This house believes that USFG should legalize recreational use of marijuana **PARLI Debate**

Scott Golde (*3)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 212
Gov: 10 Yee - Jarmel-Schneider
Opp: 15 Booth - Pracar
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Scott Golde

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Jaden Jarmel-Schneider	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ryan Booth	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Fontanna Yee	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Devin Pracar	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: fluid, good intonation, excellent stategy in final rebuttal → refuted most of their case and was substatiated earlier. Look up a little more. Well timed 1st time, Calm delivery

Prop 2: Confident, Courteous, great eye contact. Take a POI (they asked for 3). Strong evidence delivered most pesuasively.

Opp 1: Strategy well organized and persuasive. Good gestures. Strong finish. Prop team did mention that Marijuana was the issue at hand. If you make a mistake, and you will, smile when you apologize.

Opp 2: Very passionate, eye contact almost intimidating. Good smiles relieved tension. Rapid fire dismantling of their points. Try to keep hands out of pockets. Repeating the same point in the same speech sound like filling time, slow down, you are very smart. Doing so shows confident correction.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Close debate. Both side presented strong arguement, but opposition presented a strategy that went outside of the proposed resolution by including drugs other than marijuana

the United States Federal Government should mandate national service

PARLI Debate

Scott Golde (*3)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 212
Gov: 10 Gerenrot - Drake
Opp: 7 McDonnel - Flores
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Scott Golde

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo H. S.

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 15 ~~10~~	Team Code #: 7
Prop Speaker #1 Chiara Drake pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Cole McDonnell pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Irene Gerenrot pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Antonio Flores pts 25

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: Sorry, note headings altered my mistake

Prop 1:

Good eye contact, good gestures. Careful with phrases that include "Nobody or All" Strong rebuttal solid decision disassemble their Opp 1. ~~case~~ final arguements Great presentational skills; intonation and projection and Humorous and confident. Strategy and Argument had big hole in it in regards to Funding

~~Opp~~ 1: Prop 2:
I like how courteous you were to wait for your POI's. But, it is OK to speak up for effect. Good eye contact Analysis was fluid, You might have expounded on your point about specialists with in the different branches. eg Medic

Opp 2: Only one "Um", Good Work Engineer etc. "Breathe" You are very passionate and persuasive. Careful with phrases like "Opposition has no points or "wasted time"; come across cocky.

TEAM CODE #: ~~10~~ 15 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Some repetitive time filler could have been avoided if you slowed down

Opposition lacked evidence to back up some of their Arguments about poor people already joining and freedom of choice very strong points. Good Job. far reaching assertions Prop rebutted each casually, but convincingly

Legal Marijuana

PARLI Debate

Tim Aboudara (*16)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 5
Gov: 3 Bonet - Visht
Opp: 10 Lustig - Scott
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Aboudara

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Shannon Bonet	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Lustig	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Anish Visht	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Scott	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: Strong Opening Case
Excellent Speaking Style
Good use of time
Always Push Your Argument to the next level
Take Opp Point and make it Yours

Prop 2: Good Building on Case
Good Refuting of Opp Points
Always Try and Move Through the Debate... Hit a point and move on.

Opp 1: Strong Opening Case
Excellent Speaking Style
Good Use of Time
Use Opp to Both Refute Aff Case and make Your own Argument
Strive for 3pt Case

Opp 2: Good Building of Case
Strong Speaker

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Stronger Fact Based Case, Held their Grounds and Stayed off Attacks on Case.
Very Close Debate

The United States Federal Government should mandate compulsory national service.

PARLI Debate

Kumar Ramaiha (*6)
1B Round 4 9:00am Room 211
~~Gov: 12 Cao - Griggy~~ Gov 15 Holt-Mizin
~~Opp 15 Lanzone - Lisy~~ Opp 10 Shin-Shevelev
Parliamentary Debate/~~Varsity~~

Judge's Name: Kumar Ramaiah
Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington high, Fremont

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 15	Team Code #: 10
Prop Speaker #1 Lucy Holt pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Daniel Shin pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Katya Mizin pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 David Miller Shevelev 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:
Had lot of information, it was good to reiterate some of points.
well defined topic & good mandate

Prop 2:
You may want to pause between points to be more clear
very good to rephrase
mandate quickly to next stage

Opp 1: good work on Road map and bringing more examples.
very well organized info to refute all the points, could have added some of your points as well.

Opp 2:
very good style of delivery, & gestures and talking to everybody in room, even though there weren't many.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a very close call. Both the teams did excellent job in bringing their points and refuting other team points. Opp team was able to refute all the points from prop, very organized in information. Very good closing impact.

Affirmative 1

(RM)

Defination, Plan, Point

aiding, community, reg & by Law

mandate:- 18 to 25 y all genders for multiple semester or community service 10k, exception for vet, in school, timeline

533 bill, reallocate some from this

① better society, stronger military, nationalism

Super power

- good for homeless shelter

② to. - poverty

- effort way to make money

- make money without spending any more

negation 1

(RM) R.

stronger power, bring anti Servitude

- going to military

Less money earned

- 40% of military is spend in Salary

- foreign aid

Sovereign is destroyed

- less nationalism

- Internationalism not getting paid at once or time love

- govt should not force personal liberty

- can lose job for 10k

no point all negations were stricked off

Affirmative 2

(RM)

mandate repeated only for.

- how people are in military not recruiting

- we can allocate money.

- show the use of

→ military has enhanced rapidly & helped alot.

10k will be like bonus

- wealthy can't take side money not paid

→ be only for people not in school & paid for working in military

→ no validation of this

- can be faked

negation 2

(RM)

- half the time is spent in training

- 250 hour in community service, all.

Should be 2 to 3 years of service not 1 year

people escape by being in college longer

→ US creates resentment every time like Iraq, Internationalism, Afghan.

- no need in human, replace with drone, etc

:

good talking to all in Canada

negation 3

3 reasons ~~with feedback~~

① Resentment

- people don't want to be like militarism

- freedom violated other nations will resent,

- balance 2 jobs

② no benefit to community service

- drop in bucket

- cannot change any problems

- 10k will be squandered unless given

③ govt can't infringe liberty

- illusion of choice

-

***

Affirmative 3

main reasons

- 1 year - difficult to disengage more than 1 year

- too much money.

- same college, that will increase PhD & help indirectly

- not using both fighter jets

→ 250 hr can make difference

- 8 hrs on Saturday can be 250 hr

- no evidence

- naturalism is ending soon Canada

=

***

Affirmative

~~Def~~ of information & ~~need~~ safe

Between points, house ~~could not~~ ~~Speech~~ by power

Topic: Govt should Legalize Marijuana

PARLI Debate

Mark Berman (*10) (SINGLE FLIGHT)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 216
Gov: 2 Clark-Clough - Moore
Opp: 6 Gao - Moza
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: _____

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	Moore pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Moza pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Clark-Clough pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Gao 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:
Good speaker, presents arguments well. Sometimes seemed a bit too repetitive + Emotion good for impact, perhaps tone down just a bit.

Prop 2:
Calm demeanor, good eye contact. Arguments were a bit thin at times but overall nice style

Opp 1:
Very good at presenting, though arguments at times seemed to contradict. Unique approach of offering alt. plan was interesting but unfortunately supported other team argument so did not weigh out key arguments.

Opp 2:
Nice speaking style, hit on most points but lacked emotion. Possibly need to add some emphasis by tone or gestures. Overall good presentation.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
Prop had 4 key points supporting argument. Opp presented counter-plan. However, counterplan was undermined by several contentions in the main argument, and ultimately came down to Opp supporting much of Prop while not making the case that there is superior.

PARLI Debate

Natalia Mizin (*15)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 214
Gov: 1 Ghosal - Burgmann
Opp: 2 Carter - Whitmore
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Nicholas Mizin

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	1	Team Code #:	2
Prop Speaker #1	Burgman, K pts 23	Opp Speaker #1	Carter, A pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Ghosal, G pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Whitmore, N pts 28

#1 - 29 1/2 125

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

Compulsory not good service / final service

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

Prop 1: - Good structure to your opening statement, don't say what right answer.
- How does more US bases affect military, increase scientific [illegible]

Prop 2:
- good rebuttal to sexual assault point.
- Your argument [illegible] why the military is good and not fighting

Opp 1: Great, passionate opening
effectively rebuttal to everything in aff opening
~~Rebuttal~~ rebuttal to economy still a little large
- some new arguments in your conclusion

Opp 2:
- great point on the economy
- interesting point on changing society, but value of college degree leaves you vulnerable if aff could rebut it well

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff team was at one time rude to other team, opp had more structured, convincing arguments

PARLI Debate

Natalia Mizin (*15)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 214
Gov: 6 Baveja - Deshpande
Opp: 2 Hester - Yau-Weeks
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Nicholas Mizin

Judge's School Affiliation: Bentley

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 6	Team Code #: 2
Prop Speaker #1 Ishani Deshpande pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Sophia Yau-Weeks pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Shivali Baveja pts 27 #1	Opp Speaker #2 Claudia Hester pts 29 #1

Says #1 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

this house believes that the USFG should legalize recreational use of marijuana.

