

That we should remove all benefits from those deemed fit, but unwilling, to work



[rippedpantsatberkely \(PRO\)](#)

Round Forfeited



[Povski \(CON\)](#)

Bla bla

This round is to be shorter because Pro didn't get to post his with all the site issues. I will just briefly comment on some areas of the topic, and point out how they contradict it.

At first I thought that this topic is rather boring, but thinking about it I found ideas worth exploring. So i hope we can get on with this debate, [rippedpantsatberkely](#), and I hope that you will post in the future rounds of said debate. This is no offense to the fact that you forfeited 1st round - the site was slow, i get it- i genuinely care for the topic and would like to discuss. Think of it as a good chat.

“That we should remove all benefits from those deemed fit, but unwilling, to work

It sounds like a serious topic, but i think this depends on what ***all benefits*** means and how are we to ***deem*** someone ***fit, but unwilling***.

The topic applies to situations where someone benefits from another. And reversably, where somebody makes a service to another. Examples include families, school classrooms, cities, countries etc. In general, it involves communities and social interactions.

There are several reasons for which removing all benefits is not the best choice of actions in these situations:

- work effectiveness is not the main point
- immediate or quantifiable results are not the main criteria for assessing ones own work
- there is little or no value in opposing an act of benevolence
- the community is to support the individual and not the other way around

(as a suggestion, we could also take a look at behavioral psychology further on into this debate)

I take the word **fit** to mean capable of working - both physically and mentally. In other words, fit people are able to accomplish at least one job/task. When someone is **unwilling** it means that he is refusing to do any of the tasks that he is able to complete. Perhaps he has made a conscious decision not to work. Is this wrong? Some people have to refuse work in order to focus on other important matters and not get distracted. If, on the other hand, someone is too lazy to work - he knows he should be working, but he just does not do it- then he should only be helped and not punished. It is suggested that laziness comes from the fear of failure. Then what good is to add the threat of removing all benefits?

Finally (and perhaps most importantly), I think that work alone and measurable results is not what people should strive to accomplish. Abstaining from work is also important. And I do not mean merely to take a break - vacation- so as to rest only for more work. More on that in future posts :)



rippedpantsatberkeley (PRO)

Round Forfeited



Povski (CON)

Round Forfeited
