| **Student Name:** Sarah Han |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  Is there demonisation? If this is the circumstance in which death of the author is occurring, you must establish it as such; jumping into a specific framing without the groundwork only confuses and muddies the debate.  Set-up   * This is a principle in terms of how we should interpret and engage with literature; the burden of the debate must be connected to this. Is the burden that the death of the author is true, or whether or not this is good for art, or good for critical interpretation etc.?   + For instance, it is probably true that art is sometimes influenced by personal background, but other times it isn’t and could be distinct. This isn’t a debate about that - this is a debate about how this may lead to a better understanding of an art piece, as opposed to being dismissive, or leads to a better production of art etc. * We have to characterise the ways in which death of the author works/doesn’t - is it the only and exclusive means of viewing a piece of art, or is it just one critical perspective among many others? * Let’s use examples to highlight what exactly this principle is; what kind of identities and characteristics are we talking about? Explain HOW their religion shapes their work, or their personality influences a character etc.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? What exactly is principally unjust about this? Is it that it’s been too tied up in cancel culture? If that is the claim you’re making - which is what you specify in the POI - then you need to spell this out! * The principal claim can be that we lose out on important perspectives the author fought to keep in - a work by a formerly enslaved person, a woman writing under a male pseudonym etc. loses essential layers of meaning when we ignore authorial context. This erasure is particularly harmful because it was often these very contexts that made publishing possible or necessary for marginalized voices in the first place.   Argument 2   * Is it the case that art just stops? This isn’t about creating new art, it’s about existing art. If you want to make an argument about how art adapts or changes - explain how it leads to worse interpretations/or makes artists less likely to put their authentic self + political views forward.   + Why does personal belief only manifest positively - for instance, why can’t people move away from these traits or beliefs, or even rebel against it and so forth?   We’re missing out on lots of content! Where are the arguments on better understanding of context, educational value and so forth?  05:30 - why aren’t we hitting time?  Ask POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  Is Kanye the best example for your side, or would using a piece of art that is more malleable + easy for consumers to give subjective meaning to be more strategic?  Set-up is missing! Must come before rebuttal in terms of establishing what exactly your world looks like.   * Explain that it is probably true that artistic background influences the nature of art, but hanging onto this as the most valuable interpretation is wrong; this is the most strategic burden to take. * Explain what the purpose of literature or art is here, linking it to the framing for your side - which is that when reader centered interpretation allows us to have a richer + deeper literary and artistic engagement.   Rebuttal   * Good on evolution; put this in set-up please. On the POI - we don’t justify it, we identify that it comes from a certain history in time, but that it’s still wrong? Explain how killing the author means that there are more valuable interpretations/gets engaged with - they have to defend how cancel culture often captures a piece of art if evaluated from the author’s point of view. * Explain why or how this principle ends up consuming people - and what kind of art we lose out on this capacity; the point is that moral correctness cannot exist. We need to tie this into the culture war + politically correctness to up the impact of this framing. Talk about disengaging with Harry Potter, or Kanye West as a consequence. Then highlight why they could be meaningful + valuable regardless.   Set-up MUST come BEFORE rebuttal.   * Good work establishing what the interpretation of art is/must be like.   Argument 1   * On universality - fair explanation here. * On the frame of perception - we need to highlight HOW consumers can interpret art on their own terms, using their own experiences, contexts, and insights; explain how it actually helps the very people who might be ‘at harm’ per the other side. For instance, when readers from oppressed groups find liberatory meanings in canonical texts, they gain literary ownership and validation, rather than being excluded by authorial intent that may reflect privileged perspectives. For instance, through fanfiction, or fanwork etc.   Argument 2   * What is the thesis of this argument? * On engagement - good; explain why cancel culture etc. means that engagement doesn’t happen in their world - you’re assuming this is obvious. Then link to the point we talked about in class with reference to discourse and engagement; where do we actually engage with JK Rowling’s takes?   06:16 - ask POIs! | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  This nuance did not exist for you to call them out on getting rid of this; when did they say they would censor? This is strawmanning!  Rebuttal   * They say it DOES evolve - they say that’s why we need to look past the author; I get that you’re trying to safeguard against cancel culture interacting with how this principle is being implemented, but it’s just muddying the debate more. You need to explain how death of the author ALLOWS us to move past cancel culture because we can position the text contextually, rather than just speeding past the mechanism.   + In Heart of Darkness by Joseph Conrad, without understanding his anti-imperialist intent based on his Congo experiences, a reader might interpret it as endorsing colonial racism rather than critiquing it. * Is this enough rebuttal? As a Deputy in BP you have to be confident you’re taking it above OO before moving onto your own argument. * We have to characterise the ways in which death of the author works/doesn’t - is it the only and exclusive means of viewing a piece of art, or is it just one critical perspective among many others?   Argument 1   * Why are malicious intentions only scrutinised on your side? Why is fan culture and creations only possible on your side? * The implication might be that knowing this background is crucial guidance for understanding art; without considering intent, we risk fundamental misreadings that distort the work's purpose. * I don’t think you can claim this - because if the dominant reading is that from the author, how do we move past the canon? You have to explain how authorial intent can be rejected such that readers from oppressed groups find liberatory meanings in canonical texts. * Most of this argument is you impacting the value of escaping the headcanon or bad representation - but HOW does that happen? * We have to explain how exactly this principle is being engaged with; the argument doesn’t work without you actually explaining this out.   06:12  Let’s ask POIs!  Your style has improved remarkably. This is a slower, cogent speech with far more pace variation, tonal variation - even if the emphasis + performance still needs work! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Joanne Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  Explain WHY this happens or is true! Explain why or how this principle ends up consuming people - and what kind of art we lose out on this capacity; the point is that moral correctness cannot exist. We need to tie this into the culture war + politically correctness to up the impact of this framing. Talk about disengaging with Harry Potter, or Kanye West as a consequence. Then highlight why they could be meaningful + valuable regardless.  Rebuttals   * Lose out on history - explain why they will be reasonable, especially because you simultaneously claim the above re cancel culture taking over. Which one is it? We’re refusing to engage in any semblance of a trade off. * Explain that it is probably true that artistic background influences the nature of art, but hanging onto this as the most valuable interpretation is wrong; this is the most strategic burden to take. Explain what the purpose of literature or art is here, linking it to the framing for your side - which is that when reader centered interpretation allows us to have a richer + deeper literary and artistic engagement. * Good work pinpointing this is about the metric through which we evaluate art. Explain how killing the author means that there are more valuable interpretations/gets engaged with - they have to defend how cancel culture often captures a piece of art if evaluated from the author’s point of view. * On engagement - good; explain why cancel culture etc. means that engagement doesn’t happen in their world - you’re assuming this is obvious. Then link to the point we talked about in class with reference to discourse and engagement; where do we actually engage with JK Rowling’s takes?   Good on subjectivity. On the frame of perception - we need to highlight HOW consumers can interpret art on their own terms, using their own experiences, contexts, and insights; explain how it actually helps the very people who might be ‘at harm’ per the other side.   * For instance, when readers from oppressed groups find liberatory meanings in canonical texts, they gain literary ownership and validation, rather than being excluded by authorial intent that may reflect privileged perspectives. For instance, through fanfiction, or fanwork etc.   Are we willing to defend any and all pieces of art? Even the most egregious ones? What is the line that we are drawing?  We have to as POIs - without me forcing you to!  06:04 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Gemma Yeung |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house opposes the “death of the author” principle |
| --- |

| 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:  Fair enough - explain why this is a small proportion of cases, and is a wash because of the discourse on cancel culture/political correctness. We kind of just assert this out of the debate.  Why does this centering of context + nuance come as an exclusive function of the author; you have to break down how literary engagement looks like without the authorial intent/influence; and what it looks like with it.   * For instance, it is probably true that art is sometimes influenced by personal background, but other times it isn’t and could be distinct. This isn’t a debate about that - this is a debate about how this may lead to a better understanding of an art piece, as opposed to being dismissive, or leads to a better production of art etc.   Vertical   * Let’s be more sophisticated than just saying ‘vertical’; try to make the transition more seamless. The implication might be that knowing this background is crucial guidance for understanding art; without considering intent, we risk fundamental misreadings that distort the work's purpose.   + For example, Animal Farm becomes more powerful if you understand Orwell’s specific critique of Stalinist communism rather than treating it as a generic fable about power.   + In Heart of Darkness by Joseph Conrad, without understanding his anti-imperialist intent based on his Congo experiences, a reader might interpret it as endorsing colonial racism rather than critiquing it. * We don’t have to BUY into this, and believe this is the only interpretation, but in order to understand the originalist version of it, ‘death of the author’ cannot exist. * Are we shutting them up? How does this happen? Who decides what the predominant interpretation of a book is? Critics? Institutions? Committees? Explain what kind of books or art get sequestered off - is it that we make all art apolitical and neuter it?   Horizontal   * Is this horizontal, or just a clarification? On stories + personal lives; explain how and why this is unique; for instance breaking down how rap is constructed, or certain allegories or symbolism come from a particular neighbourhood that is racially concentrated. In literature - Toni Morrison's own accounts of how she crafted "Beloved" reveal deliberate structural choices to mirror trauma's psychological impact. The mechanism here is that understanding authorial technique teaches readers how literary craft creates emotional and psychological effects. * The opening half is messy because both try to claim that they get to be the ones that bypass cancel culture - but they, in the process, just muddy the debate. You could explain how the death of the author ALLOWS us to move past cancel culture because we can position the text contextually, rather than just speeding past the mechanism. More generally, you could also establish that this is a debate about literary analysis + engagement; talking about how those who are harmed by bad representation can be better treated/recovered on our side etc.   06:16 | | | | | | |