

Open

Pufo

Elims

Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Parliamentary

Writers

ELIM

Open Par to Finals

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

~~Act 231~~
Act 129

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Milpitas Presentation

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: <i>Milpitas Presentation</i>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: <i>Shikhar</i>		
	Speaker: <i>Sustri</i>		

NEGATIVE

POS	School: <i>Milpitas Presentation</i>	POINTS: _____	RANKS
	Speaker: <i>Tran</i>		<i>1</i>
	Speaker: <i>Callian</i>		

The better debating was done by the *NEG* from _____
AFFIRMATIVE / NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Oral

Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Parliamentary

Abhinav *MI* *ELIM*

*Open Purto
Finals*

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

~~Arts 129~~

Arts 129

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Milpitas

Presentation

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE *Presentation*

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: <i>Sumukh Shekar</i>		
	Speaker: <i>Vinayam</i>		

NEGATIVE *Milpitas*

POS	School:	POINTS:	RANKS
	Speaker: _____		
	Speaker: _____		

The better debating was done by the *Aff* from *Presentation*
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:

Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Parliamentary

Wants in ELIM open Puff
Finals

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

~~Arts 230~~

Arts 129

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Milpitas Presentation

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	School: Presentation	POINTS:	RANKS
1st	Speaker: Juliana		
2nd	Speaker: Nicole		

NEGATIVE

POS	School: Milpitas	POINTS:	RANKS
1st	Speaker: Samuel		
2nd	Speaker: Vikram		

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

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

Signed: Pats Per King

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Current Foreign policy hurting US Nat. Security

Neg 1

M.E. ~~an~~ include # Afghanistan / Pakistan ✓

- Iran
→ sanctions hurt Iran econ
→ slow nuclearization
→ nuclear imminence threat US security
- CT efforts Succession
→ AI Qaeda document
→ 9/11 letter = -20%
→ Al Qaeda for attack 9/11
- M.E. defense
→ flexibility hard
→ flexibility = success
→ delay

Iran 90% toward 20% uranium getting bomb only for weapon or getting 20% AP a rounded sanctions only

Draw, Afghanistan - this strategy attracts the world about the attack AP

3rd largest strategic oil reserves same cap. why? for against Syria ↓ already failing to address this

Nat. security = protection of citizens, values, & allies

Not part of M.E. strategy

Arms strikes in collection # attacks AP

delay not good enough

Weapons / Foreign policy

APP 1. ~~clear~~

1. Clear message in Syria Syria = threat to Israel

US failure to proceed w/ stronger missile prevention M.E.

3. FERS fail to slow Iran nuclear continue AP

no intent for attack, no policy and could this, with only actions

increased actions endangering credibility

no need for action have to sanctions → lead to understanding of Iran's gov. → engage the bulk

US Foreign policy currently addresses this

2 attacks AP Policy ≠ stronger

US relation sanctions do not undermine

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan) vs. Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Mountain View GGVA

Presentation CaTr

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- definition of foreign policy went neg, included moving towards objectives, not negative move as per their def. of undermine. Therefore, little ~~benefit~~ benefit or ~~stasis~~ stasis means ^{aff} ~~loss~~ losses, which increases the burden of PRAF.
- ~~the~~ ^{Neg} was ahead on CT and great D on Iran, so at least there is stasis, not an ^{detrimental} active "undermining"

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Mountain View GGVa (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan) vs. Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Juliena Tran)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

MOUNTAIN VIEW

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

PRESENTATION

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~NEG JUST DID A SR~~
ORAL.
NEG D

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran) vs. Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Mountain View

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Presentation

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Ashwin Vaidynathan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: ~~Nobill B~~ Arts 129
Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Public Forum

SEMI

Phillips, Les

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

MSJ JiZh (^{1st} Katie Jiang & ^{2nd} Alyssa Zhao) vs. Milpitas ShSa (^{1st} Sumukh Shekar & ^{2nd} Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IAC

IN

Good signposting for both teams

Have to answer iron can trade with other countries arguments

ZA

2N

Better contextualization of arguments since I last saw you

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry) vs. MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas ShSa

MSJ JiZh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Milpitas ShSa

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Negative - Both of you are really nice to listen to. You guys are wonderful speakers. But there were a lot of dropped points.

Great debate.

Room: ~~North B~~ Arts 129
Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Public Forum

SEMI

Thorpe, Jon

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

^{1st} MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao) vs. ^{2nd} Milpitas ShSa (^{1st} Sumukh Shekar & ^{2nd} Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

Milpitas

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

MSJ

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Given verbally

1:50

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

MSJ JiZh (^{1st} Katie Jiang & ^{2nd} Alyssa Zhao) vs. Milpitas LePu (^{1st} Miranda Le & ^{2nd} Jason Pugatch)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

MSJ JiZh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Milpitas LePu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Adler*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1st negation - good cross ex questions about the time frame of drone strikes leading to terrorism leading to nuclear war

2nd

2nd negation - discussion of case by case analysis was effective. Could have been made more effective had you then ~~talked~~ actually talked about how current us policy does not undermine policy with Tunisia for example

1st affirmation - smart examination of NEG's case by case analysis counters their cost benefit analysis standard

2nd affirmation - good framing of impacts and the national security framework

Room: Arts 103 O'Connor 206
Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Public Forum

QUAR

McNulty, Brian

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

MSJ Jizh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao) vs. Milpitas LePu (Miranda Le & Jason Pugatch)

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ Jizh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

~~Milpitas~~ Milpitas LePu

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from MSJ

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Nathan Tjebk

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

MIRANDA - SEXY CROSS X

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

^{1st} Milpitas LePu (Miranda Le & Jason Pugatch) vs. ^{1st} ^{2nd} MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao)

AFFIRMATIVE

MSJ

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Milpitas

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Gave comments verbally without disclosing

44
Affirmative
verbally told

Negative
verbally told

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

James Logan MoMa (^{2nd}Sohabe Mojaddidy & ^{1st}Omkar Mahajan) vs. Milpitas ShSa (^{1st}Sumukh Shekar & ^{2nd}Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Milpitas

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A

~~NEG is not going to admit~~
~~NEG is not going to admit~~
~~that drone strikes~~

don't get caught up in
crossfire ques tions, move on
- neg wasn't going to
concede correlation vs
causation arguments
about drone strike

2A

great answers on
epistemology outweighing
empirics

1N

don't good extensions of how
AFF never extended capacity,
intent, magnitude observation
and turn

2N

do not get caught up in
empirics, AFF can't/won't
provide. Show that they

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry) vs. James Logan MoMa (Sohabe Mojaddidy & Omkar Mahajan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas ShSa

James Logan MoMa

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

OMKAR - Your voice is awesome
Don't be so aggressive in CX
you keep saying "let me finish" and hardly
let VIKRAM speak
& you don't let him ask a question

Respond to ARGs - neg answer this HEG ARG

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

James Logan MoMa (Sohabe Mojaddidy & Omkar Mahajan) vs. Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan

Milpitas

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from Milpitas

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Comments & reason given verbally without discoloring

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

St. Francis AkGa (Prthivi Akella & Aakash Garg) vs. Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Prthivi Akella and Aakash Garg
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Tchernio Bortchev Jr.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff team won because they had solid arguments, such as the ineffective sanctions on Iran, as well as missing weapons that could end up in terrorist hands, and those arguments were not sufficiently addressed by the Neg team. The Aff team also had more structure and confidence in the delivery of their arguments. The Neg team was caught "spreading" and talking too fast on several occasions.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

St. Francis AkGa (Prtihvi Akella & Aakash Garg) vs. Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

St Francis AKGa

Presentation CaTr

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

LO - incredibly aggressive + loud... disrespectful
Mo - "

'Summed up this debate comes down to:

Ineffective Iranian sanctions (AFF) vs odds of terrorism (NEG)

NEG stated the criteria of NB at the beginning so we will be using that as our weighing mechanism here. NB fits in the res by way of looking @ if undermined policy is/is not a benefit — ie; if sanctions ↑ ⇒ benefit or lower terror ⇒ benefit.

In this case w/ arguments laid out AFF side wins, odds are still odds but solid sanctions win out over potential. What benefits NatSec more are solid policies.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

St. Francis AkGa (2nd Pritivi Akella & 1st Aakash Garg) vs. Presentation CaTr (2nd Nicole Callinan & 1st Julienna Tran)

AFFIRMATIVE

Presentation CaTr

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

St. Francis AkGa

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Presentation

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff - Wow, you are both wonderful speakers!

Neg - Great use of evidence.

RFD: Aff proved that there was a threat which is what the resolution called for. Neg never ~~defended~~ fought the inclusion of allies in definitions.

Both teams should work on being more respectful during cross-ex. Neg should work on not speaking over Aff.

Great Round it was super close.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Foothill HuZh (Jeffrey Huai & Jason Zhang) vs. Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Ben Gardner-Gill and Ashwin Vaidynathan

Jeffrey Huai and Jason Zhang

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

The better debating was done by the Aff from Foothill HuZh

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Tchernio Boytchev Jr. TJB

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

11/16/12

Room: Lucas 108
Flight A: Start ASAP
Open Public Forum

O'Connor 207

QUAR

Park, Sarah

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Foothill HuZh (^{1st} Jeffrey Huai & ^{2nd} Jason Zhang) vs. Mountain View GGVa (^{1st} Ben Gardner-Gill & ^{2nd} Ashwin Vaidynathan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Mountain View GGVa

Foothill Hu Zh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Mountain View G't.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg - sign post more tell me where you want me to put facts on my flow. When cutting cards have offline access to the entire file.

Aff - Have sources ready.!

Both - cross fire became messy, no points were proven. Both teams need to answer questions more directly.

RFD. Aff won on the definition debate. Also in the 1st an argument I saw proof that one policy undermines our National Security.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan) vs. Foothill HuZh (Jeffrey Huai & Jason Zhang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

MV GGVA

Foothill HuZh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1) Definition Debate: CIA vs Congress seemed a bit petty to me - none really offered me the reason why CIA > congress or why congress > CIA - both are key to foreign policy so I will use the entire area. The Pakistan argument was dropped by both sides so I will NOT use it in my RFD.

2) Messiness: Both sides appeared in my understanding to at times, advocate for the same thing. Both understood that US FP in the Mideast has led to strife.

RFD: It comes down to impacts

Affirmative stated 3,994 attacks/year \$ Bin Laden evidence (95%) \$ extended across flow. Negation needed to have proven that policies were not being undermined here, but used Bush era terror evidence, not Obama era as a reason.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Foothill HuZh (Jeffrey Huai & Jason Zhang) vs. Olive Foundation WuYu (Max Wu & Victoria Yuan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Foothill Jason Jeffrey

Olive Foundation Victoria Max

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jeff Huai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg 1: 100% killed by terrorists

Aff 1: Sanctions increase terrorism

Xfire: How the increased Al Qaeda membership undermines security

Neg 2: Iran nukes cannot reach the U.S.

Aff 2: Drone attacks. 2% or 9% successful.

Xfire:

Neg 1: increased terrorists don't mean more damage

Aff 1: Terrorists capable

Xfire:

Neg 2: ABM in Israel, Time Square, no capability

Aff 2: Neg dropped 4 points

It was close. I was a little more convinced by the Neg team.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Olive Foundation WuYu (Max Wu & Victoria Yuan) vs. Foothill HuZh (Jeffrey Huai & Jason Zhang)

Foothill
Jason & Jeffrey
AFFIRMATIVE

Olive Foundation
Victoria, Max
NEGATIVE

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
Def: ME include Pak & Afg.
Contentions
C1 Drone strikes negative impact. terrorist # go up.
C2 Iran sanction impact. common people.
C3 cumen Policy counterproductive.

NEG
ME No def provided contentions
C1 Drone attacks effective
C2 Terrorist org loosing capabilities
C3 US has improved internal security like airplane doors to make attack more difficult.
Good Point

This was a close debate. Both sides made some good points. However AFF came up with statistics which NEG could not refute. Therefore AFF won the debate.
Both teams did well.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Olive Foundation WuYu (Max Wu & Victoria Yuan) vs. Foothill HuZh (Jeffrey Huai & Jason Zhang)

AFFIRMATIVE

Foothill *Huai - 1st*
Zhang - 2nd

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Olive Foundation *Yuan - 1st*
Wu - 2nd

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Foothill.

Signed: *Richard Kere*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff :- Excellent definition of position

1. Yemen drone attacks - & position in Yemen well supported -
2. Iran sanctions - civilians impacted clearly presented.

Times Sq. bomber = good argument.
Skewed military data = good support.

Good summation on points in final focus.

I voted Aff as their overall position & style was very strong.

Neg :- Good definition.

