

BREAKING NEWS!

DAY 2 of the East India Debates



"This House Believes That the Government Should Not Spend Money on Citizens Aged Above 75 if They Are Terminally Ill and Require Life Support."



Shri Ram School, Delhi
vs.
Bishop Cotton School,
Shimla



Delhi Public School,
Guwahati
vs.
Vasant Valley School,
Delhi



"This House Believes That Indian Politicians Must Pass a Strict National Eligibility Criteria in Order to Enter Service to the Nation"



GD Goenka Public School,
Siliguri
vs.
The Assam Valley School,
Balipara



Maria's Public School,
Guwahati
vs.
Hollotoli School,
Dimapaur



MORNING SESSION



Maria's Public School,
Guwahati
vs.
Hollotoli School, Dimapur



La Martinière College, Lucknow
vs.
Vandhya International School,
Guwahati



*"This House Believes That Every Organisation
must be Under Legal Obligation to
Ensure Equity in Salary."*



St. Joseph's Convent, Tezpur
vs.
Vivek High School,
Chandigarh



Livingstone Foundation
International, Dimapur
vs.
Royal Global School, Guwahati



MOTION:

“This House Believes that
the Government should not spend on
citizens aged 75 if they are terminally ill and require life
support.”

“HEALTHCARE IS NOT A TRANSACTION”

- Kainaat Naser,
XI

...Insists DLOP

The House debated whether the state should stop funding treatment for terminally ill patients over the age of 75. The Government argued that scarce healthcare resources should be redirected towards patients with greater chances of recovery, maintaining that limited public funds must maximise overall social welfare. The Opposition challenged both the ethics and practicality of this approach, citing studies that questioned the certainty of terminal diagnoses and arguing that no government has the moral authority to determine whose life holds greater value. They further contended that healthcare is a fundamental right, not a financial transaction,

while the Government stated that prolonged hospitalisation often causes more suffering



than benefit. Ultimately, the motion posed a stark query:



Shri Ram, Delhi (Government)

vs.

Bishop Cotton School, Shimla
(Opposition)



should compassion outweigh
pragmatic resource allocation?

Winner: Bishop Cotton School, Shimla
Result: The Motion was Lost

Government:

Prime Minister: Evvah Mittal
Deputy PM: Veer Singh Ahluwalia
Whip: Sara Gupta

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Abhijato Chatterjee
Deputy Leader of Opposition: Rushan Kakkar
Whip: Shourya Sood
Reserve: Rishaan Das

THE QUESTION OF SURVIVAL *Who dies? Who Lives?*

- Urvashi Borah, XII



Delhi Public School, Guwahati
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Vasant Valley School, Delhi
(OPPOSITION)



The debate centred on whether governments should prioritise healthcare resources for curable patients over terminally ill citizens above the age of 75. The Proposition argued that finite medical resources should be directed towards those with greater chances of recovery, with Anamitra Alamyman maintaining that improving the quality of life is more meaningful than merely extending it. Leonard Barooah reinforced this by describing

the policy as a necessary allocation of limited healthcare resources. The Opposition firmly rejected the notion, arguing that healthcare is a fundamental right irrespective of age or prognosis. Vedaa Menon contended that the debate was ultimately about deciding “who gets to live and who gets to die,” while Anahita R. Ganeshan, the Opposition Whip, condemned discrimination based on age.

Winner: Delhi Public School, Guwahati
Result: The Motion was Passed

Government:

Prime Minister: Anamitra Alamyman
 Deputy Prime Minister: Leonard Barooah
 Government Whip: Punyabrat Choudhury

Opposition:

Leader of opposition: Aisha Goyal
 Deputy Leader of Opposition: Vedaa Menon
 Opposition Whip: Anahita R. Ganeshan

MOTION:

“This House Believes that Indian Politicians must pass a strict eligibility criteria in order to enter service to the nation.”



The Government argued that politics should demand the same level of preparation and accountability as different professions, advocating ethical assessments, background checks and constitutional knowledge tests to prevent individuals with criminal records from entering public office. They maintained that elections often reward popularity and wealth over competence.

The Opposition defended the existing democratic framework, arguing that the electorate itself is the ultimate eligibility test. They warned that stricter criteria could be manipulated by those in power, reducing inclusivity and diversity while creating an elitist political system. They further contended that qualities such as morality and ethics cannot be objectively measured

“WHEELS ON THE BUS GO ROUND AND ROUND; THE ELITISTS PASS WHILE THE IMPOVERISHED DROWN.”

Opposition Whip Shows Off Rhyming Skills

- Raisah Yesmin Hazarika

through examinations or formal assessments and such.



GD Goenka Public School, Siliguri
 (GOVERNMENT)

vs.

The Assam Valley School, Balipara
 (OPPOSITION)





Winner: The Assam Valley School, Balipara
Result: The Motion was Lost.

Opposition: Karan Somani
Whip: Agnivh Bora
Reserve: Vidhi Chopra

Government:

Prime Minister:
 Nitika Chettri
Deputy PM: Devishi Sah
Whip: Bibhusikha D
Reserve Speaker:
 Kaashir Siotia

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition:
 Khushi Todi
Deputy Leader of

Now Elite? DEMOCRACY

- Lorene Aishisa Rapsang, XI



Sunbeam School, Lahartara
 (GOVERNMENT)

vs.

The Bishop's School, Camp
 (OPPOSITION)



The debate opened with a clear definition of the motion before both sides engaged in a spirited exchange. The Government argued that India's electoral system disproportionately favours wealth and political influence, advocating for a qualifying examination to ensure leaders possess adequate knowledge of the Constitution, laws and public policy. Diksha Mishra stressed the need to create opportunities for capable individuals beyond party politics.

The Opposition questioned whether a single examination could reflect India's diversity, arguing that democracy already entrusts the people with choosing their representatives. They maintained that examinations cannot measure integrity or leadership and would disadvantage rural as well as underprivileged candidates. In reply, the Government described the exam as a "filter" rather than a replacement for democracy,

proposing government-supported coaching to ensure equal access.

Winner: The Bishop's School, Camp
Result: The Motion was Lost

Government:

Prime Minister: Diksha Mishra
Deputy Prime Minister:
 Ayan Mehrotra
Whip: Prem Kunan Pandey
Reserve Speaker: Shuban Singh

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition:
 Advika Parmar
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
 Aryan Srivastava
Whip: Saachi Thadhani
Reserve Speaker: Mihir Paranjpe

"Democracy already has a strong eligibility criterion, the people themselves." — Aryan Srivastava, Deputy Leader of Opposition



INEFFICIENCY OF CURRENT CRITERIA

Government Criticises Current Electoral Criteria in India

- Aahil Faraj, IX

The debate examined whether India should introduce stricter eligibility criteria for elected representatives. Opening for the Government, Indranushi Sharma argued that individuals entrusted with governing the country must possess the knowledge and qualifications necessary to exercise power responsibly. She questioned whether an uneducated person can effectively lead a nation. The Opposition defended the existing democratic framework, maintaining that the people

themselves are the best judges of their leaders. Lian Tungnungi argued that merit-based

examinations often reflect privilege, rather than reflecting potential. Soreni Jami warned that mandatory tests would allow a third party to filter candidates before voters could exercise their choice. The debate ultimately revolved around governance against

the democratic principle of popular representation.

“Every reform should be judged not by what it promises but what it risks.”

*- Soreni Jami, Deputy
Leader of Opposition*

“Meritocracy is a myth that measures privilege, not potential.” — Lian Tungnungi, Leader of Opposition

Winner: Maria's Public School
Result: The Motion was Passed.

