The USFG should substantially increase regulation of Advertising targeting children

PARLI Debate

Erdelyi, Eszter (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 428
Gov: 27 Rosenthal - Dondero
Opp: 11 Yoo - Liu
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: ESZTER ERDELYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	DONDERO pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	LIU pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	ROSENTHAL pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	YOO pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: GOOD STRUCTURE GOOD POINTS, MAY I SUGGEST MENTIONING SOURCES GOOD CONTENT KNOWLEDGE, VERY GOOD VOICE SPEECH

Prop 2: GOOD POI TOO GOOD CLARIFYING FACT / YUNK, HOW ADVERTISING $ SPENT. DID NOT QUITE UNDERSTOOD WHAT YOU MEANT BY "CHANGING FREEDOM OF SPEECH"

Opp 1: GREAT STRUCTURE, EXCELLENT COUNTERPLAN FOR A DIFFICULT RES. GOOD CLARIFYING DATA WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY "CORPORATIONS HAVE THE RIGHT TO ADVERTISE?"

Opp 2: VERY GOOD INTRODUCTION STRUCTURE, "TV TIME IS PUBLIC TIME" WAS FORCEFUL, "PARENTS CAN REGULATE CHILDREN WAS LESS CONVINCING

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: WOW, VERY CLOSE ARGUMENT. THE CHINA/NICOTINE ARGUMENT WOULD HAVE BEEN CONVINCING IF YOU DISCUSSED THE OBESITY RATE THERE. THE DISUSSION WHICH TILTED THE BALANCE WAS PERSUASIVE INTENT / VS FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

THE USFG SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE SUPPORT NUCLEAR ENERGY

PARLI Debate

Erdelyi, Eszter (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 428
Gov: 4 McAvoy - Hester
Opp: 27 Inman - Young
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: ESZTER ERDÉLYI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	HESTER pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	INMAN pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	MCAVOY pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	YOUNG pts 30

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: GREAT STRUCTURE SET OUT THE CASE VERY WELL - SOME STATEMENTS IN THE VOTER SPEECH WERE TOO GENERALIZING "US FOUND A PROPER WAY OF SAFETY INSURING"

Prop 2: GREAT IMPACT ANALYSIS IMPACTFUL DATA APPLICATION I THINK CHERNOBYL WAS IN THE LATE 80 S

Opp 1: REALLY EASY TO FOLLOW GOOD CONTENT KNOWLEDGE - GOOD RELEVANT DATA - MENTIONING SOURCES MAY I SUGGEST TO WATCH TIME GOOD VOTER SUMMARY - COULD HAVE INCLUDED MORE DETAIL ON JOBS ARGUMENT NOT STANDING

Opp 2: GOOD RESPONSE TO POI - VERY IMPACTFUL MAKING PERSONAL REFERENCE OF THE ARGUMENT GREAT OPPORTUNITY COST DISCUSSION

TEAM CODE #: OPP **on the** 27 **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: THE OPP HAD USED MORE DATA TO SUPPORT THE ARGUMENT AGAINST INVESTING IN NUCLEAR POWER, BUT WAS VERY CLOSE WELL BUILT CASE. ONLY BECAUSE THE PROP. ARGUMENTS WERE INTO CASES ANECDOTAL (RECENCY OF INCIDENTS AND PROBABILITY OF SPILL) NET BENEFIT GOES TO OPP.

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 526
Gov: 2 Rubsamen - Partsuf
Opp: 14 White - Hall
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Partsuf pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	White pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Rubsamen pts 2	Opp Speaker #2	Hall pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: In the end, the focus of the debate becomes stopping sexism/racism, which the oppo side offers compelling plan, in my judgment. I think, strategically. Prop side missed the opportunity to point out the ~~Prop 2:~~ problem of false advertisement on addictive products.

Opp 1:

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop side focuses on stopping socially negative ads, which opp side successfully rebuts with the concept of free speech and liberal education.

PARLI Debate

Liu, Hongche (*11)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 526
Gov: 16 Fogarty - Pister
Opp: 4 Murphy - DeWitt
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Hongche Liu

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 16		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Pister	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Murphy	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Fogarty	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Dewitt	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
Good job weighing the cost of incidents vs continual pollution and dependency problem.

Prop 2:
Good job pointing out that the funding could be used to solve the safety/storage issues.

Opp 1: should convince me with quantitative cost of incidents vs. cost of continual use of oil/coal for energy.
Alternative energy argument is weak and eventually get absorbed by Prop side to fund them all.

Opp 2:
Nevada incident was vivid but in the end it plays little role in my decision.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
proposed funding increase into research, in addition to, production of nuclear energy, which actually was trying to solve the safety issues raised by Opp. Weighing the chance of infrequent incidents against the vast and continually bad oil coal problem, it may be a wash.

PARLI Debate

~~Maxson, Tricia (*1)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 303
Gov: 3 Curl - Aghadjian-Newbrough
Opp: 2 Stamm-Kirk - Brogan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	CURL pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	STAMM-KIRK pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	AGHADJIAN-N pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	BROGAN pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
liked that you paused after definition and asked opponents for any questions.

