| **Student Name:** Isabella Chau |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 3 minutes’ long due to prep errors!]  I appreciate the use of examples to highlight countries doing conscription today, be sure to add strategic value here to begin with, which is all of these nations have a LOT of resources and they don’t need to resort to forceful conscription to strengthen national security.  On the case set-up:   * In this debate, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * Well done on providing some strategic alternatives!   + Excellent proposal on making joining the military a more attractive, voluntary option via more benefits to soldiers. Add on that we can celebrate soldiers as a vocation.   + Add on the alternative of investing resources in force multipliers, such as using technology to substitute for the number of soldiers.   On the first argument:   * Merely explaining the opportunity costs to the conscripts, i.e. loss of time, education, career opportunities is not enough, because you have to compare it to the opportunity cost of weakening the military.   + We have to engage in some kind comparison of the human costs involved. We need to explain the moral impact of this argument of these people losing their individual choices! Why is the moral impact of denying individual agency so important?     - Point out that this is blood on the state’s hands, enslaving the lives of people who did not consent to risking their lives.     - Use what we learn on whether the state has any authority to force this level of sacrifice. * Try utilising some moral parallels on why this is hazardous for the state to justify anything in the name of national security! * Spend some time here to complete the moral analogy as to why conscription is equivalent to death. Analyse the exact risks to their life, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well as highly IMPACTFUL   + Characterise things like people still die during training, even when they are not actually sent to the frontlines. * What is even the cost of losing these two years of training compared to the loss of soldiers during a security risk?   + In fact, military enrollment could also benefit their career longevity. So picking this practical harm may sound a little trivial in comparison to what’s at stake for Opp.   Please offer more POIs today!  3.09 | | | | | | |