Imaan Sidhu (*3)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 214
Aff: 10 Jerrar - Rosenfeld
Neg: 7 Lee - Salazar
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Imaan Sidhu

Judge's School Affiliation: ~~[illegible]~~ College Prep

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 10		Team Code #: 7	
Aff Speaker #1 Rosenfeld	pts 28.2	Neg Speaker #1 Salazar	pts 27.3
Aff Speaker #2 Jerrar	pts 28	Neg Speaker #2 Lee	pts 27.9

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

1AC CX
Miscalc IN? Military

INC CX
Summary only on PTR

2AC CX
2A should answer + evidence stand up

2NC CX
2A should be leading
Great reference to evidence

Everybody Signpost! When you move from one flow to another call out "Onto Relations"

Aff 1:
Stand up when asking in CX
Good Knowledge of evidence
Good grasp of line by line, but stick to your evidence.
1AR is toward opponents not judge. Extend more of the 2AC

Aff 2:
You should only respond to what they read
You should respond to CX questions
It's ok to use prep for the 2AC

Neg 1:
Stand up in CX (asking)
Try not to use prep for the 1NR
You repeat some cards in the INR, try and flow your partners speech
It's difficult w/o your evidence but try and understand your arguments enough to summarize
Don't drop an advantage, I know speed is an issue, but you can skip
Take a look at highlighting with your cards, they're long

Neg 2:
Get involved in CX
Good job referring to your evidence
Don't be afraid to prep the 2NR
Try and use all your time in the 2NR
Sit on the CP, you can still go for it.

During prep y'all were having a good discussion about the ideal 2NR

Case analytics were great

TEAM CODE #: 7 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

I don't think the neg gets the CP or the 2AR is good on this. But I also don't give the aff the space debris advantage impact because of 2NR work. It came down to the Relations flow where I think the neg provide better analysis on how nukes stop conflict. This was VERY close. Keep debating.
(Preston ev reference was good)

Aff	Neg
~~7:27~~	~~8:00~~
5:55	~~7:37~~
	6:00

Johanna Ilfeld (*3)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 212
Aff: 10 Wu - Tokarzewski
Neg: 7 Patterson - Sozat
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Jo Ilfeld

Judge's School Affiliation: College Prep

AFF

Team Code #: 10

Aff Speaker #1 Tokarzewski pts 28

Aff Speaker #2 Wu pts 27

NEG

Team Code #: 7

Neg Speaker #1 Sozat pts 26

Neg Speaker #2 Patterson 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Tok Aff 1: Very poised, easily understandable. Good organization. Sometimes I felt uppetness coming from you that felt as if it wasn't as logical. Perhaps watch for that in future.

Wu Aff 2: Let your partner go without correcting her and feeding her arguments. It's distracting to the argument and to her. I deducted speaker pts for this.

Dealt well with your partner

Good analysis & organization

Neg 1: Well-spoken. You didn't present as much evidence as you could. It seemed like you were asking ?s after the fact rather than tracking it.

Neg 2: Good speaking but many of your answers to the questions didn't make sense to me. Watch your facial expressions - not as convincing as your arguments.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Presented good arguments for Perming It. Good analysis and organization. Just work better as a team.

Haugh

Dawn Cutler (*17)
Round 2 11:00am Room 143
Aff: 3 hash - Jammula
Neg: 10 Aye - Rosenberg
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Cutler

Judge's School Affiliation: Sacred Heart

AFF

Team Code #: 3

Aff Speaker #1 Jammula pts 27

Aff Speaker #2 Haugh pts 27

NEG

Team Code #: 10

Neg Speaker #1 Aye pts 27

Neg Speaker #2 Rosenberg 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
good rebuttal - very effective w/ def.
Good pace easy to follow

Aff 2:
good speaker - could use a little more organization on 2A
rebuttal was good

Neg 1:
good 1N - you brought up a lot of good arguments - s/ reemphasize on rebuttal

Neg 2:
Good speaker too - I would have liked to see more time on attacking their main points - less on Counterplan

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** Neg **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Counterplan - Aff good job - definitely cooptation vs appeasement ~~won~~ won this argument for me -; however I think Aff missed some critical points i) significance - threshold - Neg did a

good job of refuting significance 1_T – 100,000 + asking for 4 threshold as to more harms now

Inherency – Wolfe amendment limits NASA but Neg provided evidence that China/US working together today on Space relations; therefore no reason to change Status quo – [perhaps you ~~should~~ could look for evidence on whether the Lone card is true or whether cooperation is working – future rounds]

May Chiu (*7)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 100
Aff: 18 Lakritz - Tonda
Neg: 3 Anderson - Prabandham
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: May Chiu

Judge's School Affiliation: Head Royce

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	18	Team Code #:	3
Aff Speaker #1	Lakritz pts 27	Neg Speaker #1	Anderson pts 25
Aff Speaker #2	Tonda pts 25	Neg Speaker #2	Prabandham 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- good clear speech
- try to use stronger evidence

Aff 2:
- Clear speech
- try to use stronger evidence

Neg 1:
- You have some good points,
- You should ~~try~~ practice speaking more so your speech will be smoother

Neg 2:
You have some good points but you should be more specific. For example, when your opponent asked you which treaty had China broken, you were not able to answered.

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
Neg was not able prove aff is wrong

Carl Siva (*9)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 205
Aff: 14 Kelly - Mart
Neg: 3 Hoge - Tandon
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Carl Siva

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF

Team Code #: 14

Aff Speaker #1 Kelly pts 26

Aff Speaker #2 Mart pts 25

NEG

Team Code #: 3

Neg Speaker #1 Hoge pts 26

Neg Speaker #2 Tandon 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Clear speaker. Good pace & data driven. ~~Between~~ Belaboring points, more concise Advantages w/ impacts

Neg 1: Hoge Summarized Aff points well speaks clearly. Needs to group together points more clearly, tell a story,

Aff 2: Mart Needs smoother transitions between points & impacts. ~~Speech~~ Speaks clearly but ~~so~~ fragmented thoughts hard to understand point. Tied rebuttles to Neg speech, good.

Neg 2: Tandon cross - Evidence based cross, solid point but needed ~~better~~ references. Speaks very clearly, concise points accurate. Overt impact statement. Good strong presence when pressed for evidence in cross could not provide.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Negative showed stronger case for disadvantages to ~~the~~ TPP w/ China. Simpler & ~~more~~ clearer points,

VERONICA ROGERS
Ben Unanaowo (*9)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 201
Aff: 18 Sullivan - Galusha
Neg: 3 Nurko - Gupta
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Veronica Rogers

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 GALUSHA	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 GUPTA	pts 27
Aff Speaker #2 Sullivan	pts 28	Neg Speaker #2 NURKO	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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: GALUSHA
- good enunciation/volume/eye
- Strengthen cross-x answers CONTACT
- Good follow up questions during cross-x.
- Clear, organized rebuttal - great job

Aff 2:
- Great research
- Great competition @ cross-x
- watch um's & ahhs
- strengthen closing!

Neg 1: GUPTA
- great research
- work on composure/volume/enunciation.
- improve defense of cross-x
- watch UMMS & AHHS.

Neg 2: NURKO
- Good enunciation & diction.
- Great research & cross x questions & answers
- improve eye contact / ummms & ahhs...

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
- Clear, consise, organized debate on AFF side.
- Neg side needs work on

Stephen Ramm (*19)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 202
Aff: 3 Paoletti - Zhang
Neg: 10 Yuan - Lichtmacher
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: STEPHEN RAMM

Judge's School Affiliation: ST. VINCENT

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	10
Aff Speaker #1	ZHANG pts 26	Neg Speaker #1	LICHTMACHER pts 29
Aff Speaker #2	PAOLETTI pts 25	Neg Speaker #2	YUAN 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
EXCELLENT COMMUNICATION SKILLS
VERY CONFIDENT WHEN SPEAKING
BEST SPEAKER OF THE DAY 6
SPEAKS WITH CONVICTION

Aff 2:
POOR DELIVERY
VAGUE EVIDENCE
DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND

Neg 1:
ATTACKED AFF WITH LOGIC
AND REASON AFTER EXTRACTING
THE WEAKNESS OF EVIDENCE.
SEEMS TO HAVE GOOD CONTROL
OF THE ROUND (CRITICAL THINKER)

Neg 2:
POOR DELIVERY - TOO MUCH READING
TOO FAST & TOO MUCH READING IN ORDER
TO SUPPORT HIS POSITION.
NEED TO RELAX A LITTLE WITH SPEAKING
SEEMS GOOD THOUGH AT UNDERSTANDING
THE CRITERIA AND THE MECHANICS OF DEBATE

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION AFF HAD NO COMPELLING ARGUMENT.

Danlei Zou (*10)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 203
Aff: 19 Hill - Ramm
Neg: 3 dhaliwal - Otavka
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Danlei Zou

Judge's School Affiliation: Lowell (10)

AFF

Team Code #: 19 Hill - Ramm

Aff Speaker #1 Hill pts 27.5

Aff Speaker #2 Ramm pts 27

NEG

Team Code #: 3 Dhaliwal - Otavka

Neg Speaker #1 Dhaliwal pts 28

Neg Speaker #2 Otavka pts 27.5

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: 1AC: good reading. Keep your CX answers short though.

1AR: Good job responding to the 2NC/1NR args, but try to cover more of their args

Aff 2:
2AC: You dropped all of case but read the correct cards on appeasement, which was good. Don't forget case though!

Neg 1: 1NC: You have a really nice speaking voice! I didn't hear any authors though — so a little hard to follow.

1NR: good answers!

Neg 2:
2NC: good responses to their case, but spend some more time on appeasement

2NR: Generally good coverage of the case, but use up all of your time.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

The neg did the best job of proving why the plan is bad and won that there's no impact to space debris.

Gordon Hart (*12)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 209
Aff: 18 Synek - Elder
Neg: 3 Goldstone - Patel
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: ~~[illegible]~~ HART

Judge's School Affiliation: Monte Vista

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Elder	pts 29	Neg Speaker #1 Patel	pts 26
Aff Speaker #2 Synek	pts 26	Neg Speaker #2 Goldstone	pts 26

Time to go to JV or Varsity

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: 1AC: Super clear. Very well put together case. Great memes to Cross-X. Good set of cross-X Q's re: reliance arguments. Very good job refuting arguments in 1AR. Great job with linguistic analysis. YOU HAVE ENORMOUS POTENTIAL!

Neg 1: INC: Should make more effort to tie your block arguments to Aff's specific arguments. Need to know your own case better, sound like you had not read it out loud before and could not answer Cross-X Qs well. But, asked good Cross-X Qs. 1NR was a little short on argument, as was not much of a rebuttal.

Aff 2: 2AC - Need to make more connections. (Didn't explain the Perm. Do both what? Seemed to assume Neg had a counterplan. They did not.) Did not explain the definition of engagement argument. What purpose does this serve? Neg. had not challenged topicality. 2AR: Good response on appeasement (but should have been in earlier speech.) Good attempt at refutation. 2AR much better than 2AC

Neg 2: Cross-x just allowed Aff to clarify and expand their case, rather than sow doubts about it. 2NC: Great evidence on Solvency. 2AR: I appreciated your attempt to refute arguments. Watch flippant language ("China could go, like 'Yo. I don't like you'.")

TEAM CODE #: 18 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION Hard debate to evaluate, because like most novice debates, both sides dropped major arguments and there was not a lot of direct clash (although both sides tried) In the end, the excellent 1AR did a good enough job refuting the Neg. to win the day.

Sanjeev Ohawla (*8)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 144
Aff: 3 Berning - Tooper
Neg: 18 Carillo - Rowe
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Sanjeev Chawla

Judge's School Affiliation: Irvington High School

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 18	
Aff Speaker #1 Berning	pts 28	Neg Speaker #1 Carillo	pts 24
Aff Speaker #2 Tooper	pts 27 (27)	Neg Speaker #2 Rowe	pts 24

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- Well articulated & organized
- Good Argumentation & Delivery
- Courteous

Aff 2:
- Well organized
- Good understanding of the case
- Excellent ~~Cont~~ Cross Examination
- Excellent Rebuttal

Neg 1:
- → Missed
- → Rebuttal was weak & Incorrect
- → Not a good understanding of the topic/case
- → Not Convincing

Neg 2:
- Casual attitude
- → Lacked Readiness
- No big arguments
- Not ~~Convincing~~ Convincing

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION AFF provided a good understanding of the CASE & countered all arguments of NEG

Aff 1

→ US laws bans.
- China ⇒ barred from Shanghai
- ASAT.

Leadership
(incl. debris cleanup)
Multiplier

IADC
Export Controls
→ US security
- Space wars (satellites)

Solvency
debris cleanup
(words between US & China)

→ US Fed.
→ Civil Space cooperate with China
80% of Military Commands
Cripple Military & Crash Global Economy

Neg 1

US block China
→ Econ & Politics.

→ ~~(text)~~ US credibility

→ Escalation

→ Geopolitical Correlation
- China "rival"

→ Ruin

Only if China support Counter terrorism

Human Rights

Negative not Commerce

China has ~~not~~ Secretive Space program

→ ~~Military~~ Pay
⇓
US Wealth.

Aff 2

Economic Catastrophe
Trade Breaks

China judging US on HR issues

US lead Regional order

Counter Plan ⇒ Pol

Relations advantage joint Coordination

No real plan

Neg 2

Contained Strong

Did not address Topicality

US will Lose Military & Political Power

We need Security in return or. it will make US look weak

1 / 100,000 ← Chance of debris hitting Satellite

→ ~~Less~~ US has more benefit
Nothing in return

Lose bilateral power

Chance = - Improve the Climate of Europe

New Cards Can't be used

China has Anti-Satellite in Accident
Reputation
Drop the Ca

Alex Elms (*14)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 142
Aff: 3 He - Wei
Neg: 19 Marzo - Stolp
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Alex Elms

Judge's School Affiliation: 14

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 3		Team Code #: 19	
Aff Speaker #1 He	pts 26	Neg Speaker #1 Stolp	pts 25
Aff Speaker #2 Wei	pts 26	Neg Speaker #2 Marzo	pts 23

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- Try to look up from your reading every once in a while. Convincing someone of your argument is easier if you're speaking to them, not reading at them.
- You NEED to get to your plan text IN the 1AC.

Aff 2:
- Although you were the strongest speaker of the round, you need to work on linking your evidence back to both your case and the opponents' arguments.
- Good start to CX questions. You have confidence, but try to ask more direct, cutting questions.

- Good refutations in the 1AR. You emphasized your opponents lack of evidence nicely.

Neg 1:
- Try to be more succinct with your questions during CX and keep hypotheticals focused & relevant.
- Your INR "analytics" are just statements that not only need evidence behind them but are far too vague to be arguments.

Neg 2:
- Same.
- You NEED to get more information out in your speech. Finish your DA (or any argument you start) but, more importantly, explain to me why their plan is bad. You didn't provide an argument with your cards. Reading alone is ineffective.
- Same
- You absolutely need to read faster and more confidently.
- I need to understand why what you're reading is relevant to the Aff case. It is clear you do not have command of your evidence, let alone an argument. Work on relating the evidence in your kit to the resolution and then to a variety of cases it may apply to.
- Everything you said Aff didn't have evidence for in your 2NR was evidence they read in their very first speech.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION
- Neg never made a case. Half of a DA introduced in the 1NC is not enough to carry a round. Neg needed evidence and attacks. They had neither. Both rebuttal speeches were riddled with unsupported, vague statements about the state of US-China relations that carried no weight. Aff essentially won simply by reading their plan in the 1AC.

Victor Rivas (*9)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 143
Aff: 3 haugh - Jammula
Neg: 18 Gothelf - Kassner-Marks
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Lucas Turo

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	18
Aff Speaker #1	Jammula pts 29	Neg Speaker #1	Gothelf pts 27
Aff Speaker #2	Haugh pts 27	Neg Speaker #2	Kassner-Marks 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- good projection & articulation.
- didn't feel very strong impacts Great sign posting and organization.
- awkwardly grips table for whole speech.
- good occasional eye contact

Aff 2:
- clear tone, but lots of filler words.
- made great responses to Neg arguments, but jumped around a lot during 2AC. - very disorganized rebuttal.
- talk directly at Neg. talk abt Neg to judge

Neg 1:
- great fluency, but reads very monotone. No eye catch
- should expand on impacts, not just reread evidence
- call out the Aff for not responding to key points

Neg 2:
- doesn't make full use of x-examination. should ask more questions.
- reads a lot, but doesn't seem to know own case perfectly - sounds like reading for the first time
- great fluency and articulation.

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Didn't see a lot of clear rebuttals on the Aff case, but Neg CP was pretty solid. Aff could have just said perm do both for Neg CP; instead attacked fiat of the CP. Neg didn't defend CP fiat so that ended up going to Aff.

Weimin Si (*4)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 141
Aff: 18 Hernandez - Jacobs
Neg: 3 Chung - Gutierrez
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Weimin Si

Judge's School Affiliation: Dougherty Valley HS

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 18		Team Code #: 3	
Aff Speaker #1 Hernandez	pts 27-	Neg Speaker #1 Gutierrez	pts 27+
Aff Speaker #2 Jacobs	pts 26	Neg Speaker #2 Chung	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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Topic: Jointed space research program
good speaking speed
clearly present evidences of necessities of engaging china
well prepared evidence

Could improve: i) time management 2) answer question directly

Aff 2: well researched topics. good speaking pace.