Opp 1:
offered quite a few evidences, strong arguments and analysis. Perhaps slow down a bit and pace your delivery.

Prop 2:
Very courteous in your responses to Opp 1 on deferring PoI requests. Delivery style was commendable for a measured and clear communication.

Opp 2:
Strong support for the team's arguments and re-inforcing rebuttals to Props positions -

TEAM CODE #: 2 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Opp wins on the strength and conviction of their arguments - while I dont give them the POOs, I commend that they listened carefully and suggested violations - Overall, stronger team performance

PARLI Debate

~~Maxson, Tricia (*1)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 303
Gov: 26 Saxena - Duncan
Opp: 27 Galli - Girimonte
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANKARAN

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	26	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	SAXENA pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	GALLI pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	DUNCAN pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	GIRIMONTE pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
You provided strong evidences which largely went uncontested by your opponents. Good summary in your final speech.

Prop 2:
Good rebuttal of Opp's misunderstanding of your plan and of Opp's Solar proposals.

Opp 1:
Watch for POOs in your rebuttal. Your opponents caught you on two of those. Good delivery style. Your counter-arguments started with nuclear fission vs. fusion which was your opponents position.

Opp 2:
Courteous in accepting PoI and provided strong and confident responses.

TEAM CODE #: 26 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop's arguments were thoughtful, strongly supported by evidence and largely not contested by Opp.

PARLI Debate

MacKinnon, Jesse (*4)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 302
Gov: 14 Wilcox - Sutton
Opp: 11 Meswani - Harith
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	Sutton pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Meswani pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Wilcox pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Harith pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Great Speech, very well sign posted and organized, well spoken. I need more quantitative analysis.

Prop 2: You just murdered that Speech. Amazing refutation and time allocation and passion.

Opp 1: You really need to get back to structure I never hear a link, internal link, or impact until you do refutation. Gives you 0 offense. Where is the X-T.

Opp 2: You are making purely defensive arguments, Stop saying don't vote for them and start saying vote for me

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Aff wins, neg has no risk of impact and no Impact Calculus.

PARLI Debate

MacKinnon, Jesse (*4)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 302
Gov: 27 Chu - Fraga
Opp: 17 Sweeney - Hsieh
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Paul Villa

Judge's School Affiliation: College Park

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 17	
Prop Speaker #1 Fraga	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Sweeny	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Chu	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Hsieh	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Your top of case order is absurd. You really needed more topic knowledge, the LO makes you look really bad when he calls out 3 different factual errors.

Prop 2: Good attempt at extending the arguments made in the PMC. Good impact calculus.

Opp 1: You need to leverage your impacts against the aff more. The CP is super vague and hard to vote for. Run X-Topicality when they use multiple steps.

Opp 2: You make the right argument to say Magnitude more important than probability. Then you say the Earth causes droughts, not people.., what?

TEAM CODE #: 17 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: The 1% risk of 10,000 years of environmental devastation vs 700 jobs and environment wins

PARLI Debate

~~Stromberg, Robert (*26)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 306
Gov: 27 Skarr - Escarcega
Opp: 2 Holt - Mizin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wilcox David
Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Escarcega pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Holt pts 26
Prop Speaker #2	Skarr pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Mizin pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: $10,000 fine disruptive to small business's true. good idea label Photoshopped images

Opp 1: $10,000 fine would be affordable to big business's but terrible for small business's. Also it would not raise equal to the 1.7B spent on children ads now as she contends and it goes towards all children and it goes towards all children

Prop 2: fine hits both for $10,000 example. Good point + well spoken federal guidelines & keep them noticeable + good point

Opp 2: ads - very odd Contends PA not aiming at young children under which I do not see. Think they did target young children

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** Prop (Prop or Opp) **wins this debate.**

REASON FOR DECISION: I check Prop but it is legal to do counter plan and double negative. However team 27's plan was just better

PARLI Debate

~~Stromberg, Robert (*26)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 306
Gov: 16 Banisadr - Weiner
Opp: 3 Wolf-Jacobs - Nagarajan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Wilcox David

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	Banisadr 16	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	~~Weiner~~ Banisadr pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Wolf Jacobs pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Weiner pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Nagarajan pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: "right now today" "New Plants take long time." "Into ocean where it doesn't do harm less" "1/2 life of Nuclear waste is very long. Amount of subsidies never stated. How can we already shifting to RE-not true. Few NE plants opening no meltdown USA-not true Smile! Good

Prop 2: subsidized? can fact check body language

Opp 1: they not prove subsidies will not be stated- good pt. Subsidies removed RE- good pt. Subsidies large sections each shut down. Sites

Opp 2: Not that effective. a bit timid how much subsidies moved good point. This team didn't catch Smile either

TEAM CODE # 3 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**

~~Affirmative - undecided~~ ~~Proposition~~ Opp

REASON FOR DECISION: This was an extremely close debate however aff's idea of shifting subsidies was not well proven. And Neg had lots of good counters and ideas

