| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** In post-colonial states, This house believes that education (e.g. history curricula) should graphically and exclusively focus on the negative impact of colonialism |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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. ]  Hold on to your composure and don’t say “shit” in the middle of your speech just because you lost your original speech flow!  On solving ethnic division, good reinforcement on the current post-colonial state being divisive.   * Link it back to colonial practices being the main culprit that will then bleed into the current practices/modern beliefs that entrench division.   + Say clearly that a lot of racial divisions are a byproduct of divide-and-conquer, so that when these stereotypes prevail, we can redirect the hurt and say that these prejudices were actually artificially constructed by our colonisers. * On unity against the common enemy, explain clearly that politicians will play the blame game, so now we avoid ethnic groups actively blaming each other. So blaming the colonisers creates a lightning rod that helps focus policy discourse on the policy agenda that actually matters.   + Could we insert some weighing or framing as to why unity for a post-conflict state must take priority over truthfulness?   + Explain that divisiveness could lead to an existential crisis for these young states and they are incapable of passing the kind of policies needed to grow out of destitution, or that the biggest risk we face is a devolution into conflict (and precisely how large the risk of this happening is).   However, why must this be done specifically by history curricula? Was this necessary in order to engage in nation-building?   * It isn’t clear why the Opposition lacks any tool towards nation-building and healing. Why can’t they engage in diverse discourse without blaming an external actor?   We need to deconstruct Prop’s argument on the state having an obligation to be truthful in all instances!   * Point out that ALL states engage in historical revisionism, history is innately subjective and told through the lens of the victor. This isn’t an obligation that any state fulfills. * Spend time pushing back on whether Prop’s policy is historical revisionism to begin with! * Opp mentioned that a lie by omission is still a lie, so clarify that no context will be lost from this historical retelling because the truth is that the colonisers are in fact responsible for the majority of the harm.   On reshaping the behaviour of society, Opp has also argued that the prevailing sentiment is one where local societies already know that colonisers are bad!   * Can you explain why the problem of not recognising the faults of colonisers even exists? * We need better characterisation of the effective way in which our colonisers have built in social systems that idolise white traits, and thus fixing the education system becomes an instrumental pathway towards correcting this.   + For example, a lot of Asian societies colonised by the West admire Western features and beauty standards to the extent of colorism and problematic practices like skin bleaching. * Can we then prove the power of history education in shaping the perspectives of the future generation?   + It isn’t clear why the existing systems under status quo would not be sufficient to deter local societies from engaging in things like brain drain, etc.   We also need to rebut the Opposition's main point on local leaders losing accountability.   * Point out different contexts in which local societies did not hold any blame in the process of colonisation! E.g. The Native Americans bear zero blame when they were colonised. * Explain that Opp is being selective in their arguments, whereas all of Prop’s arguments universally apply to ALL types of post-colonial states.   While post-colonial states could pass better local policies from, this isn’t engaging with Opp’s analysis that many of these states are actually needing positive relationships with their colonisers.   * We need to weigh how much we actually stand to benefit from these kinds of relationships in contrast to the kind of division we suffer from locally.   + Ask if there are no other diplomatic allies that could stand to help us in the post-nation building process? These benefits need not be unique to our colonisers in particular.   Please offer more POIs!  8.15 | | | | | | |