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

Prop 1: - Clear speaking voice.
- One thing you could have done is talk about how recreational mar. would be regulated
- Talk about countries where it is legal like Netherlands

Prop 2: You didn't effectively rebut point about killing the black market
You could have spent more time defeating Trumps vs. Hillary point

Opp 1:
- Great point on medicinal marijuana
- Clear speaking voice good projection

Opp 2: passionate voice, effective rebuttal but kept saying 1 million in tax revenue, that's untrue

your conclusion was a lot stronger than opening statement.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

They had more arguments that the other team did not effectively rebut.

Mandate Nat'l Service

PARLI Debate

Tim Aboudara (*16)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 5
Gov: 3 Deng - Visht
Opp: 4 Su - Her
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Aboudara

Judge's School Affiliation: Windsor

PROP
Team Code #: 3

Prop Speaker #1 Krish Visht pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 Kevin Deng pts 28

OPP
Team Code #: 4

Opp Speaker #1 Amanda Su pts 29

Opp Speaker #2 Emily Her 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: Very clear speaker for as fast as you speak
- Built a strong broad case good work having voters
- Focus on making the policy tangible for audience... what are you selling me with this.

Prop 2:
- Kept the case on track and tied things together well
- Good speaking style
- Drive home how your case meets the test

Opp 1: Strong speaker
- Good counter plans to Aff case
- Handled POI's well
- Draw out further, and very clearly how the Aff case doesn't meet the means test

Opp 2: Strong speaker
- Excellent work driving doubt using "voluntary" vs "compulsory"
- Draw out the one key thing that sets your case apart

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Final speech showing that a positive net benefit was more likely than a negative one.

Very close debate! Nice work by all!

PARLI Debate

Kimberley Haulk (*12)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 76
Gov: 6 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Opp: 3 Jones - McKinney
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Kimberly Haulk

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP 3	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #:	
Prop Speaker #1 Ganguli	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Jones	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Sanghvi	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 McKinney	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: Clearly stated points and sources but slow down in argument. Good passion to opinion. Analysis had weakened Rebuttal: Re: Recreational versus medical

Opp 1: Calm demeanor to points but pauses were distracting. Rebuttal:

Prop 2: Impassioned speaker with good speed to speech and excellent delivery with good eye contact.

Opp 2: Organized delivery however began debating your points yet provided pleasant style

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** Prop (Prop or Opp) **wins this debate.**

REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative provided strong reasons for legalization of Recreational Marijuana and their reasons were not adequately refuted by the negative

Resolution: U.S. Govt should Mandate National Service

PARLI Debate

Kimberley Haulk (*12)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 76
Gov: 2 O"Rafferty - Basrai
Opp: 3 Hinchliff - Koshkin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Kimberly Haulk

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 2	Team Code #: 3
Prop Speaker #1 Alden O'Rafferty pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Elena Kosnkin pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Sanah Basrai pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Isabel Hinchliff 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: Construction Good general analysis but speeches were secluded yet effective style.

Opp 1: Construction: you made a leap to collapse of economy without providing the reasoning and evidence

Prop 2: You had some good points but veered from premise.

Opp 2: Impassioned response yet somewhat condescending tone. Points seemed to be affirmative rather than differentiating

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Govt team provided clear analysis of arguments whereas the opposition's arguments were Not Clearly stated

PARLI Debate

Lucas Tung (*7)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 4
Gov: 2 Jayasuriya - Pashman
Opp: 9 Sinha - Almeida
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	2	Team Code #:	9
Prop Speaker #1	Pashman pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Sinha pts 27
Prop Speaker #2	Jayasuriya pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Almeida 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 projection, but lots of filler words
- repetive case. Contentions spend lots of time saying same things in different words.
- good sign-posting
- relatively clear IAR, but can sign-post voters more.

Prop 2:
- great tone and fluency, strong pacing/academic tone.
- organized case, doesn't expand mpx very much
- should work on compressing key points and setting up for voter issues.

Opp 1:
- sways a lot while speaking. Very fluent, but lots of filler words.
- poor time mngmnt. (15sec for Gov rebuttal?)
- INR wasn't very organized. Can include some clear voter issues

Opp 2:
- good fluency and organization. Poor time management
- didn't expand impacts very much. Should improve scope of analysis in rebuttals.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I agree with Opp that Gov plan is weak and vague. However, it's still specific enough to get them access to their impacts. Gov wins on line by line; no rebuttal to Gov advantages. Only response was basically restatement of disadvantages. Neither side extended impacts very well. Gov Racism not really revisited. (didn't vote on this, but Opp prob should have run a CP instead of just "MJ bad")

PARLI Debate

Lucas Tung (*7)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 4
Gov: 4 Vadrevu - Nanda
Opp: 14 Lacombe - Appel
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Lucas Tung

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	14
Prop Speaker #1	Nanda pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Lacombe pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Vadrevu pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Appel 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:
- great articulation & fluency.
- fantastically detailed ptext & observations
- impax not really iterated strongly
- can't answer questions during partner's speech.
- good confidence and conviction in delivery.

Prop 2:
- good fluency. randomly pauses to think/organize
- Advantage 2 was more of a defensive block. Good point, but nonunique to plan.
- inclusive impact with "only 30 hrs", but can't have both.

Opp 1:
- good delivery, but lots of filler words
- impax make sense, but how Gov plan links is not clearly stated. Military → can't afford college ??$$
- good voter issues, but should really quantify the impacts of Gov advantages.

Opp 2:
- fantastic delivery tone and articulation.
- make lots of impact claims without a lot of warrants (death, suicide, poverty, veteran suicide).
- good organization

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Gov team had a great/comprehensive plan text, but it's never made clear how this will impact communi. The 2nd advantage was won by the Opp's argument that it's nonunique so I dropped that. Gov's only argument then becomes that the plan will vaguely make communities better. How? Opp made a good point about the "only 30 hours" part. Is it a big impact on communities or isn't it? Can't have both. Opp wins on impact to ppl's time.

This House Believes that the USFG should legalize recreational use of marijuna.

Kumar Ramaiha (*6)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 211
~~Gov: 15 Holt - Mizuri~~ GOV 12 Cao - Griggy
~~Opp: 10 Shin - Shevelev~~ OPP 15 Lanzone - Lisy
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: KUMAR RAMAIAH

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington high, Fremont

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 12		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Cao	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Lisy	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 Griggy	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Lanzone	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:
* Very well delivered speech
* Brought very good impact to weigh all the points
* Keep doing what you are doing, can reduce points & expand

Prop 2:
* Road map was good
* well comprehended arguments
* use all your time to convince

Opp 1:
* good giving road map
* good delivery & voice modulation
* had more time, could have used to refute all of prop points

Opp 2:
* clean in delivery of speech
* Tried to cover & refute all points in nice way

TEAM CODE #: ~~Cao Griggy~~ 12 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp team was not able to convincingly argue against the points given by prop team. prop team also took advantage of proportion given by opp team to their advantage.

Cao

Affirmation 1

Benefits ~~no smuggling~~

① ~~mitigate~~ ~~tobacco~~ ~~tax~~ policy

② synthetic marijuana side effects, ~~regulated~~ regulation, safety

③ alcohol & tobacco already legal, and can bill ~~accepted~~ stats

no ~~cost~~ in margin

④ Tax savings & benefits

to bill tax Revenue of colorado

⑤ reduction of cartel statistic Mexico bad.

Lisy

Negation 1

Road map

~~state~~ can use synthetic

XNo cost or timeline

XNot free power

not responded

not responded

no responded

Find safer alternate solution

medical condition

less regulation or cost

① harmful ~~disorder~~ brain, less productive

② if FDA approved ~~work~~ to everyone, cheaper

③ Research ~~benefits~~ indirectly in the process

Grissy

Affirmation 2

~~colorado~~ (RM)

~~NO~~

→ ∞

Can we do both at same time?

→ Cigarettes cause same effect but legal

→ regulations still exist, cost also excess

Research will be expensive

→ Can be done at same time

Laxone

Negation 2

(RM)

does not solve can use different scapegoat for racism

Same with our plan

~~will not have~~ to this will also ~~help~~ reduce cartel

→ not related to debate

→ ~~no need to~~

~~FDA~~

Safety is most important point

- NO FDA regulation

Lex

Negation 3

Less Revenue, benefit

- past lawsuit money

- also kills revenue of cartel

- Safer drug

- ~~did~~ ~~add~~ ;

- brain dope Lower productivity

- Less economy

- Benefits of results

→ Safer product NOT FDA regulated

Cao

Affirmation 3

→ ~~Tax~~ no mutually exclusive

- did not provide why we can't do both

- no unique benefits

- can't define timeline its not possible

#.

