

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Jury Nullification

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker Akshay Manglik		Young Genius Neha Rachapudi	
Akshay Manglik <i>Aff</i>	<u>28</u>	Neha Rachapudi <i>Neg</i>	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Hina

Comments & Reason for Decision: Neha could have used more examples or statistics to support her argument. That could have put her in a stronger position.

Room: MAIN 7
Flight 2 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

~~3~~

Vuggumudi, Srinivasulu
DV Bridge

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Young Genius Haritha Kumar		Harker Anna Vazhaeparambil	
Haritha Kumar	<u>27</u>	Anna Vazhaeparambil	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Hirsa Bindu V.

Comments & Reason for Decision: Anna had made more points with supporting good argument. She can be more confident though.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Golden State Katia Nagarajan	(20 - 30)	Harker Ukarsh Priyam	(20 - 30)
Katia Nagarajan	<u>29</u>	Ukarsh Priyam	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Gregory B. Christainsen

Comments & Reason for Decision:

The affirmative side gave a well-structured presentation, although the relationship between 'morality' and 'utilitarianism' needs to be better developed. Also, the proper (or improper) implementation of 'democracy' requires more discussion: is more people deciding more issues by voting necessarily better?

The negative side's presentation was not quite as well structured, and the speaking style left something to be desired (looking down too much). The (first) cross examination period was not well used and made almost no dent in the affirmative side. Again, the relationship between 'morality' and 'utilitarianism' is complex and needs more development.

Neither side really gave much evidence as to whether, on balance, jury nullification enhances justice or subtracts from it.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Golden State Anushka Sanyal	(20-30)	Harker Cynthia Chen	(20-30)
Anushka Sanyal	<u>27</u>	Cynthia Chen	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: Gregory B. Christensen

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides gave well-structured presentations. Both sides were a little weak in terms of concepts such as "morality" and "utilitarianism". These are complex matters.

The affirmative side spoke more slowly and somewhat ponderously, but was -- overall -- pleasant to listen to. The negative side made points faster, and was therefore able to make more points, but ^{was} not always pleasant to listen to.

Neither side presented actual evidence about what has happened in cases of jury nullification although there has been research on the topic.

The edge here goes to the negative side for having argued in a more forceful and convincing manner.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Young Genius Surbhi Bhat	(20-30)	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	(20-30)
Surbhi Bhat	<u>26</u>	Sahiti Annadata	<u>23</u>

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

Signature: Sadashiva Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Surbhi Bhat:

- Established value/criteria well
- Clearly articulated contention -
- Handled cross-exams well (except 1-2 points)
- Tried to get opponent say one word answer - Yes or No, instead of proving the point with facts
- Talked well without referring to notes. Overall presented effectively.

Sahiti:

- Good presentation.
- Value criteria was not very explicit.
- Contention & subpoints were researched well. Could have added more contentions & points.
- During cross-ex, even though few points were answered okay, there was scope for improvement -

Decision:

Surbhi wins this round mainly for points (contentions) made and defended. versus other way.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Young Genius Diya Aggarwal

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Diya Aggarwal

24

NEG

Harker Catherine Zhao

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Catherine Zhao

25

Winner: Harker School/Team debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes, very close

Signature: Sadashiva Rao

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Diya Aggarwal

- Articulated value/merit well.
- Quoted few examples to support contentions.
- She will be more effective if she gives more relevant examples, upon asking, rather than saying that it is not her job to do the research.

