| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house would ban the payment of ransoms to terrorist 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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 6 minutes’ long.]  Good call out up top - but we need to establish why financial incentives remain, or why there are other incentives that motivate such behaviour to continue. We cannot just call them delusional and then not expand - this makes us unreasonable, as opposed to them!  Set-up needs to be done! Explain how payment would occur in your world, or how we would ensure checks and balances to ensure people or data are properly protected, and why terrorist organisations are unlikely to end up in a slippery slope - where they feel empowered to continue this further.  Rebuttal   * Good work dealing with this, but we could have moved it up as well. Good work talking about fear and hostage exchanges. We should also establish that this is about power - terrorists might do this on the basis of ideological convictions and hate, especially for fundamentalist political or religious groups. * On money, you can explain why the money from these kidnappings or ransomware is not the tipping point to funding their activities; it is a question of legitimacy and reputation. Terrorists have lots of revenue sources and streams. * We needed to engage in greater detail, explaining how their side provides no alternative! We need to question whether they are willing to sacrifice these people! If ransom payments are outlawed, what other options are available to secure the release of hostages? Military interventions are often risky and can endanger the hostages further. Negotiations without the possibility of ransom can be ineffective.   Argument 1   * Good work pinpointing how this is an absolute moral standard, and how the state must uphold these rights, in relation to why it even exists in the first place. * On this being a slight edge - don’t concede this! Explain why we don’t have any edge - make it about their right to life, where if we do not rescue them, they will be killed! * Make it about the victims - who is Prop okay with abandoning? Explain that these are the victims of circumstance - and the state has a moral obligation to rescue them. The moral push of this needs to be clearer, and more efficiently worded. * We are hiding the true impact of this argument when we aren’t paying attention to our wording!   Argument 2   * Rather than just making it about the families, make it about the victims as well as them! Analyse how these groups of people become serious victims of circumstance! Explain how people or even data, end up in these situations because the government failed them in the first place! Why do terrorist groups kidnap people? Who do they kidnap? Is it the elected officials, or Presidents who enact policies against them, or civilians, often journalists? * We need to explain how the state got them into this situation in the first place! This analysis has lots of overlap with our first argument as well.   We sound like we are reading! We need to focus on our delivery, and sounding more engaging when we speak. We are also hiding our face and eyes, such that this hurts our body language and persuasive capacity.  06:25  We needed to ask POIs! | | | | | | |