

Room: MAIN 20
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Victoria Kuhelmann
COMS
Yalamanchili, Prasad
Challenger

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge Zheng & Raganathan (Zheng & Raganathan) vs Harker CP (Cheung & Pan)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Valley Harker
 PRO CON
 Winner: Harker debating on the Neg/Con
 School/Team Side (Pro or Con)
 Signature: [Signature] School: _____

Other judges on panel: Rachel Chiang, Max Wu. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Resolved: In response to the current crisis a government should prioritize the humanitarian needs of refugees over ~~rather~~ national interests

Neg

- cost benefit not necessary
- helping but not prioritizing
- 22k children - in US only or world wide?
- consuming resources not available

CCF
None

Aff

- value lives before all else
- economy
- self sufficient - not burden
- entrepreneurs

CCF

• How to help? Idea on how to help v. prioritizing? (No plan)

- Burden?
- What unique reasons to prioritize
- No reason why cannot accept
- 22k die due to poverty, no stats on lives lost due to Syrian conflict

- economic gains
- saving lives - do poverty rates go down w/o prioritizing

Room: MAIN 20
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Chiang, Rachel
Milpitas

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge Zheng & Raganathan (Zheng & Raganathan) vs Harker CP (Cheung & Pan)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Valley
PRO

Harker
CON

Winner: Harker CP debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: (Meenakshi Sambasivam) School: Young Genius

Other judges on panel: Max Wu, Prasad Yalamanchili. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments:

Dr: * clearer arguments
* good evidences
* good cross ex
* very confident
* could have been little patient for the opponent to complete their answers

Harker: * clear understanding of the topic on "priority"
* good evidences to support the case
* solid replies to the cross ex
* good support from each partner.

* On the whole both the teams did really good!

Room: MAIN 20
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Shalizi, Abraham
~~Wu, Max~~
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Harker CP (Cheung & Pan) vs Dougherty Valley Bridge Zheng & Raganathan (Zheng & Raganathan)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Valley Harker CP
PRO CON

Winner: Harker CP debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Golden State

Other judges on panel: Rachel Chiang, Prasad Yalamanchili. Please do not start until all judges are present.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge ² & ¹ Oak (Garg & Oak) vs Nova 42 ² & ¹ Agarwal (Kyle & Agarwal)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Valley Bridge PRO Nova 42 CON

Winner: Nova 42 School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: TCA

Other judges on panel: Amy Kohrman, Cindy Wang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Comments

INC:

- Neg should say that it is in the national interest to help refugees, therefore one cannot be prioritized over the other. The neg is trying to get to it, but has not built a strong enough link.

IAR:

- There is no framework debate going on, so framework connections do not make sense at this point.

2AR:

- Establishes link
- Should say that they are achieving more & thus "saving lives" as they say in their standard

CF2

- good answer to terrorist question
- Aff look out judges during crossfire

~~AF~~

SS Aff:

- neg is topical

SS Neg:

- do not say prioritize both equally
- could have said you are achieving more (your args. + their args.)
- you save the same or more lives than them

Neg could have had ^{this} approach:

- prioritizing refugees in the national interest, therefore, you cannot prioritize both of them

Room: MAIN 11
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Kohrman, Amy
Terman

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

² Nova 42 Kyle & Agarwal (Kyle & Agarwal) vs Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg & Oak (Garg & Oak) ^{1 Putra Oak}

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Nova
PRO CON

Winner: Dougherty Valley debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Amy Kol School: Terman
Rithvik Vijay

Other judges on panel: ~~Gavin Bains~~, Cindy Wang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge Garg & Oak (Garg & Oak) vs Nova 42 Kyle & Agarwal (Kyle & Agarwal)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty PRO Nova CON
Winner: Dougherty Affirmation School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)
Signature: [Signature] School: Harker

Other judges on panel: Gavin Bains, Amy Kohrman. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Puja - Preservation of lives
- humanitarian shelter & life preservation
- def. of refugee
- ethics
- 51 Mill. refugees
- Nat'l interest second - why? save lives later - how? - connection
- helps economy - Excellent explanation how. NOT STRONG
Humanitarian needs Not Med - More clear understanding how?
clear speaker - good job! especially crossfire round.

PRIYA - Presentation - slow down - ~~speaks~~ clearer speech
- refugees are collective responsibility
- ref. are security threat - Not
- ref. benefit economy - excellent points/data

X. Fire - Puja - make stronger connection National security & refugees

ANIKA - clarify negative impact/neglect. good job in final round

Daniel - refugees & Nat'l interest go together
- arguments - clear, well laid out. Excellent presentation
- By prioritizing refugees, reduce terrorism,
- Neg. definition/position not clear. circular argument
- Review your 2nd voting issue. Strong connection Not Made,
- 4th voting issue. Framework for negation is clear.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Communication Dogra & Kuo (Dogra & Kuo) vs TCA Hiremath & Ranjan (Hiremath & Ranjan)
Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dogra & Kuo PRO Hiremath & Ranjan CON

Winner: Hiremath & Ranjan CON debating on the CON
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: NOVA 42

Other judges on panel: Akash Garg, Roy Zheng. Please do not start until all judges are present.

4
4
3 X
4
4
3 Y
2
2
3
2
2
2

1st cross - Hiremath was more convincing.
2nd cross - Kuo explained her case better.

VERY CLOSE DEBATE!

BOTH TEAMS WELL PREPARED!

OVERALL THOUGH the arguments that stuck were ① "prioritizing does not mean "ignore" refugees"

② Governments priority should be to protect its own people

③ I have a hard time understanding that Debt. is good. the pro did not convince me.

the pro case was convincing though about the exploding economies of Lebanon and Jordan.

Kuo: your passion was the most convincing, however it was leaving dangerously close to anger.

GREAT DEBATE

Room: MAIN 4
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

HARI MANKUDE

~~Zheng, Roy~~
DV Bridge

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Communication Dogra & Kuo (Dogra & Kuo) vs TCA Hiremath & Ranjan (Hiremath & Ranjan)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

DOGRA & KUO

PRO

HIREMATH & RANJAN

CON

Winner: DOGRA & KUO debating on the PRO
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: DV BRIDGE

Other judges on panel: Akash Garg, James Kyle. Please do not start until all judges are present.

PRO: VERY ATTENTIVE AND COULD FIND HOLES
IN THE CON MATERIAL. VERY APPROPRIATELY
AGGRESSIVE IN THE CROSS-EXAM.
VERY CLOSE DEBATE

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Con.

Pro

TCA Hiremath & Ranjan (Hiremath & Ranjan) vs Communication Dogra & Kuo (Dogra & Kuo)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Communication Dogra & Kuo

PRO

TCA Hiremath & Ranjan.

CON

Winner: TCA Hiremath & Ranjan debating on the Con.
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Oh Sangho School: Dougherty Valley high.

Other judges on panel: James Kyle, Roy Zheng. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Con side stated clearly their statement to deny the logics that pro side has raised.

However, pro side couldn't effectively refute the statements that con side brought up.

Especially for the 1st statement ~~that~~ ^{from} con side

"1st priority is the security and welfare of the country".

~~pro~~ pro side didn't fully refute this as they only has focused on the fact that "Refugees didn't commit Paris attacks" However this missed the point of the con's statement about the general welfare.

~~However~~ However, ~~con's~~ con's side didn't fully explain how accepting refugees will damage their own country's welfare, with no ~~e~~ evidence provided. ~~the~~ This could be a good point for the pro's side, however, they ~~could~~ couldn't fully utilize this point. Relating them to genocide is too dramatic and easily be refuted unless it is fully supported by evidence and facts.

Room: MAIN 1
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Dogra, Sonia
Communication

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Harker Jeyendran & Xu (Jeyendran & Xu) vs Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mundres (Kurella & Mundres)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker Jeyendran & Xu
PRO

Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mundres
CON

Winner: Harker Jeyendran & Xu debating on the PRO
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Sonia Dogra School: Communication

Other judges on panel: Gurukulam 3, Marc Naddell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Harker PRO

1st Jeyendran
2nd Xu

Jeyendran: speaking too fast, improve eye contact and emphasize for better connection. Ran overtime. Good evidence. Point about water coming could have been used better in crossfire and summary. Good start weak summary

Xu: Slurring on big words, suggest use words that you are comfortable with. Ran overtime. Good final focus, good questioning. Followed the pro side of the argument.

Gale Ranch. CON

1st Mundres
2nd Kurella

Mundres: Too loud. Sometimes conflicting. Take in refugees and taking a con position. Too fast.

