

# NLD

FLIP: 1 Hannah Littler v. 13 Liam Huggins

Novice L-D Debate		Amy Koenig (*28)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 722	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <u>Liam Huggins</u>		Points (20-30) <del>27</del> 27	Negative <u>Hannah Littler</u> Points (20-30) 27
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		<u>Nancy J. Cohen</u> Judge's Signature <input checked="" type="radio"/> 20 <u>CFHS/Parent/Life Coach</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

## Affirmative

1<sup>st</sup> contentions - ACLU16 can't extend through & brought up in IAR.

2<sup>nd</sup> contention - Neg rebutted w/ chilling effect.

3<sup>rd</sup> contention - & flawed

\* Point attack on minorities of color ↓ education  
Aff - Asians same as whites - negated hugs point.

+ My education & definitions needed.

- Nice job.

## Negative

Did a good job of flawing contentions through

Asking for examples from Aff which weren't given.

- Nice job.

Thank you for allowing me to be your judge.

~~KOENIG, AMY~~  
N. Cohen (20)

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

# NLD

FLIP: 11 Tucker Grams v. 47 Zoe Baab

Novice L-D Debate		Amy Koenig (*28)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 722	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b>	Points (20-30)	<b>Negative</b>	Points (20-30)
<del>Tucker Grams</del> Tucker Grams	24	Zoe Baab	26
The winner of this debate was		Nancy Cohen	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b>	<input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b>	Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)		CFHS(20) / Parent / Life Coach	
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff disproved the veil of ignorance by stating  
Equality for all. Excepting minorities needs for  
Aff covered contentions better  
She was a better speaker

NLD

FLIP: 15 Arthur Andreux v. 35 Jakob Kolberg

Novice L-D Debate		Michael Casey (*59)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 328	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <u>Ar</u> Arthur A.		Points (20-30) 23	Negative Jakob Kolberg
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature [Signature]	
Is this a low point win?		WHS / teacher School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Jakob

- Back your claims with either the German or American constitution, you used them interchangeably.
- Any def or German case law you could use to support your claims?
- Recap your contentions b/c I didnt (neither did Arthur) catch your 2<sup>nd</sup> contention.

Arthur

- Superb constructive argument w/ detailed use of court cases
- You neglected to support your 3<sup>rd</sup> contention, be careful about overlooking these
- Excellent referral back to your contentions to counter your opposit

NLD

FLIP: 35 Saloni Biyani v. 26 Margaret Krenke

Novice L-D Debate		Michael Casey (*59)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 328	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative Saloni Biyani 26 Points (20-30)		Negative Margaret Krenke 23 Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		[Signature] Judge's Signature WHS School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative

- Superb tone of construction argument but you should of included specific evidence to back your claim.
- Great catch  $\frac{1}{3}$  cell out that your opponent did not rebuttle construction 2.
- What data could you use to support your claims?
- Excellent summary of your constructive argument

Neg

- Be sure to catch all your rivals claims, that was the only reason she won.
- Brilliant constructive argument
- Be sure to have everything in order before you debate, even if that means spending a few extra minutes prepping beforehand.

~~BENTON HANNAH~~

PAXTON ATTRIDGE

NLD

FLIP: 8 Jaycee Graffus v. 29 Harris Shadmany

Novice L-D Debate		Hannah Benton (*46) PAXTON ATTRIDGE (34)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 424	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative		Points (20-30)	Negative
8 JAYCEE GRAFFUS		27	29 HARRIS SHADMAN 28
The winner of this debate was			
Affirmative		Negative	
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win?		NO	

2:30

*[Handwritten Signature]*

Judge's Signature

TPATASU

School / Affiliation / Occupation

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

ORGANIZATION IN THE FIRST REBUTTAL WAS SUPPOSE TO FOLLOW, GO DOWN THE FLOW, AND TALK TO THE LATER (LONT 1, 2) WERE ADDRESSING.

NEG

1ST AMENDMENT MIGHT NOT BE APPLICABLE (IF YOU ARGUE IT), BUT IT'S DEFINITELY TOPICAL.

YOUR CASE STATES THAT YOU'RE NOT DEFENDING HARMFUL LANGUAGE, BUT THAT MEANS YOU'RE NOT TOTALLY ADDRESSING THE RESOLUTION.

IN WITH YOUR CX ANSWER, YOU SAY THAT WE SHOULD CHANGE THE DEFINITIONS OF HATE SPEECH TO NOT INCLUDE HATE SPEECH, BUT IF THAT'S THE STATUS QUO, THAT'S SOMETHING YOU STILL NEED TO ADDRESS.

AS A RESULT OF THE ABOVE, YOUR CASE ISN'T WRONG, BUT IT'S NOT ADDRESSING THE CONTEMPORARY REASONS WE'RE ASKING THE RESOLUTION IN THE FIRST PLACE - HATE SPEECH.

IT'S NOT UNTIL THE FIRST REBUTTAL THAT YOU EXPLAIN THE GOOD FREE SPEECH WAS BROUGHT - PUT IT IN THE CASE, SO YOU SHOW US THE IMPACT FROM THE GET-GO.

NEG'S ARGUMENT WAS THAT YOUR EXPLANATION HERE IS WHAT NEG IS ARGUING - A TARGETTED LIMIT ON FREE SPEECH WHEN IT'S HATE SPEECH.

YOUR EXPLANATION OF TINKER V. DES MOINES (RIGHTS NOT STOPPING AT THE SCHOOL GATE) SLIGHTLY UNDERCUT THE FACT THAT THE RIGHT IN REFERENCE IS THE RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH.

THE FRAMEWORK DOESN'T HAVE ENOUGH EXPLANATION - I'M LEFT UNCLEAR AS TO WHAT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL RIGHTS YOU'RE MAKING RELEVANT, BECAUSE YOU'RE NOT EXPLICITLY TELLING US HOW YOU LINK

THAT'S NOT WHAT YIK YAK IS. IT'S NOT A FORUM OF EMPOWERMENT. IT'S ESSENTIALLY A YOUTUBE COMMENT SECTION WITHOUT THE VIDEO.

YOU SHOULDN'T SAY THAT YOUR OPPONENT SLAPPED EVIDENCE TOGETHER. IF IT'S WARRANTED, IT'S WARRANTED - ATTACK THAT, NOT THE SOURCE CONSISTENCY.

THE COMMON GOOD CARD DOESN'T HAVE THEOLOGY - THAT MEANS RELIGIOUS UNDERSTANDING. THE WORD CHOICE GOT A BIT MUDDLED.

RFD

THE NEG REBUTTAL GETS A BIT CONFUSING, BUT THE CENTRAL IDEA OF THE PERM HERE - THAT WE NEED TO LIMIT SPEECH THAT HARMS EDUCATION - IS BOTH IN THE AFF CASE AS WELL AS NEG GROUND (WHICH AFF DOESN'T CLEARLY ADDRESS). NOBODY WANTS TO LIMIT THE BENEFICIAL FREE SPEECH, JUST THE HARMFUL TO EDUCATION STUFF, WHICH IS A LIMIT, SO I NEGATE

~~BENTON, HANNAH~~

PAXTON ATTRIDGE

NLD

FLIP: 40 Amulya Bhaskara v. 31 Chloe Paterson

Novice L-D Debate		Hannah Benton (*40) PAXTON ATTRIDGE (34)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 424	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative		Points (20-30)	Negative
31 CHLOE PATERSON		27	40 AMULYA BHASKARA 29
The winner of this debate was		Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <input checked="" type="radio"/> Negative <input type="radio"/>		[Signature]	
(Circle Winner)		TRIASU	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

2:00

1:20  
 GENE IS SAYING THAT THREATS HARM DISCUSSION - THAT'S THE RELEVANCE

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

NEG

↳ BROTHER DEAN WAS AT ASU, NOT U OF

↳ ORGANIZATION WAS A BIT OFF WHICH SOMETIMES LOST TIME AND CLARITY.

↳ MUCH OF THE CASE MAKES SENSE REGARDING GENERAL IDEOLOGY, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT IT'S REALLY CLEARLY DISCUSSING HATE SPEECH AS IT MANIFESTS - SLURS, THREATS, ET CETERA. THIS IS THE CONTEMPORARY DISCUSSION THE RESOLUTION IS FORMED AROUND, AND SO FLESHING OUT HOW WE SHOULD HANDLE THINGS LIKE THAT WOULD BE HELPFUL.

TO ELABORATE, NOBODY WOULD REALISTICALLY ARGUE THAT WE SHOULD RESTRICT THINGS LIKE CLASS TEACHINGS, IT'S MORE DISCUSSING THE STUDENT BEHAVIOR THAT THREATENS TO DISRUPT THE CLASSROOM.

↳ THIS SEEMS LIKE A PREPARATION ISSUE.

↳ YOU DIDN'T TELL ME YOU WERE DONE WITH PREP - GIVE ME A LITTLE WARNING.

↳ I'M NOT SURE WHAT ABOUT HATE SPEECH/FIGHTING WORDS GOT REFERRED.

↳ IN GENERAL, YOU'RE TELLING ME NEG DIDN'T DO THINGS THAT NEG ARGUABLY DID. GET SPECIFIC ABOUT HOW WHAT THEY SAID DIDN'T APPLY.

**RFD:**

↳ THOSE DEFINITIONS SHOULD BE PLACED WITH THE VALUE/CRITERION, NOT A SEPARATE STEP.

↳ CLARIFYING SPEECH AS "POTENTIALLY OFFENSIVE" SOMEWHAT DOWNPLAYS THEIR SEVERITY.

↳ GIVE US CLEAR EXAMPLES OF THE TYPES OF SPEECH YOU'RE DISCUSSING, ESPECIALLY REGARDING THESE THREATS.

↳ YOU MISSED SOME TIME SIGNIFY. LOOK UP MORE FROM THE PAPER.

↳ SOME OF YOUR REBUTTALS NEED TO GET MORE SPECIFIC - I'M NOT ALWAYS SEEING YOU ADDRESSING THE LINKS/WARRANTS COMPRISING CONTENTIONS - SO MUCH AS THE CONCLUSION, MEANING YOU'RE NOT SHOWING ME HOW THEY'RE WRONG, JUST TELLING ME THAT THEY ARE.

↳ WORD ECONOMY IS SOMETIMES MAKING ARGUMENTS TAKE LONGER THAN NECESSARY. DIRECT, SHORT SENTENCES SAVE TIME, AND ARE EASY TO FOLLOW.


NEG'S CENTRAL ARGUMENT THAT VIOLENT SPEECH PROMPTS WORSE LEARNING GOES CONCEDED. NEG ISN'T TRYING TO LIMIT ALL SPEECH, JUST THREATS, CUTTING OUT THE HARMS AFF WARNS ABOUT, SO NEGATE.

MALONEY, DUNCAN

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

GONZALEZ-RIVERA, VICTORIA (J3) NLD

FLIP: 41 Myna Herrera v. 40 Xander Agnello

Novice L-D Debate		Duncan Maloney (*35)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 324	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> _____ Myna 28 _____ <small>Points (20-30)</small>		<b>Negative</b> _____ Xander 27 _____ <small>Points (20-30)</small>	
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> <small>(Circle Winner)</small>		 _____ <small>Judge's Signature</small>	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		Bonita Vista H.S. San Diego University <small>School / Affiliation / Occupation</small> professor	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Myna had a clearer case.


MALONEY, DUNCAN

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

(GONZALEZ - PINERA, VICTORIA (S))

NLD

FLIP: 21 Emily Lopez Rodriguez v. 11 Noah Allen

Novice L-D Debate		Duncan Maloney (*35)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 324	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> <u>Emily</u>		Points (20-30) <u>27</u>	<b>Negative</b> <u>Noah</u>
			Points (20-30) <u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Bonita Vista H.S. San Diego / University</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation <u>professor</u>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Noah had a clearer case.



NLD

FLIP: 26 Nik Pearce v. 1 Chur Tam

Novice L-D Debate		Julie Franke (*40)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 326	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative Nik Pearce <u>27</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative Chur Tam <u>28</u>
Points (20-30)		Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <u>Negative</u> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature <i>[Signature]</i>	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation Paradise Uly FIS / parent	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Paradise Private Univ.  
Princeton Jr.  
Zachary Thomas  
W. Brennan Jr.

Free speech wish not be that  
Value is freedom.

- Pliny Aff. cross exam he asked clarify that democracy is ~~ask~~ personal opinion of Nex also 1st term of Govt - Neg refuse personal opinion
- Free speech vs. right speech.
- Legal physical form should not be applied to the L-D.

Value is security.  
Defines the 1st (in neg. cons.)  
speech, value  
hate speech  
Huffington Post,  
news, medical  
(Gregg Tyler from Univ.)  
Gregg Coban  
Disputes due to hate speech.  
Recent event through  
restriction s/b imposed.  
rebutted 1st cont,  
Should lookout moral rights not w/  
constitution/legal.  
Attacks not having cost/benefit of aff.  
Tyler comments commit suicide men times.

Great amount of resources applied,  
clear use of value argument.  
Thinking use more of  
the time left <sup>allocated</sup> on rebuttals will  
benefit.

Well done on examples, strong  
Rebuttal Amazing!

Duencil: Neg. Wins!

LONG, EMIN (63)

NLD

FLIP: 13 Aicha Ba v. 8 Luke Chatham

Novice L-D Debate		Manjui Srivastava (*20)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 323	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <u>Luke</u>		Points (20-30) <u>29</u>	Negative <u>Aicha</u>
			Points (20-30) <u>28</u>
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		[Signature] Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		T. Bird School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- \* Good 1st Speech - lots of energy + emphasis
- \* you have a lot of places where you contradict yourself as you talk
- "They should be able to say whatever they want" "That prepares them for the real world" how is that ever true??
- "It doesn't matter if it ~~silences~~ silences them?" That def infringes on their rights!
- \* you forgot to attack your opponent in your 1st speech! you had 2min left
- \* In Status Quo it is restricted
- \* This now infringes on 2 rights - their speech + safety - tie into your Neg consequences + individual rights
- \* you are all over the place in your last speech Go point by point so you dont get bogged down

LONG, ETIN (63)

# NLD

FLIP: 26 Janani Lakshmanan v. 47 Patricia Scott

Novice L-D Debate		Manjul Srivastava (*20)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 323	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> _____ Janani		Points (20-30) 30	<b>Negative</b> _____ Patricia
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		_____ Judge's Signature T-Bird School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

\* Great energy! I wish LD would go back to these powerful enflamed speeches!

\* watch your time, lots of fumbling with papers 2nd speech with no real time to attack

\* Both had 2400m prep time left at end of round to get organized & defend each speech



\* Definations can be dropped in neg speech unless they are different from Aff or essential to your case.

\* make sure you tie into value / criterion with each point

FFD- Aff did a good job stating specifically defined value / criterion and then upholding it throughout round, plus linking Neg case into own framework.

NLD

FLIP: 12 Haniyah Syed v. 59 Jordan Barreras

Novice L-D Debate		Richard Bui (*16)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 426	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative Haniyah Syed		Points (20-30) 26	Negative Jordan Barreras
The winner of this debate was		2 min	
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		 School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Haniyah (Aff)

Jordan (Neg)

- Use all IAC time
- Make sure IAC has larger impact
- Extend evid. Explain significance & analysis of evidence/argu.
- ↳ Use up all your time
- ↳ Prep out additional rebuttal per argu.
- ↳ Spend more time on ~~the~~ case attacking framework & bringing in evidence
- Roadmap (off-time)


- Focus on the important details in evid. We ~~or~~ need all details on heirarchy of needs
- Write an NC case so you have argu to base yourself on
- You have good argu → use evidence to support them
- hierarchy of needs better functions as a criterion ~~is~~ than as a ~~cont~~ contention
- Freedom of press could be interesting.
- Difficult to make topical but it's free
- there's a difference between (V) & (C)
- cite evidence
- signpost

Both: more time on analysis

RFD: NC does not address AC argu and therefore, all AC flows through & AC extends all argu.

# NLD

FLIP: 8 Maya Chatham v. 41 Bryton Bryner

Novice L-D Debate		Richard Bui (*16)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 426	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Bryton Bryner Points (20-30): 27 2 min		<b>Negative</b> Maya Chatham Points (20-30): 30 2 min	
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		 Judge's Signature Desert Vista High School School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff (Bryton)

Neg (Maya)

- In case, make sure all contentions link back to framework of Util. Only C3 really did. I see the argu made in C1 & C2 but link is & apparent & faulty

- rebuttal to AC C2 faulty bc you & actually address slippery slope  
 - I would reconsider C2  
 - Work on & INR - good job on the analysis but you didn't build up enough evid. to support argu.

- diversify rebuttal  
 - classes & allow late speech in status quo  
 - You essentially CX your criterion which & really provide an argu to your case


- Both: Spend more time in CX addressing framework  
 - Spend more time on Framework should be 1st address

Both: you both repeat statements throughout & waste a lot of time bc of it

RFD: NC discredits link between AC value & criterion forcing me to judge on hierarchy of needs. & as NC proves & reach w/o safety, I vote NE.

# NLD

FLIP: 29 Amrita Chakladar v. 20 Danielle Muller

Novice L-D Debate		Jean Chatham (*8)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 423	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> <del>Amrita</del> <u>AMRITA CHAKLADAR</u> Points (20-30) <u>30</u>		<b>Negative</b> <u>DANIELLE MULLER</u> Points (20-30) <u>30</u>	
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 Judge's Signature <u>RMHS / PHYSICIAN</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH ARE EXCELLENT!

AFF

great use of time  
Really well argued.

NEG


good articulation / passion

Reason for Decision

- AFF shows that value is Freedom
- marketplace of ideas is evenc. neg argues protection of civilians but does not pull it in rebuttals well enough
- PTSD and failure to achieve potential do not overcome AFF contentions

# NLD

FLIP: 13 Mark Whitby v. 35 Dev Singhania

Novice L-D Debate		Jean Chatham (*8)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 423	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Dev Singhania Points (20-30) <del>22</del> 23		<b>Negative</b> Mark Whitby Points (20-30) 28	
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>		 Judge's Signature RMHS / Physician School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- CRITERIA was nonexistent so how does a judge vote?
- value in freedom but no way to apply it.
- Reason for ballot
  - 2AR was not convincing
  - neg shows real world harms
  - late speech leads to harms
  - plan was not sufficiently attached by AFF.

# NLD

FLIP: 12 Beatrice Kapchan v. 44 George Hopkins

Novice L-D Debate		Kiel Warren (*17)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 425	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> <i>George Hopkins</i>		Points (20-30) 25	<b>Negative</b> <i>Beatrice Kapchan</i>
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner)		<i>[Signature]</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<i>[Signature]</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*George Hopkins, open overtop, you will win because you have more time*

*George Hopkins, you did not use your time, you did not use your case and you did not use your case.*

*George Hopkins, you were longer and had stronger case than Beatrice Kapchan, but you did not use your time.*



# NLD

FLIP: 40 Julia Groman v. 47 Filimaua Maulupe

Novice L-D Debate		Kiel Warren (*17)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 425	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Points (20-30) <u>30</u>		<b>Negative</b> Points (20-30) <u>29</u>	
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? _____		Judge's Signature School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff: good job

neg: good job. use your prep time

RFD: aff wins the value. neg gives up her value  
aff has a stronger case and analysis

# NLD

FLIP: 35 Nivea Krishnan v. 20 Samantha Swayze

Novice L-D Debate		Julie Franke (*40)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 326	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <b>29</b> Samantha Swayze Points (20-30)		Negative <b>29</b> Nivea Krishnan Points (20-30)	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <b>29</b> Negative <b>29</b> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature <i>[Signature]</i>	
Is this a low point win? <u>No</u>		Penelope H.S. / parent / Fineburg, A. School / Affiliation / Occupation	

### Comments & Reason for Decision:

Under Affirmative:  
Not restrict constitution speech.

Dr. Martin Luther  
Need to talk about racism...  
3 contentions  
Att. speech shoud be banned  
also public discourse

Asked Neg if If we give them rights we empower them in all cases? Negative digress to answer, ~~in a~~ yes/no I wanted more clarification  
I suggest question was too general, answer ~~and~~ with a close-end question.

Negative mentioned:  
Limiting H. Speech is to protect minorities  
1980's, gay/lesbian minorities,  
3 contentions.  
log. Constructive objective delivery.

Direct analysis in 1st rebuttal is questionable but 2nd rebuttal strong. Got lost when attacking orig. 3rd contention but jump ahead to 2nd contention.


Well done on clarity of ideas. = structured plus.

Overall. I love the big clashing of arguments. Very challenging. Are you sure you are not Novice?  
Neg. wins!

Myrna Rolfness

NLD

FLIP: 46 Mariana Acevedo v. 31 Conner Camacho

Novice L-D Debate		Nathan Calahan	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 721	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Mariana Acevedo 26 <small>Points (20-30)</small>		<b>Negative</b> Conner Camacho 25 <small>Points (20-30)</small>	
The winner of this debate was <input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Affirmative</b> <input type="radio"/> <b>Negative</b> <small>(Circle Winner)</small> Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		 <small>Judge's Signature</small> PHS (40) <small>School / Affiliation / Occupation</small>	

Comments & Reason for Decision:


Prep  
 Affr / Neg  
 2:00 / 2:00

this round went to the affirmative who was able to combine both the Affirmative & Negative values into the Affirmative arguments.

Myrna Rolfress

NLD

FLIP: 55 Pietro Ori v. 29 Anissa Ferris

Novice L-D Debate		Nathan Calahan	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 721	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <u>Pietro Ori</u>		Points (20-30) <u>25</u>	Negative <u>Anissa Ferris</u>
			Points (20-30) <u>23</u>
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		 Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		<u>PVHS (40)</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative won this debate simply because the Negative did not attack all the affirmative contentions.

Aff / Neg  
2:25 / 2:03

# NLD

FLIP: 20 Jeremy Segal v. 40 Ayesha Babbrah

Novice L-D Debate		Emily Pentacost (*12)	
Round 3	Flight 2	Room 327	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
Affirmative <u>Ayesha Babbrah</u>		Points (20-30) 28	Negative <u>Jeremy Segal</u>
			Points (20-30) 27
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<u>Emily Pentacost</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		<u>Chandler HS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both: great speaking/presentation - very professional & confident  
 great use of Cross X - very strategic, specific questions to lead into points you wanted to make in your own case & rebuttal

Aff: points were more clear and thorough throughout, stuck to main points well. Deconstructed Neg's case very well in rebuttals. Examples that were used were effective

Neg: good case too, but some holes in argument that FOS is dangerous and leads to depression (death-connection not fully made convincingly. Some of examples were helpful, but some not as effective. Reagan example in particular had flaws. Connection between FOS ~~in~~ and assassination attempt not fully made). In my opinion I think it would be a stronger case if you had a couple less examples and made stronger theoretical / "big picture" arguments

# NLD

FLIP: 59 Jorge Gamboa v. 63 Lu Marano

Novice L-D Debate		Emily Pentacost (*12)	
Round 3	Flight 1	Room 327	Fri 02/10/17 07:15PM
<b>Affirmative</b> Lu Marano		Points (20-30) 25	<b>Negative</b> Jorge Gamboa
The winner of this debate was <b>Affirmative</b> <del>Negative</del> (Circle Winner)		Judge's Signature Chandler HS	
Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

**Neg.** strengths: really good job of sticking to your main points throughout and defending the details of your argument thoroughly. Conventions were very clear, logical, and easy to follow. Good clarifications in rebuttal.

suggestions: define "safe spaces" more clearly to ensure your judge is on the same page as to what you mean by that term. Show confidence in speaking, even if you don't always feel confident.

**Aff:** strengths: really good initial argument - explained speech codes impacts well and aligned it all to your value and criteria. Overall good show of confidence throughout.

suggestions: make sure you clearly support your ~~the~~ argument all the way through. Rebuttal didn't address some of your opponent's stronger points and wandered a bit off-topic towards the end. Practice good eye contact and posture, & don't hesitate to use prep time :)