

OPEN
Public Forum

ROUND 4

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL MSJHS

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 SuBa	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Ranjani Subramani	29.0	1
1st	Nathan Bao	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas TrLe	POINTS	RANKS
2nd	Bryan Tran	28.5	3
1st	Richard Le	28.0	4

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

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

Signed: Henry Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A — good speaking and time management. clear state US foreign policy to middle East especially to Egypt and Iran. Using Washington post as source and give more details.

2A — good speaking and time management. clear state Anti-US sentiment caused terrorism. Such as only 13% Egyptian support US, 6% in Jordan. Other evidences including Iran's top official targeting US military facilities, ~~etc.~~ \$1.5 billion Eco Aid to Egypt for middle East peace.

I vote AFF because this team asking NEG show Eco Aid numbers not just told the sources.

2N — Bryan is also a good speaker and time management.

1N — Richard is also good time management but weaker than others.

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	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	Harker JiXu		
1st	Amy Jin	26.5	4
2nd	Kevin Xu	28.5	2

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	Evergreen ALGi		
2nd	Himani Aligireddy	27.5	3
1st	Sahiti Gilela	28.5	1

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

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

Signed: Henry Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1N — good speaking. Clear speech and using Eco Aids Evidence to support that National Security is not determined from current policy. If not give Eco Aids to the Nation such as Egypt, our National Security will be at more risk

2N — good speaking. Question the possibilities of cyber hacker funding by Iran's government will really damage our financial systems. State Middle East unstable situation which makes this attack impossible recently.

That's the reasons I vote the NEG, but winning point is low.

2A — good speaking. Question AFF about the death number in US troops in Afghanistan. Is the number total from beginning of war or current.

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 Affirmatives are not present

POS	Evergreen RaPu	POINTS	RANKS
2	Rafi Rahman	28	2
1	Akshar Puri	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Lynbrook AsSa	POINTS	RANKS
1	Gaurav Ashok	28	3
2	Rahul Sabnis	29	1

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

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

Signed: K.A. Ke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: - clear presentation of contentions.
 - should improve on making better eye contact.
 - research well done but be prepared with providing clear evidences on the points being debated. Do not give that as an opp. to the opponents to use that ^{against you!} ~~and~~ ~~your~~ ~~point!~~

Neg: - strong rebuttal.
 - better grasp of the topic ~~and~~
 - conveyed the points clearly without wavering too much.
 - lived the way low you ~~and~~ handled the Libyan case.

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: Affirmatives are not present

POS	Milpitas LePu	POINTS	RANKS
1	Miranda Le	28	1
2	Jason Pugatch	27	2

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Francis TaBr	POINTS	RANKS
1	Shweta Tatkar	26	4
2	Ryan Brobst	27	3

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff :- clear and precise in explaining their points and getting it across.
- cyber attacks - don't think this was well researched too vague!
- came out strong in rebutting.

Neg :- need to do better in handling the questions.
- have upto date evidences. Eg:
- quantifying the 35% decrease in terrorist activities.
- need more fire!!

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	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	James Logan MoMa		
3	Sohabe Mojaddidy	27.5	2
1	Omkar Mahajan	28.5	1

NEGATIVE

POS	NAME	POINTS	RANKS
	Harker DhLa		
2	Aditya Dhar	25.5	4
4	Alexander Lam	27.00	3

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Logan.
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.

- Drone Attack kills civilians & children.
- Violence in Iraq increasing after US departure.
- Growing conflict in Syria.

CON

- Conversion to democracy
- Drone attacks kill terrorists
- Sanctions against Iran working

Omkar - Good Eye contact.
Good Content.
Sohabe - Good eye contact.

Aff side clearly one the contentions. Con could not provide evidence & defend their contentions.

Aditya -> Need better Eye Contact
Alexander - Good Eye contact.
Focus on content & crossfire.

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	Sacred Heart CaWh	POINTS	RANKS
1	Lucas Carter	26.5	3
3	Brian White	26.00	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Evergreen SoKi	POINTS	RANKS
4	Sakshi Soti	27.5	1
2	Deepti Kiran	27.00	2

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Provided Definition for Policy & ME. However missed to include Pakistan as part of ME.
 Contentions → Drone strike leads to Anti US sentiment eg Pakistan drone strikes (Not part of ME → CON raised this issue)
 → Alliance with countries leads to Anti US sentiment
 - Sanctions on Iran ~~imposed~~

CON ~~Agree~~ on definitions on Policy, ME but included Pakistan as part of ME.
 Contention → Sanctions against Iran are working
 → Aid to countries benefit US

CON clearly won the debate by defending their contentions & AFF conceded on Drone Attack. AFF could not provide evidence.

