

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

Heghine Hellen  
Maxanya

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

### AFFIRMATIVE

Kudos SY

Stanley Yu

POINTS

Max = 30

30

### NEGATIVE

Walnut BZ

Brian Zeng

POINTS

Max = 30

29

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 - Strong posture & tone. I think it would be more beneficial to you if you slowed down a little so you won't stumble over your words. Good question. Confident, thinks fast. excellent debating skills.

Walnut Bz/Brian Zeng - Speak a little louder. Try to control the swaying of the hips. Very good speaker. Points out the facts ~~out~~ clearly. Doesn't fight against all the arguments that the opponent made. about his points. Good contentions, could make them a little stronger though. Overall good job!

Affirmative debated in a more powerful & clear way. Good speaking skills. Both made strong points and did a great job pointing out the contentions.

- AC - 6 min
- 3 min CX
- NC - 7 min
- 3 min CX
- AR - 4 min
- NR - 6 min
- AR - 3 min

4 min per

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

27

**NEGATIVE**

**RIS JL**

Jonas Le Barillec

POINTS  
Max = 30

28

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

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

Signed: Alana Jims

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Use all your cross-ex time + prep time.  
Prep will help you organize your thoughts.

Aff - make sure you burden of proof for the  
Neg is ~~fair~~ fair

Neg - avoid invalid theories.

Both sides, remember to always go back to the resolution. Don't let your case get bogged down in extemporaneous subjects e.g. neighborhood rape or nuclear war.

Reason: See back

Good job, group. Enthusiastic debating + good use of evidence.

Kudos -

Aff - Victor

Neg 2:13 left  
Aff 1:50

Aff Rebuttal - Kudos

- Value - Justice
- Aff burden: Human rights exist. If they exist, they ought to be upheld.
- If a govt cannot guarantee rights, outside interference require
- Cont 1 - Human rights

- US justified b/c if human rights exist then those rights need to be protected
- No problem getting raped if you're trying to help someone else getting raped? How does this help you?

Neg Cross X

Neg Rebuttal - RTS

Burden - why do I have to prove human rights exist?  
Is this valid to the resolution?

- Aff agrees that if neg can show that multilateral intervention is better than unilateral intervention, neg has proven point. This contradicts your ~~burden~~ burden of proof introduced in Aff constructive.

- Unilateral vs Multilateral
- Rebuttal to rape argument
- Not arguing about rape or nuclear war - arguing about morality

Stay focused on the resolution - focusing on nuclear war with China is irrelevant to the res.

Nuclear war rape?

Neg Con. - Jonas - RTS

Aff Rebuttal

- Intervention destroys intergovernmental relations with china
- Intu
- Recession - investing massive amounts of \$
- totally dependent on others for oil?
- Speaking in maybes - nuclear war?
- Unilateral & multilateral - framework intervention

Multilateralism still  
US intervention

Aff Cross X

- Use all of your cross ex time

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**Nova 42 JW**

Jong Hak Won

POINTS  
Max = 30

28

**NEGATIVE**

**Kudos AL**

Audrey Lam

POINTS  
Max = 30

29

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

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

Signed: Ang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jong Hak Won - Loud and clear. (5:46 min Ac)  
Good eye contact.  
Well done.  
1:30 prep left.

Audrey Lam - Loud, confident.  
Very well prepared.  
A little too fast.  
Well done.  
I like your voice tone,  
You explained everything.  
Great eye contact.  
Keep up the good work  
very clear.  
Keep up the good work.

Reason for decision - Both argued but I feel like Audrey had more information. She explained everything and argued everything.  
Each have four minutes prep time.

- AC 6 ✓
- CX 3 ✓
- NK 7 ✓
- CX 3 ✓
- 1 AR 4 ✓
- 2 AR 6 ✓
- 2 AR 3 ✓

Audrey Lam → ~~The government~~

7:03

~~Government's agency~~

Three

vis government.

~~They~~ ~~to~~ ~~save~~ ~~more~~ ~~money~~  
she explained everything

~~steps~~  
save more  
human lives

John Hak won

~~was~~ ~~so~~ ~~good~~ ~~at~~ ~~it~~


~~he~~ ~~split~~ ~~all~~ ~~the~~ ~~parts~~ ~~off~~

~~proposing~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~

~~same~~ ~~tests~~ ~~while~~ ~~also~~ ~~saving~~

~~11.6%~~ fall  
contension one dropped out.

