PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 302
Gov: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Opp: 2 Rubsamen - Partsuf
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: 14 Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 McDowell	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Partsuf	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Shimizu	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Rubsamen	pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: - Great delivery but no real statistics. Great rebuttal - to the point

Prop 2: Fantastic delivery Very Good standing on your feet. Gay Marriage argument clinched it

Opp 1: Great delivery - spoke right to me and convincingly. Not sure your contention of "if You're dead, you can't persue liberty & happiness" really holds - that could be an argument for any topic

Opp 2: #2 - Good refutation! A little rushed and repetitive

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Their argument that the definition provided by the Prop was NOT correct was sound and they offered more salient, proven points

PARLI Debate

Whitmore, Robin (*14)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 302
Gov: 5 Siu - Moore
Opp: 16 Aguilera - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Robin Whitmore

Judge's School Affiliation: #14 Lab

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	5	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Siu pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Zhou pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Moore pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Aguilera pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Good thinking on your feet, but I felt the final rebuttal was confusing and may have actualy proved the other side

Prop 2:
Very clear on points being made & rebutted. Good try on using "idea", but not the strongest argument

Opp 1:
Excellent examples and facts. Be careful of using "like". Final rebuttal was confusing

Opp 2:
Great opposition of the other team's examples! Be careful of being repetitive.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
The Prop argument that they were only arguing the "idea" of vigilantism doesn't hold, in that no idea can be judged correctly until put into action, as the OPP team said, and they had a # of examples showing how the action/execution was bad & these were not refuted by the Prop themselves.

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 309
Gov: 4 Cunningham - Yau-Weeks
Opp: 27 Chu - Fraga
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Cunningham pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Fraga pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Yau-Weeks pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Chu pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Great Presentation, with flow of pts, connection, examples & delivery

Prop 2:
I found the participat to be rude at times, please be more courteous to your opponents. Your argument was valid but behavior ~~was~~ be more courtia

Opp 1: both team mates chosed the definition of topic ~~from~~ the broader sense. Please try to be more generic & broad. That's how resolution are made. You made a good pts & argumts to defend your definition but ~~Prop~~ your opponent were good.

Opp 2:
Good pints but not strog enough to defend your view of topic definition.

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Zaheer, Affan (*8)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 309
Gov: 16 Kapoor - Berger
Opp: 5 Jia - Jiang
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Affan Zaheer

Judge's School Affiliation: Dublin High.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	5
Prop Speaker #1	Kapoor pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Jiang pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Berger pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Jia pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
The topic definition was not used in broader sense & compelling pt were not strong enough to justify the specific definition.

Prop 2:
Speaking a little slow will help to be more impacting. It was a good & very close fight.

Opp 1: Good arguments to defend the definition (broader sense) of the Resolution. Great pts, good delivery & arguments.

Opp 2: Great Examples & control on the debate. Good work.

TEAM CODE #: 5 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 301
Gov: 14 Sutton - Moon
Opp: 7 Alvarez - Baluja
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: STACY CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Moon	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Alvarez	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Sutton	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Baluja	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ Passionate delivery
- Think about balancing pace and desire to move through

Prop 2: POINTS
+ Clear roadmap
+ Passionate delivery
- Be mindful of the volume of your conversations with partner while opposing team is speaking

Opp 1: + Articulate
+ Passionate delivery
- But a bit rushed
- Be mindful of time limit

Opp 2: - Nice pace
- Think about more eye contact

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The Opps analysis of the topic was clear & persuasive.

PARLI Debate

Clark, Stacy/Wallis (*26)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 301
Gov: 17 Sweeney - Hsieh
Opp: 11 Deshpande - Lingampalli
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Stacy CLARK

Judge's School Affiliation: Harvard Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	17	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Sweeney pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Deshpande pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Hsieh pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Lingampalli pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: + organized delivery
+ pace
+ enunciation

Prop 2: + Articulate
+ Organized delivery

Opp 1: + Persuasive examples
+ Good pace - easy to follow
+ Clear numbering

Opp 2: + courteous & clear
+ Clear Evidence & Analysis
— be mindful of time —

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The opp's analysis of the topic was clear & persuasive.