Kurella: good grasp over content, used analogy of train & plane well used. Crossfire asking questions. Although 'benefit of population' was used multiple times and not explained. Good questioning and explaining and holding claims. Final focus was weak. Conflicting position.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Harker Jeyendran & Xu (Jeyendran & Xu) vs Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mundres (Kurella & Mundres)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker Jeyendran & Xu
PRO

Gale Ranch middle kurella & mundres
CON

Winner: Harker Jeyendran & Xu debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Gurukulam

Other judges on panel: Sonnia Dogra, Marc Naddell. Please do not start until all judges are present.

-
- * Gale Ranch had conflicting ideas and they are not sticking to their initial ideas
 - * Gale Ranch had a good team work.
 - * Harker team was using electronic devices which can be avoided
 - * Both teams need to improve on eye contact.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Gale Ranch Middle Kurella & Mundres (Kurella & Mundres) vs Harker Jeyendran & Xu (Jeyendran & Xu)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker _____ Gale Ranch _____
PRO CON

Winner: Harker debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: M Naddell School: Terman

Other judges on panel: Gurukulam 3, Sonnia Dogra. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Gale Ranch [Con] Harker [AFF]
1st Mundres 1st Jeyendran
2nd Kurella 2nd Xu

Constructive : 1st Jeyendran: Good eye contact. Speak slower though you speak clearly. It would help register your points. Moral to help. Bring 35b in education to UK, less likely than Brits to stay on Gov. Assistance. Summary would help.

2nd. Mundres = Good Eye Contact. Provides definitions. Delivered a Standard: Contention 1: Security. Contention 2: economic disruption. Speak more slowly. Hard to follow all your points when you speak to quickly. 3 Is the priority the country's citizens or the refugees. 4 Let them in, but don't prioritize them over citizens

Room: MAIN 5
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Kripa, Venkatesh
~~Koneru, Surya~~
Challenger

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

(Con) Terman Middle Qu & Shaotran (Qu & Shaotran) vs Nova 42 Crawford & Choi (Crawford & Choi) (Pro)
Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Nova 42 PRO Terman Middle CON

Winner: Nova 42 School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Dougherty

Other judges on panel: Sagar Gattapally, Mrs. Kurella. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Pro Crawford Good case in general, Contention 2 could be better. Crawford should try to speak clearer. The team could have pushed on evidence for "diseases" contention better. Choi made a strong case as well. Choi could also benefit from slowing down + speaking clearly. Did not cover question from cross-fire in the follow-up speech. Unreasonable question on "refugee". When team opponent team discussed "Syrians" off argued it was "not" "refugee". For sake of a better debate, team should find better arguments.

Neg Clearly defined case. Strong speaker. They should be better prepared to answer evidence related question. Handled cross-ex well. Great attitude + demeanor. Did not cover question from crossfire in the follow-up speech. Unreasonable use of "refugee" in the speech. Syrian cri better. Speaker 2 should try to prepare for cross-ex better. Very sportsman-like.

Further based without a ~~the~~ "context-based" understanding, calling opponents comments "racist" is not a good sportsmanship

Room: MAIN 5
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Gattapally, Sagar
Brooks

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

con. 1st 2nd. Pro. 1st 2nd.
Terman Middle Qu & Shaotran (Qu & Shaotran) vs Nova 42 Crawford & Choi (Crawford & Choi)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Nova 42 PRO Terman CON

Winner: Nova 42 School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Brooks

Other judges on panel: Surya Koneru, Mrs. Kurella. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Nova 42

Cross: 1st (Crawford), good formulated questions.
2nd (Choi) → Good presentation with qualified examples.
Good formulated questions.
Choi → Good logical questions.

Terman:

1st (Qu) → good presentation;
2nd → Good presentation ~~with qualified~~ ~~examples~~.
Could not provide clear examples.
Not clear ~~and~~ on framework examples
More on defensive side only.

Room: MAIN 5
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Kurella, Mrs.
Gale Ranch

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Nova 42 Crawford & Choi (Crawford & Choi) vs Terman Middle Qu & Shaotran (Qu & Shaotran)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Nova PRO Terman CON

Winner: Nova 42 School/Team debating on the Pro Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Gale Ranch Middle School

Other judges on panel: Sagar Gattapally, Surya Koneru. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Terman Middle

Nova

~~Shaotran~~
Daniel
Qu
~~Shaotran~~
Daniel Q
1st
(could not verify that his disease part).
methodology not understood why.

