| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that developing countries have a "right to pollute" the environment |
| --- |

| 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.]  Start with a high-impact hook, rather than the signposting of your speech! When you’re describing the level of manufacturing that similarly destroys the economy and the resulting human costs, that’s exactly right, start here.  Counter set-up FIRST! Then, rebuttals. We shouldn’t be providing this at 5:45, time management!   * We need some kind of mechs highlighted from the status quo to help these vulnerable countries transition to green tech when it’s so expensive.   + E.g. Development aid with conditions for sustainable development.   + E.g. Highlight that the Paris Agreement already incorporates what Prop proposes on developed nations sharing green technology with the world. Explain the political and economic capital to make these transitions CHEAPER.   + We eventually said all of the above, it’s just very late. * Try to offer economic development alternatives as well since they have to disavow manufacturing. * Set up your winning pathway clearly, explain that the Opposition actually comes closest to any kind of approximate solution to the climate crisis and why this is the most important thing.   While it’s correct to emphasise on the human costs of pollution, it isn’t comparative with Prop’s human costs from the lack of economic development. Rather than explaining your harms in a vacuum, either deconstruct their harms, or explain why your harms are more important.  In response to the POI, good use of Indonesia’s deforestation example to explain proximate health harms caused to civilians. Bear in mind that she’s trying to wash out the harms, so we should explain why these environmental harms are actually greater in SCALE.   * E.g. If we cross the environmental tipping point, the human costs are ad infinitum across all nations, this is far greater than the costs of slower development.   Good job characterising the climate tipping point and the urgency of the looming deadline, what would it take to even accomplish this and is it even possible? It’s starting to sound like it’s doomed on BOTH sides.   * We should be stating that these things ARE possible, but could only work if EVERY nation participated in the global green transition. * Rather than just say more people die faster, explain the comparison of human costs, because Prop also argued the scale of people dying on their side.   + On your side, point out that the deaths are ad infinitum versus Prop’s losses are temporary in nature.     - Then use moral weighing to explain which group does the state owe a greater obligation to. This will take down Prop’s 2nd argument on state obligation.   On the right to pollute making things worse, it’s not just about adding time on the urgent timeline. Aside from health harms, they hurt their own economic livelihoods and pathways for development.   * Even if developed nations are helping out elsewhere, if they are polluting their own oceans, the ocean ecosystems will die out in that area. So these developing countries themselves have to practise restraint to protect their own livelihoods.   We needed to engage the moral justification by Prop on colonialism and exploitation by developed nations,  We cannot enter the first argument only at 7:20! Time management, Steph!   * The argument is entirely repetitive of the argument on health harms, we need to be able to restructure our analysis so that there is minimal repetition. * While I understand the logical reasoning on hurting people, how does this compare to the loss of manufacturing jobs being argued by Prop?   + Say you can minimise job losses because the green market also contributes to job creation.   Good job offering POIs!  8.06 | | | | | | |