

OPEN

Public

Forum

ROUND I

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 Bonita Vista ScMo	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Aubrey Schafer	27.5	3
	Matthew Moran	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Francis TaBr	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shweta Tatkar	28	2
	Ryan Brobst	28.5	1

The better debating was done by the Neg from St Francis TaBr
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: Arbol

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Arbol~~ 'Neg' team presented their arguments more clearly & emphatically. They supported their contentions with data. Preparation of Ryan was relatively much better. 'Aff' team did not do enough to build their case with supporting information beyond a few exceptional examples. Coordination between 'neg' speakers was more synchronized. Overall good debate.

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 Saratoga KoCh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ajith Kosireddy	29.3	4
	Aditya Choudhary	29.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View ThSc	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kate Thomas	29.4	2
	Ariane Schang	29.3	3

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

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

Signed: Asht

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Ajith~~ Was a very close debate & a high quality one. All speakers were very good. AFF won by a narrow margin because they gave a rationale country by country (Iran, Pakistan, Syria, Libya, Afghanistan) with examples abt how ^{US} national security is undermined. Neg had some very good points too but perhaps emphasized a technical defn of the M East to ~~exclude~~ & exclude Pak & Afghan. However, the AFF guys pointed to the broader defn of M.E to make the case. Neg could have also used statistics to show that current policies have resulted in lower terrorist attacks, deaths & the elimination of Al Qaida. All are strong speakers. Their preparation ~~was~~ excellent. Counters were crisp & well directed. One of the debates, I enjoyed the most.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

A contestants are not present

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Milpitas LePu		
Miranda Le	27.5	1
Jason Pugatch	26.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Sacred Heart CaWh		
Lucas Carter	26.4	3
Brian White	23.5	4

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

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

Signed: Kenneth Hip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1) ~~Attacks~~ FS = too fast
 2) FS = no ex contact, more pure
 - less strong on and specific in your support, need better examples.

From Better argument, more strategy - more specific about the cyber attacks

2nd speaks - Pro has better eye contact and Body gesture. good
 - Questionable about evidence off eroin sanction, but rather aggression counter on negative points.
 Bank we eroin security system?
 Jorga Iran oil Revenue. ? not 0:1
 Where was Egypt? needs side mention 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 St. Marys CoSa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Jessica Cotta	25.5	3
	Joey Salazar	26.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker KhXi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Avi Khemani	24	4
	Justin Xie	26	2

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

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

Signed: Kelly

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jessica - ~~too soft for the son~~ good speech. but counter point. Did not like you saying what you said

Joey - too safe for the son. Much more comfortable.

Justin - spoke loud, clear.

Avi - Relax a bit. Too tight move too much.

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
	MSJ Jzh		
	Katie Jiang	28.1	2
	Alyssa Zhao	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Foothill FaHw	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bryce Fan	25.8	4
	Arthur Hwang	26.4	3

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

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

Signed: Do. Kim

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Affirmative team's contention that the current U.S. foreign policy undermines our national security was very convincing. Their argument ~~that~~ was that the number of terrorists increased from 300 to 700 during a short period of time. The Negative team contended that U.S. should continue to invest in foreign policy and that their generic policies generally work well in all Middle East countries. The Affirmative team felt that we might end up in a situation where we civilians in the U.S. may end up having to depend on the Al Qaeda for protection.

1A → very good presentation of blatant facts (Katie).

2A → very convincing in her crossfire arguments (Alyssa).

1N → good at explaining but ^{not convincing enough} a confrontation (Bryce).

2N → Good at contesting in crossfire (Arthur).

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

~~NEGATIVE~~ **AFFIRMATIVE** Flight

POS	A contestants are not present Milpitas TrLe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Bryan Tran		
	Richard Le		

NEGATIVE

POS	MSJ MaSw	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Arshia Malkani		
	Sujha Swamy		

The better debating was done by the AFF from Milpitas TrLe
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 is the winner. The NEGATIVE team did not show up.

