

No vice
Public Forum
~~Round~~ Rd 2
~~Highway~~ Part I

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE Debatants are not present

POS	Olive Foundation MuVe	POINTS	RANKS
B	Vik Avantsa	27	3
	Teja Veeramacheneni	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	James Logan ShGi	POINTS	RANKS
	Kunal Sharma	28	2
f	Gagandeep Gill	28	1

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

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

Signed: D. Kelly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF - Good Communication and Speaking Skills.
All the Contant.ies were presented well and supported with evidence. Could not counter Negative answers during cross fire.

Neg: Good Communication and Speaking Skills.
All the contentions were supported with evidence. Answered all questions posed by Affirmative.

RFD: The better debate was done by Negative. They defended that USA is not part of ISE. Neg had answered all the questions posed by Aff. They countered Aff about Contentions 2 and 3 and responded to it. They were well prepared and presented their evidence at right time. They presented evidence that Anthrax attack was happened before 9/11, attack was not to do with policy.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE Debaters are not present

POS	Bonita Vista LH	POINTS	RANKS
	Kathleen Lindstrom	28	2
	Segan Helle	29	1

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ ChKu	POINTS	RANKS
	Chelton Cheung	25	4
	Ankit Kuchhangi	27	3

Aff — good evidence, Good speaker points, Good rebuttals, Good eye contact & speaking style, Good
 The better debating was done by the Aff. from Bonita Vista LH
AFF or NEG. TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Neg — not enough evidence, Benghazi is a major event
 Signed: R. Krish

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff.

(K) Good pt - defining
 Nice wrap up on how foreign
 policy impacts national security.
 Great pt on drone strikes & approval
 rating internationally.
 Good rebuttal (aid).

Good speaking style, Very
 clear delivery.

(S) Great pt on 'No Jurisdiction'
 — how our policies ~~are~~
 are ineffective — good expansion.
 good (further) enhancing on how
 drone strikes are impacting
 relations negatively.
 Good response to having
 no leverage in aid & hence
 being ineffective.

Very effective speaking style.

The attack was Benghazi
 very imp. Neg. issue in current times

(C) Weakeners but not
 undermines — expand on
 this pls.

(D) The connection b/w
 aid & oil is not very
 direct — Iran's oil is not our ^{oil} resources.
 Approval ratings def.
 impact how people respond
 & react to US presence.
 show how this becomes a
 common priority.

(A) Expand on 'capability'.
 Use more evidences/facts

There is no connection
 b/w having a nuclear
 war & presence of troops
 Good rebuttal w/ facts
 (on ~~more~~ # of terrorists
 & crime, decreasing /
 increasing). Clarify
 more that this data is
 international & not domestic
 crime etc.

Room: Casa 8
Start: 12:30
Novice Public Forum

2

Nguyen, Joseph

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present


POS	Evergreen VePo	POINTS	RANKS
	Shreya Venkatesan		
	Anurima Polisetty		

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ LiYu	POINTS	RANKS
	Diana Li		
	Kasey Yu		

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative side forfeits

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	James Logan NgTa		
	Ann Nguyen		
	Shivani Talnikar		

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	MSJ MuSi		
	Keerthana Muthukrishnan		
	Ramiya Sivakumar		

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

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

Signed: Halleh Collier

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmation team was late by 18min. Therefore they did not debate with the Negative debate team. This automatically moved to the next round

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present

POS	MSJ TaTh	POINTS	RANKS
	Pragna Tantravani		
	Abitha Thirugana		

✓ **NEGATIVE**

POS	Young Gen MeBa	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sasha Menezes		
1	Shreya Barma		

NO

at 12:55 PM

The better debating was done by the NEG from Young Gen MeBa
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 AFF team was a no show.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE Contants are not present

POS	Mountain View MyLi	POINTS	RANKS
	Cameron Myers	26.9	1
	Kevin Li	26.0	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Olive Foundation GoSh	POINTS	RANKS
	Anirudh Gottiparthu	26.7	2
	Anshul Shah	26.4	3

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Olive Foundation
AFF/NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Kenneth Nij

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Kevin - needs more eye contact, good relax posture, speak well - well practice speed

Anirudh - ~~loud~~ loud clear concise. well practice speed

Cameron - very well spoken, speaks at a good pace

Anshul - speaks a bit too fast. Needs slow down a bit

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present

POS	Norte Dame BaSe	POINTS	RANKS
3	Snigdha Banda	28	1
1	Harveen Sekhon	24	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker BhBh	POINTS	RANKS
4	Chethan Bhateja	25	4
2	Jaydev Bhateja	25	3

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Snigdha: I think you are a good speaker. Great job with your refutations as well as strengthening your contentions

Harveen: Good speaker. Good job stating of the speech as well as giving evidence.

Jay: nice job on stating your contentions. you should have refuted your opp. contentions or else you agree with them.

chet: your speech was too short, no refutations or evidence.

Both: eye contact! that is extremely important!

Both teams: During crossfire, look @ judge and not each other.