Lucas → Need better eye contact.
 Brian → Need better facts.

Deepti → Good Eye contact.
 Sakshi → Pakistan not part of ME was good objection.

Sakshi → Good Eye contact.

Room: Kennedy B
Start: 8:00am
Open Public Forum

4

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 Contants are not present

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	Leland KiZh		
	Jessica Kim	27	1
	Victoria Zhang	21.6	4

NEGATIVE

POS		POINTS	RANKS
	Bonita Vista HoDo		
	Soley Holt	25.8	2
	Katie Downing	22.5	3

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jessica cited more examples

soley was more articulate to make her points

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View GGVa	POINTS	RANKS
	Ben Gardner-Gill	224	2
	Ashwin Vaidynathan	228	4

POS	St. Francis AkGa	POINTS	RANKS
	Pratihvi Akella	258	1
	Aakash Garg	234	3

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Pratihvi has forceful arguments address with solid examples to prove his points

Ben better defended his position than others, and was more articulate to ~~get~~ get his message across.

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga JaWa	POINTS	RANKS
	Aurash Jalalian 27	2 nd AFF	4
	Nelson Wang 28	1 st AFF	3

POS	Leland ShCh	POINTS	RANKS
	Ye Sol Shin 2 nd neg	30	1
	Jeremy Chang 1 st neg	29	2

Prep
AFF
2
15
33

NEG
26
34

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

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

Signed: Brian McManis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good Round! Both sides had good points

- I don't think the Definition that Neg had to Prove All policies working and AFF only needed to Prove one failure worked in the AFF'S favor - I think Both sides ended up finding who was responsible for finding a greater preponderance of evidence to prove their case

- NEG wins on the Saudi Arabia as ally -> AFF only had conjecture that someday they may turn NEG successfully showed they are reliant on US alliance

- AFF agreed that Saudi's will defend Straits of Hormuz

- NEG SHOWED THAT Policies ~~kill~~ kill terrorists, cut off funding, training and leadership

- NEG Rebutted (LET) Terror group in Mumbai & there wasn't much to connect them to Middle East

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	Harker RaHu	POINTS	RANKS
	Emaad Raghib ^{2ND AFF}	28	3
	Joyce Huang ^{1ST AFF}	27	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Olive Foundation WuYu	POINTS	RANKS
	Max Wu ^{2ND Neg}	29	1
	Victoria Yuan ^{1ST Neg}	28.1	2

The better debating was done by the NEG from OLIVE Foundation

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

Signed: Brian P. McCarry

Great Job
Close

Prep
AFF
24
38
38

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Wow! The fact that you are both in 8th grade is impressive. Excellent work on both sides

- Neg successfully countered Drones increases recruitment

- AFF Proved that there was Economic threat

- Neg - countered the use of ~~the~~ Nukes but came close to losing it. AFF SHOULD HAVE HAD EVIDENCE to SHOW an ARMS RACE IS A THREAT

- I am siding with 50,000 Lives saved because there was nothing really countering

I WISHED somebody would have connected Nuclear threat to our strongest ally in the Middle East

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	Leland MeMe	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ann-Kathrin Merz	27.5	1
2	Sebastian Merz	27.4	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Bishop O'Dowd VeKn	POINTS	RANKS
2	Siena Vendlinski	27.5	2
1	Laura Knox	27.0	4

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

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

Signed: Shadi Holami

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

While this was very close, I believe AFF
the better logic.

Room: Arts 134
Start: 8:00am
Open Public Forum

4

Helle, Eric

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	Milpitas HaDa	POINTS	RANKS
2	Sahil Hansalia	27.3	1
1	Akshat Das	27.0	2

NEGATIVE

POS	St. Marys CoSa	POINTS	RANKS
1	Jessica Cotta	26.5	4
2	Joey Salazar	26.8	3

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: Shachi Ghole

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF presented stronger evidence.