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 303
Gov: 27 Inman - Young
Opp: 2 Booth - Pracar
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Inman	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Booth	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Young	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Pracar.	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Inman: Very good! Delivery projected well. I really liked your speaking style.
• Good contentions, the most relevant to the topic was suicide.
• Some examples/stats for the other (2) contentions would be helpful.

Prop 2: Young: Very good. Varsity + it shows. The analysis throughout was more focused on helping to not hurt others rather than themselves. Very good arguments but in this case less helpful due to the tone

Opp 1: Booth: Focused Speaker, very good! Organized contentions and listing of the stats examples really helped your case.
Portugal drug policy

Opp 2: Pracar: Very Good 2nd speaker. I liked the way your case was brought to forefront by your speech. Examples were helpful. Could have had a date from your stats (clear cite)

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close debate. The reason OPP wins is because Aff's case was more based on general protection being justified rather than individual. I had to read pretty much every sentence to decide. In Aff's case, I wish their other contentions had more examples + stats for individ

Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified.

AFF

Inman

Justified: Protect themselves.

Value of Life
- Keeping them alive

(A) Distracted driving
Stat: 3,000/yr. texted DUI:

(B) SUICIDE:-
Keep them alive.

(C) DRUGS:- wasting $$$
STD, STI's.

Give statistical evidence
Analysis is needed

Laws are working.
Drugs are NOT legal.

---

(1) Laws are set in place.
Don't lose their life.
- Life
- Quality of life.

Laws work:- Throughout time. Prevention during suicide. Get help.

Young.

(1) It works!
Rehab:- Drugs / Drug war
Hunting them / delivering them
Suicide → completely preventable.
mental illness-reasons.

NOT taking away their liberty.
Funding other things.

(1) Suicide - Justified.
Law does not work.

NEG.

BOOTH

Basic Human Liberty
Value: Life / Quality of Life

(A) Benefits from it to work
- Drug → doesn't work

DEA:- ↑ drugs use.
Portugal:-
Suicide Prevention
Stanford professor → Statistics

(B) Basic human freedom.
Taking away liberty.

Protect people from themselves not other people.
STI + STD → Stop criminalization

---

(1) Voting issue
Impact:- Criminalization
(2) Rights are stripped.

Cartels have seized to exist formulating of peoples rights. real evidence.

(3) Drug use cut in 1/2 after legalizing drug.

Prevar

(1) Washington post. Stat
more for meth, not in poor country.

(2) Legalize drugs. factual evidence
Portugal → diff than US. but it still works.
Dr Sue Kim.

(3) Small amount of marijuana not causing
- Takes away rights leading to dictatorship

(1) Distracted drug is non-topical.
= No response in AFF's speech.

Dr John Walters
Factual evidence not provided - Get therapy

PARLI Debate

Sawhney, Sakina (*7)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 303
Gov: 14 Katz - Huynh
Opp: 6 Morehead - Andrews
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sakina Sawhney

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS.

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	6	
Prop Speaker #1	Katz	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Morehead	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Huynh	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Andrews	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Katz - Very Good speaker
- Example was good, but more in the realm of a good scenario although this was not the word used by opp. They did object to it.
Opp's objection of [redacted] the vigil.

Prop 2: punishing the wrong people not addressed.
↳ Good speaker, though not enough impact with the examples given the main contention of harming the wrong people not addressed.

Opp 1: Morehead - Good speech, and delivery. Tire slasher example was a bit of a bad choice, although I do see that this person was "punished" for the texters. It does come across as vandalism.
Main contention of punishing the wrong people was your strength in argument.

Opp 2: Good speaker, delivery was good, although can bring more to the content by giving stats and refute points in an organized way. Overall the risk of harming the wrong had no oversight was the strength.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Very close debate. Hard decision. Had to go back to the definition over and over again! Opp won since Aff was not able to refute the points made by Opp about no recourse to law/justice and that the wrong people cannot be prevented from being punished.

When govts fail to enforce the law vigilantism is justified.

Katz

① Failed to enforce the law
② Taking upon themselves to enforce the law.
① Insuff resources
② Greater good outweighs
③ resources.

① Insuff resources:-
② Drug cartels: growing massive problem. Huge issue, deaths hard to control. Still spreading drugs ④ Solution: Vigilantism
Specific groups ⇒ not beneficial
Nigeria - Boko Haram
Baga → Vigilantism caused to slow down to no

② Motivating Greater good.
• Stop crime / govt did not have time to react.