Neg 1: well organized, constructive speech
well prepared,
ample evidence to move the disadvantages of policy option by NEG.

Could improve: i) time management 2) 1NR part.

Neg 2: good grasp of policy debating tactics.
well thought and organized speech.
good to the point.
clear response

Could improve: i) more engaging in topics w/ more enthusiastism ii) speak a bit louder.

Could improve: ① move away from script ② computer and engage the audience (judge)

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

NEG Team wins because it convincingly demonstrated the disadvantages presented in its policy option.

Michele Martin (*18)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 102
Aff: 3 Gupta - Kumar
Neg: 7 Dupee - Wogan
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Michele Martin

Judge's School Affiliation: Sonoma Academy

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	3	Team Code #:	7
Aff Speaker #1	Gupta pts 29	Neg Speaker #1	Dupee pts 28
Aff Speaker #2	Kumar pts 29	Neg Speaker #2	Wogan 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Nice speaking pace; work on being a little louder
Very clear organization
Great job outlining plan
- Very detailed, clear steps

Aff 2: Great diction + volume
Very well-organized arguments
Excellent job responding to questions + counter-arguments

Neg 1: Good, clear delivery. (a little fast)
Maybe practice reading more ahead of time for better pronunciation.
Nice job on cross-examination! Good questions, and you didn't get rattled by their responses.

Neg 2: Nice delivery of your arguments
The human rights argument was a little long, and you could make the connection a little clearer.
Great job asking questions + following up.
Your "counterplan" needed to be more clearly stated.

Stop talking over each other!

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION You all did a really good job! AFF had stronger arguments, which ultimately won it for them, but you all were excellent speakers. The NEG human rights argument wasn't quite strong enough to win. All very courteous - thank you!

Howard Murayama (*9)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 211
Aff: 10 Aye - Rosenberg
Neg: 3 Schulte - Pham
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Howard Murayama

Judge's School Affiliation: James Logan

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	10	Team Code #:	3
Aff Speaker #1	Rosenberg pts 28	Neg Speaker #1	Schulte pts 26
Aff Speaker #2	Aye pts 27	Neg Speaker #2	Pham 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Very good spread of contentions and points. Plan to increase coop with China in space supported well. Good recap of Aff points in 1AR.

Aff 2: Arguments in general support 1AC, but also seem disjointed. Need to emphasize how arguments support prior points made.

Neg 1: Use of appeasement disadv ok, but not presented in a way to refute 1AC points. Disadv appeared to be read as is. Extension ok, but effective rebuttal should ~~highlight~~ recap Neg's counter points.

Neg 2: Extending the appeasement disadv does not effectively counter Aff points. Lack of context in selection of arguments does not help. Hacker intrusion in 2NR appears to be new evidence. Need to recap instead.

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Neg stuck too closely to the Appeasement Disadv script without responding directly to Aff's plan and contentions.

Mimi Sargent-Leventhal (*18)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 101
Aff: 9 Bacong - Siva
Neg: 7 Diaw - Reichel
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Mimi Sergent-Leventhal

Judge's School Affiliation: Hired / Sonoma Academy

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #: 9		Team Code #: 7	
Aff Speaker #1 Siva	pts 29	Neg Speaker #1 Hanalie Reichel	pts 26
Aff Speaker #2 Bacong	pts 29.5	Neg Speaker #2 Aicha Diaw	pts 26

6:30
5:38
3:38

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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Try not to point out things they forgot in CX - it gives them a chance to answer.
start the 1NR w/ an explanation of your offense and answer the CP with the 2AR in mind

Aff 2: Good job knowing the story of your aff & understanding its response to neg arguments.
Great job responding directly to their arguments - extend impacts at the top
Good job starting w/ a summary of the debate. Focus on what they didn't extend

Use prep if you have it for the 2AR

Neg 1: prepare INCs ahead of time so you don't have to take prep.
Try to put more offense in the INC - don't save your DA you don't have to tell them about arguments you haven't made yet.
Try not to use 1NR prep - prepare during the 2NC + USE ALL SPEECH TIME
Neg 2: I would stay away from challenging scientific claims in their evidence in CX
You want to save the 2NC for analysis + reading extra cards, so read the CP in the 1NC
Make sure not to contradict the 1NC's case defense
Take prep if you have it for the 2NR! Focus on the CP + internal net benefits not more minor case defense

TEAM CODE #: 9 **on the** AFF **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

No neg offense, so space debris outweighs. 2NC human rights CP wasn't extended.

