

REGARDLESS THE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF US GOVERNMENT TOWARD GAY MARRIAGE AND STRAIGHT MARRIAGE, THUS AS A STRAIGHT OR GAY COUPLE, THW STILL PREFER COHABITATION PRACTICE TO MARRIAGE INSTITUTION

1ST AFFIRMATIVE

CONTEXTUALIZATION

When it comes to marriage, the things that may cross in our mind is about commitment and love. It's when a couple decides to take step further in their life to make their relationship become more legitimate through an institution called marriage. Basically, it's called an institution since its right, obligation, privileges and anything are regulated by the states. But, is the concept of marriage timeless? Then why in the end of day more people end up cohabiting instead of marrying their loved one.

Due to the principle, we see the problem starts to appear in marriage institution. The problem appears since marriage is "an arrangement" that deeply rooted in religion and most of it steps in patriarchy which suppress the freedom, especially woman, by sticking the paradigm that the division of husband-wife concept that the husband tend to work outside the house and the woman tend to take care of household. So does with gay couple. Even they have to work so hard to make Love Wins happen. It shows us marriages nowadays are only a gate to make a family or living under the same roof becomes legitimate.

Government has done their effort in the status quo to provide rights and privilege for married couple, but there are several things that government can't afford for instance personal development and clash of religion background which society nowadays gradually become more secular.

By preferring, this debate will show you why cohabitation is more favorable nowadays instead of marriage.

TEAM SPLIT

There are two substantive I'll show you;

1. How the idea of marriage institution is outdated
2. How cohabitation is in line with the idea of mobility and secularism that society has especially in U.S.A

ARGUMENT

1. How the idea of marriage is outdated

I will clarify once again that the scenario that likely happen in U.S.A. Due to this clarification, we believe that the standard of self-actualization as well as pursuing the happiness is various. There's a reason why liberalism fits best in U.S.A because their highest level of happiness comes in the individual freedom. When in another countries, the level of happiness can be associated with how this people can afford themselves with expensive goods and such, in here, the case is different since we acknowledge people income and spending are better in USA. The relation of this case to marriage is people freedom is somehow restricted by the regulation that attached in marriage institution. There's a reason why 'unhappy marriage' happens because there's individual interest that can't be actualized. It happens because you are already a part of this institution and there's regulation that you should obey. Thus, individual freedom will be real if people are allowed to experience chances in their life without any interference from the government about how to run their personal life. This point will be expanded in my second point.

2. How cohabitation is in line with the idea of mobility and secularism that society has especially in U.S.A.

1st layer)why cohabitation is inline with the idea of mobility or freedom of movement and personal development.

Cohabitation normatively can be said as living together without any legitimate arrangement like marriage does. Cohabitation, as marriage as well, is formed under the name of commitment. By cohabitation, people no longer are afraid about how their rights of loving someone is being regulated by government. It's about the choice how people make their living with their loved one. There's always various and personal reason why people prefer cohabit. In U.S.A., mobility is one of the main component of society living. It demands the dynamics of individuals to keep moving and commute in order to make their own earnings. Cohabitation eases the way this mobility without distancing your loved ones. For instance, many women choose to postpone or even to not marry because they are afraid of the risk of losing their own career. The development of career of course contribute to the self-development or satisfactory to afford themselves independently. They are afraid of strong presence of patriarchy that even also exist in USA, that they are tied to husband's control which keeps them in household matters. This patriarchy won't be happened in cohabitation as in this bond, both of partner shares their responsibility based their own choice upon the most comfortable way they

desire. Probably, the opposite may stand upon the responsibility will be weaker especially in the terms of taking care of children. The problem of weaker responsibility does not lie in the term of legitimacy but upon how you can build the strong commitment and plan to have children in advance with your partner. Undeniably, the increasing sex trend followed by safe-sex promotion and advanced sex education is the proof that sex is actually starting to be accepted casually by society without bothering to get married in order to get the consent.

2nd layer) Why cohabitation is more inline with the value of secularism.

Another reason why cohabitation is preferable is the raising of secularism. People tend to separate personal matters with religion and culture. This is the comfort of marriage missed. While marriage weighs everything in religion and culture, cohabit frees the couple to live together without being afraid of religion and cultural differences. We can't deny there are so many restrictions when the marriage sticks to religion and cultural differences. It's also the cause why people can't marry just because their religion is different, or can't bear with the long-tradition of marriage.

CLOSING

The right to choose should be advanced in the term of being selective upon what culture and religion we will drop or not.

1ST OPPOSITION

OPENING

The job of govt in regulating marriage is as simple as giving acknowledgment, legal protect, and facilitate it. Govt and marriage have nothing to do with the daily life of the couples, how they share the burden of jobs, taking care of children, what faith you believe in, etc. They are given to the couples to regulate by themselves. therefore all the harms affirmative brought to the table is nonexistent.

REBUTTAL

1st) Mobility of freedom is not the parameter of the debate.

If we look back to the characteristics of usa that affirmative delivered, it's secularism, uphold personal choice. Therefore it's up to the couples after they marry which style they like it, either it's old school, which man works and woman stays at home or the modern one which all of them can go pursuing their career. And government always respect the choices. Even if you are married, woman can still be career woman, and the burden of children can be shared equally as long as it's agreed by the couples. Even now we see the growing trend of house-husband and paternity leave which man also has to take day off to take care of the children. Marriage is just a regulation and symbols of commitment, whatever inside it, it's dinamic, adaptable to the modern social construct.

Cohabitation does not solve patriarchy either, as long as the couples still believe in old school relationship style, what can we do? The expectation of man to work and woman to stay is still the same. Remembering patriarchy can only be there if both wife and husband agree, if not, they can always have exit mechanism.

Therefore the best way we can do is empowering social engineering, promoting paternity leave, more equal jobs in parenthood, etc and all those solutions have nothing to do with religion

2nd) It's funny that all examples of affirmative's secularism is irrelevant with the condition in USA.

In usa you can have inter faith marriage and don't have to follow long term tradition if you don't like it either, which affirmative also never explained. Anyway, there are two type of individuals. 1st, want personal to be integrated with religion. It's a just cause, because your identity is unseparated with your religion, they are your identity, you get your own self-actualization when able to enjoy religious freedom. Being muslim is also my identity you don't want to hide. It's different why government has to be secular, because it represents many identify and you can't give one identify for all. Even though there's people who want it to be separated, you still can go with marriage, it doesn't violate your identity as well

ARGUMENT

1st) Inherently marriage is beneficial

If we characterize people who wants to marry, are people who has dated for quite long time. They do have commitment. But they don't feel, if the commitment is enough. Should they get married?

A. Yes, because what makes different between marriage and other form of relationship, is that marriage is the highest. It's united by god and it has long term commitment. In dating and cohabitation, you can easy come and go, break up, cheat, etc. But in this marriage, you will face legal consequences, losing your money in court, etc. But also social consequences that condemn you if you're unfaithful. It's actually very good, because it shows how deep your commitment is, and it can only be manifested in marriage.

B. Yes, it gives the feeling of security. You can trust your couple more, not only in personal attachment, but you know government protects you if you're violated and court can deter the unfaithful partner. And love can only grow if you're already secure, that's the moment when you can and want to give everything to your loved ones (kiss)

C. Marriage has room for improvement, you can ask your partner to be more liberal, to take care of children, etc. It's free, dinamic, also as rebuttal to affimative's first case.

2nd) The harm

Without marriage, it harms weaker actor. Let's say the wife who don't work. If one day in cohabitation the wife is left by, she gets no money, she doesn't work. In marriage, if one day shit happens, court will share the money equally, the one who works have to give several money every months until she can be fine. The harm in cohabitation is that, the weaker actor doesn't have exit mechanism, if she breaks up, she has no social protection, and at the worst, she has to obey the guy, she needs money. Even in unfair or abused relationship. It also harms the chidren who get no social and money protection if one day, the guy is unfaithful.

