| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **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 6 minutes’ long.]  Good hook!  Nice explanation on why monopolies may start with lower prices for market dominance, then they switch towards aggressive pricing mechanisms.   * Can you provide a business incentive as to why this makes sense for them to do?   After pointing out that they will eliminate all forms of competition, angle the impact towards how the free market is destroyed but it is precisely the free market that is a correcting mechanism against ALL bad corporate practices, so this is the biggest harm of all in the debate.   * We’re doing a good job on the mechanistic analysis and not enough time on the impact analysis! Why is it important that we focus on the lack of consumer choice?   + E.g. Consumers are denied innovation that are created by small companies so we are deprived of higher quality products.   + E.g. Quality of services become far worse when they are monopolies since they are not threatened.   + E.g. Post-hostile takeover, they sit on all of the innovations they acquire, their only goal is to kill the competitor.   Can you deal with Opp’s recharacterisation that there’s actually competition existing even with monopolies?   * Point out what we learned about market collusion and deciding to not compete with each other.   We are missing a key engagement on innovation from Opp!   * Explain why Prop actually gains more innovation when there is a business incentive to gain market leadership. * Point out that the state can provide incentives for greater innovation.   On the first argument:   * Good reasoning on ‘too big to fail’ companies forces the state’s hands. * Good harm on corporate capture. * Both of the above mechanistic analyses lack the kind of grounding to show when this actually happens, as well as an impact analysis on why this is incredibly harmful! * If we had spent more time analysing why the public good is sacrified, we can frame this as a response to 1st Opp’s principle argument on the injustice of taking away the right to property of private businesses. We don’t let businesses have infinite powers to expand wealth if it comes at the expense of public interest.   Please offer more POIs in the debate.  6.15 | | | | | | |