| **Student Name:** Alexander Zhu |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house believes that military conscription is illegitimate |
| --- |

| 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: | 71 | | | | | |
| 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 3 minutes’ long due to prep errors!]  Good job reinforcing the necessity of military conscription and utilising the examples we discussed!   * Be careful to not stop too early by just saying “what do you think is happening in xyz?” Actively tell me what these national security risks are, and what happens to them if we don’t use conscription.   Well done engaging with the military alternatives proposed by prop.   * But it isn’t clear WHY it isn’t effective.   + The problem with this being too costly is that the examples you gave before are all wealthy nations!   + Explain that we cannot simultaneously use money for recruitment on top of competing with the military technology of our enemies.   We need an active rebuttal against the loss of time and youth. Point out that a lot of conscripts still have a significant time to enjoy their youth and pursue the future they wanted.   * We can also point out that military training can be an ASSET, since they can serve as a launching pad for their future careers. Their skill sets also benefit from this experience. * More strategically, weigh this opportunity cost to the one suffered by national security before going into your point. * We also needed a rebuttal to address all of the individual harms to soldiers if they do get sent to war. Mitigate the harms they suffer from. Point out that the state doesn’t conscript soldiers with the intention of them dying, it’s for them to survive.   Strong reinforcement on the importance of national security.   * Conclude precisely that this is a legitimate use of force, explain clearly that national security is ALWAYS a reflection of what the general will is. Then use this specifically as the rebuttal to the loss of personal autonomy.   + Explain the balance of human costs and point out why national security is a gateway right in which everyone else’s right to life is contingent on. * We cannot just say that protecting security is protecting rights, we need to actively WEIGH which is more important in the debate.   Please offer more POIs today!  3.48 - Watch for time! | | | | | | |