Caroline Li (*3)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 139
Aff: 10 Schelstrate - Win
Neg: 7 Aguda - Prather
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: Caroline Li

Judge's School Affiliation: College preparatory School

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	#10	Team Code #:	#7
Aff Speaker #1	Schelstrate pts 29	Neg Speaker #1	Aguda pts 26
Aff Speaker #2	Win pts 28	Neg Speaker #2	Prather 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1:
- Very good speech delivery with concise points of view.
- showed confidence, good job.
- excellent rebuttal with good support/interpretation.

Aff 2:
- great eye contact
- smooth delivery/flow with sound analytical explanations.

Neg 1:
- you answered some questions really well in cross exams.
- you asked good questions during cross exams
- excellent voice projection
- but you could have been more familiar with your own speech materials, because you were not reading your speech smoothly.
- more eye contact please.

Neg 2:
- well written speech with clear points
- need to have more eye contact please
-

TEAM CODE #: 10 **on the** Aff **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

Stronger rebuttal, more familiar with ~~code~~ materials, more recent proof evidence to support point of view. More persuasive presentation.

Caroline Li
College Preparatory School

#10		#7	
Schelstrate	29	Agnolo	26
Win	28	Gabriel	27

- Very good speech delivery with concise points of view.
- showed confidence, good job.
- excellent rebuttal with good support/interpretation.
- great eye contact
- smooth delivery/flow with sound analytical explanations.

- you answered some questions really well in cross exam.
- you asked good questions during cross exams
- excellent voice projection
- but you could have been more familiar with your own speech materials, because you were not reading your speech smoothly.
- more eye contact please.
- well written speech with clear points
- need to have more eye contact please
-

10 Aff

Stronger rebuttal, more familiar with own materials.

more relevant evidence/proof to support point of view. more persuasive presentation.

Bodhi Nadler (*2)
Round 3 2:00pm Room 200
Aff: 19 Curr - Nielsen
Neg: 3 Dileep - Ilfeld
Novice Team Debate

POLICY Debate

Judge's Name: BODHI NADLER

Judge's School Affiliation: ANALY

AFF		NEG	
Team Code #:	19	Team Code #:	3
Aff Speaker #1	Nielson pts 25	Neg Speaker #1	Dileep pts 28
Aff Speaker #2	Curr pts 26	Neg Speaker #2	Ilfeld 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:** Did the debater provide a logical, clear explanation of critical issue(s)?
- **PROOF:** Did the debater support arguments with sufficient quantity and appropriate interpretation and use of evidence?
- **ORGANIZATION:** Did the debater make an orderly presentation that was easy to follow?
- **POLICY ARGUMENTATION:** Did the debater present a reasonable discussion of policy issues?
- **DELIVERY:** Did each debater deliver an understandable, interesting and persuasive presentation?
- **COURTESY:** Did each debater display courtesy towards opponents and judge(s)?

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

Aff 1: Very good pace of speech, need to work on stronger arguments. Good delivery, need better (or some) eye contact D.dent have very good Cross x or rebuttal

Aff 2: Very good pace of speech, but not much substance. Good answers (some) for cross ex, but not much in the rebuttal. Not much policy info

Both were very courteous

Neg 1: Good presentation, great eye contact, well organized w/ good points & answers for cross x & rebuttals Great analysis

Neg 2: Great analysis, Good - Great cross x, excellent rebuttals & use of proof. I personally disagree w/ this side, but the Neg made better arguments & rebuttals

TEAM CODE #: 3 **on the** NEG **wins this debate.**
(AFF or NEG)

REASON FOR DECISION

I personally agree w/ the Aff, but the NEG had better arguments, better eye contact better presentation, & won more organized w/ better rebuttals & cross ex.

Aff

good speaking pace
which side? pro agreement
eye contact = ∅
policy plan ✓

---

cross X
refute point -1

2nd eye contact ⇉ X ∅
work on pronunciation of words

Cross X

opening - ??
good answer on small
particulars
main point?

---

refuted args? not really

1st Aff Rebuttal

good recap
TPP? @ the end?

2nd Aff Rebut

prevent war

Neg

containment strategy
- appeasement

eye contact — minimal
good points; good counters to Pro
economic disincentive

Cross X

weak cross X

2nd Spkr

exaggeration?
Space within
build trust

US primacy undermined
- not us story
arguments refuted well!

Cross X

repeat stats
confusing cross X

1st Rebutt

work together = war?

2nd Rebutt

Good points, refuted Aff well