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

| **Motion:** This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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.]  Excellent observation that the harms are symmetrical in the debate when the companies eventually complete the green transition.  Good rebuttal that the Opposition's model is crossing the aisle towards state regulations.   * Aside from education, explain that Opp’s mech is singularly consumer boycott and nothing else. * Conclude that actually Prop is the one delivering all of Opp’s positive outcomes.   It’s a very simple rebuttal on why consumers can switch to green products, but this logic also helps with Opposition’s analysis on why the boycott can be easy and effective.  On the success of consumer boycott:   * We are repeating the rebuttal we made in the hook, you can go straight into other responses. * We are forgetting to flip this claim. Spend time explaining why consumer boycotts will fail.   + We need to first prove that consumers will not be able to influence corporations in any meaningful way, thus we have to resort to state regulations.     - Explain why consumers are selfish, prioritise affordability, convenience, etc.     - Explain that companies often engage in consumer manipulation, which allows them to get away with greenwashing. Explain precisely HOW they’re able to do this by funding expert media campaigns. * Good final comparison on the products being more eco-friendly in the end.   We are forgetting to reinforce the winning pathway of your case, re: corporate culpability.   * Reinforce that being green is a privileged choice, but explain how so, i.e. why exactly are green choices expensive and inaccessible. * Then immediately contrast this with the fact that it is the companies who have the capacity to produce green products and make them affordable. So the change needs to be imposed by the state. * Why does culpability matter? Explain that making more responsible choices often comes at the expense of their own quality of life, this isn’t fair. Whereas companies have all the wealth they need to make the transition to a green system. So we must hurt companies, not consumers.   Good response that regulations are more effective as corporations have to comply.   * But we are not mechanising WHY they have to. Compliance with regulations cannot be asserted, explain why the repercussions of violating the regulations would either destroy their business model, or threaten their ability to stay open. And things like lobbying will not be able to overcome this. * Spend more time analysing why exactly companies do not have the natural incentive to change and go green, and this is why your case matters. Analyse why business models will always reward polluting, and why specific types of companies do not respond to consumer boycotts.   On your argument:   * This argument has a massive overlap with what Stephanie is arguing. The only differentiation is that consumers are less likely to support the movement when it hurts them. * But bear in mind these are members of the green movement that Opp is convincing. So this is a captive audience that already believes in the cause. * I need to know why the environmental movement is capable of convincing the government better than they can convince consumers. If consumers are so selfish, how do they become effective voters who push for all of these green laws?   There was no environmental impacting throughout the speech! Focus on actually saving the environment in your final argument.  Good job offering POIs.  8.22 | | | | | | |