| **Student Name:** Kelly Au |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would make social media companies liable for any harmful content made available on their platforms |
| --- |

| 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.]  Excellent hook focusing on the worst of human costs in the status quo, we should spend extra time linking all of these harms to the actions of corporations, then point your proposal as the solution in the debate.  On the state finding difficulty regulating harmful content, explain as well that these companies protect the privacy of users, which makes it easy for individual users to hide their identity and difficult for the state to pursue criminal liability.   * What loopholes exactly are there that cannot be tackled in opp? What's the comparative here?   Work on speech structure, and transition clearly between each rebuttals.  When we reinforce the model, we need to add clarity instead of just repeating whatever she said. The core of 1st Opp’s rebuttal is that your model will involve over-censorship. So engage with the worst case scenario.   * Well done on pointing out that they could face consumer backlash if they go too far, go deeper here! There may be an incentive for corporations to balance these two competing incentives, but weigh which one is bigger.   + Explain that free accessibility is crucial to their business model, so they will never crack down on free speech.   + Then, mechanistically tell me HOW they can achieve this. Push back and say they won’t rely on faulty AI to do this. * Just saying they need profit isn't enough; why can't they still make profit if they comply with the government and so on?   + So there needs structural analysis as to why it is unlikely for the government.   Sure, government abuse is not fully mutually exclusive. But on “scale”, there is a higher possibility in the opps world. Instead of responding to extreme, engage to structural level and say why there are gaps in opp + explain why corporations wont give in   * On whether they would comply with the model: Interesting push back on media liability laws, but explain specifically that your model is not just one of financial penalties, but one of complete suspension. So the costs of companies pushing back is too risky for them to take.   On the principle justification:   * Interesting claim on corporate culpability, it’s not clear why these bad corporate practices are devised from malicious intentions, rather than just the sheer difficulty of moderating content.   + We need to spend more time characterising these terrible practices as deliberately done at the expense of consumer welfare. We have to characterise the profit incentives of corporations to explain why they have devised the algorithm in such a way that specifically enables the harmful information to spread.     - For example, the profit that social media gains from advertising is based on the number of views and engagement, thus they will develop echo chambers to keep people engaged online and encourage fake news to go viral in order to get more clicks. This explains why the algorithm is deliberately faulty.     - Point out that they don’t crack down on this harmful information because more engagement with controversial content will also bring in more money. So they let extremism fester online. * It isn’t clear why the liability passes to the social media companies, instead of the sole liability of the users who post the harmful information. * I am unclear what “these types of algorithms”. What is it? How does it work exactly? * I am also unclear what is “properly moderate”, what is “these types of information” and so on? There needs to be some structural analysis at some point of this justification for it to be complete.   Is the conclusion of this just the moral culpability of corporations? How do we weigh this principled interest against the interest of disenfranchised minorities on the Opposition?  Please offer and take POIs. And please prioritize explicitly what your path to victory is.  Good job offering POIs.  8.01 - Good timing. | | | | | | |