


LD-V


Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Osman Rahimi (*G)	
Round 2		B220	Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Ryan Darling V Davis High School	<u>28</u>	Nikhil Kona Q James Logan High School	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Basis Independent/ School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A strong frame work is essential to creating an argument during a debate as the negative placed their evidence well w/ their argument to contend each of the affirmatives ideas. The use of evidence for ones own case as well as contention was strong by both parties yet affirmative did not contend a few key ideas presented by the negative, therefore lacking a rebuttal for these reasons negative vote was cast.

ASH

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Andre Jackson (*R)	
Round 2		B204	
Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Morgan Metler V Davis High School	<u>28</u>	Abhiraam Wadekar G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>26</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		C.B. / Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

DAW ASSH

Neg did not address all of the aff contentions
 Aff was better in X. Neg wasted time in X
 with questions that did not help his case.


Aff: you spoke a little fast. It would be
 easier to understand you if you slowed down 15%
 You were a little stiff. You can be a better
 listener

Neg: Great speed of delivery, at times speech not
 clear. Good body and hand use
 Nice listener.

ROGERS, NICK

Sacramento NCFL

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Nick Rogers (*G)	
Round 2		B212	
Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Abhijeet Singh Grewal James Logan High School	<u>28</u>	Rahul Bavitisetti T Granite Bay High School	<u>28.5</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative	Negative		
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The neg has conceded offensive reasons to the shift VA — criminals will choose other weapons. The responses to this argument are merely defensive. I need evidence that ~~they~~ demonstrates the opposite, the ~~was~~ notable defense and then weighing the all impacts or both.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Rajiv Saxena (*J)	
Round 2		E200	
Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Ankita Joshi T Granite Bay High School	<u>28</u>	Moksh Modi G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>25</u>
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Definitions - good
 Suicide - 2/3 gun owner
 increase risk suicide w/ guns
 in home.

B - 68% - homicides

prejudice

cribbumpers - ? - 6 yrs

5 min - 1 min. short

not so good w/ test

H

Black market - do you
 have evidence

Morality - vague concept
good

Bans in ~~Chicago~~
 only one city

2/3 suicides

Small guns
 good questions!
 contention
Hang yourself!
 If we ben guns

Banning - guns - Black market

- Theft - for criminals
 750,000 - have

- Bans have failed
 suicide
 (Jump off cliff
 pills

3.5 minutes
3.5 minutes short

too fast - Slow down

wrong - city Chicago vs
 DC

did not have good cross
 stop checking pen

~~suicide~~
 cost 1-85

Handguns vs. guns

Increase crime rate by black market

Whole thing / presentation was
 Black market 3:30 - 2:70 short

Prichard

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Andrea Fritz (*N)	
Round 2		B202	
Sat 01/23/18 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Riley Casentini P El Dorado High School	<u>28</u>	Samrit Mathur G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative	☐ Negative	 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		 School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

your case is short. You could improve your AC by adding more evidence, lines of analysis, and impacts. Most contentions are supported by only one or two pieces of evidence.

NEG

your case is long. You left only one minute to address Aff. Your NRA, PEW, + KLECK Cards are controversial as they rely on self-reported survey data. (not at all a part of my RFD)


RFD: The Affirmative evidence that 2/3 of deaths involving guns were suicides went unchallenged other than the claim that individuals would use other means, a claim that was not established with any evidence. Thus, as the affirmative stated several times, she can solve 2/3 of the deaths involved with handguns. This solvency outweighs any benefit from defensive gun use or gun safety education.

~~SIMONSON, MONICA~~

Hickey

LD-V

Sacramento NCFL

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Monica Simonson (*L)	
Round 2		B210	
		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Vibha Gurunathan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>29</u>	Taymour Siddiqui K Rio Americano High School	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Judge's Signature  Solano C.C. School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments and Reason for Decision:


Aff.

- Good, defense of Value and Criterion
- Strong refutation against the Counter arguments

Neg.

- I needed something more than you conceding to the origandist view of the Constitution. It made it difficult for you to argue one amendment is more important than the value of life.
- None theless Valiant effort.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Donna Yanos (*N)	
Round 2		B200	
		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Prachit Bhike J Mission San Jose High School		29	Taylor Turner Q James Logan High School
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u> ?		AHS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Moral
value - Out Alit.
Homicides / suicides /
accid. deaths.

Style - liked that you had good
eye contact while reading
your case. Good speaking
voice / in control.

Cross → great evidence questions

- Background checks aren't working. Suicides / homicides aren't related to checks.
- Good point! Uniquely concealable
- Most imp rt is rt to life.

Good Pt Cross.
Govt. legitimacy. Respecting Rights
- Law abiding citizens unarmed
- crim. won't follow laws
- used for self defense.
- Gun control better solution

Style - Great speaking style. Good eye
contact. Liked that you didn't
just read your case.

- Gun control respects rights
- Stricter background checks
- Evidence range was large
- Small. used in self defense (not all guns used)
- Situations aren't under control
can't be stopped.

AFF was winner because reasoning was
clear on pts presented. Esp. "most imp right
is right to life." Suicides / Homicide pt. also.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Steven Cox (*N)	
Round 2		E201	
Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Megha Kondapally G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>26</u>	Kairi Sageshima V Davis High School	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		Antelope / Parent / Professor School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value - *manly* **AFF** *E*

Slow down - you have plenty of time. it makes you stumble on your words. ~~you~~ You finished 2 min early.

More difficulties in answering while deflecting.

Prep 1:49

Ended cross :30 early.
Use your time, don't throw it away.

You are speaking too fast. Then you have to correct yourself and repeat yourself, this slows down your point while making it more difficult to pay attention to as a Judge. Also, you end up not using all your time.

Prep 2
1:10

NEG *Prep* :32

Calm, more articulate.

Great questions asked

Spoke fast, but clear and articulate.

Interesting argument -
Bans will actually negatively impact minority groups.

Excellent followup on cross arguments.

Solid examples & refutation.


Prep 2 :28

Kept debate on target.
Was able to point out when Aff drifted.

Tighter, more consistent argument.

GREAT Job !

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Bharat Bisen (*J)	
Round 2		E202	
		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Victor liu A Saratoga High School		28	Jordan Harris N Antelope HS
The winner of this debate was		Points (25-30)	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		26	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		 Judge's Signature MSS Highschool School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- Human Right, not benefit scale.
- Suicide by hand gun and is innocent.
- 10% decrease in gun ownership reduce 345 lives.
- Australia shows a significant decrease in suicide & homicide.
- 7000 guns were destroyed, saved thousands of life. Cross
- going one continents

Neg:

- Similarity between Australia / England & US is questioned.
- Gun culture can be varied.
- Other culture can be different.

neg core

- Violent individuality / Autonomy
- Social culture not to do with self defence.
- Hunting license.
- Banning takes away practice of Autonomy / culture.

Cross
impact of high
of culture than
homicide.

Aff: Showed the linkage between Australia and US and how it applies to his case.

neg was not able to show how the cultures were different

← Cross
inocuous to
show culture
other than
generalizing
is different

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Max Hagelthorn (*V)	
Round 2		B211	Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM
Affirmative Amrita Balram G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Points (25-30) <u>26.5</u>	Negative Jay Bisen J Mission San Jose High School
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		 Judge's Signature David High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision.

Aff and Neg clashed on the substitution effect, yet Aff effectively turned sub. effect and cross applied it against Neg's case. Furthermore, Aff's evidence refuted Neg's claim on how alternatives increase death rates. Therefore, due to Neg's acceptance of the criterion of util, the Aff wins.

WESMATH

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Tawab Fakhri (*G)	
Round 2		B213	
		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Siavash Yaghoobi A Saratoga High School		28.5	Angikaar Chana T Granite Bay High School
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision.

AF/speech (29) speech
- handguns banned & value criteria
human rights to N/R/W
Obs: handguns - p death
valzolo
U.S. specific high risk
230,000 deaths
gun lobby
Cont 1: suicides 6.3/1000 people
for 2013 decrease suicides
hardman 2012 Australia gun ban
Cont 2: Peters 2013 gun culture
Australia proves gun ban solves
Cont 3: gunny guns saves lives

I think the human rights criteria is inconsistent with the harms you present.
A better criteria ~~that~~ would be
Utilitarianism / Right to life is
an interesting interpretation of human rights

AF is well suited in a public policy / ~~policy~~ policy analysis program.

NEG speech (29)
Refutes Res: New Def: Private ownership
collins prefix
Ought may banned
facts & Decide value criteria
Justice John Locke
Second Amendment Keep & Bear arms
bans extreme & unconstitutional
(Does Locke's theory suit a defense of handgun rights?)
- 14th Amendment - loss of rights
Cont 3: Violation of 9th Amendment
Life vs Justice (Locke's rights)
AF has vague value criterion

Way would be well suited for political philosophy in college.

I vote affirmative because the ~~value~~ value criterion of lives is a prerequisite to other rights.
Any risk that AF plan saves lives is a reason to vote AF.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Steve Beottner (*L)	
Round 2		B206	
Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Isaiah Gerardo Q James Logan High School	<u>29</u>	Avani Reddy G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Reform H.S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff ultimately prevailed because of
a few key points

value-morality → minimize suffering

Aff successfully argued that the morality of
its argument trumps any legal or
practical arguments against it

Aff argued that rights listed in
constitution can be limited or
changed outright. The
difficulty or likelihood of getting
that done politically doesn't
change the fact that it can
be done and the moral
imperative mentioned earlier
says it should be done

Neg in essence conceded that rights can be
limited by saying accidents could be reduced by
requiring gun owner to get permits, etc

~~ASSH, DAN~~

Sacramento NCFL

Yang, Gregory

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Dan Assh (*T)	
Round 2		B201	
		Sat 01/23/16 11:15AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Shreya Kannan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>26</u>	David Yu V Davis High School	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)		<i>Dreg Yang</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		JFK School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF in citing examples of other countries that have
bans on hand guns - neg cited those countries did not ban
they restricted - ~~greater~~ greater good came from better restriction.
not ban
neg won 6 mason points
AFF only 2

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Bharat Bisen (*J)	
Round 1	Flight 1	B204	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Avani Reddy G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Negative Ryan Darling V Davis High School	
Points (25-30) <u>27</u>		Points (25-30) <u>28</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☒ Negative ☐ (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature <i>Shanthan</i> MSI Highschool School Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- Guns are unsafe for kids.
- Hurdled if childrens die with guns.
- more suicides by firearm.
- Ban is a better policy.

Neg

- Family & property is important
- What a value
- Hard gun bans increase violence
- It has no evidence guns to crime
- 2.5 mill / year guns are used for self defense.
- Ownership increases violence decreases.


- card for gun control ↑ not homicide ↓ gun.
- Increase in criminal carrying guns.
- self defense.

[Aff did not give clear evidence on how many guns increases the homicide rate. Neg was able to give few evidence & notes showing guns to homicide.]

- Banning all hand gun.
- Can you take away all guns from every home.
- Does it have logistic difficulty?
- What is the plan for law.
- Linear regression study correlates suicide to gun.
- How can you correlate decrease of hand gun to decrease of homicide?

- Case studies are focus
- Slavery was abolished & amendment changed law can be applied to gun control

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Bharat Bisen (*J)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B204	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative David Yu V Davis High School		Negative Megha Kondapally G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	
Points (25-30) <u>28</u>		Points (25-30) <u>27</u>	
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature  MSJ Highschool School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- morality
- gun control increases death rate
- gun in house is 43% the defense.
- Vancouver has low rate than Seattle.
- People in community people with guns.
- power of police decline.

Neg:

- Best defense
- Social conduct.
- Talks only about DC evidence.
- Crack epidemic was the reason for reduced violence & not gun control.
- UK & Russia does not support gun control stats, black market grown & weapon increase.
- Criminals will have gun & innocent people will not have it.
- Aff concluded that instead of self defense impacts life.
- When was Vancouver/Seattle gun law implemented & what the rate before it.
- Handguns or guns in general.
- Victim in 90% of cases was not able to protect it.
- Right to life is violated.
- Aff concluded that instead of self defense impacts life.

Chapa, M.
YANOS, DONNA

Sacramento NCFL

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Donna Yanos (*N)	
Round 1	Flight 1 B201	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30) 28 30	Negative	Points (25-30) 28 26
Angikaar Chana T Granite Bay High School		Vibha Gurunathan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<i>Mucana Chapa</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: great organization & case set up.

Rfd: Aff upheld the value and linked to crit.

Opp: I suggest you provide a roadmap to your speech but the substance was there I just got a little lost

Aff: great first rebuttal & value analysis

Opp: great roadmap! clear and much easier to follow

Aff: watch your speed!

This was a great debate! you are both very skilled debaters! Good Luck!

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Donna Yanos (*N)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B201	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>28</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>27</u>
Taylor Turner Q James Logan High School		Amrita Balram G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<i>Micaela Chapa</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

kfd:
Aff upheld value best
when both ground was
lost.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Julia Li (*V)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B206	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Samrit Mathur G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Negative Siavash Yaghoobi A Saratoga High School	
Points (25-30) <u>28</u>		Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation DSH	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg more effectively Refused Aff Contention about suicidal Rate
 decrease, ~~and did not~~ effectively Refused Aff Contention about
~~women~~ protecting woman issue, Neg also did better
 job in his own contention about protecting minority
 for Black as same as protecting woman. And ~~was~~ Also, won
 the point on gun licensing.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Julia Li (*V)	
Round 1	Flight 1	B206	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Nikhil Kona Q James Logan High School		Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	Negative Prachit Bhike J Mission San Jose High School
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation <u>DSH</u>	
Is this a low point win? <u>No.</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both side making very good Argument. ~~did~~ brought many evidence and study
 I vote for Neg win because Neg did better Job
 in cross exam. and Also, Neg did better job in Rebuttal
 to defense his points and Also, attack ~~oppon~~ Aff's each
 contention. Neg had better time arrange and pace than
 Aff. ~~idea needed~~ Aff. (Aff. run out of time ~~at~~ at end
 of each speech.)

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Mr/s Raymond (*L)	
Round 1	Flight 1	B202	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Rahul Bavitisetti T Granite Bay High School		Negative Isaiah Gerardo Q James Logan High School	
Points (25-30) <u>27.5</u>		Points (25-30) <u>27</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Ash M Rayd Judge's Signature Rosemont School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Good Clash

Does Domestic Violence
+ suicide =
more % than
criminal homicides
in a given year?

1) IT would have
helped to hear a
stat about # of
suicides (vs) homicides
- you indicate opponent
did not provide this #

% Increase of black market
cannot be predicted - but it would go ↑

IF someone wants
to kill self, they
will find another way.

neg:
needed more
stats in United
States

gun control (vs) gun ban
Study

Missouri dropped
Black market Study
in US?

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Mr/s Raymond (*L)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B202	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Moksh Modi G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Negative Abhijeet Singh Grewal Q James Logan High School	
Points (25-30) <u>25</u>		Points (25-30) <u>28</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 Judge's Signature Rosemont School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Short on time -
elaborate on morality


- Work on more
Constructive Cross X
questions

- moral obligation
- gov. obligation to
carry out constitution
Bill of Rights

- Value Criteria

- overwhelming arguments
NOT defended by AFF

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Hassan Yaghoobi (*A)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B210	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Taymour Siddiqui K Rio Americano High School		26.5	Shreya Kannan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☒ Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 Judge's Signature Saratoga School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Although AFF had very good & unique cases, but NEG was more successful in doing realtive rebuttal & also more in depth analysis of current gun laws. Example: Australia.
- Comment for NEG:
 - Need to respect the opponent & wait for response to Q's asked during ~~the~~ cross EX. Also need to hear the Q before answering; Cannot answer Q's that are not asked yet!
- Comment for AFF.
 - Very strong & unique data re Vancouver vs. Seattle and also double suicide rate in CA.
 - Very good understanding of LD basics based on values not policies. Should build based on that.
 - Try to better address & refute contentions. Can do more preparation in advance.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Hassan Yaghoobi (*A)	
Round 1	Flight 1	B210	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Jay Bisen Mission San Jose High School		Points (25-30) <u>27.5</u>	Negative Morgan Metler V Davis High School
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature Saratoga School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This was a close debate competition. Both debaters did a good job of offering initial arguments.

Reason for Decision:

- ~~NEG~~ Although the AFF offered a more comprehensive & structured initial argument but NEG offered a more in depth argument supported by statistical data and slightly stronger real time rebuttal during the debate. Examples are ¹⁾ not sufficient statistics but more of projections. ²⁾ Effectively explaining the Australia legislation.

Other Comments

- AFF successfully argued against the jump in homicide in England 1997-2002 ^{by questioning} ~~that~~ NEG about long term impact that was expected to decrease homicide. But AFF failed to build based on that effectively.

Delgado, B
ASSH, DAN

Sacramento NCFL

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Dan Assh (*T)	
Round 1	Flight 1 B200	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>29.4</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>29.1</u>
Kairi Sageshima V Davis High School		Victor Liu A Saratoga High School	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature <i>[Signature]</i> CSUS / Alumni / Govt clerk School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

By the end of the debate I am left to weigh the Impact of Dehum, In round ethics, and death camps against suicides, accidental deaths, + utilitar minimize suffering. The aff does a good job defeating the second link of state action to the critique, and the neg doesn't go for it. However the first link of commodifying life isn't well enough answered by the aff. ultimately I think the K links to the aff. The 4 answers aren't entirely no link ans's enough.

Aff

Great debate!

Neg

- Good speaking
- Needs better answers in not commodifying life
- Too large of a risk of using suffering to guide what we do seems to be why the K links.


- Explain the internal link to your death camp impact
- Argue the Alternative more as to why it's preferred

~~F, TAWAB~~

Sacramento NCFL

MUNOZ M

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Tawab F (*G)	
Round 1	Flight 1 B211	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>26</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>26</u>
Jordan Harris N Antelope HS		Ankita Joshi T Granite Bay High School	
N702		T718	
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		University of the Pacific School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I voted on the team who best upheld their value through their argumentation & evidence. It's hard for me to vote neg for justice when the evidence you read is not all inclusive of the minority/majority of ppl. Your opponent pointed out not everyone has access to your phone survey. Your evidence needs to be more inclusive, also the argument about feasibility should be framed differently if you're arguing the NRA won't let this happen that arg. seems like fear rhetoric as to why the plan wouldn't work, it kind of goes against the value of justice which shouldn't be scared away by the NRA. The aff could do a better job of using your value (util) through your args to show how your opponents value only is beneficial or aware of certain pops & not the bigger picture. Your alt causes arg to Brazil/australia was good. Use your IAC more to refute the negs arg.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Dan Assh (*T)	
Round 1	Flight 2	B200	Sat 01/23/16 08:00AM
Affirmative Abhiraam Wadekar G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Points (25-30) <u>29.5</u>	Negative Riley Casentini P El Dorado High School Points (25-30) <u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		Judge's Signature CSUS / Alumni / Gort clerk School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff answers the 3 contentions good enough That there isn't much offense left for the Neg. Supreme court for years has ruled that indiv don't have handguns so cont 1 is non viable. Cont 2 feasibility isn't answered + obamg orderins isn't good enough cont 3 the Self defense stats argued by Aff is too damaging. ultimately I ~~am~~ am left with the aff + it's fwik. I vote Aff

Aff

- Good covering 3 cont
- wrapped your Aff into the cont
-

Neg

- The Koreq statistic became an absence of evidence fallacy. As in because there wasn't evid to prove something it wouldn't be true. which I cant evaluate
- Doesn't answer SMT guns feasibility
- Freedom values not Arto enough

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Julia Li (*V)	
Round 3		B206	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Shreya Kannan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		26	Ankita Joshi T Granite Bay High School
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? NO		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

firearm shot stock
 ought - moral obligation ??
 justice -
 util - weighs unbiasedly
 pain is universal value lives
 1) Ban is key to util
 1) Murder + if ban
 2) Violation of Victim Rights
 3) 39 p. 1000
 2nd amendments right
 Harm policy made hamper
 2) Self defense - US - 80% imitation
 3) Hand guns kill trading gunfire
 1) Limited access
 4.8x likely to have suicide than homicide
 3) Hand gun ownership will
 ↓ crime, only second
 in 1/6 of time
 Observation only
 not available in status
 quo
 They are
 in the status quo
 1 out of 100
 affectively

agree 2 definitions
 saying it is similar is similar
 justice is not agreeing
 natural rights - life, liberty, property
 1) Hand guns are effective
 2.5 million x yearly 1% 1-100 ev. done
 Since 1993 ↓ 30% does help
 decreased in gun violence
 2) Visibility
 1) Economy - provides jobs
 37,000 new jobs
 ↓ 5 Billion Taxes (Federal)
 B) NRA
 1. Good at making the system
 difficult to pass
 TO vague what is moral is open to
 interpretation
 reduce hand gun violence
 accessibility trigger lock
 Biometric Ident. fire.
 Austria banned guns
 suicide rate still went
 gun by back must have been
 back or not the
 suicide rate still went ↑

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Hassan Yaghoobi (*A)	
Round 3		B220	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Nikhil Kona Q James Logan High School	28.7	Angikaar Chana T Granite Bay High School	28.5
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Saratoga HS School / Affiliation Occupation	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Both teams offered very structured & organized arguments. They were very polite & Professional.

- Although the NEG team offered a structured argument based on Constitution, but the AFF team was able to effectively argue that the Constitution is amendable as a result, can not equate what is in Constitution today as the "absolute" & "ideal" right as it may change in the future. Example: Constitutionality of slavery that changed. AFF also mentioned that we can still preserve right to have arm w/o handguns. NEG also could have refuted the UK, Columbia... were effectively only mentioned DC.

Other Comments

~~NEG~~ AFF example of nuclear bomb use against people not a good example as nuc. likes all gov is non-gov. NEG could have used this.
 Thank you both! I enjoyed the debate!

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Cody Peterson	
Round 3		E200	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>28</u>
Isaiah Gerardo Q James Logan High School		Megha Kondapally G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature MJC School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? ☒			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

IAC - Speak a little faster so that you can get through all of your cards, or cut the length of the cards.

ZAC - Again with the speed. You argued very well, but you didn't get through all of the arguments. Not all debaters are fast, you just have to learn how to make short, smart arguments.

IAR - Really Push that you are right, especially with criterion

voted Neg. ~~That~~^{She} won the ~~debate~~ criterion argument, ~~which is~~ which made her points more valid

* Ignore color differences; it's just whichever Pen I had in my hand

Neg


- Good Job at controlling cross-ex
- very confident

INC - Great Job arguing all of his points, try to make your sign posting a little more clear.

INR - Made it through all the arguments and had good impact calc.

The
stabilizing
over
wards
lowered
your
score

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Monica Simonson (*L)	
Round 3		B202	Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>20</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>25</u>
Morgan Metler V Davis High School		Rahul Bavitisetti T Granite Bay High School	
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative	Negative	 Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation	
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Metler: ~~argue~~ mentions neg's arguments are flawed citing neg
 # mentions general, blanket evidence, but doesn't
 go into detail on how & pleads to "not buy" the
 argument

Bavitisetti: does a great job during cross ex to
 explain / clarify the evidence, research &
 stats presented

JACKSON, ANDRE

LD-V

Sacramento NCFL

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Andre Jackson (*R)	
Round 3		B213	Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM
Affirmative Y1701 Jordan Harris N Antelope HS	Points (25-30) <u>27</u>	Neg Amrita Balram G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	Points (25-30) <u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>High</u> <u>No</u>		 Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


(6 mins)

3:20 Start

- ① (over gun right)
- (not to much
- ② ② proof) when she ask (none)
- ③ no proof when she ask
- ④

- ① she is tough she ask
- ② and she get no answer
- ③ 5min of strong conversation
- ④ Great Job

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Joshua Rayburn	
Round 3		E201	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Jay Bisen J Mission San Jose High School	<u>28</u>	Samrit Mathur G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature <u>Hired</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC good pacing, though contention 3 is just kind of blipped out there, give more backing to it.

INC good poise + presence, odd structure w/ your counter plan though; quoting solvency from the NRA seems self-serving.
Should more clearly engage in the value/criteria debate, you leave too much wiggle room for the aff.


2AC good extensions, don't just let the neg get away w/ vague or unquantifiable values + criteria; take a stand and tell the critic to reject vague criteria because it's bad for debate and invites judge intervention.
Why not perm? You can receive training on something illegal (think school ed on drugs). It's squirly but Neg doesn't do any work on the type of training or why it's mutually exclusive.

INR be careful not to try and shadow cover issues you dropped in the INC. Should weigh out arguments through value + criteria more in a rebuttal, especially for rights.
Also, anecdotal evidence is not a good thing to use (quotes from gun control training).

IAR you do some work on value + criteria but try to make it more clear. Good job having voters.

RFD Vote Aff on dropped contentions on suicide and accidents; loss of rights is not effectively quantified, leveraged, or weighed enough to beat those drops.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Tawab Fakhri (*G,H)	
Round 3		B200	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Prachit Bhike J Mission San Jose High School	<u>30</u>	Siavash Yaghoobi A Saratoga High School	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative	Negative	 Judge's Signature G.B. - Engineer School / Affiliation / Occupation	
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Dan Assh

Aff did not shoot down the smart gun contention #3 of your opponent. Everything else was close

Aff: Best speaker I have seen. Spoke clearly but I questioned your facts.

Neg you spoke way too fast. Slow down you had great arguments. You should have gone farther with your smart gun argument and used it for content 1 & 2. And against the aff contention 1, 2 and 3

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Brandon Garcia (*W,F)	
Round 3		B210	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Riley Casentini P El Dorado High School		28.4	Vibha Gurunathan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley
The winner of this debate was		Points (25-30)	
Affirmative Negative		28.5	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		SUDL Cordova	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Private-collins
- individualism

Handgun-small

ought-moral

ban-ownership

Social Harm

violence

Adv-1 in suicide
WP14 XS

Handgun → 1 death
ABC News

Nature more death
WP15

Adv3- guns-26
non violence

lots of 8
Safe voices.org

Hopkins

ban not knowing

QFD - Equalizing the playing field is a dropped DA the
AFF gets to late in the debate. Education mitigates
part of the case and the empirics supporting the case
are better extended than the affs answers.

Education
doesn't
always work

guns ↑ the
risk 2/3 of
debate

if they both
have a gun

criminal/man
more likely

less concerned
with gun

still have
guns


x5

2/3 of all
guns

no ev

ni5


LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Melissa Munoz	
Round 3		E202	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative Moksh Modi G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Negative Ryan Darling V Davis High School	
Points (25-30) <u>27</u>		Points (25-30) <u>27.5</u>	
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature UNIV. of the Pacific School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>Y</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I'm voting neg to reduce the amount of suicides & homicides happening now. I like your arg. that ~~the~~ taking handguns away makes it easier for someone to calm down. Think you could go farther with this ~~as~~ as an incentive towards people seeking help for mental illness instead of being able to end it in a second b/c they own a gun. IN MY OPINION ~~this~~ this best upholds the value 2 the life & the quality of life. I don't think the neg upholds the criteria of justice if you want to say the 2.5 million cases of self defense are more important than saving the lives of those w/ mental illness. also it's likely that 2.5 million cases wouldn't have needed to occur in the first place if handguns weren't available. Since this is LD the neg should focus less on the solvency & implementation of the plan & more on the values of each side of the resolution.

LD-V X

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Donna Yanos (*N)	
Round 3		B204	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Taymour Siddiqui K Rio Americano High School		29	Points (25-30)
			29.5
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative <u>Negative</u>		 Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		AHS.	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Value → safety, sacrifice rights.
 Saving lives. → suicides
 — reduction of homicides. 20x ↑
 in US than other countries.
 — Gun controls or ban?
 — limits on 2nd amendment.
 * Life before rts, saving lives is justice.
 — some rts can be curtailed to save
 lives. Causation/Correlation.

Style: confident, well spoken.
 Defend your evidence more.

Evidence → Some evidence
 disputed by Neg because not
 written/included.

* No right is unlimited.

Value → justice. Constitutionality
 "Ind. Right". Case based on
 precedents.

— self defense
 — justice → more than safety
 — Constitution decides what is
 just.

* overwhelming evidence of cities who
 have gun controls/bans don't have
 lower crim./homicide rates.

Style: Very confident, well
 rehearsed. Brought lots of
 evidence

Difficult decision, both had compelling evidence.
 The Neg. in my opinion had overwhelming Constt.
 Precedents and won the debate. Also fact that
 Self defense was a justifiable right of being safe.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Andrea Fritz (*N)	
Round 3		B211	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative Kairi Sageshima V Davis High School		Negative Taylor Turner Q James Logan High School	
Points (25-30) <u>28</u>		Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner)		206 44* Andrew Fritz Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1- handguns cause more damage than their worth

↳ crime

86% involve handgun

↳ suicide

* impractical for self-defense

* handgun bans

Black market → vs. Buy back

→ No one willingly kills people w/ cars?

→ No one will blackmarket guns

Contention 3

minimize suffering

↳ handguns concealed for criminals
"Good job"

① Banning guns is
"sitting ducks"

② Handguns - self defense

③ Gun control instead of ban

accidents will still happen because of black market

- Prop suicide - other means

accessability vs. concealability.

- Did not do well w/ finding material

Suicide - other means

CLETS → will show other evidence

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Rajiv Saxena (*J)	
Round 3		B201	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Abhiraam Wadekar G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	27	Abhijeet Singh Grewal Q James Logan High School	28
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		MSJ Fremont School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pro/Aff proposed that multiple contentions including stats supporting that children are harmed and the issue of morality.



Neg countered by bringing to light the fact that Supreme Court in its most recent decision had declared the ban on handguns unconstitutional. Neg also proposed several methods and ways to address the issue at hand such as buy back programs. As a result, I awarded the win to NEG for presenting a more forceful case.

WONG, LISA

Wissnauth A

Sacramento NCFL


LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Lisa Wong (*T)	
Round 3		B212	
		Sat 01/23/16 02:30PM	
Affirmative David Yu V Davis High School		Negative Victor Liu A Saratoga High School	
Points (25-30) <u>26.5</u>		Points (25-30) <u>27</u>	
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>		 School, State, Team, Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative doesn't demonstrate a specific link to the affirmative plan or value criterion, so I reject the K and endorse the affirmative based on the value criterion that inequality is the most important issue/value in the round. Had the negative articulated a clearer scenario or theory of state action as emblem of genocidal violence I would have voted otherwise.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Max Hagelthorn (*V)	
Round 4		B210	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative Victor Iiu A Saratoga High School		Negative Nikhil Kona Q James Logan High School	
Points (25-30) <u>25</u>		Points (25-30) <u>24/30</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		 Judge's Signature Davis High School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ultimately, the neg was able to turn aff's evidence and cross-apply it against aff's the first and second contention. Furthermore, the neg's attacks on aff's impact meant that ^{neg} ~~aff~~ better solved for util (both aff and neg's criterion) so neg won today's debate

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Haley Smith	
Round 4		E201	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Angikaar Chana T Granite Bay High School	<u>30</u>	Isaiah Gerardo Q James Logan High School	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<i>Haley Smith</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On the utilitarian debate, I think the neg wins in this case. It seems ^{more} clear to me that from the negs arguments than the affs about who is going to save more lives. The neg also wins the card debate because the AFFs card ^{more} mentions firearms and guns in general than actual handguns. On that card it seems like the hand gun piece is almost an afterthought. There were two main places that I voted in this debate. First the neg does a pretty good job of hitting the line by line and addresses all of the AFF's arguments, although I would like to see them articulated a bit more thoroughly. The AFF mainly focuses on defending their cards and not so much the rest. The issue of people getting other types of guns after ~~firearms~~ ^{handguns} are banned goes pretty much uncontested by the AFF, and I mainly voted on that last point.

Gugino
~~ROGERS, NICK~~

Sacramento NCFL


LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Nick Rogers (*G)	
Round 4	B213	Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30) <u>28.8</u>	Negative	Points (25-30) <u>28.1</u>
Megha Kondapally G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Riley Casentini P El Dorado High School	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>Yes</u>		Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation <u>Ch McElatchy</u>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Prep A | N
4 4
-2 -1:05
2 2:55

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Michelle Wu (*J)	
Round 4		B202	
		Sat 01/23/18 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Shreya Kannan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>28</u>	Jordan Harris N Antelope HS	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AF - homicide / suicide /

Why only handgun, you can explain this point, so your opponent won't get chance to argue, you don't ~~can~~ without handgun,


~~Ng~~ ~~individualism, culture, that~~ people can still

do the crimes & killings. Even though, you

claim you have evidence, but they are not strong enough to support your statements.

Ng. You have statement about your neg/one pretty clear, and your analysis one ~~reasonable~~, but your you can ~~point out~~ have a few evidence to support your arguments. would be great.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		August Wissmath (*D,F,L)	
Round 4		B211	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative Samrit Mathur G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Points (25-30) <u>27</u>	Negative Taymour Siddiqui K Rio American High School
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 	
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision.

I vote aff because there's
 a clear risk of aff solvency
 and because the value criterion
 of life became the ~~prereq~~
 prerequisite to rights.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Vandana Lal (*T)	
Round 4		B206	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Abhijeet Singh Grewal Q James Logan High School	<u>29</u>	Vibha Gurunathan G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		Vandana Lal Judge's Signature LBHS	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. The value criterion is maximizing lives. Aft proved that banning guns would maximize lives.

Neg did not use credible evidence to refute Affirm's contention that less hand guns would lead to less homicides. Further, Neg showed correlation & not causation for Aft's contention (6). Neg could not adequately refute the last 2 contentions stated by Aft.

Aft very effectively using evidence from meta studies disproved Neg's contentions.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Kendall Mead	
Round 4		E202	Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Ryan Darling V Davis High School		29.5	Abhiraam Wadekar G Basis Independent Silicon Valley
The winner of this debate was		Kendall V Mead Judge's Signature MJC School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative Negative			
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? yes			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative: • pull arguments across. • you contradict yourself.

1. Have a source handy for definition otherwise it's not credible.
2. Don't ask same questions over again. I was confused by some questions (phrase better).
3. Be more organized when prepping, try to get thoughts in order quicker.
4. Don't spend so much arguing evidence, it's important but make actual arguments too.
5. I like the ownership is different than possession argument.

Negative: • don't say um so much. ~~don't say~~

1. Don't spend so much time on your own contentions. Make more arguments on Aff.
2. Don't talk around circles, sum it up faster. Especially in cross-ex. Answers were confusing.
3. Thank you for extending dropped arguments.

FAKHRI, TAWAB

Sacramento NCFL

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Tawab Fakhri (*G,H)	
Round 4		B200	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Ankita Joshi T Granite Bay High School	<u>24</u>	Morgan Metler V Davis High School	<u>30</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		<u>BASIS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff conceded the Round.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Brandon Garcia (*W,F)	
Round 4		B201	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative		Points (25-30)	Negative
Amrita Balram G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		28.8	Prachit Bhike J Mission San Jose High School
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative Negative		SUDL-Cordova	
(Circle Winner)		School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____			

Comments & Reason for Decision.

Legal
handgun = single gun
ought = moral
ban = prohibit
Moral
Util
Gov actors
trade off w/ ind
Util only for
policy
w/holder
Ban violence
w/holding
Possession of handgun
Dillon
Handguns cited to
criminals
Gun violence bad for kids
Society

Handguns must
Lethal
- correlation
effects of
vz
who saves
most life
- concealable
more people
die
Non UCC
Gun bans
no need
Aff says
moral obligation
Society
you don't know
Society

RFD - Affs no
doesn't guarantee
Neg makes
XTOW under Util
Farming and enough
of the means
the things/s are
not beneficial
in relation to
the aff

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Dan Assh (*T)	
Round 4		B220	
Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Moksh Modi G Basis Independent Silicon Valley	<u>25</u>	Jay Bisen J Mission San Jose High School	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative Negative		<i>Daniel Assh</i>	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		<i>Granite Bay.</i>	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Nice speed of delivery
Needs to be louder.
I missed some points
Take a pause between points

Great speaker.
Slow down by 10%
Take a short pause
between points

More research is needed on both sides. Neg was able to defend his points. Aff was shaky on evident and fact, eg 5-10 lbs hand gun. Neither knew how the black market would procure guns
Neg won both X

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Debbi Juarros (*N)	
Round 4		B212	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative Avani Reddy G Basis Independent Silicon Valley		Points (25-30) <u>29</u>	Negative Kairi Sageshima V Davis High School
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		Debbi Juarros Judge's Signature Antelope HS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Avani Reddy:

- good voice and pacing
- good sense of evidence / information
- You really need to show exactly how gun ban policy will be enforced - especially when you are questioned about the "how" of it all.

Kairi Sageshima:

- good point during cross - method of enforcing policy
- excellent voice
- good logic / thinking
- liked the way you made connections
- obviously was extremely familiar w/material

Decision:

This was a very good debate with great thinking, reasoning, and making connections. In a close decision, I am giving the win to the negative, mostly because the affirmative could not explain how a change in policy would actually / physically remove guns from private ownership. The negative did a better job of hitting all the evidence and issue with great explanations and showing connections.

Both sides were respectful and extremely professional. So nice to see and hear.

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Bharat Bisen (*J)	
Round 4		E200	
Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM			
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Rahul Bavitisetti T Granite Bay High School	<u>27</u>	Taylor Turner Q James Logan High School	<u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative	Negative		
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		 Judge's Signature MSJ High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- Justice, saving life.
- Suicide: ~~90%~~ more people kill tough gun.
85% of fire arm end in death.
- Domestic violence - 54% of victim killed by gun
- Confiscation law reduced 8% reduction in domestic violence.
- 15-4% reduction \$16.1% in missouri when asked for license/permit

neg

- Govt. rights of people.
- C1: citizens are sitting ducks. when not allowed to carry again
- C2: self defense.
- Violating rights
- Australian drops with gun control.

- How many % domestic violence to gun.

- 2/3 of suicide death are using gun.
more than homicide
- 83 women died due to gun compared to 1 for self defense
- Black market does not exist in gun ban

- Gun will be in black market
- Suicide will get saved from black market
- difference between Handgun & Firearm
- Domestic violence
- physical/verbal domestic violence
- gun violence not

LD-V

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Nathan Leal (*G,J,Q)	
Round 4		B204	
		Sat 01/23/16 05:45PM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
Siavash Yaghoobi A Saratoga High School	<u>29</u>	David Yu V Davis High School	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
<u>Affirmative</u> Negative		Nathan Leal	
(Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		Samir BASIS	
		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The negative did not provide enough link against the AC. The main issue was that the negative was not able to quantify life impacts over the Aff. The negative responds at the top of the Aff case but doesn't provide numbers of mental health checks and their effectiveness and that link to decreasing potential suicide. I dug into Aff impacts on suicide. There is also the self defense arguments that is added on to the later part of the first contention but as the Aff pointed out, the lethal cord of 2.5 mil is proven to be 1. poor data and 2. Doesn't explain how many people deter violent crime. Aff also extends gen advance Basis.

LD-V

FLIP: A727 Siavash Yaghoobi v. T717 Rahul Bavitisetti

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Hagathon, Max</u>
Quarter-Finals		B101 Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative <u>Siavash Yaghoobi A727</u>	Points (25-30) <u>27.5</u>	Negative <u>Rahul Bavitisetti T717</u>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>none</u> Judge's Signature <u>Davis High</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg refuted the Australia and England evidence, and successfully proved with the Ireland evidence that ~~MRA/IRA~~ ^{MRA/IRA} was a major factor. With that, we can see Ireland's homicide increase so Aff lost lives there as well. Also, neg refuted Aff's suicide evidence by showing correlation, not causation, of the loss of Aff lost lives there. With neg having a net benefit of more lives, Neg won today's debate.

LD-V

FLIP: A727 Siavash Yaghoobi v. T717 Rahul Bavitisetti

Subodh B.

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: Wong, Lisa C. J.	
Quarter-Finals		B101	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative <u>Yaghoobi</u> Points (25-30) <u>28.5</u>	Negative <u>Bavasetti</u> Points (25-30) <u>29.5</u>	The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>No.</u>	
		 Judge's Signature Mission San Jose, Fremont School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg's cross examination was to the point and laying groundwork for his refutations.

Aff missed a couple of points from Neg's argument, leaving his case a bit weak.

LD-V

FLIP: A727 Siavash Yaghoobi v. T717 Rahul Bavitisetti

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Rapp, Claire</u>	
Quarter-Finals		B101	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
<u>A727 Yaghoobi</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>T717 Bavitisetti</u>	<u>27</u>
The winner of this debate was			
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Davis</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg based case on international evidence but said the same case studies were irrelevant for Aff. Argued %, but not overall increase. National statistics were less impactful than Aff national statistics. Should have pushed organized crime point more.

Aff should've called out Neg's moving target.

Should've pressed NRA = special interest % ≠ culture.

Be more confident in xc.

LD-V

FLIP: J724 Prachit Bhike v. V714 David Yu


Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Tran</u>	
Quarter-Finals		B104	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative Points (25-30) <u>J724 Prachit Bhike 30</u>		Negative Points (25-30) <u>V714 David Yu 27</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Victoria Tran</u> Judge's Signature BASIS Independent School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- though neg stated during cross ex, "handguns don't have impact on access", aff stated that they do bc increase in prices in Black market
- no actual evidence that Australian buy back program would work
 ↳ mass shooting scared Australian citizens. In the US, were desensitized to mass shootings
- no actual evidence that ~~there~~ a civil war would break out
- neg: should've talked about how DCE Chicago are diverse, talk about crime rates to strengthen your evidence since it's less than 50 states

LD-V

FLIP: J724 Prachit Bhike v. V714 David Yu

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Tawad</u>	
Quarter-Finals		B104	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
<u>Prachit Bhike</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>DAVID YU</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative	<u>Negative</u>	 Judge's Signature <u>BASIS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF & Neg Both ~~argued~~ agreed of framework and presented arguments well. However Neg successfully countered all of the affirmatives contentions, proved a better alternative and backed with evidence

LD-V

FLIP: J724 Prachit Bhike v. V714 David Yu

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Jan, 2</u>	
Quarter-Finals		B104	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative <u>Prachit Bhike</u>	Points (25-30)	Negative <u>David Yu</u>	Points (25-30)
The winner of this debate was Affirmative ☐ Negative ☒ (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Janeen Jan</u> Judge's Signature <u>Graeme Bay.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirm: Contentions are good and have answered neg's questions. The point that if people are going to resist or back lash then why would they give up guns voluntarily is good. Have answered all contentions. But ~~was not~~ did not answer effectively why did not work in Chicago or Washington.

Neg: Contentions are good. Too much emphasis on Australian evidence. Answered all affirm's questions by the end. Reaffirmed his neg points as well as answered affirm's contentions.

LD-V

FLIP: Q720 Nikhil Kona v. V712 Morgan Metler

Lincoln Douglas Varsity	Judge: Yu, A.	
Quarter-Finals	B105	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Metler Affirmative Proctor 29 29	Points (25-30)	Kona Negative Dada 27 27
The winner of this debate was ☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____	aingyn Judge's Signature Granite Professor. Bay School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both did a great job to present their points supporting evidence. Using many statistics.

Though speaking fast, both did well in terms of clarity.
 both showed good eye contacts.
 Excellent legics.
 & trying to attack the opponents.

The Neg:

I very much like his way to have a short summary @ each session. Great job!

The Aff:

I vote for AFF because she did better job to emphasize the value — saving lives & solving the problem.
 I am also more convinced by the statistics she presented.
 & her argument.

LD-V

FLIP: Q720 Nikhil Kona v. V712 Morgan Metler

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: <u>Wong, Lisa</u>	
Quarter-Finals		B105	Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM
Affirmative <u>Morgan Metler</u> Points (25-30)	Negative <u>Nikhil Kona</u> Points (25-30)		
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Lisa Wong</u> Judge's Signature <u>Grimto Bay</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had more compelling evidence, strong rebuttal and good crossfire. More compelling outcome.
 Both presenters were excellent. Good debate

N

off - Nicely presented, clear case.

Neg. - strong case and excellent cross-x. good rebuttal

~~ea~~
 Pushy - always trying to take more time

6
3
7
3
4
6
3

LD-V

FLIP: Q720 Nikhil Kona v. V712 Morgan Metler

Lincoln Douglas Varsity		Judge: Roger Helman A.	
Quarter-Finals		B105	
		Sun 01/24/16 09:30AM	
Affirmative	Points (25-30)	Negative	Points (25-30)
V712 Metler	29	Q720 Kona	28.5
The winner of this debate was			
<u>Affirmative</u> Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		<i>Alisha Hi</i> Judge's Signature Attorney School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

- ban private ownership of hand guns (revolvers + pistols)
- morality - uphold safest & moral decision
- minimizing suffering - least harm

Moral obligation to remove

- resp. for ~~crime~~ crime
- good use of statistics
- people hurt by gun
- criminals use handguns b/c they can be hid
- minorities disp. effected
- law abiding cit shouldn't have guns, provocation

Banning handguns lowers overall harm

- most people get harmed when using for self defense & are not using for self defense
- showing it has worked and there is not a black market boom
- how to determine who is criminal and who is not
- half of homicides are handguns
- 99.2% of times self defense does not work
- evidence over theoretical evidence

Neg

- agree w/ definitions
- Minimize suffering
 - 1.9 million
 - handguns are most effective way to protect
 - more illegally held guns
 - illegitimate manufacturers would spring up
 - self defense
 - good use of examples from other countries
- do not know total homicides
- handguns used in deaths
- evidence says justifiable homicide
- gun control solves alternative
- no evidence that criminals won't switch
- gun bans have seen homicides go up - DC + Chicago
- 1991 evidence v. ~~current~~ current evidence
 - 10K deaths v. 2 mil self defense
 - justifiable homicide is not self defense
 - then what is it?
- attack of evidence
- she did address the issue w/ bans

Neg Comments

- watch your use of absolutes like "never." You claimed a few times she never addressed things she did address. Might want to say she didn't adequately address
- Strong use of statistics. You were using concrete #s while she was using %'s - made it hard to compare the stats.
- Nice speaking and presentation style overall

Aff comments

- nice job addressing his attacks on your args.
- presentation style was clear and effective.
- You were using %'s while he used concrete #s - made it hard to compare stats.

Reason for Decision: Negs main point was about self defense. Aff had a stat about most people getting harmed during use for self defense that the Neg. did not address.