CLOSING

Marriage is a serious business, but that what makes it beautiful.

2ND AFFIRMATIVE

Opening

Independency to manage your own love relationship without any interference from the other third party is how a love relationship works, which we see absent under the system of marriage institution. Thus we still strongly propose cohabitation rather than marriage.

Rebuttal

Before i analyze that further. Let's see first the opposition argument.

1st Rebuttal) they believe if marriage brings more benefit.

We say no. All those benefits may be true, but it's not what people are seeking for. You will never know really why your husband is not cheating, because there is a system that "punishes" you husband if you do. There will be anxiety in your relationship no matter how you love your spouse, because you are unsure how your spouse really feels even though you never fight. People want certainty and comfort which can only come from our proposal which is based sololey on commitment. When he/she stays that means he/she really wants to be with you. If not they'd leave. Because they're not binded with some stupid law. Love is enough.

2nd Rebuttal)

They believe if cohabitation brings harm.

We say No. The harm will not be there because when they first made a commitment it's in order to keep each other. They have agreements towards each other and consent in their commited relationship on how they are going to live later on. But if shit happens it'll be for greater good. Rather than be with someone unfaithful and not commited. It would be better to break up, since the actors were already aware of the risks. We regret it may have hurt to be betrayed, but it'll be a good opportunitiy to find someone who deserves you.

Argument

Welcome to my argument:

1. Lets compare the Future Impact in coalhabitation and marriage.

In a cohabit relationship, you are able to enter and exit in the name of commitment. There will be no law to bind you and your partner. But here's the beauty of a cohabit relationship. A commitment won't just appear when you say "I commit". But when you prove yourself to your partner that you are commited. In a cohabit relationship, you learn the

true meaning of commitment since you are not "forced" to stay committed by the law. As time goes by, the commitment will eventually grow stronger, because of the time, energy, affection, invested towards your partner. This is what people seek in a relationship, even though you are not legally bound by the state. When you fight with each other, your bonds can become even stronger because there's a will to keep your partner. You show it in your actions and not take it for granted because you are legally binding your partner. You grow to be more better to keep your partner. But even if at the end one of the parties become uncommitted and leave, it's okay. Because a relationship with no commitment will only hurt each other more. It'll actually open paths to find someone new, learn from past mistakes, and learn how to commit. Commitment can't be forced, because it comes from your heart.

2. Now lets analyze and compare the Sustainability between these two model of love relationship.

People crave to find their other half. Their missing soul. Their beloved someone. In a cohabit relationship, it will allow individuals to find exactly who they are looking for. When you feel your relationship is not right, you can leave. It's better than being trapped in a wrong relationship, right? As opposition said, before marriage you usually date for a long time, but dating and living together are different matters. During a dating relationship, your partner can be very understanding, sweet, and of course loveable.

But when you marry, it'll be completely different. There are 2 reasons:

1. It's how they usually are.
2. They don't have any motivation to 'keep' you because your legally his/her partner.

If we compare it to a cohabit relationship, you can know exactly how your partner is by living together and how he/she treats you. If how he treats you is not acceptable, than you can leave.

Why won't divorce work anyway?

1. It's too complicated, there are so many procedures that they have to do. They have to fill several requirements and papers disinsentifying people who want to divorce. Furthermore, always divorcing after marriage because of the same reason (spouse not treating you well like dating, etc.) won't be good because it will ruin your image which is bad for building a new relationship.
2. It's in the judges decision to grant your divorce. Your partner can also appeal to keep you. Judges will decide based on rational calculations, when your problem isn't rational since love isnt' rational to begin with.

CLOSING

That's why to have a sustainable relationship, cohabit is the answer to find the one.

2ND OPPOSITION

OPENING

A concept that's being the main concern in this debate is about commitment; while the gov team believe that commitment is best established when it comes from the individuals, we neg team believe that commitment is still best established when it's being regulated by the marriage institution.

