第12回　全国高校生英語ディベート大会（埼玉県開催）

論題（暫定的定義）

The Debate Topic (Tentative Definitions) of

The 12th All Japan High School English Debate Tournament in Saitama

3 March 2017

HEnDA Chief Judge: Yoshiro Yano

Resolved: That Japan should significantly relax its immigration policies.

日本は，移民政策を大幅に緩和すべきである。是か否か。

NB: Please note that the wording of this topic is not the final version yet. We will be debating on “immigration”, but the topic wording and definitions may be modified later.

(This tentative definition is basically the same as the 2010 HEnDA topic definition, with the exception of “refugees”. See Definition 6) )

※　日本語の説明および，論題専攻の経過は，後にあります。

# Definitions

1. "Significantly":
Debaters should suppose that the relaxed immigration policy (supported by the Affirmative side) would approximately allow the total number of immigrants residing in Japan to exceed more than 10 million by the year 2067 (within 50 years). "Immigrants" in this sense, can either be naturalized citizens, permanent residents, or temporary residents who may go back to their homelands in a few years.
2. "relax its immigration policies":
The relaxed immigration policies should include the following four actions;
a) granting working visas to foreign unskilled workers;
b) making the immigration application and examination simpler and shorter;
c) necessary adjustments should be made to the immigration bureau of Japan to enable mass immigration;
d) Technical Intern Training Program (外国人研修制度) should be shut down.
3. It is up to the Affirmative side to add plan details concerning social welfare or education targeting the immigrant families. However the workability (effect) of those additional plans must be proven by the Affirmative side. (Plans’ economic or social costs can obviously be used to make Disadvantage issues.)
4. Restriction of immigration against criminals / terrorists should be kept as the present law provides. Affirmative side cannot add restrictions that will counteract toward "relaxing" the immigration policy, such as “obligating Japanese language tests to the immigrants”.
5. The Negative team will defend the present immigration policy that is valid in March, 2017 (when this topic is announced). This means that, even if the actual Japanese Government should announce a policy close to the Affirmative position before the tournament in December, the Negative side should support the present immigration policies as they were in March.
6. Issues concerning “refugees” should be excluded from the debates (“Refugees” would constitute a totally independent debate topic.). Debaters should assume that there is no difference between the Aff. and Neg. refugee policies.

# Notes on the Affirmative issues

1. Affirmative team does not have a burden to prove that “More than 10 million immigrants will surely come to Japan” as the Definition 1) supposes. However, they cannot propose a plan that will limit the immigrants to a smaller number, or argue an Advantage on the basis of such smaller number. As Definition 4) shows, for example, to limit the immigrants by the skills of Japanese language is an abusive restriction.
2. It is not allowed to present a plan that restricts the Definition 2) by limiting the immigrants by their native country or business. For example, “granting visas to workers only in the fields of agriculture, fishery, and nursing” is not allowed. (Obviously, Affirmative team is allowed to present an Advantage that such fields suffering from worker shortage will benefit as an *effect* of the grant of unskilled workers’ visas in general.)
3. Definition 2) states that working visas to unskilled workers should be granted. In such case, it is reasonable to assume that working visas are issued only when the unskilled worker already has job appointments from a certain employer at the time of entrance to Japan. Affirmative team can clarify this in their speech, and use this to refute such Disadvantages arguing “There will be no jobs for the immigrants in Japan.” (However, such visa is effective only at the initial point of immigration. Negative can still argue Disadvantages such as “Immigrants’ bad working conditions”, “Unemployment of Japanese unskilled workers”, or “Increase of illegal residents in time of recession.”)
4. It is allowed to present plans on Japanese education, administration, and welfare concerning the immigrants, as stated in Definition 3). However, it is not allowed to present plans that provide education or welfare only to certain immigrants with certain jobs. It goes without saying that, the Affirmative team has the burden to prove that such education or welfare plan is effective. (Also, the cost of such plan can be arguable as Disadvantages)

# Notes on the Negative issues

1. In this tournament, the Negative side should not argue or attack on whether “10 million immigrants will come to Japan” or not. The Neg. side should grant this assumption and focus on what will happen if they came.
2. The Negative side cannot propose an alternative (counter) plan that changes the present situation. For example, it is not allowed to propose a plan to increase birthrate, or to promote employment of women and senior workers. (Needless to say, it is allowed, to argue a Disadvantage that the efforts to “cope with the declining birthrate” or to “promote employment of women and senior workers” may be harmed by the *effect* of accepting the immigrants.)
3. Please be careful to avoid arguments or expressions that are stereotypical or discriminative, when arguing like “Accepting immigrants harms social security”. Obviously it is simply stereotypical or biased to say that “foreigners (in general) are criminals” or some certain “religion (or country) is connected to terrorism.” (This warning obviously applies to the Affirmative team, too.)

