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

| **Motion:** This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  I would prefer a high-impact hook, not one that just summarises the motion! Please prep one next time.  On the counter set-up:   * Is there a reason why we’re highlighting the power of consumers to influence companies in the set-up? This belongs in the argument. * Good job setting up carbon footprint labels and providing tax incentives for the green transition, but all of these are GOVERNMENT regulations, which is what Proposition suggests.   + The only way this is Opp’s model is if you can explain that companies do these changes willingly as a result of consumer pressure. * It isn’t clear what we are asking consumers to do in your world beyond a boycott, so we can make the comparison on the kind of changes that will happen in both worlds.   + We should’ve highlighted the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve. * We should highlight that this is about what the environmental movement should focus on, so we can point out that Proposition cannot propose laws today.   + They have to prove that green movements have the ability to pressure the government to change vs on your side, it’s easier for you to influence consumers.   + So Opp’s changes WILL happen because green consumers are a captive audience of the green movement, but Prop cannot mechanise their arguments.   We should push back against their model and explain why corporate compliance cannot be asserted by Prop. If the regulations hurt companies, they will concentrate their efforts to undermine compliance.  They didn’t propose implementing price controls, they proposed penalties if companies pollute.  We need to engage with Prop’s claim that consumers lack any kind of power.   * Explain it takes even more motivation and capital to convert the ‘care’ of consumers into actual voting power that can influence the state. * We should be explaining that consumers are starting to care about being green in particular. * Spend some time actually characterising this claim:   + Explain that environmental consciousness is on the rise thanks to global media.   + Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy.   + Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. * We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience.   On climate taxes hurting consumers, wouldn’t this be the same harm on your side when companies go green?   * We are letting Prop get away with the assumption that their policies will pass to begin with. Challenge this feasibility by explaining how difficult it is to convince politicians. * Analyse lobbying as the biggest opp, then give examples of powerful lobbyists that win against public interest and are able to make the government deregulate, e.g. big pharma, NRA, etc. * Take this further and explain that even if the policies are passed, companies have the ability to find regulatory loopholes in order to not change in any meaningful ways.   We asserted that companies will find ways around this and pollute anyways, tell me HOW they can get around these state regulations.  On the second argument:   * On the polluting products still existing, all of these harms can symmetrically exist on your side as well. Why would they disappear under a version of consumer boycott? * On contrasting this with boycotts, I am clear that it CAN happen, but it isn’t clear that it will happen on a SCALE that is meaningful enough to force companies to actually change!   + Analyse the business models of companies to explain why companies are likely to listen to consumer boycotts. You can also explain why this is in line with future-proofing their business model and why companies will go green in your world.     - Explain what we discussed in the module on shareholders holding the companies accountable and forcing companies to respond to this boycott with a clear plan of action.     - Be more comparative and defend the power of consumers.   We should’ve also argued the long-term impact to the environment:   * If it’s just a matter of making consumers choose green products, we have to engage with Prop stating that it’s not their fault if there are limited green products.   + We should’ve highlighted ALL the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat; and then impact why each one of these things are so crucial in protecting the environment. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve.   Good job offering POIs in the debate.  8.16 | | | | | | |