PARLI Debate

Eng, Jeff (*14)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 229
Gov: 4 Figueroa - Choy
Opp: 5 Siu - Moore
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 5	
Prop Speaker #1 Figueroa	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Siu	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Choy	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Moore	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
- ~~be good to coordinate~~ head moving to points
+ calm demeanor
+ powerful presence
- point about not convincing either you two or judge was overblown and unnecessarily distracted from your arguments

Prop 2:
+ good counterpoints to #2
- ~~need~~ can pause more to have stronger voice on making points
+ like analogy of Post office job

Opp 1:
- be good to coordinate head moving to points made
+ good passion
+ able to make many points in allotted time
- can pause to make points more powerful & link evidence to point
- have difficulty connecting evidence to vision of dystopian

Opp 2:
+ great eye contact and connection to audience
+ Nice delivery
- had difficulty linking suicide, death and suffering to evidence

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Not enough supporting evidence from negation ~~Base~~ toward a state oppressed society. Better tack may have explored that existing controls are fine as is and kids are fine today and will be in the future. what evidence is there that we need more regulation.

Resolution - USFG should substantially increase support for Nuclear Energy

#1

Framework
- $20 Billion
- IFR Nuclear

Most stable
safe

Hoover / MIT

why more safe

1. Efficient fuel
   - Economy
2. Environment (lowest impact)
   - MIT - zero carbon
   - IFR - spills??
3. Secure / safe
   - US Reg NRC
   - 7x24 monitor
   - highly regulated
4. Job creation
5. Public Opinion
   - 51% favor

good points -> / Stable

Ath - destroying waste or eliminating them you realize

Better pure

#2

Counterplan
- Co Solar, hydro - Ocean

$20 B - little

1. Not feasible - 70% Controlled by Russia
   - Increase - dismantle warheads
   - 80% supply in next 10 years
   - move - made in US
   - -> Germany / Russian jobs
2. Side Effects
   - Waste - cost to contain
   - Power Plants safer (Safer) - No Chances

-> No compared clean
-> Waste - improving
-> No Human loss
-> No clean energy #

Calm - confident delivery

Cost - tidal / Solar - cost

#3

Renewable energy stat?
- ethanol - corn
  - -> Not strong
- Mixed definitions used

(supply) dismantle - nuclear

1 ton / person / year

Hydro - drought ?

No statistic - on job

9000 jobs? #

Not Specified

IFR - 1996 - Idaho
Reactor System
Core - Meltdown
Lead faults on core

Sun - 12 hours day
24 hours / Not practically

Waste -> nuclear energy

- Good presence
- Points not strong on drought

#4

renewable solar inexhaustible tidal

Solar - active
tidal - hydro electric
dynamic - no

1 pellet ≡ clean net means

Solar / -
- No power has
- No carbon footprint

Fukushima / Chernobyl

job creation
- Co job disappear

Munich - germany
70% job creation

Debris - limited nuclear warheads

80% - next 10 years

- good delivery speed
- good communication
- like the voice very good clarity
- great eye contact & connection to audience

#5

more jobs
No side effects
Dams / drought

$20 Billion
Net exist
Long

Economic benefits

Feasibility

- good points

move with purpose
many Players are distributed your pens
limit hand movement to make the ink
Chose aim to more hands

#6

Rebuttal counterplan

Solar - inefficient
Wind - inefficient

Not as efficient

70% - Russia decreasing

1) harm - inevitable
2) rebuttal - new arguments
emission - harmful (atmosphere)

-> Panel - toxic liquid

Solvency -> No benefits
Feasibility -> vacuum

calm body more

PARLI Debate

Eng, Jeff (*14)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 229
Gov: 27 Nevin - Hatcher
Opp: 16 Ginsburg - Zhou
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 27		Team Code #: 16	
Prop Speaker #1 ~~Nevin~~ Hatcher	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 ~~Ginsberg~~ Zhou	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 ~~Hatcher~~ Nevin	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 ~~Zhou~~ Ginsberg	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ made good points
+ good structure
- "Ah" are distracting
- can calm body more

Prop 2:
+ good presence on podium
- Not compelling argument on drought
- should have spent more time dealing with waste

Opp 1:
+ like calm, confident delivery
+ made great points
- be cognizant of movement of papers, better to pause when doing so, distracts
- also hand movements were too regular, reserve for making strong statements

Opp 2:
+ good delivery speed / very good delivery
+ like voice variation
+ great eye contact & connection to audience
- Some movement would even enhance your delivery (minor point)

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Hard topic for ~~Aff~~ Aff team to win but maybe an exploration that $20 Billion will provide more research & development into Nuclear industry and with Fusion reactors, you eliminate need for Russia resources & waste. Also maybe address further that tidal is limited to coast & subs (inefficient) will not meet all needs (energy) of US.

Resolution: USFG should significantly increase the regulations advertisement targeting children.

