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

| **Motion:** This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms |
| --- |

| 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.]  It isn’t clear that the Opposition was ever fighting for absolute free speech, they were simply arguing that overly censoring social media carries harms to society. So this hook seems slightly misplaced.  Good job actively clarifying what is the metric of harm for your policy, and good strategic standards such as criminal activity, misinformation, etc.   * Explain that the state will set the financial penalties based on the amount of social harms caused.   Strong rebuttal that users will complain that heavy censorship will drive them away, so companies will find a balance.   * However, if ALL social media companies face the legal risk of severe penalties, then there’s no alternative company for them to migrate to if the entire industry actively embraces the practice of over-censorship. * Are there any clear methods where social media companies can claim they have done their due diligence, so that they don’t have to resort to over-censoring?   + For example, if they have implemented strong content moderation policies, they will limit the amount of legal liability they are subjected under. So they don’t have to censor every single thing.   We are not engaging with any of the harms proposed by Vania.   * What about the loss of diversity on social media? * Explain why social media won’t take this opportunity to remove the kind of content that is not advantageous for their own agenda. * Engage with her argument on harmful groups simply moving underground.   Your argument is exactly the same as Emma’s, highlight your distinct contribution.  While you had a good description of algorithms spreading bad information, we need to explain the culpability of corporations in this process. Characterise the profit incentives of corporations to explain why they have devised the algorithm in such a way that specifically does this.   * The profit that social media gains from advertising is based on the number of views and engagement, thus they will develop echo chambers and encourage fake news to go viral in order to get more clicks.   + Point out that they don’t crack down because more engagement with controversial content will also bring in more money. So this is why they let extremism fester online.   Try to expand the harm to society beyond the one-liner of people becoming extremists.  On why corporations will comply:   * It isn’t clear how severe these penalties are in relation to how much profit they can earn from allowing people to post whatever they want. The liability needs to be high enough so that social media companies do not choose to just absorb these penalties as operational costs. * We need to engage with Opp’s point that companies will simply resort to regulatory loopholes, and resist lawful compliance.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  8.05 | | | | | | |