

Judge name: Rashid
Judge number: 4086770782

Room number: 213

AFF team name and school:

MUTYALA & MISHRA

MHHS

Neg team name and school:

SETTY & VEMULA

WASHINGTON HIGH

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

MUTYALA (AFF) 28.5

SETTY (NEG) 29

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

MISHRA (AFF) 28.5

VEMULA (NEG) 28.5

Comments:

MUTYALA - You made a good opening statement & your contentions were clear. You could have made stronger arguments to support your side.

MISHRA - You reiterated the contentions but the rebuttal could have been more specific.

SETTY - You drafted the contentions ~~with~~ effectively & refuted the arguments from AFF team. Confident speaking. ↑

VEMULA - Your arguments were stronger than the AFF team. You handled the rebuttal with valid justification.

Winner: NEG

Reason why:

NEG had strong arguments. They refuted the AFF contentions. AFF could not negate all the points of NEG.

Judge name: Roepke
Judge number: _____

Room number: 201

Aff team name and school:

Sydney Taylor - Berkeley High
Khushi Bains - Mountain House H.S.

Neg team name and school:

Lillian Serrano - Cajon H.S.
Hana Doveiri - Cajon H.S.

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Khushi Bains - 28.4

Sydney Taylor - 28.2

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Hana Doveiri - 28.7

Lillian Serrano - 28.2

Comments:

This was a close debate competition. In the end the Neg team presented more clear and strong evidence against US Gov't to move towards a system of mandatory military service. Both team focused on active combat and not the big picture of national military service.

Winner: Neg.
Cajon H.S.
Lillian Serrano
Hana Doveiri

Reason why:

Judge name: Geetha Bharathi Paladugula

Room number: 160

Judge number:

Aff team name and school:

Willa Gibson

Emma Ramirez

Neg team name and school:

Gopika Sridhar

Amika Shah

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

28

23 25

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

28

28

Comments:

- Negation had strong arguments & was confident while presenting them.
- Affirmative had good arguments, but not a lot of confidence.

Winner:

Negation

Reason why:

- Strong arguments
- Confidence

Judge name: Castelli
Judge number: _____

Room number: 217

AFF team name and school:
~~_____~~ ^{Foxcroft}
~~_____~~
PS

Neg team name and school:
Mountain House
PS

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Peri 29

SheHigan - 28

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Pungchai - 29

Sandhu parku 29

Comments:

- They provide clear and strong speech
- Had very strong evidence on the arguments
- was great answers for the opponents

winner: Mountain House
due to Park Castile

reason why:
Great job, very
strong speech

Judge name: Clausen
Judge number: _____

Room number: 153

AFF team name and school:

Marisol ~~Pen~~ Sanjana Makkala
JohnsWelf & Washington

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Marisol Pena 28

Sanjana Makkala 26

Neg team name and school:

Mina & Nicole Morales
MTHS & Melinnum

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Mina Yi 28

Nicole Morales 27

Comments:

Questions	Speaker 1	Speaker 2	Questions
I	Denmark - 1 year in military - Govt budget - mandatory - everyone not in school or on a career - define? Sentences 3 (Prison) military = career opportunities - strengthen global economy - forced? What typically happens when you try to force people into things they don't want to do? [4min]	time to experience what ppl want to do - restrictions (prevents experiences) - 4 to 12 months of service has no points b/c it's not a career - counter plan - govt funded - 100 million - 25-30 ages mandatory ages - people have to attend military (prime years) (most people settle down and have babies during this time) got a bit off track (ranting)	I
III	Speaker 2: Hundreds of different jobs - kept repeating the same points over and over. Didn't field questions well. Asked to take questions at end - nervous when speaking - stuttered a bit. Increases patriotism spending problem - can't start career after 30?	Are you proposing that they still do this / 4:52 or get rid of it altogether?	I
Full 7:15	Speaker 1: Military - recruitment - gives options - health care - trains you - gave personal example - tried Argued modified plan - family, don't procrastinate #102	Speaker 2: make corrections on opponents - 1 yr isn't enough service - physical fitness (obesity issues) 2 years of service - minimum. [3:05]	I
I (POB)		Speaker 1: Counter plan - Argued w/ a passion. Lying to the system - everyone goes into the service - opponents tried to govt him into new topic (POB) - Brought in personal views - other countries have done this? (South Korea) [4:47]	I

Winner: AFF

Reason why:
Better Argument. - Neg's side was a neg argument

Judge name: ~~Mattin~~ Shabnam Basha

Room number:

Judge number: _____

223

Aff team name and school:

1. Barrett Valentine - Berkeley High School
2. Bella Nathan - Berkeley High School

Neg team name and school:

1. Sophia Luo - Washington High
2. Isabella Morales - Washington High

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

1. Barrett Valentine - 28

2. Bella Nathan - 29

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

1. Sophia Luo - 26

2. Isabella Morales - 26

Comments:

Aff. Speaker 1
Good presentation and confidence.
Good persuasive skills.

Aff. Speaker 2

Good presentation and hand gestures.

Good persuasive skills and organisation of points.

Neg. Speaker 1

Good presentation, good organisation of content.
Could work on conclusions.

Neg. Speaker 2

Good content and presentation.

Winner: Aff. team.

Reason why:

They were more persuasive.

Judge name: Parab
Judge number: _____

Room number: 214

Aff team name and school:

Foxcroft PD

Neg team name and school:

Mountain House Kt

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Esna Dadbhavala (29.5)

Winnie Dong (29)

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Sawera Haq (27)

Vishakha Kanaki (27)

Comments:

A1 - make sure to actually good job with structure and presentation in general	- Neg struggled because you did not directly respond to aff plan, make sure to structure speeches prior to speaking
N1 - be more confident you're a good speaker... use that	- Aff essentially won the clash on every issue and extended all their responses, appeals process as an arg was <u>very</u> well done
A2 - good job with line by line and general structure	
N2 - tried hardest and very likeable speaker	

winner: Aff

~~reason why:~~

Judge name: Hurley
Judge number: _____

Room number: 218

AFF team name and school: Foxcroft

Serena Zhang

Stella He

Neg team name and school: Bentley

Devin Lanzone

Madeline Wilson

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Serena 28.8

Madeline 28

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Stella 29

Devin 28.1

Comments:

Serena - good arguments, Slow DOWN! Even if you slow down you will still be able to say what you need to. Great work in countering arguments of opponents and pointing out weaknesses in ~~their~~ arguments. Good articulation - could make a little more eye contact. Great Job!

Madeline - Good engagement with issues and I think your flow will be really good as you get more confident! Never say you are sorry! Point about disabilities is really weak - military already takes those into account. Nice presence!

Stella - Really Great! Good pacing - covered all points nicely well thought out - Great when you refuted a point of theirs and then turned it into a plus for ~~your~~ the affirmation.

Devin - Good that you were addressing ~~the~~ the neg's best points: enormous military already. Good pace and obviously great effort tackling this topic!!

① sexual harassment issue and

Winner: AFF

Foxcroft

Reason why:

More persuasive points; clearer presentation with better flow & definitions clearer

AFF team name and school:

Berkeley FR

Berkeley

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Isabel Cholbi (Neg) → 30

Ava Remler (Affirm) → 28

Neg team name and school:

Cajon CZ

Salinas

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

28 - Sara-Ann Zheng (Neg)

27 - Annika Freeling (Affirm)

Comments:

1. Affirmative team's answers to Neg team's contentions are not satisfactory.
2. They have to be prepared for the 2nd round of contentions ~~with~~ effectively.
3. Negative team ~~should offer~~ could have offered their ^{willingness} ~~responses~~ still more politely, when they wanted to answer ^{Affirm team} ~~them~~ at the end.
4. ~~See~~ Observed more reasonable contentions by Neg team

Winner: Neg team

Reason why:
Reasonable contention
by Neg team -

AFF team name and school:

1st speaker - Aishwarya Thiagarajan

2nd speaker - Niva Shrestha
Washington High School (20-30)

Speaker #1 name & points

1st Aishwarya Thiagarajan - ~~25~~ 28 Points

2nd Niva Shrestha - 25 Points

Neg team name and school:

1st speaker Eugenia XV

2nd speaker Amanda Hao
Nueva High School. (20-30)

Speaker #2 name & points

1st Eugenia XV ~~25~~ 26 Points

2nd Amanda Hao ~~25~~ 26 Points

Comments:

Loved the argument.
delivering the Strong
and Valuable Points.
2nd speaker needs more
confidence, Improve on
taking time in the
middle of the Argument.

Loved the confidence of the
1st speaker, more focus on
Education more than Security.
2nd speaker needs more confidence,
needs improvement on
the information, repeating
the same content.

winner: AFF

reason why:

AFF brought up a strong
Valid Points against the other team. they are more focusing
on Education other than the Security of the nation.

Judge name: Meyers Haimlata Maheshwari Room number: 220
Judge number: _____

AFF team name and school:

John Swett High School

John Swett BM

Neg team name and school:

Millennium High school

Hernandez Harrington

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Briana Bazile 28

Naya Murdock

(28)

Comments:

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Judith Hernandez 27

Kendall Harrington

(27)

Great Job with facial expression. every single word was understandable. eye contact was good. Asking question to other team.

Facial expression was good. Time management is good. Some points are not related to the topic. eye contact was good.

Winner:

AFF Team.

reason why:
Confidence & Every Point is related to topic.

Judge name: Sutton
Judge number: _____

Room number: 215

AFF team name and school:
Buhach Colony LN

Neg team name and school
Milenium HS BD

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Bella Lalanne 26

Riley Roore 26

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Grace Bhatia 26

Ashley Deep 27

Comments:

1A Nice opening speech! You introduced human rights as your judge criterion, but didn't tie your arguments back to it. With every contention, tell me how it ties back to human rights. In rebuttal, you really did introduce new arguments - that is a no-no.	1N Good Good solid contentions, but they need to be fleshed out - give me evidence or logic, and impact. Propped most of aff case. Great questions. Use rebuttal time for big picture - "Our world vs. their world"
2A Nice & clear speaking style. Work on organization - you jumped around a lot. It's ok to refuse to take questions if the other team is trying to burn up your time.	2N Great speaking style, very clear and fluent, but needs better organization. I had trouble following.

winner: Negative
Milenium HS BD

reason why:



A tight round! AA did a better job of not dropping things, but didn't really tie anything back to human rights.

While we dropped several of the AA contentions, they maintained & won their own. Best arguments:

- Face of military has changed. Don't need short term soldiers.

- ~~- ~~Practices~~~~

- Practices make poor soldiers

- Choice / Free will

Judge name: Ranjana
Judge number: 510-240-0730

Room number: 141

AFF team name and school:

Crystal Springs Uplands School

Neg team name and school:

Millennium Charter

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Phoebe Wong - 28.00

Kyra Roepke - 28.00

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Veronica Knowlton - 29.00

Nicole Engen - 28.5

Comments:

AFF team couldn't ^{able to} belidently ~~proper~~
definition of the debate

NEG could be able to get strong
points and support them with new
information

Winner:
Millennium Charter

Reason why:
They have good
definition of the debate

Judge name: Ghaith
Judge number: _____

Room number: 202

Aff team name and school:
Berkely Bc

Neg team name and school:
Bentley

Speaker ~~#1~~ name & points ^(20⁵-30)
#1 Cohen 28.5
#2 Berg 29

Speaker ~~#1~~ name & points ^(20⁵-30)
#1 Sophie Foster 28.5
#2 Clara Schwartz 28

Comments:

Aff
S1: Nice 1st speech. Very constructive & organized.
- I wish you would have brought up that there are a whole range of jobs in the military, not just "war preparedness". It would have strengthened your argument.
S2: Liked your passion, & rebuttal was extremely strong.
- loved the cohesive organization

Neg
S1: Very nicely articulated 1st speech. Though I wish you did not use much filler words (um, Beh, etc.) Sometimes it may distract from the debate. (speech)
- I would have helped if you brought up the federal budget. And we put so much money into the military for war heads not "soldiers".
S2: Good job holding your own on your rebuttal, you went through your opponents points really thoroughly & cohesively, nice going!

went over time: 5-7 seconds.

Winner:
Aff.

Reason why:
I felt as if the affirmative was more passionate in their delivery & presentation. Prop to their own & did a really nice job.

Judge name: Stowitts, Joanne
Judge number: _____

Room number: 212

AFF team name and school:

1. Rinisha Giri } Washington
2. Divya Jindal }

Neg team name and school:

1. Jordan Keys } Millenium
2. Manal Siddiqi }

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

Rinisha Giri 27.1

Divya Jindal 27.3

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

Jordan Keys 27.6

~~Jordan~~ Manal Siddiqi 27.5

Comments:

Notes on back →

winner: AFF
Slightly stronger case & refutations.
reason why:

Aff #1
um & uh
almost every
4th word

USFG → mand. Nat'l. Mil. Svc.

(Corps = "core" not "corpse" you experience it)

- Draft? in marines by lottery (societal welfare) currently 10% protect U.S. - can't understand war until you experience it
- other countries already do this e.g. Russia, China, N. Korea
- part-time svc.
- Semper Fi = always ready
- criminals can clear record by serving.

Neg #1
no verbal ties

- "you cannot force someone to do what they don't want to do"
- Eritreans flee due to mandatory svc.
- \$ support for mandatory mil. svc. - possible?
- enact during wartime

Aff #2
lovely pace
calm pace
"um" etc.

- N1 Eritrea v. China → chinese don't flee their svc.
- N2 no worries @ benefits since part time
- "people will have a better involvement in government by mil. svc"
- "all united to serve" U.S. would be more selective @ war. / people will try to step into the govt.
- criminal waiver
- must good for most people
- 3 mos. training period

Neg #2
look up
clear voice

- volunteer army better alternative - market wage
- submarket wage for military draftees
- unemployment after svc. - veterans today already suffer this

Neg #1

- can't afford
- can't force / volunteers have more pride

Aff #1
disorganized
shuffling papers
BREATHE
"um" etc.
rather frenetic
delivery

same

"does not hinder because of this" ↖?

Both sides had rather weak arguments and argumentation skills - neither side addressed all of the contentions presented plus both sides had faulty logic. That said, please continue to grow your speaking & debating skills. Side note: I think the USFG should mandate mandatory involvement in high school Speech & Debate ☺

* Thanks are unnecessary - especially repeated ones.

Judge name: Bantleman
Judge number: _____

Room number: 155

Proposal: Mandatory Military Service

Aff team name and school:

Ana Touriel - El Cerrito H.S.

Audrey Dowling - El Cerrito H.S.

Neg team name and school:

1. Angelina Hue - Los Altos H.S.

2. Navya Singhai - Los Altos H.S.

Speaker #1 (20-30)
name & points

#1 Ana Touriel 30.00

#3 Audrey Dowling 30.00

#5 Angelina

Speaker #2 (20-30)
name & points

#2 Angelina Hue 29.5

#4 Navya Singhai 30.00

#6 Ana

Comments:

Aff team talked about 10 year study

Neg - claims violation of Const. rights, increases depression, drug abuse

Aff - says ~~no~~ equivalency of service, slavery. Service is the obligation of Americans. People are already doing things they don't like - example taxes.

Neg - Aff supports forcing people to risk death, PTSD, drug, alcohol abuse. People don't want to be in the military and it's a 13th amendment violation. Denies the military will promote peace worldwide. Army fine the way it is.

Aff - Many have enjoyed time in service. ~~War~~ Service isn't always violent. Wants to de-stigmatize military service. Service CAN promote happiness. Opens the eyes of the service person.

Winner: AFF

Reason why:
Stronger argument

Aft

♂ & ♀ both

1 year service begin 2022
2.5% draft, study over 10 years

1) Increase world awareness &
social engineering

2) Work experience through
military

3) Promote peace through
soldiers

Promote equality

More women will be
in service.

No class waivers
Destigmatize the military

US. Military has a
bad rep which needs
cleanup

Military has other functions
besides combat.

VN War protests not do
to ~~draft~~ draft. Nor was 1812

Education level of the army
will increase, therefore
more responsible

Neg

violates personal
liberty, similar to
slavery as involuntary
servitude

Constitutional violation
13th amendment
Military service causes
depression, PTSD

status quo works

Draft service causes
national dissent, object
go to jail.

Looks weak to other
country.

→ Military is warlike &
needs to be that

Separates parents
from children
Govt shouldn't be able
to put citizens in
harm's way.

War will always
bear a stigma.

Is "equal numbers"
worth the mental
suffering.

Pursuit of individual's
happiness outweighs
common good.

Judge name: Stowitts, Sara
Judge number: _____

Room number: 152

AFF team name and school:
Mountain House

Shaik & Ghaith

Speaker #1 ^(2⁵-30)
name & points

~~Shaik~~ Shaik 26.3

Ghaith 26.1

Comments:

Neg team name and school:
Millenium Charter

Snarr & Acolatse

Speaker #2 ^(2⁵-30)
name & points

Snarr 26.6

Acolatse 26.4

Aff #1

MNMS - having 25-30
2yr mil service ALL
people

Actor - us fed gov
Imp Jan 1, 2018

Timeframe next 10 yrs

1. Improve national unity
opp to come together & interact
I: better understanding
- II increase power of democracy
- III be more open & less judgemental
IV - less divisiveness
2. Better retirement & healthcare
opp to lead better lives
better suited to live
3. Preserve right to choice
choose between areas of mil
learn new skills - applicable
to real life → higher levels
of education
- III towards a united nation

POI during N2
directly negates
own points
inappropriate POI - source
citing NOT required -
wasting time

Neg #1

Emphasis on war

1. Stamina individual & some
cannot physically qualify
Also mental stability

PERSONAL EXAMPLE

2. Hard to become a well adjusted
adult after military service

2nd PERSONAL EXAMPLE

interferes w/ education
abuse of war → PTSD
Ex. "The Lost Children"

3. Violates free will
would be impossible to continue
GI bill & VA health benefits

NO ACCEPTANCE OR REFUSAL OF DEFINITIONS

Neg #2

FINISH THOUGHTS

Review of own contentions 1-2-3

REFERENCES PERSONAL EX

Address AFF contentions:
1-2-3

Aff #2

CW

PS

Trying to spread is to your
detriment - you are tripping
over words

"Our plan is different"

2.2 → 3 → 1 → 2.2 → ~3

"Not all military leads to war"

"Citizenship as a package of
rights & responsibilities"

"All people is mandatory"

"Those who can't wait"

→ previously said "ALL people"

"You will finish college at 23" - POI

→ Assume? → "MOST DO"

PTSD is because ppl don't see

Exceedingly reliant on SI
manipulation
more equitable representation

NR

Restates contentions 1-2-3

Rebuttal of AFF contentions 1-2-3
pointed out dropped economic refute

AR

Voter issues:

Harms to people + themselves - ppl will
be able to continue to serve BECAUSE
it is mandatory
veteran homelessness
Create better citizens
Violates free will - weak
refute
Increase unity

SP

JN
AC
SH
GH