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

| **Motion:** As a developing economy, this house will prioritise trade liberalisation over economic protectionism |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 reframing that what developing nations need is a long-term trajectory of growth that protects their domestic economy and sovereignty.  On the counter set-up:   * Good job mentioning quotas, subsidies, etc; present it in a more structured way and explain exactly what are the kinds of industries we will be protecting. * How does Opp engineer economic growth in your world? It isn’t clear how you will get any kind of capital to invest into the economy. * On the winning pathway, can we explain WHY long-term sovereignty is more important than long-term growth?   A lot of the rebuttals are venturing into argument territory!   * On powerful countries strong-arming developing nations into unfavourable terms, explain precisely their incentives to do so first before mechanising how they can do this.   + On the Belt and Road example, it seems like a floating example of big countries using trade to benefit themselves, but it’s not proving why smaller countries have to agree to these terms if it is not beneficial to them overall. Point out the lack of bargaining power and why they are forced into consenting to really bad trade deals.   We are missing engagement to the entirety of Prop’s problem statement on why organic growth is made impossible due to the incapacity of developing states!   * We keep claiming that the goal needs to be about building really strong local economies. But how does Opp achieve this?   + We have to re-characterise developing nations to not be completely poor, as per Prop’s characterisation.   On the first argument:   * Strong analytical start on why local companies are not being able to compete with the companies from developed economies. * Well done on mechanising how protectionist policies improves the ability of local companies to overcome those disadvantages!   + If we can add some grounding here on companies in South Korea doing exactly that, this will complete the analytical rigour. * We are brushing over really fast on the impacts of the rich-poor gap between nations!   + We need to expand the harms of economic hegemons then having complete political control over these local governments.   On the second argument:   * On emboldening local companies to become globally competitive, there’s overlap of analysis in mechanisation here. * The harm of race to the bottom belongs in a different argument, as well as the loss of sovereignty. It seems like we’re molding the sovereignty argument with the globally competitive one! * On protecting local sovereignty, we are not completely mechanising why these local governments have no real choice but to listen to these foreign forces. * We need to explain why the state had to prioritise economic survival over local interests, due to the importance of the working class as a voter bloc and the economic growth being the foremost concern of the developing world. * There’s under-impacting of what the real harm is here.   + Explain the human costs of deregulation.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.30 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |