| **Student Name:** Jasmine Gao |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house supports tough on crime laws when combating organised criminal groups (e.g. gangs, mafia 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Excellent rhetoric in the hook about the blood not being on the hands of the disenfranchised pawns of organised criminal syndicates, spend some time here first for the intuition pump as to why you don’t think these criminals are truly criminal.  Give the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals.   * Here, we could’ve made a clear burden that clarification that you agree with the problem, but not the method.   + Then we can make an observation that a lot of the harm statements of organised crime from Prop has now become uncontentious. * What is your counterfactual? Rehabilitation? Welfare?   + An even more strategic tool would be offering tools like plea bargaining to get more information against the criminal overlords to take down the syndicates from within.   On rebutting swift justice:   * It’s intuitively clear that cutting bureaucratic processes will in fact, save time. Recharacterise the status quo and the laws that exist today that do allow speedy prosecution of organised criminal syndicates? * Defending the pawns being coerced into the crimes does not actively rebut the essence of her argument on ensuring the crimes of syndicates do not have time to play out its final harmful effects.   Good pushback that tough on crime laws do very little in unseating the criminal overlords. Highlight that the operations will continue nonetheless as they can continuously recruit poor people into their operations no matter how many people are incarcerated.   * I appreciate the structured effort to characterise WHY these people join the gangs, i.e. desperation. * But what is the point of proving all of this? On a scale, would this not still be a more preferable outcome versus none of them being incarcerated and creating more victims overall?   + It’s a slightly dangerous moral implication in this argument here, are you suggesting amnesty for these people who were responsible for massive harm? Are you not still punishing them anyways in your world?   + After explaining all of the reasons as to why someone joins organised crime, how is anything that Opp offers deals with those core motivations?     - How does your rehabilitation model deal with the financial motivations as to why people join gangs? It sounds like the Opp will similarly fail just as Prop did. * Explain that for those who commit crimes due to financial desperation, explain that courts on Opp’s side can mitigate punishment based on differing motivations AND weigh the severity of their offences. So your punishment is more fair and judicious.   + Otherwise, your side is only focusing on the lack of intention without considering the severity of their actions. Some of these people have blood on their hands.   The countermodel cannot only happen in the 2nd argument at the 6th minute! Put this in the set-up.   * We finally had the mechanisms but not enough mechanistic analysis on each one in order to counter-prove the efficacy of Opp’s world! * On more cooperation, it isn’t clear as to why there are incentives for them to do this (aside from your harm statement that they would hate the state more on Prop’s side). Won’t the syndicate have more sway over them still?   + Introduce legal policies like plea bargaining where we lower their sentence or give them immunity altogether if they offered us information. This will be more effective in cracking down on the groups while simultaneously protecting the pawns of the operations.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.02 | | | | | | |