

1) Go to Mayer - Seminar Room for pick-up and then go to Fisher B-25.

Room: FISHER-B 25
Flight 2 Start: 8:50 AM
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Li, Lindsey

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Lexington RL

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Ryan Leung

28.5

NEG

Ridge AL

POINTS

(0 - 30)

Alan Liu

27

Winner: Lexington RL debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- NEG: you're on the right track during CX but asking more targeted and specific questions ~~then~~ ^{and} pressing further on those issues will make CX more efficient for your speeches

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level
28 - Good, should break
27 - Average, shouldn't break
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Tenth points may be used
HFILL LPWs okay

- AFF: you CANNOT extend cards out of the AC by simply reading claims back to me → flesh out the warrants like you did for the DC study for each extension you make
- I also think you're spreading yourself too thin in the 1AR → spend more time on F/W and key pieces of offense to win the round

I affirm 1/2:

① F/W almost non-existent in this round (I don't think life necessarily always most important but fallacy of origin argument never fully fleshed out) BUT some extensions are made for me to evaluate the word on util.

② The ~~evidence~~ ^{offense} coming out of the AC is overwhelming, specifically:
a) Washington DC study
b) turns on NC

Room: Vance B-0 B

Round: Round 1

Judge: Schmidt ^{Vance} _{Lo}

F1: # 2

Joshua

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Debater: Hendrick Hudson ^{POINTS} 29
(0 - 30)
MG

NEG

Debater: Thomas Jessison ^{POINTS} 27
(0 - 30)
ASH

Winner: Hendrick Hudson ^{MG} debating on the Aff ^{Side (Aff or Neg)} Low point win? 29

Signature: [Signature] / Hill

Comments & Reason for Decision:

OR AL

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, late-elim level
- 28 - Good, should break
- 27 - Average, shouldn't break
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Tenth points may be used
- HFILL LPWs okay

Marriotts Ridge SB U PENN LIBRARY Bell CLASSIC
Lexington EL

Aff SB
SIVANAR

Print 0-30 [28]

Neg EC
Emily.

Print [26]

Winner SB

Debate SB AFF

Low Point win

Raghu

side (AFF/Neg)

SB AFF	EC - Neg
<p>① Morality → Minimize violence. → unstructured violence.</p> <p>② Objection of Gov.</p> <p>C1 → domestic violence. 3:1 ratio good</p> <p>C2 → African Am. 13:1 → 50:1 → gun.</p> <p>C3 → Suicide case - 147K → 90K handgun 5 times of more exposure.</p> <p>C4 → overestimate → Result to come → stat.</p>	<p>Cross X: treatment was study conducted. 3 individual studies → 10</p> <p>Examples → homicide will go down?</p> <p>① Morality → Maximizing well being.</p> <p>C2 → Police corruption: stats? ↳ Police →</p>
<p>Promote → good point raised. Missis Pamono.</p> <p>Correlation → stated city.</p> <p>lower means? → give stats.</p> <p>Crime of handgun →</p>	<p>→ Reducing crime → well being?</p> <p>→ C2 → suicide → psychological → suicide will continue (ex)</p> <p>→ Buy gun → reference?</p> <p>become check → market correct?</p> <p>Use Japan → good challenge on stats.</p>

Feedback

feedback → not for some reason

good usage of stats.
methodology → ? do you have methodology?
↳ point well raised.

Police handling → where is stats?
Opponents credibility/challenges -
where is your stats.

great (cross-X time.) good presentation

Room Civic Cen

UP and

Room 2 RAGHWENDRA

Unionville NT

Lexington JM PATHAK

AFF NT [Nichols]

Neg JM [Janet]

Point [30]

Point [28]

Winner: AFF NT

Debate on

Low Point win

Signature Registrar

AFF/Neg

Comment & Reason for decision

NT

Morality Protection of human life.
 C1 → Preventing death → homicidal/suicidal → good contrast.
 → great examples: cross countries.
 State responsible → correlate.
 C2 → Reduce death → suicide →
 C3 → Risk outweighs → benefit.
 → NA related to defence.

CX → self defence → framing same.
 → good usage of CX: more clarifying.
 self defence: if you do it.

[HIGH QUALITY BREAKING]

[IAR] good example HD → material.
 Framed: police better cases other country.
 Against self defence: good counter examples. impressive logical presentation.

Legal argument →

JM

self defence: Result to live & self defence.
 → lay back program → reference.
 CX → is more for clarifying not for challenging 100 Aggressive?

Maximum life:
 C1 → smugglers, have defat masterplans.
 C2 → police will have too much → (a) responsibility, (b)
Police protection.
 How minority has less guns?
 → defence purposes?
 → life saved better than life lost.
 → Another country → not relevant how?

Only one country? → think examples were given for more than one.
 → manufacture: dress
 self defence for 300M people →?
Repel criminals: pl.

Flight 1 Round 2

Aff: Lexington MR

Neg: Salle College JG

Voted Neg

Speaker points

Aff	Neg
27	27.5

Devin Wiseman
Monticello

Devin Wiseman

Flight 2 Round 2

Aff: Cary VS

Neg: Lexington RL

VOTED NEG

Speaker points

Aff	Neg
27.5	28

Novice LD

Devin Wiseman
Monticello

Devin Wiseman

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Clover Hill PE

Parisa Ershadi

POINTS
(0 - 30)

26

NEG

Lexington VR

Ved Roy

POINTS
(0 - 30)

22

Winner: Clover Hill PE School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The affirmative side, while not fully capturing your imagination, did present valid points. The negative side, at times, acted very condescending, and did not make very many substantive arguments.

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, late-elim level
- 28 - Good, should break
- 27 - Average, shouldn't break
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Tenth points may be used
- HFILL LPWs okay

Merits of a Ban
 Pro - No counterplans
 - Individual
 Handguns need to be banned
 - Needs of
 - But very prepared
 Very little explanation
 - Stats, studies
 - Cross-rational copywork
 Lots of evidence → Not as much explanation of the evidence

not
 Ought to ban handguns
 Con → b/c non-lethal
 • Utilitarian calculation
 • Non-lethal handguns
 ↳ technically not banned handguns
 • Slightly crazy
 • Very, very weak argument
 ↳ Forgoes many strong reasons

Con Closing
 • Focuses entire speech on his alternative
 • Very weak, unconstructed argument
 • 'Over 7 nations'
 • Doesn't advance his own arguments, just tries to discredit pro's arguments, albeit in a senseless fashion

Pro Cross
 • Very narrowly driven
 ↳ Slightly condescending
 Pro Rebuttal
 Safety > Morality
 Cannot verify counterplan
 ↳ Guns - good point about people's habits
 MPA - policy - issues

Pro Cross
 • 2nd Amendment rights preserved
 ↳ Contradicted self
 • Nobody cares about mental health
 ↳

Pro Closing
 • Merits of ban
 ↳ Death
 ↳ Lives
 • Unless OSA gun

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF		POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Princeton DL		(0 - 30)	Lexington MP	(0 - 30)
Daniel Lin		<u>27</u>	Megha Prasad	<u>28</u>

Winner: Lexington MP School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: *[Signature]*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both candidates had well-rehearsed, practiced arguments, but the Neg side presented an instantly argument that provided much more insight into the complexities of the issue.

Point Scale:
30 - Surpassing; the level best
29 - Excellent, late-elim level
28 - Good, should break
27 - Average, shouldn't break
26 - Below Average
25 - Far below Average
24 & below - Offensive, rude
HFILL Tenth points may be used
HFILL LPWs okay

Rights of Minority
 vs.
 Benefit of the white

blame what?
 suicide by other
 causes?
 Mandela a genius,
 no?

- Aff
- Morality, Utilitarianism
 - Effects
 - Prevents suicide
 - Pushing off
 - Violate crime
 - Handguns ban → fear legal sales to criminals

- Neg Cross
- Utilitarianism
 - ↳ point rebuttal by Neg
 - ↳ Majority v. Equality

- Aff Rebuttal
- Deaths in general
 - Statistics
 - Police Corruption - legislative issue
 - 2x African killed by guns than white

- Cross
- Correlation but not causation
 - Minorities →

- Neg Closing
- Oppression outweighs utility
 - Power imbalance
 - Practical considerations are important
 - Imbalance for the purpose of the debate

- Neg Rebuttal
- Racism, Community Fragment
 - Eugene's voice
 - Police corruption
 - ↳ Police Supremacy - Eric Gurr
 - ↳ Ferguson - Michael Brown
 - ↳ Police Racist
 - Historical misuse of arms/laws
 - Incarceration
 - ↳ Trials - plea bargains
 - ↳ 6m prisoners in the US
 - Gun law enforcement will be selective

- Aff Closing
- States - are not that simple

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

NEG

Lexington OR

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Thomas Jefferson HSST YC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Ollie Rourke

28

Yukta Chidanandan

28

Winner: _____

Ollie Rourke Lexington

debating on the _____

AFF
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Lynn Hanon

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Autonomy Well Being
AFF

- good stats
- didn't buy all life vs. Rights

NEG
Justice Rights

— excellent speaker

III - DC evidence

Cont II - Self Def
III Racist
Black Mkt / ch. II
Win

1 vs 83
Win

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, late-elim level
- 28 - Good, should break
- 27 - Average, shouldn't break
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Tenth points may be used
- HFILL LPWs okay

Reasons for Decision -

Very good debate, both sides had good, effective contentions, in the final analysis the AFF won on reason violence/number vs DC & surrounding areas, overall evidence to support guns not being used in self defense. Neg - rights, good - I bought your black market evidence. Self Reason did not effect my decision as the card re: Blacks support gun bans, however, it was weighed.

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Lexington KL

Katherine Lim

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Bronx HS Of Science JO

Jason Ong

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Katherine Lim

School/Team

debating on the

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF (look @ judge)
Morality/Well Being
Util.
I - Honor
II - Self Def - meppoe
III - Don't Violate / kids
IV - suicide 100% L

NEG
Justice / Rights
Locke / Const.
a) Individ. Rts.
II - Property / Body
III Locke vs -
Defensive Same lives
DC vs Heller

Point Scale:

- 30 - Surpassing; the level best
- 29 - Excellent, late-elim level
- 28 - Good, should break
- 27 - Average, shouldn't break
- 26 - Below Average
- 25 - Far below Average
- 24 & below - Offensive, rude
- HFILL Tenth points may be used
- HFILL LPWs okay

Reasons

1 - good debate! AFF presented good evidence + rebutted self def argument + did crime after ban of Neg.
AFF - Max life is not necessarily all life vs Rts - established this late which helped her. Cont IV you presented + Neg never addressed. Neg - cultural good, expand if possible.

Good luck

AFF

Allan Liu

ALD

Ridge AL

Sppts 27

Winning Debater

Ridge AL

NEG

Morgan Edwards

Costby ME

Sp. pts 26

AFF

side

judge Sydney Jones

AFF

V-Morality

VC-Max Well Being

NEG

Comments in Koon.

Judge Joe Harrison

Cosby KD	27	
Lexington JM	27.5	Neg wins