

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kudos AL

Max = 30

RIS JL

Max = 30

Audrey Lam

27

Jonas Le Barillec

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jonas Le Barillec
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- I know you'd like to get as many arguments as you can but slowing down a bit would actually help make your arguments sound more powerful.
- You make really good points and evidence to support the aff.
- I like how you were looking for evidence when asking him questions. You supported your watters with solid evidence rather than opinions.
- I ~~love~~ love that you spotted him dropping a main argument. You only have to tell me once though, you kept repeating that "he dropped them". That's huge!
★ Momentum swing
- Nice concluding statements

Neg

- Really great questions kid! I love how you put yourself in the position of control by making the opp agree with you. Note: let her finish explaining her point though, don't just cut her off.
- I like how you emphasized the important points in your argument.
- I really appreciate the emotion towards your side of the arg.
- Try not to cut her questions off as well.
- Use more evidence for your watters/responses to her questions
- She's right, economy doesn't matter in this debate, but you made it matter by showing ~~the~~ relation to human rights.
- Try to get your points across

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Walnut BC

Max = 30

Kudos SY

Max = 30

Brian Chang

29

Stanley Yu

30

The better debating was done by the Neg from Kudos SY
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - More enunciation - constructive was hard to understand. Should address judge more, very little eye contact. Excellent points centering and rhetoric. Clear signposting and significance provided. Value framework was carried throughout. Constructive. During CX 2, some questions were asked about topicality and ~~the~~ Aff/Ne grounds to argue (multilateralism), which made the 2nd CX take a different turn. Interesting strategy, changed ~~the~~ course of debate. ~~Rebuttal~~ ^{were} better explained, more effective than construct

Neg - ~~Point 1 on nothing like that~~ Confident demeanor, targeted claims made by Aff during CX. CX 1 was very incisive and aggressive, used this period extremely effectively. ~~He~~ Questioned the Aff value of "justice". Effectively utilized empirical evidence as well as studies. Extremely persuasive speaker, good speed and use of rhetoric. Used info from CX to further his case. Answered 2nd CX very

Reason for decision:

The Neg point that in order to win, Aff must change political processes (rather than just saying US) won the debate. Aff had the upper hand until this pt. was made - during Neg. rebuttal, the Aff's entire case was torn down. He used the Aff's "justice" framework as well as his own "morality" framework to show that US intervention is not justified and that the Aff's provided benefits do not him about change in political processes. Very close

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

UNI CA

Max = 30

Kudos VQ

Max = 30

Connie Ahn

27

Victor Qin

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from ~~UNI CA~~ Kudos VA
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Good use of rhetoric, a bit shaky on ^{1st} CX. Constructive was a bit too fast and one-toned, but excellent pts. made. Good significance as well - you set up the case well. Second CX was more confident. Intros (I'll be the rebuttal speaker... etc) are not necessary. When you go over pts, try to provide new significance/impacts if possible.

Neg - Aggressive ~~confident~~ confident style, good eye contact during CXs. Constructive was a bit fast, but points were excellent (as well as rebuttals). Had a good cross-case impact application, but would have been good if significance (nuclear war) was explained in more depth. Great impacting + weighing.

Reason for decision: Well-researched, strong evidence provided on both sides. Points were explained very well on both sides too. Lots of clash - very good debate. Organization/signposting was done effectively.

Neg won because main significance was carried through entire debate from CX. ~~First Neg~~ Neg. rebuttals pointed out problems that the Aff did not later address. Neg. weighed after both constructive and rebuttal speeches (compared a few human rights abuses to global destruction) - Aff did not. Nuclear warfare impact (and... not really addressed).

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kudos JW

Max = 30

Ribet AM

Max = 30

Jerry Wang

29

~~Alex Mendoza~~

25

Peter Choi


The better debating was done by the AFF from Kudos JW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jerry wins that human rts come before anything else. He then wins that the US interventions to protect HR are effective. He compares the study of his opponent which states that a data from a 5 year span to his own evidence which is over a 20 year span giving me a reason to prefer his evidence. Alex hangs on to the end! Good job! Take prep time before the NC so you can put down more answers against his case.

