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

| **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 opening that’s burden pushing for Prop to defend the entire collapse of the economy in the name of the free market correcting itself. Well done.  We need to provide set-up and framing prior to rebuttals. What does your side support, how does it work?  After highlighting the risks of inter-dependency and contagion, it’s not clear why this rebuts the moral hazard argument. That argument is meant to explain that the business models of companies is one that will prioritise risks thanks to bail-outs being a safety net.   * Explain instead how it doesn’t matter if it’s from a taxpayer, or a company, this is NEEDED. * The strategic entry into the debate must be of time. Delayed action can exacerbate the crisis and make it much more difficult to contain. A bailout, while imperfect, can provide immediate stability and prevent the crisis from spiraling out of control. So this fully weaponises the initial characterisations you laid out.   When you highlight what regulations can be implemented to prevent a repeat of the 2008 global financial crisis, this needs to be in the set-up!   * Highlight its strategic value, which is that bailouts do NOT embolden more crises, it often comes with the kind of conditions that guarantees the crisis doesn’t happen again. * Good job proposing early targeted bailouts on top of needed reforms   We need to engage with the 2nd argument on the injustice of it all.   * We need to explain here how each state has the obligation to take the steps that lead to change - and prevent the most amount of harm. This is far bigger than the moral principle from Opp.   On your first argument:   * Good mechanistic analysis on the failure of financial institutions triggers a rapid chain reaction, leading to the collapse of other interconnected institutions. * Good logical reasoning leading to the contagion which will spread quickly through the financial system, freezing credit markets and causing widespread panic. * On how bail-outs will actively prevent the domino effect:   + We’re lacking the comparative analysis here! How exactly will this restore both market and consumer confidence, thus preventing said capital flight? * Spend more time on the impact analysis here. What are the human costs of such economic collapse?   On the second argument:   * On protecting jobs, we should engage with Prop’s analysis that the free market will push those jobs to institutions that are actually in demand from successful companies. * The analysis on market collapsing is repetitive and would be a better fit in the first argument. * Good point on the state saving more money in the long-term, but I fail to see how all of these three claims are connected into one argument.   + It would be better to focus all of your effort into the widespread societal harms and then burden push the Prop to defend all of the massive violations of human rights.   Please offer more POIs!  8.05 - Good timing. | | | | | | |