

Room: Sprague 101

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Tigard High School MB

Negative: Silverton High School MT

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

Margaret Butler

30

Michael
Timmons

29

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Margaret: good case. I don't see how the social contract and the value of equality relate. Where is the link between the two? Nice work on the definition debate in the end.

Michael: good speech. I like your value and criterion. Good argument about competition, but how does it relate to your value? Good definition debate. Also, you are basically forced to be educated by the government, so I don't get your argument there. I wish you had a value that allowed you to talk more about competition leading to better healthcare. Inutilizing the people who are sick and die because they have healthcare for the sake of "liberty" doesn't help your case much, probably focus on something else.

RFD

Definitions: I buy Aff's definition on "quality universal HC" because technically everyone can get bad healthcare anytime they want guaranteed from web MD or a vet in the S. zone. So we must be debating about a better standard of guaranteed care.

Guaranteed: I buy Negs def. of guarantee - the govt is totally forcing it on these people, but that doesn't make it a bad thing.

Values: I think equality is necessary for a legit govt in the modern world.

Social contract: the govt can step in and take away liberty in order to protect the people - that's what it is doing.

Neg needs more arguments about how government HC is uniquely controlling the body and taking away liberties in a way that causes real damage to people/government legitimacy. Without that, I vote AFF

has it been a stressful day for you kiddos? Cross was tense, and not in a good way. Chill!

Room: Sprague 100

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D1

Affirmative: South Eugene High School MC

Negative: Century High School EV

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)

Michelle Chan

24

Emily Van Vleet

26

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFF • The point about technology was never made clear.

make
your
voters
clearer

- You could address her argument about cost w/ info about the projected savings down the road when Americans
- Utilitarianism may not be the best philosophical ~~to~~ view to use
- UHC would provide preventative care to all → this could enhance your case

NEG - your voters were clearer than AFF

- The US capitalistic system already employs some "socialistic" systems - education, police + fire protection, infrastructure, etc. This was not acknowledged by AFF but it could challenge part of your argument
- Avoid generalizations like univ. h.c. will compromise confidentiality. You did not support this claim.

lack of health care is also expensive

Room: Sprague 103

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D:

Affirmative: Tigard High School PA

Negative: Corvallis High School EA

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

Paul Altotsky

29

Eli Allen

2

2

28

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

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Paul —
Real Nice opening - Clear speaking & good emphasis
Good hand movements
good reasoning that preventative care = less \$ for total care.

Don't lean on the podium
Good voice projection
Bio power argument of the Negative is weak.
Don't question the Neg side and allow them to clarify or enhance their position.
good point out weakness of the bio power argument.
Back to speed up speech when you get emotional about the point you are making.
Don't take it personally.

Eli — Don't leaning on the podium
Don't crack knuckles.
Good argument that he is concerned about too much discretion is the extent of the health care plan.
good explanation of quotes that he read.

Bio power is his big concern - relies on individuality
His concerns about dehumanizing people will result in people who are not persuasive, but he makes a good argument about it in rebuttal.
Nice summary of quotes and statements of what they mean.
Slow down →
Provides an excellent alternative to universal health care - control the private health ins. industry. Regulation of the health care industry is a better way than good voice projection bio care.

Don't make it personal.

Room: Sprague 107

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Sprague High School TA

Negative: Crescent Valley High School JL

Name	Points (30-20)	Name	Points (30-20)
Treyvor Austin	2 26	Jessica Liu	1 28

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Neg: One of the key things you need to support your analysis is knowledge of (r/r) Power laws, a statistical anomaly where a small minority of elements stews numeric data for the whole. Google Gladwell's "Million dollar Murray" for a narrative description of it. Point is, as you're making, ① some people fail to take care of themselves to the detriment of those that do and ② they then consume disproportionately more HC services. Additionally, the current overload of psychiatry resources (documented at 1ulastpsychiatrist.com) show that we're already playing in the Neg world.

Aff: When you're out of time, clip your point.

Neg: It is even more reasonable to believe that the aff world would operate according to the basis of his IAC statistics. Your point is also valid as presented, though.

Aff: Where does Medicare D enforce preventative care so you can save people from irresponsibility of moral hazard? ← this is pretty much the claim that your goal is predicated on. And that's pretty questionable. A stronger case might be for health care to cover kids in school so they're not getting their peers sick, and the minimum-wage food service workers so they're not sneezing on my steak, that sort of thing. Because while it would be great if everybody were actually fully utilizing preventative care, we've got tens (if not hundreds) of millions of people today who are not. And at that gap between what you want to do & the effects you want to achieve, the neg slides in.