1. Drone strikes killed terrorists - *unproven* *not* *security*
2. Anti ballistic missiles.
3. US largest super power -

Crossfire position on Iran not maintained.

Inter continental missile position is not supported as its not just the US attack that should be a concern. Consider overall security of the citizenry.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

A ^① Leland MeMe (Ann-Kathrin Merz & Sebastian Merz) vs. N ^② Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Leland: Merz & Merz

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Milpitas: Shkar & Sastry

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Leland: Merz²
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: Ritchie

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: (Ann-Kathrin)

- ⊕: Nice delivery, not too fast, gave eye contact. Needed clear layout of contentions. Outstanding.
- ⊖: seemed a bit less sure of self during CX

2A: (Sebastian)

- ⊕: Nice delivery, good command of facts. Excellent refuting of neg contentions. Excellent access to your evidence.
- ⊖: Slow down a bit in delivery of initial argument. Better during CX.

↑ you two make a great team

1N: (Sumukh)

- ⊕: Good contentions - nice that attacked defn of middle east & start (no Pakistan or Afghanistan). Excellent CX - you really shined there.
- ⊖: Seems like read too much rather than "tell" us your argument. Slow down a bit.

2N: (Vikram)

- ⊕: Good command of facts. Good CX - excellent questions.
- ⊖: Careful not to speak too quickly. If slow down, easier for audience to follow arguments.

I voted for Aff because:

- 1) Didn't buy that CIA defn should apply to foreign policy definition of middle east.
- 2) ~~Excellent~~ does CIA set U.S. foreign policy? Did not convince of this.
- 3) Convinced by argument that sanctions strengthen oil-based regimes.

But I must add that both sides did a fabulous job & I know both teams will go far in Public Forum!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry) vs. Leland MeMe (Ann-Kathrin Merz & Sebastian Merz)

AFFIRMATIVE

Leland MeMe

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Milpitas ShSa

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I did not hear Neg's initial definition of ME - was not clearly stated initially.
Who wins argument of whether to include Pak/Afg or not in ME?
The answer is include Pak/Afg.
Council on foreign relations, Pak not support by
∴ entertain Pak argument.

Close match but I vote for NEG because of strength of best summary - sanctions are working based on evidence of real & inflation. Also, interesting and effective argument that nuclear weapons would provide cover for Hezbollah.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Leland MeMe (Ann-Kathrin Merz & Sebastian Merz) vs. Milpitas ShSa (Sumukh Shekar & Vikram Sastry)

AFFIRMATIVE

Leland MeMe

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Milpitas ShSa

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ann-Kathrin: Excellent delivery in first speech, but your fourth contention had no warrants and just a blanket claim. Summary just ignored their responses. You opened up the door for them to extend arguments without obstruction.

Sebastian: A lot of your responses were misguided and not even factually accurate. It takes away your credibility.

Sumukh: Really good job in cross-fire, you did a good job of keeping the questions going in the direction you wanted.

Vikram: Pretty good coverage in rebuttal and excellent job bringing impacts and more deep reasoning. Talk about your arguments more in final focus.

FD: Negative has cleaner lines to their impacts and more factual than affirmative.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Since the sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas LePu (Miranda Le & Jason Pugatch) vs. Harker RaHu (Emaad Raghib & Joyce Huang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas LePu

Harker RaHu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

POINTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Turkey is or not in middle east. - Aff wins due to argument "actually physically in ME."
Current cyberwarfare tactics or not. Aff ~~wins~~ wins w/ 'Wired' reference of reuse of repeated use of worms. And dormant worms in grid and actual attacks (eg bofa) carry the argument that policy undermines

Sanctions working or not - tie

Turkey nukes site or not - tie

I vote for affirmative because of the strength of the cyber argument.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Harker RaHu (Emaad Raghib & Joyce Huang) vs. Milpitas LePu (Miranda Le & Jason Pugatch)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas LePu

Harker RaHu

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Miranda Le*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Joyce: Delivery in first speech was a little too quick. Don't let yourself get dominated in cross-examination. It seems like you didn't even listen to their responses, you just repeated yourself.

Miranda: Good delivery in first speech. Good stature in cross-ex and how you are in control of the direction of cross-examination.

Your summary was pretty 😊

Emaad: Don't go over your own case when you are first speaker!!!
Emaad, because of the term "undermines" they do not need direct evidence that its already happened. Props should be top priority.

