| **Student Name:** Hanna Zhang |
| --- |

| **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: | 70.5 | | | | | |
| 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 8 minutes’ long.]  What is the strategic value of pointing out that it’s the middle class who engage in tax evasion? That’s clear because the low-income pay next to nothing under progressive taxation.   * Good conclusion eventually that it’s about the balancing of human costs.   After reinforcing that taxes are a necessity to state function, it isn’t clear what we are rebutting here. Are we trying to prove that social contract is legitimate just because a lot of countries observe it?   * Try to actually rebut specific to what Jodie said, i.e. that people did not meaningfully consent to social contract. Argue why electoral mechanisms are an adequate way in which we obtain the consent of the people. Point out that people can exit out of the social contract they disagree with.   Where are the rest of your rebuttals?   * Point out the potential abuse of their policy. * Where is the moral challenge to their principle argument of all taxation being theft? We should’ve called out their insanely high burden! * If they think all taxation is theft, why is it limited to the acts of protest then? Why don’t they oppose all forms of taxes in general, instead of limiting the discussion as a means of protest? * What is then the counterfactual in their world? How does the state retain any form of social function to support society? Are they all anarchies??   Make an observation on the Prop’s case being selective and focusing on only the worst case scenario. How are they certain that all states are abusive?  We should have the counter set-up BEFORE the rebuttals next time:   * We ended up not having any! * We are lacking a counterfactual! What are alternative forms of protests that are either more legitimate or more effective? * We need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   + Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer.   We are not actually nuancing our social contract to the criticisms of Prop on citizens not being able to consent meaningfully.   * Well done on visualising the human costs of not paying taxes! I appreciate the use of the Philippines as grounding when taxes are not paid.   + Make a conclusion here on the extent of natural rights being sacrificed if people refuse to comply with basic state functions. * We are not nuancing the argument of helping the public to Prop’s argument. They are arguing that you are enabling an oppressive state.   + We cannot assume that all states will use taxpayers’ money judiciously, how do you argue that even a bad state will still be able to do more good than harm with those resources. Do a comparison of conflicting human rights. * You are focusing on minority rights, but Prop is saying that it is precisely the minorities who are legitimate in exercising tax evasion as a means of protest. * Guide the judge is explaining who is more or less likely to exercise tax evasion as a means.   Make a very clear strategic conclusion on how to weigh these competing human costs of fueling an oppressive state vs the state cannot fund public services.  Good job offering POIs!  7.50 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |