| **Student Name:** Yeonseo Kim |
| --- |

| **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.]  I appreciate the attempt to clarify the debate, but I didn’t need you to clarify that this debate isn’t about the rich because your Opposition agrees to an extent.   * The context clarity I actually needed: 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.   This debate is not just about the poor because under progressive taxation, the poor pay next to nothing. It’s actually the Opposition who is defending the poor because they’re arguing that public services will collapse without any kind of funding from taxpayers.  On reinforcing the point that the people do not consent to the social contract, 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? Opp has argued in response to your POI that democracies are functional enough to gain consent.   Don’t concede that you made a mistake in the POI!!  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?   On the argument of tax evasion being the best form of protest:   * The point that people do not understand what the money is being used for is a technicality that can be easily overcome if people wanted to find this information. * What exactly are your criticisms of other forms of protest?   + It isn’t clear HOW the state can understand the intentions behind your refusal to comply with tax collection. Are you writing the state a letter to communicate this?? If they could have done this, why can’t they protest without the refusal to pay taxes? * Much better analysis on why tax evasion will force the state to reform! * We are not really characterising the extent of harm the state will suffer from.   + You have to explain all competing incentives the state has to consider, instead of arguing this singular incentive in a vacuum.   + If the state is an abusive actor, why will they care that other taxpayers are the ones harmed from tax evasion? * But be mindful that arguing the state will suffer immense harm precisely feeds into Opp’s argument on all of the human costs caused by tax evasion.   + Our moral justification needs to engage in the competing human costs.   Good job offering POIs today!  8.11 | | | | | | |