

Room: LH 300G
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1 ~~Sadayandy, Murug~~
LUO, WENDY

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Niveda Balemurughan

Max = 30

Hannah Zhang

Max = 30

Niveda Balemurughan 26.8 27

Hannah Zhang 27.2 27.5

The better debating was done by the ~~AFF~~ NEG from Hannah Zhang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG had ~~clearer~~ more clear question & answer, stronger & more clear arguments. NEG also had more evidence to approve her points.

Brandon Decker

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Lyan

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Ruchika Agrawal	Max = 30	Simran Johal	Max = 30
Ruchika Agrawal	<u>25</u>	Simran Johal	<u>24</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Agrawal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- left her whole case wide open
 - shoulda pointed out that SC concept made by J. Locke ... not citizens
- num

Neg

- use time ... had 1:30 left in speech after CX
 - could have exploited her lack of rebuttal against her case
- better b/c ^{AFF} case still stands

RFD: Social Contract is too vague ... constitution relates more directly to US which is subject of resolution

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Arianna Groetsina

Max = 30

Mirwais Omarkhil

Max = 30

Arianna Groetsina

25.9 27

Mirwais Omarkhil

28.1

The better debating was done by the NEG from MIRWAIS
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Political morality
Arianna - ① moral obligation - CONSTITUTION will be violated - used court cases from supreme court
② debt power increase to uphold safety
③ increase for gov. abuse - used new 2012 law
④

Mirwais - Rebuttal: use broader definition of morality, maintaining fair trial is a key

Mirwais - ① morality - not political morality, Due process = fairness, jury in US is biased
a US jury is biased cannot be fair! b. US Courts can not protect defendants & jurors!
② use alternative to achieve fairness - ICC is neutral - neutral

Alternative:
American trials are biased - will increase terrorism,
US jails are susceptible to recruiting, ICC case of Libya

Arianna - gov. abuse if rights taken away,
Rebuttal - Due process to terminate reduces terrorism

I voted for the negative since he presented a more compelling case for using alternative courts helping to reduce terrorist motivation.

Room: Mission K
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

2, Leland Judge
HAMID NOURI

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Himaja Jangle

Max = 30

Yash Maniyar

Max = 30

Himaja Jangle

27.8 28

Yash Maniyar

27.1 27

The better debating was done by the AFF from H. JANGLE
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Hamid Nouri

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

HIMAJA - Morality & fair treatment - 2. not saying way out 1. all in US territory 3. human rights

YASH - 1. due process encourages terrorists 2. Criminal trials will leak information, judges are biased against
3.

HIMAJA had more reference facts - Himaja rebutted more effectively

YASH presented his ideas well - yash was a little more nervous and as much conviction in presenting his point of view

I voted for affirmative since it was based on higher moral ideals.

Room: LH 300E
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Richard, with
~~Masood, Shamsa~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Aysha Rehman	Max = 30	Jonas Hernandez	Max = 30
Aysha Rehman	26 23	Jonas Hernandez	16

The better debating was done by the AFF from Aysha Rehman
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative debator had position tied to constitution.
 Held her ground repeatedly against counter attacks. (coll damage)
 Made reasonable points against Neg debator on human rights,
 and military tribunals.
 Both debators tended to scumble and ~~base~~ state opinions rather
 than facts throwing morality around, with no math, statistics
 or facts.
 Overall the stronger case was made by Aysha.

Room: LH 300E
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Richard, With
~~Masood, Shamsa~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Justin Xu

Max = 30

Justin Xu

~~20~~ 20

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Sara Pachauri

Max = 30

Sara Pachauri

~~15~~ 15

The better debating was done by the AFF from Justin Xu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Richard A. With

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Justin had a more effective oratory style. Sara simply read off her computer screen with no emphasis or eye contact.

Neither had very powerful ability to argue but Justin had scored a important point, by having Sara's ramble in support of national security.

Both debators have room for improvement in providing facts and documentation to support their facts.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Shrey Desai

Max = 30

Rahul Dattatreya

Max = 30

Shrey Desai

29

Rahul Dattatreya

29.5

The better debating was done by the Neg from Rahul Dattatreya
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

refer to the back of this page for decision

Affirmative	Negative
<p>Shrey Affirmative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good introduction of the topic Good eye contact with audience Engages with audience Value at Salavery Describing Human rights Good quotation Cross-examination Rights to na citizens Loop holes need to be describes Debator to prepare a little more for cross examination. More sources need to be mention to support the argument 	<p>Negative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cross examination = good cross examination good questions National Security = minimization Terrorism = greater goods NDA = source = ALABAMA → example = Status quo = No bad process Yale = school teacher = 3 quotations isueck More specific example

one?

limited eye contact

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Rishi Gupta

Max = 30

Austin Green

Max = 30

Rishi Gupta

28.75

Austin Green

28.79

The better debating was done by the Neg. from Austin Green.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted neg. because debator prouder stronger arguments on using Military tribunals to limit security threats. Prouded a greate number of data sources. to support that national security will be better cover by the use of military tribunal as opposed to dual process and defense of human rights. Good eye contact.

Aff - - well prepare to respond on cross examination work on bring up more data sources to support the arguments to work on eye contact to engage the audience.

Room: Mission A
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Peters, Bud~~
Jorgensen, Angela La

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Sahiti Shankar
Sahiti Shankar

Max = 30

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Katelyn Hoffman
Katelyn Hoffman

Max = 30

~~27~~ 27

The better debating was done by the NEG from ~~_____~~ Katelyn Hoffman
AFF OF NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff Clear argument, well-presented. The arguments you made on cross x (be fair to all people, some haven't been proven to be terrorists) were not the same arguments you made in your contention. Make sure you maintain consistency between constructive arguments + cross x arguments.

Neg Clearly delivered, well argued neg constructive. Keep your refutations topical when answering aff case. It's OK to have a shorter speech, no need to repeat yourself. You do have a lot of time left + want to keep speaking, elaborate on what you've already said - don't just repeat.

Rebuttal You do a good job answering your opponent's case + opponent's refutations of your case. Time is limited, but remember to restate your arguments + back up + elaborate earlier points.

Rebuttal Focus on important issues. You spend a lot of time discussing efficiency, com, but since you don't offer alternative definitions, this isn't important.

Overall aff failed to draw link between contentions + value criteria, so I used neg value criteria of "life". Therefore, Neg wins.

Room: Mission A
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Peters, Bud~~
Jorgensen, Angela

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Isaiah Suzio

Max = 30

Isaiah Suzio

30

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Neelesh Ramachandran

Max = 30

Neelesh Ramachandran

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Isaiah Suzio
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff const Clearly argued case, strong arguments. Neg - Cross & 15 for questions. You gave long statement that used a lot of your time.

Neg const Strong argument for your case, but you don't leave much time for answers to aff case. Consider trimming your constructive + giving more time for off-case arguments.

Aff rebuttal Strong answers to neg's case. Good clash. Strong refutations on the flow.

Neg rebuttal You have plenty of prep time. Take a few secs. to gather your thoughts before you start.

As neg wasn't able to demonstrate proof that terrorists found not-guilty, would return and attack again, ~~the~~ aff's arguments carry, and aff wins.

Room: LH 300G
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Sadayandy, Murug~~

LUO / WENDY

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anant Marur

Max = 30

Stanley Wang

Max = 30

Anant Marur

27.8

Stanley Wang

26.9

The better debating was done by the AFF from Anant Marur
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF had clear definition about his value. AFF also had more details to support his points. AFF's argument logic is more clear, AFF had better ~~arguments~~ ^{answers} as well.

Room: Kennedy C
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Kannan, Shanti~~
GARY GUBER

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Edlene Miguel	Max = 30	Weth	Max = 30
Edlene Miguel	<u>28</u>	Michelle Weth	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Edlene
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Gary Guber

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD, AFFIRMATIVE was clearly proposed and strongly supported. Rebuttal was made to the negative.

A opening value (1) (2) strongly supported Rebuttal

N opening value not strong Rebuttal, not as strong, brought up other areas outside the central question so would be helpful to say how those better tie to the central argument.

Room: Kennedy C
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Kannan, Shanti

GARY GUBER

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Claire Liu

Max = 30

Abirami Murugappan

Max = 30

Claire Liu

29.05

Abirami Murugappan

27.8

The better debating was done by the AFF from CLAIRE
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

28

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Gary Guber

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- RFD
The reasons brought out was clearest, logical and backed up.
- A - very powerful, but need to slow down at beginning
- Due process clause
- use of resume without credential
- B - very organized
- United Nations quote
- clear points

Room: Casa 7
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Mandracchia, Joe~~

Wei Wang
St. Francis

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Striplin	Max = 30	Eish Kapoor	Max = 30
James Striplin	<u>29</u>	Eish Kapoor	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from James Striplin
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____ *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: - Strong arguments and logical reasoning
- skillfully pick up contradictions in opponent's argument

Room: Casa 7
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

~~Mandraccia, Joe~~

St)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Wes Wang
St. Francis

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anmol Singh

Max = 30

Sumaiya Sayeed

Max = 30

Anmol Singh

28

Sumaiya Sayeed

26

The better debating was done by the AFF from Anmol Singh
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

NEG : dropped opponent points in rebuttal
showed a few incoherent of logical reasoning, e.g. secrecy => reduction of terrorist attacks

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Aldo Ordonez

Max = 30

Krithi Reddy

Max = 30

24

Krithi Reddy

25

The better debating was done by the NEG from Krithi Reddy
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

U.S. has obligation to non-citizens

- A 6 Const
- N 3 cross exam
- N 7 Const 6:30
- A 3 cross exam
- A 4 rebuttal
- N 6 " 5
- A 3 " "

Aldo
 - Homage vs. homeland.
 - Reduces war/terror.
 - Terrorist recruitment.

Krithi
 - security
 - amendments
 - constitution 11/3/3
 - balances rights
 - Evid.
 - Prof Al Qaida.
 Utilitarian
 Appeal again despite defects, classified into.

Dna. Access.
 disclosure
 Total.
 societal
Constitution
 - obligation to
 citizen

3 min prep. time

Adds new points

A K.

- Analysis
- Refutation
- Evidence
- Org.
- Cross exam
- Delivery

	A	K.
Analysis	5	5
Refutation	4	4
Evidence	5	4
Org.	3	4
Cross exam	3	4
Delivery	4	4
	24	25

prep time

(1)
(2)

(1)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Rahul Joshi	Max = 30	Carina DeLorenzo	Max = 30
Rahul Joshi	<u>25</u>	Carina DeLorenzo	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Carina DeLorenzo.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Piyush Shah (Piyush Shah)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

3:18
 • Immigration
 • citizenship
 • Rights of non-citizens
 • Constitution
 • government
 • dehumanization

Evidence
 Contentions 1, 2, 3
 Race
 Sex
 6:30

Debate
 3:25 : 3:28

Expressions
 clarity/speech
 Eye Criterion

preemptive detention
 gay rights
 defend arguments
 refute.

value Non-citizens
 Yes (Rahul) No (Carina)
 Normal morality (overall)
 political
 value criterion
 cont. 1.?
 WikiLeaks
 Non citizens in other countries
 Am: Constitution
 military commission / tribunals
 protect over alien rights.
 info leaking

Offtime Roadmap
 U.S → country world
 secrecy → not leaked
 value of morality

cont. 1.?
 WikiLeaks
 Non citizens in other countries
 Am: Constitution
 military commission / tribunals
 protect over alien rights.
 info leaking

Debate 3:38 : 3:42
 moral / less/more vs. important.

2:10
 constitution scope.
 present a
 Arg.
 knowledge
 debate process.

value
 Scope
 resolution context
 Conclusion.

	R	C
Analysis	5	5
Rebuttal	4	5
Evidence	4	4
Org.	3	4
Cross ex	4	5
Delivery	5	4

Room: Ben 1e
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1 WARRIOR 2, DEBAT
Dianne Fislund

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Makda Medhanie	Max = 30	Tiffany Cai	Max = 30
Makda Medhanie	<u>27</u>	Tiffany Cai	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Tiffany Cai
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Dianne Fislund

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff had the stronger value (better tied to the topic) & value criterion, but Aff did not defend her 3 contentions. Aff also did not refute Neg's contention 3 (Classified info)

Neg's contention that ^{the} Constitution is not absolute & is open to ~~interpretations~~ interpretation was a very strong criterion that Aff did not effectively argue against

Neg should beef up her cont 1 about govt rights for citizens only. The constitution does not specifically address that & infers it applies to all people.

Room: Ben 1e
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1 WARRIOR 2, DEBAT

Dianne Fishwick

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Anand Kannappan

Max = 30

Anand Kannappan

28.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Sruthi Ramabadran

Max = 30

Sruthi Ramabadran

27

The better debating was done by the Aff from Anand Kannappan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Dianne Fishwick

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff presented the stronger & more connected case. He also defended it better and refuted the neg's connection but for value criterion & value.

Neg did not successfully refute Aff's cont 2 about reckless detention - the Geneva Convention argument was not appropriate in this case

Neg did not refute Aff's contention 2.

Aff did not successfully refute Neg's cont 1 about recruitment
CIPA does not address recruitment & radicalization

Aff had better clash.

Both should read their cases to an adult to correct their pronunciations.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Yanika Magan	Max = 30	Deepthrisri Suresh	Max = 30
Yanika Magan	<u>27</u>	Deepthrisri Suresh	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Yanika Magan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff had very strong contentions that were not successfully refuted by Neg.
 "Social Contract" was a clever argument by Neg, but Aff was able to successfully argue that it was not applicable in an international context.
 Aff gave a wider, more credible variety of evidence.
 Aff spoke too quickly in their opening speech. Consider pruning some information so you can get through it all. However, rebuttal speeches were excellent.
 Neg's "mass murderer" assertion was not an effective argument. It needed to be tied more directly to terrorism.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Jay Bisen

Max = 30

Jerry Chen

Max = 30

Jay Bisen

24.1

Jerry Chen

25.2

The better debating was done by the neg from Jerry Chen
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Both sides presented their case well,~~
To my knowledge both parties presented their cases well, but I chose the negative because not only he presented his case well but he argued his opponent case and blocked him - Affirmative needs to be more well prepared next time.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anna Lu

Max = 30

Praveen Batra

Max = 30

Anna Lu

24.2

Praveen Batra

26.1

The better debating was done by the neg from Praveen Batra
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~affirmative presented her case well but negative argued the opponent case very well, and negative presented and protected his case well.~~

I believed both side prepared their case well, they presented their case accordingly, but negative argued the opponent case very well, and protected his case. I chose negative.

Room: Mission E
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

DESAI, KRAN
~~Tran, Fei Long~~
M.S.J.H.S., PREMIER

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Jashan Kashyap

Max = 30

Jashan Kashyap

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Cort Carlson

Max = 30

Cort Carlson

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Jashan Kashyap
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: Kiran M Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. was better in a logical way argued point by point. Jashan was persuasive.
Neg. dropped couple of points which aff had brought up. Neg did not bring up any argument against Utilitarianism.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Deirdre Carson

Max = 30

Neal Goyal

Max = 30

Deirdre Carson

28

Neal Goyal

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Neal Goyal
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: X

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

[Handwritten notes and diagrams for Affirmative and Negative sides]

Affirmative Side:

- 1) Clean link "I cannot find link"
- 2) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 3) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 4) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 5) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 6) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 7) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 8) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 9) I posed the over @ gets spread
- 10) I posed the over @ gets spread

Negative Side:

- 1) This is what it is.
- 2) Neg chose one side of neg of pos
- 3) World leader from due process
- 4) I flew in link between U.S. & Vc.
- 5) I dropped this
- 6) I dropped this
- 7) I dropped this
- 8) I dropped this
- 9) I dropped this
- 10) I dropped this

Other Notes:

- Handic Rufft
- use mil. tribunals legit better @ release to NC.
- 1) This is what it is.
- 2) Neg chose one side of neg of pos
- 3) World leader from due process
- 4) I flew in link between U.S. & Vc.
- 5) I dropped this
- 6) I dropped this
- 7) I dropped this
- 8) I dropped this
- 9) I dropped this
- 10) I dropped this

F.D.

leg provides compelling reasons why terrorists should be denied specific due process rights (specifically open trials + prohibitions on cruel & unusual treatment)
Aff's reasons for providing = rights are very vague and seem too unlikely.
ie if the us gives rights => World Peace. The links just were there.

Room: Library LC007
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Milrea, Ileen

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Nikita Venkatesh

Max = 30

Daniel Li

Max = 30

Nikita Venkatesh

Daniel Li

The better debating was done by the AFF from Nikita
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg - No Show
5:30 am 4:30 pm.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Nadia Cochinwala

Max = 30

Sebastian Hurtado

Max = 30

Nadia Cochinwala

29

Sebastian Hurtado

29

The better debating was done by the Aff from Nadia Cochinwala
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: NO

Signed: Shaila Krishna Sebastian Hurtado Shaila Krishna
(Krishna)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides were excellent. Neg's argument that aff was advocating for more rights for non-citizens than citizens was not clearly supported with evidence. The Runfeldt vs Hamdi evidence was not clearly ~~very~~ linked to the resolution. Aff's argument that same is ~~the~~ what aff was advocating was convincing. Aff's arguments ~~that~~ on soft power ~~and~~ was and ~~linking~~ ^{that} national security ~~is~~ individual security go hand in hand. In hand was and linking it to Neg's ~~from~~ value of national security was the reason for the vote.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Jose Sebastian	Max = 30	Shivane Sabharwal	Max = 30
Jose Sebastian	<u>27</u>	Shivane Sabharwal	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Shivane Sabharwal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both sides' V + VC were in play - neither was soundly refuted, and neither was dropped

In CX1 Aff did not give good support for VC → V link
Neg tried to put a lot of weight on the issue of following ideals even at the expense of nat'l sec, but I saw this as a minor point.

Neg only directly addressed Aff C₁, and even that was not very direct, just tried to refute with the "ideals" arg from CX1.
C₂ + C₃ not rebutted

Neg provided excellent contentions in support of V, VC, stronger than Aff
Aff did not rebut all contentions
the rebuttals Aff did provide were very good

Both sides lingered on the torture topic without really doing a good job of ~~plugging~~ using it to sway me either way.

In the end, considering the dropped args + crossex, this debate was very even, but I give the win to Neg, mostly due to a stronger case w/ better tie to V/VC.

Room: Casa Commons A
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Zing, Lucille

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Joel Cheng

Max = 30

Joel Cheng

29

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Sampada Deglurkar

Max = 30

Sampada Deglurkar

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from JOEL CHENG WEST MONT HIGH.
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Lucille Zing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Huang

Max = 30

Sandhya Vijaapurapu

Max = 30

Sonya Huang

27

Sandhya Vijaapurapu

25

The better debating was done by the AFF ~~NEG~~ from Sonya Huang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- 1) professional demeanor, logical and methodical presentation. good eye contact, loud voice
- 2) good off time road map.
- 3) value criterion was justified and linked back to value.

NEG

- 1) low voice and no eye contact. However very logical case with evidence
- 2) cross-ex and rebuttle went all over the map.
- 3) did not address all the contentions of AFF

Winner - AFF

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Jananni Ratnagiri	Max = 30	Bruce Xu	Max = 30
Jananni Ratnagiri	<u>23</u>	Bruce Xu	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from Bruce Xu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: -

- 1) no eye contact, & spreading
- 2) value criterion did not match exactly to the value.
- 3) good cross-x and logical refute

NEG: -

- 1) loud voice, professional presentation, good eye contact
- 2) good offtime roadmap
- 3) methodical and logical delivery, which matched value and criterion

Winner - NEG

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Aditi Gnanansekhar	Max = 30	Sidharth Gilela	Max = 30
Aditi Gnanansekhar	<u>27.5</u>	Sidharth Gilela	<u>26.5</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Aditi
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Meenu

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Aditi and Sidharth did well. Aditi's value criteria and contentions fit together very nicely. She was able to defend her case and rebut NEG very effectively. Sidharth's cross X was really good. He did ask for clarification on AFF's weak points but he was not able to say why due processing will not get the same results as cited in his value criteria. He also missed on asking for evidence for the one of important contentions of AFF which said terrorist attacks are increasing because we are torturing ^{captured} terrorists.

Room: Mission I
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Ram, Mrs.

RAJIVANSHY (MSJHS)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Anu Asokan

Max = 30

Mark Gubler

Max = 30

Anu Asokan

29

Mark Gubler

28

The better debating was done by the AFF from Anu Asokan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF won the round. She had more evidence and better cross x.
The neg should present more evidence, and a focused case. The ~~contentions~~ were not ~~did not~~ really good job on the debate.

Room: Mission G
Flight B: Start 3:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Sabnis, Sudheer

Bisen Aparna

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Gavra

Max = 30

Timothy Wang

Max = 30

Inbar Gavra

27

Timothy Wang

25

The better debating was done by the Aff from Inbar Gavra
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Aparna B Bisen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Contentions were well supported, and
also fitted the framework of
definition and value criterion.

Room: Mission G
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Sabnis, Sudheer
BISEN APARNA.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Ali Zaidi

Max = 30

Viraj Kadakia

Max = 30

Ali Zaidi

Viraj Kadakia

The better debating was done by the Neg from Viraj Kadakia
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Aparna Bisen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Absence of Affirmative speaker
Ali Zaidi led to the automatic victory of
Negative debator Viraj Kadakia.

Room: Casa Commons A
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1

Zing, Lucille

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harshi Desai

Max = 30

Ashutosh Jindal

Max = 30

Harshi Desai

29

Ashutosh Jindal

← ABSENT

The better debating was done by the AFF ~~HARSHI DESAI~~ from HARSHI DESAI MISSION SAN JOSE HIGH
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Lucille Zing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Mission C
Flight A: Start 3:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas



Krishna, Shaila

La /

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Team La Reina

Max = 30

Ammar Husain

Max = 30

Ammar Husain

W

dropped.

The better debating was done by the Neg from Ammar Husain
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Shaila Vasudeo (Krishna)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

CASAB Rd 4

~~A~~ Waite
Ld R:

Aff - odowd

~~Colin Walsh~~
~~Douglas Ripstein~~

27.1

Neg - Cel

~~Colin Walsh~~
~~Douglas Ripstein~~

24.9

Winner: Aff from ~~Douglas Ripstein~~
odowd

Negation conceded nearly every argument or even admitted that the whole premise of her C was flawed and contradictory. I cannot vote for a debater that wouldn't even vote for herself. Aff did what she had to do in terms of contentions, though the links to her value need to be clearer. How does U.S. global fail provide for Justice? How would fail give these rights create more terrorists? Ha

x Ripstein

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Batra	Max = 30	Milpitas Rehman	Max = 30
Praveen Batra	<u>28.5</u>	Aysha Rehman	<u>27.0</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Praveen Batra
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sania Baqai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- ~~specific~~ did not address security breach
- did better job of addressing both contentions and showing why aff. is more effective than neg.
- cited resolution ✓

Neg

- well researched points, but in the end, argument for outweighed argument against
- did not support certain points with evidence

Both teams did a very well job of creating a well developed argument, but the consequences for outweighed the neg, as the aff encompassed all the points of the neg.

Room: Mission Q
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

~~Laud, Amar~~

2mg
SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monta Vista Li

Max = 30

Evergreen Cochinwala

Max = 30

Daniel Li

absent

Nadia Cochinwala

29

The better debating was done by the NEG from NADIA COCHINWALA
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME EVERGREEN COCHINWALA

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Lucille Zing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Room: Mission Q
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Laud, Amar

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Westmont Gilchrist	Max = 30	Bishop O Dowd Ordonez	Max = 30
Daniel Gilchrist	<u>29</u>		<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from DANIEL GILCHRIST (Westmont Gilchrist)
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Lucille Zing

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Leland Weth	Max = 30	YGD Ratnagiri	Max = 30
Michelle Weth	<u>24</u>	Jananni Ratnagiri	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jananni Ratnagiri
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Michelle was not really prepared and~~
~~lost~~

Janani won this debate Round. she presented better argumtation and refuted her opponents arguments well and provided solid evidence to support her value criterion and won the framework debate

Michelle was less prepared ~~for the~~ to refute her opponents arguments and was less focused on making her case.

Room: Kennedy E
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Braun, Shirley

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Sabharwal

Max = 30

Monta Vista Zaidi


Max = 30

Shivane Sabharwal

Ali Zaidi

The better debating was done by the AFF from Shivane Sabharwal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

(Ali zaidi)
The Neg didn't show up
for the round!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Gubler

Max = 30

Mark Gubler

27.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Marur

Max = 30

Anant Marur

28.5

The better debating was done by the NEG from Anant Marur
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: Carie X. King

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

- speak clearly, point clearly stated.
- not strong enough address your point
- dropped contenge point
- need to provide more reasoning on your point

Negative:

- speaks clearly, deliver point clearly
- point well addressed with strong analysis
- good debater

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

YGD Dattatreya

Max = 30

Bishop O Dowd Carson

Max = 30

Rahul Dattatreya

KT
~~20.0~~ 29

Deirdre Carson

KT
~~26.0~~ 26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Dattatreya
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kay Takeuchi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- When Aff was presenting his contentions, the voice was a bit too overly passionate, which made him look more "defensive" than persuasive. However, the Neg's contentions were even less effectively presented with too many "ah..." "um..." (maybe reading faster than she herself feels comfortable) and sadly, no single eye-contact with the judge. (However, she had great non-verbal communication in NR!!)
- I value that ~~the~~ Neg. tried to cover all of Aff's contentions. However, some of the argument did not form good logics, due to the lack of ties to VC.
- As Aff mentioned in AR2, Neg's excuse "I didn't respond because I didn't have time to do so" was better not to be said.
- Although Neg's X-examination has a couple of very good points, Aff did a stronger attacking by ~~the~~ setting a "trap" by asking "Do you believe in the US constitution?" and forced ~~her~~ ^{Neg} eventually say ^{what} she probably did not want to.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Olive Children Reddy

