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

| **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: | 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.]  Good job starting with bailouts are necessary, here we can push for Prop to defend the entire collapse of the economy in the name of the free market correcting itself.  On the counter set-up:   * Well done on highlighting the characteristic of “too big to fail,” and this doesn’t apply in most cases. * We can just co-opt regulations wholesale, explain precisely what they are because Prop didn’t actually propose any.   + We need the exact mechs so that you can mitigate the harms later on. * 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. * After stating the metric is a healthy economy, explain your framing on why prevention/containment of the crisis is THE most important thing in the debate.   On the failure of companies, well done pushing back on possible culpability of companies vs external factors.   * At best, we are washing this out because Prop did highlight examples of where culpability existed. * How are these big banks successful when they are currently dying in the present? * After highlighting these different examples, it’s not clear why this rebuts the moral hazard argument. * 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.   I appreciate the conclusion that the trust can be restored because the government took action, however, the trust is referring to market trust! Not a moral one.   * 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. * We need to explain here how a bail out is a better way to manifest the state obligation that Prop wanted and prevent the most amount of harm. This is far bigger than the moral principle from Opp.   In response to the POI, while it could be true that one company may not have that much leverage from a statistical standpoint, your own characterisation of “too big to fail” proves Prop’s characterisation of undue leverage over the state.  On your first argument:   * Good mechanistic analysis on the failure of financial institutions triggers a rapid chain reaction, leading to the collapse of other institutions. * Before explaining the recovery of the market, start with the problem expansion first on why the initial capital flight leads 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! Don’t just assert that it prevents capital flight, why is the bailout such a powerful signalling that they ignore the systemic failure. * Well done expanding the human costs of such economic collapse, we could use more specific illustration of human suffering.   On the second argument:   * The analysis on restoring investor confidence is actually mechanistic analysis of the first argument! * On protecting innocent people, 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. * We can explain here that the state saves more money in the long-term if they invested in the bailout to protect public interest.   + I love the sentence on sentencing people to death. 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!  8.10 - Good timing. | | | | | | |