

Noice

Public Forum

ROUND I

Flight B

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	A contestants are not present James Logan AnPa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Wahab Ahmady	24	4
2	Edgar Partida	27.5	3

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ ChTa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Jacinta Chang	28	1
4	Andrea Tam	27.5	2

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

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

Signed: X. Zhang

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jacinta: nice summary,
 Andrea: could improve on logic- reasons. better put evidence together.
 Edgar: prepare more for cross-fire Qs, like evidence
 wahabe: ~~prepare~~ get familiar with the procedures. (like time for each)
 prep needs more practice and preparation for the topic, ~~see case~~
 I vote for NEG because they provide enough evidence, well prepared, nicely delivered.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	A contestants are not present	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	MSJ LiYu		
	Diana Li	NO SHOW	
	Kasey Yu		

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View MyLi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Cameron Myers		
	Kevin Li	1*	

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

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

Signed: Glenn Kelsey Donita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	A contestants are not present	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Huishen Lu	27	2
1	Shanel Adolfo	26	3


MUlamerovic

NEGATIVE

POS	James Logan NgTa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ann Nguyen	27	1
2	Shivani Talnikar	25	4

The better debating was done by the Aff from LuAd (LuMa)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- ① UAV → fear & Retaliation.
- ② Sanctions not enuf.
- ③ US selling weapons undermining Nat'l security.

Neg

- ① war on terror successful / good stats. UAV → successful attacks down.
- ② Iran Policy success
- ③ Arab Spring → cautious

* The aff team tied the undermining of national security argument well with their speech.

* The Neg team argument that Economic interests were closely tied with Nat'l security was weak.

x Good statistics and Rebuttal during 1st cross ex by Neg #1.

* Aff #2 sounded confused for final focus.

* Neg #2 did not utilize time well and mostly underspoke.

Very good poise and arguments from both teams
Great luck!

Rahman Ammon

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	Contestants are not present	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
<i>2</i>	MSJ Bhu Uma Bhatia	<i>29</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>1</i>	Charshu Hurria	<i>20.5</i>	<i>4</i>

NEGATIVE

POS	Norte Dame BaSe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
<i>2</i>	Snigdha Banda	<i>29</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1</i>	Harveen Sekhon	<i>20.5</i> <i>29</i>	<i>3</i>

The better debating was done by the *Neg* from *Notre Dame*
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:

oral

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
 BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Evergreen Kara	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Inderpal Kaur	28.1	1
2	Niharika Rane	27.9	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Bonita Vista LH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kathleen Lindstrom	26	4
2	Segan Helle	28.0	2

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

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

Signed: Deepak Sabharwal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A
~~Iran - bomb~~
~~Syria~~
 - Libya to Afghanistan
~~Iran - bomb~~
 - Sanctions failed
 - MAD treaty not signed
 - Egypt - supporting Mubarak
 - Syria - Assad in power
 - drone strikes - anti-American sentiment

1N - gaining resources like oil
 - stable relations with middle east - Egypt

Crossfire
 - danger of attack
 - not able to prove

2A
 - Egypt is against Israel
 - Al-Qaeda has grown
 - Iran not signed MAD treaty

2N
 - US is trying to mediate
 - closing bases will not be cross-effective

Crossfire
 - US taking sides with Israel and therefore not able to establish relationships with Egypt etc.
 - US mediating
 - drone strikes

1A
 - prevent attacks

Grand Crossfire
 Evidence that foreign policy is working
 - Israel
 - Gaza

2A
 Gaza - Israel attack

2N
 - suicide attacks have dropped
 - stable alliances - Egypt

I voted for AFF because the con needed better evidence that showed why their arguments were valid.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Evergreen Chko	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Divya Chandrupatla	28	1
	Meghana Kolli	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Olive Foundation MuVe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Mc Awansta Shreyan Muppiddi	28	3
	Teja Veeramacheni	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen
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:

The Affirmative team provided clear clear points supported with lots of evidence. Both members spoke clearly with confidence. The Negative team repeatedly brought up their ABM point, while the Affirmative team refuted with multiple points.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
 BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Milpitas KOSH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Alefa Kothambawala	27.5	3
2	Karen Shyu	27.	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Presentation DhEl	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Shwena Dhar	28.5	1
2	Amy Elzarka	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the Neg from Presentation DhEl
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: A. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF → first → Definition ✓ Main Point - (3 peaks fact) → 26.
 - Militants killing is not significant.

NEG → first → Definition ✓ Main Point - Speaks well with information → 28
 - Intel Report, Bin-laden complaint, several references of decreasing terrorism & support of drone policy.
 - Targeted killing of Nuclear experts.

IRAN Nuc policy has been delayed by US policy. Targeted killing of Nuclear experts.
 Sophisticated computer viruses.

cross file → Computer virus can be used against US → Not successfully defeated by Neg.

Aff Second (26) → Drone strikes estimated civilian deaths 16% - Several studies.
Computer viruses → Greater out of control 2 admin investigating smeltini + down → (Strong aff)
 IRAN Nuclear prog → Statements by IRANIS - Not strong -
 might already have weapons for several bombs - Studied.

Neg Second (27) → IRAN Nuclear prog → Allow negotiations → proven success → (Strong Neg).
rather → MAD → (Not strong).

Drone strikes → Studied.
Computer viruses → Sanin.

Robstine (2) → Neg made a strong call for MAD by IRAN because AFF did not contest it. Not a very confused round. Neg made strong call by saying no Tech attack in US.

Aff 1 - Summary: ISRAEL support undermines US security → Iran-Israel → Libya attack to P.

Drone strikes → Strong aff call that too many civilians ambushed & may be in Iran sect.

Neg 1 Summary: Libya attack - not US - purpose effective control of terrorist sect.

2nd Drone → targeted & more def definition →

3rd Drone → a good definition about drone. Neg shows evidence of decreasing in casualty. Aff presented evidence of very large numbers of casualties.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Olive Foundation WaQi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Angela Wang	27.5	1
	Michelle Qin	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Young Gen BaBh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Nidhi Bangari	26	4
	Nilabh Bhat	26.5	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Olive Foundation WaQi
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 A. Speaking way too fast
Well prepared with evidence

1 N. Not clear, spoke softly
Not prepared w/ evidence

2 A. Responded well with good arguments
good time management
good rebuttals

2 N. Made good points
good summary

I gave the win to Olive Foundation because they seemed more prepared, made their points and rebuttals more convincing.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight


POS	A contestants are not present MSJ Musi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Keerthana Muthukrishnan	27.5	2
	Ramiya Sivakumar	27.8	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen VePo	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shreya Venkatesan	27.5	2
	Anurima Polisetty	27.4	4

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I got directed to a wrong room, and didn't find the debaters till 5 minutes remaining for the flight. So within limited amount of time, two teams did contention and grand fire. Since the time is very limited, the decision may not be as fair.
- Basically my vote for AFF based on their presentation of contention and the cross fire. Their contention is more superiorly organized and clearly spoken. The Neg side does raise a lot of questions during cross fire; but the questions should be more organized and structured to their advantages.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467
~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Olive Foundation Kosi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shayna Kothari		
	Chhavi Singal		

~~NEGATIVE~~

Forfeit

POS	Evergreen SuSh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Chandra Suvana		
	Preska Sharma		

The better debating was done by the AFF from Olive Foundation Kosi
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Ram Haridasa

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg team did not show up.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Olive Foundation Gosh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Anirudh Gottiparthu	26.5	2
2	Anshul Shah	27.5 28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga RaCe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sweeya Raj	25.5	2 2
1	Michelle Cen	26	3 3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Olive
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:

Both teams need to improve their presentation skills by having eye contacts during their speech. Overall, AFF team did a much better job in crossfires by arguing effectively with strong supporting data. The quotation on the Apple case from AFF is unrelated and the AFF team should consider to stop using it.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Evergreen KaPu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Harika Kalluri	28.5	4
1	Neha Pusarla	29.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Olive Foundation YuAg	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Albert Yu	28.6	2
1	Kunal Agarwal	28.6	4