RFD: Aff can't get there from here, and neg calls it.

Room: Sprague 001

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D1

Affirmative: Westview High School NKSB

Negative: Tigard High School EAKY

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Nimisha Kapur	2	25
2	Sai Bandi	1	25

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Ervanny Astari	4	24
2	Kasey Yoke	3	24

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Nimisha,

good aggressive cross-ex.

Stumped your opponent with your 1st question. While I don't think some of your team's arguments were totally accurate (the US does not fund or encourage madrassas) your arguments, particularly during cross-fire, refuted the other team's contentions. You also argued with a great deal of passion and confidence.

Sai,

you have a good presentation and speaking style - very confident. your cross-ex pointed out an important flaw in the neg's supposition that troops in the middle east have anything to do with Iran and stability there. you and Nimisha might want to study up on mid-east a bit more - The US does not purchase any oil from Iran. Nor does the US support madrassas.

Ervanny,
Eye Contact could be better.

Make sure you ask questions during cross-ex. (We don't have any military troops in Iran, incidentally.) Otherwise you are left on the defensive. Later in the debate you seemed a bit tongue tied and you got lost in your notes. Your ideas were logical - try to present them with more confidence - and prep questions for the other team!

Kasey,

you did well refuting the aff's argument that US foreign policy is promoting terrorism. The issue that the "sanctions are working, but not enough" does seem to contradict the current foreign policy - which is sanctions. We have no military presence in Iran - troops in other countries don't apply. More confidence in your own arguments will help you. Good job bringing up the madrassas but you did not refute this weak point.

Room: Sprague 003

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

~~Neg~~
 Affirmative: Westview High School HGAC

~~Aff~~
 Negative: Silverton High School AWMM

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>1</u>	Hersh Godse	<u>1</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>2</u>	Alex Chang	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u>

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>1</u>	Aidan Wall	<u>3</u>	<u>27.5</u>
<u>2</u>	Mark Mulder	<u>4</u>	<u>27</u>

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

Low Point Win? N

[Signature]
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Lakeridge High School
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aidan - good speaking voice - well delivered speech.

~~Hersh~~ Hersh - very good work during your speech making eye contact.

Mark - good job during cross-fire.

Alex - good analysis during your speech.

The negative arguments about building trade relationships and improving our economy are a sufficient tie breaker given the competing claims elsewhere in the round and the substantial defense on affirmative arguments.

Affirmative: Lincoln HS MOSW

Negative: Tigard High School MPMP

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
-----	------	----------	----------------

1st	Mai O'Neill	1	27
-----	-------------	---	----

2nd	Sophie Wolfe	2	25
-----	--------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
-----	------	----------	----------------

1st	Mihir Paralkar	4	25
-----	----------------	---	----

2nd	Mayur Paralkar	3	25
-----	----------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- great job!
- good clarity easy to follow
- argument
- good facts
- shld have given own definition of current since not same as aff

great job too!

could have debated on definition of "current" the ~~aff~~ was using Obama administration although not within your definition and not specifically defined in their speech. This would have refuted their comments about the Bush administration.

Room: Sprague 006

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D

Affirmative: Silverton High School APTG

Negative: Sprague High School CWCG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Andrea Ponce-Velez	3	23	2	Chris West	2	24
3	Tania Gaspar	4	22	4	Colin Gesik	1	25

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

Low Point Win? ☐

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- The Debate was won by the Negative as they had a more organized argument and were able to handle a strong Rebuttal.
- Chris: defined terms well, responded to questions well, very good at answering.
- Colin: addressed questions by referring to contentions. Keeping argument clear. good eye contact and confident body posture.
- Andrea - Good delivery in "First Speaker" (first 4 mins) but used the words "I believe" (I believe it's Team Y's plan) - show more confidence in statement.
- Tania - didn't utilize time. was 1 1/2 min short in first and only used 45 sec. in second. could have used time to strengthen argument.

Affirmative: Silverton High School NKMK

Negative: Century High School FKMD

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
3	Nathan Kawaguchi	2	25

1	Mariah Kimlinger	4	25
---	------------------	---	----

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
4	Faith Knell	3	25

2	Mark Duenas	1	25
---	-------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? _

Mark Roth
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Sprague
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Topic Current US Foreign Policy in Middle East undermining our National Security

I give the win to the Negative as they cited ~~Obama's~~ Obama's current efforts in the Middle East are working. The opening of the negative was well written, included sources. Also cited that ending the war in Iraq is on the way to ending the war in Afghanistan is on the way to peace and not undermining our National security.

Both sides Aff and Neg could use more time in preparation as both parties did not seem to have a strong grasp of key issues.

In the crossfires both sides more or less clarified the opposing sides contentions but did not have questions for most of them to challenge those contentions.

All four speakers had moments of strong points, but also pauses of not having much to say. It was a fun debate and had some laughter and was light hearted. I think more experience and more time with the

Topic will help in the future

Room: Sprague 124

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

~~Negative~~
Affirmative: Century High School MENC~~Affirmative~~
Negative: Sprague High School DWRH

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>1</u>	Micah Eulberg	<u>4</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>4</u>	Danica Wilbanks	<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>3</u>	Nick Carleson	<u>2</u>	<u>28</u> 20	<u>2</u>	Riley Hoyt	<u>3</u>	<u>28</u>

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

Low Point Win? _

Katie Kantrowitz
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Silverton HS
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Very nicely done, all!

Century - you are both talented speakers (Micah, slow down a little, though). However, you failed throughout the round to provide adequate refutation of A.F.'s contentions, focusing instead on grammar & semantics in definition. While I agree that "our National Security" refers to U.S. alone, your time could have [and should have] been better spent on refutation.

Sprague - again, both very talented speakers. I did not agree with your definition of "our National Security". So it was good that you pulled back & supplied an "even if". - it was just too much of a ~~stretch~~ stretch. However, you were able to build solid cases, and asked the right questions to pull Neg's contentions out from under them.

Affirmative: Century High School CGCG

Negative: Sprague High School CABR

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>2</u>	Christian Geddes	<u>3</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>1</u>	Chris Arreola	<u>2</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>1</u>	Chase Geddes	<u>4</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>2</u>	Brandon Roth	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>

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

Low Point Win?

[Signature]
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Thurston
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

It seems to me that current policies have not terrorism, not only does the evidence from the ny seem to indicate this better than the aff, but also at least partially the small increase that may have temporarily resulted from the assassination of bin laden falls on the bush administration. Aff tried to argue about domestic terrorism, but the only example you brought up was from before the assassination, therefore it seems to me that there has been a global not in terrorism with current US policy.

This leaves the question of intl. relations. It seems to me that there are obviously problems that have caused some terrorism, like the iraq attack, however humanitarian assistance in afghanistan suggests that there has also been some improvements in relations as well. neither side really compared those for me, so I can't really say that myself. Century, if you want to win you need to explain why my thinking is wrong in round 2. It seems to me the gist of making millions of people literate, outright making them wealthy enough to cash out in one very small island incident. Perhaps they are also looking out through nuclear weapons controversy, but that debate was definitely not hashed out enough so, one to consider.

Your answers to uril were good, but in the end I believe the negative still wins even if it is abandoned.

on a side note, Century some scoring is okay. You should try to come off as someone without coming across as dismissive, backtracking on rules or things. Even if you think you are outlasting someone on the floor, try to outclass them in the round too.

Room: Sprague 131

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D1

Affirmative: Sprague High School QMAB

Negative: Century High School HMLH

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
II	Quentin Michael	I	29	I	Holden Mercurio	II	28
I	Austin Brooks	IV	27	II	Laura Huskey	III	28

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

Low Point Win? _

Dinesh Kumar
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Westview High School
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

~~Pos~~ Austin Brooks
good contents and flow
should have had more
eye contacts with judges
and body gestures.
had good sources and
examples for Iran sections
and then getting to negotiation
good underlying of Basics
understanding and definitions
examples of drone use.
Overall good Content
Slow and Presentation.

Holden
Very good Presentation
Start with negating
opponent contention
which is great.
Should have
collected more
evidence of their
contention to provide
oil dependences
and Economic Impact.
democracy does not
mean less terrorism is
great concept But
again seemed lack of
evidence and sources.
overall good content & flow
more evidence and source
citation would have helped.

Michael
great start and
content. Affirmed
their team contentions
well as well asserted
need for sources from
opponent. showed
the US Dependency
more on Canada
than Saudi Arabia
Affirmed
that democracy can
help to nations.
Also emphasis on
Egypt to Past of
Middle Eastern in
term of Debate
for Foreign Policy.
overall great Presentation
on and Content as well
delivery.

