

Lucas Tung (*11)

Round 1A 9:00am R3
Aff: 16 Fang
Neg: 8 Chillappagari
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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:

- excellent fluency, but need more eye contact than just quick glances.
- too consistent pace. slow down for important stats for emphasis
- good job grilling lack of Neg evidence, but CX should be more varied than "do you have evidence for..."
- case focused more on solvency than what arguments represented. Stress mpv of life much stronger

Negative

- good energy during CX. Needs to stand still/ look forward or straight.
- can't just say "it's clear to see" as replacement for stats. Need ~~thorough~~ thorough logical analysis to make up for lack of hard evidence.
- could have pursued ~~for~~ minority oppression argument a lot stronger. Really push that Aff world represents a fundamental threat to freedom, equality, justice, etc. ...
- need more stats to support

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate.

(AFF) or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg didn't have evidence ~~more~~ for most of case, which wouldn't have been a prob if there was clear & thorough logical analysis. Impact ~~mpv~~ calc on oppression of minorities vs. arguably nonunique gun deaths would have been much stronger. Aff was a lot cleaner and more prepared & refuted the value crit really well.

Lucas Tung (*11)
Round 1B 9:00am R3
Aff: 8 Sathiya
Neg: 16 Lee
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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:

- good delivery, but too much reading tone & falls into speech pattern.
- how does "public support" relate to what the gov't "ought" to do. Explain link to res better.
- CX questions didn't really accomplish much other than establish how you could win the round rather than help you actually win.

Negative

- excellent poise and questioning process during CX.
- need to explain the link btwn handgun ban and rise in AR usage better.
- voters could have focused more on the central ideas of the round rather than just the args that opponent didn't respond to.
- arguments not very complex. Could have easily expanded to talk about what a ban represents.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg seemed much more clean and prepared. Aff very thrown off balance during first CX. Aff case mostly unrefuted & had stronger evidence

~~Datta Makkapati~~ (*8)

Round 1A 9:00am R4

Aff: 16 Huang

Neg: 20 Luo

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

Speaker Code #: AFF: 16 pts 29 Speaker Code #: NEG: 20 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

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

● **EVIDENCE:**

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

● **ORGANIZATION:**

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

● **VALUE CLASH:**

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

● **REFUTATION:**

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

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

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

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

Affirmative:

Strong case, excellent use of evidence, good invocation of the social contract.

Acritique: Aff criticized Neg's use of evidence from Britain but used evidence from Australia without making a distinction.

Negative

Strong constitutional argument, well-crafted rebuttal and use of constitution.

Good questioning of Aff. Cross.

Argued that Aff's ~~own~~ argument would not achieve stated goal of reducing violence, but did not refute empirical evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

This was a squeaker, well argued by both sides. Aff's use of multiple studies and addressing Neg's constitutional concerns, in Aff's closing, was strategic and ultimately won. Both were courteous and civil, which is important to me.

Datta Makkapati (*8)

Round 1B 9:00am R4
Aff: 11 Kona, HI
Neg: 2 Jones-Solari, LEA
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Ken Schneider

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

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

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

Affirmative:

Well stated value and well-crafted argument, with good use of evidence. Responded deftly to cross. Acknowledged that Neg's value was in alignment with Aff. Good use of metaphor and strategic mention of Brady Law in closing.

Negative

Clearly stated value, emphasized the will of the people as gov's elemental responsibility. Presented good alternative policies and excellently returned to her value as an umbrella over all others. Raised critical question of Aff's evidence but presented little counter-evidence.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Both were courteous and acknowledged the validity of the other's value. Ultimately, in a very close contest, AFF won on presentation of evidence, although NEG gets kudos for articulating the importance of the will of the people.

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 1A 9:00am S2
Aff: 1 Rothblatt-Kenney
Neg: 16 Yu
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. ALT

Judge's School Affiliation: SRUHS (23)

AFF: 1 pts 28 NEG: 16 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:

BAN private ownership 28

Affirmative: oppressed groups

- women
- mentally ill
- Racism / classism

Negative

challenge of equality - sometimes difficult to follow on cross

1) changed value to justice - banning gun ownership violates right of property

2) violates rights to self defense

watch voice volume - sometimes too loud

tone down - don't be distant

- might be better to hold script so you can use better eye contact

- effective challenge of 2 arguments of affirm

- well organized + clear req. constructive

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Neg. wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

in cross - you did not loop back (AFF or NEG)

marginized economic - tie back to ban on all guns

good challenge to neg. - answered directly + succinctly;

- strong argument on rights of majority vs. those oppressed

- challenge of statistics - effective

req rebuttal - well organized, easy to follow

Aff rebuttal well organized + easy to follow
 Opp rebuttal content of minority activities by did not counter minority

Claudia Ault (*23)

Round 1B 9:00am S2

Aff: 11 Grewal

Neg: 16 Nielsen

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: C. ALT

Judge's School Affiliation: ZB

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

This was a very close debate — Both speakers did a great job
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? *Yes*

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

Affirmative:

- 1. less guns/less deaths
- 2. use of handgun more in US
- 3. correlation between homicide/gun etc.

watch pace - especially when quoting statistics - if you're talking too fast can be harder to follow

In answers first rebuttal, argument between assault/handgun challenge was weak

don't give up your position / look at opponent during cross

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the Neg wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

at times could be louder but basically very much liked conversational tone rather than attacking with loudness - just as effective

Negative

first challenge met by aff. - you agreed & dropped - other challenges were more effective value - should be liberty/freedom above all other rights 'handgun has violated liberty -

pace good - easy to follow, good argument re: causation effective neg. cross - especially with challenge of evidence -

- good intro. in neg. rebuttal - inherently distinction between correlation & causation. - domestic violence argument effective - recognize issue but refuted answer to handgun

be careful about many sweeping generalizations in final rebuttal effective rebuttal on cause/consolation

Danielle Kelly (*19)

Round 1A 9:00am S3

Aff: 16 Hanif

Neg: 11 Gray

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Danielle Kelly

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 Hanif pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 Gray 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 eye contact and posture.
He spoke very fast and was hard to follow at times.
He had many facts to support his argument

Negative

He brought up a few very good rebuttals.
One of his key points was possibly incorrect.
His speech was clear with just some stumbling over words

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

REASON FOR DECISION

The AFF argument was stronger with facts and numbers to back him up.

Danielle Kelly (*19)
Round 1B 9:00am S3
Aff: 8 Pandey
Neg: 16 Yao
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Danielle Kelly

Judge's School Affiliation: PVHS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 8 Pandey pts 26 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 Yao 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:

- Used the word "like" a lot too much
- He had some good points but needed a stronger argument for them.
- Good eye contact and very courteous

Negative

- He asked good questions on the cross examination
- Very good points with statistics to support them.
- He effectively challenged one of the opponent's key points (Suicide by guns - could just use pills etc...)
- Strong speech, eye contact

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

REASON FOR DECISION

The NEG side had a very strong speech with valid points and statistics. He addressed his opponent's points thoroughly and well

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 1A 9:00am R7

Aff: 11 Goduco

Neg: 2 Wilson

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

Speaker Code #: ~~28~~ 11 pts 28 Speaker Code #: 2 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:

+ Strong well constructed case
 - The neg case (& on case attacks) seemed scattered but there were a lot of arguments. That being said to ensure your case is air tight you need to respond to everything
 + Great evidence, consider prepping cross x more.

Negative

+ Great cross x + use of your own case on cross application
 - you do a great job putting arguments on the flow but I would have liked you to crystalize & focus on the most important point.
 + good explanation of her evidence
 - Could have formalized the property rights arguments for more offense

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg won through effective refutation, evidence analysis & defense of status quo.

Andrew Schwartz (*18)

Round 1B 9:00am R7

Aff: 16 Park

Neg: 9 Sterling

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Andrew Schwartz

Judge's School Affiliation: Northgate

Speaker Code #: AFF: 16 pts 27 Speaker Code #: NEG: 9 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 researched case you seemed very knowledgeable on this topic
 + great job crystalizing the debate on your suicide point.
 - felt like you could have worked harder on the value & criterion
 - I also need you to take out both ~~neg~~ neg contentions because they were so heavily applied onto your case.

Negative

+ Great use of own case to cross apply for fake outs but don't rely too heavily on it.
 - if you wanna win on preservation of life you should hit the point of suicide harder.
 - Would have liked to hear the point about reducing violence more often. It fixes the suicide point.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

give you your case if her's still stands.
 + good cocaine argument
 + stress drops continually

Aff: called a crucial drop
 RFD

+ felt like you were very prepared on gun crime but less so defensive gun use & gun accidents

Sineesh Keshav (*22)

Round 1A 9:00am R6
Aff: 16 Bronshteyn
Neg: 10 Qadeer
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

AFF: 16 pts 29 Speaker Code #: 10 NEG: 10 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:

- Great point about women's rights to vote

Affirmative:

- Good point about role of govt to save lives
- For every 1 life saved, 93 lost

- Good content & numbers provided to push position (Australia) Chicago

- Too much reliance on reading from notes
- Good rebuttal points except for constitution

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

REASON FOR DECISION

- > Both are excellent speakers and drove their points effectively
- > Neg wins on a better rebuttal (narrowly)

Negative

- Great point about refuting the DC, Chicago & Australian states
- Good cross regarding guns being a deterrent
- Constitution -> great point
- Excellent cross in a very fact based and non confrontational manner
- good points made about criminals not following laws: home made switching to more deadly
- Good rebuttal with facts except women right to vote (no counter to that)

Sineesh Keshav (*22)

Round 1B 9:00am R6

Aff: 16 Massey

Neg: 8 Tallapeneri

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: SAN RAMON VALLEY

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

Best point made: Affirmative:
- Gun ownership leads to violence
- Anshaha as example
- Handled crosses well.
- Cross of Neg should've exploited over reliance on suicides vs homicides.
- Rebuttal good - refuted minority argument by focusing on self defense rebuttal good ban vs control

Best point made: Negative
- Cross relied on one subpoint - suicides and could have been more comprehensive
- Bans would oppress minorities more
- self defense
- Delivery was too fast - no eye contact at all during initial pts.
Biggest strength: organization

Biggest Opportunity: fluency - delivery Biggest Opportunity: delivery - speed
SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate.

(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Better evidence, and better refutation

Katherine Jubelirer (*12)

Round 1A 9:00am R1
Aff: 8 Voety
Neg: 16 Patel
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: K. Jubelirer

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School

Speaker Code #: AFF: 8 Voety pts 28

Speaker Code #: NEG: 16 Patel 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:

- good evidence
- ^{some} contentions are a bit of a stretch / hard to connect to resolution
- clearly
- value clash needs to be clearer
- good eye contact
- don't need of laptop; distracting
- overall, good cross ex - wait for opponent to finish speaking
- clear refutation but value seemed to trip off to ability to clearly refute

Negative

- good evidence
- clear organization / case
- good cross ex - particularly liked asking how the ~~case~~ could win debate
- clear, easy to follow value clash - well related to aff's
- good refutation, need to emphasize more clearly how his value encompassed aff
- good delivery / courtesy

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the NEG wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

Both very good, Neg ~~was~~ had a clearer case.

Katherine Jubelirer (*12)

Round 1B 9:00am R1

Aff: 11 Gerardo

Neg: 8 Yu

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: K. Jubelirer

Judge's School Affiliation: John Swett High School

Speaker Code #: AFF: 11, Gerardo pts 26

Speaker Code #: NEG: 8, Yu 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:

- clear case, good organization/evidence
- rebuttal hard to follow at times, but clearly responds to contentions
- very collegial
- value clash is clear
- uneven refutation - some clear + good, other disorganized
- ^{Aff} was a bit condescending in 1st cross + clicking pen during neg rebuttal

Negative

- great debater: clear, knows evidence inside + out; concedes appropriate pts. to aff while defending clearly
- spends very quickly, which makes it hard to remember all points
- excellent ex - excellent
- very collegial
- excellent evidence
- great deconstruction of Neg case, esp. on philosophical level

SPEAKER CODE #: 8, Yu on the NEG wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Was an excellent debater: clear, articulate, + extremely capable

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 1A 9:00am R8
Aff: 8 Redkar
Neg: 11 Monasterial
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: M. A. Qadeer
Judge's School Affiliation: Ivington High (10) Fremant

AFF: 8 Redkar Speaker Code #: _____ pts 28 NEG: 11 Monasterial Speaker Code #: _____ pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

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

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

Affirmative:

Good definitions: Firearm use vs Child in Street Cross.
Home defense vs Accidental use
Violence ↑ Cross use.
80% suicide by firearm

Cross

Negative case: See for Rt.
Respect Rights. R of art of life
Care ↑ with Gun points. of life
Should prohibit (other means)

Negative

Cross life is safety.
Guar. violent person will be
violent any ways.
Suicide other ways.
if committed.

App. 1/ ought.
2/ open ways.
3/ effect crime ↓
4/ life vs. morality
5/ can public use
6/ infer, suicide
7/ moral vs life crime can ban
8/ Rebutts are better or not?

Good Part Correlation
is not
causation
want prove
was seek
other way.

Negative Constructive
become
value.

(Mach. Rights)
Resp. Rights
do not work
want to do
only have has it
(A) Altho bail
(B) whis get
it any.

End Cont.
opponents case
achieve safety.
not valid.
inhibit
other means

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Affirm Good Case Analysis, poor speech
not very well organized.
Good Rebuttal. (last parts).
Evidence is weak
Refutation → Tex. Cellent

NEG. Great Case Analysis, Better speech
well organized.
0-10 Rebuttal.
Good Evidence
Refutation → weak

Courtesy
Better

2nd Cont. Home defense

Rebuttal
-ve

✓ right direction
✓ Merely direction.

2nd cont @: suicide ? 80% will finish → often news.
will ↓ suicide

3rd cont easy ACCen. / dangers ?

→ A. Result of death → unpredictable

effect

and Abstinence
Rebuttal

Mohammed Asif Qadeer (*10)

Round 1B 9:00am R8
Aff: 16 Su
Neg: 11 Turner
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: M. A. Qadeer

Judge's School Affiliation: Frankston High (10)
Frement.

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 SU pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 Turner 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

(See Below)

(See Below)

Aff. Const. very Good
Good evidence, too fast speeches, some
time difficult to follow & comprehend

Good Negative How. (Good Points)
It has will be helpful, finance is best,
Negative Const. Good definition, too slow
Repeating, Govt. should respect rights,
1) Right to decide life table or not we should not left.
2) Gov Control is effective. Negative Rebuttal

Crisis why
Bam is not Control;
Russia is a form of Gov Control.
Affirm Rebuttal & Gov → Crisis, who had the
Australia Gov Control.

not built a good case
not Gov control
1) Black market
2) no control & don
3) Self define.

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

REASON FOR DECISION Aff.

Case Analysis very Good
Evidence More supportive of case
organization well org argued
value clash / Refutation: 99 weight, supports
Deliver: too fast same time but understandable

neg.
ok
not supported well the arguments.
well organized
value clash / Rebut
less supportive
Deliver: Excellent.

Aff

Negative

Case Analysis ^(one +) ~~Grant~~ justice. Detailed
 number of fundamental rights
 " " " " " "
USA
 a. Homicide
 b. Accident
Australia zero - Mass shooting 1980s
 → Per Cellat

Case Good

Case Good cases
 Guns not banned controlled
 in Australia

Evidence Good
 11,000 → Homicide 12.9 ↑

Per Cellat Solid evidence
Presented

not supported by many evidence.

Organization very well organized

organized ok

Value Per Cellat

o-k

Refutation Per Cellat

o-k

Delinq / Country Good

Per Cellat

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)

Round 1A 9:00am R5

Aff: 16 Sohi

Neg: 10 Bali

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Oleg Tiktinslei

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF:

NEG:

Speaker Code #: _____ pts 28 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 points
2. need to slow down just a bit

Bit nervous, but good

Negative

incorrect point about automatic guns (ban expired in 2004) - just tyi

good linkage to 2nd amendment
bit of studez on speech
calm to the point.

16 Sohi

SPEAKER CODE #:

~~AFF~~

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

AFF - wins

REASON FOR DECISION

Oleg Tiktinslei (*20)

Round 1B 9:00am R5

Aff: 11 Cooper

Neg: 1 Mallah

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Oleg Tiktinski

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

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

1. ~~to~~ good points about saving lives
2. speaking very fast.
3. good point on NRF.

Negative

1. good question about real vs theoretical
2. ~~to~~ good expression
3. Very good speaker + 1

Mallah

SPEAKER CODE #: ~~NEG~~ on the NEG wins this debate. i.e. NEG-wins (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

in general I was impressed with both sides - very ~~to~~ good ~~&~~ debate.

Jeff Eng

Frieda Maxson (*2)

Round 2B 11:00am S3

Aff: 1 Mallah

Neg: 16 Hanif

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High School

AFF: Speaker Code #: Mallah pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: Hanif 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 presence
- + Like voice inflection when emphasis on points
- + Clean presentation style
- Need better support of cross examination

Negative

- + Strong factual/evidence based support
- + good organization of information
- + effective rebuttal of aff points
- Delivery can be ~~calmer~~ better if calm your lower body
- ~~word~~ presentation style would be cleaner if slow down and eliminate connector words like "right"

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Very Close. Both sides provided strong evidence/facts. Aff would have won debate if performance was better during rebuttals. Points on ratio through buyback program not addressed sufficiently. - when quoting - ~~the~~ try to emphasize the quote to simply your point - hard to follow

Tricia Maxson (*2)
Round 2A 11:00am S3
Aff: 9 Sterling
Neg: 16 Massey
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: JIM SUTTON
Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

AFF: Speaker Code #: 9/Sterling pts 27 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16/Massey 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: Don't read constructive speech, your CX and rebuttal should that you know topics - you need to make better eye contact during first speech. Stand up more persuasive than sitting. Very articulate, but too monotonous - need to vary speed, length of sentences, etc. Good summary of debate in rebuttal - good job telling us which points are most important.
Winning parts: How don't give people a second chance.

Negative Good conversational speaking style, but watch delivery of some words. You need to state contention and then cite to study/article; your response in your constructive speech was just why to believe. You lost all organization in rebuttal - moved around between aff and neg. Don't bring up new points in rebuttal - give industry jobs and back pound checks. Need conclusion for both of your speeches - need to sum up why you won and why you lost. What were your strongest points? You never responded to opponent that people bring you to make don't get second chance.

REASON FOR DECISION
② Use of automatic neg as in most speeches do not reason to not have hand pass. Need conclusion in both speeches.

SPEAKER CODE #: (9) on the (AFF) wins this debate. (AFF or NEG)

Changie Sun (*8)

Round 2A 11:00am R8

Aff: 10 Qadeer

Neg: 11 Kona

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Changie Sun

Judge's School Affiliation: Douglas Valley

AFF: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

CASE ANALYSIS:

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

EVIDENCE:

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

ORGANIZATION:

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

VALUE CLASH:

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

REFUTATION:

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

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

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

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

Affirmative:

Nice speech and debating.
Value is clearly emphasized on both
Constructive and rebuttal.

Negative

Constructive and rebuttal speeches are
organized very well. Good rebuttal on
both reforming self contentions and against
other side. Tone could be a little bit
more pleasant.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Both debaters did very well on speech and debating. NEG won the debate
for more effective evidence to support his contentions.

Changie Sun (*8)

Round 2B 11:00am R8

Aff: 2 Jones-Solari

Neg: 16 Su

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Changie Sun

Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty Valley

AFF: Speaker Code #: 2 pts 28.5 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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 per speech. value and contentions are constructed very well. Some of the examples in the final speech probably should be stated in first speech

Negative

effective evidence to support contention. speech is well constructed. speech sometimes is too fast without pauses.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Both side did very well on constructive speech and cross-examination. AFF restate her value and refute the argument of ~~her~~ opponent better than NEG.

Roopali Bali (*10)

Round 2A 11:00am S2
Aff: 16 Lee
Neg: 11 Gerardo
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

AFF: _____ pts 29 Speaker Code #: _____
NEG: _____ pts 28 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:
 V = Justice VC = Protecting rights, right to life
 C1 Banning HG reduce gun crime
 - correlate to gun availability
 C2 HG provide more harm than protection → 2nd Amendment → safeguard life
 "Rt to feel safe at cost of actual safety?"
 Cx why criminals not use assault weapons?

Negative
 Cx → Proof for C1 ↑
 C2 → other ways to commit suicide X
 'black market' availability X
 NC C1: Bans don't work, CDC Study
 - 'black market'
 - Mass shooting → assault weapons

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION AFF is a confident speaker. Both speakers had good fluency and eye contact. Neg failed to respond to Aff's C1 & C2. Aff was successfully able to uphold their value & VC and ~~present~~ made a good case of putting more restrictions on black market availability of handguns. Neg could've used more stats.

Roopali Bali (*10)
Round 2B 11:00am S2
Aff: 8 Chillappagari
Neg: 16 Huang
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

AFF: _____ pts 28 NEG: _____ pts 28
Speaker Code #: _____ 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:
V = Societal welfare, VC = Minors, human suffering
C1 Guns support culture of violence
- gun safety issues at home
- 4000 children died
- more handguns = more homicide
C2 → HG - causes greater risk of suicide
AR Gun buyback system.

Negative
CX - children 91% more likely to drown
- Why not take away from criminals
- low ban compliance
C1 - Ban impractical... criminals will still have it.
- blackmarket
C2 HG protect against crime.
- criminals avoid armed citizens.
- minorities & poor benefit most.
Use gunlocks.

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

REASON FOR DECISION This was a very tough decision. Both debaters did a good job of presenting their case. In the end, Neg was better able to defend their stand and also handled the CX well.

Judge 1 Logan (*11)

Round 2A 11:00am R6
Aff: 8 Yu
Neg: 16 Fang
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Delek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: 8 pts 29 Speaker Code #: 16 NEG: 16 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:

*Spoke too quickly
Excellent use of citations
The argument that gun ownership reduces global influence is weak*

Negative

*Spoke quickly but enunciated well
Made good eye contact*

Low point win intended

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Provided a prespassive argument that the impracticality of a gun ban would not reduce violence.

Judge 1 Logan (*11)

Round 2B 11:00am R6
Aff: 2 Wilson
Neg: 16 Sohi
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Derek Barnes

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF: Speaker Code #: 2 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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:

Excellent speaker
Argument in the affirmative was persuasive.
Good use of citations.
Seemed to have a good grasp of the topic. Well prepared.

Negative

Very good speaker.
Missused statistics. Gun accident rates are per person not by country.
No one is killed in US for what they say.
Tell that to MLK.

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Speaker for the affirmative made persuasive arguments that gun ownership does not reduce violence.

Suzie Kito (*9)
Round 2A 11:00am R4
Aff: 16 Yu
Neg: 8 Sathiya
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Suzie Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito HS

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 28 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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:

Value = morality = moral obligation
 Affirmative: Criterion: Utilitarianism
 Clearly laid out 3 contentions and tied them to value/criterion
 Held ground well in the face of cross exam questions.
 Slightly muddy characterization of opponents argument
 Good argument re: lack of statistical evidence for contention that gun ownership correlates

Value = Societal Welfare
 Negative: Criterion = Safety (Freedom from harm)
 Set up conditions under which he would win well-prepared ground for undermining AFF argument
 Failed to use evidence to support that handgun ban would actually ↓ suicide
 Brought up 2nd amendment to strong effect.
 Over-reached argument that handgun ban violates 1st amendment

SPEAKER CODE #: 16 on the AFF wins this debate.

REASON FOR DECISION

Gracious about interruption
Addressed each of opponents rebuttals vis-a-vis his 3 contentions

Apologized for interruption
mischaracterized opponents of ban argument re: black market. said opponent was in favor of black market guns b/c he acknowledged that OVER

black market would increase, but AFF pointed out that black market guns were not a significant fraction of total gun purchases

AFF: had better (stronger) support for his contention (more evidence)

NEG: somewhat tortuous argument re: why AFF's contention not supported,

However NEG had ^{the advantages of} a smoother presentation style which

helped his arguments come across more soundly than the empirical evidence cited would justify.

Suzie Kito (*9)
 Round 2B 11:00am R4
 Aff: 11 Turner
 Neg: 16 Park
 Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Suzie Kito

Judge's School Affiliation: El Cerrito

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 16 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: Value: Morality

Criterion: minimize suffering

Negative: Justice = Morality

Criterion: Protecting people's rights
"give each their due"

cited Dixon: 727 homicides by handgun
 + Edgar Vallet → Washngt. HG ban → suicide rate
 Contentions clear: ① murder by handgun
 ② suicide by handgun
 ③ mass murder by handgun
 ④ Down. Violence by handgun

Brought up impracticality of getting rid of
 all HG already in circula'n
 self defense: 338,000 episodes of HG
 used to self protect.

cited John R Jr. U of C
 only 1 out of 16 felons got their gun legally.

Extremely clear contentions

The AFF would not
 ↓ violence b/c of
 the guns already in
 circulation

Refuted contentions very well during
 First AR. i.e. 7% vs 70% - HG harmed in Domestic
 SPEAKER CODE #: 11 on the AFF wins this debate.
 (AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

in rebuttal - scored a great
 point about HG > 10 round capacity
 apparently acknowledged by NEG as "ban-worthy" b/c of the amount of
 people that can be killed quickly.

AFF HG used in <1% of justifiable homicides
great point that ^{violent} crime is not low now & we currently have no HG ban.

Very effective in rebutting all of the NEG contentions - i.e. NEG "failed to provide specific examples of studies showing that HG diminish violence"

NEG - Very good point that AFF mischaracterized the NEG's first argument. "i.e. the argument is that the gov't must do what is best for citizens & this incl. making reasonable/enforceable laws."
- "308,000 civilians were saved by HG"

- flawed logic of AFF's statement saying we cannot use Australia as a model but we can use Washington & Columbia

Constructive Criticism

AFF: use more neutral ~~tone~~ to describe the fallacies of your opponent's arguments

NEG: ^(cite evidence) Address ~~how~~ why suicides would not decrease if handguns were banned.

Both AFF and NEG were extremely logical and their arguments cohesive.

Iring Kizler
Round 2A 11:00am R7
Aff: 11 Monasterial
Neg: 8 Pandey
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 27 NEG: Speaker Code #: 8 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:

Negative

- Solid case
- Strong in solvency evidence in case
- Time management in AR needs work
- Did not really address enough of his case
- Framework debate is independent of topic
- Need to weigh harms/benefits
- Solvency became an issue

- CX could be more effective
- Framework debate is independent of topic
- NL is very repetitive
- Inadequate coverage of AC
- Have to actually extend your case, can't just say to
- winning FW is not a voter
- spend less time saying "he failed to respond"
- and more extending what you claim he didn't respond to

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff shows handguns cause violence/death. Aff does not show banning them would do anything about that. Neg has evidence to show that wouldn't happen so I don't have AFF solvency.

Irina Kizler

Round 2B 11:00am R7

Aff: 10 Bali

Neg: 11 Goduco

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: Jul

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

AFF: Speaker Code #: 10 pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

CASE ANALYSIS:

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

EVIDENCE:

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

ORGANIZATION:

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

VALUE CLASH:

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

REFUTATION:

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

DELIVERY/COURTESY:

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

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

Affirmative:

- Good case
- Look at judge during CX
- Very solid responses to NC
- Extend your case more effectively (like the suicide evidence w/ 5x mortality)
- Careful about new evidence in 2AR, she can't respond. Focus on bringing existing points together (weighing)

Negative

- Tore down aggression in CX when opponent isn't being unreasonable
- Need more substantial responses to internal warrants of AC
- Making a face isn't a response in CX
- I think it's weird to rely on England while trying to disqualify Australia.
- Made new responses to original argument in second rebuttal

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Aff shows how banning guns will reduce suffering. England vs. Australia is at best a wash. Self defense arguments flow AFF due to 11 country survey evidence.

Sam Karetta (*20)
Round 2A 11:00am R1
Aff: 16 Nielsen
Neg: 8 Vogety
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SAM KARETTA

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF: Speaker Code #: 16 pts 29 NEG: 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:
 excellent flow & eye contact.
 Keep up good work. Very logical and had thorough research & evidence to support your 2 contentions.
 only feedback is to watch out timing even though you have maintained well.

Negative
 Very good flow & eye contact.
 enough evidence.
 logical & reasoning is very good maintained things very well.
 one feed back, you could have paper instead of laptop. your focus was more on laptop adjustment.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: well organized, enough evidence, timely, logical analysis, good delivery and analysis

Sam Karetti (*20)

Round 2B 11:00am R1

Aff: 11 Gray

Neg: 8 Redkar

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: SAM KARETTI

Judge's School Affiliation: Quarry Lane

AFF: Speaker Code #: 11 pts 29 NEG: 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: 1-5 Rank

Affirmative:

Negative

Case Analysis: 5
Organization: 5
Value Clash: 5
Evidence: 5
Refutation: 5
Courtesy: 4

Case Analysis: 4
Organization: 5
Value Clash: 5
Evidence: 3
Refutation: 5
Courtesy: 5

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

REASON FOR DECISION: excellent debate in case analysis, refutation, good eye contact, and usage of Leptop for evidence, logical reasoning - both have done good job.

David Ralston
~~Paul Smith~~ (*1)
Round 2A 11:00am R3
Aff: 8 Tallapeneni
Neg: 16 Bronshteyn
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: David Ralston
Bishop
Judge's School Affiliation: O'dowd

AFF: 8 pts 27 Speaker Code #: 16 pts 26
NEG:

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 to slow down speaking + make points clearer. The opening was too convoluted + confusing. No eye contact. This made it hard to follow. The connections to us soft power + terrorism seemed very tenuous.

The rebuttal however was excellent; good points raised on connecting to the "ought" of debate + using opponents logic against him. Good eye contact.

SPEAKER CODE #: 8 on the AFF wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Very close debate that went back and forth. Ultimately the debate hinged on the moral issue of saving lives + doing a ban + not effectiveness which the affirmation point managed to make at the end. Both very courteous and well spoken. Good debate.

Negative

Very nice presentation logic + clear thought process. Very good presentation on questions of effectiveness + holes in opponents arguments + links to soft power etc.

Problems with not addressing the issue of alternatives / background check. Really in ~~need~~ explaining why self-defense can be compared with homicides. Didn't refute slavery example. Good ~~rebuttal~~ cross-examination skills.

David Ralston

Paul Stein (*1)

Round 2B 11:00am R3

Aff: 16 Patel

Neg: 11 Grewal

Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate

Judge's Name: David Ralston

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

Speaker Code #: AFF: 16 pts 28 Speaker Code #: NEG: 11 pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

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

Judging Criteria

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

● **CASE ANALYSIS:**

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

● **EVIDENCE:**

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

● **ORGANIZATION:**

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

● **VALUE CLASH:**

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

● **REFUTATION:**

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

● **DELIVERY/COURTESY:**

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

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

Affirmative:

Excellent opening presentation + especially clear use of evidence + citations. Very well-spoken + calm demeanor. Clear outline of contentions.

Good points on presenting case histories + understanding + rebutting points on constitution issues. Probably not good of conceding 2 points, as it weakened position.

good eye contact

Negative

response to Excellent cross-examination. However his own cross didn't make clear link of points and questions almost irrelevant.

Presentation - included a lot of points, talked almost too fast and agitated.

Again, very nice argument in addressing and framing connections w/ constitutionalism + morality + hinges argument on this. Seemed like trying to win by technicalities of opponents concessions. Didn't respond

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

REASON FOR DECISION

ultimately, I agree it comes down to interpretation of constitutionalism v. morality + the argument that assault weapons banned seemed to suggest handguns could be considered and amendments could be made if nec.

adequately to case history of ban on assault weapons.

Faisal
Hina Habib (*22)
Round 2A 11:00am R5
Aff: 16 Yao
Neg: 11 Cooper
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Faisal Habib

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High

AFF: Speaker Code #: Yao pts 29 NEG: Speaker Code #: Cooper 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:

Defined the terminologies
Criteria: Justice, Suicide rates
Will reduce homicide rate.
Well presented facts & data
Focused and clear presentation
Well present sources for citations
Well defended rebuttals
Strong cross-examination
Emphasized his values and argued well by cross-examining the opponent.

Negative

Well presented data and statistics.
- Coordinated discussions & arguments
- Organized presentation.
- Focused on values

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

REASON FOR DECISION

Yao had presented the data and was able to convince that his presented values are more affective. He was able to defend his point of views in all rebuttals.

Hina Habib (*22)
Round 2B 11:00am R5
Aff: 16 Chen
Neg: 1 Rothblatt-Kenny
Varsity L-D Debate

LINCOLN DOUGLAS Debate
Judge's Name: Faisal Habib

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista High

Speaker Code #: AFF: Chen pts _____ Speaker Code #: NEG: Rothblatt-Kenny pts _____

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:

Absent

Negative

No Show

SPEAKER CODE #: Rothblatt - Kenny on the NEG wins this debate.
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Opponent was absent.