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

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

Signed: Mato Big

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- NEHA** - ASKED 3X FOR EXPLANATION OF 1 QUESTION
- + EXCELLENT DEFINITION OF ISSUES
- + CLEAR PRESENTATION
- SPEAKING TOO RAPIDLY
- + ELICITED PATRIOTIC RESPONSES TO ENHANCE ARGUMENTS
- + HISTORICAL REFERENCES
- + CLEAR, LOUD VOICE
- + GOOD ARGUMENTS ON DRONE STRIKES, 'BURDEN SHARING'

- + RESPONSE TO OPPOSING ARGUMENTS WAS VERY DIRECT
- + DIRECTLY ADDRESSED "JUDGE" + GOOD EYE CONTACT
- + FOCUS ON TWO MAIN ARGUMENTS
- + REFERENCE TO ^{NUMEROUS} OUTSIDE SOURCES WERE SPECIFIC
- + GOOD POISE
- EYE CONTACT. SHARE YOUR VISION BETWEEN PAPERS AND JUDGE

- BIN LADEN WAS NOT KILLED BY DRONE STRIKES
- ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST DRONE STRIKES WERE WEAK FOR BOTH TEAMS.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Harker BHBh Chethan Bhateja ^{green}	27.5	3
2	Jaydev Bhateja ^{purple}	27.4	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga MaCh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Kabir Manghnani ^{glass}	27.5	2
2	Aditya Chaudhary	27.8	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from Saratoga MaCh
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Devesh Vaughn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Cheth: Excellent definitions & well organized introduction.
very polite → thoughtful answers. liked the personal work on your crossfire statement from relative

Jay: Excellent in crossfire → thoughtful and really specific. work on your delivery of data. questions.

Kabir: Excellent definitions & support.
→ try to slow down, relax so your thoughts will flow easier
- excellent arguments & follow up

Aditya - very polished & excellent delivery - final focus was concise and well prepared. slow down in your delivery.

I have selected the saratoga team because I felt their support; data was ^{more} current and they were well organized in their crossfire & final statements. This was very close & both teams performed well.

Both teams were very respectful

Great for your 1st time!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

AFFIRMATIVE Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Olive Foundation JiDa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2A	Eric Jiang	25	4
1A	Anirban Datta	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Eastside Prep AcAF	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Alex Aceves	27	1
2	Jamie Ayon-Facundo	26	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Eastside Prep AcAF
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sharon Yao

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- 1A - good preparation. you have ~~that~~ you brought some of the good argument points. If you can improve your crossfire and rebuttal skill, you can be better.
- 1B - ~~Need~~ be more confident when you present. Please don't bring new points during crossfire. ~~Try~~ Try to fully use your time.
- 1N - good preparation. good speaking, if you could prepare your points covers more areas beside nuclear weapon, that will be better.
- 2N. - good speaking. ~~Try~~ If you can try to come up more questions during the crossfire.

I vote for NEG team because I don't ~~see~~ hear many questions from AFF team to NEG team and not much rebuttal.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

ROUNDS ARE DOUBLE FLIGHTED
 BEFORE FORFEIT TEAM CALL 510-289-7467

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	A contestants are not present St. Francis SeKa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Aksheya Sekharan	28.0	2
2	Anjini Karthik	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Carlmont NiXi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Vincent Nip	27.5	4
2	James Xie	28.0	3

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

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

Signed: [Signature] (Stefan Noz, Lebrad)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Team St Francis won the debate based on the following reasons:

- clear definitions and easy to understand extensions
- Used good examples to underline their positions ('house example')
- Took control of most of the crossfire

Overall this was a great debate and both teams showed a solid performance

ST Francis

□ Skitslays: - a bit slower in your opening section would be good

Both = you had a very good structure and I think that had counter arguments for 'Pakistan' despite the fact that you excluded Pakistan in your definitions

Carlmont

□ Vicent = same for you, your opening section should be slower and spaced. Was hard to understand

Both = I understood your 'abusive' argument but it would have been good to see more

□ James = good speaking, good gesture!