| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwan |
| --- |

| **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:  I enjoyed the hook! It would be even better if we included a more realistic depiction of the state’s lack of benevolence, rather than just the analogy in the rhetoric.  On the set-up:   * Good use of strategy to exclude corporate taxes, be sure to conclude WHY this is an important caveat, i.e. that the state will still have access to adequate funds to continue basic state functions. * We need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   + Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer. * We cannot just list out the type of wrongdoings the state could be responsible for, how does one determine whether or not the citizen is exercising their right to protest judiciously?   On the principle argument:   * We cannot just quote Thomas Hobbes, you have to lay out the moral basis of when the citizen is allowed to refuse compliance with the state. * We also cannot argue in abstract, can citizens just withdraw consent to be governed at any point? Why won’t this right just be continuously abused? * Why specifically is tax evasion the best way? Why shouldn’t we protest in any other way?   + We have to nuance the analysis to the mechanism of tax evasion in particular. * At what point do we determine if a state is ‘abusive? Under your logic, anyone at any time can refuse to pay taxes and the state will no longer be functional.   We are forgetting to ground our moral premises! We cannot argue in abstract.  There’s a practical argument hidden somewhere when you mentioned that the state will reform if people engage in tax evasion.   * But we did not mechanise this claim! What effect will this have and why is it more powerful than simply relying on voting mechanisms?   Don’t respond to the POI with a “wait, what?” Confidence is a choice! Proceed like you know what you’re doing.  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  4.47 - We are under-timed! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Audrey Lai |
| --- |

| **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:  I enjoyed the rhetoric in the hook! It would be even better if we included a more realistic depiction of the state’s malevolence as well as the human costs at stake here.   * Good signposting.   Good job flipping that Prop is actually the stakeholder that protects the average citizen.   * But we’re not explaining why the average citizen is exercising their right to protest judiciously.   + We need to respond to Opp’s nuance which is that tax evasion is being abused by bigoted citizens.   + Adrian’s POI is literally the exact thing you need to respond to, this was the perfect opportunity to address it rather than saying you will do it later.   Can we explain why the average citizen does not engage in tax evasion and this is something that is only reserved for the most extreme of state abuse?   * We cannot just assert that every instance of tax evasion was preceded by state abuse, that is an assumption you’re making.   We still need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   * Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer.   Good argument on why tax evasion will force the state to reform.   * We are not really characterising the extent of harm the state will suffer from.   + You have to explain all competing incentives the state has to consider, instead of arguing this singular incentive in a vacuum.   + If the state is an abusive actor, why will they care that other taxpayers are the ones harmed from tax evasion? * But be mindful that arguing the state will suffer immense harm precisely feeds into Opp’s argument on all of the human costs caused by tax evasion.   + Our moral justification needs to engage in the competing human costs. * If you are characterising the police as a brutal actor, then it’s unlikely that this is a democratic state that responds positively to non-compliance by citizens. So you may end up exposing citizens to even more failure.   This argument is in tension with your set-up on the state still having access to ample of resources via corporate taxes.  At what point do we determine if a state is ‘abusive? Under your logic, anyone at any time can refuse to pay taxes and the state will no longer be functional.  Please offer more POIs in the debate! Have confidence, Audrey!!!  5.15 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Sarah Choi |
| --- |

