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

| **Motion:** This house would nationalise all essential services (such as communication, energy, transportation, etc) |
| --- |

| 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 7 minutes’ long.]  Good focal point on companies profiteering at the expense of public access, hammer the point home with some valuable grounding to set the context for unaffordable public goods.  On the set-up:   * Strong strategic model for nationalisation with the hybrid approach. * On the state subsidising to improve affordability, is this truly exclusive? Opp can still suggest subsidies on a needs-basis even under corporate control. * Name me exactly what industries you will be nationalising for clarity. * Clear winning pathway, but we should also explain why accessibility is the better winning pathway over the trade-off of innovation.   Strong start on why essential goods and services often lead to powerful companies that dominate the industry.   * We shouldn’t limit our reasoning to just pricing it high leads to more money, compare this business model to Opp’s business model on why companies make more money by expanding these goods to more consumers.   + Here, we can point out that essential goods are inelastic in nature, so they can get away by pricing it high, as the demand for essential goods and services is constant.   + Spend time characterising the profit incentive of corporations too. * Well done on the impacting that these industries are the conduit for the access to basic human rights.   + Where is the illustration of human costs? How could the lack of access threaten their right to life.   + We need to expand this to the obligation of the government to nationalise public goods. What are the metrics to justify state intervention in the private market? * However, all of this merely justifies that the state engages in antitrust regulations. It isn’t clear why we can’t just break up the oligopolies, rather than assume command.   On the second argument:   * Excellent job grounding the perverse behaviours of corporations on land grabs, and why the state intervening is necessary.   + After this, can you draw a parallel to essential services? * A lot of our harms pertaining to labour exploitation and cyclical harm is not nuanced to the motion! Why does any of this have to do with essential services in particular,   On the state being able to do it better:   * I appreciate the claim of the state having better incentives, but we’re not precisely highlighting what are the structures in place that forces the state to prioritise public interest.   + We only have the model of mandating transparency, spend time explaining why information is key in holding the state accountable.   + We have to prove the effectiveness of these accountability mechanisms. Why will it be easy for backlash to be converted to anti-state political mobilisation? Are there a lot of awareness on these issues?   + Provide some grounding of when states have been held accountable. * We are not filling in the analytical gap on capacity. Just because the state will do it, doesn’t mean that they could! HOW will the state be efficient in any way?   Good job offering POIs in the debate!  7.09 - Good timing! | | | | | | |