

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington NS

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Nachiyappan Solaiyappan

28

NEG

Needham NY

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Nina Yee

27

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF's debate on financial part is not strong.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

Neg: The argument for domestic violence
lack of support.

Overall: AFF has strong argument on ~~how~~
~~women~~ protecting woman, minority
prevent disease.

Room: 122E
Start: 9:00 AM
Lincoln-Douglas Novice

1

Prabhakar, Vikas

Acton-Boxborough

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham JW

Jack Warn

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28

NEG

Lexington AF

Avery Fortier

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Lexington AF debating on the NEG Low point win? NO
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Vikas Prabhakar

Comments & Reason for Decision:

~~AFF~~ ~~Rebuttal~~

This round came down to who empowers minorities better. I really bought the fact that these homes would be implemented into ghettos and bad areas brought up by the Neg, ~~so I felt like~~ as the economy argument, which wasn't really covered by the AFF. Also, ~~the~~ ^{out} the neg outweighed the only offense brought up by the AFF, therefore, I voted Neg in this round.

Great Round!!!



Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL
Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Acton-Boxborough SL

Sam Lieberman

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Needham KR

Kelsey Rondini

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

Winner: Needham KR/Kelsey Rondini debating on the NEG Low point win? N
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Lolita G. Towers

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides spoke very well.
NEG's arguments on "by promoting housing to minorities only increases the discrimination" was very convincing. AFF could have improved the chances of winning by have more solid evidence on price control, specifics ^{on} state laws and federal laws.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington CW

Christine Wang

POINTS
(23 - 30)

29

NEG

Needham MK

Mica Kahn

POINTS
(23 - 30)

27

Winner:

Lexington CW

School/Team

debating on the

AFF

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win?

N

Signature: _____

[Signature]

Both enlisted their points by good argument. Neg could be stronger in attacking more aspects of Aff's action items. not just couple ~~points~~ points.

AFF

Contact. → shame → response

→ push other to street.

→ effect: ① no food → poverty
② Health effect.

- mental
- criminal
- family
- children

③ crime rate
↑

→ lead to crime

NEG

- state instead of fed
gov.

- efficiency.

- debt.

- insufficient

- housing ↔ debt ceiling

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive	6'
Cross-Examination	3'
First Negative Constructive	7'
Cross-Examination	3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal	4'
First Negative Rebuttal	6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal	3'
Prep Time	4'

Room: 126E
Start: 10:15 AM
Lincoln-Douglas Novice

2

Li, Yaqing

Acton-Boxborough

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Walpole LN

Lindsay Navick

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Lexington EL

Evan Li

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

Winner: Walpole LN debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: provided more solid evidences
on her case.

But can argue more on the
shelter cost.

Neg: good logic argument. good alternative
solution.
Please add more evidence.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express
ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, ex-
plain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Walpole JM

Jodi Mathew

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Lexington CW

Christine Wang

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

Winner: Lexington CW debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Really when you look at the flow, you only see
one response to the neg, and the aff needed flow, which
wasn't the strongest we heard because racism
was the largest impact coming from the
neg. ~~On the Aff, the~~ ~~wasn't~~ ~~as much~~
offense coming from their side, so I had
to vote Neg. Also, the PAA was
unresponded to.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express
ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, ex-
plain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham KR

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Kelsey Rondini

27

NEG

Lexington NS

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Nachiyappan Solaiyappan

28

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both are good argument on their points. Nachi slightly won over by using more fact & data to support his points.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

AFF

- ① - International Law. → Right to housing.
 - critical to world
 - Human Right. by inter law.
 - UN. - good.
 - leadership & responsibility for US
- ② Children. right & effect of no house problem & help.
- c. Human Right & other food. drug. effective money spent.
- Homeless children: disadvantage.
- Bond to high power
- private housing includes maintain.

NEG

- ① approach & cost
 - maintain house → not realistic
 - not clear on cost efficiency
- ② Law not so great at all time.
- ③ real cost varies in diff places
- Define: right to housing.
 - reduce local funding. ~ taxless
 - hurt public housing
 - waken state power.
 - segregation. due to public housing.
 - hurt rental market
 - can be abused by profiler.
 - no support for homeless = no education

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington PS

Pranathi Srirangam

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5 ~~26.5~~ 30

NEG

Walpole JM

Jodi Mathew

POINTS

(23 - 30)

~~26.5~~ 27

Winner: Lexington PS debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

AFF: Can 'give evidence the vacant government building is livable or not

Neg: You can provide a alternative solution. Good argument on tax. Relax.

Overall: AFF win the debate because good argument on no increasing on tax.

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham AT

Aisha Tipnis

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Lexington KY

Kevin Yang

POINTS

(23 - 30)

27

Winner: Lexington KY debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? Yes

Signature: Vikas Prabhakar

Comments & Reason for Decision:

It was not well responded to, I had to vote off that. ~~He~~ I didn't like the theory well, it was extremely frivolous, however on the flow, the standards ~~and~~ violation, and voters were untouched, and on the Aff side, everything was outweighed due to the impact.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

Room: 126E
Start: 11:30 AM
Lincoln-Douglas Novice

3

Towers, Lolita

Westford

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington SG

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Simran Gandhi

29

NEG

Acton-Boxborough BH

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Brian Hu

28

Winner: Lexington SG / Simran Gandhi debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? N

School/Team

Signature: Lolita S. Towers

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF had a solid framework. Although NEG had a solvency counterplan of raising the minimum wage, AFF successfully argued on how it causes more unemployment by hurting the employers. Thus, AFF's arguments were logically compelling.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham JW

POINTS
(23 - 30)

27

Jack Warn

NEG

Lexington RT

POINTS
(23 - 30)

27

Rifka Thomas

Winner: Needham, JW debating on the AFF Low point win? N/A
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision: Both Rifka & Jack are good debaters. They went point to point to prove their points. very close race!

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

AFF

~~Reading for~~

- political equality
- minority unheard
- exclusion. → violence
- example for housing benefit
- children disadvantage - housing helps.
- provide vacant home.
- just deny. no suggestion.
- talk 1-3 one by one
- tax x house.

NEG

- source of vacant homes
- reason of vacant homes.
- house → job?
- drop tax
- public garden for e
- segregation.
- take government building & turn into public housing.
- Block Content 1: building environment - Bad.
- dec

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington CW

Christine Wang

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

NEG

Acton-Boxborough ML

Matthew Liu

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28

Winner: Christine Wang debating on the AFF Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? _____

Signature: Dunk

Comments & Reason for Decision:

A large part
CW AFF: ~~Majority~~ of CW's argument focused
on the morality in providing housing for
homeless. The most compelling part of CW's affirmation
of value stems from detailing the pernicious
effects of homelessness and its attendant social
ills and, most importantly, the overall cost, in all ways,
to society of failing to provide housing.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express
ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, ex-
plain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

ML Neg: ML presented and reacted well
but did not establish his fundamental assertion
that racism underlies social ills like homelessness and
therefore must be addressed before resources are allocated
to housing. He cited an example of flawed public
housing in France, but that data point needed
more support, exposition, and emphasis.

In General: the "value" points abounded on the U.S. Govt.
which suggests that utility should play a large role.
CW's treatment of utility carried the debate.

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington RT

Rifka Thomas

POINTS

(23 - 30)

27.5

NEG

Needham JL

John Lively

POINTS

(23 - 30)

27.5

Winner: Needham JL debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? No

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Yaqing Li

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: good point on using ~~empty~~ ^{vacant} ~~house~~ ^{government building} but failed to argue that the claiming of more housing. Did not have good argument on the segregating minority case. Can add some evidence on money saving.

Neg: Good catch on the AFF's wrong claim ending the homeless in 2025. Valid claim on the corrupted government.

You can get the iPhone app for timing.

Overall: Neg wins on the rebut ^{most} ~~every~~ point of AFF.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham AS

Annie Stein

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Lexington NS

Nachiyappan Solaiyappan

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

Winner: Lexington NS debating on the Neg Side (Aff or Neg) Low point win? NO

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Essentially, I bought the impacts of the Aff, but the neg poked holes in the solvency of the Aff. Since the Aff had 0 solvency, I had to go with the Neg, because they ~~showed~~ ~~took~~ took out all of the solvency.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL
Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham ZL

Zachary Lu

POINTS
(23 - 30)

29

NEG

Lexington PS

Pranathi Srirangam

POINTS
(23 - 30)

28

Winner: Needham/Zachary Lu debating on the AFF Low point win? N
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Lolita Towers

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF had a solid framework, all constraints were laid out very well. AFF successfully argued NEG's point of "Racism is worse than homelessness", thus winning the round. NEG could have done a better job of going after AFF's constraints. Also, NEG could have done a better job of laying out the Framework in a clearer manner. NEG's arguments were not flowing logically, they were all over the place.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham NY

Nina Yee

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

NEG

Lexington SG

Simran Gandhi

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29

Winner: Lexington SG debating on the NEG Low point win? No

School/Team

Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Both

Both Nina & Simran are fabulous. One of the best pairs this morning, Simran seems to know her arguments more through & back with more solid fact. But they are very close matches!

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

AFF

- Morality - inequality
- Homeless - unable to escape
- Poverty
- house → addition
 - less tax money
 - children education
 - economically
- help vacant house problem
- low income house increase property value. reduce crime.
- fill in the stigma & gap

NEG

- Impact of minority
- Question the left one by one
- ask for how why who
- Redistribution of wealth
- max benefit
- empower minority
- pub house. mindown property value. down run neighbour → Econ-down
- root cause: poverty
- hurt house tax → harm local schools public services
- Children in poverty → long term

house x → poverty
job ✓

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington RT

Rifka Thomas

POINTS

(23 - 30)

28.5

NEG

Needham AT

Aisha Tipnis

POINTS

(23 - 30)

29.5

Winner: Needham AT

School/Team

debating on the Neg

Side (Aff or Neg)

Low point win? NO

Signature:

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Neg had more offense under the framework & did better weighing as to why her impacts ~~where~~ were more impt. Aff turns were not very responsive to NC (as neg pointed out).

