| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will abolish the powers of executive pardons |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  How will pardons exist on either side of the house when you are literally abolishing it?   * If what you mean is that abuses happen on either side, but there’s less abuse on your side, we have to weigh the human costs of this abuse vs the human costs on the systemic failures that cannot be reversed via the exercise of the power of pardons.   Good job reinforcing the prevalence of political abuse of this power.   * But be mindful about debating via examples only. You also have to give a reason as to WHY abuses by the executive are so prevalent. * Why are pardons so prevalent OTHER than protecting family and friends? It’s been a singular incentive analysis so far, yet we want to argue the prevalence of this abuse.   + Profit-motivated. E.g. Lobbyists donate to their political campaigns in order to secure their inner circle.   + Political patronage. E.g. All Republican presidents have pardoned their predecessors who have committed political crimes.   I appreciate that on a balance, pardons are quite limited in terms of its ability to correct injustices that are systemic. Good observation re: high volume of systemic abuses, but tell me more things about the bureaucracy and why presidents often don’t pardon the people who are truly in need of that kind of executive protection.  Good clash on pardons undermine certain principles of law and justice, but this is argued in a vacuum. Can we engage with the systemic injustices argued by Opp such as in cases of false convictions, or archaic laws? In that case, prosecution is precisely the cause of the injustice.  On the comparison of mechanisms between your two worlds:   * Good observation pardons are an absolute exercise of power, explain in clear terms that this means it could not be checked by the courts or reversed by the legislature.   + However, it’s not true that there’s zero checks because Presidents could face electoral accountability in the next election.     - So you can bring up the fact that they often do this at the very end of their term when they can no longer stand for another election. * HOW are your systemic changes FEASIBLE?   + Give me an alternative check and balance to deal with the ability of the executive to counter the failures of the judiciary and legislative.   We’re going somewhere REALLY GOOD with weaponising executive powers for politician gain!   * The Trump example shouldn’t have been a hypothetical, that was exactly what happened. His business associates were all donors to his political campaign.   + Impact this even more on creating an ecosystem of power and corruption where the financial elite trade favours with the political elite. * On doing this to advance the corruption of parties, we are so close to the correct analysis. What is the mechanistic analysis and grounding for this.   + Explain president Ford pardoning president Nixon for all of his political crimes in order to protect his own party. * In terms of check and balances, it still isn’t clear why electoral mechanisms could not be an adequate form of accountability to prevent abusive parties from getting into power.   + Explain the structural flaws with this per what I gave in the class!     - E.g. They can shift the voting issue to something else.     - Or point out that heads of states in their final term cannot be held accountable.   Good job offering POIs today!  6.57 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |