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

| **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: | 72 | | | | | |
| 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.]  If you’re questioning capacity, your state has even LESS capacity to fund the safety net policies that your first speaker wanted.   * Spend time reframing the debate that a high-capacity corporate actor can fill in the gaps in the state system.   + But it’s not very intuitive to suggest that corporate philanthropy will be meaningful, since they are profit-motivated actors. * What are all the things that corporations can do but the state cannot? E.g. They can handle job creation in the economy better than the state can.   If the problem is avoiding taxation, this is likely a worse problem on Opp.   * 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 lobbying against the enforcement of state regulations, so it minimises the exploitation of legal loopholes. * If we can spend time explaining the brief mention of capital flight, i.e. corporations move to tax havens pretty easily, the whole premise will become far stronger.   + We finally explained this in the argument later on, well done!     - Be mindful that we kept repeating this premise throughout the speech, but only proved it finally at 06:30.   Don’t stop at just using factual observations to say that Prop is ineffective, WHY are they not likely to work effectively?   * Explain that poor economic growth means the state will collect lower taxes anyway. 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 finally said this later on, well done!   I appreciate the plentiful call-outs on why some things won’t work, but we keep moving on pretty quickly after stating the counter-assertion. You haven’t proven any of these claims!   * Instead of bombarding the debate with 20 different competing premises, hunker down with 3 premises and actively give me logical reasoning why you are correct and important. * On the state being ineffective, 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 premise to explain why even a minute possibility of state abuse 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.   On the argument of economic harms, this is the best part of the speech but we are running out of time:   * After explaining that you have more jobs, explain the importance of job creation as the epicenter of all forms of economic growth. * On passing the harm 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.   7.12 | | | | | | |