Peter: If I call you Alex please correct me 

Jerry: You ARE for democratization your evidence just doesn't speak to it.

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kudos AZ

Max = 30

Nova 42 JW

Max = 30

Alexander Zhao

29

Jong Hak Won

28.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Kudos
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Tait Hawk Oren White-Rasmussen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

Utilitarianism is a cruel mistress, but you used it well. Push of L more in later rounds so no one contends the opp values from lack of analysis. The Geo Political debate made me happy, so thanks. Try to use the current political conflicts more.

NEG

ETHICAL RELATIVISM & SELF DETERMINATION IS A VERY HARD THING TO DEBATE WHEN YOU BRING UP ETHICAL DUTIES TO RESPECT SOVEREIGNTY LATER ON, BUT YOU PULLED IT OFF. LATER ON YOU MIGHT WANT TO THINK ABOUT USING DUTIES AS A CRITERIAN AND THEN USING ETHICAL RELATIVISM & SELF-DETERM AS ADVANTAGES. LOVED YOUR NEG ANALYSIS, KEEP IT UP.

REF

ON THE VALUE DEBATE THE ULTIMATE VALUE ON AFF WENT FROM QUALITY OF LIFE → RIGHT TO LIFE & THEN Q of L AS A CONSEQUENCE. WITH THAT IN MIND, I THOUGHT THE NEG VALUE OF ETHICAL RELATIVISM ALSO WAS A CONSEQUENCE TO THE RIGHT TO LIFE, AS WELL AS C: SELF-DETERMINATION/DETERMINE OWN DESTINY ARGUMENT (I CROSS APPLIED THE CONSEQUENTIAL F/W WHEN NEG ~~CONTR~~ CONT. 3 WAS PREDICATED ON CONSEQUENCES OF VALUES). ONCE THIS HAPPENS, THE DEBATE IS WON BY # of LIVES IN OTHER COUNTRIES SAVED (ONLY WAY TO INCORP. BOTH VALUES) & US INTERVENTION HAD BETTER ARGUMENTS TO SAVE LIVES.

THIS WAS A VERY CLOSE DEBATE W/ GREAT CLASH. I HOPE TO SEE YOU BOTH COLLECTING AWARDS LATER.

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE
Chandler School
May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

UNI SK

Max = 30

Walnut JJ

Max = 30

Shine Kim


29

Justin Jiang

29

The better debating was done by the neg from Walnut JJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff is too non-responsive and drops neg's VC and contentions, ultimately neg proves that aff results in more harm than good.

I buy the arg that the conception of HR warrants an obligation, but his response goes dropped. He sorta proves that HR are relative, so its easier for me to vote off the points of social welfare.

SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Resolved: The United States is justified in intervening in the internal political processes of other countries to attempt to stop human rights abuses.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

~~Nova 42 RC~~

Max = 30

Walnut BZ

Max = 30

Peter Choi Ribet

26.5

Brian Zeng

28

Alex Mendoza

The better debating was done by the NEG from WALNUT
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: Sandra Lee

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

PETER:

~~Alex - HR v. Life debate: Preservation of life is of the utmost importance while some may be tortured, many are alive living quality lives. We must look to life first.
Bring a pen.~~

NC Brian- Reagan and Bush in his case WERE unclear. You could capitalize on it b/c of the Sandanistas in Nicaragua and the IRAQI Embargo.

CX Brian- "Do you have a question?" ← If he uses the "We are protecting HR" These would work well for the negation

AR Alex- good saying Prez a valid source - don't need to get too hot under the collar... stay in command.
R Brian- it would have been helpful to get clarification in CX about the point he is trying to make in his case when he discusses past presidents.

~~Jerry - In your IAR you say I'm not trying to promote democratization. Better to say my case doesn't speak to that. Anyone who supports this type of humanitarian interv is probably looking to some form of democratization.~~

ALEX - You would win the debate: Resolved: the President is a valid source. This is not the resolution.