

77 **Rebecca Cannon - Wilshire**

Open LD Round 5- 5:30pm

Room: La Reina 1102019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 5:30 pm****Ballot Due: 6:15****Affirmative:** Nova 42 Academy SZ**Negative:** Kudos College of Youth Leadership
JL

Name	Points (100-70)
2 Sabrina Zhang	89

Name	Points (100-70)
1 Jeffrey Liu	90

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! You make this tournament possible!!

Negative weak-link in his argument is another plan or alternate to P.H. Programs (i.e. Needle syringe program). Government involvement is controlling, yes. Alternate course could be religious programs for example. Churches are getting involved in helping our entire society with drug abuse. Legalizing still leaves a problem - crime increases and health issues such as hepatitis and infections can't be resolved solely on the justice system or society.

Affirmative very strong with public health eliminating health issues related to drug abuse & safe disposal of needles and lifetime treatment - society values are moral issues, too. However, Affirmative failed to address drug rehab costs, who pays? The rights of those not abusing drugs have been compromised. They are sometimes victims of violent crimes by drug dealers, etc.

78

Evelyn
Sanjana Vintha - La Reina

Open LD Round 5- 5:30pm

Room: La Reina 1092019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 5:30 pm****Ballot Due: 6:15****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership TH**Negative:** Academy of Higher Learning SJNamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)Aff

Ted Hong

90Neg

Soren Jensen

95**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe won the debate.**Low Point Win? neg

Gustaf M. Marian Barker
 JUDGE'S SIGNATURE

La Reina High School
 JUDGE'S AFFILIATION

Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!

Aff: Your refutation of the burden was very good and thought out well. In your 1ar, I would leave more time to go over your opponents value and value criterion, because then there's not really a way for you to refute the points and value criterion are false.

Neg: I thought you did a really good job setting ~~your~~ the burden for this round with topicality. The ^{first} Neg rebuttal speech ~~has~~ was incredible and I really appreciated you going to every point on the neg case.

I voted for the neg because I think the neg did a better job at ~~the~~ weighing the impacts out and putting it at a more global scale. I wish that ~~the~~ the aff would have extended the value and value criterion more throughout. I voted on the value debate.

79 **Emma Martin - La Reina**

Open LD Round 5- 5:30pm

Room: La Reina 1082019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament**Round Start: 5:30 pm****Ballot Due: 6:15****Affirmative:** Kudos College of Youth
Leadership CF**Negative:** Nova 42 Academy AKNamePoints
(100-70)NamePoints
(100-70)AFF Christina Feng99NEG Andrew Kim97**Above, CIRCLE the SIDE and TEAM that you believe
won the debate.**Low Point Win? NOEmma
JUDGE'S SIGNATURELA REINA
JUDGE'S AFFILIATION**Thank you for Judging! You make this tournament possible!!**

First off: NEG, if your gonna operate under her VC of minimizing structural violence you can't harp abt the economy; bettering the economy in your context does nothing for structural violence, i don't really care abt it. 2-) attacking systemic racism w/ narrative pedos not ur best go in a drug courts round... ultimately I vote mass incarceration and war on drugs/big pharma impact.

80

Taylor Yatez - Kudos Leadershi

Open LD Round 5- 5:30pm

Room: La Reina 107

2019 SCJFL 4th Quarter Debate Only
Tournament

Round Start: 5:30 pm

Ballot Due: 6:15

Affirmative: Nova 42 Academy HX

Negative: Academy of Higher Learning DC

Name

Points
(100-70)

Henry Xu

90

on my right

Name

Points
(100-70)

Daniel Choi

80

on my left

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! You make this tournament possible!!

Aff

Neg

in Rebuttal you didn't touch on
any of his topics about

Strong Rebuttal, countered all neg
points.

Strong speaker, great coverage
on countering and weighing
impacts.

In rebuttal you didn't touch
on any of his Infectious disease arguments,

your value of homeland security relates
only to the US, ~~but your contention~~
~~is too narrow~~ but the resolution is
on a global scale?

Still no response to the spread of infectious
disease in prisons. Wouldn't HIV growing
rampant go against your value of
Society welfare?

1:30 prep

2:30 prep left