1

Policy (plan) advertising / Electric funding

Audio Visual Media stimulate children
- Prohibit movies due to young
- Prohibit children Product placement

ASAP
A ① Less manipulative toys, Product Placement
Can't understand benefits
Subsection →
↳ turn ad to Product companies
(1) Better Quality
② Target all age groups
③ Better family relations
B Jobs - Employees mention jobs
7% employee rates
Rank 20 unemployee rates
Reform spending

2

Framework
neg arg -
government censorship bad views
bio-political control align state w/ state
oppression against
Poison / force certain way

① Censor against threat
Free speech

North Korea
→ oppress don't know oppress

Censor why not spread down

Eliminate all controlling all EU??

② Model - best tools & state Control Puppeters / exploited
Can't think for themselves
Society -
+ Fast - arm movements too many

3

Critique
Biopo - EU - have not fallen into dystopian rules

How would this change to dynamic since only with kids ads.

North Korea No links to Kids

Evidence -

Can't manipulate - No EU -
- Check & balances good point, but need more evidence
+ jobs - Post office

Paused - give strong voice
be more powerful
Slow down to make stronger point

Good Politics

4

Goal - debate critique
EU - already policy
America like freedom
don't say / different result
Eliminate Ad - people die
- gateway drug

Censor idea - evolve
Paying way to distribute
Link → people don't like change

Place ads → $$$

Co - can't make spend less $ on ads
jobless - suicide
evidence - Vision
dead by Selling Kill people?
spending money - quality of Products?
bad family Relationship
waste money to lose $$

Good eye contact like driving connection with audience

5

Critique Ad / disad

EU - not collapse don't understand control

Impacts →
NK - Censor
- Bad policy making
- Normalize ethics to align to state
- puppet - people
- free thought
- mental war
- value to life

- less manipulation bio political control
- manipulate certain way
- ad market

exit - genocide

Good Passion

6

EU - oppress
NK - censor
No coverage about EU - censors
Massive → Smoothed

Kill themselves

change mindset

US / EU
↳ collection & States

Genocide
↳
No

Som - not reform

USFG SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE REGULATIONS OF ADVERTIZING TARGETING CHILDREN

Marzone Chahon

PARLI Debate

~~Geter, Emerald (*20)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 528
Gov: 7 Alvarez - Baluja
Opp: 16 Kapoor - Berger
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

CASASINO

Judge's Name: Shannon Angelo MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: Berkeley 13

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 7	Team Code #: 16
Prop Speaker #1 ALVAREZ pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 KAPOOR pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 BALUJA pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 BERGER pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good job with your 3 contentions and with outlining your voter issues at the end. Good elaboration of each contention with evidence. Good explanation of plan in general

Prop 2: Good repetition of main point about welfare over businesses' profits. Good point about parameters of national vs international. Good examples w/ video games.

Opp 1: Good choice for your counterplan (though it could use elaboration with specifics). Good argument about age definition. Good explanation of harms by increasing ads. Good job with wrap-up speech at the end.

Opp 2: Good point about how it isn't govt's job to parent/regulate children. Good discussion of toy companies and good comments about how adults' ads still affect kids.

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg defended status quo of ads already having regulations. Good list of harms with increased restrictions. Good defense of why age definition should include teens. Aff did win point about international issue, and neg should've elaborated on counterplan more. But overall, Neg did the better arguing.

USFG SHOULD SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASE SUPPORT FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY.

PARLI Debate

~~Geter, Emerald (*20)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 528
Gov: 4 Walsh - Moser
Opp: 14 Katz - Huynh
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

CAB 5W0

Judge's Name: MLC

Judge's School Affiliation: 13

PROP (4)
Team Code #:

Prop Speaker #1 MOSER pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 WALSH pts 29

OPP (14)
Team Code #:

Opp Speaker #1 KATZ pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 HUYNH pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Good plan, good contentions, good explanation of harms, good elaboration of potential benefits. Good world-by-world comparison in last speech.

Prop 2:
Good additions, especially point about pollution impact on solar energy and bird migration patterns. Good rebuttals overall.

Opp 1: Good counterplan. Good carryover of Aff contentions and adaptation to your own plan. Your 4 contentions were also effective to bolster your side.

Opp 2:
Good responses about potential harms of disposing of nuclear waste. Good analogy of day/night solar vs. nuclear plants operated by people. Good clear delivery.

TEAM CODE #: (4) **on the** (PROP) **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides had strong cases. AFF did a bit better on claims, warrants, links, impacts, as well as a bit more persuasive voter issues. Good job on both sides looking at harms and benefits. All were strong speakers.

PARLI Debate

~~Hulett, Paul (*27)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 309
Gov: 16 Stephen - Miskelley
Opp: 14 Yan - Yan
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Nanny Tunnell

Judge's School Affiliation: MUHS

PROP (Aff)		OPP	
Team Code #: 16	M	Team Code #: 14	
Prop Speaker #1 Miskelley	pts [redacted] 29	Opp Speaker #1 Yan	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Stephan	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Yan	pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

USFG should increase regulation of targeted advertising to children

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:
+ analysis (good definitions + timeframe)
+ Evidence (good specifics + examples)
+ Delivery (natural speech, projection is good, good language use)

Prop 2:
+ Argumentation (good organization on Opp team's [redacted] points)
+ Evidence (good emphasis on the Affs team strong contentions)
+ POI (good selection of questions)

Opp 1:
(positive adversity)
+ POI (good specific clarifications)
+ argumentation (selection criteria about the 10% reduction was strongly presented)
+ Delivery (good eye contact, great energy)

Opp 2:
- Delivery (need better longer eye contact)
- argumentation (need better organization)
- Evidence (need more organized delivery of evidence)
+ analysis (good arguments)

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** (PROP) **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

- Better organization of evidence and arguments
- Good delivery

PARLI Debate

~~Aulett, Paul ("27")~~ Young, Wendy
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 309
Gov: 11 Deshpande - Lingampalli
Opp: 14 Lustig - Gerenrot
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: ~~Nancy Tonner~~ Wendy Young

Judge's School Affiliation: ~~MHHS~~ WHS #27

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	11	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Deshpande pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Gerenrot pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Lingampalli pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Lustig pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:
30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

USFG should increase support for nuclear energy.

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater: A pleasure to listen to!

Prop 1:
Very good speaker - Clear, strong arguments Good Connection with Audience -

Prop 2:
Great ability to refute opponents arguments. Clear messagings.

Opp 1: Passionate speaker. Non repetative which was refreshing - Smart dialog. Tends to get a little "screachy" [sorry] but Calm down a bit + the message is

Opp 2: Will be Clearer.
Very good speaker. Great partner + ability to support case Clearly.

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Judge was asked to vote for team who proved the most Net Benefits for Society in General. Towards this end, I vote for the Neg (Opp.) who consistently showed the benefits of Solar energy to be sustainable, renewable, duplicable and safe to Society

Lawrence James #14
~~Roberson, Sam (*20)~~
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 527
Gov: 6 Morehead - Andrews
Opp: 27 Malfavon - Hulett
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Use 6 should substitute increase regulations better to antlers

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: James Lawrence

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 27	
Prop Speaker #1 Max Morehead	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Laura Malfavon	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Jana Andler	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Cecilia Hulett	pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Excellent for all

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

(+)	(-)	(+)	(-)
Prop 1: Clear argument Excellent POI	↓ Eye contact. Evidence lacking for effects of proposal.	Opp 1: Analysis - Clear delivery	Did not take POI - Not benefit - agreed to not values Not sure "beyond reasonable doubt" vs preponderance.
Prop 2: Good presented	Somewhat hard to follow argument in	Opp 2: Excellent response to Pos x2 Very poised and clear argument	

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp argued well that proposal to ban children in ads would not help with puppets/animation. Prop not able to make argument that banning kids in ads would achieve goals.

Max Moreheu

Policy
Definition - Children - 0 - points
-12 y o

Not benefits.

Harms in status quo

1) Manipulation.
Children too young to decide

2) Products bad for children
15+ - Fast food

Plan - USFG - ban use of
minors under 12
- not manipulate of minors

2)

Advantage. thousands.
1) Kids in advantage
- harms to kids in ads.
- cost out from peers.

2) Limit childhood obesity
Ex: Fast food
Mech: artificially spaced ads
↓ Obesity - ↑ Life exp. - ↓ health cost

(+) Clear well placed

(-) Eye contact.

Malfoy

Definition - agree
not

Burden of proof.
Claim - beyond reasonable

Plan - Not solve by banning
kids < 12 y o.
- No timeline.

Manipulation - Children do not know
Parents decide - Sag No

Fast Food -
No USFG responsibility
Paternalism.

kid job - parental right
Jobs not hard.

Not solve for obesity -

1) Freedom expression/press
People dial for 0

2) Current regulation adequate
- No truly harmful.

3) Parents vs gov paternalism
state intervene to prevent
Paternalism -

(-) Burden shifted.

(+) Clear.
well placed

POI x 2 Adds

Andrew

Roadmap
Case
Plan
Burden - will give benefits
Beyond reasonable doubt

Not attack harm

Subtlety - ∅ kids < 12 in ads
Not provide other examples

Timeline - immediate

Parental control hurtful
Not true/Reasons ban

Obesity - increasing → TOM 2 Tariff

Value vs Policy

No plan when kids
Vulnerable properly

No reputation

(+) good eye contact
Clear organization

Nolett

opp case
Ban < 12 y o kids in ads
- Other examples → not addressed
Puppets, animation,
minimize
Obesity - not just ads
- food taste, cost.

Parental Control - job of parent

POI - should government be able to reg Pepsi
Years - abuse.

Advertising - designed to manipulate
whether it works
Not state why gov fails

1) Freedom of press -
low trust
POI x 2 - Abstract →
Should be allowed to print if not easy how.

2) Status Quo - Have regulations, fines
Plan would not solve

3) Parental responsibility not gov.
Liberty - Eg Reg

Clearly present

(+) Excellent eye contact
Good Argument
(+) good response to
POI x 2

Malfavon -

step back.
Impacts ten Vols

Impact
1) Freedom of press / expression
vs value - good potential
If citizens distrust
gov more - revolt.

2) Paternalism.
Cause people to feel frustrated
→ revolt ↓ Govt power.

Status Quo - Parents Empty!

3)

4) They agree to burden
standard -
Not solve for harm.

Net benefit -
Not benefit from potential.

5:11

Marshal.

What benefits. Big
tangible effects.

Voter -
1) more people help.

2) Harms -
Do same.

Argue - kids own age
→ tries to discount
puppets / animation

3) Advantages flow
- Child stars -

Obesity → says flaws
(- decided by status
possible

Counters - Cr Rg
Not try take benefit
- impossible result.

Argument - times gov
should act again

Lawrence, Stanley x14
~~Roberson, Sam (*20)~~
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 527
Gov: 26 Kornfein - Stromberg
Opp: 22 Mubarack - Troup
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

USFG should substantially increase support for nuclear energy

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: James Lawrence

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 26		Team Code #: 22	
Prop Speaker #1 Reece Stromberg	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 Mubarack	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Caleb Kornfein	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Troup	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good

27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)

26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Excellent

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

(+)	(−)	(+)	(−)
Prop 1: Clear presentation - good orderly argument	-Called LFTR "Liquid fusion" then "Liquid thermite" -Short opening 4 minutes	Opp 1: Best delivery - warm and direct. good citation costs good Evidence	Confusion fossil fuel to non reactor (actually fission)
Prop 2: - Excellent delivery Clear, great eye contact.	(−) throw off line that devalorizing currency good Confusing chemistry and nuclear reactor	Opp 2: Well argued. -Nice style (+) Mentioned proven technology (+) Irrelevance of child labor.	(−) W.r "run off" but radioactive waste

TEAM CODE #: 22 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Opp had better arguments about risk (Prop not mentioned it was in use until late) & cost. Child labor argument not developed with evidence by Prop LFTR unfamiliar so evidence of effectiveness in operations early would help.

Strawberry

Absolutes USFG.

Policy -
Net benefit

Plan - USFG $50 billion
Using liquid fluoride thorium reactor

Σ - deficit

→ uses thorium →
safer - no Ura
very not - 1.5 x /B
DoD - Navy

1) Energy + env
- Independence (middle East civil wars)
will not burn.
Gas prices $2-4 → bat
"liquid fusion" → misspoke
2) Economy - jobs - STEM.

(+) Clear
good eye contact

(-)
"Liquid fuel"
Short - term

Union

Medstead

"Nuclear"
Scary word.

Roadmap - not
2 yrs

1) Environment - not beneficial

Energy independent - climate
CWW - fracking

1) Environment - better options
wind Power
LFTR - still fossil waste.
- using fossil fuels to make fuel.
waste:
EPA - 2000 metric tons
Team to 300 yrs.
2) Economy - Deficit spending
$50 - bad assets. types.

Negative
1) Too expensive - $5q / mw
in mid 5s, lcoe 53, gas 62
LFTR - 1.5 mw expensive.
2) Risk accidents -
Chernobyl
Fukushima
Great presentation
Good eye cont
Clear
Addressed Jon

6-90 m

Kornstein

Drive
Rest

1) Expense -
LFTR - expensive then
less upkeep.
"self-sustaining reactor"
wind / solar -

2) Accidents
Everyday occurrence
Thorium - c

- Not Uranium - tested
Beta pattern.

POI = $bil

- Energy -
Not energy independent
Canada, OPEC
Solar - small

- middle East
Civil wars.

Any alternative is better.
Thorium 0 intelligence
+ cheapness
"Car dies or collision"
- my excellent presentation.

Declare victory -
Neg value

Troup.

Imminent risk
Way fun

$50 billion -
"unproven untested technology"
Trump lots more.

Normal means - has to come from somewhere.

Evidence - no source for funds

1) Cost - Nuclear not cost effective
Cheaper - coal,

2) Risk - Accident
Der Spiegel - "even Japan cannot control nuclear energy"
waste -
Picture waste x

Not use.
Fossil fuels -
Energy independent -

- Child helper - not relevant
Economy - deficit spending
- Excellent to answer
(+) Unproven technology.
Well organized

Mubarack.

5 votes USDS
Dfensbury 150 bil
Lots + many where.
"Kinesian" economics
Jobs - Says will get done

2) Cost effective.
$5q / mwh And LSX.

Poo - Bray in Guatemala leaks
Pop No stories.

3) Environment -
Radioactive for off.
fossil fuels ✓ transport
Not proving reactor

Safe low energy use

4) Unproven / untested

(+)

Strawberry.

Pos - improved.
Not need Sam

Untested - reactor

Poo - "Not nuclear France development 70's"
- First example to respond.

RISK - No historic accidents

"liquid thorium energy"

Jobs - Sustainable
- No waste
- taken out of atmosphere

Economics. ↓

Child helper - middle East

PARLI Debate

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 307
Gov: 14 Cohen-Simayof - Drake
Opp: 13 Cummings - Ellsworth
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	13
Prop Speaker #1	DRAKE pts 26	Opp Speaker #1	ELLSWORTH pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	COHENS - SIMAYOF pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	CUMMINGS pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Need to work on speaking more fluidly/LOTS of ums... Also, not enough evidence or examples to support your point. Very abstract, not concrete but buy your social contract argument. And not sure I understood what says the govt has to protect these young porn businesses. Like innocents? Didn't buy that.

Prop 2: Thanks for clarifying plan — but PROP should have done that during the first speech. Also, you brought up a value criterion... but it's a policy round? Net benefits? Also don't get how broken families tied to your point about the future of the country.

Opp 1: Awesome. Aff did not have a solid plan whatsoever. Pretty solid refutations and good cross application. Focus on speaking more fluidly (less ums). Good final speech.

Opp 2: Good refutations on their funding model. Work on fluency/delivery. Remember that the ~~Opp~~ Aff is not arguing to ~~negate~~ get rid of ads but to regulate them. Be sure to use precise language.

TEAM CODE #: 13 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Voted for Neg because Aff did not do an adequate job FROM THE BEGINNING what the mandates were. Neg also was right in that Aff did not connect advantages to impacts. Aff didn't have enough evidence (or any really) to show harms to children in status quo. Also there's NO VALUE CRITERION I wasn't in your framework. Again, no proof of harms you act like ads are evil. Are they?

All the talk of values — relationship to advertising regulation? It was a digression.

Also, Aff, be way of making arguments bigger than they need to be. Is it exploitation? There wasn't proof.

PARLI Debate

Kovitz, Bo (*3)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 307
Gov: 27 Amato - Ringstrom
Opp: 11 Kurada - Datta
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: BO KOVITZ

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Judge's School Affiliation: BERKELEY HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	27	Team Code #:	11
Prop Speaker #1	AMATO pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	DATTA pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	RINGSTROM pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	KURADA pts 26

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

could spend your final focus explaining why your plan is fool-proof, more efficacious than their education counterplan

Prop 1: Pretty solid. Your first contention was THREE. There easily could have been 2 in there: reducing emissions + alternatives are detrimental. Try to flesh out/better organize the case. I think you could have attacked their K — and you should — but you honestly got lucky I didn't like it.

Prop 2: Thank you for defending my judging preference ☺ Good job attacking their funding plan for environmental education. Nice way of wording impacts. Think you can address their solvency critique better.

Opp 1: Interesting K, while you claim Aff has no solvency, many claims in your K lacked evidence/facts to make it believable. I think you needed to better substantiate claims — is the ecology going to be depleted? Does it necessarily lead to fascism? Your counterplan was pretty good.

Opp 2: (Btw, Aff wants to spend 7.5 bill, not 45 bill. Listen to their plan.) Also 6 powerplants, not 9 powerplants) Also, can you prove Aff's plan necessarily lead to MISUSE? Not entirely convinced that there's something wrong with the assumptions for the resolution that REQUIRES a K. Wasn't convinced by this.

Take POIs!!

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Not a fan of the K. I don't think the links were clear. I don't think it was necessary either — unless you proved to me why the K was necessary. I also explicitly asked to avoid K's and theory — I like genuine clash of issues. Also, I don't think education/changing mindset is unique to K — Aff is changing culture of sustainability and working within the system to do something realistic ($165 bill to education?)

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 308
Gov: 11 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Opp: 7 Mattegunta - Nandakumar
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Ganguli	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nandakumar	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sanghvi	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Mattegunta	pts 27

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: reasonable to analyze the topic, outlined the speech and made easy to follow. Showed confidence during debate

Opp 1: effective respond to the arguments provided supportive points

Prop 2: very effective and directly respond to the arguments, delivered the debated in an organized way. easy to understand and explained the points

Opp 2: well delivery the message. well controled the time

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
more effective respond to the arguments.

PARLI Debate

Deng, Bo-Liang (*23)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 308
Gov: 13 Sinha - Herman
Opp: 27 Shimizu - McDowell
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Bo-Liang Deng

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Academy

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	13	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Steven Herman pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Courtney McDowell pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Sarthak Sinha pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Ty Shimizu pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: reasonable analyzed the topic, and well organized, easy to follow. well delivery the message,

Prop 2: ~~clear~~ clarify the arguments and direct and efficiently respond the the points, didn't address some points made by the other side.

Opp 1: direct ~~re~~ respond to the arguments, showed very confidence during speech. provided alternative solution, and facts to support the arguments

Opp 2: effective respond to the points made by the other side. emphasized the own points,

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
more effective respond to the points.

PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 529
Gov: 5 Jia - Jiang
Opp: 7 Yu - Makineni
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HIGH

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 5		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 JIA	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Yu	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 JIANG	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Makineni	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:

Opp 1:

Prop 2:
Slowing a little bit helps a lot in speech.

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** Opp. **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
The prop plan is not concise enough and didn't successfully confronted the Opp rego. their counter plan.

The ~~USFG~~ USFG should ~~$~~ substantially increase regulation of advertising targeting children.

$. Net Benefits

1. 4.2 billion Rs. loss in costs obesity of children

2. 28% obesity. Less advertising Multinational products. Obesity → Diabetes, heart problems

3. Life Span

4.

CRU ~~CURB~~ obesity Convention

Non-unique

ASAP doesn't help - Stock market

2 PLANS ✓

---

prevention is better.

CFACI

PARLI Debate

Dara, Ramesh (*11)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 529
Gov: 14 Yee - Morrell
Opp: 3 Cramer - Griffin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAMESH DARA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Yee	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Cramer	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Morrell	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Griffin	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1:	Opp 1: Exceptional Speaker.
Prop 2:	Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 14 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

The prop Rebuttal made it convincing that research another renewable energy is needed and nuclear energy is ~~the~~ opp proposed.

The USFG should substantially increase support for nuclear energy.

&
1. Accidents Risk.
2. Risk of TARGETS
3. other renewable energy more sustainable

Research on renewable Energy

&. ↑ Increase research
1. Environment
   ↳ By product: Helium.
2. Fusion w. energy.
   ↳ Safer
3. Economy.

Efficiency.

PARLI Debate

Sadana, Sumit (*11)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 301
Gov: 2 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 4 Cunningham - Yau-Weeks
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sumit Sadana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Booth	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Yau-Weeks	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Pracar	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Cunningham	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: + Good open. definitions
+ Supporting studies cited
+ Confident, persuasive style

Prop 2: + Passionate and persuasive style
+ Clear & crisp communication
+ Good use of examples

Opp 1: + Excellent eye-contact, communication style
+ Crisp and articulate arguments
+ Some arguments had strong argument
+ Excellent come-back regarding parents being targeted in ads

Opp 2: + Excellent eye-contact
+ Calm & persuasive style, good use of humor for effect
+ Good use of sources to support

TEAM CODE #: 4 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Highlighted flaws in opponent's arguments which opponents were not able to overcome; Better prepared

PARLI Debate

Sadana, Sumit (*11)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 301
Gov: 16 Aguilera - Zhou
Opp: 14 Sutton - Moon
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Sumit Sadana

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	16	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Zhou pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Sutton pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Aguilera pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Moon pts 28

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: + Good use of supporting data and sources
+ Crisp communication but can increase eye contact

Prop 2: + Strong communication style & eye contact
+ Confident, persuasive
+ Gave solid arguments
– Some repetitions

Opp 1: + Very effective communication style with good eye contact
+/– Some strong arguments put forth, however flywheel idea somewhat far fetched for mass market

Opp 2: + Excellent, confident style + eye contact
+ Passionate & persuasive style

TEAM CODE #: 16 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Close round - ultimately #16 was able to put forth better arguments & refute their opponents. Difficult decision as it was really close.

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*7)
Round 4A 3:45pm Room 230
Gov: 14 Chin - Rosenfeld
Opp: 27 Ernst - Davis
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS, San Ramon

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	27
Prop Speaker #1	Rosenfeld pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Ernst pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Chin pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Davis pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: Excellent debator

Opp 1: Excellent debator

Prop 2: - Can be little clear
Excellent debator

Opp 2: Excellent debator

TEAM CODE #: 27 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PARLI Debate

Sharma, Kashyp (*7)
Round 4B 3:45pm Room 230
Gov: 11 Munshani - Baveja
Opp: 4 Basrai - McKenna
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: KASHYAP SHARMA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 11		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Baveja	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Basrai	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Munshan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 McKenna	pts 29

Please award each speaker points based on the following scale:

30 = Perfect **29** = Outstanding **28** = Very Good
27 = Good (but possibly not good enough to qualify for elimination rounds)
26-25 = Fair **24-20** = Poor **<20** = Reserved for rude or inappropriate behavior

Judging Criteria

- **Analysis:** How reasonably and effectively the debaters analyze the topic and the arguments offered during the debate
- **Evidence:** How appropriately and efficiently the debaters support arguments with evidence—which may include facts and references to authority as well as general knowledge
- **Argumentation:** How directly and effectively the debaters respond to the arguments made by the other side
- **Points of Information:** How relevant and effective were the questions and the answers
- **Delivery:** How well the debaters speak in an organized, communicative style that is pleasant and easily understandable
- **Courtesy:** How courteous and respectful the debaters were to opponents and judges

Using the above criteria, please offer compliments and/or suggestions for improvement to each debater:

Prop 1: good in all.
Improve little eye contact

Opp 1: Improving area
- Greet everyone → Good you corrected
- do not laugh on others

Prop 2:
work on clearity, Rest is good, face Expression Can be controlled

Opp 2:
- Be aggressive little bit

TEAM CODE #: 11 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: