| **Student Name:** Dominic Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | **4** | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 5 minutes’ long.]  Don’t draw the judge’s attention to the fact that you didn't prep the hook!  Good reinforcement of what your counter-model is, but we’re not actually adding value.   * 2nd Prop argued that donation caps will never work under regulations, so we can be more engaging in this respect. * I appreciate the summary as to how transparency would help with some of the harms.   + Here, analysing the harms in the comparative is much more impactful!   + Without lobbying, politicians will be enabled under a culture of excessive lying. Voters will experience a lot of voter remorse because their true stances will be found later on.   + Why is it worse off if the people cannot tell where the allegiances of the politicians are?   We need to engage with Prop’s main analysis that politicians will choose to listen to their lobbyists over their voters, and accountability mechanisms will fail to punish those politicians.   * Explain the true power of voters to override the power of corporate lobbyists. Characterise voters having more political consciousness and pushing back against the lobbyists, re: post-2008 Occupy Wall Street led to many politicians refusing to take money from the Wall Street lobby. * Prop said that they’re not able to raise similar sums of money. So why will politicians still listen to their voterbase over the millions in funding?   Good focal point on why these resources are crucial for the campaigning process. But why are alternatives insufficient to achieve the same ends though?   * With the Bernie Sanders example, you could’ve flipped it to prove how checks and balances do work because politicians do actively choose to reject lobbying money.   Yes, other special interest groups can also lobby, but we cannot just argue in a vacuum. How will they have any ability to compete with corporate lobbyists and be heard of MORE?   * We can use some framing here. Explain that lobbying is uniquely the only way they can improve their advocacy. In contrast, we can easily limit the bad uses of lobbying. So we have unique benefits and we can limit the harm.   Please offer more POIs today!  6.07 | | | | | | |