

Indu Kandasamy (*8)

Round 1A 9:00am B4
Aff: 19 Johnston
Neg: 11 Ramos
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Indu KANDASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 19 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

29

- Very good work on case analysis & well organized
- Had value in her case. But would be great if she add emphasize to her value & her rebuttal speeches.
- great work on case analysis

Negative

28

- Well organized debate & very confident in delivering her points.
- collected good evidence BUT would be great if she add more real time data to make her point.
- Had great refutation.

SPEAKER CODE #: 19 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both had good case analysis & organized debate. But I see #19 had great value, statistics, fact to support her side of the argument.

Indu Kandasamy (*8)

Round 1B 9:00am B4
Aff: 16 Rehemtulla
Neg: 11 Kaur
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: INDU KANDASAMY

Judge's School Affiliation: DVITS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

29

- Very well developed case in response to the solution.
- Added good points & evidence to his value.
- ~~Good~~ ^{Good} work on arguments to rebuild his side
- Delivered ~~with~~ ^{with} confident & clear and with right volume.

Negative

27

- Good work on case analysis
- But would be great if she added more evidence & value to her case.
- She had good points overall but would like see her adding value to her debate by showing more confidence in delivering.
- wish her good luck!

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both are well developed case. But I see #11 had showed great confidence & delivered debate good & supported his side.

Roopali Bali (*10)

Round 1A 9:00am B1

Aff: 19 Valle

Neg: 20 Kaur

JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation _____

AFF: Speaker Code #: _____ pts 27 NEG: Speaker Code #: _____ pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect
- 29 = Outstanding
- 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair
- 24-20 = Poor
- <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Value - Consequentialism, VC - Reducing harm.

- Misguided indiv. in society
- Direct correlation b/w gun ownership & gun related crimes

cx 2nd Amendment - X
Right to self defense - X

Negative

cx correlation leads to causation? ↑
Mental state questionable ↑
3 unalienable rights ↑

Value - life, VC - Ensuring natural rights

- Govt. obligated to protect rt. → Rt. to live but no means to protect it?
- Historical data ban would fail... alcohol prohibition, organized crimes.

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the NEG wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION (AFF or NEG)

Both speakers spoke clearly at a good pace. Neg. can benefit from more eye contact. Neg was able to prove that her value-life supports VC-ensuring natural rights. Neg also did very well in CX period while the Aff could have used more organization during the rebuttal period.

Roopali Bali (*10)

Round 1B 9:00am B1
Aff: 11 hour
Neg: 20 Ruiz
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

AFF: Speaker Code #: _____ pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: _____ pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

V = Morality, VC - Ensure safety of people.

1. Majority of homicide handgun related mindset, 0% survival rate.
2. Majority of suicide handgun related → more than 1/2.
- unnecessary, dangerous to keep guns.
3. AG's rarely used to kill criminals or stop crime. Vigilantism.

Cx: amendments & constitution has been changing.

Negative

Cx - Def of VC, Govt. Oblig. to dec. homicide stats → 2/3 of homicide/smoke ↑ decrease accessibility; direct correlation?

V - Political legitimacy
VC - Promotion of privatism.

1. Govt. Oblig. to protect BOR
 - infringement of 2nd & 10th amendment
 - civil unrest, gun ownership = more safety.
2. public opinion favors gun ownership. Wouldn't dec gun violence.

DC "murder capital", homemade guns.

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both speakers did a great job with pacing and fluency. Aff went overtime twice. Great eye contact. Neg was able to hold the contentions and had a good rebuttal.

Suzie Kito (*9)

Round 1A 9:00am B2

Aff: 20 Narain

Neg: 10 Membrido

JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Suzie Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito HS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 20 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Value Criterion: Consequentialism

Utilitarianism

- Very logical and definitions were all very clear and concise
- nice "roadmap" verbal construction - made argument more steps
- The argument flowed directly from the premises and there was strong supporting evidence.
- made a good distinction about banning handguns

- Negative
- rebutted all of aff's points - but not the suicide risk
- should have brought up the 2nd Amendment to rebut aff ~~point~~ statement about constitutionalism as supporting the ban on handguns - aff stated that constitution supports protection of life.
- stated that safety demands people be allowed to protect themselves

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 vs all of the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- argued well against the rationale
- made a smart statement
- mischaracterized opponents contention safety
- making the right to own a handgun legal
- argued well against the rationale
- some of the evidence was vague.
- Excellent point re: higher death rate in urban blacks but lower gun ownership than rural whites.

OVER

AFF won overall due to the higher degree of logical organization of the argument, however NEG's refutations were quite strong.

Suzie Kito (*9)

Round 1B 9:00am B2
Aff: 20 Karavadi
Neg: 18 Bulanova
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Suzie Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito HS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 20 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 18 pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

stated value criterion: "Increase Right to Societal Welfare" Affirmative: "Victim did not defend w/ gun 99.2% of the time"

- 24 studies show handgun → ↑ suicide rate
- excellent volume of evidence
- so much recitation of fact resulted in perhaps overly rapid speech.
- The arguments were concise and clear - little speech was wasted on non-factual statements.

Value: is mutually assured destruction via right to defend oneself:

Negative

- guns "level the playing field" btwn strong & weak.
- rebuttal: did not adequately support contention that suicide rate would not decrease.
- made very good eye contact at times.
- good point about gun-wielding attackers being less likely to harm victims

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the AFF wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

- good eye contact during summary. (AFF or NEG)

- I would leave out the argument about why your opponent failed to make an explicit statement about why they prevailed as a rationale for why you prevailed. Your case must stand on its own.

- the AFF argument regarding the value of decreasing suicides via banning handguns was not sufficiently refuted.

OVER

AFF wins this debate due to

- 1) volume of empirical evidence cited.
- 2) logical argument based on empirical evidence cited.
- 3) well-organized presentation of argument.
- 4) cogent refutation of NEG argument.

Constructive criticism for:

NEG: cite more evidence and rebut all of AFF's main arguments (especially the suicide rate related to handgun ownership)

AFF: Avoid "meta-argument"; that is avoid arguing that you won due to the absence of opponents' statements about why they should win the debate.

Irina Kizler (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am 15
Aff: 18 Gaughan
Neg: 19 Pollard
JV L-D Debate

925-223-
7293

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: [Signature]

Judge's School Affiliation: MU

AFF: Speaker Code #: 18 ~~18~~ pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 19 pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- Be clearer if you go first
- Honestly, if you go with suicide doesn't claim that many lives by handguns compared to other firearm deaths. Just a thought.
- Rather than read death bid, I'd justify rights of many over few or other controversial issues with regard to util.
- More substantive responses to her case, it was too much cross-application of AC
- weigh death count separately
- provide stats on accidents

Negative

- Your case needs much clearer structure
- value/value criterion discussion should be independent of topic
- Should be more thorough in responding to affirmative case
- Need to support intimidation argument with stats
- I don't think constitutionality is best argument
- Maybe focus on why it won't work

Good job !!

SPEAKER CODE #: 18 Gaughan on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Constitutionality is a wash or flows Aff, due to historical precedent. Accidents and all neg offense are not weighed, quantified, or really impacted. So I have to vote on suicides as only source of real offense.

~~Nanlan Xu (#18)~~
Round 2A 11:00am B2
Aff: 20 Kaur
Neg: 10 Bhagavatula
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Chien Fang
Judge's School Affiliation: # 16

AFF: Kaur Speaker Code #: 20 pts 29 NEG: Bhagavatula Speaker Code #: 10 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect
- 29 = Outstanding
- 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair
- 24-20 = Poor
- <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Good & clear delivery & statement of contentions

Rebuttal was clear and to the point, well-supported w/evidence.

Final rebuttal was well-organized and clear to the point.

Negative

Good CX questions, but don't get too narrow about meaning of individual.

Contentions are good, but evidence is a little weak.

Rebuttal was good and addressed all of opponent's contentions.

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

AFF is better organized and has better rebuttal.

AFF

AC: v: society welfare
VC: safety of individuals.

- ① Gov't obligated to protect more guns → more death <Donohue>. Self-defense not sufficient ...
- ② Protect themselves: suicide 64%, removing HG & suicide <Miller 2012> lead to
- ③ Ban HG not alternative to ~~other~~ death.

CX: B.M. evidence: Virginia Australia.
Gun ban: Australia ≠ US
Define individual!
Intimidation: escalation, aggression

1AR: Rebuttal

- B.M.
- Card: political failures. Australia not topical more guns, more death
- 1% self-defense, 50% aggression
- Guns makes it easier to suicide (Quotes from patient w/ suicidal impulse)

2AR: ① B.M. in Australia is non-topical

- ② Virginia card; on traffic, not gun ban.
- ③ Card: more gun, more death
- ④ remove HG from home
- ⑤ individual is society.

NEG

CX: How VC support V?
individual ...

- ③ suicide, homicide, accidents
- How permit relates to ban?
suicides caused by guns or easier?

NC: V: soc. Welfare
VC: safety

- ① Ban → Black Market harder to track, illegal purchase.
- WMD: ban → 60% ↑ B.M.
- ② HG → ↓ crimes
- history: 200 yrs ago.
- stats show ↑ Guns ↑ crimes
- Rebuttal: individuals
- not define individuals
- E. intimidating → self-defense
- suicide caused NOT by guns
- no evidence
- Firearm diff from HG

NA: B.M. Australia very similar to US.

- Card: refute "more guns, more death" (African Am vs. white gun ownership % & death rate)
- opponent contradicted herself in cause of suicide.

Nathan Xu (#16)

Round 2B 11:00am B2

Aff: 19 Pollard

Neg: 11 Noor

JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: # 16

AFF: Pollard
Speaker Code #: 19 pts 27 NEG: Noor
Speaker Code #: 11 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Delivery could improve by ~~being~~ adding more stresses, variations & pauses for effects. Need better time management. A little more organized final rebuttal would have strengthened your case.

Negative

Good ex questions. good case analysis, and contentions. Rebuttal was effective and to the point.

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both sides could benefit from more organized arguments and less repetition of contentions. I vote for NEG because of better rebuttals.

AFF

AC: V: Life Preservation
VC: reducing harm.

- ① More harm than good ... suicides, gun availability, child shot case.
- ② Prevent abuse of power. State law differs. Lack of universal gun laws. gun shows.

Ran out of time!

CX: Evidence from other countries. Australia evidence. Similarity

IAR: Not minimize suffering. No evidence HG is preferred for self-defense. Other options for self-defense.

B.M. gun import ~~less successful~~ more expensive & guns less available. Australia, child shot. Out of time!

2AR: Cocaine analogy is non-topical. HG will not ~~not~~ minimize suffering.

NEG

EX: US only? yes. No other country evidence. Ban → HG ↓, other means ↑ or ↓?

NC: VQ: morality ^{VC: minimize suffering}
~~promote moral values~~

① Necessary for self-defense. HG best defensive weapon.

② ↓ HG → B.M.
↑ badly made guns.
↑ illegal activities.

Australia crime ↓ HG ↓

Rebuttal:

Suicide: use any means. child case non-topical. contradiction.

B.M.: AFF agrees B.M. can't be prevented. Promote future illegal.

NR: same framework.

① HG = best means of self-defense. Need it, not preference. analogy: cocaine.

② Australia good example.

Rebuttal: suicides

• contradiction in other countries Mexico.

~~Danielle Kelly (*19)~~
Round 2A 11:00am B1
Aff: 18 Bulanova
Neg: 16 Rehemtulla
JV L-D Debate

Vivian Levy

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: LEVY, VIVIAN

Judge's School Affiliation: KOWELL

Speaker Code #: AFF: Bulanova pts 20 Speaker Code #: NEG: Rehemtulla pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

28

Great job -
Encourage more eye contact, look more at each other.

- Utilitarian value - worked well for analysis.

- Evidence of suicide deaths; college students at NYU hospital - thought started at 1. gas used in crime.

- unclear what means by "stead background check".

- good communication.

SPEAKER CODE #: 18 Bulanova on the Aff. wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

Negative

27

Great job - courteous & civil

- appreciate utilitarian explanation.

- thought definitions were clear

- could have used: societal welfare & justice cost-analysis more developed throughout.

- encourage more eye contact.

- unclear what "history shows failure" means could have used more explanation.

(AFF or NEG)

- unclear how background is internet related - better organization.

- Excellent sources: Finland example very compelling.

L-D

1:1

topic 2 mos. (Jan-Feb)
"Philosophical"
morality
value.

vs. policy (implement).

qff 6 min.
neg 3 min.
neg 7 min.

Danielle Kelly (#49)
Round 2B 11:00am B1
Aff: 11 Kaur
Neg: 20 Narain
JV L-D Debate

Vivian Levy

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Levy, Viva

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Speaker Code #: AFF: Kaur pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: Narain pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

(Kaur)

- Good eye contact, with an confident voice & stronger voice
- Good value contention (to suffer)
- Good use interpretation - of study results on nuclear E guns vs not look the same
- Refutation could have been elaborated & clearer
- Too easily dismissed ebh (alcohol) & gun - not related, as alcohol not previously accessible

Negative

(Narain)

Excellent!

- Clear, confident voice.
- good pt T regulations, may yield some better effect than attorney.
- effective questions.
- Political legitimacy contention excellent
- Prohibition argument very compelling w/ ↑ in other violent crimes
- Wash DC & NYC examples also very insightful

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 ~~27~~ NARAIN on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- good job on mentioning value contention throughout.

- unclear what "inverse effect is"
- Appreciated roadmap & summary.

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 2A 11:00am B4
Aff: 11 Ramos
Neg: 19 Valle
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: M. A. Qadeer

Judge's School Affiliation: Livingston High (10) (Fremont)

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 Ramos pts 28

NEG: Speaker Code #: 19 Valle pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Case Analysis Def. / Value → Monarchy / Right of Offense
Case 1 ↑ homicide but cells 2 to farm
Case 2 (7% → France, 8% elsewhere, 60% handgun, wide legal scope → Mejor
3 don't serve real purpose, 80% impractical
 not self defense use, (most self defense)
Rebuttal 1, no evidence. 2, Revised?
 → Concl. / Japan? exph
Rebuttal → Very Good points but weak to prove. (as stated) by NEG.

Negative:

Case / Prep. Constructive : Not be bound.
 1/2 In div. Rights - same business, 36% → few gun. Second off, Resists to Gun → objection / Rest. laws.
 2/ ineffective defend gun bans.
 3/ Rest don't reduce gun crimes 2.
 3/ cannot will get gun even if banned
 Refut. Ban is bad behavior, defensible (other ways for homicide & suicide.)
 hands regulations.
 Negative Rebuttal : other ways, not everyone can defend, options of suicide / Reward is not a chance.
 Japan example elaborated, not practical not logical.

SPEAKER CODE #: 19 VALLE on the NEG. wins this debate: (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Case Analysis → Good
Evidence → Good
Organization → well organized
Value Clash → weak
Refutation → very Good
Delivery → Good

Excellent
 Excellent
 Well organized
 Good
 Excellent
 Excellent.

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 2B 11:00am B4
Aff: 20 Ruiz
Neg: 18 Gaughan
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: M.A. Qadeer

Judge's School Affiliation: Twinley H.S. (10)
(Fremont)

AFF: Speaker Code #: 20 Ruiz pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 18 Gaughan pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Aff Construct Def: (too fast delivery) / man in court
 Good case construct, good evidence, very 1/2 defend, (2nd round). Life vs 2nd round
 2) killed to protect → well & by's conf, very good evidence
 3) Phosphate (Good Case).
 Negative Construct: too much violence? Conflict (for shoot)?
 Mutually assured dest. → So no Repe? Gun Reg. → Repe??
 Rebuttal: Very life less homicide / homicide / Repe? / Gun
 2015? 8? first defence therefore banned 2 Guns will not obvt.
 handgun use.

Negative → 2nd 8b. topic / Cross homicide? not convicted if Guns banned.
 2nd round. not legal document?
 Negative Construct: Deb: (too fast delivery).
 1st Construct. (who protects individual more) people defend themselves
 ↓ homicide → Repe ???
 Homicide → less attacked. ?
 2nd Construct ↓ Crimes & ↑ Guns. (Repe, homicide, drugs),
 (8b the topic itself)
 (conceded weapons & crimes.)
 Neg Rebuttal → values are similar. ? / No value better than
 other weapons National vs Repeal evidence of my opp. ?
 Final → all crimes → direct influence in all if Guns banned
 Repe / 8b?

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 Ruiz on the AFF wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Case Analysis very Good
 Evidence very Good
 Organiz. well organized.
 Value Criterion Clear, supported well
 Refut. Good
 Delivery/Courtesy very Good

Fair / Conflicting Confounders, 8b topic.
 Confusing, 8b topic.
 Not well organized.
 Could not clear it well, not supported well.
 Fair
 Fair.