③ Govt. delay - example of drugging.
action is justified after the person delaying the arrest is in custody.

Vig → enforces the law.
How do they uphold the law?? Slashing tires → not a good example.
Vig → better society.

① Defn + websters
A person who enforces the law w/o govt authority

① Risk of vigilantes is too high and they punish the wrong people
they are not tries
Slashing ~~tires~~ are not vigilante → it's vandalism

By passes jury → they arrest them enforce the law.
As per Aff Vigilante is just like the police they wait for the police to take them to trial.

Resource:- extra help is needed from vigilante group.
Self defense/Vigilantism both overlapping.
Motivation for the greater good.
Thomas Jefferson: "Morality not good and acted in his own self interest nature.
Time to react:- bag snatcher. Risk not weighed benefit:-
vigilante provide good.

Max Moreland.

② Value round

Ⓐ Risk of Vigilantism
① Punish the wrong people.
② No recourse.
example 2006 looting and drug.

Farmers

Impact - more people are hurt by Vigilantism

Ⓑ By passes jury trials people don't get fair trials. Basis of fair trials.
How can we say they are upholding the law. Mistaken Vigilantism.

Anecdote ⇒ used by Aff was contested. to qualify.
insuff resources ⇒ how can we be sure vigilante will enforce the law.
will they really uphold the law??
Greater good! ⇒ no guarantee that the greater good is better of vigilante.
No oversight by others, Govt has oversight.

Andrews

Enforcement for greater good

5th amendment - Violated

Police do not impose punishment.
• Vigilante would punish wrong people.
Resources:-

Greater good:- Terrorist decrease.
• Vigilante are not nice
Vote in Negative??

Risks are many not been attached
① Cannot know - acting according to law.
② Vigilante → impose punishment by slashing tires.
③ Farmers - to more people.
④ Oversight i govt vig'l. not oversight
Who establishes greater good??? →
need examples.
Hamas.
How do we know they are enforcing the law in a fair way?
Risk are involved w vigilante
Potential for abuse.

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 229
Gov: 11 Yoo - Liu
Opp: 14 Cohen-Simayof Drake
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wendy S Young

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor #27

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Yoo	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Cohen-Simayof	pts 27.5
Prop Speaker #2 Liu	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Drake	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
~~**26-25** = Fair~~ ~~**24-20** = Poor~~ **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good Speaker - Strong Start + end to debate

Prop 2: Strong supporting arguments - was good at putting holes in other sides case.

Opp 1: Cohen was a very good speaker, however she repeats herself often - But very good debater!

Opp 2: Drake - Good job supporting your partners case. Thank you for redefining case and debate. It was helpful

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Judge votes in favor of aff for their definitions + value of utilitarianism - I did not ever quite understand how I was to vote for citizens v. happiness w/ excluders quality to be. Also some v. Majority of laws, "burden" was not met. Bet Aff

did show, that the majority of laws were for the safety of its people.

The immagration argument by the neg was not relavent to the topic but good try.

PARLI Debate

Young, Wendy (*27)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 229
Gov: 4 Basrai - McKenna
Opp: 16 Fogarty - Pister
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wendy Young
Judge's School Affiliation: ~~Windsor~~ #27

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Basrai pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Pister pts 28.5
Prop Speaker #2	McKenna pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Fogarty pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify ~~for elimination~~ rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: ~~Prop~~ Basrai - ~~*~~all of the debaters were strong good speakers!

Prop 2: Basrai + McKenna - Basrai was a fast speaker but was necessary as first speaker to begin case. McKenna - Pleasant, clear speaker,

Opp 1: Pister - I liked your conversational style. You have great control + were very clear in your arguments - your flow was clear and easy to follow

Opp 2: Fogarty - Same as your ~~opponent~~ partner. Good Parering w/ there two.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Judge was directed to vote based on evidence, facts + logic. With this in mind I vote for Neg. While you defined Vigalantism as a person or group enforcing the law when govt fails to do so, your evidence of →

Harriet Tuman Saving slaves because she was enforcing the laws of the north in the South defeated your own definition. Negs argument that People would enforce laws the govt is not enforcing was supported by your own citations (attempt to). Negs statements of Vigalante beliefs not necessary representing the views of the majority rang true and that it is the laws Created by the majority which are enacted for the People to adhere to.

