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

| **Motion:** This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  In the hook, highlight that while SOME governments can be good, we cannot pursue a high-risk development strategy that is highly contingent on the merit and trustworthiness of each government.  Well done on the pushback on questioning how the state can garner the resources necessary to fund their plans.   * Conclude clearly the funding of public services will be compromised because high taxes lead to economic regression. * Then guide the judge on the strategic conclusion that Opp’s economic plan is the prerequisite to Prop’s policy plan.   We shouldn’t stop at just suggesting corporate retaliation, we should explain why this is likely and what the impact of this would be.   * Also, since the corporations are now far less wealthy on Prop, this actually limits the harm of corporations politicking,   It’s not very intuitive to suggest that corporate philanthropy will be meaningful, since they are profit-motivated actors.   * So instead, engage on the difference in capacity between the state and corporations. What are all the things that corporations can do but the state cannot.   Where is the counter set-up in this debate?   * You need strategic safeguards to deal with Prop’s human costs! * Suggest that the state can co-opt a lot of these policies without aggressive taxation. * You can support a mixed economy and still have safety net policies. * What’s your burden?   On the argument of economic harms:   * Don’t stop at just the layoffs, explain the importance of job creation as the epicenter of all forms of economic growth. * On passing the costs to consumers, will this necessarily be a problem since the state has safeguarded the level of income of the average civilian?   + We should also be comparative and engage with Prop’s argument on cyclical poverty being a byproduct of wealth accumulation by the financial elite. * We need to spend time linking all of these harms as an exclusive byproduct of high taxes.   In response to the POI, we cannot continue to assert that the state will mismanage public funds without giving me structural reasons as to why a socialist state will do this.   * WHY are they more likely to be corrupt than not?   On the government abuse argument:   * We are stating random examples of potential state abuse. Stating that it may happen is not the same as stating that it WILL happen. What is the likely prevalence of this? * We need to reframe the whole argument to explain why even a minute possibility of this is not something we can tolerate, simply because there’s no self-correcting mechanism.   + Then flip this analysis to explain why the free market is self-correcting, and abusive corporations do get punished.   Good job offering POIs today!  7.12 | | | | | | |