Government:

Prime Minister: Indranushi Sharma
Deputy Prime Minister: Devam
Bhattacharjee
Whip: Abhijit Sarmah
Reserve Speaker: Thanglenlal Doungel

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Lian Tungnungi
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Soreni Jami
Whip : Aiko Kiyala
Reserve Speaker: Chavi Jain



Maria's Public School,
Guwahati (GOVERNMENT)
vs.
Hollotoli School, Dimapur
(OPPOSITION)





“WISDOM
is not a monopoly
of education.”

...Says Prime Minister
Pranav Bhargava.

- Sneha Ngangom,
Deputy Editor, XII



La Martinière College,
Lucknow (GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Vandhya International School,
Guwahati (OPPOSITION)



are qualities that are essential for political leadership, citing instances of irresponsible public conduct by elected representatives. The Opposition continued to argue that educational qualifications should not determine political participation, stressing that democracy must remain accessible to citizens from all backgrounds. They maintained that elections themselves are the true test of leadership, as the people not examinations or committees have the

**Winner: La Martinière College,
Lucknow**

**Result: The Motion was Passed
Government:**

Prime Minister : Pranav Bhargava
Deputy Prime Minister: Aadi
Chandra Anay Singh
Whip: Anay Singh
Reserve Speaker: Japjot Singh

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition:
Ayush Longkho
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Shazaib Raif Hussain
Whip: Pragyan Mazumdar
Reserve Speaker: Ariv Das

The debate explored whether politicians should be subject to stricter eligibility criteria before contesting elections. The Proposition argued that elected representatives should possess both specialised knowledge of governance and the wisdom to exercise power responsibly.

While acknowledging that “wisdom is not a monopoly of education,” they maintained that ethical judgment and an understanding of public policy

leadership, citing instances of irresponsible public conduct by elected representatives. The Opposition continued to argue that educational qualifications should not determine political participation, stressing that democracy must remain accessible to citizens from all backgrounds. They maintained that elections themselves are the true test of leadership, as the people not examinations or committees have the

MOTION:

“This House Believes That Every organisation must be under legal obligation to ensure equity in salary”



“JUSTICE
DELAYED
IS JUSTICE
DENIED”

Says Deputy Prime Minister
Alveera Amin Aziri



St. Joseph's Convent, Tezpur
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Vivek High School, Chandigarh
(OPPOSITION)



Opening for the Government, Sibsha Goyary argued that equity does not mean identical pay but fair remuneration based on relevant factors, asserting that talent transcends gender and that pay disparities perpetuate discrimination. The Government reinforced its case by invoking the Equal Remuneration Act, arguing that "Justice delayed is justice

denied." The Opposition made a sharp distinction between equity and equality, maintaining that fairness cannot be uniformly defined or legislated. Raihat Kaur Brar questioned whether governments could legally determine fairness and contended that strengthening anti-discrimination laws, rather than imposing salary equity legislation, would be a

more effective solution.

- Lara Khaidem, XI

Winner: Vivek High School, Chandigarh

Result: The Motion was Lost

Government:

Prime Minister : Sibsha Goyary
Deputy Minister: Alveera Amin Azmiri
Whip : Birangana Borah
Reserve Speaker: Parnika Barman

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Shristi
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Raihat Kaur Brar
Whip: Naaz Mujral



St. Joseph's Convent, Tezpur
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Vivek High School, Chandigarh
(OPPOSITION)



- Chingkhei Nongthombam, Associate Editor, XII

The House debated whether every organisation should be legally obliged to ensure equity in salaries. Opening for the Government, Olemnaro Aier argued that equity is rooted in fairness rather than equal outcomes, comparing it to a football referee who ensures a fair game without guaranteeing the same score for both teams.

The Government maintained that salaries should reflect merit while remaining free from discrimination. The Opposition countered that wages are best determined by market standards and warned that excessive state intervention could reduce employer motivation, discourage job creation and complicate the functioning of the largely

GOVT. IS TALKING ABOUT A UTOPIAN SOCIETY

*According to DLOP's
accusations.*

informal economy. They argued that the Government envisioned an idealistic system that overlooked economic realities and the practical challenges of implementation.

