

NLD

FLIP: 35 Nivea Krishnan v. 13 Liam Huggins

Novice L-D Debate		Patti Wisnom (*20)	
Octo-Finals		Room 925	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
<u>Nivea Krishnan (35)</u>	28	<u>Liam Huggins (13)</u>	27
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		<u>Patti Wisnom</u> Judge's Signature <u>Cat. Foothills</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff

Clear, strong voice in IAC and xx
 Good xx and response to xx
 More focus on contentions from opponents INC would have been beneficial
 When responding to the opponents case, you repeated yourself a few times - wasn't the most effective use of time

Neg

Good approach to xx, keeping control of time in professional manner
 INC was too fast - you lost some articulation as you went
 ZNR brought up new arguments, after not addressing parts of opponents case in INR

RFD

The points that were dropped during INC hurt
 Also the argument made by Aff about the effectiveness of counter speech was persuasive

This was a close round - both did a great job!

NLD

FLIP: 35 Saloni Biyani v. 29 Anissa Ferris

Novice L-D Debate		Nathan Calahan	
Octo-Finals		Room 923	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
29 <u>Anissa Ferris</u>	29	35 <u>Saloni Biyani</u>	30
The winner of this debate was		<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Cheng Yu</u> <small>Judge's Signature</small></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Perry HS / Engineer</u> <small>School / Affiliation / Occupation</small></p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(Circle Winner)</small></p>			
Is this a low point win? _____			


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- o Good organization with 4 points to support Constitutional Law.
- o Use only 4:53 min out of 6 min. Could better use of time to provide more evidence.
- o Shows passion in defending the AC
- o Affirm was defending her case in the last rebutt as defensive instead of presenting the affirm case is a better solution.
- o In neg's construct, Saloni covered all the points brought up in the AC.
- o Use total allocated time to defend the NC
- o Shows passion in defending the NC
- o Defended line by line in her NC and also attack line by line of AC. Made it clear she spoke about the points, but logic, evidence, justification could be stronger.

Great deliveries by ~~no~~ both debaters. Neg has a better use of time management. Both debaters were great in the defense and attack of the framework. Left some of the logical and emotional reason for the different view points. In the end, I need to vote Neg because the speaker was more on the offense because she did a better job defending her points and attacking the affirm to make her defend her position.

NLD

FLIP: 1 Hannah Littler v. 20 Samantha Swayze

Novice L-D Debate		Cecelia LaPlace (*36) Brandon Faure (*35)	
Octo-Finals		Room 927	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative Hannah Littler		Points (20-30) 6.02x10 ²³	Negative Samantha Swayze
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature 	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Hamilton / Judge / Student School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

APP

- Had ~1 min left in AC. Add more carded warrants or another contention to increase your offense in the fourth, or add a spike.
- Ran out of time in IAR, work on time mgmt.
- Work on extensions: do those first - they're free offense!
- Excellent argument pointing out lack of solvency by neg
- Value of "rights" is too broad. Which rights? Human rights, says criterion, but what about the other rights? You need to specify on your value
- Hostile environment ≠ violent environment.
- No new arguments in the 2nd speech.


Neg

- Avoid spending all of CX on one area, if you off clearly isn't going to slip up, try another area and exploit that instead.
- Work on time mgmt, you dropped Lec C3, which could hurt.
- Clutch extension on OB!!
- Good key voters.

RFD: Constitutionality irrelevant, but it needed, neg shows that universities can ban racial speech & go against 1st Amendment. Burden of neg in NC OBI extended and sufficiently met. No specifics about speech codes having to be used to restrict, and chilling effect is taken out by neg perm allowing for discussion AND safe zones. This allows for similar benefits of the Aff to be accessed by neg. On aff, psychological harms still bearing misplaced ideas in impact calc. Neg wins by fulfilling un rebutted burden & through extended C2.

NLD

FLIP: 55 Pietro Ori v. 40 Julia Groman

Novice L-D Debate		Greg Maro (*50)	
Octo-Finals		Room 924	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Pietro Ori	28	Julia Groman	29
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Cat Foot / 20 / Accountant School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative	Negative		
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent debate on both sides! Well thought out and well argued, especially for Novice LD debaters.

Both ended up arguing that preventing racism (ie vulnerable parties ought to be protected) was a contention of each of their sides. Neither proved this. However when Aff said that the democratic majority will always have an advantage over minorities and Neg pointed out that this idea was counter to Aff's criterion and counter to the idea of preventing racism, it appeared that overall Neg won. Very close debate.

NLD

FLIP: 29 Harris Shadmany v. 20 Danielle Muller

Novice L-D Debate	Amy Koenig (+28) Marlene Pearce (26)	
Octo-Finals	Room 930	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative Harris Shadmany 29	Points (20-30)	Negative Danielle Muller 26
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Marlene Pearce Judge's Signature
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		ACT parent / Engineer School Affiliation / Occupation


Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Things I already gave you verbally:
- Aff - would not use "since we already have implemented speech codes": opens a big door for the neg.
 - Aff - clever use of extensive contentions - makes it harder for neg to respond to.
 - Neg - Need to better tie in evidence on your case - African American GPA lowering could be for a whole lot of reasons.
 - Neg - Your delivery could be more crisp & emphatic.
 - Neg - I think I heard you say "We need to 'fix' hate speech". Seems like that's a daunting demand, - unrealistic, IMO.
 - Your styles of debate were starkly different - Aff was fiercely protecting free speech while Neg was all about protection of citizens safety, more sympathetic? The →

4

NLD

FLIP: 29 Amrita Chakladar v. 46 Mariana Acevedo

Novice L-D Debate		JJ Garrard (*1)	
Octo-Finals		Room 929	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative Amrita Chakladar 30		Negative Mariana Acevedo 30	
Points (20-30)		Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		School / Affiliation / Occupation WISKS	

1:15 left

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirm

6 - Constitutional law

3 - Freedom (Golden rule) (do what you want as long as it doesn't step on other people's freedom)

3 - Upholding market plan of nature

3 - Protect hate speech

4 - Transparency creates social trust

6 - If constitution is broken, brought to law

3 - Too many cases is bad, because innocent people in jail

2 - Not restricting helps innocent people

3 - Hate speech ends, but alternative is worse

7 - College/journalists/people who need to know free speech

7 - Cognitive development and freedom of expression

5 - Censoring is highly a subjective

6 - People must not decide what others can hear (real problem of FoS) (example) limits ability to learn

combats hatred

1:40 left

Negative

- Subjectivity definition

- What if hate speech goes against education? (It does not, it helps because of trust it builds)

- Obligation to rebuttal to hate speech

- Hate speech has no meaning but inflames

1 -

2 -> Harassment => court in all cases

3 -> Hate speech should be restricted because it limits ability to learn. Benefits of restriction

cost of restriction universal

An act

Moral judgement must be universal.

Justice:

1 - less harassment Hate speech => Harassment


2 - less harassment makes climate better for minorities and makes education better for minorities

2 - Harassment makes competition harder for minorities academically

Universities have no obligation to correct hate speech, because it should happen outside in the world.

NLD

FLIP: 13 Mark Whitby v. 8 Maya Chatham

Novice L-D Debate		Lindsay Bryant (*31)	
Octo-Finals		Room 926	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Maya Chatham	29.7-1	Mark Whitby	29.3-1
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature Hamilton High School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Affirmative	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Negative		
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted negative on restricting hate speech
 the code of conduct flows for neg side
 as a restriction on free speech so aff would
 not get this argument

FLIP: 1 Chur Tam v. 26 Janani Lakshmanan

Novice L-D Debate		Aeryn Ohlendorf (*40)	
Octo-Finals		Room 928	
Affirmative <u>Chur Tam</u>		Points (20-30) <u>28</u>	Negative <u>Janani Lakshmanan</u>
The winner of this debate was		Points (20-30) <u>27</u>	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		Irene Fabig Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		PVHS School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Comments & Reason for Decision:			

Aff

Nice organization and flow of ideas
Tell us very specifically what rights you are referring to. You mention that there are many different rights but you didn't specify what they are. I don't have the UDHR memorized."

Good job hitting all her points in your rebuttal, but be careful because you can't just say that something is true just because you think so - why is it true that we can't just think of safety as the 1st most important right? Why do we have to consider other rights to don't think her case of safety included the right to free speech or education he didn't address your 3rd contention at all which you should point out in your final focus.

RFD

debate, but neg did not rebut 3rd contention of limiting rights

duties of citizens, which was a strong point. Overall aff's rebuttals & slightly more on point and contentions were clearly linked to value.

Neg

- Excellent explanation of your value
- You need to link your contentions to your value though. What do they have to do with safety?
- Good job bringing up Maslow but you didn't have enough time to really use it well - watch your time better
- your 1st contention seems to support the Aff side better than yours. Explain that better.
- I'm not going to count it against you b/c it's using my previous knowledge personally, but Maslow's hierarchy actually has a lot of problems with it cross-culturally.
- Make sure you know what the Geneva Convention is - it's not the same as UDHR
- Nice use of quotes - but use more credible ones than the Koch brothers I think - or explain who they are to make them credible.