Catherine Zhao

- Presented her ideas well, little too fast to start with - but slowed down after opponent requested.
- Jurors nullifying versus law makers coming up with law - presented well


Decision:

- Both couldn't establish their framework well.
- Debate was well done, both are very close.
- Decided to award to Catherine: articulated why jury subjective might dilute the effectiveness of system. and answered cross-exam questions and defended

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
TCA Andrew Song		BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	
Andrew Song	<u>27.5</u>	Vikram Kashyap	<u>26.5</u>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- AFF was able to refute NEG's contentions, but AFF was right when he said NEG grouped his contentions and just refuted that
- AFF: confident voice, work on forwarding/advancing your arguments
good refutations, try not to stutter
- NEG: good job, speak a little more smoothly so your voice flows,
refute contentions individually so you further explain
why each contention is false

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Gale Ranch Middle Srisahithi Ma...		BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	
Srisahithi Mannava	<u>30</u>	Anirudh Natarajan	<u>29</u>

Winner: Gale Ranch Middle debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: Kamini Narang

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both debaters well prepared.
- ~~Both~~ ~~Aff~~ Aff - able to find gaps in her opponents affirmations better.

Room: SHAH 401
Flight 1 Start: 1:45 PM (start 2:30)
Lincoln Douglas

3

Nallusamy, Kumaravel
Gale Ranch

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
✓ Young Genius Joanne Park		Scholars Debate Deepali Joshi	
Joanne Park	<u>29</u>	Deepali Joshi	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

well presented the affirmative case. ~~pro~~ debated and cross-examined with opponent (Neg) evidence.

Comments: Neg (good presentation and need to have more strong points to cross examine. overall good.

Room: DOBBINS 103
Flight 1 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

~~3~~

Mannava, Srinivasa
Gale Ranch

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker Annie Ma		Young Genius Anirudh Seshadri	
Annie Ma	<u>25</u>	Anirudh Seshadri	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: Srinivas Mannava

Comments & Reason for Decision:
Anirudh is good debater at structure argumentation, interactivity exchange of ideas. He is very strong at frame level arguments and responds opponents arguments.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Harker Aditya Andrade Harker Arohee Bhoja Aditya Andrade	<u>26</u>	Brooks Joshua Athayde Joshua Athayde	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Arohee - Good detailed arguments
- You went very fast and it was hard to understand, you even after it was brought to your attention before.
- Did not refute any Neg contentions.

Joshua - Good detailed & well structured arguments.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Dougherty Valley Bridge Kabir D...		Golden State Josh Sanyal	
Kabir Dubey	<u>28</u>	Josh Sanyal	<u>29</u>

Winner: Golden State / Josh. debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Anupma

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides had good detailed, well structured arguments. I favored Neg for his good arguments refuting the Aff and rebuilding his case.

Kabir - Good job in providing a good evidence in response to cross-exam. and asked good questions in cross-examination of Neg.
- Try to speak slow for clear and better understanding.

Josh - Good job in presenting the framework & refuting.

Room: DOBBINS 204
Flight 2 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

3

Le, Ryan
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Young Genius Arnav Kartikeya		Dougherty Valley Bridge Anurag...	
Arnav Kartikeya	<u>27</u>	Anurag Rao	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Critiqued orally

Room: DOBBINS 204
Flight 1 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

~~3~~

Le, Ryan
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Gale Ranch Middle Mishka Nara...		Young Genius Patricia Huang	
Mishka Narasimhan	<u>30</u>	Patricia Huang	<u>25</u>

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

Signature: [Handwritten Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Disclosed
and
Critiqued
Orally

Room: DOBBINS 203
Flight 2 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

~~3~~

Prasad, Aman
Kundassery, Keshav
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Dougherty Valley Bridge Kelly Oh		Young Genius Rohan Ray	
Kelly Oh	<u>28</u>	Rohan Ray	<u>30</u>

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

Signature: Aman Prasad

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

Room: DOBBINS 203
Flight 1 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

~~3~~

Prasad, Aman
Kundassery, Keshav
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Gale Ranch Middle Mahitha Vug...	(20-30)	Young Genius Pramukh Shandilya	(20-30)
Mahitha Vuggumudi	<u>30</u>	Pramukh Shandilya	<u>27</u>

Winner: Gale Ranch School/Team debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? no

Signature: Aman Prasad

Comments & Reason for Decision:

ORAL

Forgot to mention!

