

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Harriton AK

Andrew Kofsky

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

West Orange AL

Amanda Lopez

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Amanda Lopez / West Orange debating on the neg.
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: Elizabeth Meyer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Andrew Kofsky - affirmative

- "Justice is fairness"
- defines all key terms that he will discuss throughout his argument.
- focuses on the mental health conditions of elderly → but the elderly aren't responsible for mass shootings???
- talked about stockholders and voting rights??
- spoke about dangers of people having guns but would have been made clearer/stronger had he used evidence pertaining to mass shootings domestically vs. deaths from terrorism." + police brutality.
- doesn't tie back some of his evidence to his main points/claims.
- * tries to connect private owners of guns with the voting rights of the rich → poorly explained.
- Death is more important than political impact???
- * trying to make complicated arguments but should keep it simple.

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 |

amanda lopez

- suicide - makes a good point that suicides aren't only associated w/ guns
- mentioned that his argument about votes/inequality was unclear (disconnected → (tries to defend points but his claims were still unclear))
- Debate point was libertarianism - basic right.
- Power of the NRA lobby → talks about the inability for politicians to confront the lobby.
- Police officers may not be able to defend the masses → makes guns necessary.
- cites a specific example where a victim died because she didn't have access to a gun.
- makes good eye contact and engages throughout her speech.
- * California → best gun laws (most strict) BUT significant amount of suicides
- assaults / rapes / homicides → makes guns even more necessary.
- * value of protection → great point!
- makes points clear through substantial evidence

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

DuPont Manual KS

Kayla Soren

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Ridge JH

Jennifer Huang

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

Winner: Kayla Soren/Dupont School/Team debating on the Aff. Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Elizabeth Meyer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kayla Soren - affirmative

* talk about how the constitution is fallible - amazing point!

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

- More war + death

- private owner, handguns, → define these terms

- value = morality = respecting human rights

- morality is challenged because handguns are used to kill.

= government should respect its people. → having handguns disrespects this because guns kill

= undermines social contract.

* mentions ~~how~~ women are domestically abused + killed by guns.

* talks about how domestic shootings outnumber deaths from war in middle campaigns

* mentions statistics about how crime / deaths diminished after handgun ban in Europe.

→ talk about how the founding fathers suggested that the constitution should be changed over time. → would have made argument stronger.

Overall she makes stronger claims - provides better claims

Jennifer Huang - negation

- government need to look after the welfare of its people.
 - government can't undermine our rights → lead to loss of other rights
 - need to limit the reach of government
 - 2nd Amendment need ~~ed~~ to be upheld - relates to protection + private property.
 - 2nd, 4, 5th Amendment would be violated → how?
 - constitution protects our human rights - need to value the constitution's framework.
- Criminals will switch to other weapons if handguns are banned (shotguns are more dangerous) - expand on this point
- * women are safer when they hold guns.
- doesn't really offer any other arguments.
- * what are your solutions? → esp. if you are saying that gov. needs to look after the welfare of the people.
- Everyone agrees over 2nd amendment?? → not an accurate statement.
- ↓ 90% → how is that possible?

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Whippany Park MC

Michael Colavito

POINTS

(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Harriton BF

Ben Feldman

POINTS

(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Ben Feldman/Harriton debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Elizabeth Meyer

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Michael Colavito - Aff.

- Human condition is conflict with other

- Identity politics makes it difficult to create a true self.

Contention 1 → politicians use fear to manipulate. certain groups → keeps the dominant culture the majority

→ gender, race, and class → has to do more with opportunity and rights not provided thus making groups vulnerable

- rights discourse → vulnerability vs. rights
* white people are made to fear, too. (migrants will take jobs!)

"Promoting Identity Fluidity"

Ban handguns. because it promotes a "static ID"

* Gen Activists → instill fear, and keeping people manipulated.

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

How is this not useful? ~~Hand with banning handguns?~~

* Great link \rightarrow calls out the shaky link between Mexico laws + US potential of America becoming Mexico.

- but people of all races are impacted by guns \rightarrow
the point is nuclear \rightarrow its not exclusive to one group (what cultures are inherently violent?)

* doesn't really provide specific evidence: How not instilling fear will not motivate/manipulate people?

Ben Feldman - heg.

- what are the impacts of government on morality?