~~Daniel Q~~
Shaotran
2nd
could not provide proof how refugees are threat.
could not provide attack terrorist link.

Choi
2nd
Good point
good summarizing of all the points.
Too aggressive
bad attitude

Crawford
1st
good delivery strong points

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Milpitas Schletzbaum & Madnawat (Schletzbaum & Madnawat) vs Harker Reddy & Sajoi (Reddy & Sajoi)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker PRO Milpitas CON

Winner: Milpitas School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Debank Chy School: _____

Other judges on panel: Ravi Hems, Hong Zhang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Milpitas
Schletzbaum: Good counter arguments. Well supported by data and examples. Very good job.

Madnawat: Clear, well modulated speech. Good body language. Well timed. Balanced approach while countering; not too aggressive yet to the point; I thoroughly enjoyed it.

Harker
Reddy: Good speech. Arguments well supported by data. Did a little bit funny with the Mexican refugee & border crossing question. Focus little bit on your punctuation. Otherwise great job. Keep it up.

Sajoi: Good job. Connects well with audience. Confident approach. Good analogies; nicely explained. Citing the example of 'Germany' was great. Great future lies ahead.

Both the teams did an outstanding job. Some points that I would like to mention here:

- 'Prioritization' was a point that 'Pro' team could have clarified better.
- 'Moral obligation' point was well put across by 'Con' team.
- Also 'Con' team present the issue from various angles. 'feasibility' was a great point.

Room: MAIN 2
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

~~Hems, Ravi~~
DV-Bridge

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Harker Reddy & Sajoi (Reddy & Sajoi) vs Milpitas Schletzbaum & Madnawat (Schletzbaum & Madnawat)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker

Milpitas

PRO

CON

Winner: Harker Reddy & Sajoi debating on the PRO
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Surya School: Challenger

Other judges on panel: Chachal Hazra, Hong Zhang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

I voted for PRO because their side made convincing arguments that were clearer to understand than the NEA. PRO had 2 clear contentions. While the NEA argued well, they were focusing on the ~~the~~ evidence for feasibility of developed countries funding developing countries - even though the PRO clearly mentioned the GDP numbers. I felt the NEA can improve by focusing their analysis/arguments on their contentions of security threats #2. ~~At~~ I was also not convinced by the NEA's arguments/analysis of Mexican refugees vs terrorism since they did not provide any evidence. Both sides claimed that other did not have evidence. Both sides argued well and were very close. But overall, PRO convinced me.

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Harker Reddy & Sajoi (Reddy & Sajoi) vs Milpitas Schletzbaum & Madnawat (Schletzbaum & Madnawat)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Harker PRO Milpitas CON

Winner: Milpitas School/Team debating on the Con Side (Pro of Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: Terman

Other judges on panel: Chachal Hazra, Ravi Hems. Please do not start until all judges are present.

• All very well prepared. with clear presentation. ~~pro's first talk~~
• picked ~~CON~~ side as winner because they declared prioritization of obligation. well and used ~~terriest~~ attack number or evidences. pro should stay stronger on life's wealthiness and more data to against ~~terriest~~ f. dying number of those refugees plus who are those refugees

pro
• first presentation is not as strong as the con's.
• point out con side didn't address ~~who~~ that we all want to save more lives, but not stand on this point all the time.

con:
• during question, easily re-direct to board. mess.
• fight against evidence not strong.

Room: MAIN 19
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Abraham Lincoln
~~Thomas Jefferson~~
BASIS
Autonomy
Debate

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar (Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar) vs Gurukulam Enrichment Center Arun & Bangalore (Arun & Bangalore)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty - K & R Gurukulam - A & B
PRO CON

Winner: Dougherty Valley Bridge (K+R) debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Abraham Lincoln School: Autonomy Debate

Other judges on panel: Stephanie Alipio, Joan Lee. Please do not start until all judges are present.

AFF

+Excellent analysis
on opponents contributions.

↳ Great rebuttle

Neg

-struggle in cross ex
-Did not provide evidence for
an attack among
Europe associated with refugees.

Room: MAIN 19
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Lee, Joan
Atiiva

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Gurukulam Enrichment Center Arun & Bangalore (Arun & Bangalore) vs Dougherty Valley
Bridge Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar (Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty Valley
PRO

Gurukulam
CON

Winner: Dougherty Valley debating on the Pro
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: Mamao School: Harker

Other judges on panel: Stephanie Alipio, Anil Prasad. Please do not start until all judges are present.

aff wins the terror advantage and I think their evidence for economy is more overall while NEG is kind of showing isolated scenarios.

Room: MAIN 19
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Alipio, Stephanie
Golden State

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Dougherty Valley Bridge Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar (Kaparaboyna & Rajkumar) vs Gurukulam Enrichment Center Arun & Bangalore (Arun & Bangalore)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Dougherty - K & R
PRO

Gurukulam - A & B
CON

Winner: Dougherty - K & R debating on the PRO
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: GSA

Other judges on panel: Joan Lee, Anil Prasad. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Aff: Dougherty

- ① Rajkumar
- ② Kaparaboyna

Neg: Gurukulam

- ① Arun
- ② Bangalore

winner: pro:

Room: MAIN 8
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

OAK, AMRUTA
Hansen, Logan

Harker
Dougherty
Valley

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Golden State Mandayam & Kothari (Mandayam & Kothari) vs Challenger School SY Karim & Koneru (Karim & Koneru)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

~~CHALLENGER~~ CHALLENGER ~~GOLDEN STATE~~ GOLDEN STATE
PRO CON

Winner: GOLDEN STATE School/Team debating on the CON Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: DVHS

Other judges on panel: Rahul Bindlish, Lu Zhang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Speaker 1 Golden State ^{proced to} ~~the~~ ^{negate}

- Aid ↑ tension - & fosters ~~corruption~~
- Several quotes - solve root cause
- Speaking too fast

Contention ① what abt. blue collar
② why

1:31 log

Speaker 2 Rebuttal - NOT look to ^{think of justice}
1. Taking blue collar jobs
↳ distort economy, good pt. abt NOT paying taxes had data.
2. Good point about better foreign policy.

(AFFIRMATIVE)
Speaker 1 Challenges ^{refuges over Natl. policy}

- Blue collar as ~~not~~ local don't want these
- Basis for future.
- No control over their own treatment.

- NOT able to speak/contend strongly, Stammered
Responded well to blue collar?

2. ^{was used}

Speaker 2 Rebuttal -
1. Focusing on 'where will refugees go'
2. Help - humanitarian

weak/renewed initially

Room: MAIN 8
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

Zhang, Jun

Zhang, Lu
Gale Ranch

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Golden State Mandayam & Kothari (Mandayam & Kothari) vs Challenger School SY Karim & Koneru (Karim & Koneru)


Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

Challenger
PRO

Golden State
CON

Winner: Golden State
School/Team

debating on the Con
Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: 

School: DVHS

Other judges on panel: Rahul Bindlish, Logan Hansen. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Golden State - Con
Speaker 1 - good eye contact
- Pace is a little too fast
- Good reasoning, ① concepts
② Not solving the root cause

Challenger - Pro
Speaker 1 - clear
- 'contact' could be fitted in the time frame
- Asked good questions - root cause

Speaker 2
- calm, confident
- directly answered his opponent's ~~extensive~~ pro-arguments. ① Blue collar job
② Moral obligations using good evidences, ~~and~~ logic and reasoning

Speaker 2
- provided good examples to show her points, such as 'a child with paper cut!'

Room: MAIN 8
Start: 1:30 PM
Public Forum

Doubles

NARAYANASWAMY, RAJ

~~Bindlish, Rahul~~
DV Bridge

HARKER MIDDLE SCHOOL SPEECH DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Dec 5 - 6, 2015

Challenger School SY Karim & Koneru (Karim & Koneru) vs Golden State Mandayam & Kothari (Mandayam & Kothari)

Debaters should flip for sides. Please mark entry designations by side on the lines below

~~CHALLENGER~~
CHALLENGER

~~GOLDEN STATE~~
CON GOLDEN STATE

Winner: GOLDEN STATE debating on the Con
School/Team Side (Pro or Con)

Signature: [Signature] School: DHS

Other judges on panel: Logan Hansen, Lu Zhang. Please do not start until all judges are present.

Challenger

Golden state

- enunciation - time - weak question - too many um's	+ good story telling (pictures oneself!) + good reasoning reg. blue collar jobs	+ voice + argumentation	- eye contact - reading from - movement
		+ National / refugee interests good point of view	- no context in the beginning