2nd Add. Result

- 2nd Amort don't uphold as less more used in Cashes.
- only H0mes (↓ CASH with CASH bank remend.)
- save more lines if CASH are send

(Used 0.8% of time based for defence.)
Ban & ↓ in Cashes.

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 2A 11:00am 15
Aff: 10 Membrido
Neg: 19 Johnston
JV L-D Debate

Singme
Fright

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: ALT

Judge's School Affiliation: 23

AFF: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 19 pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative: *most good for most people*

Value - utilitarianism/# of lives

preserve

good loop back to value in your 1st Aff. Rebuttal

Watch pace - don't go too fast
statistic on deaths - source? lots of stats but seldom gave reference

when you challenge - be careful to just say ok - try to link back to your objection

SPEAKER CODE #: 10

on the Aff wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

good to refute challenge of Japan & that you gave reference for info.
good catch on contradictory stats
20/40 vs 35%

value: individuals & rights

Negative

Be careful not to drop voice so that Judge + ~~Opponent~~ *Opponent* can't hear
question on first cross-exam - after answer you dropped - did you mean to challenge when ready - don't go too fast
stats on gun rates/Russia - reference?

argument re: suicide, accidents - good challenge of Rus/Japan effective rebuttal
watch pacing of feet/eye contact

=o ^{cut} by 40 times - where did this statistic come from.
Japan rebuttal - not sure where you were going w/ this

^M
Karima Rehemtulla (*16)
Round 3A 1:30pm B1
Aff: 11 hour
Neg: 19 Valle
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Karima Rehemtulla
Judge's School Affiliation: * 16

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 hour pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 19 Valle pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- ① ● **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- ② ● **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ③ ● **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- ④ ● **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- ⑤ ● **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- ⑥ ● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

① Good
② Very good strong evidence.
③ Very good thought process
④ Excellent view point
⑤ Excellent arguments.
⑥ Very good summary. courtesy.

Negative

Use the word "like" a little less
① Good
② Very good evidence
③ good organization
④ good value clash, more needed
⑤ good but a little weak
⑥ very good, courtesy

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 hour on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very strong arguments, very clear, he refuted all her points. Well organized arguments strong!!

Karina Rehemtulla (*16)

Round 3B 1:30pm B1
Aff: 18 Gaughan
Neg: 20 Kaur
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Karina Rehemtulla

Judge's School Affiliation: * 16

AFF:
Speaker Code #: 18 Gaughan pts 29

NEG:
Speaker Code #: Kaur 20 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- ① ● **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- ② ● **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ③ ● **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- ④ ● **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- ⑤ ● **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- ⑥ ● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

① Good
② Good
③ very good
④ Good
⑤ Strong armed his opponent on small details, very clever!
⑥ Good delivery, courtesy!

Negative

① very good
② excellent
③ very good
④ good
⑤ OK - a little weak
⑥ Stronger - Excellent

- slow down
- defend your view
- argue

1st one
- 2nd one
reputation.
solid

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Her points were strong and clear they were both very close. She had more evidence that was broader. I would say that it was a tie. She had one more evidence

Judge 1 Logan (*11)

Round 3A 1:30pm B2
Aff: 10 Bhagavatula-Girl
Neg: 20 Karavadi - Boy
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Janet Cooper

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 20 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- Your facts and support statements were great!
- You held my attention and convinced me of your contentions
- you convincingly disproved his facts

Negative

- Vague response to suicide claims
- You had good values and value criteria
- Great body lang. and eye contact.
- you contradicted yourself
- Be more relaxed

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the AF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Case analysis, evidence and refutation was excellent. Presenter was great.

Judge 1 Logan (*11)

Round 3B 1:30pm B2
Aff: 20 Ruiz
Neg: 19 Johnston
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Janet Cooper

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Speaker Code #: AFF: 20 pts 29 Speaker Code #: NEG: 19 pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- Great job!
- You grabbed my attention and held it through everything
- You were very prepared

Negative

- Prepare more
- Don't read material all the time. Look up from notes and have more eye contact
- Don't play with hair, shoes and clothing. (Distracting)
- You constantly shifting your weight was distracting

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the AFF side of this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

aff speaker was more prepared and polished. aff facts were convincing and refuted Negs facts

Datta Makkapati (*8)

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Datta Makkapati

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

Round 3A 1:30pm (B4)
Aff: 18 Bulanova
Neg: 11 Kaur
JV L-D Debate

Speaker Code #: AFF: 18 pts 29 Speaker Code #: NEG: 11 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS: How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
EVIDENCE: Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
ORGANIZATION: How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
VALUE CLASH: How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
REFUTATION: How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
DELIVERY/COURTESY: Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Negative

Case analysis was very organized.
Rebuttal needs to have more specifics and detailed approach
Less use of Ah's & um's would be helpful

very well organized speech.

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Datta Mokkapati (*8)

Round 3B 1:30pm B4
Aff: 10 Membrido
Neg: 11 Ramos
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Datta Mokkapati

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

AFF: 10 pts 29 Speaker Code #: _____ NEG: 11 pts 27 Speaker Code #: _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Negative

Controlling the pace will be more effective, means slowing down a bit.

→ need to be more specific

→ Sources need to be more recognisable authors

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Katherine Jubelirer (*12)

Round 3A 1:30pm 15
Aff: 20 Narain
Neg: 16 Rehemtulla
JV L-D Debate

Singue frigate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: K. Jubelirer

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School

Speaker Code #: AFF: 20 Narain pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 16 Rehemtulla pts 25

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

CASE ANALYSIS:

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

EVIDENCE:

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

ORGANIZATION:

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

VALUE CLASH:

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

REFUTATION:

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- good case analysis w/ good connection back to value + value criterion
- use all time - plenty of time for @ least one more contention
- good responses to Neg. cross ex
- good evidence
- great cross ex - really taking opp. to task on
- match up bet. V + VC + C2
- don't let yourself get flustered
- don't let trying to speak automatically affect your ability to think
- good rebuttal

Negative

- good start of cross ex - emphasizing Aff's 1 Contention
- mind how you phrase cross ex questions
- Contentions ^{1, 2} weak - lines vs. Olympic sport?
- good evidence for C3
- good organization
- make sure your rebuttal affirms your case clearly, as opposed to seem to support your opp.
- too aggressive when being cross ex; interrupting opp. inappropriately
- remain professional - visible ^{audience} response to opp distracting
- debater is becoming unbecomingly emotional

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 Narain on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both debaters made good points, but the neg debater was at times quite unprofessional, including continuing to respond to points after the round was over. Overall, aff made a stronger, clearer case.

Judge 2 Logan (*11)

Round 4A 3:30pm B2
Aff: 19 Pollard
Neg: 20 Karavadi
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Janet Cooper

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Speaker Code #: AFF: 19 pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 20 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Negative

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Better facts and performance!

Judge 2 Logan (*11)

Round 4B 3:30pm B2
Aff: 10 Bhagavatula
Neg: 20 Ruiz
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: James Cooper

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

Speaker Code #: AFF: 10 pts 29

Speaker Code #: NEG: 20 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Negative

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the Neg wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Experience and poise won out!

Changie Sun (*8)

Round 4A 3:30pm B4
Aff: 19 Valle
Neg: 10 Membrido
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Changie Sun

Judge's School Affiliation: Doughry Valley

Speaker Code #: AFF: 19 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 10 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

Good speech and good organization
on constructive. Did pretty good
on cross-examination.

Suggestion:

-To be more strong on Rebuttal
speech.

Negative

Opened with a little bit nervous, but
went very well after. Constructive organized
very well and rebuttal is strong.

SPEAKER CODE #: 10 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Nb6 ~~was~~ ^{stated} her value well and against opponent's very well. Nb6 won
the final speech.

Changie Sun (*8)

Round 4B 3:30pm B4
Aff: 20 Kaur
Neg: 18 Bulanova
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Changie Sun

Judge's School Affiliation: Dorothy Vahey

AFF: Speaker Code #: 20 pts 28.5 NEG: Speaker Code #: 18 pts 27.5

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- **CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- **EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- **VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- **REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

*Good speech with confidence.
good questions on cross-examination.*

Suggestion:

- Refute the arguments of opponent can be improved.

Negative

Good on enforce own contentions and rebuild own side after AFF's rebuttal.

Suggestion:

- speech can be ~~more~~ stronger. better utilize cross-examination.

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

AFF won's by better cross-examination and final speeches.

