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

| **Motion:** This house believes that all patents on green technology should be  government-owned |
| --- |

| 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.]  Nice observation at the hook that Opposition simply wins on a question of scale in the innovation clash.   * Can we spend time framing your winning pathway here? Why is innovation the most important thing in the debate?   + Point out that the groundbreaking innovation that will solve the climate crisis does not exist yet, so we still need more innovation. Then point out that there’s NOTHING to create accessibility towards if the groundbreaking green innovation doesn’t exist to begin with.   After proving green innovation is better on Opp, we need to work on the impact analysis here.   * What do you think are these inventions that have the capacity to fix the climate crisis? What is the scale of investment necessary to make this possible, and why can’t the state invest to the same degree?   There needs to be a mechanistic response to the idea of ‘incentive’. You brought in the example of how students would be discouraged to be engineers when they make so little. You must explain (technically) how that is the case. For example: in the tech industry, the rationale for investment is always about being rewarded with money as a return from patents. You no longer see billions of dollars of investment in new tech when the risk is just too high. This shifts their priority away from green tech to other fields where patents are protected. Hence, under gov, big tech still innovates, however, just not in the green tech industry.  Well done recharacterising the idea of the pro-green political capital as not being this steady presence, re: green demand is still elastic in the economy.   * We should also expand this to the political incentive of the state. It’s still quite volatile and it’s frequently superseded by other issues like discrimination, economy, etc.   Your rebuttal on companies still needing to innovate anyways is feeding exactly into 2nd Prop’s rebuttals as to why patents are immaterial to corporate efforts to innovate.   * We need to explain uniquely the role of patents in securing their profit margins. E.g. It’s not that they can’t still profit without it, it’s that investors will never put money into a risky venture in which competitors can steal your green innovation as soon as it is released.   The idea that the plan might simply not exist in the future and may last for only four years may not hold a lot of relevance in the debate. A simple assumption that the gov holds these rights in general would be the right way to go for the debate.  The speech strongly lacks examples that are directly relevant to green tech.  The idea that innovation will be stuck and cannot expand is an important one. Can you connect it with how start-ups will not have the incentive to innovate as they just can’t licence them? Can we argue that start-ups of developing countries will inevitably lose to the west?  Good description of business models to explain why global distribution chains are more likely to happen when spearheaded by corporations.   * But to complete this, provide the mechanistic analysis on how resource-intensive the process of creating nationwide distribution chains for green energy vs the scale of financial burden that the state would be under when the climate crisis worsens. * We need to combine this with the political alignment claim later on as to why they will gatekeep green technology.   + We should also be comparative, since Prop’s response is that countries will engage in tech transfer in order to get more soft power, such as France spreading nuclear energy.   + We’re asking the question rhetorically on why governments will not spread their exclusive technology, but there are obvious answers as to why they would do that, as named in the above bullet point. So try to outweigh it instead.   Very interesting point about why a country isn’t motivated to give their patent away to another country in a different part of the world. Perhaps add that a lot of innovation will be kept a ‘trade secret’ which can be kept indefinitely instead of filing a patent and letting that information into someone else’s hands. You can argue that trade secrets are worse than patent hoarding.  Good job offering POIs today!  8.08 - Good timing. | | | | | | |