Jason: Your delivery is so beautiful. I think you could have benefited from an analogy when the other team called you out for what-ifs.

RFD: The affirmative team does have the most offense in this round. The negative just kind of ignored responses and kept going without being responsive.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas LePu (Miranda Le & Jason Pugatch) vs. Harker RaHu (Emaad Raghib & Joyce Huang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas: Le & Pugatch
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Harker: Raghib & Huang
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Richie

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

1A: good pace & provision of factual info to support contentions
(Miranda) good CX & command of topic.
work on delivery very good, but could slow down a bit
Silly comment - your three's deep vers
careful not to ^{distraction} ~~spoke~~ when Jason speaking
New cog. of evidence

2A: Excellent refuting of neg. contentions with
(Jason) some very specific facts. Excellent knowledge
• drones
• oil exports > damaging
Good pace & delivery.
work on using jargon specific to PuFo - not all judges are familiar with these terms.

1N: Good CX
(Joyce) Good command of topic.
work on: holding & bouncing timer
Speed - too fast - better to present less info more slowly
Relax a bit.

2N: Excellent refuting of aff. contentions
(Emaad) Good CX
work on: eye contact with all of judges - seemed to talk mostly to adult in room that was not judging.
Be careful not to say "actually" too much & relax a bit.

liked that both sides were polite to each other.
I voted for aff. because aff had better knowledge of facts & were able to cite more evidence/provide warrants for contentions. Also appeared more confident in arguments while neg. appeared more tentative & less able to support contentions & refute aff. contentions.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Diablo Valley ChPa (Annabel Chen & Emily Pang) vs. James Logan MoMa (Sohabe Mojaddidy & Omkar Mahajan)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan

Diablo Valley

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Logan

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: V. Meenakshi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The summation on both sides proved the following points:

~~NEG~~ were limited by the def. of "threat" (perception) with no concrete eg. (provided to the contrary by the AFF).

NEG's hope for an Irani-US peace talk (not yet manifested)

The AFF's arguments had geo-political issues, as well as economic issues (ineffective sanctions against Iran) ^{as per AFF (Syria-Turkey)} that clinched the argument in their favor.

Comment to Diablo Valley: Speak a bit slower - it helps to get a point across clearly.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

^{2nd speaker (2)} ^{PRO (1)} James Logan MoMa (Sohabe Mojaddidy & Omkar Mahajan) vs. ^{NEG (2)} ^{1st. (1)} Diablo Valley ChPa (Annabel Chen & Emily Pang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan MoMa

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Diablo Valley


NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from

AFF or NEG

Diablo Valley
~~James Logan MoMa~~
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- (1) Current US policy has reduced terrorism terrorist attacks has decreased over time since 9/11
- (2) More younger Iranian are pro-American younger generation will have better control of weapons, Negative will not last
- (3) Having anti-American sentiment doesn't mean they have the capabilities. # of attacks actually decreased. want # can

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

James Logan MoMa (Sohabe Mojaddidy & Omkar Mahajan) vs. Diablo Valley ChPa (Annabel Chen & Emily Pang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan MoMa
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Diablo Valley ChPa
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Emily - A little fast on your 4 minute speech - I could understand you but some parent judges might have problems following everything.

Good crossfire questions. Good eye contact in cross. (Good Summary) (Iran is negotiating w/ us good point. current evidence is good too.)
Omkar - Clear speaker, good pace.
Good cross fire questions, Good eye contact in cross. *Good point about doubled uranium*

Annabel - clear speaker, covered AFF case well.

Sohabe - Very good speaker. Good crossfire answers. Impressive explanations about terrorism and how it is a threat & a feather is not needed to establish threat.

FD: Iran has doubled uranium - aff says. Neg did not respond except to say we might have peace in the future. Also, Drones - Neg could not give examples on effectiveness of them but AFF gave plenty of reasons for negatives on them including an increase in terrorism and civilian deaths.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

James Logan TuLe (Mariah Turner & Nathan Leal) vs. MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan

MS Jose

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the NEG from M San Jose.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: V. Meen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

While the AFF's points were almost irrefutable, the NEG's case won by a very narrow margin of showing that terror incidents have decreased & US is the most powerful military on the planet & the Mid. E. come nowhere close to it in capacity.

Clincher: On the point on poverty vs killing ^(brought up by AFF) the NEG clearly stated that it was better off being poor (owing to sanctions) than getting killed (drones/terror).

↳ current policy is effective. (which actually supported AFF but the AFF didn't get them!)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

NEG (1) MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao) vs. James Logan TuLe (Mariah Turner & Nathan Leal) (2) (1)
PRO speak first

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan TuLe
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

MSJ JiZh
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- (1) Current US policy in regard is beneficial
- (2) Sanctions in Iran improve our national security. It weakened Iran's economic. Iran does not have the capabilities to threaten US.
- (3) There is no major attacks on US since 9/11. Most Taliban do not share the same sentiments to US

Room: ~~Kenna 212~~ Lucas 309
Flight ~~A~~ Start ASAP
Open Public Forum

OCTA

Wachs, Michelle
Schletzbaum Jammie

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

MSJ JiZh (Katie Jiang & Alyssa Zhao) vs. James Logan TuLe (Mariah Turner & Nathan Leal)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

James Logan TuLe

MSJ JiZh

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Jammie Schletzbaum

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nathan - Amazing speaker. Good summary speech.

Katie - clear speaker.

Mariah - Very good speaker. Good job on covering Neg case - Very good cross questions.

Alyssa - clear speaker. ~~Very good cross questions~~

RFD: This was a very good debate & close but AFF seemed to have a more convincing argument in that Drone strikes are both ineffective and increasing terrorism. Also, I really liked the link that AFF made with sanctions causing a weak economy in Iran and citizens who have economic instability are more prone to join terrorist groups. This was a very good argument. AFF also said Sanctions failed to work in N. Korea and there was no real response to this by neg other than to say we hope to delay Nukes.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

2 1 R 1
Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Julienna Tran) vs. Leland ShCh (Ye Sol Shin & Jeremy Chang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Presentation

Leland

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Kathy Maie

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams did well. The AFF seemed to address and prove the resolution slightly better. They used more current evidence, and were able to counter all the NEG's points.

AFF
Julienna: confident, good eye contact
- rebutted each point
- read case + spoke at a good rate.
- asked great questions
Knowledgeable - didn't get flustered - did well

NEG
Jeremy confident
s good eye contact, stumbled + lost place during case presentation
pronunciations were a little off.
- Your case wasn't clear how it tied into the resolution.
- used opponents evidence against them.
abstract case

Nicole
- Nice job with most current quote!
- appear knowledgeable
- confident + great eye contact
- nice job countering opponent.

Ye Sol - confident, great eye contact
- organized.
- stuck on one track that part of the resolution/ contentions
- became condescending "
- current ~~strong~~ evidence disputes your economic arg.
- applied that econ affects ntl. security

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan & Juliana Tran) vs. Leland ShCh (Ye Sol Shin & Jeremy Chang)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Presentation CaTr
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Leland ShCh
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from Presentation CaTr

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Juliana: very fast; needs more clarity & diction.
no position
- can't protect from Syria nuclear weapons.
- US failed to secure these weapons.
- most danger weapons of mass destruction.
- Iran leading terrorist.
- border dispute, religious confrontation and results in nuclear war.
- Hestla → Syria gives them to Hestla.

Response → how can we prevent the possible nuclear proliferation from Syria and Iran's nuclear bomb?

Nicole: claims → all fiscal not enough impact
→ counter terrorism.
→ drone increase more ppl offer leader dead → 2001 NY bomb → doesn't solve US terrorist

can build a nuclear weapon
effectiveness of drones untrue & that it is now creating anti-american sentiment

strong in proving that drones are not beneficial
yet congress in creating ideas of anti-america
→ Iran is still building nuclear as of today

NO link from Neg to really see how economy can fall will stop this bomb attack

can show the inefficiency of US sanctions. on preventing nuclear proliferation
→ should have attacked their defense of destroying leaders
for US can be trained

Neg

Jeremy: Saudi Arabia helps protect US interest w/ oil on terror. Pull \$ security.
Saudi Arabia helped prevent bomb in FedEx
oil → has 25% of global oil for US advantage
increase production after 9/11.
counter terrorism: target senior leader only 1 member left due to Obama admin.
Better drone 99% of attacks are successful - protect civilians.

Ye Sol Shin: Foreign policy; economy is part of national security
Iran economy is collapsing due to the building of nuclear program
40% of currency value
Drones: 99% are military deaths
Yemen endorses American drones.
Hestla taking down Uganda government will help or US foreign policy.

