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

| **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: | 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:  Good opening - clear topical focus. Our delivery comes across as very confident and clear. The language of harassing is too simplistic; these are terrorist organisations. They are doing far, far worse things to them!  Set-up   * Good on the characteristics of these organisations - explain why this means they have a certain set of ideological goals; good on how this is a mechanism to achieving legitimacy and negotiating with the state. Don’t make it about the money - terrorist organisations have a number of revenue sources. Either explain why this is so valuable, or focus on the tokenistic and symbolic value of this. * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware. Is it where governments refuse to engage with them, or pander to them?   Argument 1   * What is the outcome we want to achieve? Is it disempowering the organisation? Do we actually stop them from doing this? We need to establish the incentives of terrorists, why this ban engages with those incentives and how this leads to a change in behaviour. We are asserting that this change occurs/national security is better off in our world. * 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.   Be mindful that you aren’t being assertive when focusing on the outcome next time!  You cannot rap through your end! We have to stay within time.  04:28 | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 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:  We need to be very careful and confident with how we package what Prop does - make it about 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.  Set-up needs to be done! 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   * Why won’t it stop kidnappings? Analyse why they do it not for money, but to showcase their power; good on ideological convictions and hatred. * On money, you can 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. You can explain this in response to the POI as well. * 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   * Privacy? I understand freedom, but privacy is a bit of a stretch here. Make it about their right to life, where if we do not rescue them, they will be killed! Use the example we talked about earlier on ISIS and the beheadings they committed. * 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. * Good parallel to violence - I think the strongest version of this analogy is self-defence! We should unpack this in greater detail. * We can also analogise this to the state being okay with sacrificing people in the name of national security. * 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?   Argument 2   * We spent ten seconds on this. This is responsive, as opposed to a positive claim you prove.   Do you have time for two arguments in a four minute speech?  04:14 - Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is our opening doing right now? If you can tell me it isn’t true, then just tell me! All of this to say you will is a waste of time in the opening - which is where you could have the highest impact! Start by explaining how this empowers terrorist organisations - which is never engaged with by the other side.  Rebuttal   * Your point on money isn’t engaging with Emilia’s claim that this isn’t particularly expensive or costly to carry out. Additionally, it is very easy to flip this - terrorist organisations have a number of revenue sources. Either explain why this is so valuable, or focus on the tokenistic and symbolic value of this. * We also need to explain why, where it is money, matters the most - this means they stop engaging in kidnappings or cyberattacks - Emilia explains it is power and hatred that drives them; you aren’t engaging with this characterisation at all.   Argument 1   * Why is money what they need and the single most valuable motivator? We assert this entirely! * We need to establish the incentives of terrorists, why this ban engages with those incentives and how this leads to a change in behaviour. We are asserting that this change occurs/national security is better off in our world. * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware. Is it where governments refuse to engage with them, or pander to them? * 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.   What is the difference between our rebuttal and our argument?  04:10  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  I need a stronger opening which takes issue with the entirely money oriented push from 2nd Prop, when your first speaker establishes very clearly that terrorist organisations have a multiplicity of incentives, meaning the kidnapping continues even in their world. This is also the response to the POI Ellie asks you.  Rebuttal   * On money, you can 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. You can explain this in response to the POI as well. Good call out on how this isn’t true. You need to connect this to your case, and why you win. Explain how their entire case is contingent on money being the singular motivating factor for terrorists, as opposed to power, or ideological convictions or hatred. We aren’t bringing back anything our first said that would put this to bed. * Why are you taking THREE POIs? In a four minute speech, just take one!   We need to be very careful and confident with how we package what Prop does - make it about 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. 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.  Your time management is off! You need to budget for your argument.  04:05  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

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

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is our opening doing right now? Both sides agree terrorism is bad. If we talk about civilians, we should talk about how they are 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.  Clash 1 - National security worth practicality. This is slightly odd phrasing - what exactly does this mean?   * So does your side support intervention? This is a sudden introduction into the debate, and actually quite high of a burden to take. You need to be okay with these people dying, and accepting this trade off. * Good on past success. We need to establish the incentives of terrorists, why this ban engages with those incentives and how this leads to a change in behaviour. We are asserting that this change occurs/national security is better off in our world. * We should also explain the circumstances in which organisations feel empowered to engage in kidnappings, or ransomware. Is it where governments refuse to engage with them, or pander to them?   Clash 2 - Motives behind terrorism - this is well identified! Make this the first clash, it matters far more.   * Why is money what they need and the single most valuable motivator? We assert this entirely! * Your point on money isn’t engaging with Emilia’s claim that this isn’t particularly expensive or costly to carry out. Additionally, it is very easy to flip this - terrorist organisations have a number of revenue sources. Either explain why this is so valuable, or focus on the tokenistic and symbolic value of this. * We also need to explain why, where it is money, matters the most - this means they stop engaging in kidnappings or cyberattacks - Emilia explains it is power and hatred that drives them; you aren’t engaging with this characterisation at all.   We have to speak with more confidence and assurance! We could also afford to speak a little faster.  04:32 - manage time better!  Ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |