



AFF

Bartlesville JW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Jack Williams

26

NEG

Edmond North DA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Devraat Awasthi

27

Winner: Edmond North DA debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

debate came down to the Locke card. Neg upheld life, liberty & property better

Room: US B-32
Flight 1 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



AFF

Edmond North PL

Patricia Liu

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

NEG

Bentonville GW


Gillian Wall

POINTS
(25 - 30)

30

Winner: ~~Edmond North PL~~ Bentonville GW debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____



Comments & Reason for Decision:

great debate
excellent line by line

Room: US B-32
Flight 2 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



AFF

NEG

Edmond North NC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cascia Hall Prep CR

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Neha Chataut

25

Carrie Riseling

27

Winner: Cascia Hall CR debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

great debate



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Tulsa Washington ED		Metro Christian LM	
Emma Donnelly	<u>29</u>	Lauren Meyer	<u>30</u>

Winner: Lauren Meyer
METRO CHRISTIAN debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Dan Anthony

Comments & Reason for Decision:

SOUL AND SPIRIT - MILLSHAMMS

Doc: Soul and Spirit
Gov. US

Discussed the value/Christian
and clash the neg held
a better position on defense against
a criminal w/ a head gun
Very close GREAT DEBATE 1.1

Room: MS 109
Flight 2 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

Anthony, Dan
Crossings Christian



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Bartlesville SM	(25 - 30)	Edmond Santa Fe RM	(25 - 30)
Sean Mason	<u>30</u>	Robert Morris	<u>29</u>

Winner: Sean Mason / Bartlesville SM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Dan H. Anthony - Crossings Christian

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*v. Soc. w/aff.
e. M.I.D. - Debate*

*V. Aff. w/aff.
a. kept track*

*Sorry did not buy the card '0'
Aff was more intentional to the framework
which he set.*

Great Aff



AFF		NEG	
Norman DZ	POINTS (25 - 30)	Bartlesville TB	POINTS (25 - 30)
Doris Zhou	<u>30</u>	Tanner Brooks	<u>30</u>
Winner: <u>Doris Zhou</u>	debating on the <u>Aff</u>	Low point win? <u>NOT a low point win.</u>	
School/Team		Side (Aff or Neg)	
Signature: <u>Ratnesh Rao</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff wins because Neg ~~didn't~~ solve for ~~many~~ of the issues, but only claimed that the Neg doesn't necessarily cause them. Aff solves for at least some of the issues.

Round basically comes down to credibility and how much of the debate was purely on the content of either opponents' cases.
Aff Neg

Your case was weak in terms of solving for certain issues surrounding the debate. Like the Vigilantism argument.

In a debate like this, I guess it is assumed that your case is based in a theoretical world with no handouts.

→ Aff wins ~~because the~~ ~~to~~ ~~to~~

You had a very limited number of words to put your claims. The differences in human dignity, in varying cultures, didn't have a novel just as for example.

~~There wasn't a strong case made as to why the 'tools' of self defense ironically ~~increase~~ increase the need to protect oneself. What I mean is, why is it that we need to protect ourselves MORE as compared to protecting ourselves less in the absence of handouts.~~



AFF

NEG

Bentonville RM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Norman AW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Rachel Mauchline

30

Amanda Wheelock

30

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

Signature: Ratnesh Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Though the Aff agrees that unstable societies exist, it did not prove as to how giving minorities access to guns could potential increase the aberration and divide between them and the police.

Neg wins as Aff couldn't solve for militarization, all the while ~~not rebutting~~ that access to guns wouldn't necessarily solve for the militarization.



1.40

2m

AFF

NEG

Cascia Hall Prep CR

Edmond North PY

Carrie Riseling

Pallavi Yennapu

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

30

26

Winner: Cascia Hall CR School/Team debating on the affirmative Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Meredith K. Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You can ditch the trigger warning. We all know what the topic is...
- Contention 2 needs some work. The impacts are not as tangible and the evidence is not as persuasive as cont. 1 & 3.
- Nice job covering flow quickly but comprehensibly.

- Read some Mill. You are misrepresenting utilitarianism.
- SLOW DOWN. Eliminate "like,"
- Anytime you accuse your opponent of slavery or genocide, you're probably making a straw man arg. you use it more times per sentence
- Are you saying ~~the~~ LGBT people should shoot police officers?

Neg scores some points in the round - most notably, the attacks on the suicide issue really sticks. However, in spite of dropping some small issues, aff wins the biggest one: that neg has no way to reduce violence below the status quo. This will achieve the true aim of util: to do good for everyone, which will by necessity assist oppressed groups as well.

Room: MS 111
Flight 1 Start: 4:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 4

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



AFF

Tulsa Washington MC

Micah Cash

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

NEG

Bartlesville SM

Sean Mason

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

Winner: Bartlesville SM debating on the Neg Side (Aff, or Neg) Low point win? P

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

DA dropped Ballot flows Neg



AFF

Bentonville GW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

Gillian Wall

NEG

Norman CS

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

Chloe Shames

Winner: _____

Bentonville GW

School/Team

debating on the _____

Aff

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Euan Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- IAC very persuasive due to familiarity w/ case, eye contact & good speaking
- The UNC had a good bang of speed and persuasiveness
- Both debaters used CX well
- Good extension of suicide argument on the aff side
- Would've wanted to see a little more impact weighing
- Enjoyed the implementation/first debate.

RFD: It came down to impact calculus & solvency. I ended up buying Aff arguments as impacts were more tangible & well-founded.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Crossings Christian TM	(25 - 30)	Tulsa Washington ED	(25 - 30)
Trent Miller	<u>29</u>	Emma Donnelly	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: Ratnesh Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg Wins because Aff didn't argue about Neg's sources and claims, whereas Neg provided a full rebuttal to the Aff's case and proves that Aff wins the Value Debate.

Comments

Aff Neg

→ You could have argued that guns do cause harm even when they are not used due to emotional trauma, fear, ~~and~~ media's portrayal of guns, etc. in the Cx.

→ Just ~~saying~~ ^{stating that} life is > Justice because w/o life you can't have Justice, isn't a good argument. ~~But~~ ~~me~~ ~~try~~ Instead tell me how you can uphold both values, so you argue that you win the round on both fronts.

definitely
You ~~should~~ ~~have~~ ~~argued~~ ~~different~~ ~~about~~ ~~that~~ his argument about suicide and elder people.

→ Rather state that the card about elder people doesn't ^{uphold} ~~uphold~~ his own value due to the narrow nature of the card. It only focusses on one group of people.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Tulsa Washington ET	(25 - 30)	Crossings Christian CG	(25 - 30)
Emerson Turner	<u>30</u>	Cade Garoutte	<u>27</u>

Winner: Emerson Turner debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Ratnesh Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Wins because Neg dropped the Aff's case.

Comments

Aff Neg

→ Regarding debating about the 2nd Amendment, you can also say that the Constitution is meant to be tailored to the current society and that a 18th century amendment cannot necessarily be applied to a society with data surveillance, advanced tech, etc.

About the question you asked in CX about whether your opponent has fired a gun: It doesn't matter. In LD, realistically ~~an~~ opponent's personal beliefs, like, etc. doesn't make a difference in the debate. → Additionally, reduce ~~the size of~~ the Neg case so you have time to argue your opponent's case. → You had ~~some~~ some relevant arguments, but they aren't valid



AFF

NEG

Broken Arrow RC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Norman KH

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Reese Childress

26

Kaitlyn Hurst

26

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

Signature: Alix Haggard

1:02

1:47

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg:

"that's fine."

"like."

"ok" "So..."

Try Spreading w/ inflection. the arguments are getting lost.

great arguments, work on delivery. when you gasp for air in between words it hurts your presence.

aff: Too many Contentions. Cut it down to 3 ish, fill the extra time w/ added analysis, links, evidence and impacts. this will make your case stronger.

RFD:

I vote on the Value debate. The rest of the flow was a mess. The Neg wins because she solves for a larger Oppressed group.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cabot ZA	(25 - 30)	Edmond Santa Fe IM	(25 - 30)
Zane Ashcraft	<u>24</u>	Ian Mooers	<u>30</u>

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe IM debating on the Neg Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff. or Neg)

Signature:

1: 54

2: 36

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff:

your spread
is rather
"mumbly"
and

"breathy"

work on inflection.

Reading fast should

still be understandable.

*asking if i'm qualified
to judge is insulting.*
- ☺

RFD: I vote on the
objectivity argument.
Cars aren't banned when
they harm ppl. Guns
don't either. While
I'm sympathetic to
the oppressed the
aff does not clearly
illustrate how Banning
Guns would cause the
thought shift. The Neg,
however proves in his
evidence that Gun Control
increases Violence,
and therefore Racial
Violence.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond Santa Fe KK	(25 - 30)	Edmond North PL	(25 - 30)
Karim Kari	<u>27.5</u>	Patricia Liu	<u>29</u>

Winner: Patricia Liu Edmond North debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:45

but we only remove licenses after you break a rule ie drunk driving

If it is true that gun control will always fail then wouldn't the Aff always fail too?

1:45

you dont need to spend so long on until ignores minutes in CX, yes it does

Shot guns arent banned in the status quo... or assault weapons

Smart guns dont solve for domestic violence

I vote neg because

- Aff says we shouldnt ban driving until people break a law and does not refute Neg attacks

- He admits gun control will never be effective which is turned Neg voters and removes Aff salvecy | Value criterion debate

- Shifting the blame away from people perpetrators the culture of violence

2 Need for self defence



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond Santa Fe RM	(25 - 30)	Edmond North NC	(25 - 30)
Robert Morris	<u>28.5</u>	Neha Chataut	<u>28</u>

Winner: Neha Chataut Edmond north debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? yes
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:25
 you need answers to race
 like there were many times
 you could have taken out
 the Aff but didn't.

1:40
 While your NC is true how
 does the neg affect police oppression?

CX is not the time to try to repeat
 your case

your arguments dont really have any impact

~~It is not the time to repeat your case~~

I voted ~~no~~ because
 - Aff does not properly respond
 - Neg is able to access deliberation
 impacts

This was new to the
 CAR so I cant count

Issues

- 1 In the same oppression still happens
- 2 win framework allows for deliberation
- 3 Aff minimizes oppression/surround

Issues

- 1 value/crit debate
 Neg looks at oppressed bodies
 blacks cant express because
 of police
- 2 Racism
 blacks are oppressed
 need to preserve right against
 oppression



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Bartlesville TB	(25 - 30)	Edmond North DA	(25 - 30)
Tanner Brooks	<u>27</u>	Devraat Awasthi	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff:

- You should consider having evidence talking about how gun deaths have gone down in other developed countries to bolster your arguments about the US
- In CX, you should press him on how extreme liberty and property cannot be violated.

NEG:

- Good CX; especially on the suicide
- you had 30 seconds left with the NC/NR to better link to genocide and/or why AFF doesn't get the impacts he wants

RFD: I go AFF primarily for one reason. He proves one impact to be true if assault rifles are still used: A reduction in homicides. AFF clearly explains how and why handguns are used for crime, thus it would not make sense to use assault weapons (you cannot conceal them). NEG does not have enough offense when accepting the use of assault weapons, NEG relies on the defense of "AFF has no impacts". The black market argument also gets debunked because accidental shootings will not happen since people will not go out and seek the guns.

Room: MS 110
Flight 1 Start: 4:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 4

Zhou, Lawrence



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Moore JC		Crossings Christian GF	
Jerrod Cooper	<u>27.5</u>	Georgie Franklin	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff solves racialized gun violence

Aff
• IAR should be more word efficient

Neg
• INC too long, dropped the aff case



AFF

Metro Christian LM

Lauren Meyer

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

NEG

Edmond North AP

Ari Pappaharonis

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Edmond North AP debating on the Neg Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Turns on case +
solvency take outs

Aff

- 1AR time management
- too little time on your own case
- 2AR repetition is unnecessary

Neg

- Aff gets durable fiat



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Crossings Christian JL	(25 - 30)	Edmond North JA	(25 - 30)
Josh LaFortune	<u>27</u>	Junaid Ahmed	<u>29</u>

Winner: Edmond North JA debating on the Neg Low point win? _____
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

• Try to work on topic knowledge. I felt like you lost your train of thought a couple times within the debate. Make sure you fully understand your Affirmative so you can reference back to it in your 1AR and 2AR.

• There wasn't a lot of impact work done in the 1AR or 2AR which makes it hard to see any benefit to the Aff.

• A philosopher debate doesn't improve the way is winning Framework.

• Try to not overtake your opponent. Let him ask and answer the way he wants too and respond according

• Nice job controlling the Framework debate, try to not be so sarcastic on the question of who's until you are referring too.

• Nice job proving that deterrence is a real thing and the Aff fails to prove any real benefit on the IAC.

• You can explain a lot more of your arguments as well as extending waccents to strengthen your points

TOO MANY ANALOGYS!

I vote Neg, The Framework debate doesn't really matter because the Neg is functioning through both better, I hear no impact debate by the Aff so have no choice to vote Neg.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cabot CJ	(25-30)	Norman DZ	(25-30)
Christen Johnson	<u>28</u>	Doris Zhou	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You spend a great deal of your IAR on the uniqueness of hand guns however you lack analysis on why the deaths mentioned by the ARF are preventable with a handgun ban.
- I need to hear more on Framework and more on the Neg case. Specifically do this racism argument because it is really unclear.
- Your best chance at this debate is the observation but it still doesn't matter if you can't prove banning hand guns will directly save lives.

- I liked your INC, good points on framework and governmental power but you need to explain this racism argument, it is very confusing how you explain it.
- Rather than reforming a precedent in a ex question actually say what the card says.
- Good Extensions in INR, great analysis of the suicide argument, tackling the root cause debate.
- Good job pointing out how the ARF has no core solvency with the drops of the IAR.
- Clear solid votes, I would have liked to hear more about the Neg in the INR but overall solid speech.

• This persons blame for violence doesn't dispense that people with mental illnesses have a deeper problem than owning a gun.

I vote Neg, The ARF has not shown how the lives saved would not be lost to other forms of violence and the Neg wins Framework as well as disproving a lot of AFF solvency,



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Crossings Christian MI	(25 - 30)	Bentonville RM	(25 - 30)
Matt Ives	<u>28</u>	Rachel Mauchline	<u>29</u>

Winner: Bentonville RM School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Write your case to be more clear on evidence
- Good questions in cross-ex
- You have a very pleasant atmosphere about you
- Nice ZAR → try making it a little more offensive

NEG

- I really am digging this prison-industrial complex argument
- Nice ZNR
- Read more ev on prison-industrial complex argument and go all in on it

I vote Neg = The framework debate can be mitigated through offense on the neg flow → while I don't think the Neg has a lot of game on the framework, I still buy their case turns under the aff →

- 1. Black market
 - 2. Backlash
 - 3. Prison-Industrial Complex
- } Most go conceded and all time safety



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Norman AW	(25 - 30)	Moore WB	(25 - 30)
Amanda Wheelock	<u>29</u>	Wyatt Brown	<u>28</u>

Winner: Norman AW debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team
 Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Your advocacy gets confusing through the obsv. debate
- Extnd more of your harms/benefits
- Try having earlier answer to the PIC.

NEG

- I don't know how this observation/ground argument gets you anything
- I think the race arguments are good coming out of the INC but they seem to go away
- Not sure what the PIC is doing for you but maybe develop it more

GREAT ROUND

REFD!

I vote aff. I think there is enough defense coming from the aff to mitigate the risk of arming oppressors failing → I don't think the PIC (S) → I vote off risk of (S) under rights protection // (S) domestic violence

More decision specifics orally -

Room: MS 112
Flight 1 Start: 4:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 4

Anthony, Dan
Crossings Christian



AFF

NEG

Metro Christian CM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Bartlesville JW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cristian Meyer

30

Jack Williams

29

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

Signature: Dan Anthony Crossings Christian

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Value guarantee
Crd contrast - win*

*Value \rightarrow JWSA CW
Crd in response to forum rights*

*FRAMEWORK
AND DROPS BY NEG*

Room: MS 112
Flight 2 Start: 4:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 4

Anthony, Dan
Crossings Christian



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cascia Hall Prep LG	(25 - 30)	Cabot BG	(25 - 30)
Lewis Guillory	<u>29</u>	Briana Griffin	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: Dan Anthony Crossings Christian

Comments & Reason for Decision:

*Value Governmental Duty
Critic WEG Utility*

*Value MORALITY
Critic STANDARDS*

UPHELD VALUE AND FRAMEWORK

Room: US B-30
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 5

Hayward
Peterson, Alix
Edmond North

Kimbrough. C



AFF

Bartlesville SM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Sean Mason

30

NEG

Cascia Hall Prep CR

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Carrie Riseling

28

Winner: Bartlesville SM School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: *[Signature]*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

good case, I love the way you lay out the 2nd convention. good cx, way to place yourself in front & show control I don't buy that less interference means no gov't good job showing causal links between your evidence & ~~policy~~ arguments

Use all of your CX time! need more of a link to explain why less restrictive is inherently better saying all guns should be banned doesn't mean handguns shouldn't Don't spread if you're going to leave a minute on your speech

The Negative wants to argue solvency however cannot defend this on her own meanwhile the aff manages to disprove many of the negative arguments while being able to directly link violence to handguns, I also buy many of his arguments of presupposition or affirmation

Room: US B-31
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 5

Zhou, Lawrence



AFF

Edmond North PY

Pallavi Yennapu

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Bentonville GW

Gillian Wall

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Turns on aff case



AFF

NEG

Bartlesville TB

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Norman CS

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Tanner Brooks

29

Chloe Shames

28

Winner: Bartlesville TB debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no
School/Team

Signature: Julia M. Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both sides had well written cases and provided good sound arguments. However in the end the aff won on framework and voting issues.

Affirmedline asked many good questions in CX. Specifically the "tipping point" argument and the "does negative status quo differ from social challenges if aff happens". I do think however that social problems is a valid argument if the neg can prove through evidence that a ban on hand guns would increase these social issues.

This was actually a really nice debate. I think both sides did respectfully well. However, for me the round came down to the framework where morality is subjective and where the neg I think the social problem "caused" by a ban to be worse with the aff. Therefore I must vote for protection of life.



AFF

NEG

Tulsa Washington MC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Norman AW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Micah Cash

30

Amanda Wheelock

29

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- In the IAR you do a pretty good job on Framework and impacting the AFF but I would have liked to hear more on the self defense argument and util argument.
- Good extensions in the 2AR, good job impacting the AFF throughout the round and showing how even if the neg is right benefits still exist in the IAC.
- Good job on drops I could have voted on the Suicide trap alone even though I didn't.
- Nice work making it clear that your goal is to decrease violence and the AFF is the only one that does that.

- I think in your IAR you sort of ignore alot of this IAR and just extend stuff. You need to show me why Hand guns are not a contributor to the problem of violence with casual violence and police.
- You do a good job explaining that the police are cast but all I hear in this debate is oppression exists I never hear how taking away H&G further it more.
- When you give in to the Ecommerce debate that means you have the burden of showing me the AFF isn't helping the ~~majority~~ majority and further not I don't think you did that in the IAR.
- Overall I just don't hear enough on how hand guns are not a reason for a lot of crime and how taking them away will further oppression.

I vote AFF, I think the Neg doesn't do enough on the casual violence arg to show me how oppression is better and the AFF is impacted well the whole debate.
Good Debate!



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Cascia Hall Prep LG		Crossings Christian TM	
Lewis Guillory	<u>28</u>	Trent Miller	<u>27.5</u>

Winner: Lewis Guillory Cascia debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~These look up to~~ 2:00
Get indites to Lott
and mustard their "study"
is completely false

:50
you are not calling for an
increase in guns I stand
to your case

Dude you have to sign past
I have no idea where you were
trying to respond in the IAR

This police thing was never
a real issue
why do you guys keep refuting
what was said in CX

you should use your prep
RFJ
- I vote Aff because
opponent doesn't refute the
aff or extend his studies
- gov responsibility is upheld
on Aff
- extend dixon

issues
extend dixon

issues
1 he attacks contentions
not my value/criterion
2 when we remove criminals
still have guns



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond North DA	(25 - 30)	Crossings Christian GF	(25 - 30)
Devraat Awasthi	<u>29</u>	Georgie Franklin	<u>28</u>

Winner: Devraat Awasthi Edmond North debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Handwritten Signatures]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

all you have to do is make one
 Impact to util in the 1AR ~~and~~ ~~of just refute~~ ~~it that works~~ ~~too & guess~~ 2:00

~~you're base~~
 your response to the Neg case should
 have taken 30 secs since it was just
 2 args against the constitution
 and 3 against util
 and the militarism link but that was short

2:00

we dont see I pads
 killing people because they
 are not tools for killing.

The surprise emotional appeal
 was nice in the 2AR

I vote Aff because

- Real people > the constitution
- Fiat solves the constitution
- Aff solves militarism (somewhat)
 this has util and morality impacts
 so it wins both cases



AFF

Cabot ZA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

26

Zane Ashcraft

NEG

Moore JC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

27

Jerrold Cooper

Winner:

Moore JC

School/Team

debating on the

Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? _____

Signature:

L Shipley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - I'm ok with speed if you enunciate clearly. You do not. Neither I nor your opponent understood your value.

AFF Case - Contention II - Evidence is Not specific to hand guns.

Neg Case - 4:25 - Way too long. Doesn't leave you enough time to refute.

IAR - Spent 3+ min on defense. Did not leave yourself enough time to extend aff case.

Both agree on saving Blacks. The question of the round is who best achieves this. The Aff proves that racism exists, but never proves that a gun ban will magically eliminate all racism. The Neg proves that a gun ban will leave the blacks defenseless against armed police and criminals.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Metro Christian CM	(25 - 30)	Broken Arrow RC	(25 - 30)
Cristian Meyer	<u>28</u>	Reese Childress	<u>28</u>

Winner: Broken Arrow RC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: L Shiple

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Best round I've seen so far at this tournament. I always enjoy watching our good East OK Kids. Glad I got to judge this! Wish I could vote for both of you!

RFD: This round was lost in the IAR. Aff spent 3 min on defense of ~~his~~^{Neg} ~~own~~ case and had too little time to extend his own. As a result, he dropped multiple attacks the Neg had made, and she capitalized on them in her last speech.

Neg turns ^{Aff} Cont 2 with her long gun argument that goes unrefuted.
Neg also wins her Cont 3 on ~~the~~ enforcement not being possible b/c of gun thefts - again unrefuted.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Crossings Christian JL		Bartlesville JW	
Josh LaFortune	<u>25</u>	Jack Williams	<u>30</u>

Winner: JACK WILLIAMS School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: Ken C. [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

JOSH 1:30 1:34 1:50

NOT MUCH EYE CONTACT
MATERIAL WAS FLUIDLY GIVEN - BUT DURING X-EXAM, SEEMED HARD TO FIND INFO
HAD SEVERAL CITES + SOURCES, WELL DONE
X-EXAM SEEMED SKETCHY + SORT OF OFF TOPIC
SEEMED TO LOSE TRAIN OF THOUGHT DURING SECOND AFFIRM NOTION

JACK 1:25 2:35

GOOD EYE CONTACT
EXCELLENT X-EXAM
NEG ADDRESSED AFFIRM NOTIONS WELL, GIVING SPECIFIC EXAMPLES
NICE INTERPOLATION OF FUTURE EVENTS
MATERIAL WAS CLEARLY KNOWN - LITTLE READ + DEPENDENT ON
MATERIAL GIVEN IN FLUID ORDER WITH DEFINED CITINGS

Room: MS 110
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 5

Williams, E.
Kimbrough, Carly
Broken Arrow



AFF

Edmond North AP

Ari Pappaharonis

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe IM

Ian Mooers

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe IM debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Evan Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Enjoyed thorough & well-developed framework in Aff case
- Negative used CX well to flesh out the potential flaws of a militarism framework.
- Good description and use of framework describing a complex & in-depth non-based argument by the negative.
- Good use of ~~still~~ the negative drop of the still evidence to extend impacts

RFD: 1) Neg successfully framed the round, suggesting a non-based approach which was obviously very important in this round, 2) Winning Issues were much more crystalized on the negative



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond North PL	(25 - 30)	Norman KH	(25 - 30)
Patricia Liu	<u>28</u>	Kaitlyn Hurst	<u>28</u>

Winner: Edmond North PL School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Eileen Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- I liked how well-developed a ~~affirmative~~ framework was, but may be trying to do too much. Focus on framework to a little more
- Good CX questions by the negative, both asking and answering
- Great eye contact in the INC.
- Good use of extensions by negative but could do with impacting drops of evidence
- Negative needed to spend more time on refuting issues

RFD: 1) Framework was not clearly won by either side, so I had to revert to tangible impacts, the Affirmative better addressed things like police brutality.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Tulsa Washington ED	(25 - 30)	Moore WB	(25 - 30)
Emma Donnelly	<u>27</u>	Wyatt Brown	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

- Good C, especially your question about what deems something a right
- Say you will address your case instead of rebuild
- While this is a minute detail, it makes your case and arguments seem stronger still.
- You spent too much time describing the NEG's arguments, get to your own arguments
- Extend crucial evidence you will be using in the RAB during your 1AK speech.

NEG:

- Good C on questioning AFF's theory on government
- Work on MC/1R time management. You spent too much time on the value for ground you didn't cover on the contentions level
- ~~Say you will address your case instead of rebuild~~
- Work on your time management for the 2NR
- Extend more key pieces of evidence
- Number your arguments

RFD: The NEG wins the round because he proves to me how minorities will be harmed through the AFF case he maintains this offense throughout the entirety of the debate. While the NEG should have made protecting minorities its own voting issue, he gestures to it in all three of his votes and in addressing how racism is a problem with the government in C2. AFF does not maintain crucial offense, such as the C2, where we see more of the harms from hand guns that thus fulfill her framework.



AFF

NEG

Cabot BG

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Metro Christian LM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Briana Griffin

27

Lauren Meyer

28.5

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:
• Good Ct, especially on the brightline for gov. legit.
• You have good arguments on the IAR, but try to find evidence to back these claims (i.e. other forms of self defense are better)
• You should extend at the continental level as well

MEG:
• Excellent Ct with the self defense questioning and with the questions on the Aff topic on suicide
• You do not need to say "I have three responses" and "finally, my third..." Just say "one [argument], two [arg]..."
• You should extend in the ZMR to make the votes stronger

RFD: I vote Meg for a few reasons. ① MEG successfully wins her offense and maintains it that kernel guns are needed for self defense. ② NEG wins the prohibition arguments, which causes the AFF's primary offense to fail. ③ Even if the NEG is under the AFF framework, the NEG still wins because of the self defense argument, how people can still use kernel guns or fire them to commit suicide, and that there are other means to commit suicide. ④ Even if the NEG does not have the FW, she proves why the government has no obligation to people who commit suicide, seeing how it went unaddressed and extend



AFF		NEG	
Edmond North NC	POINTS (25 - 30)	Norman DZ	POINTS (25 - 30)
Neha Chataut	30 <i>but watch cx</i>	Doris Zhou	29
Winner: <u>Norman DZ</u>		debating on the <u>NEG</u>	Low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
School/Team		Side (Aff or Neg)	
Signature: <u>Bill McCabe</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff needs to listen during cx & when opponent says T.P. stop. it looks pretty abusive for you to go way beyond finishing a sentence — that said I love your passion

*I'm not sure where this debate ends up -
Neg's position is that banning guns will result in more minority arrests & incarceration (like drugs)*

*Aff - shows that "guns" threaten women in domestic violence - first, that evidence isn't specific to handguns
2nd, by supporting the resolution, it doesn't seem like aff solves any things*

Neg makes a much better case for guns adverse by impacting minorities with a very damning argument using "drug crime" as an empirical example of how that works -

Vote NA



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cabot CJ	(25 - 30)	Crossings Christian MI	(25 - 30)
Christen Johnson	<u>27</u>	Matt Ives	<u>27</u>

Winner: Crossings Christian MI debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
 School/Team

Signature: Brit McCabe

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Well developed IAC - Neg leaves only leaves himself 1:36 to attack that then leaves 30 ~~seconds~~ seconds on the table

The 3rd Amendment is a stretch -

When Neg attacks Aff's first contention, which literally the tag line is "Banning H.G. will Reduce homicide" you say "this is true but..." — Why would you say that?

Aff → ??? You literally leave your self 18 seconds in IAR to cover ~~the~~ Negs entire case → you didn't get it covered — Why would you go Aff/Neg in IAR ??? It will absolutely cost you the round if he pulls his case in INR — He did —

Neg ballot by almost default —

~~_____~~

The Audie Murphy Story has NOTHING to do with this debate

Room: MS 106
Flight 1 Start: 8:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 5

McCallister
~~*Timothy*~~
Larson, Trevor



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond Santa Fe RM	(25 - 30)	Bentonville RM	(25 - 30)
Robert Morris	<u>26</u>	Rachel Mauchline	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: *[Signature]*

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg wins impact debate
AFF drops turns on case

Room: MS 106
Flight 2 Start: 8:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 5

~~McCallister~~
~~Kimberly~~
Larson, Trevor



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond North JA	(25 - 30)	Tulsa Washington ET	(25 - 30)
Junaid Ahmed	<u>28</u>	Emerson Turner	<u>26</u>

Winner: Edmond North JA debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision: _____

Aff case stands
in a Marx world there will be no criminals
therefore no need for self defense



2.20

2.10

AFF

Crossings Christian TM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

26

Trent Miller

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe RM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

27

Robert Morris

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

Signature: Meredith K Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Work on enunciation. it's hard to understand your case.
- your evidence proves handguns can be misused, which isn't the same as proving they should be banned.
- work on developing attacks/defense in more detail. Nothing you're saying is wrong, but you need to provide more analysis to make it convincing.

- The arg. about things changing our environment doesn't make sense.
- Good job pulling through/ impacting dropped args. from IAR.
- Be careful not to make slippery slope args.

Neg's main arg - that guns are not inherently evil - is not refuted.
Neg also demonstrates that suicide & violence will continue even w/o handguns.



AFF

Crossings Christian MI

Matt Ives

POINTS
(25 - 30)

26

NEG

Metro Christian CM

Cristian Meyer

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

Winner: Metro Christian CM debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You conceded a lot in CX, try to answer the questions with more relation to what the AFF wants in this debate. You basically gave him all the answers he wanted.
 - Calm down in CX, no reason to get mad...
 - You basically agree the Neg case is true then say its not the only means, I don't know why the AFF outweighs unless you tell me?
 - You gave me a roadmap in IAR and didn't follow it at all...
 - You also conceded a lot of the Framework debate which loses almost all of the AFF's impacts
 - Basically I just don't have any clear analysis on any of your arguments I need more impact analysis for you to have a chance.
 - I think you spend too much time on Framework in CX and INC, you can just say morality is subjective and you get the same point across.
 - So I don't think your negative strategy is very strong but I guess you did a good job with what you had.
 - Good job extending INC arguments in INR and good evidence analysis.
 - Good job winning Framework and showing contradictions on the AFF.
 - The only thing you could have done better in the INR was elaborate on the self defense argument more.
- I vote Neg, The AFF fails to provide a key reason why guns have more harms than benefits and concedes too much on Framework especially within the criterion clash to have any real impacts.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Crossings Christian GF		Cabot ZA	
Georgie Franklin	<u>29</u>	Zane Ashcraft	<u>27</u>
Winner: <u>Cabot ZA</u> School/Team debating on the <u>Neg</u> Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Signature: <u>B. J. M.</u>			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

In IAR you go Aff/Neg. You got his case covered but it is a dangerous thing to do - After you cover Neg, Aff then goes back & forth from ~~Aff~~ Aff to Neg then back to aff. Organize more
Neg needs to work on enunciation & give me voting issues
Aff never really attacks the neg case. There are a couple of arguments but never applied - I also need voters
I actually vote on criterion - Neg pulls until leading to a disfranchised minority -



AFF

Bentonville RM

Rachel Mauchline

POINTS
(25 - 30)

27

NEG

Edmond North PY

Pallavi Yennapu

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The debate came down to the Value and criterion clash. Because the neg showed that Political stability could not be upheld on the Aff as a result of ~~lower~~ increased oppression through the turns on the case the Neg won the debate.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Moore WB		Cascia Hall Prep LG	
Wyatt Brown	<u>30</u>	Lewis Guillory	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Trevor Larson

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The winner for today's round is the Aff because he was able to show that the Neg has no way to implement his actions. He ~~instead~~ also showed how Liberty would best uphold both frameworks as ~~powering~~ gun violence was the best way to lead to peace.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Bentonville GW	(25 - 30)	Bartlesville SM	(25 - 30)
Gillian Wall	<u>28.3</u>	Sean Mason	<u>28.5</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good CX
 Wonderful job refuting and bring clash to the NEG case and weighing the harm throughout the IAR

NEG: Good CX; especially on the government and when it stops come, pressing the AFF on illegal gun purchase; and the logic following, and the logic of Util with AFF's three contentions
 Good IAR and 2NR. You extend key evidence and have a clear understanding of where the clash is

RFD: I vote NEG for a few reasons: ① NEG wins the util argument with the Johnson Carel. While they may not all be handguns, we can assume there is a significant portion of the 700,000 that use them. ② I buy the security argument/voting issue. The AFF never fully refutes why the government's obligation is not to individual security. ③ The Christoph Carel shows a better way to address the impacts of the AFF. I do give the AFF the ~~only~~ argument that the blackmarket will not uphold itself. The NEG never fully engages with this argument. ~~However,~~ this does not outweigh the util offense the NEG gets with the Johnson Carel. If AFF would have fleshed out the children with mental illness and impacted it to a greater societal harm, then AFF would win util.
 Overall, fantastic debate! Thank you!



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Tulsa Washington ET	(25 - 30)	Crossings Christian JL	(25 - 30)
Emerson Turner	<u>27.5</u>	Josh LaFortune	<u>26</u>

Winner: Tulsa Washington ET debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

- Your case can be longer. You had 51 seconds left.
- Good at getting at the logic of self defense and only banning handgun guns
- You need to extend arguments in your case to further bolster your offense. Once extended, then tell me the impacts of these arguments and weigh them. You impact some with the lay crowd.

NEG:

- You should state why I should prefer your definition
- You also need evidence to back your claims
- Make sure to give clear voting issues

RFDI: The AFF wins this debate because he presents clear evidence as to why we should ban handgun guns and explains and impacts these harms. The NEG's self defense claims hold no weight because there is no evidence. Additionally, the AFF debunks why the Constitution does not hold as a criterion of conventional level arguments through the argument about the Constitution being amendable.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Norman AW		Crossings Christian CG	
Amanda Wheelock	28	Cade Garoutte	26

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

Signature: L. Shipley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This round is over after the IAR
Neg fails to ~~present~~ present a legitimate
value and neg admits racism is
acceptable under util.

Aff capitalizes on both of these points.

Neg Rebuttal- You need to respond to what
the aff has said rather than just
repeat what you have already said.

* Remember: No new arguments in rebuttal.



AFF

NEG

Bartlesville TB

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cascia Hall Prep LG

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Tanner Brooks

28

Lewis Guillory

27

Winner: Cascia Hall Prep LG debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? P

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff sets criteria
govt must/obligation to protect life
Neg upholds Aff criteria better w/ Pittman evidence



AFF

NEG

Edmond North NC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Norman AW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Neha Chataut

29.0

Amanda Wheelock

29.5

Winner: Edmond North NC debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff reduces domestic violence / militarism

Aff

- IAC still has like 50 sec left
- IAR time management could use work, would suggest going aff first
- criterion not a voting issue

Neg

- NC too long
- more specific answers to aff
- ~~criticismism~~



AFF

NEG

Crossings Christian JL

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cabot CJ

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Josh LaFortune

26

Christen Johnson

24

Crossings Christian JL

Winner: Josh LaFortune

debating on the

Aff

Low point win?

yes

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Julia M. Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision:

By offering a counterplan the ~~Aff~~ must concede many of the Aff, @l harms. Then when the CP falls, so does most of the Neg. case. In addition the Aff upholds utilitarianism better than the Neg. However, I do prefer the Neg's speaking style to that of the Aff.

The negative speaker is quite slow in his speaking style. Normally I need to ask debaters to "slow down" but in this instance I feel that it would be helpful for the Neg. to speak at least a bit faster. On the other hand the Aff at times become very "muddy" when she attempts to speed through the counterplan.

A counterplan stretches the limits of LD debate as per NFL judges. It really depend on the judge and if the judge is willing to accept counterplans in LD. I am fairly "old school NFL" and I do not like counterplans in LD.

Aff's speaking speed was almost like a runaway train, Aff got faster and faster as the speeches went on.



AFF

Crossings Christian MI

POINTS
(25 - 30)

27.5

Matt Ives

NEG

Tulsa Washington MC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29.5

Micah Cash

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Handguns key to self-defense

Aff

- No need to shake hands before rounds
- Your first contention seems weak, not a strong reason to vote aff
- Case has a minute left
- Try to organize the lar better

Neg

- come on, Constitutionality is not a real argument
-



AFF

NEG

Bartlesville SM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Moore WB

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Sean Mason

30

Wyatt Brown

28

Winner: Bartlesville SM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Julia M. Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff wins on the flow and has the stronger case. Aff is also the stronger speaker. This was a strong round and both debaters did very well.

The Aff case is very well constructed for this resolution. In addition, the Aff speaker is very knowledgeable of his evidence and how it should be used to craft his arguments. The Aff tears apart the Neg. Value entirely and in effect claims it for the Aff. The Aff case was heavily on evidence whereas the Neg case was heavy on analytics.

I do not buy into the argument that the Aff in LD must "solve" with their case. Neg gave a very nice rebuttal. However, I feel like the Negative case is ~~is~~ inherently weaker than the Aff.

Both Aff and Neg are strong speakers although Aff is superior.



AFF

Norman DZ

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Doris Zhou

29

NEG

Edmond North PL

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Patricia Liu

29

Winner: Edmond North PL School/Team debating on the Neq Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Mattie Lugh Jett

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Nice defense of dignity w/ Clinton
- Good push on the govt legitimacy arguments in cross-ex
- Be more specific on how Obama's XO gun control = racist
- Work on IAR time management → maybe limit your case a little and focus on MAIN offense

NEG

- Nice questioning of framework
- I like the gun control CP w/ the car analogy
- Time management in IAR needed some work - also, I think you need to frame it more offensively

RFD very messy debate → I voted Neg. I think there is a risk of the CP ⑤ better than aff. At framework point where I have no idea how the aff or neg protects or frames liberties - I look @ the drop about how taking away liberties always ↑ oppression → less racist to pursue corruption of good means. Neg has best access to individual rights under Aff framework



AFF

Cabot BG

Briana Griffin

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

NEG

Norman KH

Kaitlyn Hurst

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

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

Signature: Mattie Lief Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Nice cross-ex of the NC w/ public; private @s
- Maybe consider broadening your est case a little; you have limited offense I feel like
- Careful w/ your deontological interp of morality → probably links better into Neg since oppression = deontological invasion of rights
- Try to attack more of the internal warrants within the solvency deficits she reads against you
- This could also help you turn the oppression framework since guns could increase racialized violence.

NEG

- Great cross-ex questions on the internal links between all causes of suicide and handguns
- You can definitely turn the "ontologically" worthy part of the criterion - question ontological value? For who? Black people? Probs not.
- You had some time @ the end of your NC, maybe read the part of the Miller card back @ her if you cut that
- Your time management is ON POINT
- Perhaps do a little bit more on the link between gun ownership and how taking it away is a symbol of institutional oppression - you're doing great on the impacts just try to articulate the link better

RFD

I voted negative. I evaluate this round under the framework first and I think Norman is winning that the orientation of gun ownership and govt = oppression → I don't have an answer to that but even if I evaluate it under the aff framework, I have enough risk of defuse from the Mauser evidence to view aff having a limited ^{risk} of solvency.



AFF

Crossings Christian TM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Trent Miller

~~27~~ 27

NEG

Edmond North PY

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Pallavi Yennapu

~~29~~ 29

Winner: Edmond North PY debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: B. J. P.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

This is not at all a voting issue but I would reverse the order of value/criteria & your definitions ONLY because that's more common & seems to flow better -

Neg - your con. seems short - I would add something if only to get Aff to waste time in IAR

Aff needs to apply his arguments in rebuttals & extend arguments with documentation.

Neg simply has the documentation for her arguments which pull the round - There are a lot of issues that aff could have probably won with more organized refutation.



AFF

Tulsa Washington ED

Emma Donnelly

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

NEG

Metro Christian CM

Cristian Meyer

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

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

Signature: Bjorn

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Pretty well developed IAC
Neg case could use some more analysis - your case actually only runs about 2:30 - this really doesn't push aff in IAR - put something else there for Aff to at least have to try an answer -
Aff - don't get taxed into using tasers & knives - you mentioned shotguns once -
Aff challenges Negs ~~at~~ Study's methodology which is good but then just drops the argument -
I think that Aff probably has the evidence but doesn't use it very effectively -
I vote neg on the possibility of greater safety does not outweigh the absolute denial of a Right



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Edmond Santa Fe IM	(25 - 30)	Bentonville RM	(25 - 30)
Ian Mooers	<u>27</u>	Rachel Mauchline	<u>28</u>

Winner: RACHEL MAUCLINE debating on the NEG Low point win? ~~IAN~~
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Kevin C. Kitchens

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF HANDGUNS SHOULD BE BANNED
Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAN 2:00 2:00
GOOD EYE CONTACT
VALID CITINGS—I LIKE HOW YOU SLOWED DOWN TO CITE SOURCE
MATERIAL SEEMED KNOWLEDGABLE VS. JUST READ
GOOD DEFEND ON X-EXAM
KEPT INTERRUPTING NEG DURING X-EXAM - BOTH WAYS (BEING + GIVING)
COULD TELL YOU HAD PURPOSE IN THE AFFIRM

RACHEL 1:42 2:18
EYE CONTACT WAS MINIMAL - GLANCING EVERY NOW + THEN
GOOD CITES + ANALOGIES
COULD FEEL ENTHUSIASM ABOUT NEGATIVE SIDE.
GOOD DEFENSE OF AFFIRMS NOTIONS
GOOD X-EXAM + QUESTIONS
SEEMED TO KNOW MATERIAL WELL
GOOD FUTURE POSSIBILITIES GIVEN
EXCELLENT ANSWERS TO AFFIRMS STATEMENTS



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)
Norman CS	
Chloe Shames	<u>29</u>

NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Crossings Christian CG	
Cade Garoutte	<u>25</u>

Winner: CHLOE SHAMES School/Team debating on the AFFIRM Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: Kevin Kitchens

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF HANDGUNS SHOULD BE BANNED

Comments & Reason for Decision:

CHLOE II

TRY TO HAVE MORE EYE CONTACT
LOTS OF RESOURCES & CITINGS
WIDE VARIETY OF VIEWS - SUBJECTS (PROFILING, FEARS, HOME, DOMESTIC ETC.)
GOOD INFERENCES + RELATIONS
EXCELLENT X EXAM
COULD FEEL PASSION ABOUT TOPIC

CAD E I

NEED EYE CONTACT - MOST MATERIAL WAS READ - NOT LOOKING UP
MATERIAL SEEMED NEW - OR NEVER SEEN BEFORE TODAY
LOTS OF OPINIONS INSTEAD OF QUOTING CITES
HAD SOME CITINGS BUT FAR IN BETWEEN - BUT WERE VALID CITINGS
COULD NOT DEFEND ~~DEFEND~~ ^{GIVEN} CONTENTIONS
GOOD POINT OF GETTING RID OF GUNS NOT PROTECTING MAJORITY
HAD SOME VALID X-EXAMS + ALTERNATIVES

WOULD NOT RECOMMEND "I SUGGEST..." OR "...I FEEL". USE MORE FACTS + CITES



AFF

Moore JC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Jerrold Cooper

~~26~~ 26

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe RM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Robert Morris

28

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe RM debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Euan Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Be more familiar with John Locke
- Cont's flow through impacts if you dropped the arg words.
- The negative was able to direct the debate how they wanted. I.E. There was very little talk about race.

• Would've liked to see more of a framework debate. I think this didn't happen due to a lack of understanding by the affirmative.

RFD: 1) Neg won framework debate which allowed them to gain control of the flow of the round. 2) Neg extended drops that Aff could not respond to. 3) Aff did not sufficiently address human agency argument which is all Neg needed to win really.



AFF

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe IS

Edmond North AP

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Ian Stone

26

Ari Pappaharonis

27

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Ian: Don't spend so much time explaining your opponent's arguments, get to your own.
• State the authors for your creeds
• You have a good foundation for a lot of your arguments. Go a little further with them and explain why you and your arguments are winning the round.
• You also have a good case with strong ideas, so be sure to extend these points in debates

Ari: Good CR, especially when you got to the people kill 3:21 people are not asking questions
• Don't ask "Do I win the debate?" questions. The judge ultimately decides who wins. Instead, talk about if your opp. V/CR still holds.
• Make sure your voting issues are offensive. You V2 about the Aff was primarily defensive.
• Do more weighing between the impacts of both sides. You restate to it some, but there is more ~~your arguments~~ you can do and analyze
• Make sure to make it clear where you are on the flow. Most of the time you were good, but you got lost some times.

RFD: NEG wins the round for a few reasons. His case does go dropped, which is not an automatic win, but he extends key offense that he persuaded me into. First, I buy the racial profiling, which is well applied against the AFF. Second, I buy the NEG framework, which then his impacts outweigh the AFF's.



AFF

Cabot ZA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Zane Ashcraft

30

NEG

Bentonville GW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Gillian Wall

30

Winner: Bentonville GW debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: T. Kilander

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I'm voting Neg because the harm vs. benefit analysis presented by both debaters up was shown to be weighted on the con. The evidence brought up about the increase in homicides, suicides, violence in general, etc. was proven to be better upheld on the Neg and showed that the Aff would overstep the RTS of people.



AFF

Tulsa Washington ET

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Emerson Turner

30

NEG

Cascia Hall Prep CR

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Carrie Riseling

30

Winner: Cascia Hall CR debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: T. Kilander

Comments & Reason for Decision:

I'm voting Neg b/c the flow was loaded with diverse arguments covering Justice, safety, and social interest. The aff failed to prove that the equilibrium would be upheld by "taking away the right to own a handgun." Moreover, the neg better convinced me that violence and harm would shift to other avenues.



1.30

2m

AFF

Edmond North JA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Junaid Ahmed

26

NEG

Metro Christian LM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Lauren Meyer

28

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

Signature: Meredith K Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Proving that gun violence exists is not quite the same as proving that guns should be banned. You did the former but not the latter.
- Dress up! Comb your hair! Personal appearance matters in a persuasive communication activity.
- Arguments in IAR are difficult to understand. Vigilantism, your main arg, requires evidence to be convincing.

- I question Locke's support of handguns since they didn't even exist when he was alive
- Util does not condone slavery
- Please refute each subpt. of aff case individually.
- Good job calling opponent out on dropped args in your case.
- Good defense of your framework.

Aff values life; neg persuasively argues that self defense is an extension of the right to life. Neg falsely equates this w/ vigilantism, which is not a persuasive argument.



2.30

1.30

AFF

Crossings Christian GF

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Georgie Franklin

27

NEG

Broken Arrow RC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Reese Childress

28

Winner: Broken Arrow RC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Meredith K. Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- your case is difficult to understand, and some of your evidence would work better for the neg.
- Make sure you refute your opponent's attacks in IAR, don't just repeat your case.
- Good pt. about missing percentages, but you need to impact it more strongly.

- You sped through your evidence too quickly for me to flow it.
- Good job picking up on contradictions in aff case. Make sure you don't sound condescending when referring to her args.
- Good job pointing out non-responsive args. from IAR, and pulling through dropped args.

Aff concedes that it is impossible for the police to arrive, and neg uses this to prove people must have the right to defend themselves.

Rd 2



Larson, Trevor

Haggard, Alex
(Peterson)

AFF

Tulsa Washington MC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Micah Cash

29

NEG

Bartlesville JW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Jack Williams

27

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

1:38

1:49

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff:

look up the stat about Gun owners that effectively use their gun for protection. it's like 30%...

It's so low that the "police aren't always there to save us" arg. is irrelevant.

already did. yay.

RFD:

This round boils down to if guns- specifically hand guns. and furthermore, which is the bigger dog, accidental deaths vs. self defense.

Neg:

I like the value of guns arg. When the police have guns then others want guns. +/- good points but you lacked offense. find cards that go further than we shouldn't ban them! maybe a gun education counter plan?

The Neg never answers to the 1:4 ratio of successful use of guns, and accidental deaths. The Neg ignores this and interrates that HGs are effective for SD. However, the evidence shows that guns aren't effective for SD.

Therefore I must look to ↓ misuse of guns, crime is nonunique to both sides, Accidental deaths are the only ground that there is clash Aff solves for Accidents.



AFF

NEG

Bentonville GW

Edmond Santa Fe KK

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Gillian Wall

30

Karim Kari

27

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

Signature: Ratnesh Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Neg dropped a lot of Aff's evidence and claims.
- Neg had ~~some~~ ^{some} evidence, with no sources, ~~to~~ ^{OR} ~~that~~ ^{no evidence} for claims either.
- Framework went to the Aff and Neg didn't argue this.



1:40

:52 used

AFF

Edmond North DA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Devraat Awasthi

27

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe IM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Ian Mooers

28

Winner: Ed Santa Fe IM School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Meredith K Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- your case lacks persuasive links to handguns, and cannot prove that a ban solves the problems you pose.

- Make sure to ask questions in CX, not just argue.
- Good job responding to aff's unorthodox arguments.

I find several aff args persuasive - that banning handguns equalizes power, and that guns are frequently used to eliminate agency. However, until 2AR, all of aff's impacts (and therefore most of the flow) is about militant masculinity. Neg persuasively argues that guns did not cause this problem, and therefore taking them away will not solve it. Thus, I vote Negative.



2.24

2.00

AFF

NEG

Edmond North AP

Norman CS

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Ari Pappaharonis

Chloe Shames

27

27

EdNO AP
~~Edmond North AP~~

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

Signature: Meredith K. Deaton

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You make a lot of qualitative assertions that cannot really be proven. Your point about female murders is really cool, but it's almost an afterthought at the end of your case.

- Your case comes off like you're advocating vigilantism more so than self defense.
→ This is an issue in your case also.

Both debaters rely on qualitative args. that ~~are~~ are not proven one way or another. This makes it very difficult to render a fair decision. The neg continuously states that it's bad for the state to have a monopoly on the use of violence. The aff persuasively counters that the gov's possession of military hardware makes handguns useless - and I also question exactly what the neg is suggesting people should do w/ guns if they're not going to ~~respect~~ respect the state's monopoly on violence.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Moore WB (25 - 30)		Crossings Christian GF (25 - 30)	
Wyatt Brown	29	Georgie Franklin	29

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

Signature: Euan Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Affirmative controlled CX, but should n't be too dismissive of questions.
- Negative may want to vary argumentation other than the secret amendment + contribution.
- Negative needs to attack the OLC in the NR
- Affirmative, don't be off-put by not getting responses you want in CX
- ~~Negative, consider~~
- Negative cannot ~~attack~~ make new attacks in INR but nice try.
- RFD: 1) Affirmative successfully debunks Constitutional arguments which the negative case relies on. 2) Affirmative successfully capitalizes on drops, winning on both offense & defense as well as winning tangible impact. Also, the drops allow the affirmative to frame the round through winning impact.



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Cabot CJ	(25 - 30)	Edmond North NC	(25 - 30)
Christen Johnson	<u>28</u>	Neha Chataut	<u>28</u>

Winner: Edmond North NC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
Signature: Euan Williams

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Negative gives a thorough cross-examination.
- Negative needs to give more clear signs when sign-posting.
- Affirmative need not be different in X
- Affirmative gives a straight-forward, well-structured case
- Affirmative has good passion
- Wants other things to vote off of than evidence since so much of it could
- avoid attacking opponent / calling them immoral for saying something

RFO: 1) Negative is much more responsive on the flow, 2) I bought the marginalization of minorities argument especially from the Crowe evidence. ~~3)~~



AFF

Edmond North PL

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Patricia Liu

29

NEG

Crossings Christian JL

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Josh LaFortune

27

Winner: Edmond North PL debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff solves violence from handguns

Aff

Neg
Use all CX time



AFF

Cascia Hall Prep LG

Lewis Guillory

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

NEG

Tulsa Washington ED

Emma Donnelly

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Tulsa Washington ED debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Restrictions solve enough of the aff



AFF

NEG

Crossings Christian CG

Bartlesville TB

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cade Garoutte

26

Tanner Brooks

29

Winner: Bartlesville TB School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF - Be more familiar with your case
Your subpoint two on your 1st contention sounds a little negative, but I think it just needs better rebuttal
Your contention 2 is more about efficacy than radicalism, the tagline is misleading
Don't say "Blah Blah Blah" to explain... it just seems like you don't understand your argument
Make eye contact
Readmap better
You spent half of your speech reading one piece of evidence

Not a fan of morality as a value - its a little vague
love the link you draw in your contention one
you say no solvency but don't address any specific arguments of his
a lot of guns being stolen
"the majority of criminals use stolen guns" don't misrepresent your evidence
I don't care if he dropped args - & an excuse to give a 1:50 final speech ;)

The affirmative didn't really address any specific arguments
had preemptive rebuttals which didn't even address the negative case ; only mentioned the 2nd amendment w/out impacting back to his framework



AFF

Bentonville RM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Rachel Mauchline

27

NEG


Tulsa Washington ET

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Emerson Turner

30

Winner: Tulsa Washington ET debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

love the way you use
your observations to set
up your case
love your contention 2
your criterion needs an action word
ex - increasing / protecting political
stability

need stronger link to back
up why hand guns are
necessary? not just helpful
if you're going to make
that claim, though the
layout of this contention
is very good
need to diversify your attacks
more

I overall I like the affirmative case more, however
I believe that the negative controls the round &
impacts better in the rebuttal & the debate becomes
about efficacy when the negative wins



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Norman AW	(25 - 30)	Crossings Christian TM	(25 - 30)
Amanda Wheelock	<u>28</u>	Trent Miller	<u>26</u>

Winner: AMANDA WHEELLOCK debating on the AFFIRM Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF HANDGUNS OUGHT TO BE BANNED

AMANDA 1:30 2:30

LIKE HOW YOU SLOWED DOWN TO CITE SOURCE - GOOD USE OF CITINGS
 EYE CONTACT WAS MINIMAL
 GOOD DEFENSE OF X-EXAM + CROSS EXAM OF NEG
 MATERIAL WAS READ SOMEWHAT - MOST WAS GIVEN AS KNOWLEDGABLE
 GOOD INTERP OF CONSTITUTION + VALUES
 EXCELLENT USE OF PASSION ON SUBJECT
 LIKE USE OF LIFE-LIBERTY + PROPERTY ANALOGY.

TRENT 1:30 2:30

GOOD CITE SOURCES + STATS
 MATERIAL WAS MOSTLY READ - SEEMINGLY LESS KNOWLEDGABLE
 EYE CONTACT WAS SCARCE,
 GOOD RESPONSES TO AFFIRM'S NOTIONS
 GOOD CROSS X-EXAM - QUESTIONS LEAD INTO NEG BASIS
 EXCELLENT DEFENSE OF STANCE + COUNTERSTANCE
 KNOWLEDGE OF CONSTRUCTION + AMMENDMENTS



AFF

NEG

Norman KH

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Bartlesville SM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Kaitlyn Hurst

27

Sean Mason

29

Winner: SEAN MASON School/Team debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF HANDGUNS OUGHT TO BE BANNED

Comments & Reason for Decision:

KAITLYN

EYE CONTACT WAS VERY MINIMAL - GOT BETTER OVER TIME
KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL SEEMED SLIM - MOSTLY READ
GOOD USE OF CITED SOURCES
GOOD RESPONSE TO X-EXAM
EXCELLENT X-EXAM - DEFINING TERMS + APPLICABILITY
CLEAR DEDICATION TO SUBJECT AT HAND WAS EVIDENT

SEAN

EXCELLENT X-EXAM - VERY POINT DRIVEN
EXCELLENT LEAD IN ANALOGIES
GOOD EYE CONTACT - MATERIAL WAS KNOWN LESS READ
PASSION FOR SUBJECT CLEARLY EXHIBITED
SUPER CITE SOURCES - BACKED UP NEG SIDE WELL
NICE EXTENSION OF FUTURE POSSIBILITIES TO SUPPORT BASIS



AFF

Metro Christian LM

Lauren Meyer

POINTS
(25 - 30)

29

NEG

Norman DZ

Doris Zhou

POINTS
(25 - 30)

30

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

Signature: Julia Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision: Overall, for me it came down to the Neg's contractarianism argument, and that by limiting hand guns we inhibit our ability to "fight back" against tyranny. However, it was an excellent round!

The Neg argument ^{that} contractarianism, governmental over-throw can not occur w/o hand guns and thus impedes contractarianism philosophy is very compelling. Neg takes the line of being aggressive, however she stay just on the line of propriety... Please hesitate to cross that line of "forceful" to "rude". Neg I would consider you a "fast" speaker, but I was able to understand you. This actually was a difficult round to judge as both debaters did a very nice job. I felt the Aff speaker did a great job of being both professional and standing her ground.

Doris, don't cross the line over to the "dark side" of rudeness.



AFF

NEG

Edmond Santa Fe RM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Crossings Christian MI

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Robert Morris

28

Matt Ives

25

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe RM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Julia Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The Aff offers a stronger case, evidence, and analytics. The Neg speaker offered a case that although it made some points, did not go on to extend or explain them.

It is a bad choice to argue on the Neg that suicide is "okay".

Neg, you need to make sure that you do not cross the line from "forceful" to "rude". It is very rude to cut off your opponent before they get a chance to finish the questions you have asked. You didn't give them a sufficient amount of time to finish a sentence. Yes, you come off as rude! When you are so rude in CX, it turns the judge off before you have even had your first speech.

You (Neg) are just as rude (almost) in your opponents CX. Why?

Aff makes good point that through constitutional amendments we change the constitution, which has happened 27 times. Therefore the constitution is not inflexible.