REBUTTAL

Here's the reasons why;

1. Commitment comes from the individuals without further acknowledgement from the third party is somehow tend to misuse. When couple already decided their preferences in things they may not know that in the future it will benefit them or even the other way around. Even worse, what if the consent that has been agreed upon together are somehow being betrayed by one? In cohabitation you may have rules, have agreements, but if one decides to leave, one decides not to love you anymore, who can guarantee that this agreement still works? After all it doesnt matter, only marriage can guarantee evenly distribution of rights even when the couple dont love each other anymore. The third party here which is the marriage constitution is there to evenly distribute the right and the obligation. So if somehow shit happens, the law is there to support anyone's in lost.
2. Most of the times we don't know the importance of law until we actually in the position whose right has been being violated or violating other people's right. Law exists to bring justice, and it happens in marriage as well.
3. Affirmative said that people want certainty and comfort, which we also agree. While cohabitation gives you certainty and comfort of what's happening now, marriage can give you certainty and comfort of what lies ahead in the future.

Cohabitation gives us room as if we're on a mere relationship, yet it gives us risk so much higher than that. When we're in a mere relationship and we decide to break up, the loss might be only on the matter of money we spent on each other, the feeling we invested on each other. But when we're in cohabitation and one decides to leave, the loss is so much higher than that, because we've been living under the same roof together. We've been sharing everything in our daily life for some period of time.

ARGUMENT

1. Future Impact

Affirmative said that in a cohabit relationship, you are able to enter and exit in the name of commitment, there will be no law to bind you and your partner. But see, commitment is not what you just say and tell to your partner. Commitment is something you also show to the world. And being in marriage can show that you're willing to commit more, not showing that you're 'forced' to commit.

2. Sustainability

People crave to find their other half. Their missing soul. Their beloved someone. In a cohabit relationship, it will allow individuals to find exactly who they are looking for. When you feel your relationship is not right, you can leave. The exit mechanism is explained way too simple that it backlashes the nature of commitment given in the very first place by the gov team. We all know that marriage and divorce is a very serious matter, we all believe that deciding to divorce and standing up in a legal court is a difficult matter. But that's exactly how commitment is not something to play with. When you decided to commit to someone you can't just leave when things go wrong. When you declared that you commit with someone you can't just leave to find someone better. Marriage prevents such things. Marriage is there as a proof of your commitment. So that when you decided to commit, you already know what will you give and get. Marriage helps you to fight harder and try to always be better for your spouse. Of course, after things are not getting better, the court is always there to help you both.

CLOSING

Marriage shows us that love is not something to play with. That love is something worth fighting for. That in order to make your beloved one happy (and of course the act of it makes youu yourself happy), you, together, should have good cooperation and understanding of each other.

That's why to have a sustainable relationship, marriage is the answer to find the one.

3RD AFFIRMATIVE

OPENING

True love is what we are all looking for. And the criteria of true love is only fulfilled when;

1st) you don't need the acknowledgement of third party to ensuring yourself that your relationship is actually love relationship.

2nd) the way how you manage your love live even the way how you manage the separation is not generalized by third party.

And 3rd) when you are not forced to stay in a relationship just under the paradigm that this boundary called marriage is a sacred one that should be preserved no matter how incompatible your relation with your spouses.

We see that all those criteria are better fulfilled under cohabitation practice. And we still strongly believe that marriage is too conservative to flexibly adjust with the real dynamic of a relationship.

CLASHES TEAM SPLIT

There are three major clashes of argument that I captured in this debate;

1st) whether or not cohabitation has more justification than marriage to be more preferred by either straight or gay in US.

2nd) which model of proposal that would be effective to provide more significant positive future implication toward the development of love relationship.

3rd) whether or not cohabitation creates more sustainable love relationship if being compared to marriage.

REBUTTAL

But before that. There are several rebuttal for opposition bench;

1st) They believe if our problems such as how marriage can hinder individual personal development and how cultural or religious value can also be hinderance when someone engaged themselves under the insitution of marriage do not even exist.

