

OPEN LD

ROUND 3

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Narayannan	Max = 30	Bishop O Dowd Mortarotti	Max = 30
Ajijt Narayannan	<u>26</u>	Dominick Mortarotti	<u>27</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Piyush Shah (Piyush Shah)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

A.N.
 Defn:
 Value: Morality
 Terrorism
 Ethnic
 Due Process.
 1. Int'l cooperation
 2. Terror strike
 3. Torture policy
 - courts security
 - classified info.
 current lal.
 Accused (3)
 Citizens interest.
 WWIII
 Max 289 cases

NO → do not extend due process
 B. Mortarotti
 Defn:
 - Terrorism - Utilitarianism. (3)
 - Amendment (7)
 - Non-citizens.
 Values (Repeat) (4)
 Security
 Max happiness for greatest # of people.
 Confutations
 1. Due Process. - save lives
 - security hurts due to info leak.
 Reduced Terrorism
 Detainees have dignity
 loss of secrecy = worked through each argument.

	N	M
Analysis
Refutation
org.
cross exam.
Evidence
Delivery
Total	26	27

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bonita Vista Dawson	Max = 30	MSJ Mittal	Max = 30
Imani Dawson	<u>28.2</u>	Mudit Mittal	<u>29</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Imani speech - ① Moral imperative of due process ① must hold hearing in federal courts
 ② terrorism rise up against us due to ② indefinite detention is unacceptable
 Unjust treatment
 Constitution states all humans have rights

Mudit cross-exam - what is real moral connection - what if we had chosen
 is cloning immoral? what if gov. had to choose who to protect?

Mudit speech - ① US gov. obligation is based on contract - gov. obligation is to its citizen
 ① non-citizen trials can disclose sensitive data, traditional trials can become circus
 ② terrorist starts with legal activities that is used illegally
 ③ Rebuttal - military tribunal

Imani - Rebuttal: ① Gov obligations to US have been broken ② CIPA protects sensitive data
 ③ Court effectiveness for prep for terrorism, Richard Reid was tried in federal courts
 ④ more law to be more moral by extending due process

Mudit Rebuttal: CIPA does not work since Obama got info; law can be immoral

Imani Rebuttal: US broke promise to US as broke obligation, we promote terrorism by abusing non-citizen rights

The negative established that the contractual obligation of US gov. is to its citizens first
 and extending some rights to non-citizens would potentially harm the citizens.
 The positive made a strong case of why extending due process will raise the moral
 position & standing of US with the international community and be in the long term interest of
 the country

Room: Arts 129
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Truong, Christin
St /

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
St Mary's Valdez	Max = 30	Palo Alto Zhang, K.	Max = 30
Daniel Valdez	_____	Kevin Zhang	_____

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Daniel did not show.

Room: O Connor 103
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

9, Evergreen

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Chopra	Max = 30	Polytechnic Zhou	Max = 30
Aditya Chopra	<u>28</u>	Jimmy Zhou	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the Abb from Aditya Chopra.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Di

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

^{both}
AFF: ~~8/15~~ needs to slowdown when giving his speech.

neg: couldn't provide evidences for his cases

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Tummala	Max = 30	Oakwood Mathur	Max = 30
Vineet Tummala	<u>26</u>	Shivani Mathur	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the neg from Shivani Mathur
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Diane Ronge

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

aff
neg does not have to offer a solution/only has to prove that the ~~aff~~ is not comparable.

neg
excellent refutation
good analysis

Room: O Connor 104
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Schletzbaum, Jam

BHARGAVA, PIYUSH (DVHS)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Nayak	Max = 30	Olive Children Jen	Max = 30
Akaash Nayak	<u>29</u>	Jesse Jen	<u>28-1</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Rub M...

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted for the affirmative because ~~they~~ ^{he} was able to provide evidence 2 showed that federal courts have successfully presented terrorism charges in the past. Neg was not able to counter that effectively besides saying it hasn't happened. Aff argumet on how due process helps bolstered democracy wasn't addressed by Neg.

Both debaters could have done a better job in cross examination.

I wondered why Neg didn't question Aff that if federal courts 2 due process is working so well why are we even talking about extending rights.

Room: Kenna 304
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Roza, Diane~~
fishwild, Dianne

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Rahimi	Max = 30	MSJ Lai	Max = 30
Rod Rahimi	<u>29</u>	Ryan Lai	<u>28.5</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Dianne Fishwild

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

It was surprising to hear Neg concede his VC of Protecting Nat. Security was the same as Aff's of Minimizing dehumanization. They're not the same ; so basically Aff's stands.

Social contract is discriminatory ; thus can't achieve justice.

Card that torture is unreliable ; counterproductive. carried a lot of weight.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Q-Tran	Max = 30	MSJ Hari	Max = 30
Louis Q-Tran	<u>29.5</u>	Anant Hari	<u>27.1</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Aff failed to meet either criteria/Value.
By not directly advocating, and indeed rejecting, right to public trial. Negation proved that tribunals also meet both values without harming national security*

Speaker

Aff DO NOT SPREAD. often too fast, you make it very hard to organize your contentions. Your arguments lost weight because they were often incoherent. I know there's a lot to get through, but spreading won't help.

Meg watch verbal fillers (like, um, etc) good job keeping a steady tone. However, the fillers often made you appear uncertain.

Room: Arts 134
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Krishna, Shaila
~~Deadwiler, Brand~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

San Ramon Gupta

Max = 30

Palo Alto Rao

Max = 30

Rohith Gupta

Sama Rao

dropped

no show

The better debating was done by the *Neg* from *Sama Rao*
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *Shaila Vasudev (Krishna) / Saratoga High.*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Nobli C
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Mable, Ben~~
LA

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Wei Wan of
St. Francis

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Leland Hu, R	Max = 30	La Reina Draper	Max = 30
Rebecca Hu	<u>27</u>	Kate Draper	<u>28</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG: * Strong argument
* Logical, Articulate
AFF: * irrelevant argument (e.g. "why do terrorist hate us")

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Westmont Young	Max = 30	James Logan Ritchie	Max = 30
Bruce Young	29.5	Nathan Ritchie	27
The better debating was done by the <u>AFF</u> from <u>Westmont Young</u>		Nathan Ritchie	
		TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME	

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: E. Helle

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff 1st speech - while use of consequentialism was ill defined, so was opponents value criterion - especially considering the inconsistency upon cross-examination. Contentions + warrants - well organized & persuasive.

NegAC → I had trouble following your arguments. Use clearer taglines. Even under cross ex, it was at times poorly articulated.

Shawn 11/15 pm.

Aff put Neg on ropes in 1st rebuttal.
Neg sealed his fate when he argued "It's more American to protect our own citizens than the rights of non" - You can't equate "Americanism" to morality. Your "positive benefits" were too generalized rather than concrete.
Both Aff's Rebuttals resonated with truth.

Room: Daly 106
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Pachauri, Shalin
Zeng, D

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Zhang	Max = 30	Westmont Keates	Max = 30
George Zhang	<u>27</u>	Paula Keates	<u>29</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Pachauri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ms. Keates did an excellent job defending her value criterion. she gave clear examples and spoke to the point.

Mr. Zhang also did a good job. ~~but~~ He was ~~brought~~ well-prepared and brought many facts to support his arguments.

Room: Nobli B
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Schwing, Emily
RATNAM, FREEMAN
(SPHS)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Leland Loftis

Max = 30

James Logan Lee

Max = 30

Cameron Loftis

28.5

Jia Hui Lee

28.3

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff
→ Clearly defined the value, value criterion & endorsed that his value was superseding the Neg's value

→ Aff clearly communicated sufficient evidence to prove his arguments.

→ Good alternative provided.

→ Excellent communication

Neg.
→ the value & value criterion around 'morality' was defined & well supported. However, ~~it failed to~~ prove that Aff's value around 'justice' was included under 'morality' was not supported by enough evidence

→ Neg Although Neg was trying to prove that Aff's claim were incorrect, it was not supported by adequate evidence

→ Cont could have helped if she provided alternative solutions.

Room: Nobli B
Flight B: Start 7:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Schwing, Emily

RATNAM PRABHAKAR

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

(SPTS)

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Parker	Max = 30	James Logan Meller	Max = 30
Coby Parker	<u>28.1</u>	Mikhail Meller	<u>28.1</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close debate

Aff defended the value & value criterion very well
 → Good re-examination & defending his contentions
 → Rebuttal was excellent with a clear ^{understanding} of the opponents points & attacking/negating them

NEG defended the value & value criterion very well with a focus on minimizing harm
 → Excellent X-examination
 → Good rebuttal about was not able to provide enough evidence on why was was moral or immoral.

Summary: - Both spoken were great & attacking each other on their points. I would say only half a point separated me ~~winner from the~~ If neg had provided sufficient evidence in defense of his points he could have been the winner. In this case "Aff" claimed victory because of his value defense throughout the debate.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Puri	Max = 30	Saratoga Kannan	Max = 30
Iyesha Puri	<u>20</u>	Deepti Kannan	<u>19</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: *R. Weth*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both contestants did a great job. There were not that many facts or statistics however both of them were excellent in thier oratory delivery.

Iyesha scored a few important points in the debate attacking the morality of imprisonment.

Overall it was a very close race

Room: Mission A
Flight A: Start 7:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

WARRIOR 2, DEBAT

Schletzbaum, Jammie

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Agrawal

Max = 30

Ruchika Agrawal

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Hurtado

Max = 30

Sebastian Hurtado

27

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ruchika - Clear speaker. Good job covering Neg case and refuting his arguments against yours.

Sebastian - Clear speaker, good presentation of case.

Dropped Affs 3rd contention.

Misinterpreted Contention 1 and argued both Amendment - he did not mention both Amendment in her case.

RFP -

Neg. dropped Contention 3 on Affs case which said that terrorism rates are going down and the U.S. is not concerned about terrorism and can give due process to all easily because of this. Also, Neg argued the wrong Amendment in rebuttal against Affs case. I liked Affs value + v.c. and arguments to support it better.

Room: O Connor 109
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

Patil, Mahesh

Aaron Lansing

Cal
Western

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Sandhu	Max = 30	Harker Rao	Max = 30
Jaisel Sandhu	<u>28.0</u>	Sagar Rao	<u>26.5</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Aaron Lansing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall good debate Aff was stronger ~~offensively~~ and successfully achieved both ~~of~~ values

Both were good speakers but Neg needs to look at Judge more.

Another reason for Aff victory is Aff had a stronger offense and effectively gave reasons for both morality and protection rights

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Moraes-Liu

Max = 30

Bonita Vista Rosal

Max = 30

Juliana Moraes-Liu

28

Joebert Rosal

29

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Ying

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:
speak clearly. Not enough evidence.

Negative:
Good presentation. Stay on his points very well.

Room: O Connor 107
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3

WARRIOR 2, DEBAT

Vasun Walla
Lynbrook H.S.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St. Francis Singh

Max = 30

Milpitas Garg

Max = 30

Akriti Singh

28

Rakshit Garg

28

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

V. Walla

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Akriti Singh → Great speaker, well organized thoughts. Used good examples. In X exam you could have been better. X exam was more like information session asking him to clarify what was said. Although you had brought many points you could not expand on them and focused only on couple of them. For example you never focused on international law, which you mention and your opp. ~~at~~ ignored it. Your example of Jews was great, but you never stressed it.

Rakshit Garg → Great speaker, very well organized thoughts very good at X exam and almost threw his opp' off her feet. ~~Some~~ good examples used. You were little aggressive. Your example/situation of courts getting clogged was good. Morality vs greater good argument was good. In the end I was inconvenienced that by giving same due process we will have many issues to deal with like National Security, ~~over~~ over loaded courts.

Room: Daly 206
Flight A: Start 7:00
Open Lincoln Douglas

3 Jim Zhang
Palo Alto
~~Shaw, Bryan~~
La

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Prasad	Max = 30	La Reina Sullivan	Max = 30
Abhinav Prasad	<u>26</u>	Kathleen Sullivan	<u>28</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF and NEG did very well on this debating.
NEG had better logic debate to confirm her value and her points.
NEG had good eye contact, and presentation skills, clearly make points.
AFF appeared strong and confidence with high volume of speak & high speed.
NEG effectively attacked AFF on his value, convince judge her points are
super than AFF.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Hashmi	Max = 30	Bishop O Dowd Nouri	Max = 30
Noah Hashmi	<u>28</u>	Koosha Nouri	<u>27</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Joseph Nguyen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- AFF: - cleanly delivered
 - professionally done
 - tight arguments
 - good cross/rebuttals
 - transitions & "flow" of arguments could be improved
- NEG. - great voice in delivery, ~~well~~ good, clear presentation
 - well constructed cross/rebuttals
 - need improvement on posture a bit.
- ~~NEG~~ missed/paid little attention to a key point of the AFF,
 so the AFF has an edge in this round.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Natarajan	Max = 30	Milpitas Ngo	Max = 30
Arvinhd Natarajan	<u>26</u>	Jonathan Ngo	<u>24</u>

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

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kelly Ainsworth

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Mr. Ngo should be wary during cross exs. Not to so often interrupt his opponent. It looks uncourteous and abusive to not allow the opponent time to finish a contending statement.
- Mr. Natarajan should link his contentions to his value much more directly → NO LINK
- Ngo was wonderfully organized! Very easy to follow logical flow First Speech
- Natarajan should not spread. Not specified, so no deduction, but argument would have been more effective if he'd spoken more slowly and clearly
- Natarajan's second speech was much clearer in both flow/analysis ~~flow~~.
- Natarajan however, failed Excellent Delivery to properly defend against the fueled terrorism through increased radical muslim induction → No analysis/Direct address → Pushed Point
→ LINK Not Explicit to Value
- Ngo's second argument did not address Major point about Leader's opinion
- ~~Mr. Ngo's first speech was very good but he failed to link his contentions to his value~~
Ngo failed to link to Ngo's stated link in 2nd Rebuttal as Non-existent → NEED LINKS
- Ultimately Natarajan provided a stronger, more causally linked rebuttal, winning the round in my opinion.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Fee	Max = 30	MSJ Desai, A.	Max = 30
Shannon Fee	<u>29</u>	Anuj Desai	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Palo Alto Fee
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Emily M. Purvis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- don't concede your burden in CX!!!
- great CX of your opponent
- your IAR could have been more organized - focus on signposting

Neg

- please don't run extinction
- even worse, you ran cant clog → extinction
- extinction is not a "critical argument"
- neither is a shady conditional counterplan
- I think you could have totally won with some weighing, but aff does a really solid job on stalling in IAR