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

| **Motion:** As a developing economy, this house will prioritise trade liberalisation over economic protectionism |
| --- |

| 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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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.]  The hook assumes that Opp supports completely isolationist trade policies, which isn’t likely to be the case since that’s not very strategic. We are better off focusing on the worst impacts suffered in your world.  On the set-up:   * Clear definition of trade liberalisation as well as protectionism with the use of policy examples. * We can spend time here also characterising a developing economy as contexts experiencing low growth, high unemployment, and low diversification, so it’s clear that they require foreign direct investment in order to rejuvenate its economy. * On the burden of long-term longevity, longtermism is actually a metric that Opp is primed to win. You are better-off focusing solely on the immediate economic rejuvenation of these economies.   On the first argument:   * Strong start explaining comparative advantage, and how it maximises access to a wide variety of goods and services.   + I appreciate the highlighting of low labour costs as our comparative advantage. * Aside from stating that it’s actually hard to diversify or upskill to a service economy, we should spend time expanding on the limitations of a developing economy.   + Point out the lack of capital they suffer from, and why uniquely an injection of foreign direct investment is the solution in order to spearhead the diversification/upskilling you need. * Spend more time analysing why local organic growth is not likely happening, then describe why local companies are often inefficient. Then we can point out that foreign companies often bring in tech exchange and they help upskill the local workers in the long-term, which then helps the local workforce to transition and build their own companies.   + So this deals with their best case of local companies actually expanding, but they just will never be as good as foreign companies.   On addressing the need for economic growth via FDI, good analysis as to why foreign investments will not enter under protectionist conditions.   * Spend more time on the exclusivity of this benefit. E.g. Highlight high start-up costs for infrastructural investment that the state does not have, but foreign companies will be willing to bring in capital if we embrace free trade. * The impacting cannot just be one-liners on things like job creation. We have to explain why job creation is the epicenter of economic growth, which then leads to a long-term cycle of economic development.   Focusing on brain drain does not help Proposition entirely, because a free market also makes it easy for the free movement of labour across different nations.   * I like the premise of playing catch-up to the level of economic development of first world countries, but we have to be careful because this premise is easily flippable. The global free trade fuels the trade deficit for developing nations, thus making it harder to catch-up to the growth of developed nations in the long-term.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.12 | | | | | | |