Gale Ranch - Explain Rauls viewpoint a little more because I honestly ~~do~~ did not know what you were talking about.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Golden State Steven Jiang		Stratford Independant Mohul Ag...	
Steven Jiang	<u>21</u>	Mohul Aggarwal	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

- clear & good evidence, show little more confidence.
- improve your cross-exam & its answer.
- cross exam improve a little during AFF cross-exam.
- rebuttal was weak.

NEG

- good cross-exam on "dis-regard" of law.
- excellent construction & evidence & good speech.
- excellent rebuttal.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker Quentin Clark	(20 - 30)	Dougherty Valley Bridge Justin L...	(20 - 30)
Quentin Clark	<u>27</u>	Justin Lee	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: 4 claims were released very well but just simple reading from what he prepared

NEG: In conclusion current law system already had too much power so if they will have Jury nullification as more additional power it will eventually be abused and will have another bias which will create unfair, unequal in case.

AFF: answered very well for all questions. ~~_____~~

NEG: presented all ~~extra~~ evidence which asked ~~_____~~

AFF: Jury is 12 people so make better reasonable decision.
~~_____~~

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Gale Ranch Middle Kavin Kumar...	(20 - 30)	Dougherty Valley Bridge Sahana...	(20 - 30)
Kavin Kumaravel	<u>29</u>	Sahana Vivek	<u>27</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: - we can't follow all laws lawmaker simply made even though the law was not fair or equal at all

- Justice should be optimistically good and equal to all level

- Current laws widely wrong applied in US

- help solving unfair / unequal for women, African America or minor with Jury Nullification

- Jury Nullification can be good tool to protect current laws system and improve fairness

NEG: - Jury Nullification can cause chaos

- They can easily forget laws or case facts but focus on something from feeling

- Jury can be easily irrationally by bias

- Jury Nullification is maybe against the people making laws

- Jury Nullification can make people misunderstood the laws and eventually ~~they~~ ~~can't~~ ~~be~~ ~~guilty~~ ~~because~~ ~~of~~ ~~Jury~~ ~~Nullification~~. If they made mistakes in laws they can't be guilty because of Jury Nullification.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

Young Genius Jason Lee

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Jason Lee

30

NEG

Harker Thresiamma Vazhaepara...

POINTS
(20 - 30)

Thresiamma Vazhaeparambil

28

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- UNNECESSARY definitions
- Marginalia

- Social welfare

- good examples of jury
null success

- nice one w/ music
pitch, really
got to me

- good point comparing
social welfare
and utilitarianism

- look at judge during
crossfire

- Don't bother w/ off time

- likes ad wms - avoid them
Just pause

- Don't say "I have a quote for that"
say something like "I have
evidence against this from!!"

- Don't abbreviate utilitarian, ~~it's~~
saying util gets confusing

- focus on education

- avoid solid formulae
and weights

- understated mechanism
Case, instead
like a script

Hed dint
s4 the crew
imposed,
he said
the Calise
found maps

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker Akhilesh Chegu		Golden State Austin Li	
Akhilesh Chegu	<u>26.8</u>	Austin Li	<u>27.5</u>

Winner: Austin Li, Golden State debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: WETA

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

Nice 6 min presentation, but it is not clear what are value, value criterion, and contentions. Instead presented "standards": consequentialism or naturalism.

- Jurors are not "top 10-20%" of Americans.

NEG

Did a reasonable job of pick up opponent's mistakes including lack of "value & value criterion" and "Jurors are top 10-20% of Americans"

- Did not use a lot of allocated time for presentation.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Harker D.even Parikh		Dougherty Valley Bridge Twisha...	
D.even Parikh	<u>26.8</u>	Twisha Chawla	<u>27</u>

Winner: NEG Dougherty Valley Twisha Chawla debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF
morality
utilitarianism

NEG
Justice
fairness

- incoherent arguments
beyond prepared text.

- please Do not talk to opponent
during his preparation time!