Really a great debate - if I Could have Chosen a tie as an option, there would have been an argument for such a Verdict.

LAWS WHICH PROTECT CITIZENS FROM THEMSELVES ARE JUSTIFIED

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 529
Gov: 2 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 27 Nevin - Hatcher
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	HOLT pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	NEVIN pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	MIZIN pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	HATCHER pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior ☆

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good clear argument with elaboration of contentions. Good articulation of voter issues in 3rd speech.

Prop 2: [redacted]. Good job rebutting jaywalking contention. Good reinforcement of your own case. Neg's "asylum" point was dropped

Opp 1: Good job with definitions and value criterion. Good rebuttals of Aff case. Spend more time on fleshing out your own case.

Opp 2: Good rebuttals to Aff 1C-3C. Neg 1C wasn't introduced until this speech. Good elaboration of Neg 1C-3C

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

This debate was disastrous in terms of courtesy. It started on the neg side, then trickled over into the aff side. Ignoring the petty squabbling at the end, AFF proved their burden. Neg spent too much time on definitions and not enough time on their own case.

WHEN GOVT FAILS TO ENFORCE THE LAW, VIGILANTISM IS JUSTIFIED

PARLI Debate

Cabasino, Mark (*13)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 529
Gov: 3 Wolf-Jacobs - Nagarajan
Opp: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MCC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP
Team Code #: 3

OPP
Team Code #: 27

Prop Speaker #1 WOLF-JACOBS pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 NAGARAJAN pts 29

Opp Speaker #1 DONDERO pts 29
Opp Speaker #2 ROSENTHAL pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good intro, good contentions, good speaking style, and good explanation of contentions. Good wrap-up in 3rd speech.

Prop 2: Interesting discussion of what does/does not constitute vigilantism. Good point about hypothetical scenario (murderer/5 years) and good follow-up stat on rape rates.

Opp 1: Good articulation of overarching question of the debate — is it justified or not? Good point about vigilante who murders is just as bad as murderer. Good choices for voter issues at the end.

Opp 2: Good articulate delivery. Interesting observations about vigilantes — is it their own laws or the govt's laws? Good example of the KKK as an example of a group that was not justified.

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** OPP **(Prop or Opp) wins this debate.**

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides were terrific in terms of delivery, clarity, and courtesy. Both sides did a good job of rebutting down the flow chart. While I accept AFF's definition, NEG's definition cannot be ignored. Neg also had a few more examples. Both sides needed more concrete specifics to support.

Res: Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified.

PARLI Debate

Banisadr, Allison (*16)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 428
Gov: 11 Kurada - Datta
Opp: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Banisadr

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Datta	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Wilcox	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Kurada	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Sutton	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Wow - great debaters & debate on both sides. All great speakers!

Prop 1:
⊕ Good social contract info
⊕ Nice passion when speaking.

Opp 1:
⊕ good re-defining social contract info. to your team's advantage.

Prop 2:
⊕ Good re-iteration
⊕ Good run-down of points w/ rebuttals.

Opp 2:
⊕ nice case that gov't overreach harms society by decreasing participation & causing longstanding resentment.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Overall, Prop didn't show how Neg's contention that laws re self-damage harm society overall. Neg said they aren't justified b/c ~~they~~ People don't harm society when inflicting self-damage, and Prop just used generalizations in defending this. Prop could've shown seat-belt laws, suicides affect society, not just individs.

When ~~govt's~~ govts fail to enforce the law, vigilantism is justified.

PARLI Debate

Banisadr, Allison (*16)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 428
Gov: 2 Stamm-Kirk - Brogan
Opp: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Banisadr

Judge's School Affiliation: 16

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Brogan	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Amato	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Stamm-Kirk	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Ringstrom	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
⊕ good at laying out your case, defs, & weighing mechanism
⊖ felt you got lucky they didn't challenge your definitions

Prop 2:
⊕ very good, organized, thorough refutations

Opp 1:
⊕ good in stressing magnitude of lives lost in vigilantism
⊖ could've addressed their defs & weighing mechanism more effectively

Opp 2:
⊕ lots of facts & examples
⊖ logic wasn't easy for me to follow

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Prop was stronger in laying out their case & defining the debate.

PARLI Debate

~~Galvan, Ernest (*2)~~
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 307
Gov: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Opp: 11 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Lustig pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Ganguli pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Geren pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Sanghvi pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ Clear & narrow definition
+ Good logical arguments
+ Excellent final rebuttal

Opp 1:
+ Good effort trying to broaden the topic
- shouldn't have dropped a contention
+ good attempt to try debate on own definition

Prop 2:
+ very passionate delivery
+ good defense of topicality
+ good argumentation

Opp 2:
+ good delivery & passion
+ many good arguments based on own definition
+ good argumentation

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both team did a good job arguing their case. The topicality issue become a central point in the debate. Overall, Prop has more and better arguments and OPP has less effective counter-arguments.

Laws which protect citizens from themselves are justified

AFF

(1) Def: mandate vaccination
value / evidence

a) Govt to protect people
- contract w/people to protect them.
- from others & from selves
- disease,

b) harm self also harm others
- immuno-deficient people harmed.
- death cause others to suffer

Life is most important
- Govt 1st job is to protect people's lives.

(2) Topicality:
vaccination is a fantastic example, not abasion, grounds the debate

a) Govt to protect people
b) NEG drop this contention
c) justified Govt action.

Counter-argument
a) Big Brother
b) increases Govt power
c) 5th Amendment wrongly used.
(passionate speech)

Reb Topicality: entirely predictable real issue, tangible things, clash, opponent can't grasp

NEG

(1) Topicality: AFF def. unfair interpretation. from themselves too narrow

Alternate: value, benefits society -

a) Autonomy: intrinsic right, Govt over-reach unfair, undermine democracy
- big brother mentality individual rights.

b) hurts justice system 5th Amendment

(2) Topicality: vaccination too narrow broader def.

P.I. did not bring up alternative def in 1st.
- We did not sign a social contract, our ancestors did.

a) "unalienable" rights
- over-reach of Govt power

b) can't generalize all laws.

c) Self-incrimination not by most people.

Reb
a) Topicality: skew, too narrow
b) logical fallacy
92% vaccination
c) We are best judge of our choices
one-law lead to another
⇒ no end.

PARLI Debate

~~Galvan, Ernest (*2)~~
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 307
Gov: 3 Cramer - Griffin
Opp: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Chien Fang

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Cramer pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Escarcega pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Griffin pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Skarr pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ Very clear & concise def.
+ Very good delivery
+ good example of govt failure
- vigilanti is benevolent

Prop 2: less convincing
+ good organization
+ good rebuttal

Opp 1:
+ very good definition & framework
+ Excellent argumentation
+ good evidence
+ final rebuttal is great

Opp 2:
+ Excellent delivery
+ Excellent argumentation
+ great contentions.

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent debate from both teams. In the end Opp ~~was~~ argued from many angles and with many examples that win the debate.

When govt failed to enforce to law vigilantism is justified

AFF

(1) Value / Net benefits.
- a) authority needed for safety
- b) power vaccum to be avoided.
- c) Vig = benevolent

Example of 911 w/no response
vigilantism vs. anarchy
no Vig ⇒ anarchy
temp. antidote for govt failure
Somali example: pirates
Vigilanti ≅ good people.

(2) ~~Rebuttal~~
- a) Def: Vigilanti = following laws enforcing same laws.
- b) premise is ~~Police~~ Govt has failed
  Vig ⇒ do good, follow the law
  Pirates ≠ vigilanti
- c) def. of Vigilanti = benevolent

Rebut
Ferguson riot caused by Police
Neg has not proven vig & violence are correlated.
Vig provide relief when govt failed.

[Reb] Big Picture:
what do we want when govt failed. Benevolent enforcement.
Somalia govt totally faild.
Vig is needed.

NEG

(1) value/justice ← concept of justice ← not debated
Aff did not def failure.
subjective in the eye of vig.
Govt has objective std.
Vig. is subjective ⇒ chaos.
Police is more stable, vig is subjective.
- Pirates of Somali = vig.
- Vig can be bad

Govt ⇒ stability, based on Constitution
Vig ⇒ Govt's inability to enforce law
Example of mob violence
- Social Justice.
  Demo ⇒ law change.

(2)
Def: vigilanti
Very subjective
1) kill offender, fine him, arbitrary.
It is illegal to be a vigilanti in U.S.
Somali govt doesn't exict
Power vaccum.
There are democratic process to rectify govt failure
- Vig ≠ benevolent

Vig has no checked.
Vig can make mistake & there is no checks.

[Reb] Authority:
Aff: multiple authority
Neg: 1 auth (fed govt)
~~Neg~~ Vig can't always be benevolent

Laws that protect citizens from themselves are justified

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 306
Gov: 4 Murphy - DeWitt
Opp: 26 Saxena - Duncan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: DIABLO VISTA/SAN RAMON ACADEMY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	26
Prop Speaker #1	MURPHY pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	DUNCAN pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	DEWITT pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	SAXENA pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: MURPHY

- Too much use of the word "right"
- Analysis: violence against others considered as part of topic
+ Good example of driving laws

Prop 2: DEWITT

-: too much filler words uhmm...
-: Argumentation - definition of
+: Looking at opp themselves not convincing

Opp 1: DUNCAN

+: framework defined
-: too fast
-: Frustration shows some times
+: analysis
-: too much focus on mental health
+: good point on Dr assisted suicide
+: good arguments & dynamic presentation

Opp 2: Saxena

+: good POI
-: too many hand movements
+: argumentation
+: systematic
-: no time for POI

TEAM CODE #: 26 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better analysis
- Better delivery
- Topic framing was right

PARLI Debate

Keshav, Sineesh (*23)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 306
Gov: 13 Cummings - Ellsworth
Opp: 11 Munshani - Baveja
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SINEESH KESHAV

Judge's School Affiliation: ~~DIABLO VISTA~~ SAN RAMON ACADEMY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Ellsworth pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Baveja. pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Cummings pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Munshani pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Ellsworth:
+: great rebuttal
+: Very strong opening
+: structured arguments
--: too much time on one point
+: good POIs

Prop 2: Cummings
-: argumentation: didn't address
-: delivery: hesitation 2pt about half sentences
+: good eye contact
+: good definition of law
+: American revolution example

Opp 1: Baveja. +: framing
+: evidence (philadelphia example)
+: great presentation of idea with examples
-: moving back & forth
+: called out aff gave no examples

Opp 2: Munshani
+: good argumentation
+: examples
-: hurried delivery
-: ~~some~~ repetition of points (examples)

Someone beaten to death incorrectly

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

> Better evidence
> Better delivery

PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 308
Gov: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Opp: 4 Walsh - Moser
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Galli	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Walsh	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Girimonte	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Moser	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

Little more logical reasoning helps ... what's the diff- Smoking vs terminal illness.

Prop 2:

Opp 1:

Helps to bring more contentious arg. It just appeared the topic is on "terminal illness".

Opp 2:

It helps to reduce repetition.

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Based on more sustainable contentions.

Laws which protect citizens from themselves are also Referred:

* Social Justice:
Social Contract.

1.
2. protect & Support.
3. Marijuana - Recreational.
3. Stable Centre.
↳ Second hand Smoke

1. State / nature of board.
- Prospectus

1. Terminal ... long Continue no Suffer.
Experience.

PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 308
Gov: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Opp: 4 McAvoy - Hester
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Malfavon pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	McAvoy pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Hulett pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Hester pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

EACH ONE OF YOU DID A AWESOME JOB!!

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

A very close call. Opp banked on law enforcement and prop rightly called it out.

When government fail to enforce the law, vigilantism is justified.

1. Vindication Justice.
2. Distributed Justice
   Chance for better
3. Social Contract.

More harm or

1. Training
   - Physical
   - mental.
   - Non appropriate Actions
2. Hate Crime
3. Reduces Accountability.

1. No govern

PARLI Debate

Jia, Jack (*5)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 526
Gov: 14 White - Hall
Opp: 16 Stephen - Miskelley
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jack Jia

Judge's School Affiliation: Campo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	~~White~~ Hall pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Stephen pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	~~Hall~~ White pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Miskelley pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Focus more on the "good laws" extreme good power

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: good analysis is social effect, cost, are good points of info. legalize suicide is a good talking point

Prop 2: 95% → convincing evidence
Good for argue right on (30) freedom. society: "Hurt himself also hurt others" → strong point

Opp 1: Free will is a strong point. "Law" can't prevent suicide. Backlash of good intension Probation is a strong evidence Government role → very good. or no anarchy.

