| **Student Name:** Theo Lee |
| --- |

| **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:  When you say Opp’s concept of national security is wrong, immediately tell me why, Theo! Otherwise, it’s a hung point which makes no impact.   * Good job signposting your speech.   Your rebuttal is just pointing out that attacking countries is not part of national security. Spend time actually engaging with their point about many countries facing security risks.   * Even if Opp is cherry-picking a country that is facing security risks, Prop doesn’t have an example of a country using conscription but does not actually need. Why are their examples of Singapore and South Korea irrelevant?   + Well done flipping their example and stating that those countries can actually engaging the military alternatives you highlighted.   + We can even expand this and explain why the state can make the military more attractive so the state can gain more soldiers but on a voluntary basis.   We cannot just conclude that this is an illegitimate exercise of state authority because people did not consent. We need to engage with Opp claiming that the people NEED national security in order to survive.   * 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! * 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.   Don’t take the POI as soon as it’s offered. Wait until you’ve finished a point before accepting it.  On your argument:   * Good point that forcing people to fight is counterproductive. What exactly is the civil disobedience point you’re talking about? Will they refuse to enroll? * We should have instead argued that it leads to low morale or ineffectiveness in the military.   + But the comparison is having NO people to fight, then what is the difference in outcome? If you want to protect national security as well, then surely Opp is winning this comparative.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  5.09 - Good timing! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Cyrus Yuan |
| --- |

| **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:  I like the analogy of conscriptions being a death sentence. Go even further and describe how so.   * Good job signposting.   On the case set-up:   * Good job defining military conscription. Try to exclude some of your moral conclusions here and go straight to the point. * In this debate, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * Well done on providing some strategic alternatives!   + Propose as well how you can make joining the military a more attractive, voluntary option via more benefits to soldiers, and celebrating soldiers.   + But strong set-up on 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, youth, choices is not enough, because you have to compare it to the opportunity cost of weakening the military.   + 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. * Well done on using moral parallels on why this is hazardous for the state to justify anything in the name of national security!   + But we are stopping too early here. Name the exact moral hazards.   + Why do you think 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.   + Surely the state wouldn’t enlist a person or force them to continue service instead of discharging them if they do face any long-term harm. * 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.   We should have a second argument in the debate!  You can ask for a POI from your opponents before the 4th minute.   * Please offer more POIs in the debate!   5.04 - Good timing. | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Emilia Lau |
| --- |

| **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: | 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 hook is clear, but it lacks any real impact!   * Good job signposting your clashes.   On the first clash on rights vs security:   * We may spend a little too long on summarising your opponents here, just one line overall is sufficient. Most of your time should be in engaging the human costs. * On whether this is morally valid, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * If your objection is about readiness for war, Opp will always win this on a scale because the general population has at least received two years of training versus no training in your world. * We cannot just conclude that this is an illegitimate exercise of state authority because people did not consent. We need to engage with Opp claiming that the people NEED national security in order to survive.   + 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! * 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.   Don’t take the POI as soon as it’s offered. Wait until you’ve finished a point before accepting it.   * Good reinforcement of the alternatives to national security. * Explain why these alternatives are actually viable because the speakers before have said that they are not accessible to many nations under security risks.   On the second clash:   * You are asserting that states are doing conscription for fun, but this goes against all conventional wisdom. You cannot just claim it, we are asserting that the world is in peace, but most countries who rely on conscription do face some kind of security risk!   Merely explaining the opportunity costs to the conscripts is not enough, because you have to compare it to the opportunity cost of weakening the military.   * Aside from mentioning the potential costs, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well as highly IMPACTFUL   + What is even the cost of losing these two years of training compared to the loss of soldiers during a security risk? * Surely the state wouldn’t enlist a person or force them to continue service instead of discharging them if they do face any long-term harm. What options are available here.   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.43 - So close to 5 minutes! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ethan Woo |
| --- |

| **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:  I appreciate the clarity in differentiating between peace-time and war-time conscription, but it isn’t clear what is the value of this clarification.   * Point out that peacetime clarification means that all of Prop’s worst case scenario will never happen where the recruits will all actively die. It’s just a standby mode.   Excellent pushback that most of these countries utilise conscription precisely because they are short of alternatives, i.e. small nations not having enough recruits, not having enough resources due to security risks, etc.   * However, Singapore certainly has enough resources to utilise Prop’s alternative of force multipliers.   + Also, make it clear that most conscripts are only ever in training and they are not actually sent to war. So a lot of Prop’s harms do not come to fruition.   We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’  Good reinforcement on this being 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. * Try to also include analysis on the reciprocal relationship between the state and civilians and why it’s the civilian’s obligation to do this.   We need a rebuttal against the loss of time and youth which was Prop’s main winning pathway. 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.   There is no clear 3rd argument today as the 2nd speaker.  Well done offering POIs today, you could’ve offered even more.  5.15 - Good timing | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Tongtong Lai |
| --- |

| **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:  I appreciate the use of Singapore as an explanation of the necessity of military conscription! South Korea might be an even better example since they face an active aggressor, whereas no country is actively attacking Singapore in the status quo.   * We spent a long time summarising your case line on why it’s justified in the name of minimising suffering and protecting the collective. We should keep this for the arguments later on.   Where is the counter set-up?   * Explain precisely who is eligible for conscription, and we are not forcing those who are less physically able.   + We can also differentiate them according to abilities and suitability, so not everyone is sent to the frontlines. * We can point out that only certain countries resort to conscription, and that all of them are facing security risks.   + We eventually said this later on, well done.   + Explain that most conscripts are only ever in training and they are not actually sent to war. So a lot of Prop’s harms do not come to fruition. * We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’   The speech structure does not differentiate between rebuttals and arguments!   * We need a 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.   + We eventually said that this isn’t a waste of time closer to the 4th minute, say this earlier. * 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.   On your argument:   * Good job focusing on the importance of national security.   + 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.   + Excellent explanation on what these dire national security risks are. Why can’t the state explore the military alternatives that Proposition highlighted? Explain that if the state lacks resources, we cannot afford to offer these great benefits to increase voluntary enrollment. * On this being a legitimate use of force, explain 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.   Please offer more POIs today!  5.05 | | | | | | |