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

| **Motion:** This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 5 minutes’ long.]  Have a hook, Hanna!  Prop did respond to the point on Opp needing money in order to campaign, they reset the comparative that social movements will always lose against corporations in the field of money politics due to power asymmetry.   * So engage with them charitably.   Your first speaker did not propose a cap as a counter-model! So this is a brand new evolution of a model.  On alternative pathways for social change:   * While I appreciate that other alternatives are resource-intensive, that’s the exact same with lobbying. So we should’ve focused on the fact that they are labour-intensive instead, because lobbying is much easier than organising protests and petitions! * Explain why the alternatives on Prop actively IS categorically weaker than the explicit political audience that they gain with lobbying, rather than just co-opt all of Prop’s benefits. Because we still need to defend the uniqueness of lobbying as a solution for minorities.   + Can we illustrate exactly why politicians don’t listen to minorities if they don’t utilise money politics?   We need to engage with Prop’s main analysis that politicians will choose to listen to their lobbyists over their voters, and accountability mechanisms will fail to punish those politicians.   * Explain the true power of voters to override the power of corporate lobbyists. Characterise the voters as having more political consciousness in modern times and they are capable of pushing back against the lobbyists, re: post-2008 Occupy Wall Street led to many politicians refusing to take money from the Wall Street lobby. * Prop said that they’re not able to raise similar sums of money. So why will politicians still listen to their voterbase over the millions in funding?   Good reinforcement of the democratic principles that justify lobbying, but we cannot just repeat the claims, we have to weigh it!   * We need a comparative as to why participation overrides representation in a democracy. * Principally, why is lobbying a fundamental right? What is the harm of the loss of participation?   + Explain why special interest groups NEED lobbying in order to be heard. Why isn’t protests and petitions enough, and only money would work for them to participate meaningfully in a democracy?   If we are playing on the strength of networking, then this is something that Prop co-opts.  We sound more nervous than usual today, try to project confidence when you can.  Please offer more POIs today!  5.15 | | | | | | |