

Room: 30.
Start: ASAP
Lincoln Douglas

FINAL

Lambert, Allison

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow) vs. Lincoln Southwest DC (Danny Clanton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln SW - DC

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hastings-CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Hastings CS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Allison Lambert

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff 1:30
You can get a little too sassy during cross-ex. Not necessarily a problem just don't let it get the better of you.

Neg 1:40
Good quick explanation on Kant. You restricted it to 4 mins. I studied it in classes for a month, haha.

-focus on willing a contradiction

RFD: When Aff collapses, they state I need to know morality & maxims. I need to use categorical imperative to know moral maxims to get Govt legit.
Due to morality being needed to be viewed as objectively, & police are treated as means to an end, I vote Neg
(due to frivolous lawsuits)

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow) vs. Lincoln Southwest DC (Danny Clanton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln Southwest DC

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hastings CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln SW DC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Brandy Avery

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Good use of time in your 1AR.
- Yay! Locke!
- Wish you would have pointed out how abusive his whole case is!

- Don't try to make arguments during CX!
- Your case is actually pretty abusive!
- I would definitely recommend a value that is easier to define & achieve.

RFD: By the end of this round, I end up looking through a lens of Ensuring rights & morality to achieve gov't legit. I can clearly pull the Beerman, Hassle, & Wagner cards across on the AFF side. Which become my main voters. I also buy into the ideas that NEG is using people as ~~ends~~ means to an end & that the system is not currently holding people responsible. I also clearly pulled the Dystopian card as well, esp. when the only argument that NEG gives here is an undo burden. The biggest voter for me was that trials are not frivolous but being treated as so.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow) vs. Lincoln Southwest DC (Danny Clanton)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln Southwest DC

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Hastings CS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Lincoln Southwest DC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff
Take it easy in C-X
Great V/C takedown
Need better response to neg
Con 1 & 2
Time management & organization

Neg
Use C-X to set up argument rather than asserting an argument in C-X
This use of CI is a misfire for me. This tends to happen when it's applied too strictly.

RFD - I accept the affirmative V/C, and weigh the round with govt legit & ensuring rights. Using this V/C, I do not have clear links from the neg that flow through, or compelling impacts. Aff impacts flow through, and I vote on the affs ability to clarify & ensure rights

Room: 410.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

FINAL

Sothan, Allison

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan) vs. Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough)

AFFIRMATIVE

Elkhorn South

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

~~Prema Vasudevan~~ L. Southwest

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Lincoln Southwest
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

[Handwritten signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Some questions you asked in cross would've been stronger in your speech

lost contention pull through

what late arguments

time allocation

RFD: come down to who provides justice by insuring safety preventing anarchy was left virtually untouched by off in final

Room: 410.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

FINAL

Wiedeman, Grad

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan) vs. Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Elkhorn South

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Lincoln Southwest

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Nea from Southwest
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Grady Wiedeman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD: Not until the 2AR do you bring up the state of nature claims and the rest of case is close enough.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan) vs. Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

ELKHORN SOUTH EA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

LINCOLN SOUTHWEST PV

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from ELKHORN SOUTH EA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:

- If we hold police officers liable for intentional, reckless, or negligent harms to others while performing official acts, what is the extent of their employer's liability for those actions (state, local, county gov'ts)? Should there be vicarious liability in these cases? Why? Why not?
- What is the effect of precedent holding gov't actors individually (personally) liable for their official actions? Should Mayors or city council members be similarly liable? What, in the affirmative world, is the extent of "sovereign immunity"? Overall, I have one compelling argument to the argument that precedent would have a positive effect, but there are many flaws/questions w/ the reasoning.

Neg:

- Are police officers always acting in good faith? Should they be liable in cases of bad faith execution of their duties? Does that fall w/ your exceptions of "qualified immunities"?
- It is not sufficient to re-state the author's of your material, you need to explain, expand, and adapt/apply your analysis to your opponents arguments, and to your value statement.
- Be careful when claiming an opponent "dropped" one of your arguments. If it is a strong argument, then spend your time explaining the argument, not simply pointing out that it wasn't mentioned. If it is a weak argument, they may not have needed to address it and your time may be better served on more probative issues.
- Spend more time on the value debate.

RFD: I think the affirmative wins the value debate. Consequently the benefits of setting precedent to confirm civil liabilities for police officers outweigh the potential burdens on law enforcement.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker) vs. Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln MW

Fremont CJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Kym Caddell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF showed significantly larger impacts with lives saved ~~to~~ 6.6 mil for environment + prevention of 250,000 lives per year due to medical errors.

NEG did not provide evidence in rebuttal or summary and all their rebuttal was based off opinion of the debater instead of experts in the field.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker) vs. Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen)

AFFIRMATIVE ^{1st}

Lincoln MW


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE ^{2nd}

Fremont CJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln MW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Speaker 1 - Center your arguments more around the avoidance of human error through the use of IOT devices. Circle back to the IOT of the smartphone examples. Pokemon is not an IOT-related item; that's all you need to provide.

Speaker 2 - The Chinese "abductions" have not been substantiated, and cannot be the full weight holding your arguments in place. If we're weighing those lives, then you need to demonstrate how society loses a loss without them.

Speaker 3 - Cool it on the "um"s; don't be afraid to slow a bit and collect your thoughts if it leads to a more polished presentation.

Speaker 4 - The point that money is not more valuable than lives didn't deserve 20 seconds of buildup; keep things concise. I need a lot more evidence that countries "screen through" IOT as easy as you make it seem. Your opponents said nothing about economics; I'm not weighing it.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen) vs. Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln MW

Fremont CJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Lincoln MW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Katie Pierce

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It would be great if both teams really developed their arguments during subsequent speeches instead of repeating "We read a card." It makes me think you don't understand the arguments & want to win on a technicality. The point of PF is to convince me of your views.

Nice job by Aff team turning the negs arguments against them— "If IoT's are not in 3rd world countries, how can they effect human rights in 3rd world countries." Also, the definition given of IoT devices means items used to express opinions are not IoT's and therefore cannot be used to exploit human rights— so I end up buying the aff statements about an improved environment and healthcare as out weighing the privacy arguments & vote Aff.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Ralston FV (Brendan Flick & Derick Vasquez) vs. Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln MW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Ralston FV

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Lincoln
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Look, despite the total lack of evidence as to scope of backing and lack of in-depth analysis, I almost voted Neg just because of the clarity and passion with which you explain privacy, health care and environment weakly fall through her aff, but you have to do extra steps, especially on environment, to derive human impacts.

Great Round!

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker) vs. Ralston FV (Brendan Flick & Derick Vasquez)

AFFIRMATIVE

Lincoln MV

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Ralston FV

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Katie Pierce

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The neg team didn't refute that IOT saves lives & didn't refute that cyber attacks on these devices are rare. I vote AFF.

Aff team—please learn what health care devices use IOT. There are many excellent examples out there.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Ralston FV (Brendan Flick & Derick Vasquez) vs. Lincoln MW (Luke Moberly & Madeline Walker)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Lincoln MW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Ralston FV

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln MW
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MW - I like the case, but the impact in the 2nd contention can be expanded with concrete stats or examples
- don't focus too much on the toaster
LM - great job
- numerate your rebuttal responses per specific contention

BF - add some more volume to the voice
- your case needs more harm than just risk
flow the aff rebuttal
DV - use more evidence in the rebuttal
- don't repeat cliché quotes like the "living hell" one

RFD: — health — cost ↓ by \$1800, cheaper for patients
— environmental tracking saves lives
— lots of speculation on the neg w/ cyber security, you can find examples or stats on this

Room: 410.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

Murray, Brian

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough) vs. Fremont JS (Jennifer Sundquist)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

ELKHORN SOUTH EA


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

FREMONT JS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from FREMONT JS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Too many drops coming out of the
LAR

I grant the neg courts logging bad

I grant the neg the VC debate

as they are the only ones

comparing the two

I grant the no impact claims made

by the neg as they were conceded in the 2AR

Room: 410.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

Genrich, Josh

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

230

Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough) vs. Fremont JS (Jennifer Sundquist) 2

AFFIRMATIVE

Elkhorn South EA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Fremont JS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the aff from Elkhorn South EA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

Seth Genry

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The comparison argument was clearly intended, and was able to be weighed in to proper framework. The neg. did not provide me with any compelling votes, leading to a neg. ballot.

