

T.O.H. KARL INVITATIONAL 2011

Pacific Lutheran University

January 28-29, 2011

AFFIRMATIVE Lakes 27

POS	School: _____	POINTS: _____
	Speaker: _____	
	Speaker: _____	

NEGATIVE GH 26

POS	School: _____	POINTS: _____
	Speaker: _____	
	Speaker: _____	

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

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

Signed: Lorey R McLeod AWW

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg kind of fell apart in 2NR arguments
fell short.
AFF pulled it together in 2AR
Neg lacked Evidence for his Empirical
claims

Neg. Arg was Empirical in nature
AFF wins with Rts cont 1
which connects to his VC

TOH KARL INVITATIONAL

Pacific Lutheran University

January 28 - 29, 2011

AFFIRMATIVE POINTS: 28

School: ~~Lakes~~ Lakes AD
Speaker: _____

NEGATIVE POINTS: 27

School: Gig Harbor AR
Speaker: _____

The better debating was done by the Aff from Lakes AD
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:

RFD: This case was very messy & required a bit of work on my part. in the end I extend the Aff's Criticism as it is not properly addressed by the Neg. because of this the Aff's case weighed through stronger & I vote Aff. Had the Neg defended his own Crit better or had deeper arguments against the Aff's v/c I would not have to drag the Aff v/c across.

Aff
- good job linking your cont to your v/c pair
- you dropped your cont. 2!
you didn't pull it through!

Neg
- you don't need evidence for everything but you need analysis & something to analyze. you did not offer much of either in response to his claims

Both: Warrant your extensions! tell me why I care

