

RR MV v. KK KS

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round G/S Room Simplot A Judge M. Cutler

Affirmative (code & name) Matt Vraspir RR-MV

Negative (code & name) Kimberley Simons KK-KS

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>A Perhaps add more to case beyond just a biological argument + excellent research</p>	<p>+ you make excellent points would love to see some more direct clash Although I know it's hard to argue science. I either wanted more clash or a clear case from you.</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>+ excellent research you've done + your final speech puts me in a clear spot as a judge you tell me how + why to judge</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>A go a little further in your arguments. How is that not moral. You say we need to see that but tell it to us. I see how you're looking to del address "deliberate" in the res but you didn't quite clarify + get there for me</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>+ good use of cross-x. You definitely took advantage of Kimberley's questions in reiterating your points. + you look sharp and am clear → confident</p>	<p>+ great job with time management A Give me some RFDs in your last speech. You had time. A work on flow so that he doesn't get your cross-x to restate his case</p>

Decision based on:

Your final speech really persuaded me Neg just didn't quite get there for me I wanted more clear + direct clash beyond saying matt's using jargon or I wanted a good strong neg case from you matt add more to the case + develop it. I felt like this

Decision in favor of:	<u>AFF</u> (circle)	<u>NEG</u>	Code <u>RR-MV</u>
			<u>Monica Cutler</u> Judge's Signature

Great job!
Congrats

was just 1 big big contention. give me several angles to provide more ground for the

RR MV v. KK KS

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round G/S Room Simplot A Judge S. Lee

Affirmative (code & name) RR-MV Matt Vaspra

Negative (code & name) KK-KS Kimberly Simmons


CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 (39) 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	(40) 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>Solid Case Presentation... That Being ^{said} scheduled you scheduled ground for aff right off the back clear def of Delbert was needed</p>	<p>Great case value and confusion solid for a moral debate</p> <p>Don't be afraid to go after definitions</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>1) Self Defense - Biological aspect well developed (miss applied)</p> <p>2) Self Preservation - Executive move time here was needed</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>1) Deadly Force - great set up flesh it out fact, states, stories</p> <p>2) Destroy morality - this is where you were winning <u>neutral actor</u></p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>Great Job... Seemed a little condescending at times like countries all the way through</p>	<p>Great Job - don't get flushed stay confident you did amazing</p>

Decision based on: Biology not comparable to morality and this is where the debate ~~stayed~~ on stayed. Make sure you point out errors on aff case.

Decision in favor of: AFF (circle) **NEG** Code KK-KS


 Judge's Signature

GOOD JOB
AND GREAT DEBATE

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplot B Judge Kat Miller
Flight B
 Affirmative (code & name) JJ EB Bamber
 Negative (code & name) NN BK Ko pping

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis good case, it really covered all the bases of the topic. Link your criterion more into each subpoint other wise good job flowing it through the round and bringing it up in each speech.</p>	<p>I really like your argument of the case by case punishment. The justice system isn't always fair with a blanket law. the point you were winning on is the punishment is not right point.</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning When telling me to flow over dropped arguments explain why those will win the round! Both: When you make blanket argument explain why they cover each subpoint. Also if an argument is dropped instead of flowing it over and moving on, explain why that dropped argument is important.</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning grouping sub points together is good, just make sure the argument covers all the subpoints.</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery good delivery - nice pace Both: Better time management is needed so arguments aren't dropped!</p>	<p>good delivery, during ox-try not to talk to your flow pad, and to the audience instead.</p>

Decision based on: I vote AFF in this round. Because the negative dropped the affs value and crit, but didnt uphold his own, he leaves me no way to weigh his arguments but w/ autonomy. With her value the RA on the AFF still holds up. I wanted to vote on the "punishment is not valid if ~~the~~ deadly force is allowed" but it doesn't out weigh all the dropped arguments and the value criterion being dropped.