AFF

NEG

Cascia Hall Prep CR

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Edmond North JA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Carrie Riseling

29

Junaid Ahmed

27.5

Winner: Carrie Riseling Cascia School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signatures]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

2:29 used

li 39 used

I vote Aff because
- Neg does not seem to understand the aff
- Aff outweighs under his standard
- Neg can't make make situation ~~more~~
better than the squo, good chance
Aff solves



AFF		POINTS		NEG	POINTS
Broken Arrow RC		(25 - 30)		Cabot BG	(25 - 30)
Reese Childress		<u>29</u>		Briana Griffin	<u>28</u>

Winner: Reese Childress School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff of Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signatures]

Comments & Reason for Decision: 2:40 used 2:00

When you talk about the exclusivity of HG ownership it would be good to mention black communities and criminalization

you dont need to explain why

Say card tags before the card please

I think if you want to run a CP like this you need to show specific harms of a total ban that your CP doesn't tie into

also you should shorten your case. 1min is not enough to refute the Aff

If you drop her entire case in the NC you cant go back and cover it in the NR

work on time management in the NR and the NC too actually your arguments are good though they just need to be shorter

RFD

- I vote Aff because
- Neg drops the whole Aff case too much offense flaws through it
- Dan Hughes turns a lot of the Neg and mitigates the CP

Issues

- 1 Neg doesn't refute until the NR
- 2 Drops except the fifth contention ← Why
- 3 Aff has solvency



AFF

NEG

Metro Christian CM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cabot ZA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cristian Meyer

28

Zane Ashcraft

29

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

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Nice explanation / defense of contractarianism
- I know this is a little different strat than you're used to but good job keeping your cool. 😊
- Work on line by line

NEG

- Your K (D) seems a little unclear in the NC
- Good adaptation
- Maybe don't concede upholding govt legitimacy... seems like a link to the cap K
- Interesting NC strat

More oral critiques

RFD: I vote neg. ~~don't~~ While I don't think there is a risk of a link to the K so I really don't vote off that. I vote neg off of the tradeoff DA on the NC. Sufficiently proves that the aff T violation → it's conceded



AFF

NEG

Edmond North PY

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Moore JC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Pallavi Yennapu

~~28~~ 30

Jerrod Cooper

~~28~~ 29

Winner: Edmond North PY debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Great AC! Digging the ableism add-on
- Maybe have an observation about why representations matter
- IAR time was close but you did fine, I see you stressin. It's all good!
- Make comparisons of gun control versus complete ban

C/A here

NEG

- I like the NC
- Nice reference / cross-app to your evidence
- More line by line attacks on the AC flow specifically the ableism / militarization stuff
- Better evidence comparison
- I don't think the implementation arguments matter on either side

RFD: I vote aff. I think Pallavi is winning that the standard should be resisting oppression and that there are multiple conceptions of social contract. I think even under the social contract, E North wins the root cause of militarism and by banning handguns, you can minimize the friend-enemy distinction. Aff minimizes violence thru, I vote aff.



AFF

NEG

Edmond North PY

POINTS
(25-30)

Broken Arrow RC

POINTS
(25-30)

Pallavi Yennapu

28.5

Reese Childress

~~28~~ 28

Winner: Edmond North PY debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF:

- Good CX, you had clear control when asking the questions
- Good 1AR, especially on the NEG's case and framework
- Watch using like
- Be sure the external cases, such as in C2 in order for you to generate the offense you want to for the 2AR with the voting issue about domestic violence

NEG:

- Wonderful CX, especially on the mental illness questions
- You had extra time on the NC/NR and the NR - Use this time to flesh out all of your arguments and impact and weigh everything
- Make sure your voting issues are all well explained and developed

RFD: I go AFF for this debate for the mental illness argument. The gun theft argument on NEG wasn't impacted ^{nor} weighed well enough for me to vote on it. The framework debate became cyclical for me, so I can't vote on that, but I can adjudicate the Panel based on treating people with worth. This lends me to the mental health argument because it is clear we do not treat those people with worth and I buy AFF's argument that changing the definition will not change this.

Room: US B-31
Flight 1 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

Haegard
Peterson, Alix
Edmond North



AFF

NEG

Norman CS

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Metro Christian CM

POINTS
(25 - 30)


Chloe Shames

30

Cristian Meyer

30

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

Signature: 

1:27

1:59

Comments & Reason for Decision:

aff

Neg

+/- love the criterion.
in CX when his answers are not good answers hold him to it. Don't just say "okay".

+/-
if you have evidence like this
PRINT ALL
of the study.
just strike through or small print.
I need to be able to read it.

RFD: This was a great round, though I wish it wasn't as washy with the evidence. Both sides attacked each other well, the defence was lacking for the aff.
I vote on the dropps for the aff. SD was all over the place, so the minorities carried more weight than taking guns away.

Correlation ≠ Causation.
evidence is not linked. it's not a "math equation."



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Crossings Christian CG	(25 - 30)	Moore JC	(25 - 30)
Cade Garoutte	<u>26</u>	Jerrod Cooper	<u>28</u>

Winner: Moore JC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no
Signature: Jubia McHaul

Comments & Reason for Decision: The Neg speaker had the better prepared case and arguments.

Aff you read the same closing of your case twice. Make sure you know your case better so this doesn't happen. When this type of thing happens in the AC, it becomes obvious to the judge that you should be more prepared.

Aff it helps me flow when you tell me what you are rebutting. U?, UC?, C1, C2? When you don't and it's hard to see the connection you are making, I don't know when to place your argument on the flow.

Aff watch your speech times. You don't seem prepared for your speeches to end.

Neg - you do a nice job! I appreciate watching you debate today.

Room: MS 112
Flight 2 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

Howell
Zhou, Lawrence



AFF

NEG

Bartlesville JW

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Edmond Santa Fe KK

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Jack Williams

29

Karim Kari

26

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

Signature: William Howell

Comments & Reason for Decision: Aff had the better constructed case, arguments, and evidence.

When you have life and sanctity of life as your value and value criterion on the Neg side of this debate, you can easily get trapped by an Aff who has good stats on death rates caused by handguns.

Aff be careful not to speak in a manner toward your opponent ~~where~~ when he is confused, that shows you are impatient with his confusion. It comes off as a bit "rude".

Neg as you get more and more practice, you will do better in your rebuttals. Don't be worried or afraid to be a bit more forceful in your delivery.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Moore WB		Crossings Christian JL	
Wyatt Brown	28 29	Josh LaFortune	28 27

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Negs case was a little thin but OK - the rebuttal aspect had no documentation to even show that crime is high in Chicago - Aff's case is basically untouched

Room: MS 113
Flight 2 Start: 1:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 3

McCabe, Brit
Edmond Santa Fe



AFF

NEG

Edmond North AP

Tulsa Washington MC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Ari Pappaharonis

~~30~~ 30

Micah Cash

29

Winner:

BTW MC
School/Team

debating on the

Neg
Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

Signature:

[Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Oral



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Cabot BG		Crossings Christian MI	
Briana Griffin	<u>27</u>	Matt Ives	<u>26</u>

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

Signature: L. Shipley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The aff only partially affirms the resolution, however, the Neg never argued this.

The neg debated guns in general, not hand guns, however, the Aff never argued this, until 2AR.

What's a judge to do? Since neither truly affirms or negates the resolution, I must base my decision on "debating ability."

The Neg reads a 5:46 case leaving him no time to refute the aff case.

The Aff does cover what little is on the flow in the 1AR.

Ultimately, I believe the Aff is the "better debater!"



AFF	POINTS (25-30)	NEG	POINTS (25-30)
Edmond Santa Fe IM		Tulsa Washington ET	
Ian Mooers	<u>29</u>	Emerson Turner	<u>28</u>

Winner: Santa Fe IM debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: L Shipley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Emerson - Preplanned cx questions are good, but you need to actually listen to his answers and ask follow-up questions based on those answers.

This was a very good round. I enjoyed watching/judging it very much. Both debaters debated the resolution, and both were very well prepared.
This judge thanks you.

I vote aff:

1. Buy back program - Aff can ↓ crime 37% when HG are banned

2. Suicides and Intimate partner violence - Neg never really addressed these arguments head-on. These impacts outweigh and go virtually unrefuted.



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Norman KH		Cascia Hall Prep LG	
Kaitlyn Hurst	<u>29</u>	Lewis Guillory	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Try to stay relaxed in CX I think you confused yourself at times.
- In the IAR you need to do more impact work on the AFF case, you did a decent job tearing his refutes away but tell me why the AFF achieves more and what that achievement is.
- Good work on Framework, you won that equality is key fairly easily.
- Good job on the warrant debate and showing the lack of a link on the Negs side.
- When there is no link I would spend most of the 2AR on the benefits or impacts of the AFF.

- I like what you are trying to do in CX you just need to be more assertive and follow up on your questions, don't jump to something totally new.
- You are winning the argument that guns aren't the problem and that the system is when dealing with oppression. But! The neg doesn't impact how banning handguns would lead to a worse system.
- You needed to keep self defense and spend most of the IAR on how your contention II links to Banning handguns. Also winning the criterion debate would have been a key focus as well.

I vote AFF, the AFF won framework and even though banning guns doesn't solve oppression its still does more good than the neg can link too.



AFF

NEG

Edmond North DA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Cabot ZA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Devraat Awasthi

29

Zane Ashcraft

30

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

Signature: Jacob Chenger

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- You are digging yourself a pretty big hole in CX both on how you ask and answer questions.
 - I think you spend too much of the IAR on reiterating a lot of the impacts that the neg turned in the IVE, I need to hear more on how handguns directly solve this militarized mindset. Also you assume ^{too much} and misinterpret the Framework debate.
 - I feel like you didn't do enough proving that the AFF solves for decreasing otherizing and excess this militaristic mindset.
 - The 2AR is kinda already way downhill so your best bet would have probably been to impact the Hell out of the AFF.
- Good job in CX, try to focus more on why the impacts to the Neg turn a lot of AFF ground. ~~His~~ His questions hit at this a lot.
 - Good work on Framework, the moment you win the debate is about a choice and not excluding and that morality is subjective the AFF loses almost all offense.
 - Good work on showing how the gov is the actor and the citizens look up to the gov.
 - Try to expand on resistance of power in IAR, there is enough but could have been stronger
 - Good job showing how the AFF only furthers this militaristic mindset, this was the biggest voter.

and hope I prefer your Framework

I vote Neg, I think the neg turns the IAR in several ways in the IVE and the AFF fails to show any impacts throughout the rest of the debate. Neg wins Framework and Provs importance is to not exclude.



AFF

NEG

Edmond North JA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Crossings Christian TM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Junaid Ahmed

28

Trent Miller

27

Winner: Edmond North JA School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- Not sure how Communism matters in your case
- Nice framework extension
- Work on attacks on the Neg case → maybe ~~used~~ use more evidence

NEG

- Not entirely sure on your value explanation of how the Constitution comes before LR
- I don't think the fact that he used a handgun once means I negate.
- Be careful with the intimidation arguments → you might run into police brutality arguments here
- Nice evidence
- Do better work on the line by line in the 2NR

BOTH: Please do more impact framing. Tell me why I vote aff or neg

I vote aff. While I don't think there is really any offense on the frameworks from either side, I think under either standard life would be preserved thus, I evaluate the aff risk of (S) gun violence → (S) need for self-defense

Room: US 119
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

McCabe, Brit
Edmond Santa Fe



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bentonville GW (Gillian Wall)

Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Edmond North PL debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: *[Handwritten Signature]*

Other judges on panel: Jacob Chenger, Meredith Deaton. Please do not start until all judges are present.

*Both have well developed cases - I like the analysis & rate -
Oral*



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bentonville GW (Gillian Wall)

Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Bentonville GW debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Meredith K Deaton

Other judges on panel: Jacob Chenger, Brit McCabe. Please do not start until all judges are present.

- 1st cont. does a great job establishing solvency. 2nd/3rd cont. do not, and 3rd cont. particularly stretches credibility.
- Don't wear the pin if you're going to play w/ it.
- Really amazing attacks on neg case. You do need to explicitly cover your case though, if only by cross applying args.

