| **Student Name:** Matias Li |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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: | 71.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Are the actors you are identifying being targeted by this policy? Is this about corporation tax, or CEOs specifically? We want to make sure we’re being specific to the motion, rather than the concept of redistribution specifically.  Set-up   * Good work identifying that there are many means of evading tax - but how do you deal with this? If the idea is that high taxes lead to evasion, how do you ensure buy-in occurs? * We need to explain what general rate of tax we support, and what we would use this tax for. * Good on adding in regulation of assets, but this needed to be attached to the problem characterisation.   Argument 1   * What is the thesis of this argument? * Fair work analysing that other forms of tax aren’t as effective, and hence income needs to be targeted. We’re providing analysis as to why other forms don’t work - but less analysis on why income does work.   + Talk about what political will exists for; what are people more likely to buy-in to?   + Income tax can potentially reach a broader segment of the population than asset taxes. While asset taxes primarily target those with significant wealth, income tax can apply to anyone earning above a certain threshold. This broader base can generate more revenue and contribute to a greater sense of shared responsibility. * We need to word our analysis with more clarity - the risk of moving abroad that you’re describing is capital flight. Extremely high asset taxes might be a stronger driver of capital flight than moderately high income taxes. Individuals are often more sensitive to taxes on their accumulated wealth than on their current earnings. * What did we prove by the end of the argument? What did we impact?   Argument 2   * In order for this impact to accrue, you need to explain why corporations’ ability to lobby gets taken away - why this hurts their power. * Does your side tax profit? Profit, and their market share/monopoly status is what gives companies status. If we want to explain how this aggressively redistributive income tax hurts businesses, we need to explain directly how they lose money, or lose market share, which we aren’t currently doing.   We don’t impact at all in terms of what inequality this corrects, or how this uplifts the poor. Just because this impact is valuable on both sides doesn’t mean you don’t explain it. It ends up that 1O for some reason doesn’t hold redistribution as important, so your lack of impacting here really hurts you.  Clear on burdens at the end - this should have been in set-up at the opening!  07:07 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Catherine Ho |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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: | 68.5 | | | | | |
| 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:  Our opening is pretty extreme - that collapse occurs, and also unclear. Why does this happen? How does this happen?  Set-up   * What is the point of defining capitalism? * 10% is incredibly low; if you want property tax, you need to spell this out really clearly. * The strategies we have are - saying socialism is good, but income tax isn’t the way to go, or rejecting socialism altogether. I think the former strategy is preferable, because the positive benefit of the welfare state is very difficult to argue against - you can argue that practically this won’t work out due to corruption, or the trust deficit - but it is DIFFICULT to prove this beyond reasonable doubt. Your burden now becomes to explain why redistribution isn’t justified.   Rebuttal   * Is this a fair contribution? Is this an accessible contribution? Are all employees, and all companies proving crucial, necessary goods? You need to challenge whether an income tax disables the power of big businesses - that is the best response strategy. The response strategy you’ve chosen has a very high burden of proof. * Did we engage with any of their argumentation on why redistribution is important? The analysis you’re presenting isn’t comparative at all!   Argument 1   * What is the value of innovation, compared to the benefits Prop claims in this round? * Even if we want to prove innovation occurs less on Prop - why is this true? What is the pre-condition of innovation, and why isn’t it met? This is entirely assertive. * Why does this ‘crash the economy’? How do you reign in these companies, as opposed to just accepting they stay and behave in this way?   The strategy on Opp must be explaining why redistribution is valuable, but that income tax targets people who actually do work hard, rather than the extremely wealthy who have accumulated capital. High taxes lead to capital flight, and actively hurt economic growth; you can run an argument on how taxation is theft, and must provide counter set-up explaining how your side is better able to achieve redistribution through taxes on wealth!  We need to take POIs seriously - and actually answer them. We also need to ask POIs consistently.  07:14 | | | | | | |