Max = 30

Krithi Reddy

26.5

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Diablo Valley Kannappan

Max = 30

Anand Kannappan

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Kannappan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kay Takeuchi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Aff. used expressions such as "hundreds of" and "a large portion of" instead of giving specific data, which was too easily attacked ~~at~~ by Neg.
- I feel sorry for ^{Aff's} ~~Neg.~~ coughing and having weak voice, but ~~she~~ her weakening voice ~~at~~ ^{toward} the end of sentences allowed Neg to cut in... ^{a lot.}
- Both Aff and Neg repeated the same points over and over, but Neg. could develop his argument toward the level how the decrease of US national security would impact the international security.
- Neg. needed to convince why "human justice" is over "domestic security"
- Neg. covered most of Aff's contentions in her refutation, but some of the argument did not reach the fundamental issues of the conflicting values.
- Neg. probably needed more cards - but her pointing out the ^{Aff's} invalid number of "millions" was good. Both Aff & Neg need to be a bit more careful whenever they mention numbers

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
St Mary's Carlson	Max = 30	Bishop O Dowd Medhanie	Max = 30
Cort Carlson	<u>30</u>	Makda Medhanie	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Cort Carlson
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

★ AFF: —

- 1) loud voice, clear, logical and concise presentation.
- 2) it would help to have more eye contact.
- 3) cross-ex and arguments are logical
- 4) professional and rational approach and conclusion

★ NEG: —

- 1) loud voice, good eye contact and presentation of case and rational
- 2) it would help to organized the arguments and ~~more~~ more rational argu
- 3) good offtime roadmap

Winner — AFF

Room: Benson 21
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Vaun Walia
~~Nagakumar, Jines~~
Lynbrook H.S.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

YGD Ramabadran

Max = 30

MSJ Shah

Max = 30

Sruthi Ramabadran

25

Paras Shah

27

The better debating was done by the NEG from MSJ Shah
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

YGD Ramabadran → good points, started with confidence. Good pace. you should speak with confidence thro out. many time you had good points but you just back out. In ~~exam~~ exam you let your opponnent take all the time. ~~you~~ you should be more organized in your thoughts. every phase you finished early (time left on clock) you give up fast, don't do that.

Paras Shah → good points, good pace, well organized you also left time on the clock. You repeated your own points. Had your opp. be more organized you would have been trouble. You were good in exam and throw off your opponent easily. You made her confused and she gave up

Room: Benson 21
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Vaasun Walia
~~Nagakumar, Jines~~
Lynbrook H.S.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Hernando	Max = 30	MSJ Agrawal	Max = 30
Jonas Hernando	<u>28</u>	Ruchika Agrawal	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Jonas Hernando
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Atwaha

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Jonas Hernando → Well prepared. Good pace, good confidence. Did very well in X exam. Controlled the X exam and could pin down opp. 'good points. However everytime left time on the clock.

Ruchika Agrawal → good speaker, good pace. Left too much time on clock. At times she lost focus from the topic. Couldn't counter opp's arguments very well. Could not back her arguments with evidence or examples

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Green

Max = 30

YGD Balemurugan

Max = 30

Austin Green

27.2

Niveda Balemurugan

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Austin Green
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The decision was in favor of Affirmative

Aff

→ value & value criterion were stated clearly & well defended.

→ Rebuttal was well constructed & specifics were asked

→ Arguments about military tribunals not working were well constructed

Overall: - Aff had a clear ~~advantage~~ defend against the points that Neg was putting across.

Neg

→ Value & value criterion stated clearly.

→ Backed in rebuttals & couldn't frame the questions clearly.

→ When asked about the Amendment, Neg wasn't able to support her contention

→ Couldn't support her argument about military tribunals ~~working~~ ^{working}

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
--------------------	--------	-----------------	--------

Harker Wang	Max = 30	YGD Miguel	Max = 30
Timothy Wang	<u>26.2</u>	Edlene Miguel	<u>28.1</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Edlene Miguel
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

→ Value of Equal human rights clearly stated & supported by the value criteria.

→ ~~was not able to~~ Although initially handled the ~~rebuttal~~ cross-exam well, he was not able to defend his value.

→ ~~got stuck in~~ "terrorists" vs "accused of terrorism" debate for a long time without really providing any evidence to support his claim.

Neg

→ Value of National Security & Safety well stated & well defended.

→ Clearly put forward arguments that negated Aff's value statement

→ Rebuttals were well built & defense of the case were supported by clear evidence which helped Neg win the case.

Summary: Excellent debate by Neg.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Harker Pachauri

Max = 30

Sara Pachauri

25

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Suzio

Max = 30

Isaiah Suzio

24

The better debating was done by the Ny from Suzio
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Baker Park

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

- ~~start w/ resolution ... h~~
- need better org in case
- road map, org in speeches
+ tell judge what your going to talk about b/c you speak
- + helps you and the judge understand whats really going on in the round better (transparency)
- you need evidence, can't expect judge to feel the way you do automatically

Neg

- stand still, comes down
- good how you referenced how your contentions need
- opp. VC more than opp
- road map, org in speeches b/c ...
- when theres time left, slow down and give a overview of round/cases ... wastes time and is effective for lay judges (repetition, repetition, repetition)

RFD: Analysis superior, evidence and arguments consistent.

Room: Mission K
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Kumar, Sandeep

Brandon Deadwater

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL Logan

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Gilela

Max = 30

Sidharth Gilela

23

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Olive Children Bisen

Max = 30

Jay Bisen

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Bism
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Barbara Duke

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

- ~~bring up slavery when~~
- neg has no burden!
- does not have to prove anything!
- spoke too slow but appreciate
- comb bring up new evidence

Neg

- bring up slavery when opponent references 4th and 5th amendment

RFD: M is linked to safety of US citizens thus must look to

Neg (AFF dropped this). Neg brought up impacts. AFF's case not linked to resolution transparently

Room: Mission E
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Parker, Margot

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Maniyar	Max = 30	Presentation Sharma	Max = 30
Yash Maniyar	25.2	Kriti Sharma	25.9

The better debating was done by the Neg from Presentation
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg did a good job sticking to her contention & clearly refuting Aff contentions.

Room: Mission E
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Parker, Margot

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Hurtado

Max = 30

Sebastian Hurtado

26.7

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Jangle

Max = 30

Himaja Jangle

26.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bishop O'Dowd
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Good job. You each want to get more specifics for your rebuttals. Aff did an excellent job clearly laying out his contentions and supporting them.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

St. Francis Wang

Max = 30

Westmont Cheng

Max = 30

Stanley Wang

28

Joel Cheng

27

The better debating was done by the Affirmative Stan from Stanley Wang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Sarah Park

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Stanley Wang
- nice emotional appeal
 - good delivery
 - Good cross examination
 - Good counter argument, but lacks empathy for 9/11 and the people killed there in order to prove his point
 - bit sacastic
 - overall thoughtful delivery

- Joel Cheng
- moral cross exam weak
 - lacks thoughtfulness
 - Doesn't listen to opponents response all the way.
 - Couldn't agree with his value fully.

Room: Kennedy C
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Deadwiler, Brand
MSJHS

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto DeLorenzo

Max = 30

Carina DeLorenzo

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker Ang

Max = 30

Kai-Siang Ang

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Harker Ang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____
[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both the sides were very good & had a lot of evidence.
Neg won by a small margin.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Cai	Max = 30	Leland Gupta	Max = 30
Tiffany Cai	<u>28</u>	Rishi Gupta	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Tiffany Cai
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: RSG

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both Neg & AFF had solid cases.
AFF has good defense and was able to
provide a lot of evidence.
Good job!

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Husain

Max = 30

James Logan Kashyap

Max = 30

Ammar Husain

25

Jashan Kashyap

28

The better debating was done by the Neg from Jashan Kashyap
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Diane Roza

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

off
Contentions do not link well to values and the resolution.
They could, but you don't make the connections.

Rambled in Rebuttal

Needs analysis that ties everything together and to the resolution

Neg
great analysis & Rebuttal

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Palo Alto Zhang	Max = 30	Mountain View Gavra	Max = 30
Hannah Zhang	27	Inbar Gavra	27

The better debating was done by the AFF from Hannah Zhang
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Diane Roza

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff
good analysis
nice rebuttal
On negs
Weak argument

you both
are on your
way to becoming
good debaters.

neg
Contention that
terrorist don't
want due is a
process is a
stretch
and a
Weak
argument

Room: Mission G
Novice Lincoln Douglas

Mission G

Leland Judge 3
Leland Judge 3

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Kadakia	Max = 30	Douglas Striplin	Max = 30
Viraj Kadakia	<u>23</u>	James Striplin	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from James Striplin
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Aparna B Bisen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

James demonstrated good clarity of thought with simple yet substantial justification for his value criterion.

Room: O Connor 106
Flight B: Start 5:45
Open Lincoln Douglas

2

MSJ-LD-05, MSJ-L
KIRAN DESAI, MSJHS, Fremont

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

St. Francis Ratnam

Max = 30

Sheryl Ratnam

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Zhang, K.

Max = 30

Kevin Zhang

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from KEVIN ZHANG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: No

Signed: Kiran Desai

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Neg. ~~has~~ brought a new interesting twist to the whole equation by introducing flexibility in Military Tribunals allowing international judges from other country. He argued point by point very systematically and logically against Aff.

I felt Aff was getting emotional at times.

Both were very good speakers.

(CAMACHO, ERICK St)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Suresh	Max = 30	St Mary's Singh	Max = 30
Deepthrisri Suresh	<u>28</u>	Anmol Singh	<u>29</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from James Logan
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: G. Camacho

DOUBLE WIN JAH

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

RFD

Giving the m a trial
technically would
extend to non-citizens.
"Military Tribunals
Terrorism"

Civilian Courts vs. Terrorism
Information
is kept under
wraps.
"Feds are
well equipped"

Deepthrisri:
You were right to point
out that his
position doesn't negate.

P.S. 1995 case is
really out dated.
Out of the 500
currently current
processed there's been
no harmful
information leak.

