

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

NEGATIVE

Kudos SY

Nova 42 PC

Stanley Yu

Peter Choi

POINTS
Max = 30

POINTS
Max = 30

29

25

The better debating was done by the aff from Stanley Yu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Stanley Yu

Peter Choi

3 min
py.

aggressiveness
international morality.
war crime / cooperate (not lawful)
double duty - recognize crime, cooperate with other states for consequences
- strong counter arguments
- great evidence.

Punish others when they do something bad
Deserve → justified
military intervention ✓
Didn't hear 4 counter.

Panel Responsibility
genocide
1988-2001
U.S. involved in
habeas.
"40%"
declined arms
↓
every argument and counter argument evidence. completely backed up by evidence.
no use of absolutes.

- take action. Counter arguments
value life don't seem to be
bad death too strong. Counter - ? violence vs. viol
increase in death. Can't seem to find evidence.
democrats: 1/3 more likely for war. *has supporting evidence*
state retaliation
popular support.
organization = not too good
No strong counter arguments all in the...

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 BZ

Max = 30

Kudos AZ

Max = 30

Brian Zeng

28

Alexander Zhao

29

The better debating was done by the Neg from Alexander Zhao
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Brian Zeng

Alexander Zhao

- Prepared.
- ~~well~~ mumbled
- use military force to stop atony.
- U.S. contains peace.
 - ↳ helps stop death, changed everything.
- collapse of empires.
- Year of life.
 - ↳ life is meaningless without justice.
- Panama still a fragile state
- Terror doesn't exist if U.S. is present.
- human rights are universal.
- cross exam was strong.
- dropped entanglement of U.S. in other conflicts.
- dropped land.
- entanglement does not enue.

- ~~1.20~~ Prep time over
- strong cross exam.
 - Libya, turmoil
 - ↳ increased
- destabilization.
- VERY strong counters.
- supporting evidence.
- no statistical
- strong arguments toward cross exam.
- Non-western countries have their own values.
- No universal culture.
- international ~~is~~ world-case scenario.
 - ↑
 - creates
- Use of international unravels democracy.
- Life before justice.
- prevent deaths of innocent.
- showed 2 dropped points by opponent. ✓ main.

Speaks clearly

X Da.

X Done

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

Walnut JJ

Max = 30

Justin Jiang

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Kudos JW

Max = 30

Jerry Wang

30

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jerry Wang
AFF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Denis Barsarian

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Great debate, when it came down to the negative point of view. Showed great examples of why he was counted arguing against the Affirmative side. That's the reason he won.

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

Kudos VQ

Victor Qin

POINTS

Max = 30

28

NEGATIVE

UNI SK

Shine Kim

POINTS

Max = 30

30

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Victor Qin had a better argument when it came down to agreeing with the resolution. His counter-arguments against the negative side was on point and clearly addressed. He showed good points on human rights abuse and that's the reason he won this debate.

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

NEGATIVE

RIS JL

POINTS

POINTS

Jonas Le Barillec

Max = 30

29

Walnut BC

Max = 30

Brian Chang

27

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Because of the Bostrum evidence, the debate collapsed down to extinction, so I'm only obligated to vote off whoever reverses extinction better.

The entirety of the neg advantage (neg is sustainable/HI key, stops war) was conceded meaning the aff wins the neg link to extinction.

Also, because the negs attacks on ~~both~~ intervention didn't engage the warrants in the aff's case studies about kar uni. Intervention is good ~~thus~~ 2 default that intervention stops abuses. Then, the ~~the~~ argument that aff stops extinction is triggered and I have another reason to vote aff b/c of extinction.

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 JW

Max = 30

UNI CA

Max = 30

Jong Hak Won

28

Connie Ahn

~~26.5~~ 26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Nova 42 JW
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:

Because there wasn't much of a framework debate and it was very messy on that level, I defaulted to consequentialism.

Overall, of all 4 important points in the round, I think the aff was winning 3 of them.

1. Sovereignty -

The aff was winning sovereignty off the basis that in the long run, intervention increases rights. Although in the neg may have construed sovereignty as an absolute right, the aff arg that HR trumps ~~the~~ goes against that

2. UN -

Although there were good examples of UN intervention the aff's evidence was a lot more general/systemic and had better links to the overall plans of the UN.

3. Lives -

The aff was winning this point off the Western evidence, which was an empirical study which ~~the neg~~ says that intervention decreases violence, which was preferable to her analysis.

4. Econ -

Although the aff had cards saying the mil. sector wouldn't hurt severely there was still a risk of economic ~~loss~~ that went neg.

Overall, I don't think the risk of ~~damaging~~ hurting the economy outweighed the conceded sovereignty, UN takeovers, and the Western empirics so I voted aff.

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

Ribet AM

Max = 30

Kudos AL

Max = 30

Alex Mendoza

27

Audrey Lam

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Kudos AL
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 - ~~Personality~~ I personally think that intros (Hello, my name is...) take up time that could be used to provide more significance or even effectively begin or wrap up a speech. Would have liked more connection to significance - lots of empirical evidence, but not a lot of explanation detailing how this is significant to the resolution. Good evidence provided, but analysis of evidence was lacking. ~~Time~~ left time in the AR - this ^{should} be used to refute, state significance, or impact. Dropped ~~2~~ Neg. rebuttals, and ~~2~~ Neg. contentions.

Neg - Effective ~~connection~~ techniques - called an Aff speaker out ~~on~~ on his lack of connection. Good integration of case and rebuttals. Would have liked to hear more significance - like about how governments should protect their citizens (since that ^{was} a point that wasn't really addressed) and why domestic protection is important. Very good rebuttal - hammered home points that Aff. did not address. Should have had points/plan to resolution.

Reason for decision:

Would have liked to see more significance and weighing of argument importance from both sides. Rebuttals were somewhat indirect in general they were more like case corroborations. Ultimately, the Neg won because the Aff only addressed certain aspects of the Neg. case (he dropped most of it).