- pragmatism } its moral / good to be pragmatic
- utilitarianism }

- banning guns will not reduce the # of guns \rightarrow
Black Market. \rightarrow good use of statistics

- Mexico has strict gun laws but deaths are rampant

- 40% gun owners \rightarrow w/o background check.

- gun owners will rush to states to purchase
without background materials / checks

- Republicans will overturn the laws made by Obama anyway.

How so? wont they be banned throughout the country?

are you talking initially

* calls him out for the peanut butter sandwich comparison

* provides more substantial evidence

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Woodgrove MT

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Minh-Tam Tran Le

NEG

Maret AJ

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Aja Johnson

Winner:

Woodgrove MT
Minh-Tam Tran Le

debating on the

AFF

Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Minh-Tam Tran Le - Aff

2010-2016

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

- Defines certain terms that will be referred to later in the argument
- Reduce violence → 2006-2010 (older sources)
- Decrease the amount of homicides (mentions specific stats to substantiate claims)
- "Self-Defense" claims are unwarranted. ~~because~~ gun owners claim self-defense but are actually irresponsible (Supports with specific evidence)
- * good current event example.

→ Self-defense shouldn't be legal → great point.

* trying to solve for common welfare

→ Says that self-defense arguments are weak

buy back programs → Show benefits of this!!

We are allowed to infringe on rights if they take away rights of others!! → great point.

mentions that opponent.

* ~~don't~~ address the suicide claims + data.

- Also says that she has the more moral plan.

- placing one life more important than another →
great point

* Constitution example → limiting freedom of speech.

→ no fine in the movie theatre

Aja Johnson - key.

- Banning guns will not lead to reduction in violence

* defines key definitions that will be mentioned in her argument.

- compares this to drugs → criminalizing drugs have made drug problems worse

- more police officers → not sure that this is accurate. (so much police brutality)

- gun violence has diminished over the last 2 decades.

- Reference Supreme Court case - Heller - makes the point that the Constitution would be compromised.

* BLACK MARKET → show example of what is already on the market.

* Root causes → mental health, poor economy, etc → need to mention this.

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

| AFF | POINTS | NEG | POINTS |
|------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Bronx HS Of Science KS | (0 - 30) | Bridgewater Raritan AS | (0 - 30) |
| Kathryn Sea | <u>27</u> | Alyssa Song | <u>29</u> |

Winner: Bridgewater Raritan AS debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: *Ahmad Armghan*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

They both brought up well-reasoned arguments, but the Neg speaker was very well prepared, and apart from a few minor places, presented well-etched 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 |

Aff

- Minimize Oppression
 - ↳ Disperse
 - The attempt to act in an anti-oppressive way is in itself a search for ethical values
- Oppression doesn't pay
- Guns → Hate violence
- ↳ *legitimate*
- Easy availability of handguns
- ↳ Crimes

Neg Cross

- Australia - gun ban
- Culture change
- ↳ *gun change*
- 1990-2016

Aff Rebuttal

- Who benefits society the most?
- Changing Culture
- No nukes, less crime

Neg Closing

- Must at least try, take steps down
- Punish all gun points

Aff Closing

- Other ways to protect self
- ↳ *apprehending, training*
- Change the culture gradually

Aff Cross

- Guns in American culture
- ↳ had to remove
- Anything that threatens you & violates your right to live?

Neg

- Really good speaker
- ↳ *eye contact*
- Private ownership - detriment, ban it
- Gun ban - extremely difficult
- ↳ Demand → *Black Market*
- Safety of citizens
- Crime
- Gun culture in America
- Other alternatives to guns

- Self-defense?
- Protection from criminals
- ↳ *innocent city residents?*
- Making life - *degrees of guns* -
- ↳ *more shooting?*
- Culture change? But we can work on that
- Isn't this only a small consideration in the grand scheme of things?

Notes

- Constructive questions for cross
- Unborn baby and child are actually just started last month

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Monticello SB

Somaya Bracy

POINTS

(0 - 30)

25

NEG

Bridgewater Raritan JL

Jason Lam

POINTS

(0 - 30)

26

Winner: Bridgewater Raritan JL debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

They were both pretty bad to be honest... I flipped a coin... :)

Aff

- Morality
- Gov't → Well being of people
- Monotone
- What she's also sick?
- ↳ False info in gun industry
- ↳ Created a perception of accept
- Reduces homicide
- ↳ But, concede that it is not the only factor
- ↳ Suicide rates
- Woman violence
- ↳ Domestic violence
- Weapons effect
- ↳ makes violent behavior
- Keeps guns - doesn't reduce violence

Neg Cross

- Been hardgum fired
- Argues minor points

Affs Rebuttal

- Focused on minor point
- Brings up nothing with nothing
- Simple arguments that don't really cohere

Neg Closing

- No evidence on Aff side
- Lots of statistics

Aff Closing

- Doesn't make any logical arguments
- Poles on useless hypotheticals

Aff Cross

- False info → ban guns

leg

- life → Morality
- Utilitarian philosophy
- Criminals → loss guns
- Embrace probability
- False info - non-topical
- Talked like hell

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 |

How practical do you think judges → Lagos is?