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

| **Motion**: This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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:  Where is your hook? You have a golden opportunity to explain how their side chooses to ignore the value of redistribution and helping people by correcting the accident of birth/the state’s obligation to correct the accident of birth. We are shooting ourselves in the foot by ignoring this.  Call-outs - fair on property tax versus taking on the rich, but the above is really what needs to be highlighted at the moment.  Rebuttal   * This response hurts your own case, where your first speaker’s second argument relies on explaining how this takes down big businesses… this is also the POI Shi Qi asks you. You can’t NOT answer the question. * We had ONE rebuttal, as 2nd Prop. What? We need to respond to their claim on innovation, on efficiency, and most importantly on how we are able to implement this tax well.   Argument 1   * This argument needs to be made at first; and needs to be made comparatively. We just assert that this corrects the lottery, and then move on. We spend no time PROVING how this fulfils the moral obligation of the state, or what the impact of this is, in terms of restoring dignity.   We then moved onto clashes? What is the structure of this speech?  Clash 1   * We repeated responses here, not adding any new analysis here.   Clash 2   * Is this a clash in the round? Did the other side even say they’re going to exclusively tax the rich? * We need to explain WHY income tax works better than other options.   + Income tax can potentially reach a broader segment of the population than asset taxes. While asset taxes primarily target those with significant wealth, income tax can apply to anyone earning above a certain threshold. This broader base can generate more revenue and contribute to a greater sense of shared responsibility.   + Extremely high asset taxes might be a stronger driver of capital flight than moderately high income taxes. Individuals are often more sensitive to taxes on their accumulated wealth than on their current earnings. * On moving companies - this is a debate about income tax, not corporation tax.   06:44 - we’re 15 seconds under-time! We need to hit 7.  We need to ask POIs consistently! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Shi Qi Ooi |
| --- |

| **Motion**: This house would implement an aggressively redistributive income tax |
| --- |

| 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 | | | | | |
| 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:  What is your opening achieving? I want you to consider what strategic value add it has. What you need to rescue your case from is that your side does nothing to explain why redistribution is valuable, or how you achieve it. Why are we arguing that we have to safeguard what is being presented as a terribly unequal economy because the companies will leave if they don’t - do we prove that they even leave in the first place?  Do not say that you have five rebuttals; what is the point of this?   * Why do companies respond in the way you claim? Why are companies going to get so angry - this is about INCOME tax, not corporation tax. * Fair on impressions of socialism - but how does this impact the round? You need to explain why this means political will gets exhausted on this one mechanism - which doesn’t achieve redistribution as well, because it only targets people who earn, rather than the really wealthy - who have assets instead. Hence, we are unable to engage in further redistribution, or focus on uplifting the poor in other ways. * On the birth lottery - why is our response that rich people matter the most? This is an incredibly unstrategic approach in the round.   Argument 1   * The benefit of this argument is entirely contingent on the public good being provided by the private company is even accessible in the first place. What incentive does a private company have to give cheap, fair and accessible services to those who cannot afford it? * Why does this motion impact these companies in any way? What is the delta here? * Even if I assume it hurts them, is this a fair contribution? Is this an accessible contribution? Are all employees, and all companies proving crucial, necessary goods? * What is the impact of this argument?   The strategies we have are - saying socialism is good, but income tax isn’t the way to go, or rejecting socialism altogether. I think the former strategy is preferable, because the positive benefit of the welfare state is very difficult to argue against - you can argue that practically this won’t work out due to corruption, or the trust deficit - but it is DIFFICULT to prove this beyond reasonable doubt. Your burden now becomes to explain why redistribution isn’t justified.  The strategy on Opp must be explaining why redistribution is valuable, but that income tax targets people who actually do work hard, rather than the extremely wealthy who have accumulated capital. High taxes lead to capital flight, and actively hurt economic growth; you can run an argument on how taxation is theft, and must provide counter set-up explaining how your side is better able to achieve redistribution through taxes on wealth!  We didn’t follow up on the POI we asked Marvis.  07:16 | | | | | | |