

Novice

Public Forum

Round 5

Part 2

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 ChKo | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|--------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Divya Chandrupatla | 26.5 | 4 |
| 2 | Meghana Kolli | 28.5 | 1 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Saratoga SeMa | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Vibha Seshadri | 27 | 3 |
| 2 | Nupur Maheshwari | 27.2 | 2 |

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: Kaunty Malis

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: The AFF was able to support the resolution with a better argument than the NEG. The NEG just restated their argument.

AFF

Speaker 1:

- read incredibly fast which affected how clear your speech was. If you slow down in your reading or speaking you would be more clear.
- when crossfire or presenting case, you had great eye contact, but need to organize your thoughts a bit more.
- didn't give definitions

NEG

Speaker 1:

- ~~we~~ ~~have~~ ~~given~~ ~~definitions~~, but as ~~the AFF~~ ~~you~~ ~~didn't~~ ~~define~~ ~~the~~ ~~terms~~ ~~clearly~~.
- spoke clearly; were polite.
- stated facts that weren't presented by AFF.

Speaker 2:

- very organized.
- You think well on your feet
- you come across strong, but still polite.
- like how you gave a roadmap.
- addressed opp contentions well.
- very knowledgeable

Speaker 2:

- seemed hard for you to get pass the obvious, or infer meaning
- appear naive in beliefs that just because someone says something doesn't make it true.
- good eye contact
- spoke clearly
- appear organized.

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

NEGATIVE

| POS | Evergreen ChVe | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Asmita Choppa | 28 | 3 |
| 1 | Deepshika Vellaboyina | 27 | 4 |

| POS | Milpitas ShSu | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|---------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Grace Shau | 29 | 1 |
| 2 | Misbah Surani | 28 | 2 |

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

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

Signed: K. Anita

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams need to work on delivery.

It was a pretty close competition but ~~through~~ the neg had to be chosen as they seemed to have a better knowledge and done more research on the topic which was evident in their handling the questions and the rebuttals.

Aff could have elaborated more on the Libyan case as it is more relevant ~~to~~ instead of the 9/11. Also need to organize the content better ~~was~~ instead of wandering from the points being discussed.

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 | POINTS | RANKS |
|---------------------------|--------|-------|
| Eastside Prep CaVe | | |
| Raven Campbell | | |
| Jaqueline Velazquez | | |

NEGATIVE

| POS | POINTS | RANKS |
|-------------------------|--------|-------|
| Evergreen CoKu | | |
| 2 Bukre Coskun | | |
| 1 Priyanka Kulshreshtha | | |

The better debating was done by the NEG 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:

1A

1N

NEG Team won.
 AFF team didn't show up.
 AT 12:50, NEG team showed up. It seems they were waiting outside in the hall where one of the tables was marked 1F.
 I admit it is confusing the way the marking was done in the area.
 I am sorry that AFF team didn't have a chance to 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 contestants are not present


| POS | Evergreen KaPu | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Harika Kalluri | 28 | 2 |
| 1 | Neha Pusarla | 27.5 | 4 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | MSJ BhHu | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Uma Bhatia | 28.5 | 3 |
| 1 | Charshu Hurria | 28.5 | 1 |

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- author indicts alone without analytical arguments aren't very convincing
- I think crossfire is for asking questions not making arguments.

oral RFD.

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

NEGATIVE

| POS | Carlmont NiXi | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|---------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Vincent Nip | 27 | 4 |
| 2 | James Xie | 28 | 3 |

| POS | Milpitas KoSh | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|--------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Alefa Kothambawala | 30 | 1 |
| 2 | Karen Shyu | 28 | 2 |

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

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

Signed: *Alex Shyu*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- disregarded drone evidence - couldn't evaluate debate on that point

- refutations were decent both teams, make sure to link what you're attacking to the impact!

- too close!!!

Neg team - great confident speaking

Aff team - good job sticking to your points

Neg won, because of refutation points

DOUG ANDREWS

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 teams are not present

| POS | MSJ MuSi | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-------------------------|--------|-------|
| | Keerthana Muthukrishnan | 28.9 | 3 |
| | Ramiya Sivakumar | 28.7 | 4 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Bishop O'Dowd YaVa | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|--------------------|--------|-------|
| | Evin Yang | 29.3 | 1 |
| | Tommy Vaughan | 29.1 | 2 |

Keerthana 28.9 3
 Ramiya 28.7 4

Bishop O'Dowd YaVa

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

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

Signed: Doug Andrews

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st 2nd PRO DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT CONTENTIONS! BENGAHAZI NEEDS TO BE EXPANDED UPON!
 CON HAD NUMERICAL SUPPORT OF POSITION
 REDUCTION OF TERRITORY
 PRO - NEEDS TO HAVE EVIDENCE AT HAND EITHER PAPER OR LOCAL STORAGE. HAVING THAT EVIDENCE TO WIN CONTENTIONS.

NEGATIVE WAS ABLE TO SUPPORT CONTENTIONS. AFFIRMATIVE COULD NOT PRODUCE 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 contestants are not present

NEGATIVE

| POS | Saratoga Indep ShGu | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|---------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Roland Shen | 26.5 | 3 |
| 2 | Samuel Guo | 26.4 | 4 |

| POS | James Logan NgTa | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Ann Nguyen | 27.6 | 1 |
| 2 | Shivani Talnikar | 27.5 | 2 |

The better debating was done by the Negative 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:

- 1 N Excellent job. You outlined your case very well, as well as refuted your opponents argument
 - 1 A Good Arguments, work more on specifics. good eye contact and proofs
 - 2 N Very specific in your counter arguments of opponents. Nicely done
 - 2 A Be careful not to move around so much while speaking. Stay focused and articulate your points a little clearer.
- Nice job by all!
- I voted negative because their arguments were stronger.

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 | Olive Foundation MuVe | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|--------------|
| 1 | Vik Avantsa | 28.5 | 1 |
| 2 | Teja Veeramacheni | 27 | 4 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Milpitas VyKh | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|---------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Rutu Vyas | 27 | 3 |
| 1 | Ruby Khan | 28 | 2 |

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: CMY

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
 - Good Contentions.
 VIK - Good speaking and Debate skills.
 Do not speak while opponents are presenting!

NEG
 Ruby - Try not to laugh during ex!
 Need to improve CX skills
 Good & clarity speeches from both

I am giving this win for Aff because of the CX during debates.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Current for policy ^{ME} undermines our Nat'l Security
 11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Start Flight B if Flight

AFFIRMATIVE - Affirmants are not present

| POS | MSJ DoVe | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Abhi Doddi | 27 | 3 |
| 3 | Anusha Venkatesan | 28.5 | 1 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Young Gen BaBh | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------|
| 4 | Nidhi Bangari | 28 | 2 |
| 2 | Nilabh Bhat | 26 | 4 |

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

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

Signed: Ileen Mylrea

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Current = Obama 2008 → FP: sovereign country
 #1 prevent adversary create the creates terrorism. #1 prisoner tx
 #2 drone strikes less effective kill innocent threat - intent & capability
 #3 Pro Israel - undermines Nat'l Security. Economic Aid helps Nat'l Security
 XF benefits? 1.6 Trillion. cite source Paki News drone ineffective and also kills innocent. AIO growing due to the we must protect civilians killed - revenge *US & foreign interests
 Iran are close to nuclear weapons

#1 nothing back for the amount we have spent.
 ME: define by dictionary
 std. alternative to status quo / Sanctions: better than nothing. nuclear war.
 #1 ME govt open borders. economic benefits
 #2 Should inc econ policy. Poverty disperses terror
 #3 Effects of sanctions
 #3 Israel/Pal peace agreement. Economic Aid helps Nat'l Security
 XF Q ← countries surround ar at conflict i Israel i Israel
 drone ineffective.
 Soliders & Govt who made the decision/policy of torture.
 68% of fatalities are terrorist. all civilians are innocent civilians
 major attacks since 9/11
 Many near alliances i Israel
 *benefits can. 100k many differ ways can be weapons etc.

XF Pro Summary: limit use of like stuff - mand other slang - work on a clear presentation to make your pts and strengthen your case.
 #1 Con when Q. A time states what to many time plays with pencil and fingers. distracting.

Great Clash, answers and questions. All opponents handled a somewhat heated crossfires.
 Prisoner tx along with our allies particularly with Israel and what it creates this lack of benefits due to amount of money. The increase of civilians killed and as a result of the revenge exact on US abroad. Liked their definitions statistic and facts. Was a close round
 So for these reasons I find in favor of the AFF side.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

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

Flight B if Flight

Contestants are not present

(left side)

(left side)

NEGATIVE

| | POINTS | RANKS |
|------------------|--------|-------|
| Leland CuHe | | |
| Kyle Cui | 27 | 3 |
| Ali-Asghar Heera | 26 | 4 |

| POS | POINTS | RANKS |
|--------------------|--------|-------|
| Eastside Prep AlMa | | |
| Brian Alas | 29.5 | 1 |
| Ricardo Maldonado | 28.5 | 2 |

The better debating was done by the NEG from EAST SLIDE Prep AlMa
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:

NEG was more persuasive, in clearly defining their points, analyse counter arguments and make rebuttals.

ME defined boundaries, security policy state interests.

