| **Student Name:** Ivy Xu |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  This isn’t about defending a general ability to protest, but rather an explanation of why this is specifically a legitimate form of protest. Don’t just define what a protest is, explain what the purpose behind it is - and what pushes people into these situations.  Our set-up should focus on when people protest, what the role of tax evasion in this context is, and the likely countries or states under which this would occur.  Argument 1  The thesis and direction of this argument is missing up top. Don’t take me on a journey where the argument takes on a different face with each piece of analysis. The internal signposting/roadmap needs to be present in the form of a thesis.  Don’t refer to it as Locke’s theory, but rather explain what the nature of state power is, and justify why this has to be reciprocal in nature; you can also go over the problems with the state power principle and where it stops being legitimate - such that this form of protest occurs.  The POI highlights the central issue with the first argument as it’s made within the first 3-4 minutes - that it justifies protest in and of itself, and even strikes - but not specifically taxation. What is the purpose of taxation? Why do states feel empowered to tax you? When do people engage in evasion - and WHY do they engage in evasion. This analysis is missing in entirety. Why, similarly, are people likely to engage in other forms or versions of protest, and build up to this as a means of last resort.  On Rousseau - you’re asserting his theory, rather than deriving it from them. Your argument needed to be an explanation of when the state is justified in exercising power and control over us, and why this does not exist such that people should protest in this way.  05:31 - we spoke undertime!  Ivy, we aren’t asking a sufficient number of POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Marvis Leung |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  The analogy obscures the comparison; it is not as intuitive as you think it. You are still starting your speech with ‘judge’.  Rebuttal + Set-up? We need to have pointed responses that engage with their content; we’re just providing analysis in opposition to what they say, without necessarily identifying   * We are being too hasty - why will it lead to governmental collapse? Why and how do enough people engage in this such that the state runs out of revenue? Why do the beneficiary of taxes matter more to us than those who are protesting and evading. Why will the state - or why is the state capable - of using the revenue well? Consider - why are people engaging in evasion in the first place? * The POI should be - if they concede that - is it effective at all? Argue that if the basis for legitimacy - which they never explain - is effectiveness, then it is illegitimate. * The railways is a poor example - tube strikes in the UK inconvenience people significantly! Explain here why the scale of harm is significantly different to welfare, or is far-reaching when it comes to tax; every public service is reliant on tax revenue.   Argument 1   * Good on the trade off here, and which groups of stakeholders are in opposition to each other. * Good work identifying the accident of birth. * Did we prove that the beneficiaries matter more? Did we prove the harm that they are subject to where they lose out on these services?   Argument 2   * This is a set of questions lobbied to the other side, as opposed to positive analysis proving a benefit on your side, or a moral justification on your side.   This is a speech justifying why tax evasion is bad, not an explanation as to why tax evasion is an illegitimate form of protest. We needed to spend time explaining what the purpose of a protest is, and under what circumstances it is legitimate; for instance - drawing an analogy to civil disobedience, and where and how it works, and the harm principle. Did we do any of this?  06:11  Marvis, we aren’t asking a sufficient number of POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Charles Wang |
| --- |

| **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: | 69.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  This is a tricky opening. It undermines the effectiveness claim your side is pushing; if the government is likely to survive without this revenue, why does it achieve any attention or change? The opening and the first response end up undermining the push your case has.  The way to engage is to say - they just explain tax evasion is bad because some people benefit from tax revenue, not that it isn’t a legitimate form of protest. You should then explain the circumstances under which people are likely to engage in evasion. If the state is a good actor, and deploys tax revenue well - would people have any incentive to evade tax? That people are unhappy is something that only comes out in the POI - you need to spend time characterising how this is a tool in a toolbox, or likely something that people will build up to.   * Good job, we talk about some of this later, but need to make this the central framing of the round.   This isn’t about defending a general ability to protest, but rather an explanation of why this is specifically a legitimate form of protest. Explain how we measure the legitimacy of protest; is it moral legitimacy (such as no taxation without representation), or effectiveness (that this will ensure the state corrects whatever problem it has).  Argument 1  The same comment as your opening and first response applies here!  Tax evasion as you run it faces a fundamental problem: If widespread enough to force change, it catastrophically undermines public services; if limited enough to avoid systemic damage, it fails as an effective protest mechanism. You have to resolve it and explain which one - OR, run a moral claim about the failure of the state and the state power principle.  06:10 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jeffrey Shen |
| --- |

