LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:_____Chien Tang_____

Judge's School Affiliation:_____16_____

AFF: Waterson

Speaker Code #:_____9_____ pts 27   Speaker Code #:_____19 Kelly_____ pts 28

NEG: Kelly

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 statement of contention
Children death by accident
Need to handle CX with
better clarity.
Organization of arguments
can use some work. Try to
state clearly your
contentions & rebuttals.

Negative

Good cross X
Good contentions & evidence support.
Delivery was clear & good paced w/.
Organization was good with
clear statements & well supported
by evidence.

SPEAKER CODE #:_____19_____ on the NEG wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG is more organized with better evidence and
handled CX with more control & logic.

AFF	NEG
AFF	**NEG**

AC: Protection of Life
VC: reduce death
① Children death, anecdotes
NRA, more gun → more death
Australia, accidents
Idaho case,
② Other countries
defense tiny %
CX: Neg evidence support VC?
Gun easier to use.
1AR: Rebuttal: VC of opponent
Gun control worked in Australia
Other weapons agree.
2nd contention not addressed
by opponents. 4.5 v 1.5 death
Other countries' gun control
worked.

2AR: children's death happening
Glove compartment.
2nd Amendment: old & could
be changed.

CX: Ban handguns only, how about
other types of guns?
A: case is only handguns.
NC: VC: Life Preservation
① Self-Defense: 1.5 - 1.9 million
instances. For women, elderly.
② Ban don't help. esp. handgun
& not semi-automatic weapons.
1994 Ban didn't work.
③ Handgun ban failed.
Europe cases. Russia 4x v. USA
Rebuttal: accidents & pools, etc.
stats .. wooping cough. swimming pool.
NR: Repeat of evidences.
① self-defence more frequent
than accidents. Parents'
responsibility
② Short range. knives more
dangerous. opponent agreed
other weapons. criminal don't
follow laws. Practicality
of banning guns.
③ No evidence for UK, Japan's
case.
④ Defence against criminals
. opponent dropped 2 contentions

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Chien Fang_

Judge's School Affiliation: _# 16_

AFF: Ramirez   NEG: Garg

Speaker Code #: ___1___ pts 27   Speaker Code #: ___22___ 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:	Negative
Good delivery and statement of contentions. Handling of 1AR was a little dis-organized. Should take advantage of final rebuttal to re-state your contentions & show why your arguments are better than your opponent's	CX should be more effective, e.g. the questions should be more pertinent to arguments. Delivery can be smoother, try not to break up sentence, "er", and stopping to think. Rebuttal are more organized than opponent's

SPEAKER CODE #: ___22___ on the __NEG__ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

It is a close call. Both sides need to be more organized and improve upon argumentation & CX. I vote for NEG because of the better rebuttal.

AFF

AC: V: Justice
  VC: Max Pres. justice greatest# people

① HG enable death
  stats ... 75% HG.
  HG main source of death

② HG tool of assailment
  0.7% self-defense

③ Private ownership HG to kill.
  victim had right to life
  violated.

CX: Clarification ô evidence.

1AR:
  Rebuttal:
  • morally right to infringe
  other's right by allowing
  one person's right?
  2nd Amendment outdated
  International examples.

  • HG make it much easier
  to kill; shotgun 12 Gaug.
  more effective

2AR:
  Rebuttal: and 2nd amendmet not
  to be replaced, just out-dated
  • illegal trade
  black-market, ban makes it harder
  • other countries, homicide
  rate?
  • Better secured school

NEG

CX: Shot guns are so easier to stop
  people?

NC: V: Justice
  VC: autonomy principle

① ↓ security, ↑ violence.
  already has ban for mental, criminal etc
  England, law-abiding citizen turned in
  more impact ↓ Gun in U.K. Canada
② 2nd Gun not part problem   Jamaica
  2nd Amendment right.
  Gov't should secure schools more
  Rebuttal: right shouldn't be
         taken away
  Black-market availability: England
  illegal import.
  Shotgun for ∅ sniping not
  short range (?)

NR: Rebuttal:
  ① autonomy doesn't
  ② 2nd amendmet is NOT
     out-dated.
  ③ illegal trade, ↑ demand for HG
  HG ∅ shot guns are diffent.
  Statement not relevant.

Contentions:
  ① Other countries banned guns
  not effective; U.K. etc.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Derek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: NEG:

Speaker Code #: 19   pts 27   Speaker Code #: 2   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?

low point
win

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

Affirmative:

Speak slower and enunciate.
Too many uses of 'uh'
Need to work on a smoother
delivery during rebutal
Arguments well well reasoned.

Negative

Good enunciation
Need more eye contact
Don't say 'oops'. Hide your mistakes.
Well reasoned argument.
What about long guns?

ASF

SPEAKER CODE #: ~~2~~ 19 on the ~~AFF~~ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

~~Better presentation~~. Stronger argument.
~~Banning handguns doesn't prove to reduce suicide~~. Wash DC given
The speaker for the negative was unable to refute the affimative
claim that a gun ban would reduce gun violence.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Derek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

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

Poor enunciation made it difficult to understand the arguments

Too much of the presentation was monotonal. Need to emphasize main points.

Need better citations to back up contentions

Negative

Strong voice and good enunciation.
Excellent use of citations.
Well argued

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

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Speaker for the affirmative did not provide evidence for how a gun ban would ensure public safety which was his main point. Second point of feasability was well refuted.

Faisal
~~Hina~~ Habib (*22)
Round 1A 9:00am A1
Aff: 2 Nadler
Neg: 12 Choudhry
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Faisal Habib_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Monte Vista High._

AFF:
Speaker Code #: _Nadler_ pts _26_

NEG:
Speaker Code #: _Choudary_ 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:
Focusing on safety & Violence.
well present her case
Clear delivery
Supported her values

Negative
Focusing Hand Guns vs Guns
Well prepared case analysis
focused rebuttal
Organization was good.

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

REASON FOR DECISION
Clear points on the topic and well presented rebuttals.

Faisal
~~Hina~~ Habib (*22)
Round 1B 9:00am A1
Aff: 19 Jerez
Neg: 8 Makkapati
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Faisal Habib

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High.

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: Jerez	pts 26	Speaker Code #: Makkapati	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:

Clear presentation

Statistics related to gun fatalities

Well presented arguments

Negative

Evidences and their background citations were presented.

Well argued rebuttal

Concise points

Focused delivery

NEG.

SPEAKER CODE #: Makkapati ___ on the ~~28~~ ___ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION Makkapati presented the data for his value criterion and his rebuttals were focused.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _WSTIG_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Lowell_

AFF: _Romero_

Speaker Code #: _19_ pts _27_ Speaker Code #: _22_ pts _28_

NEG: _Abimanyu_

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:

Well done on both sides, although making notes

Affirmative:

Strong arguments, but never countered the argument that whenever guns laws are upheld, violence goes up - also did not effectively deal with the fact that criminals will always be able to get guns.

Negative

One glaring mistake — handguns have been used for mass shootings in several instances eg. Sandy Hook — this was refuted properly. Also did not agree that he made his case that owning a gun provides security. Surprised he did not utilize 2nd amendment

SPEAKER CODE # _22_ on the _Neg_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

The main reason why that the aff never proved her primary contention that it is gun availability that increases violence) — Most guns are owned by well-meaning citizens - and banning guns will not remove them from the hands of criminals.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Changie Sun_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Doughny Valley high_

AFF:
Speaker Code #: _2 2_ pts _27_

NEG:
Speaker Code #: _2_ pts _28.5_

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:
- need build more confidence.
- improve good eye contact
- stated value and contentions very well.

Negative
good speak with confidence and good eye contact. good attack on ~~other~~ side. and rebuild her own side.

SPEAKER CODE #: _2_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
NEG did very well on debating when attack AFF's contention and emphasized his own contentions.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Changie Sun_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Dougherty Valley High_

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: _2_ pts _18_	Speaker Code #: _22_ pts _28_ _2?_

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:

improve eye contact and be more confident on cross-examination and Rebuttal

Negative

nice speech and eye contact. did very well on debating and emphasize own contentions.

SPEAKER CODE #: _22_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Good evidence to support NEG's contentions. Attacked AFF's contention very well

Karina Rehemtulla (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am A2
Aff: 22 Wei
Neg: 8 Tang
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: _Karina Rehemtulla_

Judge's School Affiliation: _16_

AFF: NEG:
Speaker Code #: _22 Wei_ pts _29_   Speaker Code #: _8 Tang_ pts _25_

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect   29 = Outstanding   28 = Very Good
37 = 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 argument
(2) Good evidence.
(3) Good organization
(4) Very good
(5) Excellent refutation
(6) outstanding delivery.

Negative
(1) OK argument
(2) weak evidence
(3) OK organization
(4) not very clear.
(5) Missed on many points
(6) good.

SPEAKER CODE #: _22 Wei_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
She had a solid argument. Opposition did not attack points made. Wei's arguments was consistent through out.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Karina Rehemtulla

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

AFF:
Speaker Code #: 22 Khan   pts 28   NEG:
Speaker Code #: 20 Kareti   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:

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 Very good
② Excellent
③ Very good
④ Excellent
⑤ Very good
⑥ Excellent

Negative

① OK
② OK
③ Good
④ Good
⑤ OK
⑥ Excellent

SPEAKER CODE #: 22 Khan   **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Good strong argument. a clear argument.
Consistant with points

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _YIMING YAO_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Monte Vista_

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: _12_ pts _29_	Speaker Code #: _19_ 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:

Well prepared.
Fluent delivery
Good hand gesturing
A lot of citations + evidence

Should have more eye contact

Negative

Well paced speech & argument
Good use of evidence,
Logical organisation

Try not to read too much from notes

SPEAKER CODE #: _12_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
AFF won on stronger rebutal and cross examination

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:_____ YIMING YAO

Judge's School Affiliation: _Monte Vista_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #:____8____ pts_29_		Speaker Code #:____19____ 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:	Negative
Forceful delivery & arguments	Well paced delivery
Good use of evidences	Eye contacts
Logical organization	Good use of citations & evidences
Try to have more eye contacts	Try not to read too much from notes

SPEAKER CODE #:____8____ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

AFF won on clearear & stronger arguments & rebuttals.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: 22	pts 28	Speaker Code #: 2	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:
- great volume & tone, but needs to read less & make more eye contact. Lots of filler words.
- should take advantage of the full CX time to attack opponent's case more
- good case construction, but very messy responses. -left many parts of Neg case unrefuted

Negative
- decent ideas in CX, but need to articulate better.
- good voice projection. Can work on being more fluent when presenting case. + more eye contact
- very clean & organized case and responses, but no value or crit or contesting the Affs.
- be sure to point out areas where the Aff doesn't respond to certain part

SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg had no value or crit, so while her contentions were very clean & organized, there was no direction for them. Both teams can work on fluency & delivery more comprehensive rebuttals, but the Aff did a better job of stating how their arguments upheld the value/crit

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: 20	pts 28	Speaker Code #: 19	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:

· clear tone and projection, but can work on reducing filler words and improving eye contact.
· strong case with good rhetoric. Could have linked contentions to the value and crit a little more
· great explanation of framework & could have challenged the Neg value/crit more strongly.

Negative

· very crisp & clean speaker. Organized case and responded very clearly to Aff case.
· state econ burden too big in first contention subpoint a., but contradicts self by saying econ impacts not relevant in Aff case :/
· excellent response to Aff value/crit, but tell me why that does anything for your case.

SPEAKER CODE #:   19   on the   NEG   wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg value crit didn't really make much sense, but explained the link to her value reasonably well. The arguments and response generally conveyed a stronger Neg understanding of the topic. While the Aff had a very organized framework, she didn't explain how her contentions upheld her criterion.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Andrew Schwartz_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Northgate_

AFF:
Speaker Code #: _8_ pts _26_

NEG:
Speaker Code #: _22_ 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:
+ Good job explaining your case, I understood it & it was easy to flow.
+ You have a calm & clear speaking style but you tend to get lost / flustered occasionally
- most of the neg's claims were about the feasibility & unpredictability of crime but these go both ways!
- when you start a point with "my opponent said" consider instead referring to where on the flow her argument is

Negative
+ you do a great job explaining your case however I feel that a weakness is that your case rarely makes arguments that seem unique to handguns as opposed to guns
+ you do a good job coming up with arguments on the AFF's case. Just be careful that these quickly built attacks don't contradict one another. The AFF could have blown big holes in your case with them had he called them
+ good value drop catch.

SPEAKER CODE #: _22_ on the _Neg_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION / RFD:
Neg on Value + 1 drop off case

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Andrew Schwartz_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Northgate_

AFF:
Speaker Code #: _2_ pts _28_

NEG:
Speaker Code #: _22_ 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:

+ a strong case that was very easy to understand
+ strong cross X showing
- Even if she did drop your value it doesn't hurt to dispute the evidence behind ~~good~~ her criterion since its such a huge part.
+ good argumentation throughout

Negative:

+ I think you had several great arguments but I would have liked more development on your offcase.
+ if your value is ~~so~~ different enough to make a difference in how the round is judged then you need to go hard on it. I loved your value + criterion
- I think your contention level argumentation is fantastic but I need to hear more on the value level

SPEAKER CODE #: _2_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- You did great but it felt like you were easily side tracked (beginning of 2R for ex)

RFD: AFF won crucial value

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)
Round 2A 11:00am A3
Aff: 19 Kelly
Neg: 2 Aldana
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Oleg Tiktinsci_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_

AFF: **19** pts **27**
Speaker Code #: _____

NEG: **2** pts **26**
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
1. good talking points	1. calm speaker very good
2. Bit confused on background checks.	2. in some ways argued aff side, however good points of diff methods of gun improvements
	3.

SPEAKER CODE #: _19 Kelly_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)
Round 2B 11:00am A3
Aff: 22 Habib
Neg: 9 Waterson
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Oleg Tiktinsk__

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: _22_ pts _26_		Speaker Code #: _9_ 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:
1. Studez a bit
2. Interrupted opponent. few times
3. Ban guns vs. Ban for gun manufacturing? Confused:

Negative
1. Good speach, emotional.
2. Could be more prepad.

SPEAKER CODE #: _9 Waterson_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Both speakez pretty equal.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _K. Jubelier_

Judge's School Affiliation: _John Swett High School_

Speaker Code #: **AFF:** _20 Shvakel_ pts _27_   Speaker Code #: **NEG:** _19 Jerez_ 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: Both: Work on idioms ("suicide themselves") + pronunciation (plethora + homicide)

Affirmative:
- good V/ VC; unclear contentions
- good evidence
- OK being ex/ good doing cross ex
- good going after Neg's research
- value clash?
- good refutation/rebuttals
- good delivery + courtesy

Negative
- CATO.org is not gov't run
- OK evidence → evidence for C2?
- good, clear organization in constructive
- work on cross ex
  → what were aff's contentions?
- value clash?
- work on "Uhs" etc.
- clear refutation
- needs to use all time + have evidence for all contentions

SPEAKER CODE #: _20 Shvakel_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
While Aff's contentions were unclear, the rest of his debate was methodical + well-organized. Neg's case was [far] unclear + did not sufficiently respond to Aff.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _K. Jubelirer_

Judge's School Affiliation: _John Swett High School_

	AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #:	_2 Littlesun_	pts _26_	Speaker Code #: _22 Cheng_	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: _Both: timer etiquette — ask judge if ready to start time ea. time_

Affirmative:	Negative
- clear speaker	- pretty good cross ex
- good organization	- evidence for ea. contention!
- all contentions need evidence (C1?)	- clear organization + refutation
- use all time	- value clash good
- good cross ex on value clash	- not sure about case analy sis — guns
- good value clash rebuttal	have intentions? + morality?
- pretty good overall rebuttal	- use all time!
- citations?	- good organization — clear

SPEAKER CODE #: _2 Littlesun_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very close, based on better argument

Danielle Kelly

Round 2 11:00am P3 (single flight)
Aff: 22 Gupta
Neg: 1 Ramirez
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Danielle Kelly

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF:
Speaker Code #: 22 Gupta   pts 26

NEG:
Speaker Code #: 1 Ramirez   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:

- He had great comparisons between US & Australia
- Could use more eye contact
- Forgot cross-examination
- Was fairly clear and concise
- Strong rebuttal

Negative

- Stumbled a little bit around her point
- Good key points
- Relax, take a breath for clearer speech.
- Be watchful of time

SPEAKER CODE #: 22 Gupta **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Affirmative had a stronger argument with evidence to back it up.

Brian Yo (16) 3040
Ms. Kenney (*1) 300
Round 3B 1:30pm P1
Aff: 19 Kelly
Neg: 22 Khan
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Brian Yo James NERNEY_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Monte Vista / CAMPOLINDO_

Speaker Code #: AFF: 19   pts 29   Speaker Code #: NEG: 22   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:	Negative
- GREAT COMMAND OF DEBATE PROCEDURES - POSITION NEEDS MORE SUPPORTIVE EVIDENCE - REFUTATION NEEDS TO BE POINTED - GREAT DELIVERY!	- CLEARLY REASONED ARGUMENTS. - APPROPRIATE & RELEVANT EVIDENCE! - REFUTATIONS LARGELY EFFECTIVE! - NEED TO APPEAR MORE CONFIDENT

SPEAKER CODE #: _22_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Roopali Bali (*10)
Round 3A 1:30pm A2
Aff: 19 Romero
Neg: 2 Littlesun
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Roopali Bali

Judge's School Affiliation: HHS

AFF: 19

NEG: 2

Speaker Code #: ~~28~~ pts 28   Speaker Code #: _____ 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:

Affirmative:

V= Societal. Welfare
VC= Reducing harm.