Effectiveness of SANCTIONS was debated. LA NEG was more forceful in putting up their rebuttals ~ how ~~great~~ sanctions were effective in enforcing US security interest.

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 ShGi | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|------------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Kunal Sharma | 25.5 | 3 |
| 1 | Gagandeep Gill | 25.7 | 1 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Norte Dame BaSe | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-----------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Snigdha Banda | 25.6 | 2 |
| 1 | Harveen Sekhon | 25.4 | 4 |

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:

Good job! Close round!
 Gagandeep well laid out opening argument, Harveen good job in crossfire. Kunal liked arguments about Egypt having been an ally, but no longer and obligation to protect Israel as ally.
 Snigdha good to argue effectiveness of drone strikes and reason for Syrian support
 AFF good to bring up negative effects of Syria policy on Turkey. Good Aff closing arguments. Good crossfires for both teams. Very close 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 | St. Marys CILO | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-------------------|--------|-------|
| 2 | Christopher Clark | 27 | 3 |
| 1 | Ashley Longmire | 26 | 4 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Mountain View MyLi | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------|-------|
| 2 nd | Cameron Myers | 28 | 1 |
| 1 st | Kevin Li | 27 | 2 |

PREP

AFF

30

37

53

NEG 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:

NO

Signed:

Brian McGarry

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The reason I went with the Neg case is that they successfully argued that Alliance w/ Israel Beneficial

AFF → argued that sanctions ultimately be beneficial by increasing supply for Iran. It didn't hold much weight (???)

NEG → You didn't gain a lot of ground arguing whether Economic interest is part of NATIONAL security — they introduced it with enough evidence.

AFF — NEED MORE concrete evidence to Back up your arguments & Bolster your case. HAVING more quotes will support your arguments & take it out of conjecture

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 ~~Startants~~ are not present

| POS | James Logan AhPa | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Wahab Ahmady | 4 | 27.5 |
| 2 | Edgar Partida | 3 | 27.5 |

NEGATIVE

| POS | Olive Foundation KoMe | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|-----------------------|--------|-------|
| 4 | Rohan Kota | 2 | 29 |
| 3 | Rohit Menon | 1 | 29.5 |

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

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

Signed: *JS*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A Good evidence to support his points

2A Spoke clearly.
Good time management.

1N { Good speaking!
Arguments made were very well supported.
Good gestures. Very confident.

2N: Arguments were well arranged.
Good eyecontact.
Good time management.

I voted NEG because they showed good evidence and logic about their arguments. Job well done.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Resolved: Current U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East undermines our national security.

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 KaRa | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Inderpal Kaur | 27 | 2 |
| 2 | Niharika Rane | 26 | 4 |

*prep
50 sec
50 sec
to rebut*

NEGATIVE

| POS | Leland GoMu | POINTS | RANKS |
|-----|----------------------|--------|-------|
| 1 | Sathvik Gowda | 28 | 1 |
| 2 | Madhukar Muralidhara | 27 | 3 |

*prep
30 sec
35 sec*

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: _____

Signed: *[Signature]* Jesuit Sacramento

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg (Gowda/Muralidhara) Positive; More effectively demonstrated how all 3 contentions (Drone strikes + Sanctions + Education) does not undermine U.S. national security. Drone strikes do not put our U.S. troops in harms way while effectively taking out militant leadership. ~~3~~ 3 points of evidence used to support logic of sanctions on Iran to prevent/shutdown nuclear capabilities. Very clear support for how education strengthens U.S. security. Good flow/carry of contentions throughout. Overall wins cross fire sessions: stayed on point, addressed questions, power & presence

Aff (Kaur/Rane) Positive: Laid out framework very clear with strong start/opening, rebuttal/contentions (emboldens U.S. adversaries + anti-american sentiment over F35s + drone strikes, killing civilians). Both speakers delivered confident & clear arguments (with exception of Education rebuttal).
 Improve: I did not hear as many convincing arguments that directly linked contentions to the impact on U.S. if nuclear security is undermined = There are some great examples that provide the evidence to support Aff's logic which were not used = 9/11, Libya, etc.

Neg 2 (Gowda) Positive: Excellent time spent to lay out 3 contentions (clear & understandable); well done ending impacts of contentions for example foreign policy on drone strikes protects U.S. ~~prep~~ troops.
 Improve: Timed out on summary; did not support "caution revolution hellory" argument.

Aff 1 (Kaur) Positive: Set the framework well supported by multiple use of evidence to strengthen logic. Very good speaker: calm confident voice + eye contact = very convincing, very impressive with holding ground in cross fire.
 Improve: ~~Attempt~~ Attempt to refute Neg education contention was not well structured or communicated.

Over →