

Affirmative : La Reina High School HB  
 Hannah Bartels

Negative : The Harker School SR  
 Sagar Rao

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Michael Brison

Kudos

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Keeps proper level of eye contact.

Comments:

Affirmative

- Confidently opens case, stating brief constitutional synopsis, criteria, and goal. Uses powerful historic examples. Utilizes effective sources of information to solidify framework. Manages to effectively incorporate efficient quotes.
- Begins by stating opponent's goals, proceeds to successfully prove opponent's argument is faulty. Manages to successfully refute opponent's strongest claims against affirmative action. Continues to prove opponent's claims as irrelevant.
- Strongly attempts to convince audience that opponent's claims are entirely invalid, manages to prove that opponent's main points are invalid values on impacts and decisions are false.

Occasionally makes eye contact.

Negative

- Opens rapidly describing constitutional term. Rapidly states examples to attempt to solidify case. Attempts to combat opponents arguments aggressively and rapidly. Stumbles over own words and arguments.
- Begins slowly, speaking quickly as opponent's contention, abruptly stopping, dropping topic, and switching suddenly to another. Aggressively claims opponent's definition cause contention to be disregarded due to being non-relevant. Claims all of opponent's impacts are to be dropped and frames within favor of negative. Repeatedly claims against opponent's main claim is non-relevant due to definition.

Affirmative : La Reina High School HB  
Hannah Bartels

Negative : The Harker School SR  
Sagar Rao

104

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Christoph Ostry

Kudos

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Hannah Comments:

- Calm opening state merit. Very informative and well rounded. Slight stammers in an otherwise perfect opening statement.
- Did not have all research, but did not need it. Immediately trained when needed.
- Had successful questions that slightly flustered opponent.
- Put aside useless arguments to concentrate on the important factors. Finds major flaw in Sagar's contention.
- Provides plenty of examples for her contention.

Sagar

- Persuasive clarification on opponents opening statement in preparation of possible rebuttal very systematically.
- Speed strategy ~~and~~ for his own contentions. Countered most of his opponents contentions, but also had an extremely slight statement equal to opponents.
- Comes in with a powerful and persuasive argument using their shared beliefs.
- Falls short when it comes to examples.
- Does well to cover most of all topics well in final statement.

both spent a lot of time debating topicality of kid. maybe a waste of time, but still a key factor.

Room: Camino Real  
Building (CR) 225

2013 Glendale Middle School Warm up Speech and Debate Competition

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: La Reina High School HB  
Hannah BartelsNegative: The Harker School SR  
Sagar Rao

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Alejandro RocaGlendale Community College

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

## Comments:

Affirmative: Allow Clarity in your opening. Your final speech was a lot better - I saw more logic in your speech.

You did a good job in your examination you had two really good questions (which) that cornered your opponent, you need to capitalize on that, take it all the way.

You need some work reasoning, and to quickly think of a rebuttal to arguments.

Negative: Slow down! I understood almost nothing in your first speech in the beginning. You did much better in your 2nd speech because you did not have it all memorized and were rather actually using reasons. You never referred back to your evidence throughout the speech. In your cross-X, you asked to Aff to recite definitions and asked a 'why?' question three times. Personally I don't believe you should ever ask an open-ended question, stick to 'yes' and 'no' only. You had ~~really~~ really good volume, your diction was very impressive.

Reasons for Decision: Aff's stand, value stand, and Aff's rebuttal stand

RAND MA  
 2012 2015 2016 2017

Aff

Interpret: policy + others

Value: Human Rights  
 Utilitarian

Carlson & Inter. Works

A Military Intervention

B Humanitarian Aid

C. Human Survival

Cont 5. US Exp. to protect  
 Human Rights

- Responsibility to Protect Doctrine

- Any action that is being a political

- Culture & for

Cross exam: From neg

- Rebuttal
- Why

• What are human rights  
 are we respecting?  
 every human being

• Is the US the only  
 power capable of  
 intervention?  
 Yes

~~people~~ economic space  
 goe ~~economic~~  
 100 prep left

Slow Down's Beg

• The US will be forced  
 to choose which  
 countries to intervene

• This will force US  
 to choose ~~the~~ therefore  
 lose humanitarian

• Negative view of  
 US  
 Military Intervention - will  
 be the one always used

• No meddling, or even  
 stab's a gun in Libya

• Giving aid ~~is~~ not intervention

• We can't have a moral obligation

Cross X Aff

• How is the Libya  
 example relevant to all?

• Was Libya a failure?  
 Success or failure?  
 Success

• So Libya was your  
 main example?

100 left

Argue with value

- Exhibit 1

• Success means  
 I am not afraid

• We are effective  
 in helping  
 rights violations

- Disregard's example  
 of America

- We are not there to  
 be pressing we are  
 there to solve a  
 problem.

- We have reservations  
 to support Aid door,  
 not value we care.

Yes Rejo.

- Aid: not intervening in internal  
 process of foreign gov.

- No evidence that Libya  
 helps

- Soft power is anti-American  
 - original losing credit.

- Must be a goal for gov

• Aff must prove cost/benefit

• Little interventions leads to  
 people getting killed

no solving

Aid is topical because  
 of definition.

- spending more in intervening

- No contribution