This is where opposition failed to characterize the mechanism of marriage institution itself. Marriage itself is not just a traditional practice that binds 2 different individuals, but also 2 different families with two different background culture, perspective, and sometimes religions. Our first speaker never said if culture nor religion differences in marriage insitution in US is forbid, this is where opposition bench once again failed to capture the essence of our first speaker's argument. The essence of our first speaker's argument was that this cultural and religion difference in US even if not forbid by gov and society system, but most of the time appears as major obstacle that can make this couple unable to step further into marriage institution, or even if this couple has already been bound in this marriage institution but very often this couple decided to divorce just because the difference of culture or religion between these two families is too severe to be united. This where we see how opposition failed to explain why under the this marriage mechanism whose purpose is to unite two families then they can over confidently claimed if marriage institution bears more sustainability if compared to cohabitation where the decision to live together is independently decided by the couple without have to listen to third party like family especially if one side of the family or even both often have traditional mind set over household chores division between husband and wife under their patriachy paradigm that limit the freedom of the couple to develop their self without have to be limited by traditional value of marriage. Even if under the culture of secularism but we can't denied that society who lives in US has so many cultural diversity since they come from many other nations outside of US thus cultural and religious clash especially between families from different cultural and religious background still often happens in the marriage institution which make this institution to be not that sustainable compared to cohabitation that I 'm going to further explain in my clash analysis.

2nd) Opposition claimed that marriage institution offers more future insurance toward weaker stake holder if shit hits the fan.

We do acknowledge that this system exist in the status quo yet the problem is the after divorce system is generalized by government as if every couple's problem and situation is the same. Even if the court decision is set based on every couple situation yet tsince the decision, the enforcement regulation, and the punishment that is attached on this divorce system regulation is all based on government law then whether or not the couple want it they have to obey the law or at least choose the available option given by government that sometimes not compatible with their value or perspective but they have no choice to choose those option because it is the law,it is not an free option if the option is not compatible with their value.

CLASH ANALYSIS

Welcome to my clash analysis.

1st) Whether or cohabitation is more justifiable than marriage.

Love relationship, to begin with, is meant to accomodate and facilitate the couple's value. In which when we are talking about the nature of this couple's value, it is a set of comfort zone standard that they made to be compatible to each other, and to meet this middle way agreement is not easy. Thus the interference of families' value moreover government's value will only create disturbance ripples toward comfort zone standard that this couple, uneasily, has already consented that makes the sustainability of this couple relation is at stake.

What affirmative team wants is simple. We just want this couple to manage and decide their own relationship system independently. Condemning that this couple is unable to do so is just the same like lowering and undermining their maturity to think and make decision that is compatible with their value and comfort zone standard.

2nd) Whether or nor cohabitation is more effective to create significant positive future implication toward the development of love relationship.

We said yes. Because under the system of cohabitation you will have more motivation to preserve the quality of your love to each other in which every night will feel like the first nite, every day will feel like dating for the first time. You will

cherish every moment, especially when you are awake, you are there next to your spouse every morning because you know that you are there, and he/she is there, is only for you, and not for government nor for your family. Even if your family or your friend or even the whole world doesn't like your spouses but you chose to stay there for her and give her the real meaning of love. That is how we see the maturity of cohabitation practioners to manage and decide their own relationship system shall create significant positive development toward their love relationship.

3rd) whether or not cohabitation is more sustainable.

Opposition said if marriage is the highest manifestation of love. But we say that the main ingredient of sustainable relationship is where your love is still there even if there is no one, no nousy third party to tell you what to do and acknowledge you so that you will feel that your relationship is indeed a love relationship. Cohabitation practioner doesn't need all of those things to make them believe if their relationship is a love relationship. The maturity and the quality of love in cohabitation is highly tested in daily basis, unlike the quality of love in marriage institution that is mostly degrading over time and couple in marriage institution tend to take their relationship by granted and tend to still try to stay in marriage institution even if there is no more compatibility between them, leading only to a fake love relationship, unlike in cohabitation. More over even if married couple decides to divorce, the divorce system itself is interfened by gov. This will only, one more time, undermine the maturity and the intellectual capacity of the couple to manage and decide their own separation system. Condemning that without gov's rule then this cohabitation couple will abuse the other stake holder during process of separation is like generalizing that all cohabitation couple are a barbaric lower IQ individual who don't have heart at all. That's logical fallacy of generalization. Where you easily put people randomly into one unfair criteria.