Explained well but not as good as Audrey Lam.



# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**UNI SK**

Shine Kim

POINTS  
Max = 30

28

**NEGATIVE**

Kudos JW

Jerry Wang

POINTS

Max = 30

30

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

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

Signed: Matilda Berke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Definitions are not necessary (ones that are logical like US especially). Good observation in the beginning, but should have referred back to its value as "happiness" was open-ended and hard to prove. Should have jumped on the fact that neg. was basically controlling the debate from the neg. constructive and tried to turn the debate back to your case. Spent too much time debating framework (1st Aff was almost entirely devoted to that and value)

Neg - ~~Did not spend time debating with the Aff~~ Good conviction and expression. Interesting approach to the resolution, was a very unique form of argumentation that dealt with moral standards as opposed to the resolution-specific contentions. Risky move, but ~~was~~ able to pull it off. Took the approach that human rights abuses are inherently inevitable and beneficial, elaborated very well. ~~Should have been able to do this~~

Reason for decision / Round overview: Was one of the best performances I've seen, based on argumentation, strategy as well as rhetoric. Debate became very moral as opposed to evidence/resolution-based. Neg. won the debate because Aff. was unable to turn the debate towards her case - she focused on trying to debate framework, morality, etc. Neg. hammered impact home and really won the debate based on reasoning/rhetoric rather than evidence.

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**Ribet AM**

Alex Mendoza

POINTS

Max = 30

27

**NEGATIVE**

**Walnut BC**

Brian Chang

POINTS

Max = 30

28

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

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

Signed: Celena Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Alex louder, clearer please! Some points were difficult to hear. Speed is also rather choppy - you started out very slow and then sped up a lot

Brian good volume, speed, please try to speak a little more clearly.

AFF should probably explain framework better - I find myself siding with Neg on that because your framework is vague and appears abusive

AFF dropped several key NEG arguments - C2. Money could go to better cause, collateral damage.

I think you probably could have done a better job with the collateral damage arg had you had more stats.

AC-6  
CX-3  
NC-7  
CX-3  
IAR-4  
NR-6  
ZAR-3  
4 min pre

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

**AFFIRMATIVE**

**Nova 42 PC**

Peter Choi

POINTS  
Max = 30

27

**NEGATIVE**

**Kudos AZ**

Alexander Zhao

POINTS  
Max = 30

29

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

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

Signed: Calvin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Peter set up a great variety of arguments and defended his issues well. He is very clear in his ideas and conveys his reasons properly. He gave great evidence and balanced his time well between attacking/defending. He did ~~lose~~ lose his pacing on occasion from the influx of information but regained control and never stepped down.

Alex has a great control of voice, pacing, and gives a great sense of urgency. This helps with his emphasis & impact on the subjects of nuclear war/terrorism/ international relations. He was able to show the relevance of his arguments and convey his ideas and reasons clearly.

There was a good amount of clash and most ideas were responded to or defended and emphasized. It came down to impact and Alex's sense of urgency and use of great impact he did earn the advantage.

Edison Way

# SCJFL SPRING DEBATE

## Chandler School

May 25, 2013

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

### AFFIRMATIVE

### NEGATIVE

Walnut JJ

UNI CA

Justin Jiang

Connie Ahn

Max = 30

Max = 30

27

26

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

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

1150

2m/1m

Signed: Edison Way

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good voice  
~~Good voice~~  
Don't stutter  
Try to use all of your time  
Good cx

Needs more eye contact  
good speed  
good impact  
good link  
sarles

Cl rights? - dan dan  
good (etc)  
Too  
A little a busin?  
Good refutation  
Good uninter

Good questions  
-un?  
Respect as UC?  
Voice is a little soft  
Rebuttal to cl isn't 100 better  
Good eye contact  
Good points  
Needs stronger cx  
Why are bumpy little  
bad  
Some points are confusing  
good interest?  
Good debate?  
Why is us not justified?  
No impact?