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

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  Good start on how democracy being harmed is the focal point, but link it back to the actual problem statement of defamation laws being weaponised in order to harm democracy.   * Good job signposting.   On the set-up:   * Very strategic counterfactual on improving media literacy and higher standards, but it’s not clear why any of this is exclusive.   + Highlight why members of the state will engage in low-hanging fruit tactics if the option to sue media companies exist. * We need to highlight that the media is self-correcting in nature and not exaggerate to a harmful degree!   + Competition in the free market, so there will be call-outs,   + Loss of credibility/reputation,   + Potential loss of investors, etc.   On the first argument:   * We started with the less contentious material, which is that the private lives of politicians are matters of public interest, it isn’t immediately clear why Opp cannot concede any of this stuff!   + So we actually have to explain first why the weaponisation of defamatory lawsuits will lead to media organisations self-censor and deny the public access to this level of scrutiny to their private lives.     - We need to start by structurally highlighting all the incentives of politicians to silence the media, e.g. improve electoral chances by avoiding accountability/criticism, create perfect echo chambers that will never have any counter-narratives, etc.     - Then prove the chilling effect proper, but clearly explains why the legal risks and costs will alter the business model of media companies, OVER the profits they will gain from engaging in discourse. Then you can force them into self-silencing when they have to criticise politicians.   + All other harms are contingent on this premise, but it wasn’t even clear why mechanistically this had to be an exclusive benefit! * While this has a really good impact on media organisations on scrutinising politicians, we are not nuanced in our analysis here.   + Why do you believe the media will even be responsible in the process of reporting here, and how do we know that voters have adequate media literacy to navigate this?   On the second argument:   * Again, we are analysing the powers and capacities of politicians too broadly, without explaining the link to the motion! Why do you think the media and voters will lose its ability to even scrutinise politicians just because lawsuits become an option? * Good analysis that lawsuits can dominate the airtime and create a political diversion. What are then the harms of not being able to hold politicians accountable due to the opportunity cost?   + E.g. Explain things like the business model of media companies to justify the existence of investigative journalism would disappear. Point out the extent of the role that media scrutiny has contributed to political accountability, such as with Watergate. * On politicians being distracted from their duties, it isn’t clear why this isn’t a choice they can actively make. Why do they have to spend their time pursuing the case legally, rather than actually doing their job? * We need to work on the impact statements to voters and public interest here.   Please offer more POIs today!  7.55 - Watch for the double bell. | | | | | | |