| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that governments should not bail out banks deemed ‘too big to fail’ |
| --- |

| 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.]  We need to get out of the habit of self-deprecation before starting your speech.   * Good signposting.   It’s weird that our first argument is that the loss of trust is symmetrical, because your first speaker argued that erosion of trust only occurs under a bail-out model.   * While the money to big banks doesn’t actually trickle down the wealth to the people, Opp’s argument is that it actively prevents the collapse of the financial system. So the money is containing the potential harms instead.   Good moral push on the culpability of these companies and their exploitative ways.   * We’re running a half principle here, what is actually the moral harm beyond a broad claim that this is unjust? Actively outline what is the role of the government, and why this betrayal of confidence matters in the debate.   + Engage with Opp’s counterclaim that the state’s role ought to be in the containment of the crisis in order to protect public interest.   Good work characterising the culture at big banks, I was persuaded that they do engage in high-risk business models.   * But spend more time linking how it is precisely the bail outs that set these banks up into risk taking behaviour further, otherwise it’s symmetrical. Let’s point to how this will remove the implicit guarantee that encourages excessive risk-taking. We need to explain why no set of regulations can succeed without this specific change; we need to link it to the influence these banks hold over the state.   + Large banks employ armies of lobbyists and contribute heavily to political campaigns, giving them significant influence over policymakers.     - We mentioned this later, spend more time on it!       * Over time, regulatory agencies can become "captured" by the industries they are supposed to regulate.       * The movement of individuals between government regulatory agencies and the financial industry (the "revolving door") further blurs the lines and can lead to regulatory capture.   Good response to the POI, but it’s an even better response to say that all of Opp’s harms pertain to the failure of big banks, so they cannot just pick and choose the context when it’s convenient for them.  The claim that the banks will no longer take terrible corporate decisions if bail-outs are not offered is not proven clearly. Many of them do make high-risk decisions even when bail-outs are not a certainty, so what is the delta?   * Spend more time defending the free market’s ability to break out of the instability by helping the companies with the best potential and innovations. * What exactly do you think the companies left alive would be able to do in order to help us get out of the crisis? What innovations are so powerful?   + E.g. Investors will not engage in capital flight of the whole market, but reinvest into these smaller companies.   + E.g. Create popular low-risk financial products.     - We finally mentioned this later on, good job!   Opp is asking you what are you going to do to deal with the crisis? It’s not clear how we will find recovery. So all of our harms on market crashes come across as lacklustre because you’re actively allowing the initial crash to happen. Opp is the one arguing that human costs are minimised as a result.   * We also have to engage with Opp’s countermodel on imposing regulatory reforms to co-opt the benefits of no longer having to face a crashing economy.   Please offer more POIs today!  8.20 | | | | | | |