Mass Shootings?

- UK/Canada ban
- ↳ Mass shootings in US/UK

Suicides → there may claim to show the benefits w/ guns have since

↳ Short time period before suicide

- Cannot a woman have gun to protect herself?

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Marriotts Ridge RP

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Renee Paulraj

25

NEG

Bridgewater Raritan RR

POINTS
(0 - 30)

Rahul Ramanathan

~~28~~
28
LL

Winner: Bridgewater Raritan RR debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff: KNOW your case, specifically for CX - even if you don't have stats that NEG asks for in CX, \emptyset make concessions

Neg: Be careful about the # of claims you make in the NC sans warrants (i.e. "people are more ^{susceptible to danger} if handguns are banned")

Both: Work on diversification of arguments - offensive
Neg: If you're going to challenge credibility of sources, make sure your evidence of such is more than just "it probably isn't credible; mine is better"

| 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 | |

I negate 1/2:

- ① F/w debate fervor at best on both sides BUT ~~aff~~ neg extends pre-reg argument (social welfare before min. oppression/death) to provide lens through which to evaluate round
- ② Job creation (Pundome card in NC contention 2) clearly extended & linked back into standard
- ③ Sufficient mitigatory defense on Aff, specifically on suicides/domestic violence arguments that the AFF proves in 1/2AAs

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Bronx HS Of Science AK

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Anika Kalraa

NEG

La Salle College JG

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Jake Goodwin

Winner: Bronx HS of Science AK debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG: diversify your arguments + be sure to use all your time! As the negative, you should always cover the entire Ae but unfortunately specific ~~pieces~~ ^{pieces} of evidence go unrelated, making it very easy for the AFF to extend them

| 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: flesh out ~~the~~ ^{the} warrants in your extensions → it's not enough to tell me that Valentine goes dropped; tell me how Valentine links back into the standard and why I should care that it went dropped in this round (i.e., ultimate function in my decision process)

NEG: good explanation of Denmark study + how it ties into resolution

I affirm b/c:

- ① Extensions of Ripstein + Valentine (dropped in NC) are sufficient + establish P/W for AFF
- ② D. on extension
- ③ Mitigatory defense on self-defense takes out majority of NEG offense

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Lexington EC

Emily Chen

POINTS
(0 - 30)

24

NEG

Cary SS

Selma Said

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: SELMA SAID School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Kyle Traynham

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SELMA'S SPEECH WAS DELIVERED WITH POISE AND STYLE. HER ABILITY TO ARTICULATE HER CLAIM IN A STRONG AND POSITIVE MANNER HELPED HER CASE. SHE REFUTED HER OPPONENTS POINTS VERY WELL, WHILE PROVIDING HER FACTS OVER HER OPPONENTS AND STANDING FIRM ON HER POSITION THROUGHOUT. SHE NULLIFIED HER OPPONENTS POINTS ELOQUENTLY.

Point Scale:

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Woodgrove SA

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Sam Allison

NEG

Monticello SC

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Steven Cammerino

Winner:

STEVEN CAMMERINO

debating on the

NEG

Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Kyle Traynham

Comments & Reason for Decision:

STEVEN PERFORMED THIS SPEECH IN A WELL-ORGANIZED MANNER. HIS DELIVERY WAS CONFIDENT AND HIS POINTS WERE STRONG AND HELD WEIGHT FOR HIS ARGUMENT. HIS POSITION WAS CLEAR AND AUTHENTIC. ON THE OTHER HAND, HIS OPPONENT, SAM ALLISON, OFTEN CONCEDED HIS POINTS AND SEEMED QUIZZICAL ABOUT HIS POINTS.