CLOSING

Love should be independent thus it doesnt require the acknowledgement of third party.

Love should be mature thus it doesn't require somebody else to regulate you how to run your relation or to separate your love relation

The quality of love should be tested and go higher over time and not to be taken into granted just beause you feel that you have already feel safe under the legalization from third party like gov.

Thus under cohabitation practice, love shall win

3RD OPPOSITION

OPENING

We all know that the relationship between spouses will not always go that well even though they think they have found their true love and living under the same roof. what if inappropriate thing which can harm spouses happens? In cohabitation practice, they may have made commitment, agreement, etc but what if one decides to leave, one decides not to love you anymore, who can still guarantee that this agreement still work? Plus, cohabitor doesn't have acknowlegement and legal protect. The government in status quo has done a good job to provide social institution - in this case, marriage institution, to protect spouses from those possibilities. And that is why in doing its obligation to provide couples welfare, government has the right to use the mandate that has given to government by society to be used to make regulations. And we're still massively prefer marriage than cohabitation practice.

REBUTAL

There are several rebuttal to response the case of government team:

1st) govt team delivered that marriage is an outdated institution.

This is where government team failed to characterize the mechanism of marriage institution itself. Essentially a couple that love each other are entitled to built a relationship. They feel the same thing, that is : Love – it is a connection, association, or involvement. When they are in love, it would make them want to continue the relationship into the next step, that is Marriage - which also provide protection for both parties whether in a straight or gay relationship. It is important to protect a relationship to prevent inappropriate manners like physical abuse, child labour, violation, etc. It offers a more stable and official under the Government. An institution cannot be outdated if it retains legal importance in modern society. And it is so much different with the Cohabitation Practice which is living without marriage. For your information, In North Carolina, a sheriff told a cohabiting dispatcher that she would lose her job unless she got married.

In Michigan, a judge denied visitation rights to a divorced father because he had a live-in girlfriend. In West Virginia, the state parole board added three months to the sentence of a prisoner because he told them he planned to live with his girlfriend when released. They actually all occurred in between 2005 and 2010. Therefore we strongly believe that Marriage is not an outdated institution because the rule of its marriage dynamic and marriage has relevance to modern society.

2nd) Govt team said, "There's a reason why 'unhappy marriage' happens because there's individual interest that can't be actualized."

I wonder what kind of individual interest that can't be actualized in your marriage? this is where govt team once again failed to analyze the essence of our first speaker. The essence of our first speaker was government and marriage have nothing to do with daily life of couples that they want to actualize such as how they share the burden of jobs, taking care of children, what faith you believe in, etc - as long as it doesn't break the law, government always respect your choices.

CLASH ANALYSIS TEAM SPLIT

There are several clashes of argument that I'm going to analyze from this debate

1st) How actually marriage is more justifiable than cohabitation practice

2nd) How actually marriage would be effective as solvency mechanism than cohabitation practice

3rd) How actually marriage has better future implication than cohabitaion practice

Let's analyze the 1st clash:

1st) How actually marriage is more justifiable than cohabitation practice.

