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

| **Motion:** This house would focus on holding companies legally responsible for environmental harms, rather than emphasise the role of consumer responsibility |
| --- |

| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  On acknowledging the backlash the companies suffer from, we need to actually analyse the business models of companies to explain why companies are likely to listen to consumer boycotts.   * Point out things like the boycott is in line with future-proofing their business model and why it makes business sense for the companies to go green. * Explain what we discussed in the module on shareholders holding the companies accountable and forcing companies to respond to this boycott with a clear plan of action. * Characterise the power of consumers.   On strict regulations passing down the costs to consumers, we have to engage with Prop saying that the harms are symmetrical since the corporate boycott will also lead to higher costs, and these companies will also pass it down to consumers.   * Good rebuttal after that stating that companies have to keep prices affordable due to the competitiveness of the market. But it isn’t clear why this market logic cannot be used by Prop to say why companies will also keep prices affordable in their world! * On prices being low as companies make the changes over a longer period of time, that’s much better since that would be unique to the Opposition. * But underlying all of this, we have yet to prove the assumption that consumers would even have the ability to convince corporations to change!   In response to the POI, engage with Prop’s claim that consumers lack any kind of power.   * Explain it takes even more motivation and capital to convert the ‘care’ of consumers into actual voting power that can influence the state.   + In terms of consumers, these are members of the green movement who are willing to make ethical consumer choices. But in terms of voting, there may be other voting issues that results in their votes going a different way. * We should be explaining that consumers are starting to care about being green in particular. * Spend some time actually characterising this claim:   + Explain that environmental consciousness is on the rise thanks to global media.   + Point out that green products have been made accessible, making consumer boycotts really easy.   + Green movements have massive followings who will listen to their advocacy. * We cannot analyse that they ‘care’ in a vacuum, you have to compare this incentive with Prop’s competing incentives on affordability and convenience.   We also need to deal with the fatal observation by P2 that your set-up actually crosses the aisle into government regulations.   * Criticise their model as well. Push back that corporate compliance cannot be asserted by Prop, and question whether or not they can convince the state to impose regulations.   On your argument:   * The argument has significant overlap with all of the rebuttals you’ve already mentioned. All of the above feedback applies to this. * After highlighting that companies are greatly hurt by green laws, we have to explain why they will then resort to tactics like lobbying to reverse these laws.   + Then give examples of powerful lobbyists that win against public interest and are able to make the government deregulate, e.g. big pharma, NRA, etc. * Explain how they can evade compliance to regulations, such as the revolving door mechanism to appoint corporate leaders into federal agencies to regulate.   We should’ve also argued the long-term impact to the environment:   * If it’s just a matter of making consumers choose green products, we have to engage with Prop stating that it’s not their fault if there are limited green products.   + We should’ve highlighted ALL the different ways in which consumer responsibility can create better habits that are outside of the company’s control, e.g. stop wasting electricity or to stop eating meat; and then impact why each one of these things are so crucial in protecting the environment. Opp can achieve green changes beyond what Prop can achieve.   Good job offering POIs in the debate.  8.22 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |