| **Student Name:** Andrew Man |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house believes that tax evasion is a legitimate form of protest |
| --- |

| 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 work identifying that this is about when the state has made bad decisions; rather than asserting the social contract, we need to establish why the state has a reciprocal relationship with us, and must uphold their end of the bargain. Establish when specifically people decide to dis-engage with the system.  Set-up   * I think we are too literal with our definitions of tax evasion or protests; rather - we need to establish what legitimate means. How do we measure or define what a legitimate protest is? * In this case, it should be moral legitimacy - such as the claim that there can be no taxation without representation, justifying where the state should have power - and practical effectiveness - comparing this to other forms of protest/analogising this to be an extension of civil obedience and establishing how these changes occur. * The sudden pre-emption is slightly random and sounds very insecure and erratic. Integrate the intentionality of these evaders and protesters as positive content in your argument, analysing how this is a method of protest, as opposed to being motivated by self-interest, or selfishness where people opt out because they don’t want to pay up!   Argument 1   * Please don’t repeat John Locke verbatim, but establish how we have certain natural rights, and the point of the state is to protect them; you can also connect this to our earlier discussion of collective action problems - and how the whole point of the state existing is to ensure we all have equal freedoms. * The next step is to explain how the state at present is not upholding their promise, or providing equality of freedom. Give me EXAMPLES of where this is happening; for instance, is this a failing and corrupt state where officials pocket the honest man’s income tax? Is it a state where some groups - genders, or races - have greater freedoms or protections? * Why will these protests work? Why do they achieve the change your side wants? What is the change your side wants? Why can’t strikes or boycotts do the same job? We skimmed over this! * On intentionality, as per above - if the state is a good actor, and deploys tax revenue well - would people have any incentive to evade tax? That people are unhappy is something that we need to spend time characterising as a tool in a toolbox, or likely something that people will build up to.   07:00 | | | | | | |