| **Student Name:** Boris Cheung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good opening - clear topical focus. Our delivery comes across as very under-confident and nervous. We have to focus on sounding more sure of what we are saying.  Set-up   * We need to characterise what the incentives of terrorist organisations are, and how they have acted in the past where the state has engaged with them on serious terms. * We should use examples here to illustrate the ways in which they operate. * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What is the title? * We need to run a PRINCIPLE argument here, which is utilitarian in nature. We need to start by explaining the outcome we prioritise - which is that we need to disempower these organisations, and empower people and governments to make good decisions. In order to do this, we must ban this payment. * Is this the only source of revenue that terrorist organisations have? We are overclaiming the extent to which the terrorist organisation suffers. * After this, we need to characterise why we are okay with this data being lost, or these citizens dying. We should explain how paying ransoms directly funds terrorist operations. This money can be used to purchase weapons, recruit members, plan attacks, and spread propaganda. Essentially, paying ransoms strengthens the organization and enables further acts of terror. * 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.   Our conclusion has to be stronger! We sound so under-confident.  We need to pay more attention to flow and clarity, to ensure there is fluency and smoothness to our delivery.  04:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ishan Harishankar |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying 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: | 69 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening should be less focused on the people who are making this decision, and more focused on 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.  What do we mean by bribes and terrorist societies? We need to use the language in the motion, rather than our own.  Set-up needs to be clearer! 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   * 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 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   * Clear identification of the right being sacrificed here! Is it about self-protection, or about people being abandoned, when the government bans the payment of ransom. * Explain why compared to alternatives, this is the only way forward where we don’t sacrifice these lives. * On the gateway, explain how this means people cannot engage in a number of actions if we limit this, for instance, using their own money for what they want; if a family or company is willing to pay a ransom to save a loved one, it should be their prerogative. * We can also analogise this to the state being okay with sacrificing people in the name of national security. * Where is blackmail coming from? We introduced this in the middle of the argument with no build up! * 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?   Good work trying to follow the steps you were taught. We need to consider the best way to package and present our logic, so it doesn’t get lost during the argument.  05:15 - We didn’t ask Boris any POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shawn Nip |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would ban the paying 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:  We had a strong tonal start. Good opening! Explain right from the start why this is the trade off. Don’t assume this is just intuitive to the judge.  The distinction between your rebuttal and the argument is unclear? The transition needs to be marked very clearly. Overall, the structure of your speech is very messy today. This could have been a solid speech if organised clearly.  We should highlight that we need to disempower these organisations, and empower good decision making. In order to do this, we must ban this payment. 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.  Good on how this empowers the terrorists. Excellent on symbolism - talk about how this gives the organisation legitimacy. We need to go into a little bit more detail here - we should explain how paying ransoms directly funds terrorist operations. This money can be used to purchase weapons, recruit members, plan attacks, and spread propaganda. Essentially, paying ransoms strengthens the organization and enables further acts of terror.  Good on whether or not we get these individuals back. We should also spend time characterising the incentives of terrorist organisations; upon payment, will they release these individuals or data? We should explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware. 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.  04:31  We didn’t ask a single POI today! You also must use more formal language. | | | | | | |