→ only real defence is the fact provide in hypertechnology
leaders destroyed will stop terrorism
→ not persuasive w/ only one idea of point of drones
accuracy.
→ great way of hitting a ? on audience
if we feel safer today.

only real defence would be the dismantling of terrorism organization stopping nuclear war... need more effort if leaders are gone

need to show a stronger link of economy neg. affecting Iran: preventing nuclear proliferation

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Leland ShCh (Ye Sol Shin ² & Jeremy Chang ¹) vs. Presentation CaTr (Nicole Callinan ² & Julienna Tran ¹)

AFFIRMATIVE

Presentation

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Leland

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

- Impacts outweigh
- Turned Syria links
- Sassy crossed (let your opponents finish)
- Neg dropped their economy offense
- Drones cause instability utilize this.

I wish I could give this feedback
 → verbally and explain more/answer questions.
 IF you ~~ask~~ ask me. ~~see me~~
 see me

Negative

- Talk about probability of impacts
- Backing Israel = more war
- Timeframe,
- Why are the drones significant to security?
- Stick with economy and definitions, you were winning on those points.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

St. Francis AkGa (Prtihvi Akella & Aakash Garg) vs. Evergreen SuBa (Ranjani Subramani & Nathan Bao)

AFFIRMATIVE

St. Francis

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Evergreen

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I wish I could give this feedback verbally and explain more and answer questions. If you see me, ask me.

Affirmative

Negative

- Strong crossex, However, let opponents finish
- Good connection between econ-national security
- Turned drone link
- Thank you for roadmap
- Economy link + Impact won on
- Bring in stronger definitions
- Talk more on the probability of your situations.

- Good use of definitions
- Shorter/more precise questions in crossex
- Attack their "anti-American terrorist attacks"
- Talk about more than education is at stake
- "Impact outweighs"
- Good use of debate language
- How do the drones make use safer

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Evergreen SuBa (Ranjani Subramani & Nathan Bao) vs. St. Francis AkGa (Prithvi Akella & Aakash Garg)

AFFIRMATIVE

St. Francis AkGa

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Evergreen SuBa

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

The better debating was done by the Aff from St. Francis AkGa.

AFF or NEG

TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative

Aakash: 6000 US. army died 7% of National Debt from Middle East. Diplomatic strain → anti-american. Terrorist detainee too expensive → how does that undermine security? Al Qaeda recruit w/in US due to US. policy in middle east. Prithvi could help →

* BBV → 14 new leaders in Al Qaeda. great defense

- AQ/PA → Al Qaeda in the Arabia Peninsula. → had 2 home land attacks, Prithvi

→ great @ using the fact that Al Qaeda has an embargo attack w/ 0 members in US.

* Fueling terrorism w/ Drones. w/ increase ... Not convincing 14 < 20 ... there is still less leaders ... quantifying it is only one small point. Drones show statistics in efficiency can also help ... quantify that to refute the 99% efficiency of attack on terrorism still a great statistic! counter

? I don't understand how you proved the inefficiency of US screenings against nuclear proliferation.

Argument of 2009 attack will be stronger w/ the actual evidence of the terrorist objective: whom he recruited to answer if it is more policy link. What policies have terrorist or policies you believe. + trigger anti-americanism in US

Negative

Nathan: what individual activities? Is that even quantifiable? Secretive widely more? → 2/3 destruction of Al Qaeda. → less than 1% of civilian → planes not killed. → Drone strike help protect American ppl. limit of life lost

→ economic mens by ending war: 34-4 trillion for Iraq, US.

→ New leaders can form: You need to see if there is any new leaders. No presumption that 20 die so 10 are left

* disagree anti-americanism is a direct influence on national security

Don't agree w/ your attacks on your opponents argument

→ they did connect Middle East Al Qaeda's ability to influence our citizens: → national security

→ Plots ... plans are still to be wary ... it is technically a threat.

→ Instead of asking for just the link on anti-america links in America increasing, show beneficials of how our attack policies hold position, allies relation in ME & even in US.

→ I want you to counter more on the Guantanamo Bay commitments because the cost of protecting our national security is priority

→ Does it matter what terrorist group me is from ... a threat is a threat ... only is valid if you can show that this is not influenced by current ME foreign policy.