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	Harker LuTu	POINTS	RANKS
2	Serena Lu	27.1	3
1	Liza Turchinsky	26.9	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Foothill FaHw	POINTS	RANKS
2	Bryce Fan	28.0	1
1	Arthur Hwang	27.8	2

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

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

Signed: Vijay Tatkar (SFHS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Harker: The moral imperative in the aff argument was ambiguous eg killing is wrong, but killing Bin Laden was generally considered good. but I do buy that killing even Bin Laden can have negative repercussions.

Foothill: Good, clear args and cross. Like the fact that you stayed focused on security and goals.

Like your "causation vs correlation" argument
Also like your "Cato Institute is libertarian, and opposed to Democrats" argument to dismiss that data. I buy that

Overall, the neg stuck to their points well, backed up their arguments with good cross and challenged aff. In particular "immortality does not imply security risk" and "Cato Institute data is biased against govt policies" were good arguments

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	St. Marys MeMa	POINTS	RANKS
1	Laura Becerra	27.5	3
2	Shareen Mann	28.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga KeLi	POINTS	RANKS
1	Parth Kejriwal	27.8	2
2	Justin Liu	27.2	4

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

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

Signed: Vijay Tattkar (SFHS)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

St. Mary's Aff defense had some holes that Saratoga exploited which they did not respond to

Both teams made good cases for their sides and were cross-examining well.

Clearly both have researched well

Both team equally seasoned and prepared. Neither team made the "if ^{foreign} ~~national~~ policy" then "threat to security" argument in the large.

Make the connection beyond the obvious, otherwise neither of you will convince me.

Both arguments were reasonably convincing and both failed to "complete the sale" (ie make the clinching point)

eg single events in national security vulnerability can have enormous lasting effect and numbers can make the case for financial, stability, military expenses, etc.

Overall, the arguments were close and there was no clear winner here.

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	Evergreen ShSu	POINTS	RANKS
2	Preska Sharma	26.5	2
1	Chandra Suvarna	26.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Harker ChCh	POINTS	RANKS
2	Matthew Cheng	27	1
1	Brandon Chow	26.5	3

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff ^{wins} drone effectiveness ratio of 50 to 1. ^{Neg's counter} is stated as ~~in~~ poor. (22")
 Neg does not (until end) reduction not clear enough to me
 Wins - drone argument

Aff wins increase in Al Qaeda - not countered effectively by Neg

Aff loses cyber argument - Neg's "hypothetical" attack very good

Aff wins ~~the~~ misuse argument - Neg weak attack. ^{However Aff's economic} impact not significant overall

~~Neg~~ ^{wins} ~~the~~ ~~strengthen~~ Nuke weapons program as active and a threat to U.S. Aff
 ineffective @ countering. Neg could have been more forceful in showing
 this issue as a higher risk/impact to M.E. and U.S. Won this pt but
 not forcefully enough. Neg should have hammered Aff on Iran Nuke but
 did not.

Close match, but after reviewing wins and losses I move for
 the affirmative. Neg may have ~~done~~ attacked drone ratio (50 to 1)
 from numerator not just denominator.
 Affirmative wins both.

Speakers all close in terms of rank. Slight separation w/M.Cheng.

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

NEGATIVE

POS	Presentation CaTr	POINTS	RANKS
2	Nicole Callinan	28.2	1 ***
1	Julienna Tran	27.6	3 **

POS	Saratoga KoCh	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ajith Kosireddy	27.7	2 ***
2	Aditya Choudhary	27.5	4 *

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg's "current" ^{definition} ~~attack~~ while clear, still not attacked by Affirm. - Current policy and current state linked by Neg - not strongly attacked by Aff.

Aff ~~made~~ started definition of ME and scope of national security (US and Israel) ^(no Pak) questioned

Aff Win Affirmative wins definition of middle east scope (no Pak) and ^{target} ~~address~~ of national security (vs, allies, troops). ∴ Israel in scope.

Neg position that sanctions are working but Aff shows no link between Iran economy and nuke program. Neg uses "cry wolf" approach while good, not forceful enough.

Affirm wins Neg - support for democracy = no war. while Aff says foreign aid ≠ democracy & stability.

This is a tie!

Aff use of pro-emptive foreign policy introduced ^{good} but not est'd.

Neg's rebuttal question "Can you name leader of Al Qaeda" ^{great} - great, but "killed" answer by Aff while weakening, was only jab not knockout.

Neg's Saudi alliance good but limited

I vote affirmative mostly because of Syria/Israel link. Neg's attack on scope of ME and US only national security not forceful enough - (over)

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	Foothill HuZh	POINTS	RANKS
	Jeffrey Huai	25	1
	Jason Zhang	21	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Milpitas ShSa	POINTS	RANKS
	Sumukh Shekar	23	3
	Vikram Sastry	24	2

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

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

Signed: Venkataram R Kelluri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① ~~contestant~~ The Negation Team has enough evidence and ^{it is} recent.
- ② The speakers from the negative team has shown the ~~error~~ how the foreign policy is working ~~and~~ in reducing terrorism and how effectively they are using the nuclear materials for medical purpose

Decision: Negation Team won the debate

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 ~~Starts~~ are not present

POS	MSJ JiZh	POINTS	RANKS
	Katie Jiang	25	2
	Alyssa Zhao	21	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Diablo Valley ChPa	POINTS	RANKS
	Annabel Chen	26	1
	Emily Pang	24	3

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

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

Signed: Venkelensana R Kellni

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- ① The speakers presented their case effectively with statistics on how the terrorist ~~act~~ incidents were reducing with ~~new~~ current foreign policy
- ② This team has more recent and authentic information from different sources
- ③ The methodology used to collect the ~~same~~ information is excellent
- ④ The data collected is related to the case is more supporting that the terrorist activities reduced and foreign policy is working

Decision: Negative Team won this

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	Harker KhXi	POINTS	RANKS
1	Avi Khemani	27.8	3
2	Justin Xie	28.0	1

NEGATIVE

POS	LaReina leGe	POINTS	RANKS
1	Allegra Iezza	27.7	4
2	Katie Gerbasi	27.9	2

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

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

Signed: Aeresa Vaughn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Avi - Excellent use of proofs. you read at a good pace & looked up & were engaging. Good crossfire - I like how you redirected the question asked.

Justin: you really know the information well. Excellent restatement of concessions but you really need to lower your voice. you are too loud. Work on tailoring your voice.

Allegra: Very clear introduction - and emphasis on key points. clearly stated key points. it would have been helpful to be clear on region you are speaking to -

Katie - you are a very persuasive speaker. Great logical presentation. you are theatrical in your delivery and you may want to curb that & focus on backup info

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	Harker AgKw	POINTS	RANKS
2	Neeraj Aggarwal	27.9	3
1	Michael Kwan	27.8	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga JaVa	POINTS	RANKS
1	Ruchi Jain	28.0	2
2	Bhavana Vadrevu	28.1	1

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

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

Signed: Theresa Vaughn

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Michael
Great introduction delivery. You were clear and organized. Good quotes. Try to relax when you are speaking - you are doing very well. Excellent questions at crossfire. Rational questions.
Work on your summary - your delivery fell apart a bit. Try to stay focused & to the point.

Neeraj: Very well organized and you clearly reviewed all points. Good explanation of those going into power when a top leader is killed ↓

Ruchi
You are very engaging & look up often when you are speaking. Nice presentation of contentions & data. Good use of words like "net benefit" to summarize argument.

Bhavana - excellent presentation skills & quick key points supported by facts and/or back up. You have a nice way of explaining info. and ~~try~~ connecting to proofs.

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	Milpitas PaSa	POINTS	RANKS
2	Pranay Patni	28	3
1	Satvir Saggi	27.5	4

NEGATIVE

POS	James Logan TuLe	POINTS	RANKS
2	Mariah Turner	28.5	1
1	Nathan Leal	28.5	2

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

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG team won this debate by dominating the crossfire with right questions and proper evidences. They clearly debated on each of the AFF's points and weakened the AFF's claims. They pointed out that Afg. is not in the middle east and the AFF's card is general not on the middle east. The AFF acknowledged these in the end.

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	James Logan LeCh	POINTS	RANKS
1	Carol Lee	28	3
2	Jennifer Chen	28	4

NEGATIVE

POS	Mountain View ThSc	POINTS	RANKS
2	Kate Thomas	28.5	1
1	Ariane Schang	28.5	2

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams did a good job in their speeches. However, the NEG team did better in cross fires by clearly defining the debate scope and driving the AFF on the agenda. They made the AFF weaker by asking for the related evidences. Some of weak points by the AFF

- "obvious" does not need "evidence"
- more people are joining terrorism because US policy is killing innocent people.