| **Student Name:** Jodie Li |
| --- |

| **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:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 8 minutes’ long.]  I like the analogy in the hook, but sometimes it can sound like a kiddy introduction. enjoyed the hook! It would be even better if we included a more realistic depiction of the state’s oppression, rather than just the analogy in the rhetoric.   * Opposing ALL forms of taxation with the “taxation is theft” angle is a far higher burden than necessary!   On the set-up:   * Good job defining the 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.   + But at what point do we determine if a state is oppressive or abusive? If we allow citizens to self-define in every instance, then anyone at any time can refuse to pay taxes and the state will no longer be functional. * Good burden and winning pathway.   + Good clarification that you’re not opposing all forms of taxes always, but now it makes me confused as to why you referenced taxation being theft in your hook.   We would benefit from clarity of the context of the debate. Can we explain why the average citizen does not engage in tax evasion and this is something that is only reserved for the most extreme of state abuse?   * We cannot just assert that every instance of tax evasion was preceded by state abuse, that is an assumption you’re making.   Interesting argument on consent of the people, but what does this even look like? Do we need a referendum on every single point of the federal budget? How do we ever gain a consensus on anything? Can they fund some parts of the state and not others?   * It’s also not clear why the people CANNOT consent in any instance. Why do you think voting mechanisms are an ineffective vehicle in gauging consent?   Arguing ‘taxation is theft’ is too radical in this debate, because you’re allowing Opp to argue wholesale on the collapse of the state. There’s a lot of follow-up questions here:   * Why is it limited to the acts of protest then? Why don’t you oppose all forms of taxes in general, instead of limiting the discussion as a means of protest? * What is then the counterfactual in your world? How does the state retain any form of social function to support society?   We cannot just list out the type of wrongdoings the state could be responsible for such as lobbying, how does one determine whether or not the citizen is exercising their right to protest judiciously?   * You have to lay out the moral basis of when the citizen is allowed to refuse compliance with the state, because the wrongdoings you’ve listed only apply in very specific circumstances. * If you oppose all forms of social contract, can citizens just withdraw consent to be governed at any point? Why won’t this right just be continuously abused?   Why specifically is tax evasion the best way? Why shouldn’t we protest in any other way?  We are forgetting to ground our moral premises! We cannot argue in abstract and just borrow analysis from Ryan Lafferty without nuancing it to today’s motion.  Both arguments are fueled by the same moral premise, we could still argue practical things such as why tax evasion will force the state to reform and become less abusive.   * We could have characterised the extent of harm the state will suffer from is precisely the reason why changes will happen.   + Our moral justification needs to engage in the competing human costs.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.15 | | | | | | |