Sam Karetta (*20)
Round 4A 3:30pm 15
Aff: 16 Rehermtulla
Neg: 11 naur
JV L-D Debate

Single Flight

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SAM KARETTI

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

Speaker Code #: AFF: 16 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 11 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

- 30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
- 27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
- 26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS:**
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- EVIDENCE:**
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ORGANIZATION:**
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- VALUE CLASH:**
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- REFUTATION:**
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- DELIVERY/COURTESY:**
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Scale (1-5)

Affirmative:

Case Analysis - 5
 Evidence - 5
 Organization - 5
 Value Clash - 4
 Refutation - 5
 Delivery/Co - 4

Negative

Case Analysis - 5
 Evidence - 4
 Organization - 5
 Value Clash - 5
 Refutation - 5
 Delivery/Courtesy - 5

SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Good eye contact, delivery of the speech and logical reasoning

Brian Yu
Ghion-Fang (*16)
Round 4B 3:30pm B1
Aff: 19 Johnston
Neg: 20 Narain
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Brian Yu

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

Speaker Code #: AFF: 19 pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 20 pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?

● **EVIDENCE:**

Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?

● **ORGANIZATION:**

How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?

● **VALUE CLASH:**

How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)

● **REFUTATION:**

How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- Value analysis is thorough and well-justified
- You have more time in the Aff constructive, use it to its fullest to make stronger warrants for your argument
- Great job pointing out flaws in the Negative evidence during cross-examination time
- Saying that it is practical to but handgins isn't really a value argument, it's a way of linking into your opponent's framework

Negative

- If you don't get the answers you're looking for in cross-examination, ask follow-up questions and place pressure on your opponent
- Interesting approach to the topic by working in arguments about pragmatism
- Good job engaging with the value debate, but you should provide deeper warrants and engage in more comparison between criteria
- Excellent organization of your rebuttal speech
- You could do deeper analysis comparing the evidence brought up by both sides, to give me a clear reason to prefer your evidence.

SPEAKER CODE #: 20 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

The Negative provided better warrants for pragmatic policy under a political legitimacy framework. Under that framework, the arguments about public backlash to the stripping of rights and the effectiveness of regulation instead of banning have the clearest link and impact.

Brian Yu
Chion Fang (*16)
Round 4A 3:30pm B1
Aff: 11 Ramos
Neg: 18 Gaughan
JV L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Brian Yu
Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

AFF: 11 pts 27 Speaker Code #: _____
NEG: 18 pts 28.5 Speaker Code #: _____

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect 29 = Outstanding 28 = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair 24-20 = Poor <20 = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement for each debater:

- CASE ANALYSIS:
How well did the debater develop a case in response to the resolution?
- EVIDENCE:
Although value debating emphasizes logic and persuasion, evidence (quoted material, contemporary or historical examples) should be used to support arguments. How effective was the evidence?
- ORGANIZATION:
How well did the debater organize both the constructive and rebuttal speeches?
- VALUE CLASH:
How clearly did the debater emphasize the value being supported by his/her side, and how well was that value measured? (Criterion)
- REFUTATION:
How thoroughly did the debater refute the arguments of the opposition and rebuild his/her own side?
- DELIVERY/COURTESY:
Did each debater speak in communicative style that was pleasant, easily understandable, and civil?

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Affirmative:

- Good use of evidence in the case, although some of the evidence needs a stronger link to the policies advocated by Aff.
- During the AR, be careful not to just repeat your original arguments, try to engage with the NC's responses (you did this well for Concession 1!)
- When the Neg challenges the validity of your evidence, show why your evidence should still be considered

Negative

- Excellent cross examination questions
- Still evidence is effective, but providing statistical evidence to counter the Affirmative would be valuable
- Analysis about pre-emptive intimidation is interesting and potentially very persuasive - expand on that.
- Careful about time, don't go over time.
- Engage with the value debate - explain why I should give preference to your value criterion
- Explaining how arguments interact could be valuable.

SPEAKER CODE #: 18 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG shows me evidence that, despite current use of legal handguns, a handgun ban will cause people to still get guns illegally. That, coupled with the self-defense argument out of the Negative's first concession show me reason to believe that a handgun ban would increase suffering and worsen self-defense. I would have liked to have seen more framework debate on both sides, but Negative impacts to both.