Opp 2: Research on suicide data ✓ risk is ok ← good CDC data. Is the government more qualified than person people is behind government → good question! What how should be qualified?

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

Good for lots of points!

REASON FOR DECISION:

Give up freedom will preserve more freedom. | Gov. scope.

Opp has a little more evidence and goes a bit deeper in analyses.

PARLI Debate

Jia, Jack (*5)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 526
Gov: 27 Ernst - Davis
Opp: 3 Curl - Aghadjian-Newbrough
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jack Jia

Judge's School Affiliation: Campo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Ernst	pts 30	Opp Speaker #1 Curl	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Davis	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Aghadjian	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Ive land good evidence. American west ↗
⇒ Add more analyses
Mordern examples are good too
Good analyze in closing speech → word by word analyses is very good.

Prop 2:
KKK, ISIS not enforing law
→ good points.
Good for going deeper on what is vigilantism.

Opp 1: Justice is subjective → good points.
No superman. KKK → vigilantism
Very strong example. ISIS relevant and effective. Martin example is not strong (he might be self defense)

Opp 2:
Visi... causes lives.
Good argument!
Why law is better than visi...

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** prop **wins this debate.** if both are subjective.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Really close debate, but the prop team's closing speech is relevant and effective, and I was convinced of their arguments against the prop's examples. So win. Opp team is a little lack of organizing

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 527
Gov: 7 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Opp: 14 Yee - Morrell
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Susie Choy

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	7	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Nandakumar pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Yee pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Mattegunta pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Morrell pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
good presence & delivery

Opp 1:
great analysis!

Prop 2:
good job supporting partner.

Opp 2:
great job addressing Prop's contentions.

Try not to talk so loudly when opp is speaking

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Although OPP's points were not that strong, they did an excellent job addressing prop's points & refuting their case.

PARLI Debate

Choy, Suzie (*4)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 527
Gov: 11 Meswani - Harith
Opp: 16 Banisadr - Weiner
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Susie Choy

Judge's School Affiliation: BOD

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	16
Prop Speaker #1	Harith pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Banisadr pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Meswani pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Weiner pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

Great delivery & wrap up.

Prop 2:

Focused too much on definitions rather than addressing Opp's points.

Opp 1:

Fantastic concluding argument! 1st speaking section you seemed too mad. Waving off POI w/ your hand rather than speaking should be avoided!

Opp 2:

Great points.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP did a better job of making case & addressing points of Prop. Prop failed to refute some of Opp's pts like KKK/1875.

Jacobs

PARLI Debate

~~Maxson, Tricia (*1)~~
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 528
Gov: 22 Mubarack - Troup
Opp: 4 Figueroa - Choy
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	22	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Mubarak pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Choy pts 27.5
Prop Speaker #2	Troup pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Figueroa pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Really weird flow: how do u track reasons ~~Reading of contention should be an argument~~ It was Good, clear speaking style

Really? "Justified" is a fact topic, not value?

PMR Good observation, but sum up ur args, e.g. "Some laws protecting ppl from themselves are justified b/c we can identify some types of actions that are inherently harmful to self and others"

Prop 2: Ur overview talks about Opp examples but doesn't name them - maybe be more explicit?

Rhetoric on freedom, but no analysis. I think ur key pt is that collateral harm to innocents & their freedom. I really want to see more on the freedom vs. survival tradeoff: it's at the heart of this debate.

Better in rebuttal

TOO FAST, ESPECIALLY WITHOUT CLEARER ENUNCIATION

Opp 1: Some words get slurred together. "USFG" was almost unintelligible. Just say "the US" or "the federal govt."

Survival vs freedom is a great arg. How about using it against Prop's explicit std (utility) and implicit std (avoiding physical harm)? Tell me I shouldn't use those standards, esp. if u dispute that laws actually work, say that. the latter. Might not want to spend so much time on semantics.

Opp 2: POI: Prop point is not about whose "fault" it is, but about what laws are covered by the resolution.

Dictatorship arg seems weak given Prop def of res as US.

Suicide = "tortured over and over again" - clumsy rhetoric. Be more real: people have painful medical conditions, huge financial burden on family, losing their cognitive function, etc.

You need to listen to the POI, and take it seriously. Taking it and saying "Yeah, sure" is worse than not taking it at all.

TEAM CODE #: 22 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Freedom of choice is good, but it would be good to hear more about why it's important in LOR (humanity). And Prop undercuts it with ~~taking~~ collateral harm to third parties who have no choice. Opp accepts Prop std of ~~team~~ utility/harm avoidance, giving themselves an uphill battle. Stronger moral framework would have helped.

Jacobs

~~Maxson, Tricia (*1)~~
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 528
Gov: 16 Ginsburg - Zhou
Opp: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jacobs

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Zhou pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Chin pts 27.5
Prop Speaker #2	Ginsberg pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Rosenfeld pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: Not a fan of "down the flow" rebuttals

"Justified" sounds like value, not fact

Prop 1: Nice intro. (Thx for the translation...) Were vigilantes in occupied France enforcing the law or fighting a war?

PMR: "implied in res" that Vs are enforcing laws is weak & confusing. Better! Opp accepted Gov def of V, which said Vs enf law, and (2) even if random acts by Vs is technically w/res, Opp doesn't explain why it's a real problem.

Prop 2: The real reason bribery ineffective is that Vs are decentralized, isn't it?

Best HS parli speech I have ever seen! Exceptional analysis, explanation, level of detail, delivery

You need to explain why a V would kill a Tibetan or homosexual who is innocent, not just that it fits w/ the resolution.

Opp 1: If ur "starting w/my opponent's case," then tell me where V are on case. If ur starting w/an overview/observation, say so. Good call moving ur analysis re trust in govt, instead of saying "I'll talk about it forever."

Opp observation (res doesn't say "Vs enforcing law") was right, but u need to do more with it - show me what the alternative look like

Opp 2: Case turns on dueling descriptive claims: whether Vs do good things or bad. Prop has lots of detailed examples. V can't counter that with assertions but no examples or evidence. "French govt was dissolved" is irrelevant - it still failed to enforce. Why is homophobia "more frightening" than racism? They both seem bad.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**

(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp misses forest for trees. Vigilantes do lots of terrible things (retaliate against wrong person, overreact, impose collective punishment against families, kill innocents to express rage), but Opp doesn't talk about any of them. The closest it gets is "Vs cd be bribed" (why is non-action by Vs worse than SQ?) and vague hypothetical ("could harm racial minorities or gays" - with no examples, analysis, or evidence). Prop had tons of concrete examples, solid analysis.

PARLI Debate

Byrne, William (*20)
Round 3A 1:30pm Room 230
Gov: 14 Yan - Yan
Opp: 13 Sinha - Herman
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: William Byrne

Judge's School Affiliation: Pende Valley

PROP			OPP		
Team Code #:	14		Team Code #:	13	
Prop Speaker #1	Yan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Herman	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Yan	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Sinha	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: You are a very strong speaker with excellent knowledge which is well-suited for this kind of debate. I do believe that the team could benefit from more group preparation.

Prop 2: Although you have good knowledge, I think that you need to work on your speaking skills as the long pauses hurt your case.

Opp 1: You are excellent speakers with a clear cadence and quality vocabulary. As a team, the two of you compliment each other well and I see you both going very far this season as a team. I don't have much else to say as I have no critiques for you at this time.

Opp 2: Applies to both speakers.

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The deciding factor here was not only the Opp's abuse case, which I accepted for the victory, but their rebuttal that would have come extremely close with the Prop in the event that the abuse case was unsuccessful.

Byrne, William (*20)
Round 3B 1:30pm Room 230
Gov: 7 Yu - Makineni
Opp: 26 Kornfein - Stromberg
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: William Byrne

Judge's School Affiliation: Pinde Valley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: 26	
Prop Speaker #1 Yu	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Kornfein	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Makineni	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Stromberg	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: I wish that I could say more, but you are simply an excellent speaker.

Opp 1: I wish that I could say more, but you are simply an excellent speaker.

Prop 2:

Opp 2: The choice to use speech time for prep was a good one as you were able to get your points out concisely.

A plus to both speakers.

TEAM CODE #: 26 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Although this was an extremely close debate, I felt as though both the fact framework and safety value favored the Opp as the dangers of vigilante justice were well defended on their end. Best debate of the day.