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

| **Motion:** This house would break up monopolies |
| --- |

| 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.]  Good starting point reframing that monopolies deserve their market dominance, but this isn’t ALWAYS true. So some kind of examples or grounding here would be better suited to prove that reality sides in your favour.  Provide the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.   * We’re suggesting anti-trust laws in the middle of your rebuttals.   + But be mindful that this also undercuts potential innovation because these laws significantly hurt your profit margin. * What is your burden/winning pathway?   A lot of our rebuttals are overlapping with your constructive material later on.   * While SOME monopolies engage in the kind of behaviour that benefits consumers, they also do engage in destructive and harmful behaviour.   + So we’re currently washing out this point! We have to prove why there’s a structural business incentive to ALWAYS do what’s right for consumers, e.g. analyse the ‘loss leader’ strategy to maintain market dominance, which is always pro-consumer in nature.   On opposing the divestiture strategy, a lot of your criticisms are precisely what Proposition wants to happen. They want these companies to struggle more and profit less. So those are not harmful.   * Good point that the costs will just transfer to consumers, spend more time here. * We are assuming that these monopolies suddenly become small fledgling companies, Prop has already pointed out that they will still make a lot of profit, just not EXCESSIVE profit.   On your 1st argument:   * Good characterisation on why this worsens operational costs, and increases the costs to consumers.   + But this is repetitive of your rebuttals.   + What is not clear is why doesn’t the competition in the free market kick in and allow prices to be optimised to a point that is affordable?     - At best, I can agree that prices might go up, but these prices will be at price equilibrium between demand and supply which is good.   We randomly went into the principled argument with no transitions.   * What is the justification as to why the state has no right to intervene on privately accumulated capital?   + The problem is that your model of anti-trust laws is also in violation of this principle, you technically also don’t believe that private property ought to be absolutely protected.   Don’t take the POI in the middle of your sentence.  Good job offering POIs in the debate.  8.15 | | | | | | |