| **Student Name:** Emi Ruijs |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house opposes philanthro-tainment |
| --- |

| 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 6 to 6.30 minutes’ long.]  I like a bold opening on the moral repugnance of it all, but we should probably go deeper into it and tell me exactly why that is! Otherwise, charity sounds pretty harmless.   * Good effort signposting today.   On the set-up:   * The description of philanthro-tainment is fine, but we need to also explain the counterfactual in a value debate. What do you support in place of this form of charity instead? Make the comparative clear. * What is your standard for why this version of philanthropy is bad? This is a value judgement debate, it's important to have these standards to frame the clashes within the debate.   Strong description of why it’s morally questionable to be making profit off of charity, but the argument is heavily under-analysed!   * Why does intention matter in the big picture if it achieves the goal of more charity? Does this result in pernicious ways in which the charity is being distributed?   + E.g. Are they not supporting the people truly in need, but instead helping people based on what is the most commercially palatable? Such as helping those with sob stories but not those with stigmatised struggles like drug addictions?   + E.g. Are they only helping in superficial ways and then refusing to help in the long-term? Such as buying them a house and not helping them pay the taxes on it?   + E.g. Does the content captured represent these people in their worst moments? How can this impact them mentally, as the content captured stays on the internet forever?   + It would have been good for you to move away from the Tesla example - that is just one particular case. What is your comparative anyway? * If the Opposition explains that profit improves the incentive for entertainers to raise money for good, this principle argument is going to be severely limited in impact. So we need a moral impact on why this matters at all in the debate.   How can Proposition claim that the people with the “correct” motivations will actively be providing charity to the scale that the Opposition is?   * Can we weigh why the “correct” charity on a smaller scale is more impactful than “incorrect” charity on a grander scale? * We can mitigate and challenge if Opp’s problem statement is true on the status quo lacking people with altruistic intentions giving back to society.   The argumentation about people not being willing to help anymore/rely on these YouTubers is a bit odd. The reason for this is because it doesn’t really deal with the main incentives that people have when it comes to charity.  What is the unique harm that these YouTubers bring? You suggest it is because it is an overgeneralization of what the poor needs - but this already happens with charities, independent of YouTubers. What makes them uniquely terrible? Is it because of their audience, etc?   * How would you otherwise send the correct messaging related to how one ought to support meaningful charities?   The harms would be more magnified if we explained why it’s impossible to hold these entertainers accountable as they are hiding under the guise of being “charitable” when they do abuse the people they help. Do they have a cult of personality?  I understand the criticisms on why this form of help to the poor is quite limited. What isn’t clear is the counterfactual. Can Proposition claim that you are in any way genuinely helping the poor? At the very least, isn’t the Opposition still helping more poor people on a scale?  Good job offering POIs today!  6.29 - Solid timing! | | | | | | |