

**NLD**

FLIP: 35 Saloni Biyani v. 40 Julia Groman (Con)

Novice L-D Debate		Hunter-Rogers (*11) <i>Leah Veseth (H)</i>	
Quarter-Finals		Room 923	Sat 02/11/17 02:15PM
Affirmative <i>PRO</i>	Points (20-30)	Negative <i>CON</i>	Points (20-30)
<i>Saloni</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>Groman</i>	<i>30</i>
The winner of this debate was		<i>Leah Veseth</i>	
Affirmative	<b>Negative</b>	Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		<i>Bruce [unclear] USA</i>	
Is this a low point win? <i>NO</i>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*PRO* ~ Academic freedom  
 ~ Free speech  
 ~ ↑ Educ

~ Constitution  
 ~ subjective

- max. rights - freed. of speech.  
 - overb. govern (Con - asked for examples & given)  
 - academic freedom

*(Con) @ Justice*

*#1 Free speech*  
 A. drop out / racism C. Stereotype  
 B. prevention of ed

*limiting speech, & totally getting rid of it*

Both components did a great job. Both are extremely articulate + presented their cases very well. I had trouble determining the winner as both had strong support. I chose *Con* as the winner b/c *Groman* argued against her opponents points slightly better. Great job both of you

# NLD

FLIP: 46 Mariana Acevedo v. 29 Harris Shadmany

Novice L-D Debate	Cheng Yu (#47)	Jim Bishy
Quarter-Finals	Room 926	Sat 02/11/17 02:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Harris Shadmany 26	Points (20-30)	<b>Negative</b> Mariana Acevedo 27
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <del>Negative</del> (Circle Winner)		JMB Judge's Signature
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		ACP, ERIC / Coach / Pilot School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFT clearly stated voting criteria came down to "Hate speech" and used Neg's definition, he added violence to it.

AFT CON Nice defn public of university... 1st Amn

(6) Quality → low / SCOTUS

(Promote Democracy) → sole purpose of Constitution - Benefit all members of society

- 1) Free speech essential
  - 2) <sup>imposition in our</sup> Trigger warnings → Exposure therapy
  - 3) Rights available to all
  - 4) Cognitive development
- Speech combats tyranny [CANT democracy lead to tyranny of majority de Tocqueville]
- Very clear statement of Framers

(3) minority obligated → student role in govt, Do we affect democracy, indirect role in election

(7) Neg X defined Hate speech

1) Original position → just society 2) Principle universality

3) Anonymous Actor [VOI] Veil of Ignorance

CANT 1) should restrict 2) hate speech against purpose Does NOT promote debate

Quality of Evidence → one they university specific

Democracy (1st Amendment 1791 not 1787, Hate speech no purpose


\* Hate speech leads to oppression, Do fear stop learning

Hate speech no other way

\* Nice phrasing - Very clear & cogent

# NLD

FLIP: 35 Nivea Krishnan v. 13 Mark Whitby

Novice L-D Debate	Aradhana Kumar (*16)		
Quarter-Finals	Room 924	Sat 02/11/17 02:15PM	
<b>Affirmative</b>	Points (20-30)	<b>Negative</b>	Points (20-30)
<u>Nivea Krishnan</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>Mark Whitby</u>	<u>30</u>
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)		<u>DVHS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:



- Good, Respectful handling of cross - x
- You probably need to justify why we focus only on freedom of spee
- Very good Strategic questions asked in cross - x
- Life, liberty comment seemed a little out of place and random
- I don't know if your attack on speech codes being ineffective was strong enough
- Your "its an opinion" argument could lead to a slippery slope where any gov law could be called "opion"
- Good defense of education, although you both refrence the real world

- Good, Respectful cross - x attitude
- Good application of your own cards on her case
- INR was very well done
- Great job extending your framework and linking to education and using her own arguments against her
- Great job extending Contention 4
- Good job extending rebuttals on her contentions
- I like that your INR was very clear and the logic was understandable
- Good re applications of your cards

1st, I picked Neg framework as Aff did not adequately address this in the IAR. So we looked at real world impacts not individual rights. While I buy Aff's arguments that Hate speech is not 100% limited, Neg's card still shows some reduction and some impact. Thus, I negate

# NLD

FLIP: 20 Samantha Swayze v. 1 Chur Tam

Novice L-D Debate		Richard Bui (*16)	
Quarter-Finals		Room 925	Sat 02/11/17 02:15PM
Affirmative Chur Tam 1:04	Points (20-30) 29	Negative Samantha Swayze 2:30	Points (20-30) 30
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature  School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Chur

Samantha

- Your IAC needs more evd & citations to strengthen chain links
- don't bow off NC C<sub>1</sub> & C<sub>2</sub>
- pain & gain
- very very difficult to buy into NC def.
- time allocation in 2AR

- the biggest argu. against AC contention level is your C<sub>2</sub>. You ex it to framework well but it would funct. much better as block to the AC content.
- Instead of citing psychol. harm, focus on the <sup>in rebuttal</sup> C<sub>2</sub> concrete evd. on GPA
- In 1NR, 1st focus on ~~the~~ def., then framework
- mention observet in V that you do focus on majority

NC

RFD: BC the ~~best~~ best links argue to framework (& best supports framework, argu. flow though), NC wins.