Survey

respect to POI

good eye contact

& good liars

* * *

respect to POI

Don't have to take POI in Lain

Can bring normie

- had Lain in nebulla

* *

~~Lap~~ ~~Red~~ finished in 4:27

- expand more

very respectful & thanks

over this by 15 seconds

did not take POI

ha

Working good impact now

PARLI Debate

Hillary Larkin (*2)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 70
Gov: 4 Gupta - Maitra
Opp: 12 Colenbrander - Katewa
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Hillary Larkin

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	12
Prop Speaker #1	Gupta pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	Katewa pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Maitra. pts 26	Opp Speaker #2	Colenbrander 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: Good evidence argument
well organized
Needs to slow down

Opp 1: Good presence + use of voice
and use contact.
Good organization → argument

Prop 2: organized information
also needs to slow down.
edit more → points need
to be precise

Opp 2: good evidence + summary
of argument.
Good use of voice + hand.
Well organize responses
to Pro arguments / stats.

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Good organization of info, good arguments
to the Pro points. Delivery better

legalization of marijuana

PARLI Debate

Hillary Larkin (*2)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 70
Gov: 12 Fehring - Masters
Opp: 6 Moturi - Datta
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Hillary Larkin

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 12		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Cole Fehring	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Ahir Datta	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Carina Masters	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Sampreeth Moturi	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: Relaxed demeanor good eye contact slowdown to emphasize points

Opp 1: good use of voice. needs to stand more still. facts are well reasoned & referenced.

Prop 2: organized thoughts need to slow down. choice when to allow questions or not. good eye contact

Opp 2: Clearly engaged in argument + thinking. can be distracting w gestures Enthusiastic debater with potential.

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** PRO **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
argued to move → change status quo

Needs more compulsory national Gov.

This House Believes USFG Should Legalize recreational use of marijuana

PARLI Debate

Susie Barton (*13)
Round 1A 9:00am Room 215
Gov: 1 Nagarajan - Wolf-Jacobs
Opp: 3 Firsov - Kwak
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Susie Barton

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 1		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Wolf-Jacobs	pts 28.5	Opp Speaker #1 Kwak	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Nagarajan	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Firsov	pts 28.5

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: Stated 1st 2nd 3rd arguments concisely/Strong. Very good articulation took a point of question from other team.

Prop 2: Chemical addiction is inevitable good analogies - Good counter to Opp 1

Opp 1: Defined Rec Marijuana Countered - pts. additional opp pts. increase drug use rate - biggest pop that uses Safety - traffic 16-18 Clear articulation - addressed pts. by prop

Opp 2: Good arguments lives its money counter - that it would only help current ad passed offenses. - still illegal under 25

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very good debate - Both sides strong - OPP- wins

USFG should establish a compulsory draft

PARLI Debate

Susie Barton (*13)
Round 1B 9:00am Room 215
Gov: 4 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 12 Cheng - Shifs
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Susie Barton

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	12
Prop Speaker #1	S Bardalai pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Shifs pts 29.5
Prop Speaker #2	Rangwala pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Cheng 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: Concise arguments
Good arguments in what would happen without this - good refutations for opp's pts.

Prop 2: Good: More military brings more peace - we need to present the image that we are a force to be reckoned with

Opp 1: Excellent delivery style. Very good arguments, good refutations
Effective aggressive style backed up by facts and examples.

Opp 2: Good refutation of comparison of China's spending on our military and what U.S. would spend financial burden and lack of morale.

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall both teams argued their sides very well. It came down to more points made by opp than Prop sides. Very good debate. Prop side had many good points and delivery style, but again - Opp - edged them out.

I like that both teams took the questions/clarifications from the other teams.

PARLI Debate

Jonathan Miller (*10) NM 217A
Round 1A 9:00am Section 7
Gov: 15 Modi - Hemerling
Opp: 4 Khan - Sharma
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MILLER

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP
Team Code #: 15

Prop Speaker #1 MODI pts 29

Prop Speaker #2 HEMERLING pts 29

OPP
Team Code #: 4

Opp Speaker #1 KHAN pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 SHARMA 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: Strong Points:
- Pot is a gateway drug for suppliers, not just users, leading to increased crime
- Enforcement is disproportionately applied in poor communities where there is more police presence

Prop 2:
- Regulation reduces THC, adds age (ID) checks to counter underage use
- In Netherlands, less usage
- Comparison w/ legal Alcohol & Tobacco, included lack of physical dependence of pot

Opp 1: Weaknesses
- Comparison to Prohibition illogical - this legalizes vs. status quo, Prohibition prohibited vs. status quo
- Insufficient evidence for extreme assertions of downside to pot use: psychotic behavior, murders, hallucinations, aggressive behaviors
- Illogical argument that legalization would lead Opp 2: to more stronger drugs - still illegal - increase black market for those.
- TRIED TO REFUTE TAX REVENUES SAYING TAX BURDEN WOULD BE XFERRED BY SUPPLIERS TO OTHER PRODUCTS - WHICH PRODUCTS? NEW INDUSTRY

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
- PROP GAVE STRONG, CONSISTENT ARGUMENT, DEFENDED P.O.O.'S, DISTINGUISHED BETWEEN POT AND ALCOHOL/TOBACCO
- OPP PRESENTED UNSUBSTANTIATED BEHAVIORS ATTRIBUTED TO POT

PARLI Debate

Jonathan Miller (*10)
Round 1B 9:00am Section 8 LM 217A
Gov: 3 Siu - Stankus
Opp: 6 Meswani - Yoo
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MILLER

Judge's School Affiliation: CORNELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	STANKUS pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	YOO pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	SUI pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	MESWANI 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: Support for US Military interventions claimed support of democracy as best form of gov't to protect human rights — DID NOT CONNECT MILITARY INTERVENTIONS TO ACTUALLY

Prop 2: SUPPORTING DEMOCRACY

Opp 1: Yoo W particular was extremely strong speaker — logical, clear, WIN BASED ON SUCCESSFUL TOPICALITY

Opp 2:

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP WIN BASED PRIMARILY ON RUNNING TOPICALITY. SWUNG PROP'S PLAN TO BE VERY CLOSE TO STATUS QUO & REFUTED PROP CONTENTION THAT U.S. MILITARY INTERVENTIONS IMPORT DEMOCRACIES AND HUMAN RIGHTS. AND, TIMEFRAME TOO VAGUE TO ARGUE — NOT IMMEDIATE PLAN, RATHER IN TIME OF WAR - WHEN? 100 YRS FROM NOW

A friend to everybody is a friend to no one

PARLI Debate

Victor Lacombe (*14)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 76
Gov: 6 Gao - Moza
Opp: 10 Yee - Jarmel-Schneider
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 14

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 6		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 Moza	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Jaden Jarmel-Schneider	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Gao	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Fontanna Yee	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: Very clearly presented points Thorough Argument

Prop 2: Very professional clear Speaker

Opp 1: Very clear speaker organized Good voice

Opp 2: Passionate Speaker

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Very Tough Both sides did well. AFF had a lot of great contentions and though Neg had good points they were not able to overcome all of them.

Friend

(+)

genuine
Special

society competitive, hierarchical

① Math - constant · Δ
+1 to everyone all = #

WC

② Conflict of interest, friend & enemy

③ Political - Snowden
US Govt - the Public
→ no one

④ HISTORICAL - BETRAYAL BENEDICT

⑤ Philosophical - TRUST
⑥ EVOLUTION - DARWIN

5:30

---

① Competitive advantage.

② Practical refutation of
can't help everyone w/o
helping one

7:20

· Village - not applicable
· self
competitive disagreement

Voters related

(−)

BURDEN - EXAMPLE

① Distinctions count, added value

② Only need to show
supports 1 person.

③ are some supporters.

④ Helped both.

⑥ Intent > outcome

- Friend helps or supports
- can't be friends & enemy

① Contradictions in term.

② even a bill is from

③ friends with yourself

7:00

· Repeated AFF
contradictions passionately
and Definition of friend
w/o comparison

· Trinket
· Burden
· Math
Logic 4:51

PARLI Debate

Tariq Mustafa (*6)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 4
Gov: 9 Sinha - Almeida
Opp: 10 Gerenrot - Drake
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Mustafa

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON HS.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 9		Team Code #: 10	
Prop Speaker #1 27 (Sinha)	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 28 (Gerenrot)	pts 28pt
Prop Speaker #2 27 (Ahmed)	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 27 (Dsche)	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:
- framed the argument in terms of risk - greed & not ambition.
- very hard to buy good pts on not taking risks.
- ~~should~~ have clarified & framed the argument very clearly & forcefully
- well done

Prop 2:
- Good pts.
- US GDP ≃ $16T, Chi ≃ $7T
- Should have been more partially argued/rebutted OPP1's pt.

Opp 1:
- good pts very passionate.
- but 97% startup's could be failing of not doing something correctly instead of risk? - will argue.
- brought good example
- ~~US GDP ≃ $16T, Chi ≃ $7T~~
- greed ≠ ambition (close but good if you could have clarified the.

Opp 2:
- good overall
- well argued

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
OPP framed the debate very concisely & brought good rebuttal's for the PROP's pts. PROP did not respond well and were last in rebuttal.


Sink:
> quantity
> certainty
not good exp. — now vs later
—
—
> disappointment
— quotes ✓
— stories of not getting
— urban / grand
> good & wealth
> certainty /
> depth = Ukraine
repeat
SOP
Ab
— 97% fails — not reasons
— school rejected
— wrong fact: China / US
— disappointment /= betting / gambling / risk
— bad idea
— story of CA & getting goodly
— guarantees
— sad / hateful to society
why?
how?
— Grey
— actuary
— trade
— new stage
— poorly/Relax
— business rules or risk
— hiring/rank
— eg.
— investor
dad group
advertising
Risks
— goal exp w/ economic
— each d.
— actuarial — no planning
— no pol.
— stock market → good exp.
— mutual
— school
— risk/reward — better fate. — good exp
— US ea W/ world.
— good exp.
— CA migrate to take risk.
— migrating to USA — risk/reward
— goal/ — greed. = ambition
— crucial to our success
(Grant)
Dorm:
— new rules —
— take risk
— what about Floats as security?
— college ed helps the migrants
— diploma = discount
— quality = Ham always wins
↓ local
agent
— last resort — foreign
— Midfield. — is that allegation of risk?
— ambition:
↳ vs risk.
greed to attain extent
expl.
goal
— cash — not goal
Rep:
— incorrect assets
— what am is available
— cash/97%
— risk vs ambition
— certainty helps
Create Economy of scale
— going to college

A friend to everybody is a friend to nobody.

PARLI Debate

Arna Katewa (*12)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 211
Gov: 10 Lustig - Scott
Opp: 2 Clark-Clough - Moore
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Arna Katewa.

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High School.

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 10.	Team Code #:
Prop Speaker #1 Miriam Lustig pts	Opp Speaker #1 pts
Prop Speaker #2 Silas Scott pts	Opp Speaker #2 pts

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:

Team 10 showed up and waited for the other team.

Prop 2:

Opp 1:

after waiting for 20 min in Rm # 211, Team 2 did not show up. (12:38 – 12:58 pm) –

Opp 2: based on the Director's directive it was a NO SHOW.

TEAM CODE #:_____ on the _____wins this debate.
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Opp no-show

Bird in the hand is better than 2 in the bush.

PARLI Debate

Michelle Place (*15) (Single Flight)
Round 2A 11:20am 217A
Gov: 10 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 6 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MICHELLE PLACE

Judge's School Affiliation: BENTLEY

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 SHEVELEV	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 GANGULI	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 SHIN	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 SANGHVI	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 speaker, direct and organized. Hemit pushing up glasses - distracting

Prop 2:
good speaker, clear

Opp 1:
Strong speaker; organized and energetic

Opp 2: Good speaker, clear and well organized.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Topicality: Prop's definition was very narrow. Neg had a strong argument for T as well as good argument against pro team.

SHEVELEV	GANGULI	SHIN	SHANGHVI	GANGULI	SHEVELEV
VALUE ① ↓ pop ② ↑ hatred against west ③ Syrian civil war → refugees. – MORAL – ECONOMY – helps world opinion.	status quo 1 bad change 2 bads	refugees in us versus learning them in Syria	Breadth vs depth.	Topicality.	POO (2)

THB that a bird in the hand is worth more than two in the bush.

PARLI Debate

Jeffrey Eng (*10)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 215
Gov: 6 Moturi - Datta
Opp: 4 Vadrevu - Nanda
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	GOV 6	Team Code #:	OPP 4
Prop Speaker #1	Moturi pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Ansh Nanda pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Datta pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Vadrevu 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: Very good energy to much rocking & moving was distracting

Prop 2: good delivery & nice eye contact

Opp 1: Excellent calm approach make too many redundant point distract from your message - If you can organize your points to connect them so you don't need to restate

Opp 2: Good voice projection & nice delivery on points

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Two debates in one. Opp wins on contention that sphere of influence is too narrow for resolution. Draw on sphere of influence good points on anti-sentiment (Aff) and Nucleus control (Opp). Aff did not address points on investment value.

Prop 1

Fact case - T/F
must evidence - wins
fraud alg

Intergovernmental / country / NGO

abnormal - society for everyone
① can't take side
can't rely on you
Swiss - cannot acq - never get involved, never help
② opp cost - spend time with everyone - only slightly share advocacy - mutual agreement
never a true friend
never friend back !

Clear voice projection
Nice speed
never is a strong word

Opp 1

Accept definition

Swiss - Not a friend

I/R - UN, NGO cooperative parties
HR / water supplies
Not friends as no one
NGO / Syria - $2M aid water / HR supplies
able to help everyone

Communication - emo gain community social
Bill Gates - incorporate ideas to whole
C Firm - HP is friends everyone in the end

abnormal - Swiss not compatible

Schedule - 8 hr/day
Groups Friends hang out together - time / friendship

debate friendship

Voice reflection
→ very convincing

Facial
Nice Expression on points

really helps on reality

Prop 2

Friend / nobody

No friends with everybody - misinformation

NGO - Suffer people
helping Syrian people

emotion good a Bill Clinton ??

HP - Not friends with Assad, UN

Swiss - maintain neutrality

Not a friend to each

can't help

can't talk to everybody
- friends to nobody

time exist & guilt

Good delivery
like hand gestures

got a little excited
those & ~~distracted~~ passion

Opp 2

Assad, Kim Jong UN
Not a friend

Naturally - help him

can't 2 sides on fight

Dark place when
NO friends

Slow logic
about friends

bonds not linked by time

Good rebuttal
on Assad

Opp Sum

Split time
vs bonds

helping
Not friends to
nobody

Prop Sum.

Logic flaw
evidence (not supported)
lack of evidence

HP enemies within others.

Assad / UN
not friend

spirit - technically

Commit to you

mutual friend

This house believes that a bird in the hand is worth more than two in the bush.

PARLI Debate

Victor Lacombe (*14)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 76
Gov: 4 Khan - Sharma
Opp: 6 Baveja - Deshpande
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: LACOMBE

Judge's School Affiliation: 14

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	Humaira Khan pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Ishani Deshpande pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Harshad Sharma pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	Sharada Baveja 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: Strong speaking style. Strong close

Opp 1: Good Argument for Topicality. Nice closing

Prop 2: Nice speaking voice. Try to directly address opponents contentions

Opp 2: Good Organization & good thought content.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Specious definition from Prop. Opp did a good job arguing Topicality. Prop realized and countered but not until it was too little too late.

2 birds in hand. 2 bush

⊕ AFF metaphorical

2 birds 1 stone

- "issues"
- heavy around the bush = not solving ignore the issue
- Net benefit more people

① physical / medical ISSUES
DM - D_x = tx
ignore = harm
POI - BAB = Do nothing?
Ignorance is bliss - neg
- small % better than 0%
also helps others by preventing black plagues, pox
- Slavery 3/5 - in bush mission Compromise

② - WMD - IRAQ - ISIS ALQAEDA NUKES
KOREA -

③ Inflation -

④

not a clear rebuttal of neg contentions, Non any restatement of your own points

4:30

⊖

NEG TOPICALITY

Redefined - 1 more shortterm 2 longterm
better Educational T-N+ent.

① IRAQ = Shortterm - NO WMD

② Inflation - Spend now causes inflation.
Slow growth - Stagnancy

③ Drought - Excess Water use in time of plenty

Def. unfair
Topicality

→ POI compromise not just density

Restated points addressed

- Good Rebuttal to 3/5

very 2 birds

6:37

Bird in the hand work more than 2 in the bush

James Sweeney (*11)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 214
Gov: 12 Cheng - Shifs
Opp: 3 Siu - Stankus
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Jim Sweeney

Judge's School Affiliation: MHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 12		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Shifs	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 David Gomez Siu	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Cheng	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Sophie Stankus	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: (28)
creative definition with Syria refugees. Three strong points, each backed with reasoning

Prop 2: (28)
Built nicely on first speakers arguments, solid rebuttal of opposition

Opp 1: (29)
Very good job of building on bird in the hand throughout the debate. But didn't clearly distinguish why refugees are better off elsewhere.

Opp 2: (28)
Reinforced points about domestic terror risk, also worked to narrow contentions by emphasizing value of existing camps in the region, but didn't overcome moral argument of proponents

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Proponents established a creative approach of Syrian refugees & limited range of opposition by terms. Both sides argued well.

A friend to everybody is a friend to nobody

PARLI Debate

James Sweeney (*11)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 214
Gov: 12 Colenbrander - Katewa
Opp: 3 Li - Qian
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jim Sweeney

Judge's School Affiliation: WHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	12	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	Colenbrander pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Austen Li pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Katewa pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Ming Qian 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: (28) Explained proposition and definitions clearly. Used a good 'circle' analogy to back argument, but tended to generalities

Prop 2: (28) Tried to harass terms for opponents' stated but didn't build much on proponents' case.

Opp 1: (28) Used specifics, such as Switzerland & neutrality, to undercut proponents arguments. Also took on concept of loyalty well; specific arguments harder to follow

Opp 2: (28) Strong defined terms, used good 'dictatorship' analogy

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** ~~_____~~ **wins this debate.** Opp
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Proponents tried to establish a binary choice, but it was quite narrow, and the opposition demonstrated that it didn't hold up to a multi-dimensional argument

PARLI Debate

Thomas Wyszynski (*10)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 5
Gov: 3 Jones - McKinney
Opp: 15 Modi - Hemerling
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: THOMAS WYSZYNSKI

Judge's School Affiliation: LOWELL

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	15
Prop Speaker #1	Colin Jones pts 27/28	Opp Speaker #1	Shail Modi pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	William McKinney pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Alexander Hemerling 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: NICE POISE & MEASURED SPEAKING STYLE BUT CHECK EXAMPLES (NUMBERS) ALSO GOOD WITH FLOATING LIVING

Prop 2: NICE POINTS POI, COULD HAVE BEEN UTILIZED

Opp 1: GENERALLY VERY GOOD FLOW BUT
1. STOP CLICKING PEN (BIG NERVOUS HABIT)
2. DON'T APOLOGIZE WHEN FLOW GETS BROKEN. JUST RESTART.

Opp 2: GOOD POI'S

GOOD FLOW + PRESENCE BUT LEARN HOW THE STAGE MIC WORKS.

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.** (Prop or Opp)

PEOPLE INVEST TO OWN FUTURE CASH FLOW.

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP HAD A TOUGHER CASE TO DEFEND AND WHILE GOOD LOST BECAUSE 1. THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE USED ULTIMATUMISM AS THEIR BASIS.
2. REMINDING FLOWERS WHAT HAVE BEEN BEFORE WAS WITH LIVING ARGUMENT WAS CRAZY.

A FRIEND TO EVERYBODY IS A FRIEND TO NOBODY

Thomas Wyszynski (*10)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 5
Gov: 4 Su - Her
Opp: 2 Jayasuriya - Pashman
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: THOMAS WYSZYNSKI

Judge's School Affiliation: LWSEN

OPP

~~PROP~~ 2

Team Code #:

6PP

~~Prop~~ Speaker #1 Michael Jayasuriya pts 29 PHP

OPP ELIA

~~Prop~~ Speaker #2 Pashman pts 27 PHP

~~OPP~~ 4

Team Code #:

PROP TEAM

~~Opp~~ Speaker #1 Amanda Su pts 28

Opp Speaker #2 Emily Her 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: GOOD JOB PUTTING PROP ON THE SPOT. GREAT ENERGY BUT TAKE IT DOWN ONE NOTCH.

Prop 2: GOOD PROJECTION + FLOW. TENDED TO OBFUSCATE DETAILS. NOT CLEAR.

Opp 1: POWER + GOOD BUT SLOW DOWN NICE OUTLINE STYLE OF PRESENTING AND YOU HAD GOOD POINTS NICE TRY UNDERMINING TIME

Opp 2: FLOW WAS TOO ENERGETIC, MAYBE FRENZIED. IF THIS WAS A TACTIC, IT DID NOT WORK.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP HAD THE HIGHER ARGUMENT AND UNDERMINED THEIR POSITION BY USING LITERAL INTERNAL EXAMPLES IN A METAPHORICAL DEBATE. GENERALLY STRONG PERFORMANCES BY BOTH SPEAKERS ON BOTH SIDES.

Devendra Kumar
~~Scott Engstrom (*13)~~
Round 2A 11:20am Room 70
Gov: 15 Lanzone - Lisy
Opp: 1 Ghosal - Burgmann
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DEVENDRA KUMAR

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington

PROP Team Code #: 15

OPP Team Code #: 1

Prop Speaker #1 Lisy pts 27 Opp Speaker #1 Kai Burgmann pts 27

Prop Speaker #2 Lanzone pts 25 Opp Speaker #2 Gaurav Ghosal 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:
Mostly Reading
need to go bit slow
Excellent comeback on knowledge / Reading
Confident

Prop 2:
Countered Problem restatement - well
Clarity
Better Prepared on TOPIC
Explained Both sides well

Opp 1:
Got long term view of problem
Problem stated well - redefined
- good & confident
Positive Body language
Good Analogy / wrong example of Natural Res SDV

Opp 2:
Was able to counter Prop argument on knowledge
Compared economy & Nature well
Have clarity on subject
Presented well.

TEAM CODE #: 1 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Confident, Good counter arguments,
Good analogy.

Devendra Kumar

Scott Engstrom (*13)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 70
Gov: 14 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 2 O"Rafferty - Basrai
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: DEVENDRA KUMAR

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 14		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 APPEL	pts 26	Opp Speaker #1 O'Rafferty	pts 26
Prop Speaker #2 LACOMBE	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 BASRAI	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 Analogy on WWII
Repeating first round

Opp 1: Good Start. with example
Spontaneous -
need more relevent example (-)

Prop 2: Very Calm & composed +
spending time in Reading (-)
Differential liking & Friendship
practical approach

Opp 2: Excellent example, confident
only Given 4 political examples
Mostly ~~REPEATING~~ definition (-)
Second Round - need relevent Analogy

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Relevent Analogy, in first round, spontaneous

This House believes that a bird in the hand is worth more than 2 in the Bush...

Arna Katewa (*12)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 211
Gov: 7 McDonnel - Flores
Opp: 3 Deng - Visht
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Arna Katewa

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin High School.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 7		Team Code #: 3.	
Prop Speaker #1 Antonio Flores	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Krish Visht	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Cole McDonnell	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Kevin Deng	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: Construction: Good speech. Started with nice definition & structuring the debate. It would be nice if you could go a little slow.

Rebuttal: It was good, but you could have made it slightly stronger for affirmation

Prop 2: Nice and organized speech. You did a good job refuting the negation & rebuilding your affirmation case.

Opp 1: construction - great speech, very well structured. clear contentions which were backed up nicely with examples & arguments.

Rebuttal - it was done very well, all the points were made clearly & had strong arguments.

Opp 2: Great speech, very well organized, made some really strong arguments about Risk & probability & rebuilt/setup the arguments for Neg. rebuttal.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Both teams gave a great speech. The opposition team had stronger arguments and refuted the affirmations strongly with nice structure & and made their point come across clearly. Great job!!

PARLI Debate

Tariq Mustafa (*6)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 4
Gov: 2 Carter - Whitmore
Opp: 4 Bardalai - Rangwala
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Mustafa

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON H.S.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Carter	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Bardalai	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Whitmore	pts 26	Opp Speaker #2 Rangwala	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: - good points, and crisp presentation.
- framed the argument well. and had good support plc
- should have clarified the fallacies better (everybody nobody etc)

Prop 2: - gave away four points to opp.
- good points.
- argued well on some points, but appeared lost, and checked for time several times.

Opp 1: - Good argument about the veracity & refutation of the sources by Prop 1.
- framed the argument very well by putting Prop 1 on the spot for lack of clarity

Opp 2: - good argument to rebut Prop 2.
-

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP's argument was weak and did not frame the study argument well, which was exploited very well by OPP. Overall OPP was better in rebuttal and arguing their points.

A friend to everyone is friend to nobody

Carter :-

Strict definition of friend :-
- mutual support / cooperation
- destroy trust / what if one betrays
- example of movies - attempted to please
- friendship become shallow
- no one is liked by everyone
- mutual trust
- literally means "everyone"
- simply impossible to expect some but lack from everyone

Whitman :-

- definition notion :- lack of friends. seems
- keep friend does NOT mean stay info with other.
- seems lost
- opp is does not with count like "Death"
- Care about as society.
- to much clearly the world.
- repetition.
- outer

Carter :-

—

- what mean everybody / nobody? (Broader)
- duplicity
- "mean girl" - incorrect sense.
- "Death" - not real scenario.
- pros - did not properly define the possitive-
- Circular logic.
-

(Rapaport)

- JFK.
- Sad & Tom
- Friendship not possible with everyone
- opponent did not provide framework for the discussion
- movies are for entertainment.
- What does everyone mean?
-

Bard:

- Pro's did not define the term properly or clearly.
- Rebuttle Pro's example.
- Clearly contrast the pts between Pro's & theirs
-

A friend to everybody is a friend to nobody

PARLI Debate

Jeffrey Eng (*10)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 215
Gov: 15 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 3 Bonet - Visht
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jeff Eng

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: GOV 15		Team Code #: OPP 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Booth	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Bonet	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Pracar	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Visht	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: Clear Voice Projection
Nice speed delivery

Prop 2: like hand gesture during delivery
got a little too passionate during presentation

Opp 1: Like your facial expression really adds to your presentation
Voice inflection on points are really convincing too.

