What I also like from the closing opposition is their further explanation about maintaining social life by giving second chance to people who might be somehow irrational in short period of time. While the idea is the same with opening opposition, their explanation about isolated case and how unfriending closed the chance for people to make amend is exclusive and I credited them for that. They also make explanation about how offensive or not is subjective and baseless doesn't mean it's false but I can't see the relevance of those arguments in this debate, maybe further explanation will make me able to understand what point they wanted to refute or to support in this motion. In the end, I believe closing government deserved better position than opening opposition because they offer an exclusive broader analysis in this motion. Thank you for reading my adjudication.