Room: Sprague 132

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Neg
Affirmative: Sprague High School DOJMaff
Negative: Lakeridge High School DZAW

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
<u>2</u>	Devon O'Donnell	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	David Zhou	<u>27</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>1</u>	Jeff Metzger	<u>29</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	Addison Wurtz	<u>26</u>	<u>4</u>

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

Low Point Win? _

Don Steiner
JUDGE'S SIGNATUREWilson
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

at the end of constructions the debate will turn of two key points - 1) Does the Status Quo already provide effectively what Aff is asking? 2) Does it link to preventing terrorism? The aff case is well documented and offers an interesting example in Yemen. Jeff - very effective (Neg block, especially providing a weighing mechanism. The debate gets muddled when Iranian nukes get tangled with terrorists and the Taliban, but basic arguments hold.

By debate's end I am persuaded that there is no impediment to us increasing our developmental aid. By rebuttal, the link between this aid combined with drone strikes, despite some shaky evidence here and there (Owen?) provides a rationale for voting Neg.

Excellent arguments on both sides - thanks!

Room: Sprague 133

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot D

Affirmative: Tigard High School CCKA

Negative: Westview High School SPKC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
3	Cassidy Cole	3	26
1	Kristian Allen	1	29

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Saachi Patel	2	28
4	Kathryn Chen	4	25

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

Next time, prove to judge that there is a direct correlation between strengthening middle Eastern security and our own nation's security. It can be done! (see +)

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Sprague

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- 1 - Please try to avoid subpoints. These tend to lead to nitpicky loopholes that take away from your overall ideas. You tripped over this one.
- Work on your eye contact and you speak a little too quickly.
- Great point about how we should worry about our own economy first.
- I couldn't comment on as much of your speaking time being as you were first speaker! Overall, nice job tying everything back to your main economy point.

- 3 - on Israeli-Palestinian conflict: by recognizing to U.S.'s role on latter's statehood, you concede to rising animosity issues.
- You really drive home economic point home!
- Great point about Iran's nuclear ventures compared to other "distractions".
- Good point in CX about "domino effect" or history.
- "Spending money is decreasing our national security...? Specify where money is specifically going then. If to economy, wouldn't this increase domestic security (in monetary sense)?"

- 2 - wow! Great distinction between past policies and those of today! This is very unique.
- nice reading voice! Perhaps leave some room for rebuttals. This slings down chances of opponents to pull loopholes.
- Never apologize!
- you proved that Iran has directly threatened the U.S. in CX.
- "debt & national security concern" Nice!
- nice point about how w/economic problems middle Eastern religious problems would still exist!

- 4 - nice point about how U.S. has helped strengthen Israeli-Palestinian ties!
- You do not seem confident but you really do try! Really work on your eye contact, you missed a couple of important time signals. Also, try to focus on one thing at a time until you are more comfortable.
- Nice Smile! Build all your points first, then strike all of them (or vice versa).
- * For 2/4: I know what you guys were trying to say, but it didn't strike totally clear compared to 1/3. This was evident in grand CX. You guys had to nail how there is a direct correlation between threats to our allies but had to in turn back them up (at least).

loop hole and used it! close the loop hole! This loop hole was indirect. Thus found this loop hole and used it! close the loop hole!

Affirmative: Sprague High School ASKG

Negative: Clackamas High School AMMC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Anna Silberman	2	29

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Akshay Moorthy	3	27 27

1	Kate Goldsworthy	1	29
---	------------------	---	----

1	Morgan Custer	4	27
---	---------------	---	----

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

Low Point Win? _

Joe Provencher
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Lake Oswego
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Obviously the neg is at a bit of a downhill (the case isn't totally fleshed out). I think once you do a little more research and flesh it out, you'll be in a better position.

