| **Student Name:** Emma Demopoulos |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that governments should not bail out banks deemed ‘too big to fail’ |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 like the moral push at the start, but at this point, Opp also has a full case of human costs, so they still have the moral highground here on the immediate protection of the people. Try to be more comparative.   * Good signposting.   It sounds like we’re completely evolving the model at 2nd speaker!   * Well done explaining what else we’ll do to ensure these banks don’t gain more risk, and how they can be more sustainable. Good reference to regulatory reforms. We can also add:   + We could introduce regular and rigorous stress tests that realistically assess banks' ability to withstand severe economic shocks.   + Extend regulations and oversight, including hedge funds, private equity firms etc. * But how do we get out of the crisis? What is our positive path to victory?   + Opp is asking what you will do to contain the spread of the financial crisis.   Good pushback on the free market breaking out of the instability by helping the companies with the best potential and innovations.   * But the problem is that this is too abstract, with no real grounding.   + What exactly do you think the companies left alive would be able to do in order to help us get out of the crisis? What innovations are so powerful?     - E.g. Investors will not engage in capital flight of the whole market, but reinvest into these smaller companies.     - E.g. Create popular low-risk financial products.   On closing the wealth gap, it isn’t clear why the Opposition has to oppose this since it has nothing to do with bail-outs.   * So spend time on the link on why it’s mutually exclusive due to the opportunity costs.   We dived straight into innovation, which we’ve already brushed through in the rebuttals, when it isn’t clear why innovations are the priority when the economy is in the brink of absolute collapse.   * Failing back on the government for survival, but innovations will allow them to thrive. So why will they lose the incentive to innovate? * Good work characterising the culture at big banks, and why they will be competitive and accountable. But if that’s the case, then why did they engage in such terrible practices within a free market?   + Instead, spend more time linking how it is precisely the bail outs that set these banks up into risk taking behaviour further. Let’s point to how this will remove the implicit guarantee that encourages excessive risk-taking. We need to explain why no set of regulations can succeed without this specific change; we need to link it to the influence these banks hold over the state. This will prove the entrenchment of the harmful system you’re speaking of.     - Large banks employ armies of lobbyists and contribute heavily to political campaigns, giving them significant influence over policymakers.     - Over time, regulatory agencies can become "captured" by the industries they are supposed to regulate.     - The movement of individuals between government regulatory agencies and the financial industry (the "revolving door") further blurs the lines and can lead to regulatory capture.       * We finally referenced this in the 2nd argument, well done!   A lot of the larger socio-economic harms you’re referring to are against capitalism as the economic system altogether, it isn’t clear why it is solely the banks that should be taking the brunt of this moral culpability.   * We’re running a half principle here, what is actually the moral harm? Actively outline what is the role of the government, and why this betrayal of confidence matters in the debate. * We are speeding through fast on the human costs. We are simply stating what the harm could be, when we should be illustrating the precise lived experiences and loss of quality of life on a day to day basis.   Please offer more POIs today!  8.05 - Good timing. | | | | | | |