Opp 2: Good rebuttal on Assad & Kimberly Ann.

TEAM CODE #: OPP 3 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

OPP point about NGO/UN being a friend to everyone was a strong point. AFF argument that NGO/UN can never be a friend to Assad not strong enough since NGO/UN would want to try to be friends with Assad. Also HP/Code F. is friends with everyone with the scope of HP.

Hand / Bush

Prop 1

Definition - Idiom

Bone - mirror

US - house -

bird - eagle

① - sphere of influence (greedy not good)
- most strongest
- Guatemala
- 2nd bird
capitalist / manipulative
Intervening
Economy controlling
Sanction → US. removed monetarie / eco
below

② Vietnam - war - Influence
Asian - Communism

③ Ant - sentiment US
push back - more control
oil / ports
use weapons / drones
breeding terrorist
drone - Citizen

speed action issue, but calm

Rocky - distracting & too excited

good energy

Opp 1

Value round Fact, policy

Framework - fact, value, policy

U.S. - this house

Proverb → common sense
ex
Nothing about government

abusive → Not good action

Potential - wasted opp

Possession - Not topical

---

① US Checks actions
India / Pakistan
North Korea
Nuclear wires - required sphere

② Ant - ?? - CNBC
Forbes
(e) - Warren Buffet - richest
Smith - John

Need way to make sound

Title calm approach

Redundant too much as you get excited

Prop 2

Metaphor / Value

interpolicy metaphor
- Social welfare
- common sense

THB - Federal govt
deeper house
(people in general)
review contentions

reciprocal → discuss debate

Pause about at work

No

Nuclear winter
status Quo
- current state already
- slow

Anti - CNN
govt ant-west

Opp 2

Value ~~character~~ as

Num -
No ground

Bush - good - overreaching

New sphere of influence
- Family term apart - Not like

Yield discussion
Right to gain Value

Good Voice
Projection
Nice points

Opp Sum

- contention
- proverb
- value

Need to
Subside case

- Wasting our time
- Not fair - on time

Good organization specific on point

But a better
Strong overarching
connecting message
your ~~argument~~ could help

Prop Sum

- Proverb - open to interpretation
- investment only
- sphere of influence

PARLI Debate

Lin Jie Wu (*3)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 216
Gov: 6 Meswani - Yoo
Opp: 4 Gupta - Maitra
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Lin Jie Wu

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	6	Team Code #:	4
Prop Speaker #1	Yoo pts 30	Opp Speaker #1	Maitra pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Meswani pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Gupta 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: Great understanding of "framing" the issue, Good analysis of ~~debate~~ procedure, Brings up good debate and specific examples for counter arguments. Good volume, excellent delivery. Great POIs. Need to keep within time.

Prop 2: Great analysis of counter arguments, and Great preparation. Great delivery, full use of time, Very eloquent.

Opp 1: Good understanding of how to frame the issue, good delivery. Needs to better address counter-arguments, rather than bringing up standalone arguments only. Great attempt at using debate procedure to argue opposition.

Opp 2: Needs better preparation and better use of time, need to provide more / better evidence. Otherwise decent delivery. Also need to work on analysis of counter-arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION: Proper use of debate procedure, good definition, large amount of evidence, amazing delivery,

PARLI Debate

Lin Jie Wu (*3)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 216
Gov: 2 Hester - Yau-Weeks
Opp: 12 Fehring - Masters
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Lin Jie Wu

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1 Yau-Weeks	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Fehring	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Hesters	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Masters	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 delivery, strong definitions. Understands how to frame the issue. Needs less filler words like "um" and "uh" to make delivery perfect. Good preparation, good use of time, good analysis of counter arguments.

Prop 2: Very passionate speaker, ~~very~~ good volume and eye contact, Great preparation and addressing of counter arguments, Needs less pathos arguments and more Logos arguments. Great delivery.

Opp 1: Good confidence, Great delivery. Very convincing arguments and evidence. Good preparation. Analysis of propositions arguments on point, good use of time, good eye contact. Frames the issue well, but need to address specific counter arguments by prop better.

Opp 2: Understands the concept of framing the issue, good analysis of counter arguments. Good volume.

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

REASON FOR DECISION: Stronger/more convincing evidence and arguments, slightly better addressed the counterarguments, VERY close debate; both sides had great evidence and arguments,

A friend to Everybody is a friend to No One.

PARLI Debate

Julianna Phillips (*2)
Round 2B 11:20am Room 212
Gov: 3 Hinchliff - Koshkin
Opp: 12 Cao - Griggy
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Julianna Phillips

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1 Koshkin	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Cao	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Hinchliff	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Griggy	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: Koshkin

Very clear points. Narrow, precise defition of resolution helped you tremendously.

Prop 2: Hinchliff

Good response to opponent's questions, clear arguments.

Opp 1: Cao

Very interesting points about the unfair advantage, given their very precise defition of resolution. Maybe should have broadened or questioned definition to open up more grounds of debate.

Opp 2: Griggy

Very creative speech, a valiant effort to bring up good points against opponent. Awesome!

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

A very interesting debate as it also contained a second debate about the debate itself! Very well handled on both sides.

1 Koshkot

~~Content is WRONG~~
→ country alliances
: everybody - all countries

- cannot provide ben to all countries w/o at harm another
- cannot honor alliance, cannot provide benefits.
- during time of war cannot be neutral
- trade ≠ alliance
- alliance - formally cooperating w a military purpose

2 Cao

- skews against negation and request was denied
- nothing to prepare.
- unfair prep time.
- vote for negation.
- no mutual wasted w/ out.

✓ don't have to give all your friends the same thing / amount

✓ can help + cooperate w/ 2 countries that are not allies w each other

Sum up:
vote for negation
no equal ground

3 Hinchliff

- could have tried to redefine interpreter tion rather than negate

→ - metaphor frees opp to be creative, educational
→ - asked questions.

- no real life context proves the point
- allies in wartime, militarily

✓ refute non military example given.

✓ A true ally can only give aid to one side, or else betrayal

4 Griggy

- debate is proven to be unfair abusive
- "insulted" not time to prepare.
- "uneducational" stop debate

✓ can do a "ceasefire deck" which is military way of helping both sides

Smush/Ishmael were not involved militarily?

anybody/everybody ?

- not an educational debate
- shifted term of debate.

2 Cao

- Prepared for many scenario, instead of just one.
- a SKEW against neg.
- creativity is a scapegoat
- forced allies do their side

→ bullying, should have argued against definition.

1 Koshkot

✓ - addressing arguments
✓ - had arguments, so it was fair (just few of them)
✓ - not faulted for what GGLA gave them
✓ - did not redefine, just part of point
✓ No real life examples proves point that this cannot be true.

This house believes that a bird in hand is worth two in the bush.

PARLI Debate

Julianna Phillips (*2)
Round 2A 11:20am Room 212
Gov: 3 Firsov - Kwak
Opp: 15 Holt - Mizin
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Julianna Phillips

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 15	
Prop Speaker #1 Kwak	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Holt	pts 30
Prop Speaker #2 Firsov	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Mizin	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: Kwak
Your points became clearer the second time you spoke. Beginning was a bit rushed and might have worked to your disadvantage.

Prop 2: Firsov
You're comfortable speaking which is great. But points need to be more relevant and tied into support for your arguments.

Opp 1: Holt
Great debater! Clear, concise, great references.

Opp 2: Mizin
Good clarifications.

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very clear points and opposition.

1

Kwak

- defines the this "house" - US
  What we have
  vs. risk
- background.
  1) Iraq war (Bush) 31 K soldiers
  - lost in risk
  2) Vietnam.
- lost more soldiers?
  3) Alcohol ban in America.
  4) Drug. Gambling
- Taking the risk is a detriment.

2

Holt

- ✓ prop misunderstood topic
- metaphorical fact topic
- ✓ Iraq. was in fact a risk
  Phop lost a pt. negated
- alcohol ban. drug use decrease does not apply; increased risk when something illegal.
- soc. sec. more in long term

metaphorical:

- Bentham. more is better for longer time
- Kant risks make for innovation

good refutations of other team points

3

Firov

- need to link points directly to the metaphor
- key.
- people are for keeping that "bird"
- social sec. not a gamble.
- gambling vs. long term gains.
- bird is the salvation
- * points not rec. clear

4

Mizin

- ✓ Congress is representing people, so that is the HOUSE
  - Iraq
  - Vietnam
  has taken risks
- ✓ - alcohol ban, illegal is RISK. the house took risks to continue alcohol
- take risks, save for the long run = main vs. betterment of society.
- negation.

2

Holt

- clearly won because:
- circumstance + facts
- evidence + metaphorical link
- Epicurus
  - taking risks is important
- Kant
  need to take risks to innovate

Whaaaat?

- Iraq / Vietnam.

1

Kwak

- ✓ Social sec. not linked to metaphor.
- more topical on resolution
- do people value risk more than not.
- if some people do not want war.

A couple people does not equate "the house"

We should abolish the death Penalty

PARLI Debate

Ceslavs Belinskis (*3)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 215
Gov: 12 Fehring - Masters
Opp: 10 Yee - Jarmel-Schneider
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Ceslavs Belinskis

Judge's School Affiliation: CAMPOLINDO HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	12	Team Code #:	10
Prop Speaker #1	Cole Fehring pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Juden Jarmel-Schneider pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Carina Masters pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	Fontanna Yee 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 pace, Easy to understand and follow delivery

Opp 1: Great use of sources. Very effective analysis.

Prop 2: Great use of evidence, strong delivery

Opp 2: Great use of logic & argument.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Very strong arguments and analysis. Great rebuttal of proposition's points.

PARLI Debate

Steven Archibald (*15)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 4
Gov: 10 Gerenrot - Drake
Opp: 6 Ganguli - Sanghvi
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: STEVEN ARCHIBALD

Judge's School Affiliation:

violence is a justified response to political oppression.

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 10	Team Code #: 6
Prop Speaker #1 Irene Gerenrot pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Ganguli pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Chiara Drake pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Sanghvi 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 speaker; arguments were somewhat circular

Opp 1:
Tried to get too much into one speech.
Speaks very passionately

Prop 2:
Good points across; A little heavy reliance/nervousness in voice.

Opp 2:
~~Good~~
Also speaks w/ great passion - but again, trying to get a little too much into speech -

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** Prop **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams were a good match for each other. The major flaw for the negative team was insistence that political oppression is oppression of a political party - which was not part of the Affirmative definition. Very close & difficult decision. Well done to both teams!

We should abolish the death penalty.

PARLI Debate

Santosh Sasi (*6)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 70
Gov: 10 Lustig - Scott
Opp: 2 Carter - Whitmore
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANTHOSH SASI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 2	
Prop Speaker #1 Miriam Lustig	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Carter, Antonia	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Silas Scott	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Whitmore, Mike	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:
Very good Analysis
Very passionate
~~Very knowledgeable~~
slow down a little
~~totally~~

Prop 2:
courteous.
Very good analysis
~~Good~~ improve on delivery

Opp 1:
Very good delivery
Very Courteous
Very passionate way of delivery
Very good argumentation

Opp 2:
Very courteous
Very good delivery
Very good articulation
Very good argumentation

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

THE OPP Team were a ~~little~~ better at delivering and across more convincing

Whether to Abolish Death Penalty

PARLI Debate

Louis Cisz (*2)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 214
Gov: 10 Shin - Shevelev
Opp: 6 Baveja - Deshpande
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Louis J. Cisz

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Shevelev	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Deshpande	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 SHIN	pts 30	Opp Speaker #2 Baveja	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: Impressive effort. Would have been a 30 pt effort but had a relatively weak rebuttal as compared w/ opposing effort

Prop 2: SHIN: Passionate, sophisticated argument. Very appropriate for the topic.

Opp 1: Strong effort. Took solid and smart positions over stated one point on No Innocent ever executed. Otherwise super strong performance

Opp 2: Started out a bit slow but picked up steam as the argument progressed. Very good finish. used time well.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very strong team effort. Good balanced argument. Could have had a stronger final rebuttal but edged out the opp nonetheless

Violence is a justified response to political oppression.

PARLI Debate

Ceslavs Belinskis (*3)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 215
Gov: 15 Modi - Hemerling
Opp: 6 Gao - Moza
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Ceslavs Belinskis

Judge's School Affiliation: Campolindo HS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 15		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 Shail Modi	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Vasuman Moza	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Alexander Hemerling	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Andrew Gao	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: Strong delivery and pace. Good examples and sources during the speech. Strong background information presented. Asked great questions.

Opp 1: Great Roadmap introduction. Handled the question of the opponent well. Strong counterpoints used.

Prop 2: Very organized speech. Great rebuttal of the opposition's side points. Very strong and logical ~~se~~ delivery

Opp 2: Very clear and clearly organized ~~delive~~ speech. evidence Great references during the speech

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Well organized speech. Great pace and delivery.

we should abolish the death penalty

PARLI Debate

Anchi Lee (*6) (SINGLE FLIGHT)
Round 3A 2:00pm 217A
Gov: 14 Lacombe - Appel
Opp: 12 Cao - Griggy
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Anchi Lee

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington H

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	14	Team Code #:	12
Prop Speaker #1	Lacombe pts 28	Opp Speaker #1	Bill Cao pts 30
Prop Speaker #2	Appel pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	Griggy 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: very good speech with good point of view

Prop 2: very clear state. and fluency in speech.

Opp 1: very fluent and strong speech. also good argument points.

Opp 2: good presentation maybe a little more relax would be even better.

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

the winner team have over all better points on-topic ☺.

Violence is a justified response to political oppression

PARLI Debate

James Nam (*12)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 76
Gov: 4 Gupta - Maitra
Opp: 7 McDonnel - Flores
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jimmy Nam

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 7	
Prop Speaker #1 Gupta	pts 27	Opp Speaker #1 Antonio Flores	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Maitra.	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Cole McDonnell	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:
Clear statement of arguments - you could have used more time to flesh out your evidence.
Rebuttal: Nice wrap up / summary.

Prop 2:
Good address to the opponents non-violent examples - by stating that violence is sometimes the answer.

Opp 1:
Good presentation of non-violent resistance to oppression - does it mean violence is never justified? But you had so many good examples. Rebuttal: Great presentation of two worlds

Opp 2:
Pointing out that the issues in Libya / Syria still need time to resolve - still an open issue was smart. I felt the American Revolution was a bit of a stretch.
Very organized presentation of your argument

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

Sometimes violence is the answer - not the ideal solution, but it's hard to prove otherwise.

We should abolish the death penalty

PARLI Debate

James Nam (*12)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 76
Gov: 2 O"Rafferty - Basrai
Opp: 6 Meswani - Yoo
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Jimmy Nam

Judge's School Affiliation: San Marin

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 6	
Prop Speaker #1 O'Rafferty	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 William Yoo	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Basrai	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Rishabh Meswani	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: Excellent outline - very easy to follow the road map. I thought it was great that you offered some counterpoints to your arguments

Rebuttal: Great Summary

Prop 2:

Good arguments - strengthening case for reduce costs via less appeals,

Opp 1:

Great address of opponents arguments while offering some alternatives to improve justice system. - Innocence Project

Rebuttal: Scotus argument [redacted] was good

Opp 2: Try and make sure to stay close to your time

Effective support of your teams initial arguments in response to ~~prop~~ opponents counter.

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** Opp. **wins this debate.**
(Prop or ~~Opp~~)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Toughest match to call all day - the negations arguments were strong.

VIOLENCE IS A JUSTIFIED MEANS FOR Political opportun

PARLI Debate

Santosh Sasi (*6)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 70
Gov: 15 Booth - Pracar
Opp: 9 Sinha - Almeida
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: SANTHOSH SASI

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON.

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	9
Prop Speaker #1	Booth pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	SINHA pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	Pracar pts 29	Opp Speaker #2	ALMEIDA 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:
Good Analysis
Very good delivery

Opp 1:
Very pleasant and Courtious
Very good analysis

Prop 2:
Very good delivery
Very good argumentation
Very good Analysis

Opp 2:
Very courteous and pleasant
need to improve on delivery

TEAM CODE #: 15 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

PROP TEAM WAS SUPERIOR IN TERMS of delivery, & analysis, argumentation and points of Information

PARLI Debate

Ajay Nanda (*4)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 212
Gov: 15 Holt - Mizin
Opp: 3 Siu - Stankus
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: AJAY NANDA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	15	Team Code #:	3
Prop Speaker #1	HOLT pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	SIU pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	MIZIN pts 28	Opp Speaker #2	STANKUS 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 Opening with Definitions. Very objective argument of tying Violence to Self-Defense, and as a response to terrorism.
REB: Good Rebuttal of "Power Vaccum" with Risk Taking logic.

Prop 2: Impressive Challenge in opening remarks with questioning Peace Took questions to Reapit a healthy debate. Good logic to separate oppression from violence
SUGGESTION - More Stats could have been used.
Some light Humor to Reapit interesting.

Opp 1: Impressive Oratory. For Terrorism logic. URL example was not a good rebuttal, but Iraq example was "We live in a violent World"
REB: Impressive opening with violent World" Countered "Self Defense" Smartly and pro-actively

Opp 2: Allowed Question in a healthy exchange. Smart Rebuttal by offering alternate solutions Good Logic about innocent lives affected by violence.
SUGGESTION - More Stats could have been used.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Both teams did really well but the OPP team did a better job of rebutting the PROP's team's position point by point

PARLI Debate

Ajay Nanda (*4)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 212
Gov: 2 Clark-Clough - Moore
Opp: 3 Firsov - Kwak
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: AJAY NANDA

Judge's School Affiliation: DVHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 MOORE	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 KWAK	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 MOORE	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 FIRSOV	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: Use of Stats in opening remarks Poised and confident
REB: Passionate speech

Prop 2: Use of Stats for Rebuttal
Effective use of pressing team into.
Very strong speech
SUGGESTION - Allow 1-2 questions. It's a sign of healthy argument.

Opp 1: Good. Start with questions of defs.
Very objective rebuttal of PROP's points.
Impressive stats.
REB: Highlighting the Natl vs local stats
Strong Rebuttal of each point
Good humorous start. Very objective

Opp 2: Rebuttal of innocence argument.
Very impressive speech. Good oratory
SUGGESTION - Allow 1-2 questions.
It's a sign of healthy argument

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
This was a REALLY REALLY close one! But have to pick PROP bcoz she made really effective use of challenging OPP's position of "Death Penalty" to save money.

Violence is a justified response to political oppression.

PARLI Debate

Meg Scott (*10)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 5
Gov: 1 Ghosal - Burgmann
Opp: 12 Colenbrander - Katewa
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MEG SCOTT

Judge's School Affiliation: CHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 1		Team Code #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1 BURGMANN	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 KATEWA	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 GHOSAL	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 COLENBRANDER	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:
- excellent articulation w/ good examples and arguments
- careful in tone about opponents

Prop 2:
- strong clash on whether violence is justified

Opp 1:
- good examples - Ghandi, germany peasants civil war, tetes
- stated peace is more efficient but not now (would have been more effective to show it is more effective)
- MLK point was great

Opp 2:
- good job outlining the issues
- clear articulation

TEAM CODE #: 1 **on the** PROP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Clearly articulated the justification arguments for violence as one potential response to political oppression. Opposition did not focus on how negating that justification (but not why violence is not justified) & mainly focused on peace as a better option

We should abolish the death penalty.

PARLI Debate

Meg Scott (*10)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 5
Gov: 4 Su - Her
Opp: 6 Moturi - Datta
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: MEG SCOTT

Judge's School Affiliation: LHS

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	6
Prop Speaker #1	SU pts 27	Opp Speaker #1	MOTURI pts 28
Prop Speaker #2	HER pts 27	Opp Speaker #2	DATTA 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:
- very articulate
- really good rebuttal at end

Opp 1: great argument, very articulate
- slow down a bit - can be hard to follow

Prop 2:
- good initial rebuttal of lack of clarity on Prop counterplan

Opp 2: - good job addressing Prop's critique & counterplan

TEAM CODE #: 6 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Excellent on both sides but Opp ~~was~~ had creative counterplan ~~that~~ and ~~each~~ more effectively addressed each point on the Pro side. Pro rebuttal largely focused only on loss of innocent lives & morality

Violence is justified by Power to

PARLI Debate

Louis Cisz (*2)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 214
Gov: 4 Bardalai - Rangwala
Opp: 1 Nagarajan - Wolf-Jacobs
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: Louis J. Cisz

Judge's School Affiliation: Bishop O'Dowd

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #:	4	Team Code #:	1
Prop Speaker #1	Bardalai pts 29	Opp Speaker #1	Wolf-Jacobs pts 29
Prop Speaker #2	Rangwala pts 30	Opp Speaker #2	Nagarajan 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: Started out very strong. Good style and focus.

Prop 2: Super strong — picked up steam as he went along. Very logical style.

Opp 1: Excellent debuttal. Strong style. Very good analysis & clear thought process.

Opp 2: Very impressive performance. No discernible weakness. Great effort. Clear & cogent thinking.

TEAM CODE #: 1 **on the** Opp **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:

Very close call. Both teams were very strong. In the end, the Opp team grew stronger as the debate went on and eked out a win. Strong args on both sides

Prog - Debuttal

Net benefits

Civil liberties - content violence

Hornor v. violence
(Jews / others)

Permutations - NO OFF for
NON violence

Warrants Banks -

Long term impacts - more
beneficial to harm reduction
early

Violence is a justified response to political oppression.

PARLI Debate

Ravinder G (*6)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 216
Gov: 3 Li - Qian
Opp: 12 Cheng - Shifs
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAVINDER GHANKOTA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 12	
Prop Speaker #1 Austen Li	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Shifs	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Ming Qian	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Cheng	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 presentation.
Note: work on evidence

Opp 1: Good debate skills. strong Refutation.

Prop 2: Good Argumentation Skills
Note:- accept POIs

Opp 2: Good Argumentation
Note: more presentation skills

TEAM CODE #: 12 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Strong presentation and Refutting skills

We should abolish the death penalty

PARLI Debate

Ravinder G (*6)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 216
Gov: 2 Jayasuriya - Pashman
Opp: 3 Bonet - Visht
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: RAVINDER GHANKOTA

Judge's School Affiliation: IRVINGTON

PROP	OPP
Team Code #: 2	Team Code #: 3
Prop Speaker #1 Ella Pashman pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Shannon Bonet pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Michael Jayasuriya pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 Anish Visht 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 Presentation
Note: Donot introduce New statements in final Round.

Opp 1: Strong Analysis and evidence
Note: accept the POIs

Prop 2: Nice Argumentation Skills
Note: Donot Repeat the same statement again and again

Opp 2: Strong Argumentation
Note: accept the POIs

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** OPP **wins this debate.**
(Prop or Opp)

REASON FOR DECISION:
Presented the case very well with good Analysis and evidence: Great Argumentis Skills.

We should abolish the death penalty

PARLI Debate

Steven Archibald (*15)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 4
Gov: 4 Khan - Sharma
Opp: 3 Jones - McKinney
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Judge's Name: STEVEN ARCHIBALD

Judge's School Affiliation: _____

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 4		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Humza Khan	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Colin Jones	pts 27
Prop Speaker #2 Hemalshat Sharma	pts 27	Opp Speaker #2 William McKinney	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:
Very animated! Very logical presentation. Let a POI cut into his time too much.

Opp 1:

Prop 2:

Opp 2:

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

REASON FOR DECISION:
~~Too~~ A close decision. Looking over my flow, it seems the Neg. team left a few more points uncovered — or else it was harder for me to discern what they were saying.

Marcie Schade (*13)
Round 3B 2:00pm Room 211
Gov: 2 Hester - Yau-Weeks
Opp: 3 Deng - Visht
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

Violence is a justified response to political oppression

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Marcie Schade

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 2		Team Code #: 3	
Prop Speaker #1 Claudia Hester	pts 29	Opp Speaker #1 Krish - Visht	pts 29
Prop Speaker #2 Sophia Yau-Weeks	pts 29	Opp Speaker #2 Kevin Deng	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:

only suggestion is to be aware of hand gestures ↑

Prop 1: Claudia - Did a great job - even though she wasn't feeling well. Very organized in presenting and stating exactly what the debate should be judged on. Very thorough and prepared.

Prop 2: Sophia prepared and extremely prepared and knowledgeable of the facts being presented. Organized, professional & very courteous.

Opp 1: Krish - Extremely professional and polished. Very organized in his presentation and gave relevant argument for diplomacy.

Opp 2: Kevin - also very professional and had many facts to support his argument. Did a great job of refuting the other team.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

This was by far the best debate all day and by far my hardest to decide. The Prop team wins in my opinion because they did the best job laying out exactly what the definition and judgment →

Should be based on and they stuck to it.

Abolish the Death Penalty

Marcie Schade (*13)
Round 3A 2:00pm Room 211
Gov: 3 Hinchliff - Koshkin
Opp: 4 Vadrevu - Nanda
Parliamentary Debate/Varsity

PARLI Debate

Judge's Name: Marcie Schade

Judge's School Affiliation: San Ramon Valley High

PROP		OPP	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 4	
Prop Speaker #1 Koshkin	pts 28	Opp Speaker #1 Nanda	pts 28
Prop Speaker #2 Hinchliff	pts 28	Opp Speaker #2 Vadrevu	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:

Would work on slowing down.

Prop 1: Koshkin - Very courteous and respectful. Provided appropriate facts and supported their claims very well. Also had a good job of refuting the opponents points.

Prop 2: Hinchliff - Also very courteous and professional. Organized presentation and nice job of pointing out counter claims.

Opp 1: Nanda - Did a very nice job of presenting in a professional and organized manner. Presented a logical and fact based arguments. Also succeeded in refuting the Prop's argument. Would highly recommend slowing down.

Opp 2: Vadrevu - Very professional and courteous. presentation was compelling and good job of supporting his side.

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

REASON FOR DECISION:

I found in favor of the Opp because they were more effective in arguing the reason that the death penalty was valuable.