Alt - I would work more on your Chernsky point. The important part of that evidence is not that the US is a terrorist, per say, but is that bad policy (terror-drones) makes resentment (and thus recruiting and attempts against the US) inevitable, thus demonstrating a failure of policy to produce security. Link it back to the rez /

Room: Sprague 010

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:


Ballot Du

Neg
Affirmative: Tigard High School DSJGAFF
Negative: Sprague High School TFCS

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	^{4 8 40} Daniel Sacks	4	22	1	^{2 20} Trevor Ferris	2	24
2	^{3 8} Jake Garcia	3	23	2	^{1 2} Chris Silver	1	25

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

Low Point Win? _


 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

 Westview
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff. could tighten up signposts tags

After Aff & Neg 1st constructives, reality is both cases exist; they're both true - not mutually exclusive

The "current" debate is splitting hairs - clin not going there

No one's ~~not~~ giving me much to work with here. I guess since Neg. "Clash" w/ Aff. contention's wasn't really impactful - there's a difference between mocking opponents ideas & providing impactful analysis & examples.

conceded JHS - mocking again... does nothing to persuade

Room: Sprague 011

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

we flipped

NegativeAffirmative~~Affirmative~~: Century High School CDCF~~Negative~~: Sprague High School AFBG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Connor Daliposon	29	1
1	Chris Finley	29	2

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Aujalee Fisher	29	4
2	Blake Gesik	29	3

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Resolved: Current US Foreign Policy in the Middle East undermines our national security.

Aujalee | 3:53 / 1:57 | I'm not sure I buy your definition of national.

Chris | 3:58 / 2:00 | clear discussion of the definition differences between aff & neg.

Blake | 4:00 / 2:00 | Pakistanis, not Pakistanians. Make sure to allow your opponent to ask questions in crossfire.

Connor | 4:00 / 2:00 | work on eliminating "like" - it marks your otherwise very fluent delivery. Don't allow the other team to use the entire crossfire to ask you questions.

RFD Overall, this was a enjoyable debate, and a nice way to end the evening. It all comes to nothing. Democracy defers error. The affirmative gives me a world with resentment and death but no tangible instances of our national security being undermined. Therefore I vote neg.

²⁶
Affirmative: Tigard High School ACYF

³⁰
Negative: Lincoln HS JMWL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
2	Austin Carsh	3	28
1	Yussef Fakh	1	29

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-20)
1	Jaxom Moore	2	28
2	Will Leo	4	28

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

Low Point Win? _

Jennifer Gruter

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Clackamas

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Excellent debate, it was clear and enjoyable. The clash was strong and the analysis was interesting.

RFD

① The aff shows that current policies hurt the U.S. Economically and that the middle East hates the U.S. ② Aff shows being an ally with Israel hurts the U.S. ③ The neg had a difficult time naming 4 countries that like the U.S. and current U.S. policies.

Room: Sprague 114

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Silverton High School LM

Negative: Westview High School AA

Name	Points (30-20)	Name	Points (30-20)
<u>1</u> Luis Morales	<u>1</u> 24	<u>2</u> Ananth Agarwal	<u>2</u> 26

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

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I find for the affirmative for the following reasons:

- The contentions presented were not refuted with evidence by the Negative side. Specifically, the points that people without Health Care get worse treatment and that Health Care is key to equal opportunity received no rebuttal by the negative. The contention that health care is not a right, as defined by the UN human rights convention, was only refuted by a quote stating that the constitution provides only rights to "life, liberty, pursuit of happiness." This only proves that it is not a constitutional right, it does not prove that it is not a human right.
- The contentions presented by the negative were focused on the recently passed health care bill PPACA, not universal healthcare. The contention of expanded govt control is ~~not~~ applicable only to provisions within that bill, not universal health care in general.
- While the contention that medicare costs were underestimated was unrefuted by affirmative, that contention alone was insufficient to ~~refute~~ beat the remaining contentions of the Affirmative.
- Source citations by the negative were vague and ~~lacked~~ leaned more to hyperbole instead of fact and policy.

-OVER-

Affirmative: Westview High School RS

Negative: Silverton High School JS

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)Rama
Somayajula

1

27

Jonathan Sisley

2

26

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Rama — Good presentation style → relaxed but poised. In first speech, you read too rapidly (given judge's stated protocol). Effective citations to the Constitution and authorities on death rate & 'happiness' index; very persuasive. You asked great questions which exposed the errors in your opponent's case ("How does health care violate a right? Is John Locke's social contract a right, or a philosophy?"), and used opponent's contention to support your position ("Wouldn't increase in medication use increase the economy?"). Your arguments regarding reducing the gap between rich & poor, and making the correlation between longevity and wealth, were winning ones.

