

Motion: THBT states should reclaim a large proportion of all donations to charities and redistribute it across charities on the basis of their effectiveness

Theme: Sociology

Summary

PROP	OPP
<p>Characterisation / Status quo</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large donations in charities do not effectively solve social issues 2. Give well, effective altruism communities and academics etc are already researching the efficacy of charity organisations and programmes 3. Charities' finances are private and unaccountable to the public 4. Charities with large public attention and funding have bloated bureaucracies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Large number of board members that are paid high salaries drive compensation up b. Large part of funding goes to advertisements and staffing to achieve brand recognition c. Reluctance to cut down on bloated bureaucracy d. Charities become unproductive and inefficient as large staffing is difficult to manage and costs a lot 5. Charities focus more on appealing to the public eye than efficacy 6. Most individuals donate to appealing and popular charities 7. Donations are centralised in famous charities 	<p>Characterisation / Status quo (response)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anti-secrecy laws govern the actions of charities, problems raised in PROP do not continually exist on our side 2. Immense scrutiny over charities: people gravitate towards the most transparent and competent charities they're passionate about 3. Charities are shunned for bureaucracies 4. Charities can keep funds for future use, they can never be "overfunded" 5. People would donate to state run charities had they trusted the state to use their money wisely, but they choose organisations they want to donate to due to mistrust or for personal reasons
<p>Stance</p> <p>-Redirect donations to effective charities that solve important social issues</p>	<p>Stance</p> <p>-Will not redistribute donations charities receive but instead allow charities to gather and use own funds</p>
<p>Burden of proof</p> <p>-Redistribution of funds makes charities efficient in aiding social issues</p>	<p>Burden of proof</p> <p>-Redistribution of funds is harmful and allowing each charity to manage their own funds would better aid social issues</p>
<p>Mechanism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Set up an independent third-party organisation that evaluates non-profits on numerous metrics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Cost efficacy b. Quality adjusted life (how many years of life people gain; how significantly people's lives are improved) 	<p>Mechanism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taxation to create welfare schemes will be used to solve critical but neglected causes 2. Robust regulation of charities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Mandating charities to release all their financial records to respond to freedom of information requests and banning misleading advertisement

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Set up independent auditing of charities' finances and operations; force charities to disclose finances 3. Charities with worse cost efficacy and quality adjusted life will have its donations allocated to more effective non-profits that focus on the same issues → Donations will be allocated to charities that solve similar issues if it is not possible to find a charity that solves the exact same issue → Fund allocations are managed by the government of the place where the non-profits are founded 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Require charities to disclose finances to the public but will not evaluate their efficacy 4. Support third party charity watchdogs compiling metrics for the public 5. Publish objective indicators for citizens to choose which organisations and causes they want to contribute to
<p>Argument #1 Incentivises charities to act</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most effective charities structurally tend to be smaller and are more principled e.g. Against Malaria -Does not have a flashy website -Takes action: provides inexpensive malaria nets that are proven to reduce deaths in children in the developing world -They are not getting recognition and their reach is limited because they're not expanding staffing to ensure maximum outreach 2. Prop redistributes donations to smaller charities and gives them recognition and validation of their efficacy (subject to state independent board) 3. Provides huge incentives for larger charities that have large funding to improve <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. More transparency -Fund management is made public and people can understand where their finances are going to determine their efficacy b. Active reason for charities to cut down on bureaucracy and costs that decrease efficacy -Incentivises donors who donate large sums of money to pressure non-profits to improve so the donations would not be allocated to other charities instead c. Actual metrics for evaluation -Competition between non-profits creates efficacy which encourages productivity 	<p>Argument #1 Undermines individual autonomy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Donations are a morally praiseworthy act and NOT a moral obligation: taxation fulfils moral obligation to help the vulnerable 2. Donating is beyond what people are expected to do and is not bound to any restriction 3. Efficacy to restrict donations is problematic: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Efficacy ≠ importance of charities e.g. Suicide prevention hotlines would not seem effective as individuals' distress cannot be measured by numbers and are uncertain, but are still important Discredits the work of charities and choices of people to contribute b. This is money individuals fundamentally have autonomy over to help society, their choice cannot be controlled and not donating to the most effective charity is not a moral blame they can be ascribed with
<p>Argument #2 Improves charities' capacity to act/excessive funds going to emergency situations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fund allocations are unproductive and overflowed to the same charities that do not 	<p>Argument #2 Reduces amount of donations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Counterproductive for governments to remove autonomy of donations: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Most people become unwilling to

<p>ensure proper use</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Donations are most relevant: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In cases of emergency when charities are needed the most In times of urgency when an average individual is most likely to donate (after natural disasters/times when non-profits are in high demand) However, in the event of disasters we often donate to the charities we're the most familiar with Smaller local charities would be better at using funds productively Winning points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Efficacy of using funds are maximised Responsible charities that take action will get funds Local lesser known charities that effectively target local issues will get funds Diverse advocacy Different charities that effectively target the same problems instead of same charities getting consistently overfunded and ineffectively using those funds Even if there's a marginal decrease in funding, charities targeting key causes effectively get the funds and allocation of funds is productive 	<p>donate as their money might not stay with the organisations or causes they care about</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller/less effective charities now lack crucial funding to promote awareness about their case Majority of individuals do not know majority of charities outside of ones they're personally linked to Outreach is important for awareness about a charity's causes e.g. Rare disease charities PROP's world: These charities die off due to being forgotten or lose ability to help people
<p>Argument #3 Fairness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Charities are fundamentally creatures of the state which gives the state significant control over them States provide large subsidisation to charities by making donations tax deductible States provide regulatory compliance, making it easier for charities to control for legal liability Governments give artificial legal and financial subsidy to charities in recognition of the good they do Reciprocal relationship: state subsidies charities so they can fairly demand things in return 	<p>Argument #3 Allows states with nefarious intents to seize funds on political grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Charities are supposed to pick up where governments left off → Defunding or redirecting funds from important charities occurs when metrics and evaluations on the efficacy of charities are published Less important charitable causes or those that are smaller in scale decreases economic effectiveness as higher fixed costs and lower marginal costs have to be dealt with Governments are not effective in dealing with such bloated bureaucracies/fund allocations