

4. This House believes that hyper-consumerism has done more harm than good.

Context: This debate examines whether the culture of hyper-consumerism — characterized by excessive consumption, constant pursuit of new products, and defining identity through material possessions — has caused more harm than good to society. Some people may argue that it fuels economic growth, innovation, and accessibility to goods that improve quality of life. Others may believe it leads to environmental degradation, social inequality, and declining mental well-being. The discussion centers on whether the benefits of economic dynamism outweigh the societal and ecological costs of overconsumption.

Proposition Arguments:

- **Environmental Destruction:** Overproduction and waste driven by consumer demand contribute massively to pollution, resource depletion, and climate change.
- **Erosion of Values:** A focus on materialism fosters superficiality and weakens community, empathy, and personal fulfillment.
- **Mental Health and Inequality:** Constant marketing and social comparison fuel dissatisfaction, debt, and class-based insecurity.

Opposition Arguments:

- **Economic Prosperity:** Consumer demand drives job creation, innovation, and higher living standards.
- **Improved Quality of Life:** Access to diverse goods and technologies has increased comfort, health, and convenience for billions.
- **Empowerment Through Choice:** Consumer markets give individuals agency to express identity and influence industries through spending power.