

## Debate speech

You are the captain of the school debating team. Next week you will be attending the finals of the inter-school debating contest. The motion is "Democracy brings social disorder." Decide whether you are for or against the motion and write your debate speech.

Good morning everyone,

For a very long time, democracy has been cherished as a universal value of human society. Yet, recently, there is a heated debate on whether democracy brings social disorder. According to Oxford Advanced Dictionary, democracy means that people possess the right to monitor, exert influence on or participate in the operation of the government equally to avoid the abuse of power by rulers. In this sense, I strongly believe that today's motion mustn't stand.

First of all, some people supporting this motion argue that democracy brings social disorder by allowing people with dissenting views to voice their opinion freely and intensifying conflicts of ideas. They superficially believe that when people are allowed to present different views towards social issues or government policy in a democratic society, they'll easily disagree with each other and more conflicts will arise because differences in ideology, social belief or political philosophy become more apparent with a democratic and liberal atmosphere for discussion. In my opinion, this argument is utterly unfounded and resembles the excuse of why a dictator refuses to embrace democracy. In fact, democracy exactly prevents conflicts that arise due to differences in values among people. With democracy, people of different social, cultural and political backgrounds can channel their emotions and express their views more openly, which facilitates the policy-making of the government by taking different views into consideration and achieving a more balanced policy. As a result, democracy creates a liberal and open atmosphere for rational discussion among people and provides a legitimate means for people to voice different opinions by protecting their freedom of speech. This equality-based protection of diverse interests and views favours protection of pluralistic values and ensures social harmony. For instance, in Western countries like the U.S., since different people can have a say in social affair and the government can formulate policy that caters to the needs of different groups, they have a relatively stable society when compared to dictatorial regimes in the Middle East, where people cannot express their opinions freely and are angered by the dictatorship, thereby leading to more rebellions.

In addition, there are two more reasons proving that democracy brings social stability and harmony instead of social disorder.

Firstly, democracy enables policy that better defends public interest to be made, ensuring social stability through better safeguarding people's livelihood. Being able to monitor the government through voting in both president election and referendum, people can exert their influence on the economic and social policy launched by the government, making the government unable to manipulate national resources for selfish ends and personal gains easily. As a result, public interests are generally safeguarded and people's livelihood is more secure, helping maintain social stability. For instance, in democratic countries like the U.S. and European countries, the governments actually adopt more appropriate economic and social policy (e.g. capitalism that ensures higher productivity) and social measures (e.g. well-established social

security system). Furthermore, misbehaviours of government officials are limited as people can monitor their performance with their voting power. Thus, people can effectively prevent the abuse of power by rulers that harms national interest and become more capable of making the government protect their interest. Hence, is it justifiable to say that democracy worsens people's livelihood and triggers social disorder? The significantly lower crime rate and better social progress of democratic regimes when compared to the suppressive ones provide a crystal clear answer.

Secondly, democracy empowers people to monitor the government through peaceful means instead of violent means, reducing possible violence and social disorder. In a democratic society, voting, expressing opinions through different media and running for elections are common and effective practices to limit the power of the government. These are non-violent means while opinions can be expressed rationally through these ways. On the contrary, a lack of democracy deprives people of non-violent channels to vent their discontent towards the government due to suppression of the freedom of speech by dictators. So, how can people not resort to violence to express their boiling rage and end the governance of the dictator? The horrifying riots in the Middle East to fight against dictators are concrete and indisputable evidence showing a military rebellion against dictatorial rule caused by a lack of democracy can greatly undermine social order. Hence, we can see that the opposite of 'democracy brings social disorder' is true as democratic Western countries do not need such radical rebellions to limit the government's power.

To conclude, it's clear that democracy does not necessarily lead to social disorder. It actually works the other way round by protecting social stability through accommodation of diverse views, protection of public interest and provision of non-violent means to regulate the government's power. Hence, it's indisputable that today's motion must be defeated. Thank you.