| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 is too contingent on these situations; it’s also a utopia. The citizens of Omelas are unlikely to know or care about this, because it would disturb their emotional needs. See the POI Ethan eventually asks us.  Right from the get go, you need to characterise what this suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is. Good analogies to the status quo that highlight the harm - but be more direct!  Set-up - our set-up needs to be more word efficient. Remember that this is a five minute speech!   * Good work covering both outcomes that could occur; but do note - we don’t get to change the way in which Omelas works; it is just about the individual moral choice that we’re making. We don’t get to alter the circumstances. We can take this action, and hope change occurs. But this doesn’t guarantee it. There will presumably be someone else that will take up this role or mantle instead. * Don’t speak in the first person! * We should establish what happens to Omelas once we leave, presuming that this continues, and if Omelas collapses and becomes a regular society - what would this society look like, and why is this preferable? Where do we go? In that kind of society do we find ourselves? Why is this a preferable life?   When do we transition from the set-up into the argument? We needed to run a principle argument, explaining how the cost of this utopia is too high, and it is morally incorrect to do this.   * We need to start by pinpointing how we’ve robbed all personhood from the child; first explain what personhood is - going into detail on all four facets we covered last week - these are autonomy, rationality, dignity and moral agency, and explain how it isn’t just that we’re depriving them of humanity, but rather depriving them of a net neutral existence - we are actively hurting them. * We should talk about how people choose sub-optimal situations because they value a more moral life all the time; they pay taxes rather than evading them, they risk protest even if it means they may lose their life or be thrown in jail; they are asserting their moral agency - this is what we need to say! * We need to explain the comparative. What would it be like to be this person, with this knowledge choosing to stay in Omelas? Happiness built upon the suffering of another is inherently flawed and unsustainable. The knowledge of the child's suffering would create a constant undercurrent of guilt and unease, even if subconsciously, undermining the true happiness of the citizens. Impacting! What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   There could have been a second argument on culpability and the harm here, to address the second situation where the circumstance doesn’t change.  05:27 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 POI to Cyrus!  Don’t say it is very terrible. Give me a better one, or explain HOW it is bad because it either isn’t in line with the spirit of the motion and hence their burden. We are phrasing ourselves to sound too critical, as opposed to responsive.  We could have also jumped in by explaining how there will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Our opening can also instead spell out our key response to the biggest thing that they say, in this case which is that we are putting an individual through suffering - a child.  Set-up? Rebuttal?   * What do you suggest happens instead? The individual stays, with this knowledge, and with this responsibility? * Explain how even if this person leaves, the life in Omelas continues, with a replacement for this child being found. So all this leaving and freeing does is that another child suffers pre-maturely. They actually increase suffering. We eventually do say this - good! * Explain why and how they suffer misery in the real world. We need to explain why the child loses autonomy in both worlds - it is just that in our world, not everyone else has to.   Argument 1 - excellent attempt at sticking to the framework taught to you today!   * We need to first explain what the benefit or outcome is; characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house.   + What do we mean by safe from suffering - what harms exist in an average society that would not in this world? What are the problems current cities face? * You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. * Excellent on how suffering is symmetric. Unpack how suffering is worse in their world; we just claim it exists. The only examples that come out - that you also just list, as opposed to unpacking are due to the POI Theo asks you. * Whose autonomy and freedom are we choosing between, and committing to trading off? * Mitigate more explicitly! Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class.   05:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Theo Lee |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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:  Excellent POI to Ethan!  Good opening, even though it’s slightly vague. Pair it with a characterisation of what suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is.  Rebuttal   * Explain how exactly the society develops and becomes perfectly fine in the counterfactual. You should also explain why the city can eventually get it together, or there are systems or mechanisms that can lead to this. Then, explain why it is fundamentally unfair for the city’s happiness to come at this cost. Your side can access benefits - not a utopia per say - without this moral sacrifice being needed. Explain how a society which is imperfect, but doesn’t come at the cost of such high suffering is preferable. * The police officer example is slightly left-field, let’s find something slightly more reasonable! * Our side hasn’t really explained how this is principally unjust. We need to start by pinpointing how we’ve robbed all personhood from the child; first explain what personhood is - going into detail on all four facets we discussed, and explain how it isn’t just that we’re depriving them of humanity, but rather depriving them of a net neutral existence - we are actively hurting them.   Argument 1   * I think we need to argue that there is a purpose to life, that goes beyond perfection - and explain what gives people fulfilment. It is moral agency and autonomy - explain how utopia is robotic. Don’t default to the example of the Giver, but rather - analogise it to decisions people make in the status quo. * We should talk about how people choose sub-optimal situations because they value a more moral life all the time; they pay taxes rather than evading them, they risk protest even if it means they may lose their life or be thrown in jail; they are asserting their moral agency - this is what we need to say! * The principle you’re arguing here is moral agency - that a utopia deprives people of this, and we need to restore this. * We can also make this argument about the individual responsibility or culpability the actor in the motion faces - and how the most moral decision is to walk away, and absolve themselves of this.   + This person takes a direct action that causes immense suffering to another human being. They are fully aware of the horrific conditions the child endures and the purpose of this suffering. They are not forced or coerced in a way that completely removes their agency. They are responsible for the *ongoing* captivity and suffering of the child. They actively maintain the system that perpetuates this injustice. * Where is the impacting? What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future?   04:30 - excellent argument idea. You should read about Nozick’s experience machine! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 opening - explain how this isn’t even a debate about no suffering vs one person suffering. There will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Explain both what Omelas looks like, as well as the general society or world that this person is stepping out into.  Rebuttal - good work dealing with both the big arguments coming from Opp.   * We need to be able to read our own handwriting! * Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class. Don’t jump to the trade off in the response, minimise suffering for all involved first. * Trade off the suffering for the benefit - characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. * Never perfect; explain why we prefer people to have actual material satisfaction, even though they don’t get to choose what a ‘good life’ is.   Argument 1   * This is more or less an extension of the first argument from your first speaker. It should be different. * Unpack what the average society looks like - what harms exist? Explain how much people earn, how discrimination exists, and whether or not people are happy. Don’t list off problems that may exist! Compare this to the utopia, and how people are meaningfully happy. * Question that Prop claims that they can have a good society, even if it isn’t perfect, but they never mechanise this! Challenge their missing comparative! * Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class.   We should have taken a POI! We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  04:47 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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. I think we need to argue that there is a purpose to life, that goes beyond perfection - and explain what gives people fulfilment. It is moral agency and autonomy - explain how utopia is robotic. We should talk about how people choose sub-optimal situations because they value a more moral life all the time; they pay taxes rather than evading them, they risk protest even if it means they may lose their life or be thrown in jail; they are asserting their moral agency - this is what we need to say!  **Following our opening, establish clearly what your two clashes will be, and what their names are. The structure of the speech needs to be tighter! We don’t have any signposting or structure.**  The principle you’re arguing here is moral agency - that a utopia deprives people of this, and we need to restore this. Good work trying to explain how hard work and earning as a task can be enriching as an experience.  We need to explain what the consequences of living in a world are like this! What does it mean to live in a world that prescribes to such a moral calculus - explain how accepting the suffering of one for the benefit of many creates a dangerous precedent. Where does the line get drawn? Could this justification be used to sacrifice more individuals in the future? In the case of moral agency, what happens if we’re okay with people getting to decide what the ‘good life’ is for us.  You need to mech out why the average society is not as bad as it will be, or compared to the world the other side tries to push on you. You should also explain why the city can eventually get it together, or there are systems or mechanisms that can lead to this. Then, explain why it is fundamentally unfair for the city’s happiness to come at this cost. Your side can access benefits - not a utopia per say - without this moral sacrifice being needed.  We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  We can also make the claim on individual responsibility or culpability the actor in the motion faces - and how the most moral decision is to walk away, and absolve themselves of this.   * + This person takes a direct action that causes immense suffering to another human being. They are fully aware of the horrific conditions the child endures and the purpose of this suffering. They are not forced or coerced in a way that completely removes their agency. They are responsible for the *ongoing* captivity and suffering of the child. They actively maintain the system that perpetuates this injustice.   Right from the get go, you need to characterise what this suffering looks like - and explain how it is incredibly harmful that this exists. This will highlight what the trade off Opp wants to defend is.  04:12 - we need to hit 5! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Josephine She |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would walk away from Omelas |
| --- |

| 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 think our opening needs to engage directly with whether or not the citizens of Omelas have moral agency, and whether this matters. Unpack what the average society looks like - what harms exist? Explain how much people earn, how discrimination exists, and whether or not people are happy. Compare this to the utopia, and how people are meaningfully happy.  **Clash names need to be included in signposting!**  Clash 1:   * Explain how this isn’t even a debate about no suffering vs one person suffering. There will be suffering in the counterfactual too, it’s just about who suffers and if their suffering matters less. Explain both what Omelas looks like, as well as the general society or world that this person is stepping out into. * Question that Prop claims that they can have a good society, even if it isn’t perfect, but they never mechanise this! Challenge their missing comparative! * Explain how freeing the child and leaving would result in the collapse of Omelas's utopia, leading to suffering for everyone, including the formerly imprisoned child. Explain how this leads to a moral hazard, in the way we discussed in class. * Fraud and depressed lives are insufficient to characterise the way an average society in the world looks. Explain why we prefer people to have actual material satisfaction, even though they don’t get to choose what a ‘good life’ is.   Clash 2:   * Characterise what a utopia is, and in which ways Omelas would be the best place to live. Then - explain why these benefits are only accessible on your side of the house. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on the net in terms of where they are likely to settle. We don’t really go into much detail as to what a utopia is, and how it brings happiness and meaning to everyone who lives within it. * POI - negative emotions are part of this? How? Explain why these can be compatible! Don’t take two POIs back to back! * Make sure you’re staying consistent with your team line! We need to defend this extreme happiness and satisfaction. Good on how this all people strive for at the moment; maybe this is their revealed preference about what they want - hence this is a morally autonomous decision they are making.   We need to ask POIs consistently. How many POIs did we ask today?  05:43 | | | | | | |