

Varsity Policy Debate - Round 3

Double Check Sheet

1, grossmont	2B Canyon Crest Ac	Vainavi Viswan Mitali Juneja	28.0	✓	3B Carlsbad HS	Caroline Allen Corin Magee	29.0	✓	NEG	Room 304
			27.0	✓			28.0	✓		
3, Rancho Bernardo	2A Canyon Crest Ac	Rithvik Rao Nathan Thoms	30.0	✓	5A Classical Acader	Chris Tai Crystal Sung	29.0	✓	AFF	Room 305
			29.0	✓			28.0	✓		
	5C Classical Acader	John Melton Jake Melton	26.0	✓	1A Bonita Vista HS	Danielle Bloom Joseph Casey	29.0	✓	AFF	Room 306
			27.0	✓			26.0	✓		
18, MVHS	5B Classical Acader	Alex Tseng Christian Wort	28.0	✓	3A Carlsbad HS	Yousuf Hashmi Zahra Alawi	29.0	✓	AFF	Room 307
			29.0	✓			28.0	✓		
	BYE	BYE			10A Mission Vista HS	Alexander Bodc Anamaria Carlc				Room 308

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate				grossmont 1 (*8)			
Round 3				Room 304		Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
(1st) 2nd	Vainavi Viswanath	2	28	(1st) 2nd	Caroline Allen	1	29
1st (2nd)	Mitali Juneja 2 Canyon Crest Academy	3	27	1st (2nd)	Corin Magee 3 Carlsbad High School	2	28
The winner of this debate was							
Affirmative Negative							
(Circle Winner)				Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? _____				Mission Vista High School			
				School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Affirmative:

Did a great job on reading their speech → Vainavi → Good job clarifying case to negative
 Fairly well at defending their case on cross examination
 Vocal pauses used often in the third constructive speech
 Awkwardly swayed back and forth in the third constructive speech
 Excellent job on pointing out that your case isn't abusive ← misuse of the word "Literally" (x3) ← mitali
 * Partner talked too Partner to partner interaction on affirmations
 first five minute rebuttal speech
 misuse of the word "Epic"

Negative:

Great job on clarification questions → Caroline
 Excellent first constructive rebuttal
 Amazing tone of voice
 Princeton - Fantastic source! → Caroline
 (Corin) (I'm sorry about your computer dying just as you were going to read from it)
 Excellent defense
 Great job expanding on the world using "actors" (UN, EU)
 "Nuclear" not (Nuke-U-lar) → Mispronounced multiple times
 pronunciation (Nuke-lee-ir)
 misuse of the word "Literally" (x2)
 • Negative won because they expanded on countries to help China and, amazingly, defended their case

18, MVHS

Jim Kennedy
VCX

SDIVSL 1B

Varsity Policy Debate				MVHS 18 (*10)			
Round 3				Room 307		Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st 2nd Alex Tseng		2	28	1st 2nd Yousuf Hashmi		1	29
1st 2nd Christian Worthen		4	29	1st 2nd Zahra Alawi		3	28
5 Classical Academy High School				3 Carlsbad High School			
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature			
Affirmative Negative (Circle Winner)				Mission Vista School / Affiliation / Occupation			
Is this a low point win? <u>NO</u>							

Comments & Reason for Decision:

Christy - Nice Response. A few stumbles when you talk faster. Good sources. Not sure it's a good idea to let speaker highlight his cards again during your cross-x. Can you ask the question without having them read the card again?

Yousuf - stumbling due to fast talking. Good job of slowing occasionally to stress a point. Do this more, not just at the end of a card. Good point on Fiat. Good eye contact when off card. Good, pointed questions in cross.

Zahra - good questions - watch the word "like." Watch the "un" word. Good eye contact when off-card. Good enthusiasm and passion. Good answers on cross-x.

Christy - Alex - stumbling during fast talking. Mark better where your cards end so you don't trail off on points.

RFD - Very balanced debate. NEG should have attacked the multination first move, though did mention it once. NEG also ignored the proxy argument. AFF should have asked why China would want to model in their human rights issues.

VCX

NAME		DATE	TIME
1	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
2	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
3	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
4	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
5	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
6	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
7	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
8	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
9	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
10	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
11	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
12	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
13	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
14	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
15	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
16	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
17	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
18	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
19	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
20	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
21	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
22	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
23	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
24	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
25	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
26	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
27	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
28	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
29	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
30	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
31	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
32	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
33	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
34	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
35	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
36	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
37	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
38	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
39	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
40	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
41	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
42	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
43	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
44	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
45	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
46	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
47	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
48	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
49	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
50	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
51	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
52	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
53	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
54	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
55	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
56	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
57	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
58	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
59	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
60	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
61	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
62	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
63	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
64	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
65	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
66	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
67	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
68	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
69	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
70	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
71	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
72	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
73	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
74	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
75	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
76	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
77	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
78	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
79	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
80	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
81	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
82	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
83	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
84	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
85	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
86	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
87	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
88	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
89	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
90	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
91	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
92	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
93	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
94	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
95	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
96	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
97	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
98	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
99	10/10/81	10:00	10:00
100	10/10/81	10:00	10:00

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate		Rancho Bernardo 3 (*12)			
Round 3		Room 305		Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM	
Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle) 1st 2nd	Negative
<u>Rithvik Rao</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>Chris Tai</u>	
1st 2nd <u>Nathan Thomsen</u>		<u>2</u>	<u>29</u>	1st 2nd <u>Crystal Sung</u>	
2 Canyon Crest Academy				5 Classical Academy High School	
The winner of this debate was				 Judge's Signature	
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				RANCHO BERNARDO HIGH / DEBATE / OVER, REBUTALS School / Affiliation / Occupation	
Is this a low point win? _____					

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH SIDES: EACH SPEAKER

PRESENTED A LOT OF
CONTENT & EVIDENCE

FOR THEIR DEBATES, HOWEVER

AFFIRMATIVE PRESENTED

A MORE CLEAR & LOGICAL

ARGUMENTS. ACROSS ALL

CONSTRUCTIVE, CROSS-EXAMS,

& REBUTALS.

NEG SPOKE TOO FAST AT THE COST

OF ANNUNCIATION. IT WAS TOO

HARD FOR ME TO UNDERSTAND THEIR REASONING.

XCV

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000



100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

VCX

Varsity Policy Debate				Judge			
Round 3				Room 306		Tue 10/04/16 01:00PM	
Speaker (circle)	Affirmative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)	Speaker (circle)	Negative	Rank (1-4)	Points (25-30)
1st (2nd) John Melton		3	26	1st (2nd) Danielle Bloom		1	29
1st (2nd) Jake Melton		2	27	1st (2nd) Joseph Casey		4	26
5 Classical Academy High School				1 Bonita Vista High School			
The winner of this debate was							
☒ Affirmative ☐ Negative (Circle Winner)				 Judge's Signature			
Is this a low point win? <u>yes</u>				<u>MYHS/PARENT/ENGINEER</u> School / Affiliation / Occupation			

Comments & Reason for Decision:

BOTH AFF & NEG. ARGUED THAT THE US SHOULD INCREASE ENGAGEMENT w/ THE PRC. AFF ARGUED FOR BILATERAL ENGAGEMENT; NEG ARGUED FOR MULTILATERAL (WHICH, GIVEN THE ARGUMENTS PROVIDED, MIGHT BE A BETTER APPROACH) - BUT DID NOT SUCCESSFULLY REFUTE THE NEED TO INCREASE ENGAGEMENT.

Danielle - you speak clearly & passionately and nicely outline the logic of your argument. My only recommendations are to concisely pronounce nuclear (it came across as nuclear) and not to focus so much on details not relevant to your case. Whether "substantial" means 10% or 40% or somewhere in between, the important part was what affs how well off would improve. They got there eventually, but I think you could have pushed them harder on the substance behind the substantial.

Jake - you smoothed out once you slowed down a bit. Danielle's hard to follow from a speed perspective. Just yourself & be yourself - you have a showboat trial attorney persona that came through in your final argument. Recommendation - don't fall for the bait of irrelevant definitions.

John - you recovered w/ your final speech. Following Danielle's rapid-fire diction, you started out way too fast & were nearly unintelligible. Once you slowed down, your arguments became much clearer.

Joseph - you speak very clearly & have a nice speaking style. Unfortunately, you didn't take full advantage of your 8 minutes, and that argument was somewhat circular, coming back to topicality after moving to the aff. case.

