

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Stockdale Alphonso & Vemuri	POINTS (50 - 99)
	Samantha Alphonso	87
	Neha Vemuri	70

OPP

Spkr	San Marin Ayyar & Turner	POINTS (50 - 99)
	Rohan Ayyar	93
	James Turner	80

Winner: San Marin Ayyar & Turner debating on the OPP Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? no

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Gov built strong case for safety in whether Anonymous speech is more harmful than good, but opp adequately considered potential harms and rights violations in banning it. Gov did not specify platforms and opp brought up differences in social media policies.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range. Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-4-5 minutes. Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Menlo-Atherton Klein & Desaram	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Steven Klein	83
2	Alex Desaram	82

OPP

Spkr	Stockdale Abramson & Burrus	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Chase Abramson	85
1	Phoebe Burrus	83

Winner: Stockdale debating on the opp Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? _____

School/Team

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

1. Both teams have space to improve on better usages of allowed time.

2. Opp side's arguments are better connected and focused, thus more powerful. Also opp side's arguments are better articulated.

3. Great jobs on both sides though. Keep it up!

Thanks.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Club Parli Gao & Xiong	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Benjamin Gao	82
2	Sean Xiong	80

OPP

Spkr	Menlo-Atherton Waller & Koenig	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Anthony Waller	84
1	Peter Koenig	86

Winner: Menlo - Atherton debating on the Opp Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? _____
School/Team

Signature: G Shridhar

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Both Speakers in Gov spoke faster & slurred words & Phrases making it difficult to understand
- Benjamin was literally reading through his points v/s making an argument to the judge was more nervous
- Sean delivery can be much improved. was very nervous too in his opening slot
- Peter and Anthony were repetitive on the points within a speaking time/slot
- Much more facts & argument construction needed from both teams
- preponderance of evidence not for either team. Quality of evidence also similar for both teams.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Irvington Sachar & Yan	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Kritika Sachar	89
1	Grace Yan	88

OPP

Spkr	Stockdale Kasula & Puga	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Abhishek Kasula	85
2	Alex Puga	62

Winner: Sachar & Yan debating on the GOV Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? ☒

Signature: Cash Aungle

Comments & Reason for Decision:

- Opp had 1:30 constructive
- Didn't flow across Gov 2nd contention.
- Opp misinterpreted Fact-based debate as they had only 1 viable example & 1 stat used as rebuttal.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

Room: 234
Start: 9:00 AM
JV Parli

1

Huddleston, Crys-
Stockdale

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Irvington Bagepalli & Chari	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Neha Bagepalli	92 90
1	Prahalad Chari	90 88

OPP

Spkr	Club Parli Wen & Ma	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Andrew Wen	79
1	Michael Ma	79

Winner: Irvington Bagepalli & Chari debating on the GOV Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? NO
School/Team

Signature: 

Comments & Reason for Decision:

submitted online

E

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Irvington Prashar & Dave	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Kanan Prashar	74
2	Hridini Dave	83

OPP

Spkr	Valley Christian Rakasi & Brashears	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Meena Rakasi	88
1	Samuel Brashears	83

Winner: Valley Christian debating on the Opp Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? No

Signature: [Signature]

Comments & Reason for Decision:

On the framework:

The distinction between "fact round" and "value round" is odd; the two aren't mutually exclusive, and neither side used the FW that much to tell me how to evaluate the impacts. The closest ~~the~~ was opp claiming that freedom should be valued above all else, but this is more consequentialist weighing so it would fit just as well in a "fact round."

Aff/GoV Case/Voters:

- scientific papers were dropped/not weighed heavily in final speech
- main ~~the~~ argument by the end: anonymous speech hinders movements like #metoo and prevents organizations from tangibly helping survivors and oppressed groups
- people trust named speakers more and so they would not be attacked as much if named

Neg/Opp Case/Voters:

- without anonymous speech, those who need to reach out could not do so at all
- gives freedom + control, and protects victims
- even named victims are torn down (identity attacks online, China, Anita Hill)

I found the Opp to be more directly responsive to Gov's main voters, and it also provided a clearer framework to weigh the debate by. I have the full flows with me if anyone would like individual feedback or more detailed analysis of the decision.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.

Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.

Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.

Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Irvington Suresh & Vairavan	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Sumukh Suresh	80
3	Natraj Vairavan	75

OPP

Spkr	Bentley Trezevant & Wilson	POINTS (50 - 99)
4	Tallulah Trezevant	75
2	Madeleine Wilson	80

Winner: Bentley Trezevant & Wilson debating on the OPP Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? _____

Signature: _____

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Content:

Gov primary arguments

1) identity theft

- refuted effectively: anon speech is separate from authenticated speech

2) Anon speech creates more room for hate speech.

- not effectively poorly supported, but not refuted

Opp

1) anon speech creates protected voice.

3 examples

2) sexual discrimination LGBTQ

b) dissidents

c) Allow LEO to be anonymous to combat protect

not refuted effectively. Winslow case was not anonymous.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range. Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.

90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.

80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.

70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.

60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.

50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-8-4-5 minutes.

Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.

No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

Format

+ Points for gov for format and questions

? for bad POI

- points for opp for introducing new concepts in summary

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	Irvington Odaiyappan & Khatavkar	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Vickneshvaran Odaiyappan	87
1	Yash Khatavkar	88

OPP

Spkr	San Marin Miller & Colenbrander	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Ryan Miller	89
2	Evan Colenbrander	89

Winner: Irvington

School/Team

debating on the Gov

Side (Gov or Opp)

Low point win? San Marin

RYAN

Signature: Wheing

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Both sides had great points.
- had proved anonymous online
speech is more harm than good.
- examples - suicide, leads to
death, no acct. for laws
to be enforced.

(Opp)
Ryan was very convincing as
well on the opp team.

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a
speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find
much that could have been done bet-
ter.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for sig-
nificant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in
terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that
contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in con-
structive speeches, but not in the
first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but
new examples, explanation, and
weighing are permitted.

CAL PARLI INVITATIONAL

Oct 6 - 7, 2018

JUDGING RULES

Do not interrupt any speech or give comments before the round is over. * Do not leave the room during the round.
Do not consult with anyone else while making your decision.
Please be sure the competitors in the room match the ones on your ballot and they are speaking on the correct side.
Turn in your ballot to Dwinelle 182.

GOV

Spkr	San Marin Fox & Fink	POINTS (50 - 99)
1	Trevor Fox	87
2	Wesley Fink	89

OPP

Spkr	Menlo-Atherton Hartsell & Galhotra	POINTS (50 - 99)
2	Alana Hartsell	89
1	Emil Galhotra	91

Winner: Menlo-Atherton H debating on the Opp Side (Gov or Opp) Low point win? No

Signature: Niteesh Kuchakulla

Comments & Reason for Decision: Opp provided more substantial instances of harm within the Net Benefits framework and definition of "anonymous online speech".

Point Scale:

Most speakers will be in 70-89 range.
Do not give <60 points unless a speaker was rude/offensive.
90-99 Fantastic speech. Hard to find much that could have been done better.
80-89 Good overall, but areas for significant improvement are easy to find.
70-79 An average speech, both in terms of content and delivery.
60-69 A below average speech that contributes little to the round.
50-59 Rude or unprepared.

Speech Times:

Speech times: 7-8-8-8-4-5 minutes.
Points of information allowed in constructive speeches, but not in the first/last minute.
No new arguments in rebuttals, but new examples, explanation, and weighing are permitted.

- ① AFF claim of abduction of children need to be clarified with the evidence about sexual solicitation from Australia Institute of Criminology. In addition, your argument on cyberbullying was not supported until second speech with the statistic about be 2 to 9 times more likely to commit suicide. The NEG also has work to do in this area because the only concrete statistic provided was about South Korea's RRN system which led to 23 deaths according to Human Rights Watch.
- ② The NEG 3rd contention was what I voted for because it was uncontested and extended in the last Neg speech.
- ③ To the AFF, the Neg claimed email scams have nothing to do with anonymous online speech. You MUST explain why email scams fall under your definition before you explain the impact of this. I bought your argument that discriminatory opinions can create a toxic work environment, which is a firable offense but the AFF made this a non-issue by saying it doesn't fall under a definition of anonymous speech.
- ④ The argument that countries will still track those using anonymous platforms was good but missed the point that people are more likely to die when their identity is known without anonymous platforms.