| **Student Name:** Tony Huang |
| --- |

| **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 want the opening to be beyond the argument titles. Don’t make this just an acknowledgement that issues exist, but rather that conscriptions are immoral, or illegitimate. This is your burden, not that it shouldn’t be mandatory.  On the case set-up:   * Good job defining military conscription. Good job including examples of countries which have conscription. * In this debate, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * We need to provide strategic alternatives! If it is optional, how do you engage people into the military?   + 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 saying that there is a social contract, and that this voids this because it is too much is entirely insufficient. You need to first establish the social contract in the way we discussed, and then explain how this is an overstep. You are merely asserting this to be true. * We have to analyse why the moral impact of denying individual agency is 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.   On the second argument:   * This economic harm is in a vacuum. Yes, it hurts the economy, but so does the very state of being in war. Historically, countries have compensated for this by incentivising women into the workforce. Why isn’t this possible?   03:17 - we need to keep going, to at least hit 4!  Good POI to Alissa! Let’s offer more POIs! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Alissa Mak |
| --- |

| **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:  How does your side support the social contract? Claiming that it does, and explaining that it does are two different things!  On the counter set-up   * This isn’t the social contract per say, but rather you uphold the purpose of the social contract, which is that there is an exchange of rights and freedoms that occurs; this is in alignment with it. * Why 10%? Do you achieve your benefits in this way? * 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 need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’   Try not to take a POI in the middle of set-up. The answer here is that sometimes, we are engaged in self-defense, or don’t really choose warfare. You should use examples of who engages in conscription! South Korea, or even Singapore!  Rebuttals? This wasn’t clearly done, or signposted!  On the first argument:   * I think we need to establish the state power principle, and exchange of rights and freedoms as we discussed in class, and how the exchange must shift in the context of war and conflict. * We need to focus on 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. * 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. * Explain why personal autonomy can and should be traded off, when safety doesn’t exist. It isn’t even about trust and perception, it’s about the preservation of life! * Good impact of deterrence! Explain why this is so valuable, and why security and safety matter more. Consider the hierarchy of rights - why is the right to life most sacrosanct? * This argument needs more rigorous structure and clarity in terms of the roadmap.   Good job offering POIs!  06:02 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Angela Qian |
| --- |

| **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:  Do we want to admit that conflict and national security is the context in which this debate occurs, given the other side claims that this context necessitates a trade off? How else will the state take action? The claim we’re making makes our side sound unreasonable, which is that the state must prevent conflict and war, but do this without involving people/making it voluntary, without any explanation of how this alternative manifests. How do you achieve any change without sacrifice as you claim?  Rebuttal   * In this debate, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * On life and future; why do they have this in your world, where the military relies on only volunteers? If it is optional, how do you engage people into the military?   + 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. * We mentioned tactics and technology, but how does your side access these and make it so that troops and conscription are unnecessary? How your side achieves safety is unclear, which makes the comparative of this debate one of freedom, but under war which may threaten your life, to safety, where we sacrifice freedom for security.   On the argument:   * How does the state fulfil their duty in your world then? * Merely saying that there is a social contract, and that this voids this because it is too much is entirely insufficient. You need to first establish the social contract in the way we discussed, and then explain how this is an overstep. You are merely asserting this to be true. * We have to analyse why the moral impact of denying individual agency is 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. * On losing faith - the comparative is losing their life. How does your side deal with this?   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.   We need to offer more POIs in the round!  05:35 - let’s push to 6 next time! | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Karin Yeung |
| --- |

| **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:  We were just reading in our opening? Speed reading, at that! We need to remember that this is meant to be a persuasive speech. We need to open clearly and slowly, pinpointing what is wrong with the debate at this point, which is the lack of comparative analysis from Prop. they fail to acknowledge that the comparative isn’t freedom vs no freedom, it’s war!  We need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’  Rebuttal   * Good on lack of volunteers - pinpoint why these countries utilise conscription! It is because they are short of alternatives, i.e. small nations not having enough recruits, not having enough resources due to security risks, etc. * We can point out that only certain countries resort to conscription, and that all of them are facing security risks. * Don’t respond through the analogy on subjects and studying math, this makes the point you are trying to make harder to understand, not easier! * We need to focus on 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. * 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. * Explain why personal autonomy can and should be traded off, when safety doesn’t exist. It isn’t even about trust and perception, it’s about the preservation of life! * This isn’t the social contract per say, but rather you uphold the purpose of the social contract, which is that there is an exchange of rights and freedoms that occurs; this is in alignment with it. People don’t choose whether or not they live in a state - so choosing to live in a country isn’t a part of this debate.   Don’t take three POIs!  On the argument:   * Is this the best or only way to help people develop skills? * We can 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. * Point out to the extent that they need to go, this is not the worst way to spend war-time. * The benefits to the economy are a jump. What benefits, how do they occur, to what extent do they even exist?   We have to offer more POIs!  06:19 | | | | | | |

| **Student Name:** Renee Yang |
| --- |

| **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:  The opening is putting us on the backfoot. You need to argue why security exists on both sides, because conscription is not the only way to win a war. At the moment, the comparative is looking like freedom versus safety, prioritising Opp.  What is the structure of this speech? If you’re going to deal with new material from 2nd Opp before you go into clashes, say as such!  Good on calling out their set-up! Explain how this hurts the benefit they claim; how can they succeed? They have to defend full conscription properly.  Good on how this is the state overstepping, and how nothing we get in return is equivalent to the harm to life. However, it is still unclear how your side protects them from harm to life; war can take their life when the state does not have strong enough national security. Your path to victory is contingent on proving this.  On the first clash:   * How is this distinct from the responses you made above? You sound repetitive here! * On whether this is morally valid, we need to explain what is the metric for what constitutes ‘legitimate.’ * 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.   POI - why are volunteers sufficient to achieve national security? You need to mechanise this out, as opposed to just asserting that there will be enough due to patriotism?  On the second clash:   * We need to provide strategic alternatives! If it is optional, how do you engage people into the military?   + 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.   05:06 - offer more POIs! | | | | | | |