| **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: | 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:  Good opening, deal with this up top rather than immediately telling me that you’ll do this in your clash. Their entire push is based on practical benefit; the claim on moral legitimacy is largely dealt with in 1st Opp, with no following response from 2nd Prop. You have to explain that there is a structural impossibility of tax evasion working as a legitimate form of protest; if the government is likely to survive without this revenue, why does it achieve any attention or change?  Clash 1   * Clear explanation as to moral legitimacy; I do think we need to spend more time explaining why the harm to tax revenue - taking them through one version of their case, is that there is a difference between strikes, and other forms of civil disobedience that are morally legitimate. For instance, the difference between strikes and tax evasion - explain here why the scale of harm is significantly different to welfare, or is far-reaching when it comes to tax; every public service is reliant on tax revenue. * Consider - why are people engaging in evasion in the first place? Our weighing of people who benefit from taxation has a pretty big gap - we don’t explain why the state will - or why is the state capable - of using the revenue well? * We aren’t engaging with their claims on people having meaningful justification to dis-engage. This isn’t necessarily made very strongly on Prop - so call it out first, but the point is that there is no justification to state power without representation; we don’t need to uphold our side of the contract, without sufficient representation.   Clash 2   * On effectiveness, we do well to call out the two iterations of their case. However, we should go further and explain why tax evasion is structurally limited in its ability to do this. Unlike traditional protests which can calibrate their impact, tax evasion offers no middle ground. Either it's too small to matter (failing as protest) or too large to be justified (causing disproportionate harm). * Explain further how the snowball effect kicks in - unlike protests which can declare victory and end, tax evasion creates self-perpetuating incentives. Once normalized, becomes impossible to distinguish protest from opportunism. We explain how there is a difference in sitting at home versus speeches, but should have spent more time justifying this - and the different, better, ways people can engage in protest on your side. * I think we can also explain why engagement with taxation promotes engagement with government systems, rather than disengaging and alienating yourself. Tax evasion could create budget crises that encourage rushed spending, or even end up weakening oversight mechanisms.   If we speak too fast, we become difficult to track - and hence harder to give feedback to!  Good POIs!  05:36 - slow down! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Daryl Ng |
| --- |

| **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:  We need to engage with the push from 2nd Opp - which is how your side balances between this being widespread and such that the state needs to listen, or that there are other sources that the state can engage with to provide welfare etc. The resolution of this with regards to this being a ‘warning’ or moral signalling, is a start, but we need to expand further!  This isn’t about defending a general ability to protest, but rather an explanation of why this is specifically a legitimate form of protest. Explain how we measure the legitimacy of protest; is it moral legitimacy (such as no taxation without representation), or effectiveness (that this will ensure the state corrects whatever problem it has).  Clash 1  We have to explain why tax evasion doesn't need universal participation to be effective! Critical threshold exists where it:   * Creates sufficient pressure for reform * Maintains basic state functions * Demonstrates widespread dissatisfaction   This is the same as voter turnout - doesn't need 100% to be legitimate!  We should also explain why their side doesn’t get sufficient change! Explain under what conditions people turn to tax evasion.  Clash 2  The way to engage is to say - they just explain tax evasion is bad because some people benefit from tax revenue, not that it isn’t a legitimate form of protest. You should then explain the circumstances under which people are likely to engage in evasion. If the state is a good actor, and deploys tax revenue well - would people have any incentive to evade tax? You need to spend time characterising how this is a tool in a toolbox, or likely something that people will build up to.   * Good job, we talk about some of this later, but need to make this the central framing of the round.   06:16 | | | | | | |