


VLD

FLIP: 46 Brendan Morey v. 20 Joshua Cohen

Varsity L-D Debate		David Blair (*40)	
Octo-Finals		Room 912	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
<u>Joshua</u>	<u>30</u>	Brendan	27
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative	Negative		
(Circle Winner)		<u>PVHS</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>N</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

6-7-4-6-3

Good main points.

Good Ref.

Super Summary

Free Speech!

Good arguments.



College is a choice.
Not A Requirement

Words Hurt.

Racial Slurs in politically
protected speech is a Jump.

VLD

FLIP: 55 Parker Whitfill v. 20 Maxim Quint


Varsity L-D Debate		Jim Bishop (*26)	
Octo-Finals		Room 909	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
<u>Parker Whitfill</u>		<u>Maxim Quint</u>	
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative	<input type="radio"/> Negative	Judge's Signature	
(Circle Winner)			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Voted on Ice Park

VLD

FLIP: 51 Kristen Arnold v. 20 Scott Wisnom

Varsity L-D Debate		Colin Redman (*16)	
Octo-Finals		Room 907	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
Scott Wisnom	27.5	Kristen Arnold	28.5
The winner of this debate was		 Judge's Signature	
Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		DV School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral RFD:

K as a pre-empt argument was not fully answered leading to me weighing it over the post-fiat of the AC.

Also on a contention level, the neg does a better job weighing the impacts of the cases, eg: The impacts of the government being intolerant towards certain moralities was not impacted as far as the impacts of allowing some people to be silenced/abused.

VLD

FLIP: 20 Meena Venkataramanan v. 53 Gilbert Neuner

Varsity L-D Debate		Alexsandra DeReal (*12)	
Octo-Finals		Room 910	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative <u>Gilbert Neuner</u>		Points (20-30)	Negative <u>Meena Venkataramanan</u> Points (20-30)
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<u>[Signature]</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? _____		<u>Brogby / Spy for the Kremlin</u> School Affiliation / Occupation	

↑ You change your criterion impact back

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gilbert: Your criterion lacks the warrant ~~it~~ necessary to justify the offense from your ~~own~~ contentions. Most of your contentions pre-empt the negative's arguments but, you need more independent reasons as to why this ~~case~~ position is right in and of itself. Your justification of Rawls ~~isn't~~ don't explain the veil of ignorance but, preempt why identity is ~~isn't~~ necessary for the veil of ignorance. Your contentions also need lines of analysis that impact back to the Rawlsian veil of ignorance i.e. why do I care about real world necessity of combating hate speech under the veil of ignorance?

Meena: Your case is a little too long against the ~~neg~~ aff to leverage more offense against it. You need to read less and spend more time turning the aff. Having two prerequisites against the affirmative only stops myself from accessing it but, doesn't prove why the criterion itself is wrong. "its pretty clear at the"

CX: Gilbert, making side comments against her doesn't help your case. Also, never yield CX when you can use it to perceptually dominate the round. Both of you: raising your voice in CX doesn't prove you are any righter. I don't vote on CX, it just annoyed me enough to write it too.

RFD: I vote for the ~~aff~~ since the argument that turns the NC is dropped because the turn against the criterion is dropped. I also buy the weighing arguments made by the aff.

VLD

FLIP: 16 Ryan Kibby v. 41 Jessica Carter

Varsity L-D Debate		Richard Quint (*20)	
Octo-Finals		Room 911	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative Ryan Kibby Points (20-30) 28		Negative Jessica Carter Points (20-30) 27	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner) Is this a low point win? <u>no</u>		Judge's Signature CFHS / Parent / DPM School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- 1) Good clash in cross X - Need to allow questions to be fully asked before responding
- 2) Yes or no questions should be answered as such, and the answer can be explained in greater detail, should one elect to do so after answer is given.
- 3) Neg makes good point about off introducing new definitions from dictionary regarding restriction/limitation, however aff was convincing in 2AR that definitions were rebuttal and not new argument.
- 4) Both sides left issues from AC and NC unaddressed about equally.
- 5) One debater used the word "um" repeatedly, try to eliminate its use, if possible
- 6) Neg made valid point that Aff's use of Father being in Iraq was in conversation and not valid according to Tigger's definition which defined use in media
- 7) Very close debate with valid points and good argumentation on both sides

Trevor Swafford

VLD

FLIP: 20 Gabe Cohon v. 35 Greg Miller

Varsity L-D Debate		Vijay Ramakrishna (*20) Trevor Swafford (53)	
Octo-Finals		Room 931	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative	Points (20-30)	Negative	Points (20-30)
<u>Gabe Cohon</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>Greg Miller</u>	<u>29</u>
The winner of this debate was			
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative (Circle Winner)		<u>J. Miller</u> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>		<u>Bonita Vista High School</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision:

So I voted Aff as the Neg lost the framework and it ultimately resulted in a beating of the 2 Neg counterplans really having no impact. The Aff was able to prove one impact while the Neg had no impact, on the value. So ultimately I had to vote Aff in order to as it was the most Just side on the round. Good job to both and good luck. Great Round!!!

12/45

1:5

FORE, LAURA

Bobcat Bonanza 2017

VLD

FLIP: 11 Finley Dutton Reid v. 53 Mary Talamantez

Varsity L-D Debate		Laura Fore (*51)	
Octo-Finals		Room 908	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative Points (20-30) <u>Mary Talamantez 29</u>		Negative Points (20-30) <u>Finley Dutton Reid 27</u>	
The winner of this debate was Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)		<u>Laura Fore</u> Judge's Signature <u>Pinnacle H.S.</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Excellent/Style/Voice
 excellent/well written IAC.
 it flowed beautifully and I could easily grasp where you were going w/ it.

CX
 excellent questions in CX.

Well done 2AC/Reb
 I felt like you did a great job of direct ref. good, but would suggest you argue contention by contention - ~~bring you forward then together~~

Questions in CX were not ^{too} ~~some~~ ^{style + voice} somewhat sig to IAC case I value you used that time to pursue your argument

- IAC Very well constructed + supported. lost a little to spready but mostly kept on flow. Great argument + support for arg. ^{Also you had what this an over which this # of who + promote to NEs..}

I do think you evaded the question a little in her CX. Wouldn't

- Still exists underground
 Rhetoric does have big power

- Fabulous Rebuttal! excellent counterpoint attack and rebuttal of case - s. ^{personship} strong argument.

RFD

They stayed true to contention by ~~points/essies~~ ^{contention} - Had better direct refutation of all the strongest more consistent better executed.

VLD

FLIP: 53 Anthony Kolshorn v. 16 Lauren Barney

Varsity L-D Debate		Kiel Warren (*17) <i>Jim Bishop</i>	
Octo-Finals		Room 933	Sat 02/11/17 12:15PM
Affirmative <i>Lauren Barney</i>	Points (20-30) <i>(27)</i>	Negative <i>Anthony Kolshorn</i>	Points (20-30) <i>(28)</i>
The winner of this debate was Affirmative <input type="radio"/> Negative <input checked="" type="radio"/> (Circle Winner)		<i>JMB</i> Judge's Signature	
Is this a low point win? <i>No</i>		<i>AP. ERIE / Coach / Pilot</i> School / Affiliation / Occupation	

Comments & Reason for Decision: *ON BACK*

No 7/8

*Govt best for country - Value -
"Could lead to other restrictions
across society...."*

*1) Free Speech
Education → individuals → makes
of Govt Critical thinking
2) Limiting on Comp affects rest of
world*

Journalist

1.1

Case X Govt can't be moral action

*3 oblig 1) not see
2) Integrity
3) well-being*

Slippery slope → back at up

Free speech → essential building block to society

Neg must show not true

Neg - must show gov't role in morality

NEG CONST (7) Justice is blind - over the veil

1) Hate speech → well defined → Hate speech protected? → slide up

Govt moral action? → John Rawls veil of ignorance

Free speech → education? Are wrong ideas harmful,

hate speech will grow [Aff must disprove]

Safe to speak out, Slippery slope used European argument nice cards