| **Student Name:** James Cao |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Have a hook, James!   * Provide signposting before diving into your rebuttals.   Good counter-claim that many individuals prefer not joining the army at the expense of their careers, but it’s not clear what exactly we are rebutting here.   * The Opposition is claiming that national security is more important than individual interests. * Surely, the greatest individual cost is their actual lives, and not their future career.   I appreciate the response as to why the Ukraine example does not favour the Opposition.   * Here, we could’ve reinforced your model to explain the alternatives ways in which we can bolster national security without conscription.   + Explain how you can make joining the military a more attractive, voluntary option via more benefits to soldiers, and celebrating soldiers.   + You can also focus on investing resources in force multipliers, such as using technology to substitute for the number of soldiers.   On your argument:   * Interesting claim on weakening everyone’s military simultaneously, but this isn’t a policy debate that guarantees your opposing country will also not conscript anyone.   + This is a value debate discussing the legitimacy of conscription.   + So your enemies will still take every military advantage they can in a war. How do you even manifest your benefits of weakening everyone’s military? * In response to the POI, you are referencing a global mechanism that rarely works. There is also no existing international law against military conscription. So what are we proposing exactly?   We need to explain the moral impact of the state forcing everyone to lose their lives and autonomy!   * 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 offering POIs today!  5.05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Bernard Chong |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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 reinforcement in the hook that the state cannot just simply mandate that people die, but spend some time here addressing the issue of national security, wherein more people might die according to the Opposition.  Good job signposting all of the issues.  On the rebuttal:   * We cannot just use China as an example to win the clash, as opposed to using logical reasoning!   + You are cherry-picking a country that has plenty of people to volunteer, and a vast wealth of resources to make the military an attractive option.     - Engage with the Opp saying that many countries do not fit the above description.   On the first issue:   * We are doubling down on military conscription being a death sentence without engaging with Opp’s reasoning that some soldiers only have to go to training, instead of being sent to the frontlines.   + Characterise things like the chain of command to explain why soldiers are endangered without having any agency to say no to intense training. * We are reducing the harms to just an office worker doing 20 push-ups, why can’t they improve their strength?   + If they die from starvation, how does your military have resources to improve the military as an alternative? * Aside from mentioning the potential risks, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well. Arguing that it COULD happen does not prove that it WILL happen.   On the second issue:   * Good point that forcing people to fight leads to low morale.   + But the comparison is having NO people to fight, then what is the difference in outcome?   We need to explain the moral impact of your case! 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 lose your train of thought, just improvise! We wasted a lot of time trying to articulate ourselves.  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  5.47 - Watch for time please! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ellie Fu |
| --- |

| **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 medical analogy but we can go even harder! The human costs of potentially going to war is surely more visceral and impactful than a vasectomy.   * Good job signposting.   On the case set-up:   * We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * Well done on the case strategy on how to make joining the military a more attractive, voluntary option via more benefits to soldiers, and celebrating soldiers.   + You can also focus on investing resources in force multipliers, such as using technology to substitute for the number of soldiers.   On the first argument:   * Aside from mentioning the potential risks, explain why the risks are highly PROBABLE as well. Arguing that it COULD happen does not prove that it WILL happen.   + Characterise the environment of the military to explain why it’s danger-prone even when you’re training. * Surely the state wouldn’t enlist a person or force them to continue service instead of discharging them if they do face any physical long-term harm. * We need to explain the moral impact of this argument! 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.   On the second argument:   * Good job characterising the chain of command and why soldiers are often powerless!   + But this sounds like a mechanistic analysis that actually proves the first argument on how dangerous the military is. * We could’ve focused on why it’s impossible to reform the military without abandoning national security interest.   + And this is why consent is important, because they have no more agency and rights as soon as they enter the military structure.   Don’t take the POI right away, wait to finish your sentence.  Well done offering POIs today!  5.22 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Jacky Xu |
| --- |

| **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:  Good hook, but focus on maximising impact!  On the counter set-up:   * Well done on the clarity of who is eligible for conscription, and we can differentiate them according to abilities and suitability. * When we mentioned that they’re not all in the frontlines, this would be a good point to explain that most conscripts are only ever in training and they are not actually sent to war. * We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’   Don’t take the POI right away, wait to finish your sentence.  Where are your rebuttals today?   * We need to address all of the individual harms to soldiers.   + Mitigate the harms they suffer from, and explain why individuals actually benefit from a lot of protection and career advancement from conscription.   + Point out that the state doesn’t conscript soldiers with the intention of them dying, it’s for them to survive.   On justifying conscription:   * I appreciate the analysis on the reciprocal relationship between the state and civilians. * We need to explain precisely 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. * Point out that the kind of states who rely on conscription are precisely those who are the most in danger! * Well done pointing on the human costs!   + But we need to be comparative on which one is MORE important.     - Explain why national security is a gateway right in which everyone else’s right to life is contingent on.   Well done offering POIs today!  5.05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Christy 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 | | | | | |
| 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 can make the hook a lot more impactful!  Well done on the rebuttal as to why Prop’s alternatives are rarely effective!   * Aside from explaining that if the state lacks resources, we cannot afford to offer these great benefits to increase voluntary enrollment.   + They also cannot invest in military technology to overcome the lack of soldiers.   Don’t take the POI right away, wait to finish your sentence.   * Don’t take the POI back-to-back as well.   + We could’ve pointed out that China has a billion people, so they have no shortage of humans to volunteer. The state also has vast resources.     - Point out that the kind of states who rely on conscription are precisely those who are proximate to war and don't have plentiful resources.   We still needed a rebuttal to address all of the individual harms to soldiers.   * Mitigate the harms they suffer from, and explain why individuals actually benefit from a lot of protection and career advancement from conscription.   + Explain that most conscripts are only ever in training and they are not actually sent to war.   + 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 balance of the human costs!   + Explain why national security is a gateway right in which everyone else’s right to life is contingent on.   + We need to explain precisely what these dire national security risks are. We cannot assert that everyone else will simply die without proving it!   Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.58 - So close! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |