

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 SY

Max = 30

Walnut JJ

Max = 30

Stanley Yu

27.5

Justin Jiang

26.5

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: TALIA HAWK OPEN WHITE-RASMUSSEN

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

You making F/W ~~of~~ of AFF THE F/W FOR THE RD. WAS A HUGE ADVANTAGE FOR YOUR REFUTATIONS. DO SOME MORE RESEARCH ON YOUR CRITERIA & IT WILL HELP YOU DRAMATICALLY (I KNOW ITS THE LAST TOURNAMENT BUT U.S. INTERVENTION COMES UP AS A RESOLUTION ALL THE TIME)

NEG

Your speeches are dense & full of different points that can be expanded w/ the time you leave over. Use the extra 2 min. in your 1NR to talk about F/W for ballot.

RFD

EV. for U.S. INTERVENTION HAVING LONG-TERM (S) WON AFF THE ROUND FOR SUPPLYING THE JUSTICE VALUE YOU BOTH USED. b/c JUSTICE IS CONFINED TO BORDERS & LONG-TERM (S) for all I vote AFF.

Aivedjian K

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 AL

Walnut BZ

Audrey Lam

Brian Zeng

POINTS

POINTS

Max = 30

Max = 30

30

30

The better debating was done by the AFF from Audrey Lam
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:

- more obligations
- more concerns
- all human beings have = rights
- ~~more~~ violate
- responsibility
- justification for foreign intervention
- save lives

- military intervention
- a lot of deaths
- 20-30 million people death
- increase death & oppression

* Both are amazing speakers & debaters, but Audrey's topic was more persuasive to me.

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 AZ

Alexander Zhao

POINTS

Max = 30

29

NEGATIVE

RIS JL

Jonas Le Barillec

POINTS

Max = 30

30

The better debating was done by the

Neg
AFF or NEG.

from

Jonas Le Barillec
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Angela Chon

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff, has to give neg some ground. → so theory contention doesn't work.
- Aff has no multilateral contentions, so neg → multilateral.
- Aff → don't drop contentions → neg said "probability vs. magnitude"

most of my notes were said after round.

structure-wise → neg → get more organized in NR,
you were all over the place

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

Walnut BC

Brian Chang

POINTS

Max = 30

29

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: David Finnigan, Nova 42 Academy

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: This Round was won by the NEGATIVE Speaker who deconstructed the Affirmative case in such a way so as to warrant a Negative ballot. The Affirmative case had merit and was expressed with a confidence more commonly with high school, rather than middle school, ~~with~~ The Affirmative's construct, however, seemed unnecessarily narrow, with the Affirmative speaker declaring, "my sole contention is that human rights exist." Placing any contention in a, "sole" category is limiting and in this case that did hurt the ~~affirmative~~ Affirmative position. The Negative speaker started off slow but his analysis improved greatly as the Round progressed. The Negative speaker stuck close to his utilitarian arguments and this allowed him to meet his burden and thus win this Round. However, the Negative speaker must be careful to not overemphasize the supposed inability of anyone to define human rights in any reasonable, cogent, functioning way. This judge's fiancée, for example claims it is her "human rights" to go to Disneyland three times a month, but this judge disagrees and thus defines human rights, shall we say, more broadly than three-times-a-month rides on Pirates of the Caribbean (annual passholders or not). From that micro example to the macro of global politics, the Negative must stay on guard to not overrely on his human-rights-cannot-be-defined angled which can prove as limiting as any other broad-brush declarations.

Thank you, gentlemen of ~~Kudos~~ Kudos and Kudos-Walnut