[Small handwritten mark]

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 DhLa		
2	Aditya Dhar	29	2
3	Alexander Lam	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Foothill HuZh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Jeffrey Huai	30	1
2	Jason Zhang	27	3

The better debating was done by the Neg from Foothill HuZh
AFF OR REG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Jerry Mandachia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Great evidence
 Good speaking presence

1N - Arguments well well supported
 + opening statement

2A - Excellent counter arguments
 Evidence is well supported

2N - Well supported evidence
 Arguments were countered very well

RFD: I vote ~~oppositional~~ ^(Negative) side because the facts that they had stated had very well supported evidence. The oppositional side stated that Pakistan should be included in the middle east/debate and supported it with evidence, well enough to lead me to believe Pakistan should be included, which concludes my opinion that the oppositional side wins.

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 Saratoga Java	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ruchi Jain	29	1
2	Bhavana Vadrevu	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen AIGi	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Himani Aligireddy	26	4
1	Sahiti Gilela	28	2

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

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

Signed: Joey Mandachia

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Great opening arguments
 well supported evidence

1N - Great on status supporting negative
 side
 Great basis of blueprints for
 opening statement

2A - Facts supporting deans attacks
 and drone warfare
 All evidence were from
 valid and recent articles

2N - Countered every argument w/
 evidence
 - great impact analysis

RFD - I vote for the affirmative side because the affirmative
 side countered every argument the negative side had, and had a
 very good speaking presence.

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 ShSa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Sumukh Shekar	24	2
	Vikram Sastry	20	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland ShCh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ye Sol Shin	18 20	4
	Jeremy Chang	25	1

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

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

Signed: KOB.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Team MILPITAS ShSa clearly articulated their Assertions and defended them. Additionally, they countered most of the "Con" challenge well.

Team Leland did well in Crossfire but got sidetracked into minutiae and failed to negate the 'AFF' team

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
	Milpitas HaDa		
	Sahil Hansalia	21	3
	Akshat Das	23	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen SuBa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ranjani Subramani	22	2
	Nathan Bao	19.25	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from MILPITAS HaDa.
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 clear in connecting
 → Assertions → Impact on U.S Policy.
 → Evidence → "In Crossfire they stumbled."
 the "NEG" team was strong in the
 2nd Crossfire but did not summarize
 well. However, they proved their
 Assertions better than "AFF"
 The "AFF" team however disproved
 the "NEG" team's ASSERTIONS.

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 Leland Kizh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1A	Jessica Kim	27.4	3
2A	Victoria Zhang	27.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	James Logan LeCh	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1N	Carol Lee	27.7	1
2N	Jennifer Chen	27.1	4

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A - Persuasive
 4M - Anti American sentiment
 4M - Funding Park -
 - On time completion
 - Evidence

3M
 4M
 2A - Invasion:
 - on cost:
 - completion on time
 - Persuasive

3M
2M

1N - Evidence - Good
 - Cont-1 -
 - Cont-2 - situation is improving
 " - 3 - Report ^{for US} improving.

2N - Good Evidence
 - completed on time

Room was Noisy

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
	Harker Lulu		
2A	Serena Lu	27.8	4
1A	Liza Turchinsky	28.8	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas PaSa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2N	Pranay Patni	29.2	1
1N	Satvir Saggi	29.1	2

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

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

(Moisy Room)

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: Good Evidence
 (4M) - Cont-1 28.7
 - Cont-2
 - Respectful to opponents

(3M) - Good Questions 29.1
 - dropped

2A: - Categorical Imperative
 - Moral/immoral 28.0
 - Not worthy (helping other countries)
 - no

(3M) { - missing Evidence } 27.5
 { - dropped confusion }

2M - (Summary) 1A - Evidence - good 28.7

1M - (2A) - (lost vote) or (need more organization) 27.5

1N (4M) 29.1 - Cont 1 - Attends declined
 Cont 2 - Support for Democr.
 Cont 3 - Support of Israel
 Cont 4 - US Turkey Reln.
 Cont 5 - Nuclear Iran
 Cont 6 - ECO Dev in Aid
 - Nice Language
 - Persuasive

