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

| **Motion**: This house believes that multinational corporations operating in developing nations should be compelled to follow the environmental standards of western liberal democracies |
| --- |

| 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 want to focus on the specificity of the problem - which is lax environmental standards; this is what brings MNCs to these countries (alongside cheap labour costs), and leads to the harms you claim.  Set-up   * Refer to carbon leakage as we discussed in class; note how this means emission quantities change; explain how standards are more scrutinous in WLDs, rather than developing countries. * Caveat as to why MNCs now become more responsible actors, but are still based in the LDC - so co-opt the economic benefit here! The justification is that the overall cost of production is still cheap.   Argument 1   * Are we claiming consumers only care about cost? If we want to argue that they’ll buy the more expensive product because there are fewer environmental corners cut, we have to characterise them as somewhat aware. * The point to make is that developing nations often lack the resources and regulatory capacity to effectively enforce environmental regulations.   + This creates a "race to the bottom" effect, where MNCs relocate to countries with weaker standards to reduce costs, leading to increased pollution and environmental damage.   + The developing nation isn’t scrutinous because they want to attract development, and hence cannot enforce regulations independent of this standard being implemented. * We eventually note that labour costs mean these MNCs stay. Good. * On development, explain that sustainable development actually requires balancing economic growth with environmental protection.   + This can only happen on your side, because by enforcing higher environmental standards, MNCs are incentivized to invest in cleaner technologies and sustainable practices, fostering a greener development trajectory. * Why is this an exclusive fix? You want to make sure you consider what Opp is likely to run to make your argument comparative; they are likely going to focus on the merits of development to accept this harm, and then talk about climate advocacy at a later timeline; the urgency of the problem hence must be emphasised on your side.   + How does this compare to the other strategies we talked about in class?   We should run a principle on how this creates a double standard and perpetuates global inequalities. People in developing countries are disproportionately affected by environmental damage, despite contributing less to global pollution.  07:36 | | | | | | |