Room: 410.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

Thornhill, Zach

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Elkhorn South EA (Ellie Akough) vs. Fremont JS (Jennifer Sundquist)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Elkhorn South EA

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Fremont JS

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Elkhorn South EA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Zach Thornhill

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- You have a great pace & solid IAC. I like racial relations here

- Solid INC do your best to get coverage on all of her points

RFD: There is no real reason as to why the Squo is good. The only thing is the court clause but that is outweighed by corruption & racism

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen) vs. Lincoln Southwest XX (Sam Spethman & Kynsli Dohrman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

LSW XX

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Fremont CJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Fremont CJ
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Nicole Dilli

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Neg

2nd speaker - ~~the~~ Since you're the first rebuttal, you should spend at least 3/4 of the time attacking...
- only attack on opponent's case was a claim, no analysis, warrant or impact
- How do you KNOW we could have prevented Flint? (You keep saying we could, but never show proof)
- Try to provide better links to the resolution.

Spr1 - If you're going to ask for a follow-up question, make sure it's a question
Pokemon Go? Interesting!
S2 - Very polite in CX (don't want to be creepy, but I LOVE your hair)
- Good job tying back to resolution

RFD: Aff dropped basically all of ~~case~~ Neg's case in rebuttal & tried to attack in summary. I buy the neg argument about impact analysis (Aff's are minimal to non-existent & Neg's are huge). Even if I didn't buy that Neg's arguments outweighed, I have lives lost on the neg and I gained on the Aff. Lives > \$ (kind of have to be alive for \$ to matter...) Also - a lot of Aff arguments lack warrant & proof.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln Southwest XX (Sam Spethman & Kynsli Dohrman) vs. Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln Southwest XX
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Fremont CJ
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Fremont CJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg simply had a better case. They were able to stand up to questioning better and had better contentions. Neg, however ~~the~~ did not relate back to privacy as much as they should have. Aff did not point out this error, ~~so~~

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Fremont CJ (Seth Cunningham & Liberty Jensen) vs. Lincoln Southwest XX (Sam Spethman & Kynsli Dohrman)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

LSW XX

Fremont CJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Fremont CJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Kym Caddell

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG one this round because they proved that people are losing jobs, being arrested, and disappearing and this went unrefuted. They win the Spying argument, because it went unrefuted. Although AFF did have an impact from healthcare, it doesn't outweigh NEG's arguments that went mostly unanswered by AFF

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow) vs. Lincoln East JW (Jennifer Wang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hastings CS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Lincoln East JW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hastings CS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Brandy Avery

AFF COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I haven't seen anyone use observations like these. Great idea!
- Your case does a good job of building on itself.
- Watch your time!!

NEG

- Learn to slow down & gather your thoughts. You ramble & repeat points a lot when you start trying to go faster.
- Sign posting!!!
- Due to speed, I had a hard time following your case

RFD: There really aren't any standards to view this round through, so I'm left w/ a jumbled mix of Justice/Gov't legit & Max Util. Through these muddled lenses, I'm left looking @ the contention level to help define them. I buy into the AFF's arguments that they don't have to provide 100% solvency for tyranny, but @ least some rather than none in the NEG world. I also buy into the clean extension off AFF's cont. 3 that the increase in deterrence & accountability, helps future conduct. Based on these two, I vote AFF.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln East JW (Jennifer Wang) vs. Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Hastings CS

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

LE JW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

4:00
1:30

The better debating was done by the Neg from LE JW

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

4:00
1:30

Signed: Alex Wang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:

- I like the case, but feel like the observations serve more so to trick your opponent than to enhance the debate.
- Better time allocation in IAR would help - you didn't leave yourself much time to generate meaningful offense.

Neg:

• I am more traditional in this regard, but you speak way too fast for me to follow. I flowed what I could, but missed a lot.

RFD: It was a really muddy round. Offense is essentially dropped by both sides by the end and there isn't enough clash on the standards debate. I end up almost having to default neg, as I see no confirmed, tangible benefit from the aff. Neg at least puts the aff into question, forcing a neg ballot. ∴ I negate.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln East JW (Jennifer Wang) vs. Hastings CS (Cole Shardelow)

AFFIRMATIVE

Hastings CS


NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Lincoln EJW

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Hastings CS
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

• Manage Your 1st time
better < 30 sec for the neg
case is & enough

• I missed the last 2 arguments
You made in the NC at the bottom of
the AC because I could not understand
You
• work on signposting in the NR it
was hard to follow where you were

Both sides dropped Impacts that hurt each other side severely.
The V/C debate becomes a wash with & clear winner. In the end
Im forced to weigh the "chilling effect" on the neg case vs AC2 about
this distrust leading to the riot impacts & the aff outweighs

Room: 417.
Start: ASAP
Novice Lincoln Douglas

SEMI

Wiedeman, Grad

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan) vs. Millard South LC (Lia Coulliard)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln Southwest

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Millard South

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the APP from Lincoln Southwest
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Grady Wiedeman

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I think you are handling this case 100% appropriately.

Neg
Ya I'm not cool with coming into a Novice LD round and essentially reading a J-off k. Truthfully, I think it's very counter educational to come into the ~~second~~ second non-novice tournament.

RFD: Neg concedes case and is untopical.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Millard South LC (Lia Coulliard) vs. Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

LINCOLN SOUTHWEST PV

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MILLARD SOUTH LC

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from LINCOLN SOUTHWEST PV
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:

- I don't fault policy a political question? I don't it important to give some discretion to governmental actors? Don't we want to defer to governmental actors/policy created by elected bodies (legislatures, governors, sheriffs)?
- There is a problem with your definition of "qualified immunity." If the potential lawsuit is borne from criminal or unconstitutional actions/behavior of the police officer, a plaintiff wouldn't likely have standing in an action against a government official acting within the scope of their official duties, even if they could be held singly and divisibly liable for their individual actions.
- Work on eye contact, look up as you go up and down the flow.

Neg:

- I don't understand debates have an impact on anything beyond the participants to the activity. Do you not think debate is a good activity? Then why do you do it? Why do you want to win? Wouldn't ~~the~~ voting for you merely perpetuate this system?
- Using a chair to prop up your laptop blocks yourself from your audience. Generally ineffective body language.

[RFD:]

In the end, assuming everything the negative said was true, I don't see how voting for the negative will make debate or increase inclusion activity.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Millard South LC (Lia Coulliard) vs. Lincoln Southwest PV (Prema Vasudevan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Lincoln Sw PV

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Millard South LC

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Neg from Millard South LC
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Allison Lambert

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: you have 1:20 left in aff case, please use that!

You are very ~~sweet~~ ^{sweet} and answer cross-ex questions perfectly!

-you need to debate nitty-gritty of Neg case in order to truly knock it down

Neg: You should probably stay in business attire during out rounds.

-your case could be structured much clearer in a way that better proves your points that I, as a judge, can follow

~~DONT TEXT IN ROUND!~~

RFID: Roll of ballot and debate about debate is prerequisite is dropped. Lack of Aff arguments on neg made neg ballot,

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Millard West FP (David Fager & Chris Powell) vs. Lincoln East XX (Ojus Jain & Sam Wismer)

1st

AFFIRMATIVE

Indea

NEGATIVE

Lincoln East

Millard West

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the

AFF

from

Lincoln East

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed:

Leo Kallis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

As a fan of the philosophical and estotone, I want to go
Neg. The link story, however, cameras, decreased autonomy, decreased political
change got lost when applied to Black Lives Matter specifics
There's no specific link from cameras to Black Lives Matter. At
that point any IoT benefits outweigh. I would have
liked more extension of the changed behavior from care
As a quick side note Mediam (SP) is not First World.

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Millard West FP (David Fager & Chris Powell) vs. Lincoln East XX (Ojus Jain & Sam Wismer)

AFFIRMATIVE

Lincoln East

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Millard West

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from Lincoln East XX
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I vote aff due to the environmental argument. (capitalism, health care, ~~issues~~ were dropped or washed leaving me with @cor cameras. Aff won camera non-uniqueness leaving eco. They show specific ecological benefits unique to smart cities. This outweighs the non-uniqueness of waste, which was not disputed. They should invest in smart cities and their implementation in developing countries.
- @Cameras. The aff de-linked them and proved non-uniqueness, leaving the neg with no reason to vote for them when the aff shows benefits

2016 ROGER MAXWELL

Norfolk, NE

November 12, 2016

30-point scale

Millard West FP (David Fager & Chris Powell) vs. Lincoln East XX (Ojus Jain & Sam Wismer)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE


Lincoln East XX

Millard West FP

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Millard West FP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- Dont be talking during speeches. This is not Policy
- ~~slow~~ slow down. This is not Policy.
- Be nicer during CX
- Dont drop attacks on case
- while your partner is talking dont tell him things
- you dropped all attacks on case and let the debate focus on the Negative side

NEG

- Dont take Prep before CX.
- very risky to only have one contention.
- Be nicer during CX
- Dont do line by line in final focus
- in Grand CX calm down some.
- watch the speed.
- work on stronger link of plate readers to BLM if that is the Biggest impact you chose

RFD | I voted Neg because they pulled through the case and was able to prove that the benefits did not outweigh the harms. The Negation also pulled through attacks on Aff case which were unanswered by the Affirmation