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

| **Motion:** This house believes that developing countries have a "right to pollute" the environment |
| --- |

| 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.]  Excellent opening explaining that the state doesn’t have to pursue unfettered, extreme pollution while in pursuit of economic development.   * However, if your team has characterised that these nations deeply lack economic alternatives, then why wouldn’t they pursue manufacturing unabashedly? * Explain how the nation can BALANCE pollution and sustainable development, how do they operate with such competing incentives?   While I agree that it’s not financially viable to engage in green tech development at the same time as economic development, we need to engage with Opp’s counterfactual!   * They proposed things like green tech transfer to developing nations.   + Point out that none of these mechs are even exclusive, so we can have tech transfer while allowing developing nations to pollute.   It isn’t clear why the opportunity cost had to be no healthcare or no infrastructure altogether, why can’t it be drawn from the investments put into manufacturing.   * We need more mechanistic analysis why these developing nations only have comparative advantage in the manufacturing industry, thus will have little to no alternative economic plan.   + E.g. Large-scale jobs at an entry-level can only exist exclusively via manufacturing.   + If Opp showcases ANY viable alternatives, then all of your harms no longer materialise.   We have to engage with Opp’s main harm on the climate apocalypse.   * We need to be more comparative and explain why there is still time for these developing nations to catch up to the green transition after taking their time to accumulate their wealth first.   + Only then, you can use the weighing of having wealth as a prerequisite towards the green transition.   Good characterisation of the domestic political climate falling apart if baseline economic development has not been achieved.   * We need to first break down why Opp’s suggestions of development aid would not be enough to reach this baseline development. * You did a good job proving more harm than good, but it isn’t clear that after your level of baseline development, that this same disastrous society would then choose to embrace the green transition.   I appreciate the pushback that the building of infrastructure is the gateway towards important climate defense mechanisms, but Opp’s analyses are far more preventative. So we need to explain why preventative means would not be effective, so we are better off building reactive mechanisms.   * Opp suggested that developed countries will assist them in building this, so we can analyse why nationalistic interests will outweigh global collaboration as we get closer and closer to the climate deadline.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.19 | | | | | | |