

590

Ted Kim - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 401

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership M2EMJ -

Negative: Fairmont - AYA2

Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
A	Michael Huang	1	28	N	Alexander Tso	4	26
A	Mai Johnson	2	27	N	Adrian Israel	3	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

- All
- Sec 4 violates Constitution
 - Rights - technically correct (individual/collective)
 - States should be treated equally
 - ↳ Citizens
 - ↳ Federal interference is enough → individualism
 - ↳ Use of Supreme Court
 - States are a change of ruling laws
 - Application of Sec 4 is arbitrary
 - ↳ M2EMJ in ~~Chapman~~ Chapman, Michigan
 - I don't support state → negative Shelby
 - All has to be individual or collective
 - VRA causes discrim. based on location color
 - States w/ R(1) ~~are~~ are of federal govt.
 - Protection determines constitutionality
 - States imposing their ruling rights is wrong 33%
 - Claiming illeg. connects to framework
 - VRA is inappropriate, thus it requires federal oversight
 - All states ~~are~~ framework was not related
 - No need to relate individual point

- Neg Chapman
- Shelby Case: Racial Challenge
 - ↳ Race that Sec 4 is unconstitutional = win
 - ↳ All not pure all of Sec 4 is entirely unconstitutional
 - More discrim. in areas covered by Sec 4 is requiring it
 - Multiple states protect discrim. which laws follow Sec 4
 - All framework will be done it consider "rightly" 4%
 - Difference in state ~~action~~ action be to state action all
 - ↳ Congress has the right to do this
 - ↳ to protect civil state treatment
 - Sec 4 protects minority, which ruling rights/debates discuss
 - 5th Amend → allows federal intervention
 - Claim's All is a reactive move 33%
 - But-out for states that don't make discrim laws
 - VRA stopped 2000 cases, acts as evidence that VRA works
 - Some evidence of Chapman, Virginia 9%
 - Framework is based on Shelby + Only + unreliable
 - All unable to relate 2000 cases

All provided clearer framework and maintained greater workload points. All's win

589

Ted Kim - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 401

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership VLNC -

Negative: Fairmont - ZSKK

Pos	Name	Order	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
A	Vincent Liu (2)	2	29	

Pos	Name	Order	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
N	Zaina Syed (2)	1	30	

A	Miranda Chang (1)	4	27	
---	-------------------	---	----	--

N	Kyle Kishimoto (1)	3	28	
---	--------------------	---	----	--

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

*Proportionality & Consistency

No

*Must be

- VSA + violates Constitution
- to Outdated
- Protections action right. States = win
- "Formula is too old" → History was on
- to other nondiscriminatory standards in states
- Unable to state post-VSA actions by states
- Rightly = actually went to Constitution
- to Moral = Utilitarian view
- Other id → Branch other branch
- to Not discrim.; that who increased after other id use
- Conceded Sec 4 was effective, but no longer needed
- Sec 4 not considered w/ proportionality
- Lack of evidence to back "Formula is old"

- Rightly = Truly Right (Case 23 = win)
- Sec 4 necessary due to existing discrimination is unconstitutional
- Evidence: Texas has passed after Sec 4 repealed → But still Sec 4 was effective
- Legally wrote due to repealing

- Who did the re-attack quickly of VSA?
- to Do evidence given by Aff. &
- States were in fact not due to discrimination, why laws to not violate by Aff. &
- "Formula is old"
- to Claim that date of formula too - effect on quality
- Claims Aff. 7 state is more discrimination
- Sec 4 protects right from forms of discrimination
- New formula (VSA 2011) is better, protects discrimination
- to 15% rule protect voting → VSA unconstitutional
- Relates "less serious" due to lack of evidence

Final Decision: Aff was unable to back claims with evidence as well as white carbon claims presented by Neg

Page 24/27, Created Sat-1:23 pm

Neg's Win

611

Carene Toh - RIS

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 606

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Honor Academy MCCY

Negative: Nera 42 - CPRL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (10-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (10-15)
1	Michael Chae	1	25	1	Cristina Peng	3	24.5
2	Chloe Yi	4	24	2	Hyo Lee	2	25

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? YES

Matthew F. Brandstetter

Fairmont

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

1st Aff: I would recommend tucking in your shirt while debating - looks more professional.

2nd Neg: You spend one minute reading one piece of evidence - ^{use your} time more efficiently.

Aff inadvertently grants/accepts Neg position as cross-fire

1st Neg summary extends this error. Aff admits it was a mistake.

2nd Neg: Do not stand and speak w/ both hands in your pocket.

LPW: Aff proves that section 4 is outdated and suggests a new formula would solve - this is never countered by Negative.

Neg are better speakers but argument go Affirmative. LPW

Pronunciation: precedence (note the correct accent mark); efficacy (note correct accent mark)
 Ginsburg (hard G sound)
 Bader, integral
 fewer states Not less states

640

**Mathew Brandsetter -
Fairmont**

Open Policy Round 3 - 1:30pm

Room: CC B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
BKAJ -

Negative: Nova 42 - EDM5

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Brian Kong	1	30
1	And John	2	29

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Richard Song	4	25
1	Michael Brennan	3	24

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? No

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

The Archer School
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

And - Keep working on spreading the AC needs evacuation work, but lots of potential. For in-mouth practice will help a lot!
Excellent ex responses, good job! Strong.
Try passing notes when you want to tell your partner something instead of speaking over him during his time.

Michael: It seemed you were not very familiar with the case you read. Also practice reading. A little more speed would be great even for lay judges. You have a very nice, clear voice.

Brian: Excellent speaker, great clear speed. Excellent overall. Very logical. Good list of votes.

Richard: Very unorganized speech. Didn't know where to flow your arguments. You make very good args, but unclear where to flow and you work on your presentation. Speed is (w) but needs to be more calm + composed. You need to read better and post sign!!

RFD: Neg tries to access AFF impacts but AFF proves neg counterplan is the same as status quo, for status quo not working. AFF simply for outweigh on both quantity and magnitude of impacts. Overall, neg needs more FACTS/CARDS.

GREAT DEBATE OVERALL!!!

614 Angela Yi - Cerritos

Open Pub.-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 608

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: New West Charter School DSGN - Negative: Kudos - JMBL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Dorotea Crank	1 2	30		Jasper Moh	3	28
2	Grace Nelson	2 3	29.5		Bryan Long	3 4	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? NO

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Cerritos
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

~~AF~~ ~~neg~~
~~1:05~~ ~~1:30~~
~~1:00~~

voted for update needed &
 AF's 3rd contention.

613 Angela Yi - Cerritos

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 608

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: The Archer School for Girls EMMP

Negative: Nova 42 - ASSN

Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Iran Mohammad	4	26	2	Anna Shim	1	27.5
1	Madeline Foster	3	26.5	1	Sary Nicholas	2	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

~~1:50~~~~1:50~~~~1:20 0:50~~

Aff depended on their definition of rightly, which went against their case.

to both:

EXPLAIN IMPORTANCE OF YOUR FW

615 **David Chavez - Nova 42**

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 607

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
LJAM -

Negative: Emerson - MKTS

Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
-----	------	----------	----------------	-----	------	----------	----------------

1	My	Laura Jenkins	3	25	18	2	Matthew Kim	26	2
---	----	---------------	---	----	----	---	-------------	----	---

2	My	Alisha Mehta	1	29	41	1	Theodore Bladdy	25	34
---	----	--------------	---	----	----	---	-----------------	----	----

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGES SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

Laura

Set up well, left powerful in arguments. Almost lost her nerves but kept it up for a solid finish. Great eye contact. Good focus. Less offensive, more defensive. Needs to push more. **UN**

Alisha

Great animation and voice projection, eye contact. Great stage presence. Great at pushing, arguing circles back to defend well. Def. the leader type. **not change**. Great use of time.

Theodore

Great organizer. Could use time more efficiently. **UN** Uses metaphors, creative. Good speaker. Less aggressive.

Pushes same point too hard. Needs to split focus.

Matthew

Good gestures, eye contact. Let Alisha overtake, but fought back, focused on limited point. Good offense, less defense.

612 Calvin Chen **David Chavez - Nova 42**

Open Pub. Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 607

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: New West Charter School DGJB - Negative: Carrites - EXJL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (20-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (20-15)		
2	Aff	David Gonzalez	4	25	2	Arg	Edward Kim	2	27
1	Arg	Joshua Baruch	3	24	1	Arg	Joseph Lee	1	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

Joshua

Pretty good beginning
debater. Not a really aggressive
or defensive speaker. Tries
to maintain focus/relevancy.

Joseph

Strong speaker, good use
of time. He pushes and
defends effectively. Taking
control during Xfire

David
needs to push his speech to
the final seconds.
Needs to push points more.
Emphasize importance and value
of arguments.
Be more specific on arguments.

Edward
needs to push speech to
final sec.
Focuses on same point
repeats too much, but did
defend it successfully.
Guideline used focus better
but great speaker.
Great strong attacker.

610 Audrey Jang - Whilshire

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 605

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kurus College of Youth Leadership CDSP

Negative: New West - IHCM

Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	BK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Osby Deng	2	26.5	2	Irwin Bakht	3	23
1	Shriya Padajepati	1	27	1	Kennedy McIntosh	4	23
			53.5				46

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

Startup

- Good tone, you have a good professional voice.
- You did a good job not letting only points by in your summary.
- Good partner support.

- Correct your attention to your contentions.

Crash

- Don't disregard encouragement; and say it falls to it doesn't have an impact - explain.
- Good tone, you have an admirable presence on the platform.

Kennedy

- More eye contact, look up while you speak.
- Do not mumble.
- Make your contentions clearer; say #1, #2, etc.

- You are persistent in ~~your~~ ^{living} your points just listen to what the opponent is wanting to say against your argument trying to refute that.

- Look up to the judge.
- Don't just read your speech.

- If there are points you don't understand ask questions during cross examination; you can ask.
- Have more confidence; it's ok if you're a beginner, you had a lot of evidence that would have been useful if you were more confident.

609 Audrey Jang - Whilshire

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 605

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership TCJC -

Negative: UNI - NKYK

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Thomas Chen	4	25	1	Nathan Kim	1	26
2	Jacob Chen	2	26.5	2	Yeeah Kim	3	25.5

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

1. • Good argumentation
• Do not forget to make eye contact
• Avoid reading continuously

1. • Clear enunciation - good
• Supports can be clearer - a reader would help

2. • I want to see clash! your argument that black votes have increased DOES NOT rebuttal against the ^{argument} that later ID laws have sprung up after VRA was struck down.
• You cannot bring up a plan
• You have a very good speaking voice but you need more clash.

- Good partnership ~~by~~ support
• Good argument with your framework

2. • Good rebuttals
• Dropped 4th argument
• Watch your time in Cross examination
• CrossEx is a time for questions

- "balls down to" = very good.

607 Ho Joon Kim - Whilshire

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 601

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Honor Academy MCDG

Negative: Kudoo - AFIC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
3	Matthew Choi	1	26.5	2	Aarna Fong	4	25
1	David Cheong	3	25	4	Ian Chen	3	25

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES!

- NEG
- ① Word discrimination after
 - ② Not as all equal
 - ③ Minister can rule
- If ministerial (domestic) getting caught. (black ground)
- POS
- ① No more such left to do
 - ② Black/white
 - ③ Otherwise a big distinction
- In this framework, saying I should not have to deal with it.
- I don't know what AT.
- Chen, at Fong speak during GC

Refused to 2 arguments, litigant just to be not under that ruled earlier & fixed making in court. I call this a tie, & my vote falls.

603 Derek Chen - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST BLDGS 602

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Negative
Affirmative: UNI Institute JCAK -

Affirmative
Negative: Kados - WZMC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Jason Choi	3	22	2	William Zhu	2	26
1	Alex Kim	4	21	1	Minerva Cheung	1	25

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

Derek Chen

Nova 42

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES

1st Neg - Speak louder and try not to mumble. Use eye contact!
2nd Neg - Compose yourself when you speak. You sound frantic and desperate. Your speech is supposed to refute the Aff, not read contentions again. Link impacts. Clarify your words.

Summary Speech: Be clear! Reiterate contentions if you must. You have to give a summary of your side and possibly a few voters.

FF - Need voters!

1st Aff - Use eye contact to catch the judge's attention. Consistent speech with some pauses. Try to be more fluent.

2nd Aff - Speed/Spreading will confuse a lay judge. Think out what you say and slow down. Speak fluently, not so incoherent. Give me more impact. You sound desperate and rude; fix that!

Summary Speech: You also need to try to make your speech more fluent. Eye contact is necessary to influence the judge. Summarize your case.

FF - Give me clear voters!

~~Tell me why you won on this voting issues!~~ Don't spread so much!

604 Derek Chen - Nova 42

Open Pub-Forum Round 3 - 1:30pm

FLIGHT: B

Room: EAST BLDGS 602

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: 1:30pm

Ballot Due: ASAP

Neg

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership AFED -

Negative: Whilshire - SJD

Aff.

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Ajoo Peng	4	24	1	Sarah Jung	1	29
1	Eric Deng	3	25	2	Darren Jeong	2	27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

Derek Chen

Nova 42

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

FLIP FOR SIDES

1st Neg - Give me eye contact! Stand straight and be confident! You mumbled a little bit; fix it.

2nd Neg - Be clear and compose your speech. Very fragmented speech/work on fluency. Good eye contact but there can be more. You sound very uncertain.

SS - don't look around so much! Focus on giving me eye contact. Your eyes make you nervous and desperate.

FF - make Voting issues clearer! Tell how you were successful in refuting.

1st Aff - Could use some more eye contact.

2nd Aff - Good fluency and relation to judge. Add a bit more eye contact, but good.

SS - good, clear speech. Good summary and partial voting issues. Voting issues should ~~also be~~ also be stated more by FF. Try to also restate your contentions.

FF - You imply voting issues. ~~Specific~~ You should specifically state the voting issues before stating the reason you won on these points.

638 **Bill Bartels - La Reina**

Open LD Round 3 - 1:30pm FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST Biology

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due:

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership GW -

Negative: AcHL - MK

Name

Points
(30-15)

Name

Points
(30-15)

Greg Wong

25

Mirjeon Kang

26

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win ✓

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The negative case was collapsed
for the one arg that was dropped
with offence still on aff

low point win for aff being made
asking to explain without issues and (logics)

635 Jong-Hak Won - Nova 42

Open LD Round 3 - 1:30pm FLIGHT: A

Room: EAST Chem B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due:

Affirmative: Kados College of Youth
Leadership JLG -

Negative: La Reina - KH

Name	Points (30-15)
Jacobson Lin	2 275

Name	Points (30-15)
Kathya Hoffman	1 285

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ☒

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I vote off because they uphold restriction.

Great debate! Tough decision!

At the end of the debate I am left with
two values and criteria. (Neg) Self determination + Realism
were not fully explained in this debate. As the
judge I need to know how they impact the council
leave them into your contentions such as refer back
to them through out your speeches.
I vote for greatest good.

633 Matt Karnyski - AofHL

Open LD Round 3 - 1:30pm FLIGHT: B

Room: MSET B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due:

Affirmative: Honor Academy EL

Negative: Kudos - SY

Name

Points
(30:15)

Name

Points
(30:15)

Eunice Lee

1 27

Sylvester Yue

2 22

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I voted AFF because NEG's case did not have very many examples, and was hard to understand NEG dropped most of AFF's arguments

627 Matt Karnyski- AofHL

Open LD Round 3 - 1:30pm FLIGHT: A

Room: MSET B

2014 SCJPL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start:

Ballot Due:

Affirmative: Magnet Learning Academy ML

Negative: Cerritos - EJ

Name

Points
(30:15)

Name

Points
(30:15)

Mark Lee

1 28

2

Edward Jung

27

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I voted AFF. because NEG's whole case was only based on untruth. AFF responded well during the crossfire. AFF proved his value throughout. NEG. dropped a lot of AFF's case.