Decision in favor of: (AFF) NEG Code JJ EB
 (circle)
 Judge's Signature

this round WAS SUPER CLOSE AND WAS THE BEST ROUND OF THE TOURNAMENT THAT I SAW! GREAT JOB!

It is morally permissible for victims to use Deadly force as a deliberate response to repeated domestic violence.

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simple 13 Judge Co NEGRi
Flight B

Affirmative (code & name) JEB Bamer


Negative (code & name) NNBK Kopping

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
Affirmative	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
Negative	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis <u>Case & Analysis</u></p> <p>DEFINITIONS RA EXERT ASSUME VICTIM INNOCENT ONLY WHEN DV IS BEING USED. AUTONOMY (LOCKE) (NATURAL RT). DEONTOLGY. PERMISSIBLE DOES NOT RULE OUT PUNISHMENT</p> <p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning NOT ATTACKED. ELIMINATION of option will allow in flatness of offense allowable but PUNISHABLE. PERMISSIBLE DOES NOT PREVENT POSSIBLE PUNISHMENT OF CONSEQUENCE</p> <p>Delivery <u>Delivery</u> WELL SPOKEN. CLEAR VOICE. GREAT PRESENTATION.</p>	<p>C & A</p> <p>REJECT AFFRA (limiting) NOT ALLOWING FOR CLASH VALUE. JUST SOCIETY. HOBBS SOCIAL CONTRACT DELIBERATE IMMORAL. OTHER OPTIONS (Cost Bana) VOIDED IN CASE OF SELF DEFENSE ANALYSIS. IND BASIS REPEAT DOES NOT Quantify offense</p> <p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning ONLY 1/2 of all DA end in DEATH. NOT ATTACKED. MUST INCLUDE ALL CASES life Valued but # of DF LOWER. Defin - allowable (permissible) Not punish. CLASH</p> <p>DEL WELL SPOKEN. CLEAR VOICES.</p>

Decision based on: LOCKE NATURAL RT NOT ATTACKED. EVEN IF SOMETHING IS PERMISSIBLE DOES NOT MEAN THE POSSIBLE PUNISHMENT IS NEGATED. NEG CI ACTUALLY SUPPORTED AFF RA IN THE ORIGINAL ARGUMENT.

Decision in favor of: (AFF) (circle) NEG Code JEB

 Judge's Signature

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simple + B Judge Christopher Gale

Affirmative (code & name) JJVV Vamer

Negative (code & name) MMBK Kopping

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 (38)	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 (39) 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Inherent Flaws:
 Case & Analysis Case & Analysis
 RA is self-explanatory, IDC
 RA: you try to say defining the round won't change the grounds of debate when that's the very definition of defining the round
 Allowing Autonomy: how can you say you value the freedom when you'll put victim in jail? She's still not free.

Good choice of criterion
 could push it more
 very effective analytics against RA

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning
 Natural Rights: how can the inalienable right to life support intent to kill.
 Deontology actually flows neg if you use it right. means must justify ends. Killing is not an acceptable way to achieve autonomy (which you lose in prison anyways).

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning
 (I'm not so good at judging delivery. Deal with it).

Delivery Delivery Don't let him control your ~~flow~~ ex
 I REALLY hate when you give me flow voters. You don't tell me who won what arguments. I do. Tell me why you should win not what you did win.

such a time sink asking clarification questions all ex
 very good answer to devaluing life.

Decision based on: Neg wins based on uncontested impact of C2 + unexplored alternative in C1. Neg wins as main clash because the aff's claim to RA is both ridiculous and patently in the face of the analytics provided by the neg. By not accepting this, C1 wins + Aff case falls. Also, Aff's value/crit conflict with her own case, see above.

Decision in favor of:

AFF

(NEG)

(circle)

Code MMBK

Christopher Gale

Judge's Signature

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet B Judge C. Gale
Flight A

Affirmative (code & name) RRSH Holsinger


Negative (code & name) UUTC Crawford

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>Major flaw in NhhT. You never specified the link between (im assuming) representative govt and justice.</p>	
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>Great support for both sides. No problems w/ evidence here. Being able to communicate analytics in RA was an issue for both sides</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>Very fast, despite a common judge. Balby. That's good. Both: Both sides mentioned RA of other and proceeded on an assumption that opponent will con to this. Comes off as very vague and nontopical</p>	<p>Very well put together.</p>

Decision based on: The first big point of this case is the Resolutional Analysis War. In reading the resolution, I found permissible to allow for options on both sides. Permissible does not imply a duty that would confirm the neg RA and the Aff RA therefore wins. The debate then becomes whether killing is a viable option or not, among others. Based on the aff's point of proportionality, in certain cases deadly force must be used when Domestic violence is of a deadly nature itself. Obviously based on Aff winning criteria of safety as safety is a prerequisite for Justice.

Decision in favor of:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <small>(circle)</small>	<input type="radio"/> NEG	Code <u>RRSH</u>  Judge's Signature
------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	---

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet C Judge Wilkins, AJ
Flight B

Affirmative (code & name) AA KH HOCH

Negative (code & name) GG KS Smith

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 (39) 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	(37) 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p style="text-align: center;">Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * well structured analysis * Clear presentation * Strong case, logical flow 	<p style="text-align: center;">Case & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sensible case, reasonable analysis * loosely structured
<p style="text-align: center;">Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lots of supporting evidence, well cited * Effective use of definition 	<p style="text-align: center;">Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>Hard to understand flow of support due to speed of delivery. Vocals were clear just very fast.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Delivery Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * confident delivery * Very well structured, logical * Poised delivery, calm & effective 	<p style="text-align: center;">Delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Fast delivery, clearly stated but very fast. * Good rebuttal. More composed than your construction.

Decision based on:

Affs argument and flow were more consistent and persuasive
 Aff countered all points
 Affs definitions stands ~~affs~~

Decision in favor of:	<div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; width: 40px; height: 40px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center; margin: 0 auto;"> AFF </div> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">(circle)</p>	<p>NEG</p>	<p>Code <u>AAKH</u></p>
			<p style="text-align: right;"><u>Aud J. Wilkins</u></p> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: 10px;">Judge's Signature</p>

Great job from both sides!
 Thank you for participating, keep it up!

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet C Judge Carol Hill
Flight D

Affirmative (code & name) AAKH

Negative (code & name) GGKS

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 <u>(39)</u> 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	<u>(37)</u> 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis <i>Good organization - well defined and in control of your knowledge. Nice flow. Handles questions with</i></p>	<p>Case & Analysis <i>Strong case. Lots of research + it was cited and tied in appropriately. Quick to question underlying assumptions.</i></p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning <i>Statistics were evident in opening. Do you have citations of sources? Creative use of definition of deadly to give more leverage in your favor!</i></p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning <i>Reasoning did not always support your case - Definition of "deadly" - I wasn't clear on your agreement...</i></p>
<p>Delivery Delivery <i>Nice strong voice. Demonstrates ability to communicate well. Very much in command of yourself. Good job!</i></p>	<p>Delivery <i>Opening comments very hard to hear! <u>Slow Down</u>. Delivered with conviction! Projects self confidence.</i></p>

Decision based on: stronger speaker in aff.

Decision in favor of:	<input checked="" type="radio"/> AFF <small>(circle)</small>	<input type="radio"/> NEG	Code <u>AAKH</u> <u>C Hill</u> Judge's Signature
------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--