Because it is an institution that has existed in most societies around the world for an incredibly long time. Marriage is a legal way to build a relationship under the Government and its constitutional of each country. In marriage, we also have protection under the Government. So if there is something inappropriate manners like violation (verbal or physical) by one of a member of couple, or they want to divorce, they can send report to the Government. For example, let's say Anang – Krisdayanti had been married more than 5 years and had 2 children but in the middle of their way, they decided to divorce. After that, because they had marriage, all the processes from they married until they divorced were written and under the Government. So they went to the lawcourt and had some conferences until they officially divorced. In those conferences, they also talked about how to decide custody of their children, finance, and finally the cusdoty of their children is on Anang's position. And now, they live happily with their own new family. From the example we can conclude that marriage really protect the citizen so they will feel safe because they are protected by the Government. Those things will not be found in cohabitation practice, even if they think that they have found their beloved one and had children, when one decides to leave, who can guarantee the agreement still work? Once again, cohabitor doesn't have acknowledgement and legal protect from the Govt. Thus, marriage is more justifiable than cohabitation practice.

2nd) How actually marriage would be effective as solvency mechanism than cohabitation practice.

Because you can see how high the commitment of your spouse when he/she wants to continue your relationship to marriage. It means that she/he is ready to take the risk. It means that he/she wants to tell the world that the love they give to you is real. They want to build a family with you which protected and legal under the Govt. Even though you dont know what will appear in the future, marriage is not something to play with. That's why you can see how serious your partner when they ask to marry you. Unlike under the system of cohabitation practice, it means that they let your relationship does not have protection by the Govt. They can leave you whenever they want because no one will guarantee the agreement still work between you and him/her. Therefore, marriage would be more effective as solvency mechanism than cohabitation practice.

3rd) How actually marriage has better future implication than cohabitaion practice.

Because in marriage, your love relationship will be more sustainable. your spouse can't just leave you behind. It doesnt mean that couples in marriage tend to still try to stay in it even if there is no more compatibility between them, leading only to a fake love relationship. no. It means that everything happens for a reason and every problem can be solved. It can make your relationship become stronger than ever. You can learn from the past and more understand each other. Even if somehow the best solution is divorce, you can fix it in lawcourt. it doesn't mean that your relationship between you and your partner will completely cut off before you havent fixed it, because the Govt would not let it happens and

the divorce system itself is interfered by govt. This also doesn't mean to undermine the maturity and the intellectual capacity of the couple to manage and decide their own separation system, but, one more time, government have nothing to do with your reasons to divorce. Govt provides the processes in divorcing so everything end up in justice. Plus, you can still communicate with your children as their parents even though you didn't get the custody.

CLOSING

Once again, govt has the right to use the mandate that has given to govt by society to be used to make regulations. In this case, the govt will make a decision such as who will get the custody of children, that would not harm the couples. Thus, marriage has better future implication than cohabitation practice

OPPOSITION REPLY

OPENING

Why did the LGBT movement fight so hard to legalize homosexual and make "Love Wins" happen? If all of the gov sides claim was true, than they wouldn't have to fight to begin with. Meaning, that there are several things only marriage can provide, furthermore the acknowledgement from the government, couples need.

TEAM SPLIT

Let's play old school. I'm going to bring 3 points in my reply.

1. Justification
2. Future Impact
3. Sustainability

REPLY ANALYSIS

1. Justification

They say that under marriage your mobility, your freedom (especially as a women) would be restricted because of the harsh stigma society has built, which is patriarchy where women are only limited to do household chores, or only useful in the kitchen and bed. But their justification falls because they never proved how patriarchy will be gone when they cohabit. Moreover, we proved that patriarchy is a problem of mindset and understanding between couples and not something marriage creates. While we as the opposition fully explained to you why marriage is beneficial for couples. Not only is it a form of love and commitment which is the highest, but also gives you the sense of security not only between individuals as a couple but also, secure knowing that the gov is protecting you from violations that may happen done by your partner in worst case scenario. Moreover, we also proved to you how it's harmful for certain actors when there is no marriage (which most of the time is women) on how when they are left by their partners, they will turn even more vulnerable because in the worst case the women has nothing to begin with. Under this point, obviously team opposition wins this.

2. Future Impact

The gov came up with the idea of true love where you can't be tied up with some stupid law. They also say under marriage it will bring insecurity because they don't know whether their spouse truly loves them or not. When you cohabit you know exactly your partner loves you when they decide to stay since there's no law binding them. But this point actually falls too. In the short term yes it provides security and certainty but it's only in the short term. Because basically that security will happen under the scenario that they'll live happily ever after when they dismissed the fact one party will be more insecure when the other party decides to leave eventually. We as the opp bring more better future. Marriage will give you security in the longterm cause there will be a third party to ensure their security and relationship. To ensure that no weak actors will be violated (because we never know how important a law is until we get violated ourselves). Under cohabitation also, without a third party knowing, their agreement will tend to be misused and that's what we're trying to prevent. The state has the obligation to ensure that nobody will be violated. Under this point we are also upperhand.

3. Sustainability

The gov tried to argue that it will bring more sustainability in a relationship because they can find their true love easily. They can leave when they are not satisfied. Sadly, this point also falls. Changing your relationship over and over again to find the "one" already proves how unsustainable your relationship is to begin with under cohabitation. It also backlashes with their idea of strong commitment to fight to keep each other till the end. We opened your eyes and showed that marriage will be more sustainable. Why? Because under marriage, it will ensure that both parties do their best to keep each other without taking a shortcut to leave easily when things go wrong. They learn to understand each other more better resulting to a more loving family. When you decide to commit you can't play with it. Especially when it's related to your feelings as a human being. Obviously this point is ours as well.

Under those 3 major points, we opposition are more upperhand than the gov side.

CLOSING

Marriage proves your commitment. If you try to run away from it, then you're truly not ready to commit. For the sake of love, we say go with the opposition.

AFFIRMATIVE REPLY

TEAM SPLIT

I'm going to break down the debate into 2 points;

1st) the practical

2nd) the principles

1st) For the practical;

if you look back to prime minister's speech, our goal is to empower the equality or anti patriarchy value. We agree, LO's speech was right, patriarchy is created in the mind of couples. What we regret is that marriage creates a comfort zone for that patriarchy value to flourish. What happens when gov intervenes, and it shares the couple's money equally when they divorce, you create a comfort zone for the housewife to not pursuing the career. She knows if she will be just fine and she doesn't need to work. This is a false sense of security, it disincentive woman to work as well as justify man to be patriarch. What we propose, we want woman to be independent in any scenario, because when she knows if she can't depend on her husband, she will work to secure her life. That's the moment when patriarch value can start to be obsolete. Therefore our case can achieve LO, DLO, and OW's biggest and only goal, protection of weaker actor.

In their case, after divorce, the protection is only about sharing of money, after that the wife's career has to be from zero again. But in ours, she will have sustainable job, higher position of career, and she doesn't need to start from zero again after divorce, because she never leaves her job.

Oh, how about the kids? Look, in this modern world, kids will always get social protection from their biological parents, even if the kids are born outside marriage, the parents are divorced, law oblige biological parents to take care of the children.

2nd) Now the principle;

In marriage, the symbol it creates, love is only right when it's united and bounded by religion and tradition. That's shameful how your love can be defined by majority. Because infact marriage value is by default unfair. When you divorce, the wife will likely get more money than the husband. It's unfair, because it actually undermine woman's capability, that woman is always weaker. Woman is also likely to get child custody than the man, because the man naturally can't take care children. Man is also likely to be blamed for being home wrecker, because man is always unfaithful. Marriage and its court are just the manifestation of patriarch value and we, as modern USA citizens believe, marriage is not worth to be followed any longer.

It's wrong to say if the ideal relationship is where the couple can be together forever, who are you to judge? It's sometime better for you to just leave and find other person, maybe the love of your life is not her, it's your friend perhaps, go get her. In cohabitation you have full freedom to choose, if you love her, stay. If you don't, you may easily go.

That's the most ideal way to let people define their happiness. Compared to marriage, where your happiness is defined only by one person, you're trapped there by the fear of losing your money in court, it closes all the chance to get even bigger happiness.

CLOSING

Let's be an adult here, there's no such a thing of romeo and juliet, we're free to define our own happiness.