| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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:  I would prefer you highlight what is uniquely harmful about monopolies - is the lack of innovation the highest impact harm in this debate, or is it exploitation and predatory pricing? The other side can explain how their side gets innovation, but they definitely can’t deal with abusive prices in the same way - why is it so harmful that it must be broken up?  Set-up - took us 3 minutes, we need to be more mindful of our word economy.   * We need to define what a monopoly is through examples - it shouldn’t just be an overview of their characteristics; with each characteristic, ground it using an example. * What do you mean by unnatural monopolies? What if they engage in the same ‘bad’ practices? How do you engage with it then? * Good work explaining the different ways in which the breakdown occurs - good link to the examples in class! * What do we mean by market shocks and government management? Explain this properly * Is the burden just to prove that monopolies are bad, or is that regulation is impossible necessitating an extreme form of government intervention.   + Monopolies often engage in rent-seeking behavior, using their political influence to protect their market dominance and extract unearned profits. This distorts the political process.   Argument 1   * Fair on brand loyalty, fair on lack of innovation - I just don’t know why innovation is such a good thing? * Why is this so valuable we’re willing to expend significant political will on this?   Argument 2   * Principle - is the purpose of a company to behave ethically or fairly - or even be hurt such that other companies can perform? What do companies owe other companies? * The principle justification needs to pinpoint why hurt or harm exists - and the correct angle is that customers get hurt; and put the 2008 example on bail-outs here - that consumers pay the price, or the tax-payer does when they act out. But why do they act out? * This example was 2 lines, and then you moved onto a pre-emption.   We have to speak with more intention and purpose! You’re trying to prove a point! We need to enunciate, and cultivate a presence.  06:18 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Good, clear call out! Give me an example of where it makes no sense to break a company up - and not just in the case of a natural monopoly.  Set-up   * Good work having a bucket of options! Go over the different instances where you identify the specific problem with the monopoly and take action accordingly; for instance, where there is a lack of innovation - forcing them to provide some open-source technology to encourage competition; where there is a lack of accessible pricing - forcing them to stick to price ceilings or floors. * Good work thinking up of time limits on patents or intellectual property - give me an example as to what outcome this helps achieve. * What is the distinction between this and Prop? Yes, you neutralise harms - but what do you get in return? What is the positive gain on this front? * You need to call them out on their exclusion of unnatural monopolies!   POI: Why do they work? This was a dismissive response!  Rebuttal   * Responses aren’t as magical as just pointing to your counter-model, you have to explain why your counter-model is BETTER at solving the problem. * What do we mean by them still being in an umbrella company - this claim at best washes their claim, rather than tipping this point in your favour. It doesn’t prove that keeping it as a monopoly is BETTER. * We didn’t engage with their principle on companies owing it to other companies to be broken up!   Argument 1   * Why can only a monopoly achieve this? What is exclusive about this benefit? Why is accessible pricing or cross-subsidisation always going to happen? Is the best impact we can come up with that it leads to an injection of money into the economy? * Explain HOW they dominate through merit - due to their ability to achieve economies of scale, reduce costs, and offer lower prices. They were able to cultivate customer loyalty and achieve a brand name in a league of their own due to the quality of their products and their ability to listen to their consumers. Why must they be broken up if this is true? * We just assume that monopolies behave in a certain way, and assert this behaviour to be the case - but this needs to be established in the round!   06:26  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Hanson Ko |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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:  Good work slowing down your opening - but the upshot of the three reasons are missing entirely! You need to make sure the implication of your response is incredibly clear - and THEN move on.  Rebuttal   * Unfeasible - bargaining power; this is symmetric. You need to explain this beyond asserting they have power. You cannot just say etc. etc. - I cannot buy the justification if half of it is going underexplained.   + Explain HOW monopolies engage in rent-seeking behavior, using their political influence to protect their market dominance and extract unearned profits. This distorts the political process. * Explain that they don’t explain why monopolies have incentives to be accessible without a clear gain for them; you have to explain how this is part of their practice to increase barriers to entry - they will later on hike prices. * The responses cannot be focused on why monopolies are BAD - but why the only solution to engage with them is breaking them up.   I do not want you to have extensions. This is not a BP speech. You have to provide me with a new and distinct second speaker argument. Your speaks in WSDC competitions will get tanked if you do this.  On monopolies being bad; you have to incentivise their interests. Is the lack of innovation the highest impact harm in this debate, or is it exploitation and predatory pricing? The other side can explain how their side gets innovation, but they definitely can’t deal with abusive prices in the same way - why is it so harmful that it must be broken up? Good example of tech companies - but you need to explain this example in significant enough detail to talk about how abuse occurs at a scale that cannot be regulated.   * For instance, tech giants operate with incredibly complex algorithms, data-driven pricing models, and opaque internal structures. Regulators often lack the technical expertise and resources to understand these intricacies, making effective oversight extremely challenging. * The tech landscape evolves at a breakneck pace. By the time regulators catch up with one abusive practice, these companies have already developed new, more sophisticated methods of exploiting consumers. Regulation becomes a constant game of catch-up, always one step behind.   Redistributive - access to people HOW? Explain this step by step!  On innovation. I buy that your side gets more innovation - but what is the value of innovation?  Your first speaker’s principle gets dropped entirely - you need to recover it, and pivot it to owing consumers fair practices, rather than other companies.  