# 論題の定義

1. 「大幅」とは，日本に滞在する移民の総数が，2067年までに（50年間で）大体1000万人を越えるような政策をとると想定して議論することを指します。この定義での「移民」とは，海外で生まれ日本に帰化した市民，永住者，あるいは何年か母国に帰る在住者を含むことにします
2. 「移民政策を緩和する」際には，次の４つのアクションが含まれるものとします。
a) 海外の単純労働者にも労働ビザを発給する
b) 入国手続きや審査を簡素化し，審査期間も短縮する
c) 多くの移民の受け入れのため入国管理局の体制を適宜，整備する
d) 外国人研修制度は廃止する
3. 肯定側は，移民の社会福祉や教育について，プランの詳細を付け足すことができます。もっとも，こうしたプランの詳細がどこまで機能するか（プランの効果）については肯定側が証明する必要があります（当然のことながら，プランの経済的・社会的コストは，弊害になりえます）。
4. 犯罪者やテロリストの入国を防止する現状の移民制限は，そのまま継続することにします。肯定側は，移民政策の緩和に逆行するような入国制限などを付加すること，たとえば「入国者に日本語能力検定を課す」ことは許されません。
5. 否定側は，（この論題の発表の時点である）2017年6月に通用している，日本の移民政策を継続することを支持して論じることにします。つまり，仮に実際の日本政府が肯定側に近い政策をとることを12月の大会前に発表したとしても，6月の時点での移民政策を支持して論じることにします。
6. 「難民」についての議論は，この移民ディベートでは行わないことにします（「難民」政策は，それ自体で完全に独立したディベート論題になりえます）。難民政策については，肯定／否定でまったく政策の差がないものと前提して下さい。

# 肯定側への注意点

1. 肯定側には，定義1)にある想定に従い「移民が1000万人以上確実にやってくる」ことを証明する責任まではありません。が，移民を少数にしぼるようなプランやAdvantageを述べることも許されません。定義4)にあるように，例えば入国時に日本語能力で制限を加えるようなプランは，不当な制限となります。
2. 定義2)を制限して，特定の業種・国からだけ移民を増やすようなプランを付け加えることは許されません。たとえば「農業・漁業・看護の人材に限り移民を解禁する」ということは許されません（プランで単純労働者が認められた結果として，そうした人材不足業界の問題が解決されるというAdvantageを論じることは許されます）。
3. 定義2)では，現在専門職以外に制限されている労働ビザを，単純労働にも解禁すべきことが述べられています。単純労働の場合でも，勤め先が決まっていない限り，労働ビザが発給されないというのは現実的な想定です。肯定側は，これを反論として利用して「移民は，日本にやって来ても仕事がないので，失業者となる」というたぐいのDisadvantageに反論することも許されます（もっとも労働ビザについてのプランは，単に入国時についてだけあてはまるので，「移民の劣悪な労働環境」とか，「日本人単純労働者の失業」とか，「不況時の不法滞在者化」などのDisadvantageを述べるのは可能です）
4. 定義3)に従い，移民向けの日本語教育・行政・福祉のプランを述べるのは許されます。が，特定の移民や業種だけにしぼった教育や福祉などは違反となります。もちろんプランに実際に効果があるかは，肯定側に証明責任があります（そのコストはDisadvantageになりえます）。

# 否定側への注意点

1. この論題では，否定側は「日本に移民が1000万人がくるかどうか」について反論してはなりません。否定側は，それを話の前提にして，来たとしたら良いか悪いかだけを議論して下さい。
2. 否定側は，現状を変える代案（counter plan）を述べることは禁止されています。「少子化対策」や，「女性・高齢者の雇用振興」などのプランを論じることは禁止されます（移民を受け入れた結果として，つまりDisadvantageとして少子化対策や女性・高齢者の雇用が損なわれたりすると議論することは許されます）。
3. 否定側の議論で，たとえば「移民社会では治安が悪化する」などと議論する場合，くれぐれも外国人全般が犯罪者であるとか，特定の宗教信者(や特定の地域出身者)がテロリストであるとか，偏見やステレオタイプに基づいた議論や表現がないよう議論をして下さい（これはもちろん肯定側についてもいえます）。

# HOW THIS TOPIC WAS CHOSEN

# 論題選定の経緯

 The HEnDA committee selected four potential topic areas from your suggestions in mid-February, and called for public opinion poll whether you approve each potential topics. The result of the poll was: (Total number of votes N = 46)

(1) Immigration: 29 votes

Japan should significantly relax its immigration policies.

日本は，移民政策を大幅に緩和すべきであるか，否か。

(2) Active euthanasia: 27 votes

Active euthanasia ("sekkyokuteki anrakushi") should be legalized in Japan.

積極的安楽死を日本でも合法化すべきである。

(3) Japan-U.S. Security Treaty: 20 votes

Japan should terminate the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

日本国は，日米安全保障条約を終結させるべきである。

(4) Driving age limit: 24 votes

The Japanese Government should set a (maximum) age limit for driving.

日本国政府は，自動車運転に（最高）年齢制限を設けるべきである。

As the “Immigration” topic was the most approved topic of the four, the Committee selected it as the 12th national topic. Thank you all for the wonderful and inspiring suggestions and very useful comments!