

809 **Matt Conrad - La Reina**

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST Biology

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning GK - Negative: Magnet Academy - ML

Name

Points
(30:15)

Name

Points
(30:15)

AF Christopher Kirk

27

NEG Mark Lee

26

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AF - Declaration of what
an opponent can or cannot
do is up to the opponent
for a negative 1 -
as the value is
to win.

NEG - "You'll like"
value - as state case -
Batsman card is
excellent.

Based on the debate for the
AF was the better team
and was held together
better than the neg

807

JUDGE TBA - Joey Holic Vain
Nova 42 Academy

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST Chem A

2019 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership IINegative: Magnet Academy - DL

Name

Points
(30-15)

Name

Points
(30-15)Justin Jang28Oliver Limaye26Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

I voted aff because the neg dropped aff's
contention 1 and the impacts in it. Aff has already
met the value criterion of preserving lives. Furthermore,
the only neg response to this contention was made
in the second speech, which at that point was too late.

Also, the neg dropped aff's ~~rebuttal~~ rebuttal
about how resource extraction actually harms
indigenous peoples. Aff also successfully proves how
resource ~~extraction~~ extraction exacerbates poverty.

JustinOliver

- Your pace was good
- Slow down just a bit
on your impacts. Make sure
you're making each one clear

- Make sure to
respond to all
arguments in your 2nd speech

By the way, I apologize for my atrocious handwriting.

806 **Willie Washington - Nova**
42

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 609

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: La Reina High School ES -

Negative: Magnet Academy - JY

Name

Points
(30-15)

Name

Points
(30-15)

AFF

Elena Svoboda

29

NEG

James Yin

27

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

Low Point Win? ____

Michelle Chin

Cerritos

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

RFD: Voted for the Affirmation because upheld her framework and resolution clearly explained how we must look to her Framework before all other FW in the round. Upheld her burden of proof and successfully defended her case. Great evidence & in your rebuttal!

tips/comments
for Neg

- refute value criteria!
- tell the judge why your FW is most important & your contentions
- You had a great case, but try to find some more blocks for future topics
- Great confidence & loudness of voice

AFF: - good eye contact
- give some hand gestures
- case was strong.

BOTH did a
GREAT JOB!

Ballot: _____ Judge: Weiss
 Room: 607
 Round Start: 5:30 PM

Open LD Round: _____
 2014 SCJPL March 2014 League Debate
 Ballot Due: _____

Affirmative Team: _____

Negative Team: A of HL

Name	Points (30-15)	Name	Points (30-15)
<u>Grant Sheen</u>	<u>28.5</u>	<u>Khai Bury</u>	<u>28</u>

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

Low Point Win? _____

[Signature]

Ridgecrest

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Comments:

Aff. Get a time piece so you can time yourself!

He is using China as an example to take us million out of poverty. Too bad we can't breathe in Beijing!

To both of you:

Extend your evidence - not just the ideas they expound

I feel the Aff is doing a better job of responding directly to the arguments.

I vote Aff off the "2nd" (it's your 1st)

Contention.

Good job taking down his ^{stage} solar flairs! ☺

Neg. A better CX on where in your case doesn't state Do you prove the planet is warming from RE activities.

Unusual roadmap

"NC → Then AC"



JOHN FAUCHER

EverythingTab.com

803 - ~~David Finnigan~~ - La Reina

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 606

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Magnet Learning Academy OK -

Negative: Kados - CC

Name Points
(30-15)

Name Points
(30-15)

Olivia Kim 27

Courtney Chen 24.5

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Both sides did a lot of frantic spreading.
But both showed themselves knowledgeable
in cross-exams + rebuttals.

I give the debate to affirmative because she
was more poised, clearer to understand, and
more organized.

802 Neil Ettington - RIS

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 605

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy TL -

Negative: Magnet Academy - MY

Name

Points
(30-15)

Name

Points
(30-15)

Tiana Lopez

28

Myoungjun Yun

27

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff won framework and blocked out neg impacts. Voted 2 of one aff benefit that was RTT

801 Sophie Pielstick - Kudos

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 604

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

~~NEGATIVE~~~~Affirmative~~ La Reina High School HB~~Affirmative~~~~NEGATIVE~~ Magnet Academy - JS

Name

Points
(10-15)

Name

Points
(10-15)

Sarah Bartles

29.5

Justin Shin

28

NEG won on value, style, and arguments

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

EFF - SHIN

NEG - BARTLES

Don't use framework
as contention 1.Just a stylistic thing.
did not affect decision- state definitions in
framework- love the energy!
- enthusiastic- you did a good job
refuting against her attack on
your value, but be more
polite.- there was the problem of
linking things back. you did it all w/ cards
but didn't expand
- you're very good @ debate &
I urge you to continue with
this!- I love your argument against
life. "death is inherent to life" is good
and manipulative in the best
way. A+

- you're great! stay w/ debate!

- you had great contention
- work on being thorough
and having more
factual (number-y)
cards.- ~~you~~

800

Joanne Lee
~~Sean McKeever~~ - Magnet
 Academy

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: IDEA B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: UNH Institute EP

Negative: Kudos - BC

Name

Points
(30-15)

Name

Points
(30-15)

Eunice Park

29

Brian Chang

28.5

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Honor
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Aff

- drop disease will not cause extinction (answer in reb)
- drop impact of value/criterion ("once you die...")

Neg

- drop 1: 8-15 (neg said in reb)
- drop gov has resp. to protect people (utilitar)

Note: even if neg did win framework, aff still fulfills better because she won contentions + utilitarianism
 neg needs to specifically say why aff does not fulfill neg criterion

framework: neg and aff both did ok, ^{neg have gone} on why neg value is better
 econ: aff won, neg answered in rebuttal, aff provided more ev.

climate change: neg ev. was not valid, aff won
 disease: neg won, aff conceded disease

instant win
 because IAR
 did not specifically
 go on framework
 she just went a
 little on it

799 Willie Washington - Nova
42

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: MAT A

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
MIT -

Negative: Nova 42 - KH

Name	Points (30-15)
Mahmoud Hassan	29

Name	Points (30-15)
Kylian Han	28

Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.Low Point Win? NO

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Cerritos
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

~~AFF~~ ~~NEG~~
~~3:24~~ ~~2:21~~

- Voted AFF for - GDP turn

- Political corruption needs ~~new~~ ~~proves~~ ~~more~~ ~~neg's value~~
- Biodiversity impact outweighs

Don't drop arguments!

Good job overall - best round I've judged so far
😊

798

Tiya Basilio - AofHL

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: MAT B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Ridgecrest Intermediate School
MG -

Negative: Magnet Academy - MH

Name	Points (30-15)	Name	Points (30-15)
<u>Aff</u> <u>Shon Sung Gwak</u> <u>28</u> <u>WTFN</u>		<u>NEG</u> <u>Mel Hines</u> <u>20.5</u> <u>21</u>	

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

Low Point Win? _____

Tiya Basilio
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Academy of Higher Learning
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

AC - Good support and impacts but slow down. You are not repeat important tag line. You are running this like a policy round when a key component to L.D. is the emotional appeal to value. Maximize speaker points by slowing down.

NC/HR - Speak up during cross-X. Use all of the prep-time to clarify or prove a point to advance your case. You are mumbling and understand. You gave up during rebuttals. Should have used more prep-time. Silence is concession.

IAR - Good addressing every rebuttal like it is important. Point out drops and extended impacts. Don't say we can't care about justice because morality is often defined as justice and that is your value.

2NR - You need to sign post better. When you rebuild your case you need to word it "I said...", "He said...", "However I say... because..." When you rebuttal his case you need to repeat what you are rebuttaling the rebuttal. Also, end with why your value should be preferred. You barely touched value debate.

2AR - Most of your case is a slippery slope ... extinction, natzi ... however opponent did not address.

825 Janice Lee - RIS

Open Pub. Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 402

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

~~Negative~~
 Flip for sides: Kudos College of Youth Leadership MIMJ -

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>1</u>	Michael Huang	<u>1</u>	<u>30</u>
<u>2</u>	Mei Johnson	<u>2</u>	<u>29.5</u>

~~Affirmative~~
 Flip for sides: Kudos - WZMC

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>2</u>	William Zhu	<u>4</u>	<u>28</u>
<u>1</u>	Minoda Cheung	<u>3</u>	<u>29</u>

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

Low Point Win? _____

Janice Lee
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Ridgcrest
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

That was a really awesome round you guys!!
 so... I voted for the negation because

- ① The neg won on Framework because they responded to the "too broad/vague" arg. against their FW of human rights/const. they were able to convince me that their criteria encompassed the AFF's and was topical.
- ② The neg effectively extended racism impacts throughout the debate that weren't answered earlier.
- ③ Mei's Anal focus really convinced me because she clearly laid out that they won on 1) Human Rights and 2) constitutionality so that even if the AFF did win their FW the ballot would still go towards the neg.

OVERALL a fantastic round!!! keep on debating :)

833 Carene Toh - RIS

Open Pub.-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 603

2014 SCJPL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Nova 42 Academy TCKP -

Flip for sides: Nova 42 - SWCY

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>Neg</u>	Timothy Choi	<u>(3)</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Aff</u>	Sam Walton	<u>25</u>	<u>(2)</u>
<u>Neg</u>	Kaitlyn Pak	<u>1</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>Aff</u>	Carson Yu	<u>24</u>	<u>(4)</u>

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

NEG

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

- ① Aff did not refute Neg's 2nd contentions.
- ② Aff's contentions are ~~not~~ sufficiently lack evidences.
- ③

830 ~~Angela Yi - Cerritos~~

Open Pub. Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 411

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Walsby Academy ICMK - AFFFlip for sides: RIS - SLJZ NEG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>2TE</u>	Isaac Chung	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>3CC</u>	Sung Gyung Lee	<u>1</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>1PC</u>	Max Kang	<u>4</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>1CC</u>	Irene Zhen	<u>3</u>	<u>25</u>

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

Low Point Win? YesE. B.
JUDGE'S SIGNATUREMagnet
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The AFF ev. on racial gerrymandering say Sec 4 is the cause. It does say remedies set up future conflict, but that's not a causal claim about the roots or origin of R.G. Unfortunately, the Neg doesn't point this out in a speech until the CFF. That's too late and I would have to intervene to make it relevant and true. PFF strategically uses this arg to cancel out the good that Sec. 4 does for voter discrim. That impacts the 15th Am - Constitutionality debate. AFF's C1 + C2 on Federalism and state sov args were answered early by the Neg. Neg extends the answers in the CS speech, but Aff only extends its Art. 4 + Art 6 top lines. This makes a mess of the debate. I vote ~~Pro~~ PRO on State sov and unequal application.

826

David Lee - Nova 42

Open Pub.-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 403

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Judges' Crest Intermediate School
LKSJ - **Negative**

Flip for sides: Kudos - VLNC

Affirmative

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

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

2 Lauren Keeg 2 28

3 Vincent Lin 3 27.5

4 Sonali Loomba 1 29

4 Miranda Chang 4 27

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

Low Point Win? **NO**

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Fairmont Preparatory Academy

Case strong - good framework
↳ consider using subpointsCase strong - good framework
↳ consider using subpoints for further organizationLauren - you are a great speaker,
comparable w/ some high school students.Miranda - you are a good speaker;
don't let your opponents throw you off guard; bring more energy to the round.

Sonali - organize your responses; number them

Vincent - you need to defend your own frame

- your rebuttals are excellent, very creative; you show knowledge of the topic.

↳ you need to address all of your opponents' observations

↳ you control the creative

↳ Miranda can't do it if you do;

Very nice - keep practicing
↳ excellent presence
you remind me of myself. Keep it up!

↳ you really needed to use congruence + proportionality - you can use it to win in the future. during final focus, you brought it in that's too late!!

Both teams must winning how many point each team dropped, they close.

EverythingTab.com

823

JUDGE TBA

Open Pub-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

FLIGHT: A

Room: ROOM TBA

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Fairmont Preparatory Academy
2SKK

Flip for sides: Nava 42 - SCPH

Pos Name

BK (1-4)

Points
(30-15)

Pos Name

BK (1-4)

Points
(30-15)

2 Zoro Speed

29.5

2 Sue Woon Chai

29

1 Kyle Ekelomoto

27.5

1 Preston Ho

27

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

1. ~~reorganized~~ sometimes difficult to understand - add strategic points goal depending to positions
don't get flustered; start w/ conclusion in summary = good.

1. more eye contact; be careful of only reading from paper just
Summary should be another rebuttal point

2. GOOD analogies. Good rebuttals + evidence
Good answers to XE, and good
Presenting your points spinning
opponents' arguments toward your side.
Clash like evidence = GOOD.
More precise notes would be
Good broad use of the entire debate
even in the final focus.

2. Redtrap - Good
Good rebuttals - prepared evidence.
~~Good rebuttals~~
Good questions up for clarification of generalist arguments.
Don't forget rebuttals against
your opponent's defense of their points
2. their rebuttals
and focus should point out weaknesses
aspect of debate

827 Mandy Nelson - New West

Open Pub-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 404

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Nova 42 Academy AKTC -

Flip for sides: Nova 42 - BPSH

Aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Andrew Kwon	2	28
2	Tiffany Chang	1	29

Neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Regina Park	3	27
1	Stacy Haddock	4	26

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

Low Point Win? ____

Mandy Nelson
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

New West
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

The Affirmative has strong contentions ~~but~~ ^{and} the Negative didn't rebut their contentions. Neg got intimidated and lost track of the contentions. Speaker 1 ~~needs~~ on Neg needs to participate in cross.

824 Samantha Weiss - RIS

Open Pub. Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 401

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Fairmont Preparatory Academy
GSP -

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
---	Garveer Singh	1	27.5
---	Jake Palmer	4	24.5

Flip for sides: Carritas - JCHL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
---	Jake Cha	3	25.5
---	Ho Hyun Lee	2	26

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

RFD: I vote off due to framework and upholding the Res
 Neg You must state your action/framework if you would like it
 used in the rounds. Going first gives you the opportunity
 to set up/frame the debate.
 Freedom of speech contention was a strong contention link it
 to the resolution (constitution) and provide the impacts in
 your first speech.

Aff- Take P. we talked about the fine line, time down the opposition
 Both key to tie your contentions to your framework more
 often and throughout the debate. Just because section 2
 can do the job doesn't make section 4 irrelevant.

832 Rashin Simoni - New West

Open Pub.-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 602

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Wilshire Academy CPAL -

AFF

Flip for sides: Wilshire - SJD

NEG

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>1</u>	Candice Park	<u>2</u>	<u>27.5</u>	<u>1</u>	Sarah Jung	<u>3</u>	<u>27.5</u>
<u>2</u>		<u>4</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>2</u>	Doyeon Joong	<u>1</u>	<u>28</u>

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

Low Point Win? NO

Matthew F. Charleston
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Samant
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Complements to both teams on appearance - very professional demeanor
Very good debate - excellent analysis and refutation. Best debate I have seen all day!

This debate boils down to the first focus speeches. Negative does a superior job of extending five overall block arguments to Aff Case that Aff first focus is unable to address.

Overall, Neg ballot!

prevalent [note correct accent mark]

828

Rebecca Cannon - Whilshire

Open Pub-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 407

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Ridgcrest Intermediate School
NTBZ -

Flip for sides: Fairmont - AYAI

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)	Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
<u>2</u>	Natasha Tira	<u>2</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>1</u>	Alexsso Tira	<u>3</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>1</u>	Bohan Zheng	<u>4</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>2</u>	Adnan Ismail	<u>1</u>	<u>26.5</u>

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

Low Point Win? 20

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Bohan: You should speak slower. I know you feel like you have alot to cover, but you are speaking faster than your mouth. pleasant and charming.

Alexsso: Your Attitude in CX was snippy. Be careful to be more professional. I do love your delivery. It is clear and confident.

Natasha: Very good Coverage and Empirical knowledge. I would prefer some additional evidence and some expert analysis.

Adnan: Your volume is confident, but it comes across as arrogant. You have very good analysis. Adnan's pointed a legitimate reason¹

All ¹ Tag more clearly.

2. Time starts when the opponents finish speaking.

RFD - the CON had more consistently standards

Be careful about re community like that. Instead of saying it is so, prove

834 **Michelle Chin** - **Cerritos**

Open Pub. Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 406

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Honor Academy IIAC -

NEG.

Flip for sides: Fairmont - SKEP

AF

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

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

3 Justin Jung 3 21.5

2 Sahar Khayashar 2 28.5

1 Alice Chan 4 26.5

4 Eric Frankel 1 28

Yes rather low > speaks

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

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

NEG
 Prof. Bundy's criteria: most
 1) Rhetoric
 I: applying to products after,
 set another change.
 I: belonging from America will
 cause harm.

2) Current trend - better to have
 to have 100% democracy change
 less, a possible voting & legislation

3) Suppose that court ruled
 10th, + compare at SC
 again, but make not be the
 right body to decide

100% democracy change.

points 4 and 1, not 100%

100% democracy change.

100% democracy change.
 100% democracy change.
 100% democracy change.

AF
 1) 1st & 2nd
 5 minutes in P.
 2) 50+ I: make
 1) what to contribute?
 2) What is the
 3) 1st - 1st
 4) 1st - 1st
 5) 1st - 1st
 6) 1st - 1st
 7) 1st - 1st
 8) 1st - 1st
 9) 1st - 1st
 10) 1st - 1st
 11) 1st - 1st
 12) 1st - 1st
 13) 1st - 1st
 14) 1st - 1st
 15) 1st - 1st
 16) 1st - 1st
 17) 1st - 1st
 18) 1st - 1st
 19) 1st - 1st
 20) 1st - 1st
 21) 1st - 1st
 22) 1st - 1st
 23) 1st - 1st
 24) 1st - 1st
 25) 1st - 1st
 26) 1st - 1st
 27) 1st - 1st
 28) 1st - 1st
 29) 1st - 1st
 30) 1st - 1st

1) 1st - 1st
 2) 1st - 1st
 3) 1st - 1st
 4) 1st - 1st
 5) 1st - 1st
 6) 1st - 1st
 7) 1st - 1st
 8) 1st - 1st
 9) 1st - 1st
 10) 1st - 1st
 11) 1st - 1st
 12) 1st - 1st
 13) 1st - 1st
 14) 1st - 1st
 15) 1st - 1st
 16) 1st - 1st
 17) 1st - 1st
 18) 1st - 1st
 19) 1st - 1st
 20) 1st - 1st
 21) 1st - 1st
 22) 1st - 1st
 23) 1st - 1st
 24) 1st - 1st
 25) 1st - 1st
 26) 1st - 1st
 27) 1st - 1st
 28) 1st - 1st
 29) 1st - 1st
 30) 1st - 1st

1) 1st - 1st
 2) 1st - 1st
 3) 1st - 1st
 4) 1st - 1st
 5) 1st - 1st
 6) 1st - 1st
 7) 1st - 1st
 8) 1st - 1st
 9) 1st - 1st
 10) 1st - 1st
 11) 1st - 1st
 12) 1st - 1st
 13) 1st - 1st
 14) 1st - 1st
 15) 1st - 1st
 16) 1st - 1st
 17) 1st - 1st
 18) 1st - 1st
 19) 1st - 1st
 20) 1st - 1st
 21) 1st - 1st
 22) 1st - 1st
 23) 1st - 1st
 24) 1st - 1st
 25) 1st - 1st
 26) 1st - 1st
 27) 1st - 1st
 28) 1st - 1st
 29) 1st - 1st
 30) 1st - 1st

NEG
 1) 1st - 1st
 2) 1st - 1st
 3) 1st - 1st
 4) 1st - 1st
 5) 1st - 1st
 6) 1st - 1st
 7) 1st - 1st
 8) 1st - 1st
 9) 1st - 1st
 10) 1st - 1st
 11) 1st - 1st
 12) 1st - 1st
 13) 1st - 1st
 14) 1st - 1st
 15) 1st - 1st
 16) 1st - 1st
 17) 1st - 1st
 18) 1st - 1st
 19) 1st - 1st
 20) 1st - 1st
 21) 1st - 1st
 22) 1st - 1st
 23) 1st - 1st
 24) 1st - 1st
 25) 1st - 1st
 26) 1st - 1st
 27) 1st - 1st
 28) 1st - 1st
 29) 1st - 1st
 30) 1st - 1st

AF
 1) 1st - 1st
 2) 1st - 1st
 3) 1st - 1st
 4) 1st - 1st
 5) 1st - 1st
 6) 1st - 1st
 7) 1st - 1st
 8) 1st - 1st
 9) 1st - 1st
 10) 1st - 1st
 11) 1st - 1st
 12) 1st - 1st
 13) 1st - 1st
 14) 1st - 1st
 15) 1st - 1st
 16) 1st - 1st
 17) 1st - 1st
 18) 1st - 1st
 19) 1st - 1st
 20) 1st - 1st
 21) 1st - 1st
 22) 1st - 1st
 23) 1st - 1st
 24) 1st - 1st
 25) 1st - 1st
 26) 1st - 1st
 27) 1st - 1st
 28) 1st - 1st
 29) 1st - 1st
 30) 1st - 1st

808 Sreeni Padigepati - Kudos

Open LD Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST Chem B

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Affirmative: Magnet Learning Academy - CL

Negative: RIS - AC

Name	Points (30-15)	Name	Points (30-15)
1 Chris Lee	1 28	2 Allen Chan	2 27

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

Low Point Win? _____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Affirm 6

1. Most life saved

Cot #1: Re source extract endowment
Economic growth→ Re source extract - increases
revenue - reduces total jobCot #2: "Increases violence"
- Good way associated w/ resource
extractCot #3: Threaten environment
- Eco system
- species extinction leads to human
extinction.

Cot #4: exam - 3m

1) life - how scary life

2) year in Africa, Zimbabwe

3) Civil war - Angola vs China

4) COTM 3m

1. 1) What is content?
2) War in Africa is
3) more life saved in Africa

Neg 1

Cot #1: exam - 3m

1) What is value

2) Cot #1 - endowment economy
do you have example, which look

3) Cot #2: Increases violence related

4) env. protection can it be after
resource extract

1) Alleviating poverty

2) Utilitarian: private to help people
benefits to what off is more way

3) Poverty is root cause of everything

4) High income associated w/ improved
economy

Cot #4: People are dying because of poverty

Affirm: Large people - most people
life saved

Cot #1: Re source extract exam - 3m

2) people are dying because of poverty
3) Good for economy4) Vote for Affirm as his value, criterion to put life ahead
of everything else is defended well & was consistent all along debate

Prep - 11:50

4 a.

- 1) morality can't be used as value prop.
- life is more valuable.
- I save life of every species, while my opponent alienates property.
- people are dying.
- I save more lives with my content.

Prep - 1:10

- 1. Refuted Economic boom.
- trees cut down.
- Key victory when
- I saving life of all people.
- poor.
- the value @ critical.
- life saving - morality.

4. poverty is low
5. 56 more dead.

prep: 4.

6 a.

- 1) my value is morality.
- After Resource extraction, we can reduce people dying of poverty.
- 2) Dutch disease: Resource rich countries are well off.
- 3) poverty is main cause of 232 m deaths/yr.
- 4) Bio diversity has long term effect.
- 5) Resource extraction #1 priority.
- ENV - #2. to save life of people suffering poverty.
- 6) Income inequality 2.4%, whereas it is an.

829

JUDGE TBA

EverythingTab.com

Room: EAST BLDGS 409

Open Pub.-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Argumentation and
Communication Leadership Academy JPET -

Flip for sides: Nova 42 - ALAL

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
2	Jake Fox	4	27.5
1	Ethan Thio	1	30

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Annette Lee	3	28
2	Ashley Lim	2	29.5

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

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

KUDOS

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Annette: I love your speaking style!

If you want to "emphasize" that the opponents didn't answer case, say "extend our case" and touch base on it. You did good on the grand crossfire but I think you were too wild on the first crossfire.

Ethan: you have an awesome speaking style! I love how you explain your arguments! Great eye contact but next time, lift prep after the crossfire! and don't get shumped if you don't have the exact evidence yours was right

Ashley: you sound really persuasive when you speak! It was great that you answered everything! but in your last speech, spend some time telling me why your team should win.

Jake: you're so confident in cross fire and that's awesome! but I don't know why you have some of that confidence during your speech. It's better to refute THEIR speech in your first speech than defend yours.

In the end, I had to vote Neg because the aff dropped their case and they refuted more arguments. You both did awesome but it was the little arguments that added up! Great job to both aff and neg!!!



♥ you guys are so cute ♥



Decision review
around 1984-5

Section 4 is
unconstitutional

54... necessary
proper

A) not outdated

B) effective

C) prevents
future problems

72. motives
not justified yet

A) it is
questionable

B) not eliminated
by state sovereignty

e
x
+
e
n
d
e
d
?

The VRAA
makes it not

1. State equality
is still there.

AFF CASE

52.4 (unreliable)

1) Sec 3 & 2 are
good replacement

Section 2 is
unaffected

Sec 2 allows state
much easier to
get them
can enforce

Section 2
is ineffective

never gave
the due.
this can be
overlooked now

Failed to meet
criteria.
Section 4 was a
long time ago.
we shouldn't
follow this

2) how the times
have changed

4 laws were
eliminated, etc

only talked about
discrimination but
Sec 4 not only
discrimination

is legitimate
VRAA will
cover for it.

why follow
Sec 2 & 3
if VRAA

desperate
times =
desperate
measures.

no longer
necessary to
break the 10
amendment

3) VRAA is a
great replacement

↳ replace say
worse.

↳ makes it
more effective.

gave no direct
evidence

never listed
the purposes

the VRAA would
cover less states

There is a
source for this.

bill in

people who
still find
ways to
discriminate.

water ID

831

JUDGE TBA

Open Pub.-Forum Round 4 - 4:00pm

Room: EAST BLDGS 601

2014 SCJFL March 2014 League Debate

Round Start: ASAP

Ballot Due: ASAP

Flip for sides: Honor Academy MCCY

Flip for sides: Palemont-PEAD

Aff

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Michael Choe	3	26.5
2	Cindy Yi	4	26.5

Neg

Pos	Name	RK (1-4)	Points (30-15)
1	Pelin Enayati	1	28
2	Alexis Duke	2	28

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

Low Point Win PEAD

Jay Majumdar
JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

Ridgecrest
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Look at the VRA.

1. Times have changed

u. Link

June 25, 13

changed after

Chief Roberts

did things

over 4 yrs

old

1. VRA violates

10th amendments

John Sutton-1972

VRA 1965

2. looking

it makes /

Critic '10
Affected constitutionally
only sides to go

1st that is what

2. Maintains Racial

Relations

4. Turnouts

35% of people

Section 5

Asian Americans

Disenfranchising race

based voting

VRA Sec. 5

TX Richmond

b. African Americans

Shake, ...

protected by Sec. 4

US 1 African on (m)

7 2.7%

Section

TX, FL, +

NE

2. protects rights

20,000 blocked

1:15 left

- Society has

changed

- 15th amendment

allows to enforce

- Election will

always exist

As a whole US

not racist

- Section 4 not

needed

page 1 instant

- They have not

ended racism

Harvard

20,000 ppl of

Racism 1. part

of the point

2 states affected

11th century

John P. Henry

on sovereignty

when applying

to Voting rights

Harvard - Racial

- RACE

a. observations

=

2. Maintains Racial

Relations

stopped

2010

John Sutton-1972

40 more yrs

of Disenfranchising

African Americans

got more votes

in the past.

New Formula Used

of old laws

or change

or outdated

Majority changed

6.4% in Missouri

2004 76%

Times have changed

harshly - 3%

out of the voters

haven't got others

bopped arguments

- Constitutionality

How is outdated?

part of debate

Two worlds

not reserved - no

states sovereignty

does not violate

VRA not outdated

UC Davis / Kentucky

States in Deep south

Anti-Black

1960s - LARGE

view - STILL HERE

4 states is it

F

haven't got others

bopped arguments

- Constitutionality

How is outdated?

part of debate

Two worlds

ORAL COMMENTS

RFD The Negation has won this round because the Aff failed to respond to the arguments of the NEG and did not properly lay the plan for why they should win.

GOOD JOB !

