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

| **Motion:** This house would prohibit elected officials from pursuing defamation lawsuits against media 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 8 minutes’ long.]  Good hook, use illustrations to drive the point of the rhetoric home!  Excellent pushback that when politicians lose the lawsuits, it creates the false impression that the media was truthful. But we need to explain properly why the defamation laws often protect the media over the politicians who are being hurt.  When we are reinforcing that the public deserves to know information on the politicians, it isn’t immediately clear why Opp cannot have any of this stuff!   * So we actually have to explain first why the weaponisation of defamatory lawsuits will lead to media organisations self-censor and deny the public access to this level of scrutiny to their private lives.   + We need to start by structurally highlighting all the incentives of politicians to silence the media, e.g. improve electoral chances by avoiding accountability/criticism, create perfect echo chambers that will never have any counter-narratives, etc.   + Then prove the chilling effect proper, but clearly explains why the legal risks and costs will alter the business model of media companies, OVER the profits they will gain from engaging in discourse. Then you can force them into self-silencing when they have to criticise politicians. * All other harms are contingent on this premise, but it wasn’t even clear why mechanistically this had to be an exclusive benefit!   On Trump still being elected despite false information, it isn’t clear how you get to fix this either in your world. How will media literacy improve without suing, and how do they navigate the falsehoods in the media?   * Explain HOW they can behave responsibly. Point out the credible sources that voters are more likely to listen to, i.e. the politicians themselves and what their campaign says. Explain that electoral campaigns have greater airtime than some random tabloid. * In the bigger picture, we need to explain why aiming for the long-game of media literacy would solve a host of other problems, which is preferable because the media could cause other problematic practices.   + Removing just ONE problem of ‘allegations against politicians,’ doesn’t remove the perverse incentives of the media to hurt other stakeholders. This is why it’s much better to aim for a large cultural shift of readers demanding ethical journalism. Then make observations to show why you think this is even feasible.     - E.g. Bring in the post-Cambridge Analytica context, with things like media literacy being taught in schools.   Good descriptions on the power of politicians and why they’re capable of silencing media organisations. But the chilling effect has been proven by your first speaker and you are just explaining it in more words.   * Good analysis that lawsuits can dominate the airtime and create a political diversion, but this is also the same thing that Hanna argued. We can nuance it to something more specific in order to add value:   + E.g. Explain things like the business model of media companies to justify the existence of investigative journalism would disappear. Point out the extent of the role that media scrutiny has contributed to political accountability, such as with Watergate. * While I agree with the media’s role as the fourth estate, we’re not being very comparative to Opp’s counter-characterisation. Why do you believe the media will even be responsible in the process of reporting here, and how do we know that voters have adequate media literacy to navigate this?   + Charles has given multiple layers of analysis on why the media cannot self-correct sufficiently, such as confirmation bias so they cannot call each other out. We have to reinforce your other checks and balances, e.g. loss of credibility/reputation, potential loss of investors, etc. * All of the impacts are well done, but we’re lacking the grounding!   Please offer more POIs today!  8.12 | | | | | | |