Reason for decision: AFF followed framework. Clear contentions and refutations. NEG did not refute, dropped contentions, therefore losing this round.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present

POS	Olive Foundation KoMe	POINTS	RANKS
	Rohan Kota	25.8 26.1	4
	Rohit Menon	26.1	3

25.8

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ KuLo	POINTS	RANKS
	Lucas Kuo	26.1	2
	Darien Lo	26.1	1

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

4
 4
 3
 4
 4
 3
 2
 2
 3
 2
 2

Neg team has good points in their contention but some crossfire arguments are weak. AFF team needs more evidence to support their contentions.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Affirmative contestants are not present

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	Olive Foundation WeSa		
1	Jennifer Wei	26.5	3
2	Rohan Saxena	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	St. Marys CILo		
2	Christopher Clark	27	2
1	Ashley Longmire	26.5	4

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

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

Signed: Rajiv Jamun

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A spoke well, presentation clear.
got confused.
summary a little confusing.

1N presentation okay.
asked good question

2A passionate speech.
argument convincing
summary captivating

2N well defended & rebutted.
got a little stumped on questioning.
summary presented well

I gave the win to Olive Foundation mainly because their second speaker was very captivating and convincing. He showed more passion than the others

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Harka

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE contestants are not present

POS	Saratoga LiNg	POINTS	RANKS
1	Alex Li	25.8	1
2	Ethan Ngai	25.8	2

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ AcJa	POINTS	RANKS
4	Aditya Acharya	24	4
3	Amit Jamuar	25.1	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga LiNg
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. could follow up more on questioning; ~~to be~~ be more confident;
2. when rebel. prepare more on the arguments; more practice so won't be too nervous; like body languages;
3. time-management; more logic-reasoning;
4. ~~take~~ give notice to use prep-time; need more practice ^{& preparation} to get familiar with the whole debate flow & topic.

I vote for AFF as they are more logic-reasoning & supporting their opinion, with ~~enough~~ by providing ~~more~~ enough evidence & attacking the other side with good reasons.

The NEG could prepare & practice more.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE Plans are not present

POS	Saratoga RaCe	POINTS	RANKS
	Sweeya Raj	26.7	3
	Michelle Cen	27.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Francis SeKa	POINTS	RANKS
	Aksheya Sekharan	26.5	EP
	Anjini Karthik	27.2	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga
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:

Current US policy in M.E. undermines security

IA something lead to Anti-Am invasion field noted in Iran anti-American

Drawn ~~Good~~ strike military - draw strikes breed anti-American, 1/50 dollars similar. military spending \$711B - econ. weakened, diverting \$ from other issues.

Understand. to danger with

IN • has avoid war so far
 • failed terrorist attacks
 • fig. establishes good relations w/ foreign countries military defense position

Direct attacks?

XE Anti-Americanism current F.R. vs history

2A No direct attacks vs improve without to all. We've failed terrorist attacks. Evaporate radical. F.R. denies threats not just only Iran - only. Anti-Am sentiment to be into dollars more.

Draw strikes too obvious more than at each

2N Threats not seen as action. So security has undermined. Anti-Am sentiment not substance to current policy - historical. Reducing military spending with reduce debt - why? No proof.

US F.R. hasn't proved weakness N.A.S. security.

XK reducing military spending with reduce debt - ? Neg says it's not true. No proof. Evidence that we avoided war?

3A - asking for direct link to travel blogs

GXF AIG is an organization that can't be included in f.p. debate

Aff pls speak more clearly + clearly. Less is more w/ impact! Good speaking neg. Do more research!

I voted for the aff because I felt they showed current f.p. had weakened our nat'l security. With well-cited evidence may not have clearly defined the difference between historic vs. current problems but our security nonetheless was compromised. The neg. + aff both didn't address each others' arguments with fresh proof + was largely repetitive. Neg needed better evidence + proposed sol'n or alt. ideas.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Affirmative debaters are not present

POS	Saratoga SeMa	POINTS	RANKS
1	Vibha Seshadri	26	2
3	Nupur Maheshwari	26	3

~~NEGATIVE~~

POS	Evergreen ChVe	POINTS	RANKS
2	Asmita Choppa	27	1
4	Deepshika Vellaboyina	25	4

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

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

Signed: Son Stoddard-Phillips

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Both teams had solid contentions which, for the most, were supported by evidence & responded to by the opposing side. One exception was the oil dependency contention which neg dropped (mention @ end was unconvincing & undeveloped.)
- Neg controlled cross with arguments & stats.
- Both sides: cite source of evidence, & if opponents claims are far fetched, make them produce the source, read it. (It's possible you'll be better able to refute (weak evidence or mis-quotes))
- Some statements were dubious, e.g. "Muslim Brotherhood elected due to U.S. efforts"
- Asmita: listened well & had effective responses in cross.

(one)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE Debatants are not present


POS	MSJ ChTa	POINTS	RANKS
	Jacinta Chang	29	1
	Andrea Tam	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas VyKh	POINTS	RANKS
	Rutu Vyas	23	3
	Ruby Khan	22	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:

AFF

NEG

#1A) - well stated and definitive arguments

X #2A) - Excellent argument with evidence

#2A) - opmionated points very nervous

X #2) - Addressed arguments as stated in #2N

#3A) - restated unaddressed arguments, clearly strongest debator in round

Ground x) #4 - Dominated G.F.C.

#4A) - much more confident than opponent

#1N) - uses unrelated analogies

X #1N) - Asked untopical questions, did not answer fully

#2N) - unorganized and scarecrow arguments

X #2) - no resistance did not answer

#3A) - repeated already addressed arguments

Ground x) #4 - Again did not refute argument and evidence

#4N)