

Novice

Parli

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

26.5 → ~~27.5~~

POS	Sheth & Veeraragavan	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Rahual Sheth	27.5	27.5 4
	Anirudh Veeraragavan	27.0	27.0 3

NEGATIVE

27.5

POS	Yip & Nikkanti	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Czarina Yip	28.5	27.5 1
	Divya Nikkanti	27.3	27.3 2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 7 aff: money, life, interest in mil., Foreign affairs.
- 7 neg: ~~right~~ no provide good supporting detail.
- 7 root of cause of war.
- 7 cost vs. life, not whole army in afg., but small portion.
- 7
- 5
- 5

Neg team show the clear and sufficient evidence to support the arguments about the how their plan protect life and money of America.

Yim Zhang

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Isaacs & Griffin	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liam Isaacs	26.5	27.5 1
	Nathaniel Griffin	25.1	25.1 4

NEGATIVE

POS	Chen & Pai	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sabrina Chen	26.8	3
	Sonal Pai	27.4 26.4	2

25.8

The better debating was done by the AFF from Isaacs & Griffin
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:

- ① relatively the AFF team support the evidence to their 3 points, morally, Financially and prevent terrorism.
- ② Neg team needs more detail and concrete evidence and the link between evidence to their points.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Chee & Wang	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Zachary Chee	20	4
1	Brian Wang	22	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Cunningham & McKenna	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shawn Cunningham	30	1
2	Hailey McKenna	25	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from Shawn Cunningham.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Shivjee Samdarshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF team did not define the resolution. ~~etc~~ This was pointed out by the NEG team.

AFF team's contentions were repeats.

Shawn's ~~was~~ speaking style was direct & clear. He ~~also~~ should avoid repetition while speaking.

Hailey should be louder and project better while speaking.

Both AFF speakers need to speak clearly and should be to the point. Their contentions were ~~presented~~ They should present their contentions more directly.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Liongasari & Wu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Caroline Liongasari	20	3
2	Elizabeth Wu	23	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Le & Liu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Minh Le	25	2
2	Nieman Liu	25	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Le & Liu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Shivjee Sandarshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg team did a good job at clearly stating their contentions and made provided a very clear set of arguments for ~~the Neg~~ continuing with drone strikes.

Neg team did cite some facts that were challenged for their accuracy. For example, they claimed that there were no civilian deaths from drone strikes in 2012.

Neg team did not cite correctly the information used by the Aff team. However, the Aff team did not call this out.

The Neg team's arguments could ~~the~~ have been stated better. They took the position that instead of drones troops should be sent in to assassinate targets. This was not necessary. They were not required to provide an alternative.

The Neg team did not speak very clearly and were halting in their presentation.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Decker & Gernand	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sean Decker	27	4
	Elsa Gernand	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Chawla & Dubey	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ishika Chawla	28	3
1	Neha Dubey	29	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from Chawla / Dubey
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: "

- Good Presentation
- " ~~Rep.~~ Stronger reb. would help.
- ~~More~~ Need more elaboration on the argument

Neg. a strong argument.

- clear & focused
- More elaboration would be better

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

#2: USFG should significantly increase security on its ME embassies.

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Diep & Bhattacharjee	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Anh Diep	28	1
2	Priya Bhattacharjee	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Liu & Wu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Richard Liu	26	4
1	Brendan Wu	28	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Diep, Bhattacharjee
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:



Argument:
 1. + + + +
 2. + +

Presentation
 1. + + + +
 2. + +

Neg teams:

- Great presentation
- More clearly to the points may help.

1. + + + +
 2. + +

1. + + + +
 2. + +

AFF team.

- explicit points.
- strong argument
- More elaboration on the argument would help

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USFG should ~~stop using drone strikes as a method~~ ^{11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012} of assassination.

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Webb & Phan	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	David Webb	28	1
	Grace Phan	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Kanekar & Samdarshi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kunal Kanekar	27	3
	Mihir Samdarshi	27	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from David & Grace P
AFF / NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Krishna

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

D good ^{Aff} pt on economy. GREAT rebuttal on contention (inn. v/s terr.). ~~Be~~ Difficult to control drones - add a fact to it. Great pt on people being involved in killing Osama Laden. Good rebuttals. Good pt on technology being relatively new - back it by facts. Good eye contact & delivery style. Good rebuttal (Laden). Weak pt on surveillance being more effective when + Las Vegas. **G** Defn: Net benefits, ↓ societal welfare. Good pt on innocent v/s terrorist deaths. Accuracy - costly. - good pt. Are you saying drones are not good & helicopters are a better choice ??? Too much repetition of same pt.

NEG:

K Good speaking style. (voice throw, volume, speed). Too much assumption (HD cameras) on risk (Laden) - good expansion on this pt. at later stage.

M contention - opponent didn't say # of terrorists killed - they said innocent v/s terrorist. Please don't use - 'I think', 'I am not sure' - 'Good research/facts. Good rebuttal on co-lateral) - good pt on being human life in a manned aircraft. Good pt on how terrorists kill innocent ppl (ultimately saving more lives). Completely automated what does this mean ??? - this mean

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

USFG should leave No residual forces in Afghanistan when it withdraws
 11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Athreya & Bhike	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Vikshar Athreya	25	4
	Prachit Bhike	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Seideman & Johnson	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ryan Seideman	27	1
	Anna Johnson	27	2

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Seideman & Johnson
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

(V) - defn. - good points with more flow. Speak louder. Could barely hear you. Good expression. Expand on how Afghans can do it themselves (good pt.), good pt on Malala. Good pts on net benefit - assumptions made by locals (nice choice of words)

(P) - good pt. on not being able to guide Afghan gov. all the time. Expand more on counter arguments. Good pt. on subjective decisions made by US forces. Great rebuttal on "US Pres." pt.

Benefits (good pts)

(R) - good pt. abt bringing up plan. improve their gov - trust is the Afghan perspective? Good 3 contentions (protection anti-terrorism for US officials) A US President Never goes w/o protection (so this wnt a valid pt.) good pt on stopping resurgence of Al Queda.

(A) ~~that points are~~ good pt on saving money (war). But pl do not think on behalf of Afghan ppl (weak pt.). Good rebuttal, (especially on pt. abt 'helping that much'). How do you define More (Bengali): Foreign rel. (good pt)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Dewitt & Post	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kendall Post	30	1
1	Bryce Dewitt	29	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Ashktorab & Cuevas	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Kimia Ashktorab	29	4
1	Melissa Cuevas	30	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Kendall and Bryce
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:

Affirmative * voted based on more net benefits

- arguments
 - C1: stop senseless killing in regime
 - C2: BOOST regime economy
- refutations
 - C1: training ppl to kill tactfully.
 - informing citizens
 - resources: info & training
 - C2: didnt attack their peaceful negotiation way but mentioned "U.S. tried peaceful negotiation"

Negative * next time place a weigh mech based on lives being saved (lost)

- arguments
 - C1: more blood shed with military
 - C2: alternative [peace]
- refutations
 - C1: training leads to killing - LINK?
 - C2: didnt attack the boosting of economy much
 - oil
 - trade 7 points

Kendall: great speaker! very clear
 Bryce: strong, -try to avoid "uhms"

Kimia: talk a little louder, more eye contact
 Melissa: confident, loud good!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Abushama & Gowda	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Basil Abushama	30	1
1	Nihal Gowda	27	A

NEGATIVE

POS	Akeley & Xiao	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	David Akeley	28	2
2	Kelly Xiao	28	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from BASIL and NIHAL
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Amanda King

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Affirmative announced the evaluation and stuck by it and supported it throughout the round. evaluation based on NET BENEFITS!
- Affirmation had 4 main arguments provided evidence to support contentions
 - First ARG: costs lot of \$ to keep troops
 - 2nd ARG: American lives are at stake
 - 3rd ARG: Afgh is at unrest
 - 4th ARG: no nation building happening in America
- Negative did refute some Aff points but could not provide enough evidence to support their own.
- negation had 3 main arguments
 - First ARG: Taliban in Afgh will retaliate against America
 - 2nd ARG: Afgh along with middle East will attack America
 - 3rd ARG: America will keep Afgh in check
 - ~~4th ARG~~
- aff refutations were a bit clearer and had evidence to back their points up
- neg needed to expand their points more for clarity

Evaluation: aff provided more net benefits speaking evaluation: BASIL: good loud voice! NIHAL: try to talk with more fluidity David: great fluctuation in voice Kelly: Talk much much LOUDER!