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

| **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: | 72.5 | | | | | |
| 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.]  On the clash of voter interest:   * Good reset of the comparative that Opp co-opts all the alternatives, with an additional tool to be utilised. * While these corporations are still influential on Prop, their biggest political tool is lobbying which is removed. So it’s unclear why the harm is actually symmetrical.   + I appreciate that corporations can still blackmail the state, but on a SCALE, this is a losing battle to focus on because Prop will always have less harms. * We need to recharacterise why good lobby groups are the ones who dominate lobbying.   + We can make a stronger strategic observation that Prop has a very narrow definition of who these lobbyists are, give me a counter-characterisation, such as Emily’s List. WSDC rules require broader engagement with all contexts.   Well done on the characterisation of political consciousness on how taking lobby money from bad actors becomes counterproductive.   * Perhaps Luigi Mangione is not the best example since it doesn’t relate to lobbying! * Use post-2008 Occupy Wall Street led to many politicians refusing to take money from the Wall Street lobby.   + Use the anti-NRA movement.   Very interesting characterisation on the rise of populism dominating the status quo, but it’s not clear how lobbying uniquely overcomes all of these political obstacles!   * It’s looking like minorities will fail on either side. * 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.   On the clash on minorities, how will they have any ability to compete with corporate lobbyists and be heard of MORE?  We completely dropped our second speaker’s argument! 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?   Good job offering POIs today!  4.50 - Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |