

44 Evelyn Barber - La Reina

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 1082019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 1:45 pm****Ballot Due: 2:30 pm****Affirmative:** Academy of Higher Learning TH**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership THNamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)Aff

Timothy Ha

93Neg

Ted Hong

92**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**Low Point Win? yesEvelyn-Marian BarberLa Reina High School

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!AffNeg

- phrase your questions in cross-x as questions. don't focus on 1 point too long because you loose sight of the main debate.

- 1 AR: I like how you outweigh one thousand over 1 million. Extend that argument over your whole case because it gives a good sense of perceptive case.

- If you're going to run a ^{"racism"} ~~racist~~ contention, I would make ~~the~~ it more about the CJS, and not just the drug courts.

- Link your V and VC more often in your case.

- I like how you talked about his value and value criterion in his case.

* In cross x, be more assertive and don't let your opponent talk over you. Make your claims with confidence.

- Neg Rebuttal: I like how you used your Singapore evidence to conclude that there is a pattern with specking. I like how you did the case rebuttal in the last speech. However I don't think it left you enough time to expand on voters.

- I like your refutation to the racist police argument.

I voted for the negative side because I felt like the value and value criterion were stronger and upheld ~~stronger~~ better throughout the case. The neg did a good job on refuting everything and his arguments were more believable than the arguments on the affirmative side. If the neg aff had extended more of his arguments like the worldwide scale and proven that Singapore wasn't a valid example, it would have worked in his favor.

47

~~JUDGE TBA~~

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 105

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership FZ

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning DC

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Franklin Zhu

90

N

Daniel Choi

92

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

Low Point Win?

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Franklin - pro -

- ⊕ logics → many people w/ disorder. / misuse
 - mass incarceration → poverty → violence cycle
 - ineffective in drug abuse
 - immoral - no rehab -
 - minority targeted

- Daniel Choi → great tempo, eye contact, engaging - 3 min
 - cost too much to rehab -
 - Domestic security
 - \$ - tobacco → legalized drugs → imagine if drugs made legal
 - drug is a choice - prevent drug trafficking
 - war on drugs - also helps
 - ex: Singapore - effective drug laws tough criminal law

Franklin, need to make connection between drug use
 and police incarceration of color people
 (are they being pulled over for other non-drug
 related activities) - harassed.

* Domestic Safety -

Poor / Black people being harassed for using drugs?
 But I like incarceration - is not moral → rehab is
 the answer.

Franklin
 I don't like
 just reading
 off and
 document

Wilshire

- Daniel → domestic security -
- legalization of drug with male society more KO
offer domestic security.
 - No link between black harassment and drug
use -
 - Drug crimes vs. drug trafficking -
(Mass incarceration →)
 - Singapore → rehabilitate not its courts -
Sweden - prevention drug laws

Franklin → rehab (public health) helps

The bottom line for me was that I was waiting for
Franklin to
connect the dot between incarceration
of black people and the treating of drug as public health.
I understand that majority of people suffering
from opioid crisis is white people. So
how does help treating these people relates to
the structural discrimination? I couldn't
resolve it. ②

(But Franklin had a good amount of evidence.
I am impressed.)

Daniel's reference to Singapore and its success
of drug ~~use~~ reduction w/ iron clad law was
very convincing.

42

Taylor Yatez - Kudos Leadershi

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 322

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy SZ

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning SJ

Name

Points
(100-70)

Name

Points
(100-70)

Sabrina Zhang

898

Soren Jensen

92

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Aff

Neg

Very well delivered constructive. Normally I
don't do well with speed but you had great
diction so it was easy to follow.

good counter on his 2nd contention.

Strong first rebuttal, you covered a lot of ground
in 4 minutes.

Great case and great use of time. You countered
her points, set your case, and even touched on
CX.

Your defense on CX is very strong, but I
agree with Aff on your 2nd contention not standing,
against HIV + AIDS. I hope you bring this back up
in your speech

Telling us to move away from evidence is a shaky
argument,

Needed you to counter her syring exchange point and
focus more on criminal justice.

2:07 sec of prep

6

3

7

3

4

~~0~~

3

45

Kian Yeow Gan
Gary Chang - Kudos
Leadershi

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 107

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning JM

Negative: Nova 42 Academy AK

NamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)

James Miller

93
93
93

Andrew Kim

95

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

Low Point Win? ____

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Evident prepared.

Great speech

Good argument

Great speech with passion
 with evident provided (quoted)

Rebutted with well prepared content

46

~~Teja Vepa - La Reina~~

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 106

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning TS

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JL

Name

Points
(100-70)

Tarun Subramanian

85

Name

Points
(100-70)

Jeffrey Liu

87

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

Low Point Win? ____

~~Tarun Subramanian~~

La Reina

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Aff

If you don't speak clearer I won't be able to flow your speech. Look at the judge, not your opponent. Kept saying "Um a" which is a really bad habit. Talk about cards neg brought up.

Neg

Don't ask questions during aff cx of neg. Value criterion was negative rights, but kept bringing up autonomy.

49 Kelly Barber - La Reina

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 103

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Academy of Higher Learning PP

Negative: Kudos College of Youth Leadership
LW

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
Phillip Park	75	Luke Wu	85

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

Low Point Win? _____

Kelly Barber

JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Aff

- Come prepared to the round with pre-flows so the round can start on time
- ~~§~~ ~~Contentions~~ are a little confusing
- ~~you~~ need cards ~~and not just~~ that prove what you're saying
- can't bring up evidence that wasn't in your case
- even if you don't know what to say in a rebuttal say something don't just drop the whole case

Neg

- a very unique case but I would focus more on how criminal justice is the best
- Find evidence on how public health works in prison
- good how you it was good how ~~he~~ you tied in your value
- bring up your value criterion
- ~~§~~ ~~rebuttal~~ ~~and not just~~
- address all points

43 SanjanVintha _ - La Reina

Open LD Round 3- 1:45pm

Room: La Reina 109

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 1:45 pm

Ballot Due: 2:30 pm

Affirmative: Kudos College of Youth
Leadership CF**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy HX

Name	Points (100-70)	Name	Points (100-70)
Christina Feng	92	Henry Xu	89

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

Low Point Win? ____


 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging!

Christina:

- good speaking style
- Knows points and case really well
- supported side well and is able to make sure point is clear and understood
- talk a little slower, so you don't have to stutter a little
- very good at being able to take every NEG points and have them in favor of AFF

Henry:

- supports his contentions very well
- refuted points very well
- defended side very well, was able to use cards to put down AFF points
- explained value and value criterion clearly and upheld it through the case