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

| **Motion:** This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms |
| --- |

| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  Grocery store knife selling is a good analogy. But it needs analysis to explain why the characters are analogous on a structural level. Is it intent? Is it capacity? Don't hinge analysis on example only!   * Good job signposting the rest of your speech.   I appreciate the effort to challenge their model and metric of harm, but this would’ve been better placed in the 1st Opp speech since 2nd Prop has re-clarified their standard of harm.   * Spend time concluding the point of making this strategic observation! Explain that therefore, corporations will err on the side of caution due to the ambiguity of the law and the incentive to avoid liability.   On engaging with P2’s response that companies will find the right balance:   * While shut down is a greater risk, not making your social media accessible will also completely destroy their business model. * Spend more time proving the mechanistic analysis that overly-censoring is the most logical way for companies to approach Prop’s policy. * Engage properly with Prop stating that users will actively complain about over-censorship, so the companies will find an active balance somehow.   + Point out that competition doesn’t actually work for Prop. If ALL social media companies face the legal risk of severe penalties, then there’s no alternative company for them to migrate to if the entire industry actively embraces the practice of over-censorship. * Shut down corporation vs losing 90% user losing. Both are extreme. I am unclear why this is what the case will be.   In general, well done burden-pushing over-censorship.   * As a comparison, explain why the alternatives that exist in the status quo are actually sufficient to deal with all of the prevailing harms.   + Point out that the free market and competition means there’s a race to the top to make these platforms safe for users.   + We also exist in a post-Cambridge Analytica world where users have more digital literacy to be unaffected by harmful information online, and to prevent social media companies from exploiting them.   On echo-chambers:   * I am unclear who is moving to a different website, and why? Can they speak in-person? Or on messenger group chats? Those are not being closed. Will they go to a "different platform”? Can that also be similarly regulated? Why not? * I am unclear where they will go? Why is that bad? * Regular social media has less eco-chamber and has more information with more views. Why are competing views better? Just because there is a competing view does not mean extremism is addressed. There needs to be more analysis here.   On harmful content going underground, isn’t this infinitely better because the scale of exposure to the public is significantly reduced?   * Good point that the underground platforms will have zero content moderation platforms. * Tell me the ease in which people can seek these places, e.g. VPN exists to hide digital footprint and go into places like 4chan.   We should’ve spent more time focusing on the harms of social media being cleaned out.   * Prove the loss of diversity of content. We still needed to explain why mainstream media engages in practices like coverage bias which silences the views of minorities because your 1st Opp did’t explain this yet. * Characterise social media as the only space where social movements thrive.   + What are the social costs of killing off social media? How does this impact discourse and democracy?   Coverage disparity argument   * Why is it bad, again? Sure they can blame the big company, but can also still prosecute the hate speaking individual, or the drug dealer, and so on. * Even if companies are blamed on only, that as per props analysis makes them better regulated. What's your engagement with that analysis?   On shifting the blame to companies:   * While companies are not actively committing the crime, Prop has given enough analysis to link a lot of the harms to the decisions of companies and their profit incentive.   + Such as their algorithms rewarding the proliferation of the bad content.   + We need have active engagement in this analysis, beyond just re-stating our analogy of the social media companies not actively making the post.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  8.13 | | | | | | |