| **Student Name:** Vania Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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:  Good opening! Clear illustration of the harm here. I do think our opening should be delivered with more gusto and control over tone, indicating that this is unjust and something the judge should be angry about.  Set-up   * Excellent characterisation on the way in which politicians interact with lobbying. I think we should also illustrate that there is a barrier to entry with lobbying - which is money. You cannot access this mechanism without wealth. So not only is it that politicians are susceptible to this, this is only possible by powerful interest groups. * I think we want to establish the framing which is that you can regulate all you want, but the access to this mechanism is privileged - only the wealthy can do this. * How and why is lobbying different from donations? What’s the distinction here?   Clear signposting! Excellent work labelling what your second speaker will talk about.  Argument 1   * We need to start by establishing why they are likely to exploit this - we know the push from Opp will be that this is a mechanism good actors can use/it constitutes as free speech. We should establish how exploitation and lobbying are interchangeable. * Good connection to bottom up change. Explain how exactly lobbying incentivises politicians to disregard what the average voter wants. * Unpack what the purpose of a politician or elected representative is in a democracy in greater detail! Explain how democracies, principally, must be equal and fair. Explain how lobbying distorts this principle. * Why are their interests oppositional? Explain this to me! * The answer to the POI is that minority groups don’t lobby politicians, they engage in social movements - that is the mechanism they use to influence politicians. Where are these minority groups getting money from? * Good on how this locks people out - backlash isn’t necessarily the push here, but rather alienation and apathy. If you think your engagement with the political system doesn’t do anything, you stop voting.   We aren’t making any eye contact as we speak. You have to look at the audience when you speak! Our hand gestures are good! Our tone could use more variance, especially when we talk about how the vulnerable are put under harm.  Where is the positive comparative? For instance, this increases accountability - banning lobbying would increase transparency and make it easier for citizens to understand how and why decisions are made, fostering greater accountability from elected officials.  06:33 - Why aren’t we asking POIs? | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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 slower than usual, which is good. My immediate problem is that intuitively, a minority group doesn’t have access to lobbying - there is a barrier to entry; wealth?  Set-up   * High regulated ‘things’ - the first part of set-up needs to break down the changes to status quo you would implement, and cover them comprehensively rather than brushing over this. * Fair on not having to defend corrupt groups, as well as donation limits. * We need to slow down + have a clearer sense of what is important to cover here, because that’s where the slurring of words and filler words come in; you’re using time to think about what to cover here.   Rebuttal   * Why would they use lobbying to access critical mass? Any benefit from this point on is contingent on you proving access. * You have to be more mindful of sentences + filler - you said or whatever lots today! * Our rebuttal is tangential; you identify what they say, and say something oppositional in a different direction, not disproving the key claim here.   Argument 1   * One party takes all; why is this true? What link does this have to lobbying? * Your win is contingent on proving that (a) lobbying is a unique mechanism which cannot be replaced by other mechanisms, and (b) that lobbying is accessible to a multiplicity of actors, as opposed to just wealthy actors. * Why can’t we change the system and their political incentives? You need to explain why we are working within existing constraints and politician’s incentives. Then, you need to explain how vulnerable groups can access this mechanism, and how change occurs. * We talk about lack of regulations, which is good - but flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence. * What have we proven at the end of this argument?   Argument 2 - do you prove anything here?   * The principle of free speech needs to be developed from autonomy and the purpose of democracy; we link it to minority groups, but to the extent we haven’t proven why lobbying is the best or only means of speech, this is not important; you also haven’t proven the value of free speech here. * Good on lack of critical mass, hence money is the tipping point, but where do they get this from?   06:04 - We are a lot slower today, which is great, but we are still not enunciating or emphasising as clearly. No problem with transition-marking and signposting today. Good strategy of picking things to work on! Ask POIs more consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Seryoung Choi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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:  Instead of saying ‘Opposition loses this debate when..’, start with the response. Point out instead: minorities cannot access lobbying, lobbying requires wealth, requires capital - they do not get access to this. The upshot of this - they do not have a positive case. Then move onto signposting. Cut out the fluff here - it isn’t adding anything.  Rebuttal   * Our style here is once again going into the cursive territory, with a fair bit of gaps as we look at our paper/trying to cook up the syntax. We need to slow down + focus on phrasing with more efficiency. You’re saying simple things with too many words, which end up obscuring the very simple point you are trying to make. When we look at the paper, we get quieter. We have to have intentional pauses. Our pauses at the moment are only because we either don’t have a specific next sentence, or because we have literally run out of breath. Control your pace and tone! * We need to explain how this only works for the rich! Explain how and why it does prioritise them! The current system favors well-funded lobbyists and corporations, giving them a disproportionate voice in shaping policy. A ban would create a more equitable system where all citizens, regardless of their wealth or connections, have an equal opportunity to be heard. * The structure of rebuttals needs to be more direct; identify the argument, the premise of the argument, tear it down. Don’t rebut in cursive! Go point by point in the simplest way possible. If you did this, you’d be able to take down free speech in 5 seconds - which is that they never explain why free speech is valuable, why this is deprivation, why lobbying is the only equivalence to free speech. The argument is barely made.   Argument 1   * Explain why social movements don’t rely on lobbying for success in the first place. Rather, it is groups that are against this that rely on lobbying. Use an example to illustrate the power asymmetry that exists here, for instance between big oil and the environmentalists. We need to explain why this mechanism just isn’t the one that social movements even use! * Why are funds the biggest tipping point to change? The reason why lobbying occurs is because a politician is willing to support the policies a group of people or companies want. Is there high demand for these fringe parties policies in the status quo to begin with? In order for this argument to work, you need to establish why lobbying is the biggest reason as to why who wins an election is distorted. Have we done sufficient problem characterisation? * Unpack what the purpose of a politician or elected representative is in a democracy in greater detail! Explain how democracies, principally, must be equal and fair. * Good on impact on voters - link this to apathy and alienation, rather than backlash per say. We use the buzzword of meaningful change, but do we explain?   06:29 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house will ban all political lobbying |
| --- |

| 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:  What does this observation do up top? Your case is entirely contingent on proving that (a) lobbying is a unique mechanism which cannot be replaced by other mechanisms, and (b) that lobbying is accessible to a multiplicity of actors, as opposed to just wealthy actors. The longer you take to do this, the bigger hole you are digging in terms of your path to victory.  Rebuttal - the structure of rebuttal is slightly messy. If there is lots of content, at 2nd Opp, use clashes.   * Fair observation on contingency. Explain why this is a sufficient enough degree. Don’t stop here! Otherwise, the mitigation of harm is lost out on. * Why will they be public friendly policies? This is skimmed over entirely. * Why do they all come out and contribute; how often and frequently do these PAC contributions occur? This isn’t sufficient in proving that they have access. You have to spend more time here! * Good on advertising + advocacy - explain how lobbying isn’t just for individual politicians, but on issues. So for instance, that Planned Parenthood will fund advertisements, or endorse certain politicians.   Argument 1   * We talk about lack of regulations, which is good - but flesh out the real comparative here. A complete ban is unlikely to eliminate advocacy altogether. Instead, it could drive lobbying activities underground, making them less transparent and more difficult to regulate. This could lead to even more corruption and undue influence. * Explain why there are incentives of companies and industries to engage in donations, especially under the table. There is nothing that can stop this from happening; this is a debate about what the best way to incorporate this is. * Rather than making the impact about corruption, make it about keeping the playing ground as fair as possible, or on how we equalise it and make it less network oriented - anyone can donate to a PAC, rather than being a big organisation that has direct links to a politician or cause.   05:40? We didn’t take a POI? We also didn’t ask any POIs?  We didn’t bring back the principle at all? The principle of free speech needs to be developed from autonomy and the purpose of democracy; we link it to minority groups, but to the extent we haven’t proven why lobbying is the best or only means of speech, this is not important; you also haven’t proven the value of free speech here. | | | | | | |