Rush

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet C Judge Moss Sheldon

Affirmative (code & name) Bowman JJ NB

Negative (code & name) Andrew AA JA

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	(40) 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	(40) 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>I love your criteria, also your 2nd Amendment reference. The Natural Man (Rousseau) focuses on the self. Great analysis of Reasoning to see the individual is important (things to look up are Pierre Joseph Prudon's social contract. (Pierre Joseph Prudon)</p>	<p>I love your value & criterion. Great reference (8th Amend) but it must be done by the U.S. government, fulfilled</p> <p>You did a great job of predicting the Aff case with counterpoints which directly clashed with her theories. Over all I love your law</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>You could have answered her attacks less condensedly. Also, the way you answered was made for judges who flow, I don't. (I do keep track in my head).</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>great questions in C-X, I love your criteria term (I would have liked less statements in C-X & more 's)</p> <p>(Locke's social contract would have been great to back up U.S. law)</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>You should really have your case prepared before you enter the Room. Great voice projection. Great usage of Opponents down time.</p>	<p>great stance & eye contact. Though you do need to work on projection of your voice. It's a big room.</p>

Decision based on: whereas my original paradigm was not met I defaulted value. In order to understand which upheld the value better. The Neg attacked the criterion which should uphold the value. the turn (done by neg in 1st speech) went unanswered. Also the Aff value was solved using Neg's V of C. Neg won. Due to the fact the Aff voided the cycle argument of The (C)

Decision in favor of: AFF (circle) NEG Code AA JA

Judge's Signature

Idaho High School Activities Association
 Room **LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT**

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet C Judge Wilkins, AJ
 Fight A

Affirmative (code & name) JUNB Natalie Bowman

Negative (code & name) AAJA Jacquelynn Andrew

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 <u>39</u> 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 <u>38</u>	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * strong case analysis, well defined * clearly stated argument * clear logical flow of ideas 	<p>Case Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * well organized presentation * logically defined arguments + analysis * persuasive flow
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * good support for case + analysis * Evidence is clearly stated 	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * support was well stated and cited * many good examples of evidence
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * confident delivery, strong speaking skills 	<p>Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * poised delivery, quality presentation

Decision based on:

Affs contention 1 was very well stated + supported and not affectively rebutted
 Affs arguments stand, neg addressed them during rebuttal.
 morality not legality, Affs analysis stands

Decision in favor of:	<u>(AFF)</u> NEG <small>(circle)</small>	Code <u>JUNB</u>	
			<u>A.J. Wilkins</u> Judge's Signature

Great work from both sides!
 Thank you for putting me through this.

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet C Judge Hill C.
Flight A
Affirmative (code & name) JJNB Natalie Bowman
Negative (code & name) AA JA Jacquelynn Andrew

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 <u>39</u> 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 <u>38</u>	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
Case & Analysis Case & Analysis Original + well-organized case Good research + nice flow	Good Value - should tie it stronger to why that defines morality. Criterion seemed to repeat the value.
Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning Reasoning was valid - Good command of L-D rules & procedure	Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning Not a lot of evidence. Reasoning was hard to follow New arguments brought in too late.
Delivery Delivery Clear, concise, Excellent speaker	Professional appearance, nervous at times - Be more confident! You are doing great

Decision based on: Better argument presented by AFF.

Decision in favor of:	<u>AFF</u> (circle)	NEG	Code <u>JJNB</u> <u>Chiel</u> Judge's Signature
------------------------------	------------------------	-----	---

Rook

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet D Judge Miller T

Flight A

Affirmative (code & name) SSMM - M. Murry

Negative (code & name) JSMP - Rebels

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 <u>39</u> 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 <u>36</u> 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>I think your criteria needs more explanation and it should connect explicitly to your primary arguments (don't say it once & let it disappear) especially contentions #2. At least mention it in your concluding statements. Contention 1 is too long - work to balance arguments. Give us voters in your last rebuttal, not just line-by-line.</p>	<p>Give more time to your value & criteria analysis - especially in comparison to hers. You barely address and these are the core issues in the round. Case construction is good. Definition debate is mostly unnecessary (except as it relates to Resolutional Analysis). Prioritize your argumentation.</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>Excellent response to the Natural Rights criteria. Need to address the "call the police analysis". There are stats that say the risk of victim death is greatly increased when police are called or victim leaves or threatens to leave.</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>"I don't agree with that, yea" is not an argument. If you don't understand her criteria really grill her in CX - you had extra time to get clarification - use all speech time as well - had a minute left in your constructive responses to criteria deficient - barely discussed in your rebuttal.</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>Work on developing a really persuasive tone. This is an emotional topic that could use some inflection, you are very monotone. Almost nonchalant (work on not smiling when talking about this painful topic).</p>	<p>Please stop clicking your pen!</p> <p>Delivery is a little choppy - you seem unfamiliar with case. Work on eliminating ums and yea. It detracts from fluency & credibility. You seem REALLY nonchalant about this debate & topic. Utilize your tone to convince us.</p>

Decision based on: Value: Analysis on need for self before society is most persuasive to me
Criteria: Neg said 200 in response to Aff criteria and Aff demonstrated how Neg did not even uphold their own. -> Aff you still need to talk about yours more!
 At end of the debate you both seemed to think the most important debate was whether the trauma from abuse is more/less than trauma of killing. That arg. went Aff.

Decision in favor of: AFF (circle) NEG Code SSMM

 Judge's Signature

Rock

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplet D Judge Domenich L
Flight A

Affirmative (code & name) SSMH - Murray

Negative (code & name) JMP - Rubols

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	<u>34</u> 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	<u>37</u> 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Case & Analysis Case & Analysis

Human kind must do what they must. Urgency! Right to life.

Right to life. Since abuse occurs over long period of time retaliation would be premeditation

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning

Human Right to life. "Stockholm Syndrome" Self Preservation.

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning

Psychological effects of killing family member are huge. Violates 6 Amm. Right to fair trial.

Delivery

Delivery

Interesting interpretation of the morality of killing as alternative as a "win/win". Interesting! Great.

Well spoken & well researched. Presentation of evidence was

Decision based on:

Affirmative agreed with Negative debate on several points. Contradiction on definition of deadly force by Aff side. No definition of self defense offered when asked by opponent.

Decision in favor of:

AFF (circle) NEG

Code

JMP
Julie Domenick

Judge's Signature

Room

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simple + D Judge Grosshans D

Affirmative (code & name) S SMM Murray

Negative (code & name) J J M P Paboles

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good case but don't drop any of your points. If your opponent doesn't attack something that doesn't mean you're done talking about it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case was well organized but you didn't carry all your points through.
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasoning in your 2nd speech was clear but you could have been more organized Evidence was presented when needed 	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some reasoning was muddled - you said you didn't really know what her criterion was but then claimed you upheld it.
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good confident tone You could memorize your speech more and maintain eye contact with your audience to enhance your message 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good tone, could use more eye contact Be more confident with your refutation. There were a few times you sort of left an open ended statement rather than a pointed attack

Decision based on:

The negative did not effectively address the aff case.
The Aff also wins the value/criterion debate.

Decision in favor of:	AFF (circle)	NEG	Code <u>S SMM</u>
			<u>J D Grosshans</u> Judge's Signature

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simpler + D Judge Leslie Bonwick
Flight + 15

Affirmative (code & name) UUPH-Herman

Negative (code & name) BBSJ-Johnson

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	(37) 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 (35)	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p style="text-align: center;">Case & Analysis</p> <p>Deadly force must ONLY be used in case of eminent danger. Necessary to save one's life.</p>	<p>If you can plan to kill in response to violence, you can plan another options. It's proportionate to put your rights above others.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>If society can't protect us, we should protect ourselves. Abusers forfeit "life" when victimizing others.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>Stated that 85% of dom. violence was unreported so how did people know they had NO OTHER OPTION! Great Point!</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Delivery</p> <p>Good Statistics to back argument. Very sure of self & well prepared.</p>	<p>Great statistics to back argument! A little shaky on one rebuttal - couldn't say why argument was flawed - just felt it was.</p>

Decision based on: Neg was asked question of using deadly force herself if she were threatened by a man. She said that was a "disproportionate" example - because a man is a lot bigger than her. As Affirmative side proved domestic violence is usually a man violating a woman.

Decision in favor of: AFF (circle) NEG Code UUPH

Leslie Bonwick
Judge's Signature

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplot D Judge Den Grayhans
Flight B

Affirmative (code & name) 44 PM Herman

Negative (code & name) BB S3 Johnson

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 (39) 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 (38)	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case was well presented, clear headlines • Good analysis, you defended your case well. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good case, but a little unclear at times.
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoning was clear throughout • Good job defending your evidence • Thank you for addressing my paradigm 	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of personal logic • Try to be more organized, you jumped around quite a bit in your oral speech. Just follow the flow.
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good confident tone • Memorize your speech as much as you can so you don't totally rely on your paper. Eye contact = connection with audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good passion • Put the binder down. It was almost in front of your face and was a distraction.

Decision based on: The aff had excellent logic and addressed everything on the flow. The neg allowed some key points to flow through, the intent and planning argument the aff used to defend their 1st contention and the contradiction between the neg value of social rules and defending the abuse, which the aff pointed out

Decision in favor of: (AFF) **NEG** Code 44 PM
(circle)

Den Grayhans
 Judge's Signature

a few times.

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room Simplot D Flight B Judge T. Miller

Affirmative (code & name) UUPH - Herman

Negative (code & name) BBSJ - Johnson

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Case & Analysis Case & Analysis

Your criteria is very well extended throughout the case but Quality of life is not mentioned outside of the value at top of case. You seem to be talking about life much more than the Quality. Make sure your value exists throughout the Constructive.
 Good case. Appreciate the stats. Get another of deliberate.

How are your definitions different than hers? If they are the same why offer them again? Poor use of time. You don't seem to fully understand what the Social Contract theory says. We give up right to drive 150 miles an hour in exchange for police protection when you call 911 CHALLENGE by P/A.

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning

Good CX
 Good rebuttal of her points. Get some stats on likelihood of accelerated abuse/danger when victim leaves or threatens to leave. You could use her opening quote against her by drawing a parallel to warfare.

Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning
 It's not enough to say that theories are flawed without providing some analysis in how or why. You misrepresent/understand her statistics. You hurt yourself when you admit that the abusers are larger/stronger and you couldn't defend yourself.

Delivery Delivery

Good - Work to develop meaningful inflection. This topic allows for the incorporation of some emotion into what you are saying - don't be too monotone.

Good persuasive speaking tone.
 Work to avoid platitudes "No one would ever" "How could anyone"
 Use all your rebuttal time you had 2 minutes left?

Decision based on:

NEG Your analysis that the ONLY time you can use deadly force is if you are dead minimizes this discussion. You accept self-defense theory. If you were advocating a firm pacifism position this would work but otherwise it comes across badly.
NEG - You cannot compare these 2 statistics - hers is ONLY in cases when someone is killed - not total cases of Domestic violence. The value Debate: Wholly undeveloped on both sides.
Criteria: Neg never answers what a victim should do if Police/State protection fails. I like the discussion on proportionality but the Aff Resolution Analysis & brightline defines this in such

Decision in favor of:

AFF (circle) NEG

Code UUPH

T. Miller
 Judge's Signature

a way that deadly force is the proportional response.

mm AO v. JJ PG

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round _____ Room _____ Judge Monica Cutler

Affirmative (code & name) Parker Goris JJ

Negative (code & name) Aubrey Ogaard mm

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis</p> <p>You have a good case + I buy your 2nd contention. Your first I feel like is more RA - explaining SA + I'd like the 3rd contention explained better - seems far fetched</p>	<p>I love your neg case. You make excellent points + address several angles. You can probably get rid of your stuff about Domestic Violence surveys -> we all know its an issue or it wouldn't be a topic</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>I feel like you were grappling to make the same couple of arguments over & over. Develop your case more + that will help you. Be sure to just address negs case</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning</p> <p>Your argument about the person being a judge, jury + executioner is great. You're right in bringing in the analysis with courts</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery</p> <p>Good clear speaker. love your 2 world idea at the end but leave more to time for it. make sure to argue neg case. Great, great sign posts</p>	<p>Good speaker, work on eye contact for judge signals. Time management make sure to give room for RFDs work on flowing so that you don't have to clarify in your cross-x</p>

Decision based on: I buy negs argument that victim becomes judge, jury + executioner which defeats aff's value. Also I totally buy negs analysis that b/c other ares exist thus deadly force becomes imoral. Run with that... I don't think I heard Aff address this

Decision in favor of:

AFF (circle) **NEG**

Code mm AO

Monica Cutler - BSU
Judge's Signature

mm AO v. JS PG

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round GS Room Simplot A Judge James Mosby

Affirmative (code & name) JS PG Parker Goris

Negative (code & name) MM AO Aubrey ~~the~~ Ogaard

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	SUPERIOR	EXCELLENT	GOOD
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 39 <u>38</u>	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 38	<u>37</u> 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis well organized constructive + easy to follow & flow with appropriate evidence. Clever use of military MOE as Justification</p>	<p>some of your case directly relates his case. Be sure to cross apply. Finally cite Black's law in Rebuttal. Needed to be in constructiv</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning good question on the viability of shelters. → even better that you pulled it through. Superior IAR overall. 2AR was also a nice wrap.</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning you give a lot of facts but do not cite evidence for the #s. I didn't hear a single citation in your constructiv The reasoning is there but you need to back it up.</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery good concise speaking style, easy to understand & follow.</p>	<p>→ Ditto. Poised & easy to understand.</p>

- Decision based on:
1. Aff builds stronger case through evidence citations. Neg only has 1 cite in rebuttal.
 2. Neg reference to shelters shows system not working & turned by ARs
 3. military rules of engagement provides justification for the use of deadly force by extension of existing mores in society. Feeds into

Decision in favor of: AFF (circle) NEG Code JS PG

 Judge's Signature James Mosby

Value of Aff. Its not meant to address the topic directly.

Just because she hates them doesn't mean I hate definition debate if it's relevant.

MM AO vs.
JJ PG

Idaho High School Activities Association
LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE BALLOT

Round Gold/Silver Room 316/A Judge Steve Lee

Affirmative (code & name) JJ PG Parker Goris


Negative (code & name) MMAO Aubree Ogaard

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER

	<u>SUPERIOR</u>	<u>EXCELLENT</u>	<u>GOOD</u>
<u>Affirmative</u>	40 <u>(39)</u> 38	37 36 35	34 33 32
<u>Negative</u>	40 39 <u>(38)</u>	37 36 35	34 33 32

AFFIRMATIVE	NEGATIVE
<p>Case & Analysis Case & Analysis Well constructed case needed more evidence and example would have been nice. Criticism was a touch wrong maybe use something more accessible</p>	<p>Great case layout you set up a case easy to defend objectiveness vs effective use it</p>
<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning 1) I society - this doesn't answer the question of if its moral... 2) Self Defense - yes but is deliberate action just? 3) Econ - Why?</p>	<p>Support of Issues Through Evidence and Reasoning 1) Def - good DU vs a simple assault 2) Option - use evidence shirers ect 3) Judgment - state of mind all good</p>
<p>Delivery Delivery Smooth speaking style well thought out. Increase energy and use of emotional vocals</p>	<p>Great job staying engaged in debate did a good job answering questions and asking. use time a little better especially last speech</p>

Decision based on: aff gave me only voters if neg had gone so they get my ballot. However they didn't so aff gets the vote. Great Balance aff great team on Options available

Decision in favor of: (AFF) NEG Code JJ PG
(circle)

Judge's Signature