- Dress professionally! It's a part of being persuasive.
- I really like your approach to res. but wish you had more evidence that b/g checks are effective.
- Offense in Nc seems a bit rambling/disorganized... maybe take more than 20 sec. of prep time?
- Disorganization in NR likely influenced my decision.

1) I buy gov. legit. as best criterion. This becomes the lens through which I evaluate the round. 2) Both debaters talk about shifting conversations on violence/mental illness. This has nothing to do w/ gov. legit & is not part of my decision. 3) This leaves us w/ the more tangible args. regarding violence, suicide, and misuse of firearms, which are legit. aims of gov. Firearms sellers cannot be fairly held "accountable" for suicides. Neg solvency relies on untested exec. orders, w/ very little evidence behind them. Aff provides evidence that people view XO's as

Quarters



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bentonville GW (Gillian Wall)

Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Gillian Wall debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Meredith Deaton, Brit McCabe. Please do not start until all judges are present.

RFD Aff because
- Neg has two offensive
I will verbally explain
Neg has dont blame guns
gun control solves
Aff responds

Aff
1 HG ban saves lives
minors exposed to violence
otherization

Issues
1 Value/crit
Guns necessary to peoples personal liberty
Reduce violence
Neg also solves for violence etc
Aff doesnt solve otherization
exec order
not works as well
as the Neg wants
stopping snatching

Room: US 118
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Zhou, Lawrence




Norman DZ (Doris Zhou) vs Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Norman DZ _____ Edmond Santa Fe IM _____
AFF NEG

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff. or Neg)

Signature: 

Other judges on panel: Carly Kimbrough, Linda Shipley. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Turns on case



Norman DZ (Doris Zhou) vs Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Doris Zhou Ian Mooers
AFF NEG

Winner: EDMOND SANTA FE IM debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Linda Shipley, Lawrence Zhou. Please do not start until all judges are present.

A few key concessions lead to a negative ballot

1- the lack of positive obligations

2- the evidence showing that Americans don't fear guns (this argument failed to give me a causal link in the first place)

I also feel that the negative never gives a ~~good~~ causal link for how mindsets will be changed.

I buy the negative framework that objects themselves cannot be immoral? If there is no positive obligation towards rights then there is no justification for banning guns, especially when paired with the lack of warrant for inherently immoral symbolism



Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers) vs Norman DZ (Doris Zhou)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

DZ _____ IM _____
AFF _____ NEG _____
Winner: _____ IM _____ debating on the _____ Neg _____
School/Team _____ Side (Aff or Neg) _____
Signature: _____ L Shipley _____

Other judges on panel: Carly Kimbrough, Lawrence Zhou. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Very Messy Round - Debaters got lost in the trees and couldn't see the forest - the big picture.

Neg wins. ① If HG are banned people will switch to long guns - which are more harmful

② Only 11% of people will suffer from the fear that restricts free speech

③ Aff never proves that HG ban will change the mind set that leads to vigilantism

④ Neg wins that HG ~~ownership~~ is not immoral - only their use

Room: US 117
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Williams, Euan
Metro Christian



Bartlesville SM (Sean Mason) vs Edmond North PY (Pallavi Yennapu)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Edmond North PY Bartlesville SM
AFF NEG

Winner: Bartlesville SM debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Euan Williams

Other judges on panel: Tish McAllister, Nathan Thompson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

• RFD I bought negative solv arguments 2) Didn't understand how discourse by itself had any inputs and even if, negative took part in discourse in-road 3) Aff points in court citizens

Room: US 117
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



Bartlesville SM (Sean Mason) vs Edmond North PY (Pallavi Yennapu)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Edmond North PY _____
AFF

~~Edmond North PY~~ Bartlesville SM _____
NEG

Winner: Bartlesville SM School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Nathan Thompson, Euan Williams. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff - please learn to use turns properly
Neg - very clean debate. Nice line by line

Quarters

Witman, Mattie



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Mattie Witman

Other judges on panel: Julia Howell, Trevor Larson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

AFF

- Solid responses to Micah's cross-ex
- IAR dropped some important offense; work on time management; Granted, this was a overwhelping NC.

NEG

- Good NC, impressive coverage of AFF args. I like the variety of offense you put on the race arguments
- I think the NR focusing on the counter-advocacy would have been a more strategic option or would have given another way out
→ overall good use of evidence and analysis there

1 vote Neg. 2 main areas

- 1.) Framework - I think that through evaluating the ⑤ turns from the Natl Academy of Sciences ~~based~~ evidence, I think MC is right that ^{AW} ~~you~~ ϕ has access to the FW standard of protection rights
- 2.) Conceded ⑤ for counter advocacy → we can regulate guns to ⑤ self-defens which I think there isn't really arguments about how they don't

Room: US 121
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Howell, Julia
Bentonville



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Julia M. Howell

Other judges on panel: Trevor Larson, Mattie Witman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Overall, this was a nice debate by both sides. However, I feel that the Negative had better arguments and evidence.

The Negative National Academy of Science card is compelling. In addition, so is the argument that we should not punish the innocent for the crimes of the guilty. I liked the cards better on the Negative, and believe the Negative solved better for the women and minority harms. I felt this debate was also won by the Negative on the Framework debate.

Room: US 121
Start: 5:00 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Quarters

Larson, Trevor



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Micah Cash debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Trevor Larson

Other judges on panel: Julia Howell, Mattie Witman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

The Neg was able to uphold that they were best able to help with domestic abuse & safety through the argument of guns being used as deterrents not just weapons.



AFF

Norman DZ

Doris Zhou

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

NEG

Tulsa Washington MC

Micah Cash

POINTS
(25 - 30)

30

Winner: Tulsa Wash MC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: L Shipley

Comments & Reason for Decision:

IAC- No need for speed. You had 30+ Sec left.

Neg is able to capitalize on all the drops made in IAR. AFF has no offense left after Neg rebuttal.

Neg wins: Criminals defy gun bans
90% murderers had prior convictions -
backgnd ✓ solve

No direct link guns - chill speech
Majority blacks say need gun
Police respond < 3% serious crime
Least restrictive alternatives

Room: MS 110
Flight 1 Start: 11:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 6

Thompson, Nathan
Norman



AFF	POINTS (25 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (25 - 30)
Edmond Santa Fe IM		Edmond North PL	
Ian Mooers	<u>29.5</u>	Patricia Liu	<u>28.5</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral RFD

Room: MS 110
Flight 2 Start: 11:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 6

Thompson, Nathan
Norman



AFF

Cascia Hall Prep CR

Carrie Riseling

POINTS
(25 - 30)

27.5

NEG


Bartlesville TB

Tanner Brooks

POINTS
(25 - 30)

28

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

oral RFD given



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Moore JC	(25 - 30)	Tulsa Washington ED	(25 - 30)
Jerrold Cooper	<u>26</u>	Emma Donnelly	<u>30</u>

Winner: Tulsa Washington ED debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1:20
I really like your contention one subpoint B. However I think you need to diversify your arguments a little more. Don't forget w/ your chair during CX - ~~it~~ it was distracting
- Don't say that she dropped racialized violence ~~she~~ she didn't
Watch your time Management

1:45
Excellent speaker
good job taking out your opponents causal links in his contention. I good job tying legality in with individual rights
good job explaining why his claims on self defense are not legitimate
~~conceded~~ I do agree that conceded carry would refer to handguns

The affirmative primarily used one argument throughout the entire round which at times didn't even address the crux of the Neg args. While the discrimination argument was well layed out, the Neg turns the argument by addressing institutional racism which goes unaddressed - this is also true of self defense - While I don't think the Neg adequately proves that restrictions were well the aff doesn't touch on that problem enough to sway the vote. The aff also never addresses the ~~need~~ need for restrictions on liberty
Overall I feel like there was quite a bit of conjecture in this round but the Neg did a better job turning arguments



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Bartlesville JW	(25 - 30)	Cabot BG	(25 - 30)
Jack Williams	<u>28</u>	Briana Griffin	<u>26</u>

Winner: Bartlesville JW School/Team debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

When running the SC I'M not sure I believe that the gov't has an ob to ~~protect~~ protect people from accidents on your contention 1. I do however buy the argument that people shouldn't have a need ~~to~~ for self defense

Don't stick your pen during cx
Your definition of morality is way to vague
Your case is way to long
You seem like you're trying to read the card against Locke w/o really knowing the philosophy.
Very circular
Don't roll your eyes & talk under your breath in cx

The ~~the~~ negatives inability to explain the importance of their framework while also attacking the aff's from a card which misrepresents Locke's social contract means that the aff wins the framework debate while the aff also proves they're saving lives, ~~Plus~~ all neg evidence was speculative



AFF

NEG

Metro Christian LM

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Edmond North NC

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Lauren Meyer

29

Neha Chataut

30

Winner: Edmond North NC debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- I think the machine gun question could help you with some different framing
- Nice aff case!
- You had alot to cover in the 1AR, try limiting your responses to solely defensive arguments and spend more time shutting doors offensively for the NR. Nice job though.
- Persuasion 2AR but make sure to be answering some of the important offense

NEG

- SUPER cross-ex of the 1AC
- Good defense of not having to talk about extra-T topics
- The attack of the AC was really thorough - nice job
- Maybe use a bit more cross-app of your case to answer AC stuff to save time
- Great NR

RFD: 1 vote negative!

1. Framework - Even if I grant the contractarian standard, the offense of race arguments means that ↑ oppression → probably means social contract is upheld correctly even if I don't buy the turns.
2. Offense - There are a couple pieces of conceded offense out of the 1AR that were well extended in the 2NR
 - Black Market → Tussel evidence means (S) deficit to aff
 - Mass Incarceration → Gowrick ev means there's a different angle to the self-defense turn which is where AFF spends most time arguing



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Broken Arrow RC	(25-30)	Edmond North AP	(25-30)
Reese Childress	<u>28</u>	Ari Pappaharonis	<u>29</u>

Winner: Edmond North AP School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF
- Interesting framework!
- I don't understand the internal link between banning handguns and stopping discrimination against mental illness
- IAR needs to be much more thorough on the NC - Ari is making different warrants as to why gun control is racist that aren't just stop and frisk
- Explain the author indict more on ^{Lott} ~~Hughes~~ or read the Hughes evidence word for word // Tell me why your studies are better

NEG
- Good NC attacks on the Aff! Use more of your evidence to answer the contentions
- Talk a little more about how the turns on her case also turn the framework
- Solid NR!

RFD: 1 vote Negative.

1. Framework: There's enough defense on the AFF standard that means I probably grant the standard of minimizing oppression so the I weigh the offense:

2. Offense:

- 1. Politics Turn → backlash // conceded observation means I evaluate implementation consequences for the AC and it increases extreme gun laws → still conceded from AC.
- 2. Racism → Conovich evidence means there are other means of racist gun control that the aff (profiling, surveillance, etc)

Room: MS 106
Flight 1 Start: 11:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 6

Zhou, Lawrence



AFF

NEG

Norman KH

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Edmond North JA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Kaitlyn Hurst

28.

Junaid Ahmed

27.5

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff violence arguments

Aff
Less on fw debate

Neg
*More on how CP
solves aff*

Room: MS 106
Flight 2 Start: 11:00 AM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Rd 6

Zhou, Lawrence



AFF

NEG

Norman CS

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Edmond North DA

POINTS
(25 - 30)

Chloe Shames

28.5

Devraat Awasthi

28

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff reduces violence

better ev comparison from both



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Moore WB (Wyatt Brown)

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

AFF

NEG

Winner:

Norman AW

debating on the

Neg

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature:

Mattie Lugh

Other judges on panel: Kevin Kitchens, Euan Williams. Please do not start until all judges are present.

AFF

- I think the Constitutionality arguments can get you into some trouble... perhaps broaden your offense a little.
- Solid cross-ex of the INC
- Work on time allocation in IAR
- I think there should be a better articulation of the liberty balance arg in the IAC.

