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

| **Motion:** This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media organisations |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Nice focal point on the media getting away with lies, some real-life examples would really drive the point home.  On the counter set-up:   * We should highlight the business models of media companies and how they developed defense systems around being sued, such as insurance and a strong legal team. So they know how to survive being sued. * Good job explaining how defamation laws will work. Conclude clearly that the likelihood of legal abuse can be minimised through other legal mechanisms.   + E.g. Frivolous lawsuits get thrown out by courts very quickly during the summary trial, so it doesn’t get abused very much. For the trial to go on, the lawsuit needs merit.   Well done counter-characterising why their media checks-and-balances will fail!   * Conclude this with a burden push that Proposition will have to defend toxic practices like the spread of misinformation.   Interesting pushback that the media cannot find information on your private lives without going too far, but there is no need to defend breaking the law! The media can still investigate and scrutinise politicians without harassing people or trespassing.   * Spend more time on the point of low media literacy in the status quo, then explain to me why it’s impossible for this specific problem to improve for as long as tabloid journalism exists.   We should explain that on our side, the courts will only eliminate false information that is actively harmful.   * However, we need to specifically engage with Prop explaining the chilling effect that occurs even when the lawsuits fail.   + We should be comparing competing business models and showing why more money is made by lying, than being ethically responsible instead.   On the first argument:   * Instead of starting with false information that will hurt politics which is the impact, we have to start with the mechanistic analysis on media incentives to propagate these lies.   + Don’t just throw in all the forms of biases as if the judge already knows what you mean, explain each one to conclude why lies become the truth * We are under-explaining the harm here, expand to explain how the media then becomes weaponised into political tactics that divert discourse and hurt people unfairly.   + Expand this to people sending in false information and making up rumours just days before the electoral voting happens. * On politicians being distracted from their job, explain proper why they cannot just ignore the media, i.e. electability overshadows things like policy merit, because one precedes the other. * The harm is not just contained to politics, you’re explaining that their life is ‘ruined’ in the context of losing the election, rather than real victimisation of politicians as individuals, i.e. hurting their families! They deserve rights too despite their occupation.   + Focus on the most vulnerable stakeholder such as female and minority politicians. Expand the harms of these people being victims of a public witch-hunt, and how this hurts other minorities from becoming political representatives.   Please work on time management, we didn’t have enough time for a second argument!  Good job offering POIs today!  8.11 | | | | | | |