Winner: Royal Global School, Guwahati

Result: The Motion was Lost

Government:

Prime Minister - Olemnaro Aier
Deputy Prime Minister - Visita
Government Whip - Hinovi T.

Zhimomi
Reserve Speaker - Bisali Sangtam
Whip : Birangana Borah
Reserve Speaker: Parnika Barman

- Chingkhel Nongthombam, Associate Editor, XII

Opposition:
Leader of Opposition: Shristi
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Raihat Kaur Brar
Whip: Naaz Mujral

AFTERNOON SESSION



"This House Believes That AI Does More Harm Than Good."



Shri Ram School, Delhi
vs.
Bishop Cotton School,
Shimla



Delhi Public School,
Guwahati
vs.
La Martinière College,
Lucknow



The Assam Valley School,
Balipara
vs.
Maria's Public School,
Guwahati



The Bishop's School,
Camp
vs.
Vasant Valley School, Delhi



MOTION:

“This House Believes That
AI Does More Harm Than Good”

“THE MAIN REASON
FOR DEVELOPMENT
IS NECESSITY.”

- Aahil Faraj, IX

The quarter-final on whether artificial intelligence does more harm than good featured a closely contested exchange. Opening for the Proposition, Evvah Mittal argued that AI encourages cognitive offloading, reduces human agency and raises concerns over accountability and transparency. Veer Singh Ahluwalia reinforced the case by highlighting job displacement and describing many AI systems as opaque “black boxes.” They were countered by the Opposition emphasising on AI’s transformative role in healthcare and everyday life, citing medical technologies, wearable devices and advanced software that have significantly improved human well-being. They

argued that AI should be viewed as a tool whose value depends on its application rather than its existence. The debate concluded as an engaging clash between technological caution and technological optimism.

Winner: Bishop Cotton School, Shimla

Result: The Motion was Lost
Government:

Prime Minister: EVVAH MITTAL

Deputy Prime Minister: VEER SINGH AHLUWALIA

Government Whip: SARA GUPTA

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Rushan Kakkar

Deputy Leader of Opposition: Abhijato Chatterjee

Whip : Shourya Sood

Reserve Speaker: Rishaan Das



GD Goenka Public School, Siliguri
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

The Assam Valley School, Balipara
(OPPOSITION)



MERELY A TOOL

- Chingkhei Nongthombam,
Associate Editor,
XI



Delhi Public School, Guwahati
(GOVERNMENT)
vs.
La Martinière College, Lucknow
(OPPOSITION)



The quarter-final debate on whether artificial intelligence does more harm than good witnessed a compelling clash of ideas. Anamitra Alamyan opened the debate by arguing that AI weakens cognitive abilities, threatens privacy and national security, reinforces algorithmic bias and accelerates job displacement. The Government further warned that AI's rapid development makes effective regulation increasingly difficult. The Opposition countered that

AI has transformed healthcare, disaster prediction and scientific research, citing its role in early disease detection and improved accessibility. They maintained that AI is merely a tool whose impact depends entirely on those who wield it, arguing that misuse should be blamed on people rather than the technology itself. Ultimately, the debate weighed innovation against responsibility. The House sided in the Government's favour.