Would have liked to see some more direct evidence comparison from aff & weighing (especially b/c there is no fw clash!)

Great round guys! Both of you did very well.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington SG

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Simran Gandhi

29

NEG

Needham OB

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Olivia Blackmer

28.9 29

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

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF: Good evidence using data. evidence.
valid rebut on opponent's point
on can't get a job without house.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Neg: Best neg so far for today.
argument
valid point on ending poverty.

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

Can add more alternative to reduce homeless
missing to rebut on why can't provide both
house and job.
Overall: AFF won because of more evidence.

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Lexington EL

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Evan Li

28.5

NEG

Needham AS

POINTS

(23 - 30)

Annie Stein

28

Winner: Lexington EL / Evan Li debating on the AFF Low point win? N
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Lolita Towers

Comments & Reason for Decision:

AFF had a solid frame work. Although NEG successfully argued that Federal Govt. is not built to solve house and they often get bogged down with processes and making bad policies, this round came down to going back to who argued the value criterion of "minimizing pain" better. AFF did a better job of logically arguing on "humanizing the people" and thus winning the round. NEG could have done a better job in this respect.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL
Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

AFF

Needham ZL

POINTS
(23 - 30)

Zachary Lu

27

NEG

Lexington ED

POINTS
(23 - 30)

Elizabeth Ding

27

Winner: Needham ZL debating on the AFF Low point win? NO
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Bo Zhou

Both are good debator that are clear and tight to the points.

Comments & Reason for Decision:

But both of them can use more fact to support their argument
ie. dive deeper into their argument with fact & reason.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

AFF

Empower Minority
All voices heard

1. Harm.

- Stigmatized ← change
- Being Ignored.
- Valiance. ← ok to hurt them.

House.

- opportunity
- out of poverty
- chance to escape

House - addiction x

- Education for children

House - save \$

- ≠ - help vacant property

NEG

- How. habitable vacancy
- ← - Stigma → valence..
- Education.

- same

- Housing - different components

- Segregation. } safe location

- discrimination.

← Attack each points by points

Discrimination - Death.

- addition: isolated cases

not address root: poverty.

- in efficiency in gov. management.

- child education: just no, no reason explained

Case: 1. non-equal by gov.

2.
3.

In General: IT felt like EW took the
debate on a tangent which JG lex mostly
resisted.

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL

Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

Acton-Boxborough EW (Eric Wang) vs Lexington JG (Jeffrey Gu)

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

JG Lex AFF EW A+B NEG

Winner: Jeffrey Gu Lex debating on the AFF
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: DWNL

Other judges on panel: Ariana Orczo, Sarah Rosenberg. Please do not start until all judges are present.

JG Lex AFF: - JG presented a cogent argument for a legal obligation to provide housing as ~~an~~ an agent for ameliorating various social ills and addressing relative inequalities. JG cited evidence supporting the scope of the problem and the ways in which a legal right will or have resulted in betterment in the cycle of poverty, crime rates, "structural oppression", etc. JG addressed the relative benefits of a legal right to housing as compared to doing nothing, the negative construct.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'

EW AB Neg: The preference of EW's argument struck me as tangentially related to the resolution; the participation of African Americans in political discourse and the efficacy of that participation does not fully ~~encompass~~ encompass the issue at hand, over →

MSDL STATE DEBATE FINAL Mar 25 - 25, 2017

Resolved: The United States ought to guarantee the right to housing.

Sides are locked due to a previous debate between these entries

Acton-Boxborough CL (Christina Lai)

Lexington AF (Avery Fortier)

AFF

NEG

Winner: Lexington AF / Avery Fortier debating on the NEG
School/Team Side (Aff or Neg)

Signature: Lolita G. Towers

Other judges on panel: Jacob Gorenburg, Corey Jacobson. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Both sides had solid framework. NEG had a strong logical arguments on why utilitarianism is better than human dignity for the following reasons: I voted for the ^① NEG ^{said} "util prioritizes life which includes human dignity".

② NEG made a strong argument for how Govt does not have a good track record on providing housing.

③ NEG also made a convincing argument on collapsing the economy. AFF could have done a better job of explaining how corporations are using LIHTC program to their advantage.

AFF ^{could} ~~never~~ explained ^{better on} why NEG does not care about implementation/solvency.

Point Scale:

Use whole or half points 23 to 30
30: Truly amazing - top 3 pct
29: Fantastic - top 10 pct
28: Very good - top 25 pct
27: Solid debater - top half
26: Still learning but with potential
25: New at debate yet trying
24: Unprepared or unable to express ideas
23: Rude or unprofessional (rare, explain on ballot)

Speech Times:

First Affirmative Constructive 6'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Negative Constructive 7'
Cross-Examination 3'
First Affirmative Rebuttal 4'
First Negative Rebuttal 6'
Second Affirmative Rebuttal 3'
Prep Time 4'