NEG

- Shorten NC case because the aff C3 isn't answered completely
- I don't know ~~if~~ the NC advocacy on guns/protests. It doesn't seem specific to answer his questions.
- Need better explanation of how blacks using guns against police ^(S) for racism/liberty

I vote Neg. I think the AFF doesn't handle the evidence debate as well as would be necessary - even if I grant the framework on the aff, there is significant evidence to reference a ^(S) takeout to the aff even if there is a minor risk that it doesn't ^(S) racial violence.



Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash) vs Norman KH (Kaitlyn Hurst)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below.

Norman KH Kaitlyn Hurst AFF Tulsa Washington MC NEG
Micah Cash

Winner: Tulsa Wash. MC debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Julia M. Howell

Other judges on panel: Alex Hales, Carly Kimbrough. Please do not start until all judges are present.

The Neg wins the framework debate and turns the Aff contentions for the Neg.

This is an interesting spin on the Aff that I haven't seen get on this topic. The Neg does a very nice job of turning the Aff cl. I agree with the voting issues provided by the Neg.

The arguments that we should not ban guns until lesser restrictive means fail - per contractarianism is strong.

The "bad people will have guns regardless" argument is also strong.



Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash) vs Norman KH (Kaitlyn Hurst)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Kaitlyn Hurst Micah Cash
AFF NEG

Winner: Micah Cash debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Other judges on panel: Julia Howell, Carly Kimbrough. Please do not start until all judges are present.

1:30 left
or McManhan
you use McMan to basically
extend every argument, don't.

1:15 remain

there are

I vote Neg because

- Neg actually reads and defends studies
so they control all util impacts or violence reduction
issues
harms

- Neg impacts directly to
the difference principle
thus turns Aff case

- Aff has no real studies
for their case

- All the drops, Neg
gets all the solvency

- The soft "counterplan" solves

1 least advantaged

2 Drops takes
McManhan
Webster

3 HG defends when the
Gov want/cant,

issues

1 Nat link to his
framework

2 helps the
disfranchisement



Norman KH (Kaitlyn Hurst) vs Tulsa Washington MC (Micah Cash)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Kaitlyn Hurst

AFF

Micah Cash

NEG

Winner: Tulsa Washington MC debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Alex Hales, Julia Howell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

I don't think I really buy the attacks on the neg's 2nd contention - it doesn't really get to the root of the arg. I really like your first contention, however I wish you had spent more time buying out the causal links in your contention 2 - his empirics make more sense to me rather than just calling them a tool of violence. - The individual to individual bias is a great arg against self defense in my opinion - but you don't explain it well until your last point. = don't use it against that argument.

Overall I buy the ties between unequal enforcement of gun control policies & disproportionate needs for self defense much more on the negative side. I also don't believe that the chilling effect interferes directly with discourse because it's on a much broader scale than the argument which the aff originally makes which seems to be on an individual basis. Because the neg has better causal links & empirics on violence & discrimination he gets my vote.

I love your turn on the discrimination argument - showing both how my law would be more heavily enforced against these minorities? how they are most in need - as well as the punishing the guilty for the innocent. Thank you for impacting the props.



Cascia Hall Prep CR (Carrie Riseling) vs Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

CR PL
AFF NEG

Winner: Edmond North PL debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: L Shipley

Other judges on panel: Trevor Larson, Tish McAllister. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Very Close Round- Debaters were evenly matched.

For me, the round comes down to the argument on a gun control legislation. Neg argues that the "new" legislation will solve without violating the public's right to own a gun. Aff refutes the S.Q. legislation, Not the new executive order.

Room: US 119
Flight 1 Start: 3:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Octas

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu) vs Cascia Hall Prep CR (Carrie Riseling)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Cascia Hall Prep CR

AFF

Edmond North PL

NEG

Winner: Edmond North PL

School/Team

debating on the Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Trevor Larson, Linda Shipley. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff - way to many turns on case dropped.
Neg wins framework debate



Cascia Hall Prep CR (Carrie Riseling) vs Edmond North PL (Patricia Liu)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Carrie Riseling Patricia Liu
AFF NEG

Winner: Patricia Liu debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Tish McAllister, Linda Shipley. Please do not start until all judges are present.

The Neg won for best being able to show that new gun control would solve for the problems on the Aff. This way the most good (liberty) Happiness happened on the Neg not the Aff.

Room: US 119
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Octas

McAllister, Tish
Cabot



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers)

Edmond North AP (Ari Pappaharonis)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Edmond Santa Fe IM debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: _____

Other judges on panel: Trevor Larson, Linda Shipley. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Negative - work on your line by line
- you are not using turns properly

Voting on police militarization

Room: US 119
Flight 2 Start: 3:30 PM
Varsity Lincoln Douglas

Octas

Larson, Trevor



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers)

Edmond North AP (Ari Pappaharonis)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Ian Mooers debating on the Aff
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Other judges on panel: Tish McAllister, Linda Shipley. Please do not start until all judges are present.

The aff won the round for me by showing that the buyback program was a way of fair implementation in the round as well as ~~the~~ winning the militarization argument that answered discrimination of minorities which was the Neg case.



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Edmond Santa Fe IM (Ian Mooers)

Edmond North AP (Ari Pappaharonis)

Winner: ^{AFF} IM - aff debating on the ^{NEG} AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: L ShIPLEY

Other judges on panel: Trevor Larson, Tish McAllister. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Best round I've seen all year.

I suspect I'll see both of you again
this summer when we prep for Nats.

I'm voting Aff

- ① Police will militarize ↑ harms to the minority
- ② Suicide- direct link to hand guns
- ③ Buy Backs- I don't see this ~~as~~ as an unfair argument. Buy Backs are simply the way a ban is implemented - and they have been proven effective in other countries



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Moore WB (Wyatt Brown)

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

AFF

NEG

Winner: AMANDA WHEELLOCK debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Ken C. Kitchens

Other judges on panel: Euan Williams, Mattie Witman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

WYATT
GOOD EYE CONTACT WITH JUDGES
GOOD LINE OF REASONING + THOUGHT FLOW
GOOD USE OF SOURCE CITING + STATISTICS
TRIED TO OFFER SO MUCH, IT SEEMED TO TRIP YOU UP.
WELL ANSWERED X-EXAM QUESTIONS
GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL, DID NOT NEED TO REFER MUCH
VERY WELL EXECUTED X-EXAM
COULD FEEL THE PASSION FOR YOUR AFFIRM OF RESOLUTION

AMANDA 2:03 1:57
GOOD EYE CONTACT WITH JUDGES
WELL EXECUTED X-EXAM, VERY POINT ORIENTED
WELL USE OF DATA, STATS, + PAST HISTORY
GOOD CITINGS + SOURCES, INCLUDING DEFINING THE SOURCES
EXCELLENT USE OF MATERIAL, DID NOT NEED TO REFER MUCH
EXCELLENT CRITIQUE OF AFFIRMS NOTIONS
VERY WELL STATED FUTURE ANALOGIES
X-EXAM GOT A LITTLE HEATED, BUT YOU MAINTAINED COMPOSURE
COULD FEEL YOUR DETERMINATION ABOUT YOUR STANCE



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Moore WB (Wyatt Brown)

Norman AW (Amanda Wheelock)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Norman AW debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Euan Williams

Other judges on panel: Kevin Kitchens, Mattie Witman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

- Good line of questioning by the negative concerning the justness or morality of laws.
- ~~It~~ a little more civility in CR by avoiding flippancy
- The affirmative is compelling with the idea of a need to balance it.
- The police argument is mishandled by the affirmative. It doesn't argue to fire on police, only that guns are needed for them to protect themselves as the police are unable to.
- Negative ~~good~~ did a good job of impacting dropped evidence.

RFD: 1) Negative capitalized on evidence drop to effectively ~~draw~~ the affirmative from their impact 2) The affirmative mishandled the police situation, meaning oppression ~~on the neg~~



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bartlesville TB (Tanner Brooks)

Norman DZ (Doris Zhou)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Norman DZ debating on the Neg
School/Team Side (Aff/Neg)

Signature: Meredith K Deaton

Other judges on panel: Kevin Kitchens, Euan Williams. Please do not start until all judges are present.

- At the end of your case, you say banning guns ~~reduces~~ reduces homicide, suicide, & accidental shootings... but none of your evidence actually says that.
 - Attacks on neg 1st cont. are non-responsive to the substance of her arg. Attacks on 2nd cont & defense of your case could be more thorough. Better word economy would help w/ this.
 - Good CX questions
 - Chill out a little. Frantic delivery makes you seem less confident, not more.
 - You do a great job tearing down aff case. Your own case is significantly less persuasive. 2nd cont. needs to focus more directly on hand guns, and I'm not clear how guns protect from police brutality.
 - Eek! I really needed voters - manage time better!
- ① Self defense args. are a wash - no one tells me why to prefer their evidence.
 - ② Framework debate doesn't have much impact in round. Not a factor in my decision.
 - ③ Accidental shooting: Aff wins.
 - ④ Suicide: neg wins. People will choose other means.
 - ⑤ Murder: ~~over~~ the round is "tied" when I get here on the flow, so this is the decisive issue. Kates/Mausser card stands - Harvard Policy review is credible source. If countries w/ gun bans still have high murder rates, aff



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bartlesville TB (Tanner Brooks)

Norman DZ (Doris Zhou)

Winner: Bartlesville TB debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Euan Williams

Other judges on panel: Meredith Deaton, Kevin Kitchens. Please do not start until all judges are present.

- Good questioning of institutionalized racism in affirmative
- Negative could've fleshed out the racism argument to have more tangible impacts
- Crystallization in INR was lacking, leave time for voters
- AFF case set up in such a way that they can lose parts without losing round

RFD. 1) The affirmative impacts were much more tangible to the point they only had to win one contention 2) Crystallization of AFF much better



Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Bartlesville TB (Tanner Brooks)

Norman DZ (Doris Zhou)

AFF

NEG

Winner: DORIS ZHOU debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: *Tanner Brooks*

Other judges on panel: Meredith Deaton, Euan Williams. Please do not start until all judges are present.

TANNER GOOD EYE CONTACT
WELL KNOWLEDGABLE ABOUT MATERIAL
VERY WELL NOTED CITINGS + SOURCES OF RESPECTABLE INFLUENCE
SLOWED DOWN A BIT WHILE QUOTING SOURCES
WELL ANSWERED QUESTIONS TO X-EXAM.
WELL DEFINED QUESTIONS DURING X-EXAM OF NEG.
GOOD EXPLANATIONS OF NEG'S SOURCES + INTERP THEREOF

~~DORIS~~
DORIS GOOD X-EXAM VERY DETAILED + POIGNANT
EXCELLENT RESPONSES TO AFFIRMS NOTIONS WITH NOTABLE CITINGS
1:51 GAVE MATERIAL QUITE RAPIDLY, SOMETIMES HARD TO FOLLOW
2:09 VERY WELL DEFINED EXAMPLES OF ALTERNATIVES
EXCELLENT COUNTER VIEWS OF AFFIRMS VIEWS
GOOD ANALOGY OF FUTURE EVENTS
EXCELLENT CLARIFICATION OF AFFIRMS SOURCES



AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Crossings Christian GF	(25 - 30)	Cabot CJ	(25 - 30)
Georgeie Franklin	<u>27</u>	Christen Johnson	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Mattie Leigh Witman

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- AFF
- I feel like your aff is primarily defensive
 - Use some prep to write answers to the Neg case
 - Don't admit drops!

- NEG
- Shorten your neg case → You only had 30 seconds left to attack her case
 - Good evidence extensions

Great round!

RFD:

I vote neg on the 'marginalizing poor' argument → this turns the aff's value of social contract → means the aff has offense under that FW. (P 5) 100% of Aff

↑
Conceded throughout
AFF

5 = solves