C_1 - Pvt. ownership escalated violence
- suicide more in homes with guns available.
- handgun used in lethal killing
C_2 - HG Acts not making impact on society

Negative

V = Justice
VC = Govt. Legitimacy
C_1 - Inc. regul. give comparable benefit
- only for sane citizens
- stricter background checks.
C_2 - Ban will lead to increase "black market" activity.
- ban will make it exclusive to criminals.

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

REASON FOR DECISION Neg forefeited the debate due to health reasons.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Roopali Bali

Judge's School Affiliation: IHS

Speaker Code #: **AFF:** 12   pts 28   Speaker Code #: **NEG:** 22   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:

V= Safety
VC= Reducing violence
HG #1 most used firearm in homicide, suicide.
C1 - Pvt. Ownership problematic due to lack of gun laws.
 - 21 yr old can purr it w/o background check.
C2 - Most guns pvt. owned, easy to acquired, shared with family/friends.

Negative:

V= Protection of Life
VC= Protection of Right
C1 → HG dangerous only if used in dangerous way.
 - regular check needed.
C2 → Too hard to get rid of all HG's.
C3 → You don't know when you need to protect yourself

SPEAKER CODE #: 12   on the **AFF** wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION Both debaters did need a good job presenting their case. Neg. was unable to link her value to VC and then accepted during debate that her value was wrong & her opponents was right. Aff should work on more eye contact. Aff was able to defend the contentions & did well during CX.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Oleg Tiktinski_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: _____ pts _29_		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:

1. Good point about age,
2. Good speaker +1
3. Stronger argument.

Negative

1. Bit too loud/studez
2. Good point about security
3. Good point about background checks,

SPEAKER CODE #: _2 Poten_ on the _AFF_ **wins this debate.**

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

While both debaters pretty good, AFF had stronger arguments and better speach.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Oleg Tiktinsk._

Judge's School Affiliation: _Quarry Lane_

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #:_____ pts 27	Speaker Code #:_____ /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~~ Negative:	~~Negative~~ Affirmative:
1. Good Point about equalizer	1. Good speech. Lots of good facts.
2. Good Point about gun Ban —> alcohol Ban	2. Calm. maybe a bit more articulation
3. Trip over grass? funny	

SPEAKER CODE #: _2 Nadler_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Brian Yu (16)
~~Ms. Kenney (*1)~~
Round 3A 1:30pm P1
Aff: 22 Cheng
Neg: 8 Makkapati
Novice L-D Debate

(19)

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: ~~Brian Yu~~ Sam Roberson

Judge's School Affiliation: ~~Monta Vista~~ PVHS

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: 22	pts 28	Speaker Code #: 8	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:

Make sure to use all the time you have ~~~~ very good job try to speak a little louder

Negative

Great job try to use all the time you have and try to speak a little louder

SPEAKER CODE #: 22 on the A F F wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Better argument from aff then neg

Faisal
~~Hina~~ Habib (*22)
Round 3 1:30pm P3 (single flight)
Aff: 8 Tang
Neg: 9 Waterson
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Faisal Habib_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Monte Vista High_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: _Tang_	pts _28_	Speaker Code #: _Waterson_	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:
Well presented response to the resolution.
Strong points during rebuttals
Shows great capacity to overcome opponent's arguments
Strong performance on values

Negative
Clear presentation & eye contact
Impressive way to show second side of coin.
Strong presentation
Courtious and supportive.

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

REASON FOR DECISION
Tang showed strong performances during rebuttles. She ~~was~~ was able to emphasized on her values and at the ~~same time~~ was able to counter the opponent arguments in a concise manner.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name:_____

Judge's School Affiliation:_____ 16

AFF:

Speaker Code #:_____ 1 _____ pts 29.5

NEG:

Speaker Code #:_____ 20 _____ 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:

- look at judge during CX
- great case
- Bring across arguments from case more clearly
- Dont look at opponent during rebuttal!

Negative

- Look at judge during CX
- Speak more clearly
- Don't just re-read case during rebuttal. Try to engage opponents arguments more.
- Don't say police will not have handguns. "private ownership"

SPEAKER CODE #:_____ 1 _____ on the __AFF__ wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff engaged neg's arguments better and showed how guns aren't used effectively for self-defense and the presence of alternatives.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____ 16

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: ___2___ pts 27	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: • Good case

• The anecdote is strange.

• Need stats even in LD.

• Discussion of morality of self-defense seemed out of place

• Need to respond to opponents case more substantively

Negative • Solid case

• I think discussion of assault weapons is irrelevant

• You should respond to opponent in first speech

SPEAKER CODE #: ___19___ on the __NEG__ wins this debate.
(AFF or **NEG**)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg is more responsive and shows that the ban may not work / guns are needed for self-defense.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Lucas Tung_

Judge's School Affiliation: _James Logan_

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: __22__ pts _28_	Speaker Code #: __20__ pts ~~28~~ 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:
· crisp and clear delivery, though somewhat monotone and shakey
· good job refuting the notion that we can't rely on old documents, but contradicted when mentioned evidence from 1997.

Negative
· excellent understanding of fallacies and logical analysis, but delivery is rather monotone.
· gets noticeably tripped up during cx.
· very little signposting. Great case, but feels messy.

SPEAKER CODE #: __22__ on the __AFF__ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

The question of why we <u>ought</u> to ban guns was never answered by the Neg & pushed by the Aff. Aff does a good job of laying out clear voters and better links his contentions to the value

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: __Lucas Tung__

low pt point win

Judge's School Affiliation: __James Logan.__

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: __22__	pts __27__	Speaker Code #: __19__	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:

- decent fluency & lack of filler words, but does a lot of distracting swaying while speaking. Also has hands in pockets a lot
- pretty organized case, but needs to link arguments to the value/crit more

Negative.

- Uhhh, what happened to the Aff case CX?
- has a decent fluency & voice projection
- makes some appeals to logic.
- had no value/crit & didn't contest Aff FW.
- decent eye contact, but can be more articulate and not drop arguments.

SPEAKER CODE #: __22__ on the __AFF__ wins this debate. **LPW**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff actually provided a value/crit for the round and it wasn't contested. Was overall more organized on a case argument basis. Both teams need to present clear voter issues and link to the value/crit.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _D. Ralston_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Bishop O'doud_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: __22__	pts __26__	Speaker Code #: __12__	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:

Handgun ownership

Affirmative:

Defined terms
Social contract principle, Don't need to shout.
and more eye contact please. Good initial
evidence to back contention. good
responses to cross-examination questions
and handling opponents attempt to trip up.
Refutation was a little unclear but
good persistence to keep line going and
defending contention.

Negative

Talking too fast makes it very hard to follow
Work to make sure judge can follow + understand
logic of argument. Work on eye contact
as well.
Mentioned case of Washington DC as cite but
begs question of benefit/change if at all reference
to hand gun deaths
Good interrogation of opponent contentions.
Good ability to articulate value clash and put
opponent off-balance. ~~Ho~~ A little dismissive of
opponent's statements.

SPEAKER CODE #: __22__ on the __AFF__ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

overall good ability to hold onto consistent thread of
argument + balanced presentation

D. Ralston
~~Judge 1 Logan~~ (*11)
Round 4B 3:30pm A3
Aff: 22 Wei
Neg: 19 Kelly
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: __D Ralston__

Judge's School Affiliation: __Billy Odom__

26

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: __22__ pts __26__		Speaker Code #: __19__ pts __26__ 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:
- Very good use of data + evidence to support contentions + case studies
- Nice calm collected responses to cross-questions
- Probably work to stand more center + confident poise. A bit too fidgety distracts from listening
- Better tracking of time will help

Negative
Good cross examination line to get concession from opponent.
In construction - reads too much of out eye contact, don't put paper in front of face. Good presentation of evidence to support contentions on criminalization viz-gins. Good use of info on Japan case study + other case study contentions (Europe ch.) Good responses to cross-examination & negative rebuttal points. - could be more concise

SPEAKER CODE #: __19__ on the __NEG__ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
good overall + consistent presentation + use of evidence to support points.

Irina Kizler

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Irina Kizler_

Judge's School Affiliation: _MVHS_

Speaker Code #: AFF: _20 Shvakel_ pts _28_   Speaker Code #: NEG: _22 Gupta_ 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:

Great cross-ex, time was used well, case had some good statistics, however it ~~was~~ would benefit from better organization and structure. Good attempt to analyse evidence.

Negative

Case could benefit from more substantial analysis of neg. position, less repetition. I liked that you tried to establish your position.

For both debators : refutations shouldn't be limited to evidence quality analysis, but involve substance of the arguments

SPEAKER CODE #: _20 Shvakel_ on the _Aff_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Speaker of affirmative was more substential and persuasive.

Irina Kizler

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Irina Kizler_

Judge's School Affiliation: _MVHS_

Speaker Code #: _19 Alam_ pts _28_   Speaker Code #: _2 Aldana_ 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:
Strong case analysis, well organized, easy to follow, well supported! Not as strong in your 2nd and 3rd speech. You need to watch out for use of "like" during your speech.

Negative
Very thorough case, however it didn't leave you time to deal with Aff case. You seemed to not have a good command of your own materials, that prevented your refutations to be more effective.