| **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:  When you’re calling out Opp’s logical fallacy of arguing a slippery slope, you then have to fully execute it and tell me why their logic is false and the state won’t collapse.   * Actively weaponise your strategic set-up of the state still having access to corporate taxes.   Good signposting.  Well done on pointing out that Opp is assuming that the state is not abusive. But you cannot end it here! Ryan made the reverse observation that Prop is assuming the worst case scenario. You have to guide the judge and explain which scenario is more likely to be true.   * We’re not explaining why the average citizen is exercising their right to protest judiciously. Can we explain why the average citizen does not engage in tax evasion and this is something that is only reserved for the most extreme of state abuse?   + We need to respond to Opp’s nuance which is that tax evasion is being abused by bigoted citizens.   We still need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   * Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer.   Instead of feeding into the practical clash, Prop should’ve won on a moral clash. We needed to shift the debate to what is considered morally legitimate.  Good reinforcement on why tax evasion will force the state to reform.   * We are not really characterising the extent of harm the state will suffer from.   + You have to explain all competing incentives the state has to consider, instead of arguing this singular incentive in a vacuum.   + If the state is an abusive actor, why will they care that other taxpayers are the ones harmed from tax evasion? * But be mindful that arguing the state will suffer immense harm precisely feeds into Opp’s argument on all of the human costs caused by tax evasion.   + Our moral justification needs to engage in the competing human costs.   At what point do we determine if a state is ‘abusive’? Under your logic, anyone at any time can refuse to pay taxes and the state will no longer be functional.  Please offer more POIs in the debate!  5.05 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Ryan Qian |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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:  Excellent observation on the Prop’s case being selective and focusing on only the worst case scenario.   * Conclude this strategic observation and tell me why Opp’s charitable case needs to be prioritised. * On logical analysis on tax evasion being a right that the people abuse.   + But be careful, Prop isn’t arguing for this to be a right that exists for everyone, but merely that it is a legitimate action from a moral perspective. We need to clash correctly.   + Go further and explain why your context of protestors are more prevalent, or explain why the severity of harm is more severe and justifies prioritisation.   We are STILL lacking a counterfactual! What are alternative forms of protests that are either more legitimate or more effective?   * Otherwise, you are not being charitable and engaging with Prop’s context of abusive states. * We need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   + Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer.   Good focal point about Prop sacrificing all other public interests and stakeholders.   * There is no real characterisation of the human costs of how other taxpayers will suffer if protestors choose this method.   + Explain the extent of natural rights being sacrificed if people refuse to comply with basic state functions. * But make your moral clash clear here. What are the exact obligations of citizens here? Where is the moral challenge to their principle argument?   We are not nuancing it to Prop’s argument. They are arguing that you are enabling an oppressive state.   * We cannot assume that all states will use taxpayers’ money judiciously, how do you argue that even a bad state will still be able to do more good than harm with those resources. Do a comparison of conflicting human rights.   You are focusing on minority rights, but Prop is saying that it is precisely the minorities who are legitimate in exercising tax evasion as a means of protest.   * Guide the judge is explaining who is more or less likely to exercise tax evasion as a means.   If the people who are exercising tax evasion are bigoted citizens, this also means that the state will be pushed to reflect the wants of a bigoted community and institutionalise that kind of bigotry in state systems if no one can resist compliance to the state!  Good job offering POIs!  5.06 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Adrian Wong |
| --- |

| **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 | | | | | |
| 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’ll accept your hook because it’s funny.  Very interesting focus on bigoted citizens, but this also means that the state will be push to reflect a bigoted majority and institutionalise that kind of bigotry in state systems if no one can resist compliance to the state!   * We cannot end early with just a counter-assertion.   + Either explain why your context of protestors are more prevalent, or explain why the severity of harm is more severe and justifies prioritisation.   In the set-up:   * We are lacking a counterfactual! What are alternative forms of protests that are either more legitimate or more effective? * We need some kind of metric as to what constitutes a ‘legitimate’ means of protest.   + Try to contrast it to other kinds of protests that Prop may deem as legitimate, or illegitimate to make the moral clash clearer.   Where are the rest of your rebuttals, aside from potential abuse?   * Where is the moral challenge to their principle argument? * Where is the response to Prop saying that the state will reform to be better?   On your first argument:   * It seems like the whole argument only has a singular point on not having any money for the state to spend. * There is no real characterisation of the human costs of how other taxpayers will suffer if protestors choose this method.   + Explain the extent of natural rights being sacrificed if people refuse to comply with basic state functions. * We are not nuancing it to Prop’s argument. They are arguing that you are enabling an oppressive state.   + We cannot assume that all states will use taxpayers’ money judiciously, how do you argue that even a bad state will still be able to do more good than harm with those resources. Do a comparison of conflicting human rights.   Stop looking at your teammate for help! Just push through and improvise, confidence is a choice.  Good job offering POIs, we could offer even more.  3.54 - We are under-timed! Wait for the double bell! | | | | | | |