| **Student Name:** Caitlyn Szeto |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  We need to engage with the characterisation from Prop - which is that this is a failing state. Does a failing state have shining public service provision? The people you are talking about here are a wash - they suffer on both sides anyways. Evasion doesn’t affect them to the extent you claim. We mention later that there is some public service provision, but you need to deal with this up top! Lay to rest how these people matter, and/or why they matter MORE.  Good work establishing what a legitimate form of protest is - but we say this and move on. Use this to structure your speech into clashes; the first on the moral legitimacy, and the second on the capacity for this to work.  On big/small government - good on how this is context dependent; this is good narrowing, but what is the strategy here? Why would they, in this situation, pursue tax evasion, as opposed to other methods or versions? We need to be more engaging with WHY and in what conditions people evade tax.  On the comparative; we assert the optionality of petitions - why do they work? Why is there sufficient buy-in, why do states believe you, especially where it is corrupt? The POI highlights the central issue with the comparative - for instance a strike or boycott; technically, tube strikes in the UK inconvenience people significantly! Explain here why the scale of harm is significantly different to welfare, or is far-reaching when it comes to tax; every public service is reliant on tax revenue.  Rather than who engages and doesn’t - we should go further and explain why tax evasion is structurally limited in its ability to do this. Unlike traditional protests which can calibrate their impact, tax evasion offers no middle ground. Either it's too small to matter (failing as protest) or too large to be justified (causing disproportionate harm). Explain further how the snowball effect kicks in - unlike protests which can declare victory and end, tax evasion creates self-perpetuating incentives. Once normalized, it becomes impossible to distinguish protest from opportunism. I think we can also explain why engagement with taxation promotes engagement with government systems, rather than disengaging and alienating yourself. Tax evasion could create budget crises that encourage rushed spending, or even end up weakening oversight mechanisms. At the end of your speech, you haven’t proven why your side wins on change.  We eventually explain what is effectively the harm principle. Good! I still think we need to spend more time explaining why the harm to tax revenue - that there is a difference between strikes, and other forms of civil disobedience that are morally legitimate. For instance, the difference between strikes and tax evasion - explain here why the scale of harm is significantly different to welfare, or is far-reaching when it comes to tax; every public service is reliant on tax revenue.  What is the structure of this speech? We have to clear delineated issues, or rebuttals and then an extension; we had rebuttal and then a comparative? This is messy and harder to track.  07:02 | | | | | | |