| **Student Name:** Edna Chow |
| --- |

| **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:  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.  Set-up   * 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. There will presumably be someone else that will take up this role or mantle instead. * POI - explain that they’re suffering; the opening could have highlighted this clearly.   Argument 1   * 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. * Excellent on North Koreans who risk their life and try to leave, but do so anyways, because it is what they believe a good life or valuable life to be; 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. * 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?   We need to speak with more confidence!  04:39 - we should hit 5!  We need to ask POIs - to BOTH speakers on the other side. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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:  We’re back with the critical openings, as opposed to responsive openings. Don’t point out that they didn’t prove xyz - why as the judge do I even think this is important? Our opening should 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.  Rebuttal   * Where does this right to live come from? How is it being jeopardised in the counterfactual? The response is contingent on this explanation, but you’re not actually providing it. * We needed to challenge whether change can occur, or if Omelas continues to exist in this way. * We needed to challenge whether or not suffering robs the child of autonomy in this way.   Argument 1   * 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. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on net in terms of where they are likely to settle. * Following from this, explain the trade-off! We just jump to the trade-off. * Lastly, mitigate - 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.   03:01 - we need to hit 5!  Good work asking POIs! I gave you a +0.5 for this! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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:  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.  Rebuttal   * Oversimplification - perpetual suffering, good. 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. There will presumably be someone else that will take up this role or mantle instead. * Can we provide details as to what this perpetual suffering might be? * Explain why the city can eventually get it together, or there are systems or mechanisms that can lead to this. * On the POI - just say that it can never actually be happiness; does this qualify as happiness?   Argument 1   * Good on culpability as the key claim here. Explain why we are culpable in this situation!   + 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. The individual still makes a choice to participate in the system. They are not forced or coerced in a way that completely removes their agency. Their role isn't a one-time action. They are responsible for the *ongoing* captivity and suffering of the child. They actively maintain the system that perpetuates this injustice. * 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. * 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. * 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?   We need to pay more attention to our delivery. Sound and look more confident!  We need to ask POIs - to BOTH speakers on the other side.  04:43 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **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:  We have to illustrate what this looks like. What exactly is the suffering that occurs in the comparative. Explain both what Omelas looks like, as well as the general society or world that this person is stepping out into.  Rebuttal   * Excellent challenge on what the point is; explain how people can be autonomous and suffering and prefer to lose autonomy instead. What examples or analogies could we use here that demonstrate that this is a revealed preference? * Is this all the rebuttal we had? We had no response to the claim on culpability which is the second speaker argument from 2nd Prop! * We needed to challenge whether change can occur, or if Omelas continues to exist in this way.   Argument 1   * 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. You have to explain how Omelas breaks down when the person decides to leave/what society looks like on net in terms of where they are likely to settle. * Following from this, explain the trade-off! We just jump to the trade-off. * Lastly, mitigate - 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.   Good attempt at following the framework taught to you, but we need to actually explain why what we claim is true; what is this suffering, what does it look like?  POI - explain why they still suffer in Prop’s world - this is symmetric. Hence, we shouldn’t consider their rights - but those of everyone else’s.  Remember that utilitarianism cannot just be quick maths! You have to go beyond the quantitative analysis.  04:17 - we needed to hit 5! | | | | | | |