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

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Lexington JM

Janet Mariadoss

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

Livingston SP

Shyam Patel

POINTS
(0 - 30)

27

Winner: Lexington JM School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Tongman Yang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

JM has a better value of maximizing life. Her arguments are better and well organized. Very quickly picked up on SP dropped the argument. Clear delivery during the debate.

SP has a less value of ethics/government legitimacy. Evidence is thin with two surveys. Most importantly, he ~~did~~ conceded during the debate by not attacking the JM's contentions.

JM is a better debater overall.

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
- *FILL Tenth points may be used
- *FILL LPWs okay

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Bronx HS Of Science JO

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

Jason Ong

NEG

Clover Hill AS

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Amber Spalek

Winner: Bronx HS of Science JO debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Tong Yang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

JO's value on morality/minimizing violence held. I hope he can further improve upon his delivery skills. But he did attack on the framework of the AS' 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

AS has a stronger value of ~~legitimacy~~ democratic/constitution legitimacy. However she did not successfully defend with her arguments.

JO did well in the 1AR & 2AR by citing the Harvard survey across all 50 states relating increased gun violence with increased gun ownership. He did a better job arguing if law cannot change society then why we need follow the law (constitution).

Good job by both debaters.

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------|--|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| AFF | | POINTS | | NEG | | POINTS |
| DuPont Manual DE | | (0 - 30) | | Bronx HS Of Science JO | | (0 - 30) |
| Phoebe Monsour | | 26.5 | | Jason Ong | | 26.5 |
| | | 27.5 CC | | | | 26.5 CC |

Winner: Bronx HS of Science JO School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

NEG: 1) Use your CP time more wisely - be in control of your time.

2) I appreciate you noticing how similar the P/Ws are + not addressing that BUT you spent 15 seconds saying that watch your fluency breaks

| |
|---------------------------------|
| 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: 1) Be careful of making claims w/o evidence e.g. Washington DC & have a ban, you're right, but instead of just saying that, ask for his evidence and show me why he's wrong

2) You spent an entire min. trying to distinguish b/t ^{two} very similar end-based P/Ws in the IAR, a speech already very constrained on time

I asked for some kind of weighing at the beginning of the round (which should have been easier considering the round defaults util) yet very little impact analysis occurred.

I negate 1/2:

- ① Washington DC / NYC study - though overstated, the stats from the study still hold (no impact on crime)
↳ extended & linked into standard
- ② Reducing violence applicable to all AC contentions

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Haverford WC

Will Clark

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

NEG

DuPont Manual NL

Nivedha Loganathan

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: DuPont Manual NL School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both: Look at the judge (not each other) during CX

AFF: Watch your time in the AR - it is already a very time - constrained speech so instead of spending 45 seconds on the Supreme Court case, just extend your argument at the top of the AC that says we're focusing on ~~leg~~ morality, not legality (and she drops this in NL)

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

NEG - your case is very counter-plan esguc but provides no comparative analysis to a world of banned guns vs. gun control -> this type of weighing would make your case very strong

You both are great speakers!

This round was very, very close but I negate 4c

① Though not fully impacted back to why I pref it over foreign data, the argument against stricter gun laws in Chicago/Missouri is clearly extended and remains unresolved at the end of the round

② The att in the NL is tied back into the standard and extended through the NR -> this in addition to the mitigating defense abundant enough for me to negate!

Great job to both debaters.

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

La Salle College SM

Seamus Maguire

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Lexington LE

Luke Eriksson

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Lexington LE School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Tongman Yang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters set on the same framework of preventing harm. However LE has better research with evidence to support his contentions. He is better organized in the delivery. SM started well at AC. Need more attack at LE's contentions at CX-affirmative. His contentions will be better conveyed with more facts, such as gun influence on young adults, and private ownership, etc.

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

UPENN LIBERTY BELL CLASSIC

Feb 13 - 14, 2016

AFF

Princeton EZ

Elizabeth Zhang

POINTS
(0 - 30)

28

NEG

Thomas Jefferson HSST YC

Yukta Chidanandan

POINTS
(0 - 30)

29

Winner: Princeton EZ School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Tomymanys

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both debaters based on the same value "morality/maximizing human lives". The judge's decision was based on aff's support for the value, who provided hard evidence that gun control can save life lives.

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

However YC organized her deniers and arguments very well. She needs research more on more data to argue overall welfare did not improve with gun control. I also felt the contention on more racism with gun control is circumstantial. YC did make a couple of strong arguments on leveling play field with equal access to guns and gun control can be counter-productive with black market trade.