NEG

- Enrenches division
- Causes division
- Care-giver
- Care-giver

☑ Good - keep to U.S. - good

Negation

Universal employment

☐ Universal employment

☑ Good response on inflation

- Good response on inflation

☐ Fuller words - try to eliminate weaknesses in argument

☐ “Right” argument needs warrants

☐ No evidence

☑ Caregiving - not what AFF said - call her on that

☑ Prove economically

☑ Missed opportunity

☑ Missed opportunity

☑ Missed opportunity

Her 6 Trillion argument

☑ Good job continuing to point to

☑ Good job continuing to point to

She didn’t know what policies were in place to handle poor job performance

☑ Missed opportunity

☐ Missed opportunity

☐ Missed opportunity

[Continued your woman focus, call out sexism]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A239</td>
<td>Ruby Gao</td>
<td>Sreeisha Puranam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I vote for the affirmative because the argument addresses the question at hand and shows exactly how it would benefit society. The opponent failed to address one of our main points and mostly focused on his own points.
**NLD**

**FLIP: 32 Jayashree Vinod Adivarahan v. 15 Grace Vohs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Lincoln-Douglas</th>
<th>Pooja Paode (*30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter-Finals</td>
<td>A201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Vohs 15</td>
<td>Jayashree Vinod Adivarahan 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points 20-30)</td>
<td>(Points 20-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner of this debate was **Affirmative**

(Circle Winner)

Is this a low point win? [No]

**Judge's Signature**

Teresa Smith

Pinnacle H.S.

School / Affiliation / Occupation

---

**Aff. claimed that the Neg. can't bring in new evidence in her constructive.**

You said this in your 1AK. You'd really only be ever to claim that in your 2AK. Her constructive is all new - it was her first and only speech at that point. Her evidence stands.

Attach it, don't just try to get me to drop it.

You are wrong on this.

Be sure to extend your 2AK.

She dropped some of your points by not responding, so you need to go back and remind me of your points and extend them.

---

**Neg. - You said "poverty can be caused by financial problems." That's kind of the definition of poverty. And you cannot deny that Societal discrimination plays a part in societal poverty.**

There are a disproportionate number of women and minorities in poverty. You can't just dismiss that.

Also, your grand sweeping claims against immigrants kind of mess up his points.

You own claims that "immigrants don't have as much education as Americans so they'd never be able to learn enough to give back is discriminatory."

---

**RFD:** Super close round. Both had flaws & strengths. It was a little pre-prepared. Arranging the case you prepared in the 1AK, then pre-prepared, arguing the case you prepared in the 2AK versus being in the 1AK rather than being in the 2AK.
**Novice Lincoln-Douglas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Team 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quarter-Finals</strong></td>
<td><strong>A207</strong></td>
<td><strong>A Hall</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td><strong>Paul Meade</strong></td>
<td><strong>S Scarangella</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCALANGELLA 27</strong></td>
<td><strong>NLD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Points</strong> (20-30)</td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The winner of this debate was:**

- **Affirmative (Circle Winner):** No

---

**Comments & Reason for Decision:**

Both cases were highly rhetorical. There were a lot of unsubstantiated (with evidence) claims. Reasoning is good, but there should be an example of potential for the Aff case especially with NEC framework called for a cost-benefit. In the absence of better evidence, I evaluated both cases on the few facts provided.

Can you quantify economic benefit? NEC framework was not included. Social and economic commitment to the community is valuable. It is very hard to link cost-benefit framework of NEC.

Is this a low point win? A low point win.

- **Affirmative**: if you want to keep what people value.
- **Negative**: NEC can sustain this morality - how much morality do I get for what cost? At what cost-benefit point do I achieve a moral compromise within a moral value?