We have to slow down. We need to vary our speed.  06:15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  How do monopolies help other people? Is this the most important issue we need to focus on?  Rebuttal   * We need to explain why regulation is possible in our world. Hanson provides many reasons as to why regulatory capture means that it isn’t possible to reign these companies in. You cannot just assert that it happens, not engaging with any of this content. * We spent 1 minute on responses. As 2nd Opp - is this sufficient?   Argument - Innovation   * Why do monopolies have the incentive to innovate? We just talk about the impact of innovation making a product or service better, as opposed to how we even get this in the first place.   POI: You have to ANSWER the question.   * Why does this data lead to a better product?   There are many reasons as to why monopolies innovate!   * Even without direct competition, monopolies still have a profit motive. Innovation can lead to cost reductions, new revenue streams, and expanded market opportunities, all of which increase profits. * While a monopolist may not face direct competition *currently*, the threat of future competition can incentivize innovation. By continually improving their products and services, monopolies can erect higher barriers to entry and deter potential rivals. * Innovation can allow monopolies to expand into adjacent markets, further increasing their dominance and profitability. * Monopolies often have significant financial resources and expertise to invest in research and development. Smaller, competitive firms may lack the resources to undertake large-scale innovation projects - this explains why innovation is **EXCLUSIVE** to your side. * We also talked about internal competition and innovation culture in class!   We just assume that monopolies behave in a certain way, and assert this behaviour to be the case - but this needs to be established in the round!  05:57  Let’s ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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:  The impact of our opening goes out the window when we cut it short and then just say we’re proud to propose! You need to finish it and explain WHY we are the side that achieves this.  Please simplify your signposting - it needs to be short and sweet, not so extensive!  Rebuttal - make this a direct engagement with their model, and then move onto the clashes - otherwise this just becomes messy. Why are we going speaker by speaker?   * Go for the low hanging fruit first! Explain why none of these regulations can be applied due to regulatory capture!   + Explain HOW monopolies engage in rent-seeking behavior, using their political influence to protect their market dominance and extract unearned profits. This distorts the political process. * Once you’ve addressed their lack of a functional alternative strategy in this way, then say - but let’s take them at their best and even if this can be implemented, why it can’t work. * Don’t say not only that! We use this far too much. * What incentive do small businesses have to engage in this way? * What incentive do monopolies have to spend more money on IP and patenting, as opposed to R&D?   Clash 1: Innovation   * You cannot say ‘better logic’ - if you say this, do I just automatically buy it? * Good on risk - but doesn’t this mean they’re the most likely to be able to take it? * You need to analyse what incentive there is to just stay in the monopolistic position and not move, rather than asserting the ways in which they behave.   + Good on risk and money loss - give me more reasons!     - Disruptive innovation often cannibalizes existing product lines. A monopoly has little incentive to introduce a new product that will compete with its existing cash cow, even if the new product is superior.     - Innovation can open the door to new competitors. A new technology or product can disrupt the existing market structure and create opportunities for rivals to enter. * What is the value of innovation? Why is having more innovation so important? The impact is entirely under-explained.   Clash 2: Access   * Explain that they don’t explain why monopolies have incentives to be accessible without a clear gain for them; you have to explain how this is part of their practice to increase barriers to entry - they will later on hike prices.   The responses cannot be focused on why monopolies are BAD - but why the only solution to engage with them is breaking them up.  06:00 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would breakup monopolies |
| --- |

| 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:  This is a funny opening. Good job. Point out that there is a difference between this, and their fiat to break them up. You need to explain why this isn’t a fiat attack.  Strategic Observations   * Good call-out! Explain WHY their burden has to include natural monopolies - point out how these companies engage in the same bad practices they are arguing against - do they just let these be in those instances? * Explain why regulation is possible. This is attacked by 2P and 3P, and there is no response from Opp on this.   + For instance, you can argue that regulatory agencies will be required to disclose all sources of funding, including private donations or grants, to identify potential conflicts of interest. There can be transparent and well-defined regulatory guidelines and processes that make it more difficult for special interests to exert undue influence. Use the fiat Opp has in the round!   Substantives? Why aren’t we just using clashes?  Good on natural bias. What is the upshot of this claim? Rather than saying it is a mini-monopoly, explain how they still remain dominant; i.e. who becomes Instagram’s competitor?  Good on patents - explain why this remains on your side of the motion! However, all this does is wash this point; I understand why monopolies don’t engage in ‘bad’ behaviour - but why are they GOOD? What is the positive case?  Clash 1 - AT 5 MINUTES? Even in an 8 minute speech, this is TOO LATE.   * The clash title needs to be clear, not etc. etc. * This is just about all the benefits? You need to explain what the structural incentives of monopolies are. For instance, on innovation - explain HOW you get it. * We just talk about the impact of innovation making a product or service better, as opposed to how we even get this in the first place.   There are many reasons as to why monopolies innovate!   * Even without direct competition, monopolies still have a profit motive. Innovation can lead to cost reductions, new revenue streams, and expanded market opportunities, all of which increase profits. There is always the threat of future competition! * Monopolies often have significant financial resources and expertise to invest in research and development. Smaller, competitive firms may lack the resources to undertake large-scale innovation projects - this explains why innovation is **EXCLUSIVE** to your side. * We also talked about internal competition and innovation culture in class!   06:18 - what is the structure of this speech?  Let’s ask POIs consistently. | | | | | | |