Winner: Delhi Public School, Guwahati

Result: The Motion was Lost

Government:

Prime minister: Anamitra Alamyan

Deputy Prime Minister:

Vihaan Malhotra

Government Whip:

Punyabrat Choudhary

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Pranav

Bhargava

Deputy Leader Of Opposition :

Japnot Singh

Opposition Whip: Anay Singh



YIN & YANG:

"AI is like the black half of the yin and yang—the darkness represents its harm, while the white dot reminds us that some good remains." — Anamitra Alamyan, Prime Minister



The Assam Valley School, Balipara
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Maria's Public School, Guwahati (OP-
POSITION)



The quarter-final debate on whether artificial intelligence does more harm than good witnessed a compelling clash of ideas. Opening for the Government, Anamitra Alamyan argued that AI weakens cognitive abilities, threatens privacy and national security, reinforces algorithmic bias and accelerates job displacement. The Government further warned that AI's rapid development makes effective regulation increasingly difficult. The Opposition countered that AI has transformed healthcare, disaster



prediction and scientific research, citing its role in early disease detection and improved accessibility. They maintained that AI is merely a tool whose impact depends entirely on those who wield it, arguing that misuse should be blamed on people rather than the technology itself. The debate ultimately weighed innovation against responsibility.

**Winner: La Martinière College,
Lucknow**

Result: The Motion was Passed

Government:

Prime Minister : Pranav Bhargava
Deputy Prime Minister: Aadi
Chandra Anay Singh
Whip: Anay Singh
Reserve Speaker: Japnot Singh

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition:
Ayush Longkho
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Shazaib Raif Hussain
Whip: Pragyan Mazumdar
Reserve Speaker: Ariv Das



The House debated whether artificial intelligence does more harm than good. Opening for the Government, Advika Parmar compared AI to Pandora's Box, warning that once unleashed, its consequences cannot be reversed. The Government argued that AI threatens employment, weakens creativity and critical thinking, and places an enormous strain on the environment through its

vast consumption of resources. Aryan Srivastava reinforced this by questioning whether AI itself can ever be considered innocent of its consequences. The Opposition countered that AI is fundamentally a tool whose impact depends on how humans choose to use it. Citing its applications in medicine, they argued that human oversight, verification and ethical decision-making

PANDORA'S BOX

- Lara Khaidem, XI

remain indispensable despite rapid technological advancement.

Winner: The Bishop's School, Camp
Result: The Motion was Passed

Government:

Prime Minister: Advika Parmar
Deputy Prime Minister :
Aryan Srivastava
Whip: Saachi Thadhani
Reserve Speaker: Mihir Paranjpe

Opposition:

Leader of Opposition: Aisha Goyal
Deputy Leader of Opposition:
Amaira Chopra
Whip: Vedaa Menon
Reserved: Anahita Rene Ganeshan



The Bishop's School, Camp
(GOVERNMENT)

vs.

Vasant Valley School, Delhi
(OPPOSITION)



THE HANDS BEHIND IT

*Introducing the Ones
Who Brought
You the Twentieth
Volume of the
East India Times*



PHOTOGRAPHY

Tanushree Gimiray, XI



REPORTERS

Featuring (L to R): Lara Khaidem (XI), Aahil Faraj (IX), Lorene Rapsang (XI), Raisah Yesmin Hazarika (XII), Urvashi Borah (XII), Kohana Kakati (XI), and Kainaat Naser (XI)

THE TEAM

(From L to R): Nongthombam Chingkhinganbi Devi (Associate Editor, XII), Sneha Ngangom (Deputy Editor, XII), Rianna Lingjel Irom (Editor-in-Chief, XII)





Editor-in-Chief: Rianna Lingjel Irom

Deputy Editor: Sneha Ngangom

Associate Editor: N. Chingkheinganbi

Correspondents: Aahil Faraj and Tanushree Ghimiray

Design & Layout: Rianna and Tanushree

Illustrators: Sneha, Austin, Baibhav

Photography: Tanushree Ghimiray

Mistress-in-Charge: Ms. Sarmistha Paul Sarkar

Publisher: The Assam Valley School, P.O. Balipara, Dist. Sonitpur, Asom-784101, India

E-mail: ave@assamvalleyschool.com

Telephone: 09678074320/08812009627 Website: www.assamvalleyschool.com



The views expressed in articles printed are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect those of AVE or its editorial policy.