(3M) -

2N - Framework 28.9
 - Content - 1
 - Evidence - good

(3M) - 29.1

- Good Questions (2N)

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
2	Sohabe Mojaddidy	30	1
1	Omkar Mahajan	28	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook AsSa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Gaurav Ashok	28	3
2	Rahul Sabnis	28	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Logan MoMa
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:

Omkar - clear speaker, Good Summary Speech.
"92% ineffective"

Gaurav - Good Speaker.

Sohabe - Very good speaker, Good eye contact.
Good response. Very good points in crossfire

Rahul - Good eye contact

RFD - Essentially it came down to Neg. arguing that Nukes are the only real threat and AFF saying that Nukes are not required for there to be a threat against the U.S. AFF used 9/11 as an example of terrorism without Nukes. Also, AFF claimed Dron attacks are increasing and American sentiment and Neg claimed they were 80% effective but that makes them 92% ineffective.....

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

POSITIVE Flight

contestants are not present	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
Mountain View GGVA		
Ben Gardner-Gill	29	2
Ashwin Vaidynathan	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Marys MeMa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Laura Becerra	27	4
2	Shareen Mann	29	3

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

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

Signed: Jammi Schiffrin

ISSUES & REASON FOR DECISION: - For Neg. Even if some things are working, AFF proved we are undermining Nat. Security.

- Clear speaker, Good eye contact. Good answers in crossfire.

- Clear speaker. Seemed flustered for Summary speech.

- Clear speaker. Covered Neg. case well. Good eye contact. Very good in crossfire.

- Good speaker; eye contact. Your response about Lebanon & its funding Lebanon & Lebanon funding terrorist organizations did not link... you said we expected to intervene? - Very assertive in crossfire.

in going to go with the more inclusive definition of NS, however, AFF claimed they only had to prove instance of something undermining National Security → agree with. Also, AFF ~~gives~~ gives examples Syria, Iran, and Lebanon. AFF then later argues that current U.S. policy does not impact Iran. (When Neg's cent. #3. Lebanon, however - We are funding terrorists in Syria - both were won by AFF side. Even if some things are

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 St. Francis AkGa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Prtihv Akella	30	1
1	Aakash Garg	29	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga JaWa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Aurash Jalalian	28	3
1	Nelson Wang	27	4

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

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

Signed: Melanie Fishkin

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Foreign Policy in Middle East

Akella Affirm - Well organized presentation, presenting facts & points, logical very good eye contact, clearly enunciating words, very calm in presentation. Rebutted neg points very well. Very confident presentation.

Neg Wang - Effect → Direct Effect - some slurring of words, good eye contact. Counterterrorism good examples given, points made, facts, dates. Sanctions - more difficult for Brian

Affirm Garg - Defining terms - good strong, clear voice, needs more eye contact. Stated many examples, supported statement w/ facts & statistics. Policy - stimulating anti American feeling, well informed. Very confident

Neg Jalalian - Challenged Definitions - got info from State Department good eye contact. Rebutted Affirmative points very well.

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 LaReina leGe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Allegra lezza	27	4
2	Katie Gerbasi	28	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Olive Foundation WuYu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Max Wu	30	1
1	Victoria Yuan	29	2

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

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

Signed: *Melanie Fishbach*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirm
Lezza - Well organized presentation, provided well supported info + facts
spoke clearly & calmly, ✓

Neg
Yuan - Spoke quickly but very clearly. Rebutted affirm points w/very well
well thought out presentation, very confident

Affirm
Gerbasi - Good eye contact & posture + hand gestures, projected voice w/very well,
Rebutted all 4 points of neg. very well - supported w/ evidence + facts

Neg
Wu - Projected voice very well, spoke quickly + clearly
Very persuasive, countered Affirm points + questions very well

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

SINGLE FLIGHT

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

~~AFFIRMATIVE~~ Flight

POS	Contestants are not present Bonita Vista HoDo	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Soley Holt	27	2
1	Katie Downing	28	1

~~NEGATIVE~~

POS	Harker JiXu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Amy Jin	26	4
2	Kevin Xu	27	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from BONITA VISTA
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:

sorry: you did not refute
neg's 2nd contention.
Do not forget about that.
Overall, good speaker.

Katie: you are a good speaker.
Work on giving a little more
evidence for your contentions.

AMY: How does the drone
(strikes help the united
states?)

Kevin: you are a good speaker.
show me more evidence for
your 3rd contention.

Reason for Decision: AFF was able to support
their framework. NEG did not show me the
net-benefit. Although AFF dropped a contention,
they provided strong evidence that led to
their win.

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 Soki	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sakshi Soti	20	4
1	Deepti Kiran	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd VeKn	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Siena Vendlinski	30	1
1	Laura Knox	28.5	2

The better debating was done by the WEG from BOD
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

Neg

- Aff can't win off
 Anti-American
 sentiment. Need to
 link to ~~natl.~~ natl.
 sec. threat.

- Very little offense
 on Aff's diplomacy
 arg.

- turned cyberwarfare
 arg
 took down their
 evidence about drones
 - Good analysis on
 nuclear energy

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 Diablo Valley ChPa	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Annabel Chen	29.5	2
1	Emily Pang	30	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Leland MeMe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ann-Kathrin Merz	29	3
2	Sebastian Merz	28	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Diablo
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

- Excellent speakers
- Be careful about crossfire - you didn't have some answers
- Nice card on Saudi Arabia
- Correct - you don't have to provide a counterplan for drones

- Neg actually had no warrant that US is safer now.
- Said nothing about AFF's claim that Yemen is breeding more terrorists now.

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 RaPu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Rafi Rahman	27	3
1	Akshar Puri	26.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker RaHu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Emaad Raghieb	30	1
1	Joyce Huang	28	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st Aff Good points, well-supported argument. Delivery wasn't as clear as it could be - try to be more dynamic/energetic in speaking.

1st Neg Enthusiastic, dynamic delivery, + good points made. Although this is a short speech, a little more addressing of aff's case would be helpful, if you can find time for it.

2nd Aff Good response to neg arguments + rebuttals. Well argued, intelligent points.

2nd Neg Well-argued, good answers to aff's arguments. Good questions on cross/x.

Rebuttals Good summation of final points. With limited time, be sure to limit arguments to the more contentious issues. Don't introduce new arguments in final focus.

Aff dropped neg's contention 3 (Promoting democracy in middle E. + Africa) + failed to support their anti-American sentiment contentions w/ evidence. Therefore, Neg wins.

Jorgensen, Anyola

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 ShSu	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Preska Sharma	25	4
1	Chandra Suvarna	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	James Logan TuLe	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Mariah Turner	30	1
1	Nathan Leal	29	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st Aff Good arguments & evidence, well-delivered. Struggled a little on cross-fire, familiarize yourself a bit more so you can confidently defend + support observations.

1st Neg Good counter-case w/ good evidence. Clear, comfortable delivery.

2nd Aff Your contention was mostly just repeats of the 1st aff speech. Use this time to counter their case, and counter their rebuttals and the points they hinted at in cross x.

2nd Neg Clearly articulated, well-made points. Pointed, powerful questions on cross x.

Aff You start the round off well with good arguments that have strong evidence to back them up, but you drop the majority of the neg case throughout the round, and fail to address their rebuttals about lack of link, etc.

Neg Good clash + counting of aff case. Clear, articulate arguments. Be careful how you make use of time, especially on second speeches. Don't waste valuable speaking time on new arguments about Israel when other issues go unaddressed due to lack of time.