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20-30)	NEG	POINTS (20-30)
Harker Montek Kalsi		Young Genius Shachi Prasad	
Montek Kalsi	<u>29</u>	Shachi Prasad	<u>28.5</u>

Winner: Harker debating on the Aff Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win?

Signature: Vibha Gurunathan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Comments + Critiques:

AFF + NEG:

- achieve util. I don't need the morality vs. justice debate. Morality is almost the same as justice. Instead of that, show me how your side best achieves util for v/c.

NEG AFF:

- Can say that Congress makes the laws
- won b/c they successfully rebutted opp's pts plus upheld their side.

NEED VOTERS!!

- I don't need you to reiterate the same pt several times -> you said it 3 mins ago. Instead, Crystallize: Tell me, "I won b/c of X, Y, Z..."

Neg:

- Congress makes laws so wouldn't make laws restricting themselves

NEED VOTERS!!

- Don't reread your case. DO voters, destroy your

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

u mins prep

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Young Genius Vivek Agarwal		Harker Reiya Das	
Vivek Agarwal	<u>28</u>	Reiya Das	<u>29.5</u>

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

Signature: Vibha Gurunathan

Comments & Reason for Decision:

• Show how both of you actually achieved until

Neg:

- loved the ton of evidence
- bring up dropped args

Aff:

- USE ALL your time

- no one's case is perfect, try to poke as many holes as possible in X

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker Rishab Parthasarathy	(20-30)	BASIS Independent Silicon Valle...	(20-30)
Rishab Parthasarathy	<u>27.5</u>	Lakshmi Balram	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: Srieta Shandilya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF.

Standards / Framework: Value: Morality. Value: Util
Contention 1: Congress, members are rich. ^{thus} wealthy are over represented. Judges have socio-economic bias.
*L the contention does not support the value criterion

Contention 2: Judges are corrupt. - How does jury nullification check?
Contention 3: legal legitimacy.

* did not explain how the contentions -

X exam - How is Morality measured - Strong x exam by
Neg, How does jury nullification solve for wealthy.
How ~~does~~ does

Neg Framework: Value: Justice Criterion: Maximizing well being.

Contention: → inconsistent application of law.
Contention → cannot be implemented;

Neg Rebuttal → Attacked cont 1 (wealthy), Contentions 2 (attacked statement) - Attacks Value, Contentions 3 (legal legitimacy)

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
TCA Grace Huang	(20 - 30)	Harker Sachin Shah	(20 - 30)
Grace Huang	<u>28</u>	Sachin Shah	<u>29</u>

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

Signature: Siveta Shandilya

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF Framework: Value: Justice Criterion: Govern shd. Govern self.
 Contention 1:
 Contention 2: Preserve democracy
 3: Judges choose law over justice
 NEG X Exam: Strong X exam by NEG.

Handwritten note: Presentation was weak - couldn't follow the arguments

Neg Constructive: Value: Morality & right behaviour. Criterion: Util
 Contention 1: Jurors lack info to make decision in consistent application of law.
 Contention: We need legal legitimacy: Rule of Law.
 Contention 3: Judicial nullification is jury nullification
 Contentions 1
 X Exam: Morality - who values.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Amudha Amudha Sairam	(20 - 30)	Harker Avi Gulati	(20 - 30)
Amudha Sairam	<u>27</u>	Avi Gulati	<u>26</u>

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

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Amudha started really well with very good examples to support her case. She was clear in expressing her case. She did defend her case explained how she answered question from opponent.


Avi started with confidence and was very expressive through body language however his focus changed from debating the opponent to more advising his judgement. He was also in his questioning session cut off his question as he was not able to put it across clearly.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS (20 - 30)	NEG	POINTS (20 - 30)
Golden State Kaushik Jasti		TCA Rukmini Banerjee	
Kaushik Jasti	<u>27</u>	Rukmini Banerjee	<u>28</u>

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

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Kaushik started well but wasn't so effective in defending & answering the opponent. Rukmini started her case fast. as if she wanted to finish ~~her~~ reading her document. Everything put together Rukmini evolved a better debater of the two though it was a very close competition.

Room: DOBBINS 208
Flight 1 Start: 1:45 PM
Lincoln Douglas

3

Aggarwal, Anuj
Stratford

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF

NEG

Young Genius Surya Midha

Dougherty Valley Bridge Shanno...

Surya Midha

Shannon Zhang

POINTS
(20-30)

POINTS
(20-30)

27.9

27.20

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

Signature: Anuj

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF

1:49

- Morality over justice
- Cross-x
- Asked good questions and eventually opponent got stuck on one question which was never answered or addressed
- Gave good answers to the questions asked.
- Contents may need to be shortened as he took 15 seconds more of some time speed was too fast.
- Good rebuttal.
- Good speaker

NEG

2:37

- Justice over Morality
- Modulation in speech/voice will help to convey important observations.
- Cross-x
 - Asked good questions and could have asked some more questions
 - Answered some questions but did not give answer addressed one question saying she will address it later
 - Need to fully use his prep time that will help
 - May need to be little more organized that will help her case impact-
 - Good debator

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker Aditya Tadimetri	(20 - 30)	Young Genius Sheyhan Lalani	(20 - 30)
Aditya Tadimetri	<u>20</u>	Sheyhan Lalani	<u>26</u>

Winner: NEG - Young Genius Sheyhan debating on the NEG Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

<p><u>Aff Construct</u> Aditya</p> <p>✓ Morality, utilitarianism - jury wants to send message - Define both morality and utilitarianism Cont 1: laws are biased towards rich = congressman - lawyers - Rich get better treatment Cont 2: jury nullification is a check against law/judge - safeguard - jury cannot be punished Jury nullification is safeguard for unjust law</p>	<p><u>Neg-cross</u> Sheyhan</p> <p>Law unjust - Congress/lawyer - evidence - how many unjust law 3 strike law - Can ^{we} you reinstate unjust law - why money influences law - Congress support to make law to help society - Do you have example of law by congress</p> <p>✗✗</p> <p>✓ Good cross by Sheyhan. ✓ Opponent failed to satisfactorily answer</p>	<p><u>Neg-construct</u> Sheyhan</p> <p>Waller: justice Mutual agreement - Definition Cont 1: Criminals go back and commit crime - example Cont 2: Same understanding of justice Cont 3: Jury is not told whole story <u>Refute:</u> * Cont 1 - 3 strike law does not explain rich congress * Cont 2: - ??</p>	<p><u>Aff-cross</u></p> <p>- Value criteria based on mutual agreement between society & person - 3 strike law support congress money/influence * Explain Cont - Criminals go back & commit crime again - evidence * Diverse thinking of justice system *</p>
---	--	--	--

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

AFF	POINTS	NEG	POINTS
Harker N Wang	(20 - 30)	Young Genius Akash Balakrishn...	(20 - 30)
N Wang	23	Akash Balakrishnan	18

Winner: AFF: Harker N Wang Debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Aff (Wang)	Cross (Akash)	Neg - const Akash	Aff Cross (Wang)
<p><u>Aff - win</u> <u>construct</u> ✓ Argument ✓ Value: Utilitarian, MO Cont 1: Bias to rich congress men, lawyer ✓ Cont 2: solves injustice ✓ Cont 3: legal legitimacy. Helps people, rebuild govt. legitimacy;</p>	<p>Value - Morality? examples for cont 1. NO answer explain 2nd cont: solution for bias - NO response Challenge: Cont 3 jury legitimacy - NO proper response</p>	<p>Argument Value: justice Cont 1: leads to bias implicit bias ex: African American Cont 2: Undermining law Rebuttal Challenge Aff cont 1: - missed what you were challenging Challenge Aff cont 2: - missing example completely missed it</p>	<p><u>Neg-win</u> Jury bias - good response from Neg. Value Criteria - good response Jury nullification leads to bias</p>

P.T.O