**Online Debate Resolutions**

Below you will find the 4 proposed resolutions. The text of the resolution is in bold. Incidentally, a resolution is merely a statement— like a thesis statement. You may choose to argue any one of these resolutions, or, all of them. However, only one will be evaluated. If you choose to argue more than one, you must let the evaluator know which one should be judged. You may reach the evaluator at kbankston@newmanacademy.org or contact him directly through Google Classroom. You may not argue any other resolutions—only these resolutions will be considered.

Please remember, when you make your video and upload it, you must begin by stating your first name, your last name, your campus affiliation, your grade level, (in this past year) and lastly, whether you will be taking the affirmative or the negative position. Here’s an example: “John Smith, NICH, 9th grade, I will be taking the affirmative position.”

After you have introduced yourself in this way, you will begin your argument. You will begin by stating, “Resolve”. Then you will state the resolution you are arguing. All resolutions below are stated in the affirmative. For example, the following resolution is stated in the affirmative: “The historic figure, Jesus of Nazareth, as referenced in the New Testament of the Bible, did in fact, rise from the dead.” If you wanted to argue the negation of this resolution, you would say, “The historic figure, Jesus of Nazareth, as referenced in the *New Testament* of the *Bible*, did in fact, **not** rise from the dead.

Lastly, before creating your video, please read the document titled “Debate Basics” (a link to this document may be found under this or these videos on debate. Not following the RES format elucidated therein, will result in your elimination from the competition. And further, learning the format will not only help you in this endeavor, but it will also help you to formulate persuasive papers, essays, and speeches from now on.

* **During a life-threatening crisis, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, the proper role of the US government, under the Constitution, is to protect the lives of some of her citizens— even if in the process it usurps the Constitutional rights of those same US citizens.** You should address the proper role of government, as well as the nature of the relationship between rights and morality. For example, if you have a right to life, that is inalienable, I then have a moral obligation not to kill you, and probably even to protect your life, even when it endangers my own. What then would be the responsibility of government?
* **Human beings possess certain rights which are inalienable [cannot legitimately taken from them without due justification] specifically because these rights are endowed to humanity by our Creator— who created us in His image.** Regardless of whether you argue in the affirmative or the negative, you must reference “The Declaration of Independence” (second paragraph) and you may reference the Bible (Gen 1:26-30 would be appropriate) given this was the intellectual context of those who wrote *The Declaration*. If you choose the negation side of this argument, you may argue either that, humans have no inalienable rights, or, that though they do, these rights need not be grounded in God. Regardless of the position you take, you must address the relationship between rights and morality. For example, if you have a right to life, that is inalienable, I then have a moral obligation not to kill you, and probably even to protect your life. And if I am obligated, regardless of my opinions or preferences, to whom am I obligated and why?
* **The historic figure, Jesus of Nazareth, as referenced in the *New Testament* of the *Bible*, did in fact, rise from the dead.** Regardless of whether you choose the affirmative or negative side of this argument, you must cite from the *New Testament* of the *Bible*. You should reference experts on this claim. Some experts who are skeptical are: Bart Ehrman, Richard Carrier and Robert M Price. Some experts who affirm the resurrection are: William Lane Craig, Gary Habermas, Lee Strobel and Josh McDowell.
* **During a period of crisis, such as the Covid-19 pandemic, capitalizing on the demand of critical items such as protective masks by radically increasing the price, is a perfect example of a properly functioning capitalistic, free market society.** If you argue that this is not a perfect example of free market capitalism, you must show *why* it is not, and what a perfect free market capitalistic society would have done better. If you argue that this *is* a perfect example of free market capitalism, you must argue why it is good or bad and what alternative would be worse or better. In either case, regardless of whether you take the affirmative or the negative, you must address the distinction between greed/selfishness and self-interest. I recommend listening to this podcast (starting at 14:00) which discusses free market capitalism, greed and socialism from a Christian point of view: <https://www.str.org/w/interview-jay-richards-money-greed-and-god>