Johnathan — Excellent personal presentation (clear, confident voice) marred only by use of "uh's" and "uhm's." Great use of census data re: citizens' able to purchase health insurance choosing not to purchase it. You only lost this debate because of an error ("Freedom of Choice in the Bill of Rights") and two omissions → failing to counter or in any way address the death rate ~~to~~ data and rich/poor - longevity/wealth correlation data & contentions presented by your opponent. For future debates on this topic, look at the prioritization that governments impose; it contradicts your argument that "There is no end to the amount of health care that people would use" if it were free. Overall solid presentation, though.

Room: Sprague 116

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Sprague High School GA

Negative: Lake Oswego MP

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)Georgia
Armitage

26

Min Park

26

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Georgia

- you came off as bored
- if the contention is not clear (which is which) describe it for clarity when asking questions
- most judges don't speak French so simply saying "the French method" or something to that effect would suffice.

Min

- you sounded like you were competing in radio in your intro, suggest a less rehearsed sounding approach
- organization was not clear
- your case did not clash with your opponents, you did not refute any of her points

The affirmation had the stronger case and the negation did not adequately refute the affirmations case. Therefore, the affirmation won this debate

Room: Sprague 117

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: South Eugene High School SJ

Negative: Silverton High School HW

NamePoints
(30-20)NamePoints
(30-20)

Syrus Jin

30

Houston
Winslow

27

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

Low Point Win? _

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Syrus: Excellent organization and use of questions. I was impressed. The only thing I would encourage you to do is if you finish what you need to say, stop talking. There are no minimum speech times, and repeating yourself isn't necessary unless you're hammering in a point.

Houston: You did well, but you occasionally seemed flustered. Be confident. The only flaw in your case was that your value wasn't as significant as his and that you sounded unsure of yourself. You had some good points, and I think with a little self-confidence and a better criterion, you will do really well.

Decision: I chose Aff because his value was stronger and he upheld it better.

Room: Sprague 118

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Westview High School CC

Negative: Wilson High School AO

NamePoints
(30-20)1 Cindy Chou125NamePoints
(30-20)1 Ashlynn Olsen224

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

Low Point Win? _

Clark YeakleClackamas

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AF F : If you are going to use the social contract as a value (which you shouldn't), make sure you know exactly what it is so you can explain it to others. You had a good plan, but in refutations, your organization needed work.

OPP : First, you should think about doing parley. You seem fiscally intelligent and parley is more about money. However, It looks like you need more organization.

Both: You spent way too much time arguing over a definition that did not matter. Both of you also need practice especially at refutations. You had good cases, but failed to hurt your opponents case at all.

Decision: Aff and Neg did not clash very well. They left me with the choice between economic issues and social welfare without any connection. Since social contract held as the better "value" and social welfare applies better to that, I chose Aff.

Room: Sprague 119

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Clackamas High School KC

Negative: Lincoln HS NH

Name

Points
(30-20)

Name

Points
(30-20)

A1 Kevin Chu

27

A2 Noah Hoffman

28

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

Low Point Win? yes

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

US ought to guarantee universal health care to its citizens

Aff 6 ✓

Cross 3 ✓

Neg 7 ✓

Cross 3 ✓

A Rebuttal 4 ✓

N Rebuttal 6 ✓

A Rebuttal 3 ✓

Prep 3 ✓

WON THE ARGUMENT

Look up when speaking voice will carry better.

Look up more often ^{Time} 5:22

Looking up became much better as speech progressed, more confident and passionate, good supporting evidence.

Better Speaker

Practically vs. morality

Good speaking voice

Didn't support argument during crossfire stumbled with question.

Very confident speaker

Don't buy that power is morality

How can

Where do you have evidence that more people go ~~for~~ to Doctor every little thing if they have health care where evidence of failure.

Room: Sprague 121

2012 Sprague Invitational Deb

Round Start:

Ballot Du

Affirmative: Century High School CO

Negative: Lake Oswego DT

Name	Points (30-20)
Christopher O'Brien	28

Name	Points (30-20)
Dan Tudorica	30

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

Low Point Win? _

James Saddler
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Tigard
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AFFNEGChristopher - good speaking style.

Work on organization! You almost seemed lost and dropped a point or two because of it. Also, use more of your time! You barely touched the Neg's case.

good job, watch fillers!

Dan - I'm not sure what it is, but you have a very logical, smooth speaking style. It aided your points of analysis and also during a solid rebuttal. You proved to me that UHC did not help the whole.

good job!

RFD - I voted Neg because of the dropped contention of capitalism and also the argument of util that Neg convinced me with ~~the~~ the 90% vs. 10% issue. Also AFF did not prove to me that Crit of Equality outweighed Util.