| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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.]  We need to have a stronger hook! When we say we provide the moral case, we should highlight what exactly we mean by this. For instance, we need to dis-empower terrorist organisations, and take away their most valuable revenue source, or refuse to engage with them, sending a moral tone.  Set-up   * Good work explaining how this works, and who this targets such as aid-workers. We need to establish what the characteristics of these organisations are - explain why this means they have a certain set of ideological goals, and want the state to engage with them and legitimise them. We identify this as a revenue stream well, but how significant is this as a financial incentive? Are there no other revenue sources? * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware. Is it where governments refuse to engage with them, or pander to them? * How do we get hostages or data back? Do we abandon them, do we intervene?   Argument 1   * Good work following the structure of a utilitarian argument we’ve reviewed today! I think we need to be clearer about what we’re trying to achieve! What is the specific outcome we’re gunning towards? * Is it disempowering the organisation? Do we actually stop them from doing this? We need to explain how this financial incentive goes away and changes their behaviour. * We should develop the incentives of these groups with more nuance - is it just financial? We should also explain that paying ransoms creates a perverse incentive for more kidnappings and hostage-taking. It signals to terrorist groups that kidnapping is a profitable enterprise, encouraging them to target more individuals and potentially escalating the violence. This puts more people at risk. * We should transition into the element of victims of circumstance here, explaining how terrorist groups may execute hostages even after receiving payment, or they may take more hostages to replace the released ones. These will be our last step on how we minimise suffering. * Towards the end of this argument, we start to get pretty repetitive and keep going over the financial incentives - let’s be a bit more mindful about what we have and haven’t covered.   I think we should consider whether the payment of ransom actually gets hostages or data back; are terrorist organisations rational and trustworthy?  We sound unsure when we speak! We use lots of 'I suppose’ or ‘maybe’! Is this projecting confidence?  We only had one argument! We should have run another argument about how we cannot trust people to make justified or good decisions because they are likely to be emotionally involved - hence, we must take their right of choice and freedom away.  06:22  We needed to ask POIs! | | | | | | |