SPEAKER CODE #: _19 Alam_ on the _Aff_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Aff demonstrated better command of the material, was easier to follow.

Sineesh Keshav (*22)
Round 4B 3:30pm A2
Aff: 2 Nadler
Neg: 1 Ramirez
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _SINEESH KESHAV_

Judge's School Affiliation: _SAN RAMON VALLEY_

AFF: **2** pts **27**   Speaker Code #: _____

NEG: **1** 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:

Best Point / Moment: Cross

Value: morality & individual worth

- Good point about mental illness

- Delivery: no eyecontact while reading from notes. You could be more effective looking up once in a while.

-

Key strength: Cross Ex
Key opportunity: Delivery

Negative

Best Point / Moment: ~~Discarding~~ model citizen point

+ Cross relied too much on just reiterating points made by AFF

- Re self defense - right to life

- Great point about rights needing to be based on model citizens.

Key strength: Case Analysis
Key opportunity: handling of cross ex

SPEAKER CODE #: **2** on the **AFF** wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- Both debaters were effective in presenting their case
- Edge to aff on questions raised during cross

AFF

- Great point about "trigger may be pulling the trigger but the trigger is also pulling the trigger"

- Great cross - excellent questions on diff between pain meds & guns.
  - ↓ used to save lives
  - ↓ used to kill

- First Rebuttal could have been better. Delivery.

- Close reiterated the points made in the constructive. More effective would have been a refute.

NEG

- Great example for pain meds
- Good stats on ineffectiveness of ban on guns.
- good point about Stanford prison experiments not being relevant to this debate
- Guns vs other means as a deterrent - great point
- Close could have been better.

Sineesh Keshav (*22)
Round 4A 3:30pm A2
Aff: 9 Waterson
Neg: 19 Romero
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

AFF: 9 Speaker Code #: _____ pts 26   NEG: 19 Speaker Code #: _____ 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 of 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:

Best moment: Close

Value: protection of life & reducing gun related deaths

- Good point about NRA exploiting
- Good point about Australia
- Too much reliance on harm to children
  • suicides & mass shootings.
- Cross relied too much on information reference and not on substantive points

Key strength: Content & evidence
Key opportunity: Delivery: Fluency & consistency

Negative

Best moment: Rebuttal & cross

- Good cross. good points on solvency issues with AFF.
- value criterion of logic was refreshing. Ban cannot be enforced.
- Gun laws & death rates correlation
- Great delivery
- Banning guns do not prevent criminals from arming themselves

Key strength: Delivery & organization
Key opportunity: Rebuttal to refutation could be stronger

SPEAKER CODE #: _____19_____ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

- Better rebuttal and delivery.

AFF	NEG.
- Loved the Sarah Palin cross .. :)	- Lots of numbers. to support position
- "not in the near future" liked the rebuttal to that	- Good point on black market
~ Black market~	- Handled cross well.
- Great points but I think you got a little nervous on the rebuttal.	- Good point about national rights encompassing the AFF value - protection of life
- Good point of refutation about costs on the black market being a deterrent to criminals.	- Good summary of negation to close.
- Good finish!	

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Suzie Kito_

Judge's School Affiliation: _El Cerrito W_

AFF: **8**   pts **26**   Speaker Code #: ____

NEG: **19**   pts **26**

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:

Value/Criterion - welfare can be t'd by banning HG

Affirmative: → Societal Welfare

cited stats re: violent crime HG assoc'd: 32K deaths/yr.

Contention #1: Guns in the untrained are dangerous

Society cannot prosper due to concern for violence

Contention #2: even those trained in gun use can harm others.

Contention #3: ban on guns can protect society.

Value/Criterion - r → pragmatism

Negative

Contention #1 → HG ban impractical & won't prevent AR, semi-auto's could still be used to cause violence.

Contention #2 HG ban does not ↓ violence b/c people cannot protect themselves.

- Criminals will still obtain guns.
- Need, rather, to educate the public.

SPEAKER CODE #: _8_ on the _AFF_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

First Rebuttal Handled rebuttal well. (Answered rebuttals & good re-rebuttal)

Gov't can pay more attn to Black market

AFF wins because his contentions were better aligned with his value & value criterion & b/c his evidence supported those contentions.

AFF

— NEG stated that HG ban impractical - you should have argued that impracticality does not change the duty of the US Gov't to enact laws which ↑ societal welfare.

— quoted 2nd amendment + stated why it doesn't apply to contemporary HG ownership - However NEG, interestingly, never raised the 2nd amendment.

— Addressed the refutation about getting people to turn in their HG's. - "Law-abiding citizens would turn in their HG's"

NEG

— AFF actually did address contention #1

— Strong point about how difficult it would be to deal with a HG black market.

— NEG did not address why HG ban does not address violence from AR's (as you pointed out.)

Constructive Criticism

AFF work on improving organiz'n. While I appreciate the anecdotes, citations of studies tends, in general to provide more solid proof and therefore trumps anecdotes when economy of words is called for.

NEG - should have brought up the 2nd amendment -
- should have emphasized your value criterion more. The value of pragmatism may not be the most powerful frame of reference when debating issues of safety and health, rather the value of equality or justice may have been more appropriate values here.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Suzie Kito_

Judge's School Affiliation: _El Cerrito HS_

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: __20__ pts __26__		Speaker Code #: __22__ 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: Value Crit: Safety

Contention #1 US Gov must protect Life (before Liberty & Happiness)

#2 costs ↑ due to HG (Liberty & Happiness)

excellent points about health + Financial costs attrib. to HG's

rebutted the argument of safety of banning HG very effectively

Good argument about why we must uphold constitution.

Negative: Value/Crit: Security/Consequentialism

- Cleverly used the device that NEG can simply show that the banning of all HG may not be the only method safety to establish that he can win w/out disproving the AFF contentions.

- Cited John Roberts Jr.   - cited U of C re: HG preventing rapes + murders

- cited Canadian murder rate higher than US

- Value "Security is broader than safety"

SPEAKER CODE #: __22__ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION _See Over_

Did → should have related this the cost of HG violence later to safety. b/c cost is not in speech. de facto related to safety (the AFF value) - that relationship should have been argued for.

- Successfully argued against the contention that costs are high due to HG is valid - costs are not related to safety.

AFF	NEG
Failed to address the issue of homicide rate in Canada	- Addressed AFF argument that homicides are ↑ing by stating that NEG argues for closing loopholes + other ways that non-law-abiding citizens may harm others with guns.
very effective use of specific example- i.e. "2 generations of the Chicago kids, life wiped out"	- handled the AFFs issue c̄ constitution's importance well.
During last speech, AFF did a great job of tying the _financial_ cost of ~~gun~~ handgun violence to decreased safety.	- "won" the alternatives argument.

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

NEG won due to the fact that he successfully argued that there were less drastic ∨ alternative solutions ✓ to the issue which would not prevent Americans from defending themselves, and he successfully negated the AFF's rebuttals.

Danielle Kelly (*19)
Round 4B 3:30pm P2
Aff: 2 Littlesun
Neg: 8 Tang
Novice L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: ___Danielle Kelly___

Judge's School Affiliation: ___PVHS___

AFF:	NEG:
Speaker Code #: ___2 Littlesun___ pts __27__	Speaker Code #: ___8 Tang___ 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 strong points with evidence to back it.
- Spoke in a clear, strong voice with some eye contact.
- Jumped around a bit in the last rebuttal

Negative

- She brought up good points in her cross with evidence and spoke with conviction and passion.
- Could have used more eye contact with opponent/judge

SPEAKER CODE #: ___8 Tang___ on the ___NEG___ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

She made a stronger argument with facts and evidence to back it up. She was organized and thorough.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Danielle Kelly_

Judge's School Affiliation: _PVHS_

AFF:
Speaker Code #: _22 Khan_ pts _24_

NEG:
Speaker Code #: _2 Poten_ 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:

- Very soft spoken and almost seems timid with her debate.
- She had a few good solid points but lacked conviction and evidence to support it.
- I suggest speaking clear and with conviction to your side

Negative

- Very strong cross
- Spoke clearly and with conviction, backed by evidence and logic.
- She made several good points and was organized with her material.
- She did excellent with her cross.

SPEAKER CODE #: _2 Poten_ on the _NEG_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG clearly had the stronger case and had the evidence, stats and conviction to back it up.

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _Erika Pineda_

Judge's School Affiliation: _Lowell HighSchool_,

AFF:		NEG:	
Speaker Code #: _19_	pts _28_	Speaker Code #: _22_	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:
Great job! Good use of vocabulary - practice some of the infrequently used words to improve pronunciation. Argument was very well organized and thought out. Try keeping papers on the podium - it was a little distracting to have them in your hands.

Negative:
Really great - well thought out rebuttal. Your rationalizations were very clear.
Watch the use of "uh", "um" Your points are valid - you do not need the fillers.

SPEAKER CODE #: _22_ on the _Neg_ wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
This was a very close argument. Both sides did a great job presenting their argument. The negative side was able to present an effective rebuttal with appropriate rationales.