* great job @ using statistic to show Obama's inefficiency.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Evergreen SuBa (²Ranjani Subramani & ¹Nathan Bao) vs. St. Francis AkGa (²Prithvi Akella & ¹Aakash Garg)

AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

St. Francis

Evergreen

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: *Nathan Malu*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: *The Neg was able to use more current data and could counter every point. The Neg was able to prove their case slightly better*

AFF: 1 ~~Nathan~~ Aakash

- defined each word in resolution
- asked good questions
- good eye contact
- pronounced words well even when reading fast
- You tended to be too loud for the size of the audience.
- didn't really let opp ask a quest. used opp evidence against them.

NEG: 1 Nathan *try to relax - appeared nervous*

- didn't understand your fiscal point
- did well under cross - Don't be afraid to interrupt politely
- when reading case - sturred your words a bit.
- had trouble formulating questions + answers that weren't on your card.

AFF: 2 Prithvi *confident, good eye contact*

- used a metaphor - good idea - ~~maybe try~~
- good evidence
- like that you know the topic well enough to have to not read your case.
- addressed the NEG case. (the secrets the, 2 homeland)

NEG: 2 Ranjani

- Very organized, confident, great eye contact - attempted to address all points
- plots = threat
- didn't address the new terrorists
- presented case well
- don't need to thank everyone everytime you come up.

Said: "I haven't said, but will say now" 2 times - awkward

it appeared you were eating during your speech

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Milpitas PaSa (Pranay Patni & Satvir Saggi) vs. Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan)

AFFIRMATIVE

Milpitas - Saggi = 1st
Patni = 2nd

NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

NEGATIVE

Mtn View. = Gardner-Gill = 1st
Vaidynathan = 2nd

NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: Nithreen Heera

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff:

Contention = double standard
position is very good.

* Anti American sentiment -
is a valid argument.

Overall support for contention is
solid however presentation is
very difficult to follow.

* Pakistan position (example) solid
research - unclear as to why its
deemed irrelevant.

I voted for Aff case as their
case and positions were well supported.
However ~~if~~ their presentations were not
as strong as they could have been. Need to work on style & language.

Neg:

- 1. Obama = positions well grounded & formulated
- 2. killing terrorist leaders - position is hard to conceptualize & didn't make sense.
- 3. US should not intervene in Syria = not supported.

Cross fire positions = difficult to follow.

Need to focus on your case.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan) vs. Milpitas PaSa (Pranay Patni & Satvir Saggi)


AFFIRMATIVE

NEGATIVE

Milpitas ^{Satvir}
Pranay
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mountain View ^{Ben}
Ashwin
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff1: speech not clear enough

Neg1: current policy preferable and improving security

Crossfire:

Aff2: Anti-American sentimentism increases terrorism

Neg2: Killing terror leaders in middle East decreases terrorism
No major terror attacks on the US in last 10 years.

Crossfire: terrorism 17 people killed. more got killed by furniture

Aff1:

Neg1: Pakistan not considered part of M.E.

Aff2: Double standard undermining security

Neg2: Iran nukes not a threat to the US

Terrorism: Killing terrorists strengthens US security

Summary: Neg team more convincing, confident, clear.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012


Once sides have been determined, please insert the name of the affirmative team on the AFFIRMATIVE line and the negative team on the NEGATIVE line.

Mountain View GGVA (Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidynathan) vs. Milpitas PaSa (Pranay Patni & Satvir Saggi)

Milpitas **AFFIRMATIVE**
1 → Satvir Saggi & Pranay Patni
NAME OF AFFIRMATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

Mountain View **NEGATIVE**
2 Ben Gardner-Gill & Ashwin Vaidyanathan
NAME OF NEGATIVE TEAM OR CONTESTANT

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
 No definition for ME.
 CON Def not challenged.
 contentions
 c1 Double standard
 c2 Soft Power does not solve terr.
 c3 Iran Sanctions no impact
 c4 Cyber Attack (Good Point)

CON
 ME excludes Pak, AFG.
 contention
 c1 Current policy is at least neutral
 c2 ~~Pat~~ Drone strike effective
 c3 Policy in Geria eff.

Neg team won as they provided contentions & Facts that were not successfully challenged by AFF team. Neg statistics was more meaningful. Ben & Ashwin good facts & statistics. Satvir & Pranay Focus on facts & stats.