Room: Mission A
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Leal, Steven

(CAMACHO, ERIK)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Xu	Max = 30	YGD Xu	Max = 30
Bruce Xu	<u>30</u>	Justin Xu	<u>25</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bruce Xu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: E Camacho

DOUBLE WIN JAH

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF
Torture → Terrorism
↓ torture = terrorism
Q Torture = counter terrorism

NEG
It's bad to drop your Opponents Case.

You pronounce Guantanamo wrong.
You can call it Gitmo for short.

RFD
Morality
>
Nat Security

AND...
Water Boarding
Extend that Dropped AFF Case
JAH fair lol

Room: Engineering 108
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

CHEN, Cheyenne
Patil, Mahesh
St. Francis High School

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Deglurkar	Max = 30	YGD Gnanansekhar	Max = 30
Sampada Deglurkar	<u>27.8</u>	Aditi Gnanansekhar	<u>28.5</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from YGD Gnanansekhar
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Cheyenne Chen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Negative showed good research, understanding and analysis of the topic.

Room: Engineering 108
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

CHEN, Cheyenne
Patil, Mahesh
ST. Francis High School

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Sayeed	Max = 30	Palo Alto Groetsina	Max = 30
Sumaiya Sayeed	<u>27.8</u>	Arianna ^{please correct it} Groetsina	<u>27.6</u>
		<i>Groetsema</i>	
The better debating was done by the		<u>AFF</u>	from <u>Evergreen Sayeed</u>
		AFF or NEG	TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *Cheyenne Chen*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The affirmative arguments about constitutional due process based on in depth research.
The negative needed better analysis.

Room: Ben 1c
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2 WARRIOR 1, DEBAT

Santa Clara

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Chen	Max = 30	MSJ Desai	Max = 30
Jerry Chen	<u>25</u>	Harshi Desai	<u>24</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Harker
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signatures]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: *The Neg didn't respond to the argument that the Aff made about the success of other, less violent, interrogation methods. No reply to the second, double standard, argument made by Aff either. Finally, the only argument made on the final Aff point was that other countries might be using E.T. as well. The Aff countered the first Neg contention by saying that the U.S. and its soldiers are actually being harmed by instances of Gitmo/A.G. etc. Generally speaking, Neg needs to do more work on the flow to counter the Aff's rebuttals.*

Room: Ben 1c
Flight A: Start 5:00
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2 WARRIOR 1, DEBAT

Santa Clara

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Goyal

Max = 30

Leland Huang

Max = 30

Neal Goyal

24

Sonya Huang

27

The better debating was done by the Neg from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: For the value of morality, the Aff failed to defend the framework/value when brought into contention with citizens v. suspected terrorists. He also failed to refute the point that holding these trials in the United States (K.S.M.). Neg defended case relatively well and the only link that the Aff put on the case was akin to "any evidence" or "that's not true." Need to actually have coherent arguments. Aff never responds to "enemy combatant" argument made.

Room: Casa 3
Flight B: Start 5:45
Novice Lincoln Douglas

2

Schletzbaum, Jam

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

YGD Kapoor

Max = 30

Eish Kapoor

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Liu

Max = 30

Claire Liu

28

The better debating was done by the NEG from Claire Liu
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Jamie Selph

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Eish - Look at judge during cross ex.
You jumped around a lot during 4 minute speech.
Good call on MLK ~~got~~ Killer-gattas 79 yrs

Claire - Look at judge during cross ex. Good cross ex questions concerning using due process, but not the same due process citizens get.....
Good job covering AFF case.
* Good point that you can't compare a convicted murderer to AFF - an accused terrorist that is not a citizen.
Neg. said we already give Due Process, just not constitutional due process. She said we are not obligated to give non citizens constitutional due process protections. AFF argued Amendment 5 & 14 but Neg. said they were outdated & we cannot define what framers meant. It was a Safety/Security vs. Justice debate and National Security was a better argument.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

NEGATIVE

POINTS

YGD Katrina LE

Max = 30

St. Francis Magan

Max = 30

Katrina LE

28.9

Yanika Magan

28.9

The better debating was done by the NEG from YANIKA MAGAN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Really Well Done } difficult to choose who won!

Aff: ^{style} Presentation was excellent - voice modulation, clarity, logical & organized. Definitions were clear & developed. Constructions/Contentions were logical & well developed. Needed more than 1 cite of successful "not torture" interrogations though to strengthen your case. Senator McCain could have been cited. IAR was weak. #2 not developed well & not clear. #4 was repetitive & no additional points raised.

You could have won w/ those changes & stemmed your victory home.

Negative: Excellent style - really well done. Clear - understandable. You did a great job of Cross Examination because you listened to the points raised & dealt w/ them.

Alternative case of supporting ICC was persuasive. Well done. I personally don't support it but you raised good points so you won this debate.

Mismanaged US Prisons was a weak point & not relevant.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Mountain View Khan	Max = 30	YGD Venkatesh	Max = 30
Julia Khan	<u>28.5</u>	Nikita Venkatesh	<u>27.3</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>Aff</u> from <u>Julia Khan</u>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>BShaw</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Presentation: Very clear, organized & linear thoughts well laid out. Good statement of definitions & effective defense of values.

- Contentions #1 & #2 not rebutted.
- Cross examination was stronger than Neg.
- Extra points for being polite in CE. (May I move on?)
- Not sure you understood "Witness Protection Program". Use *was not appropriate or supportive*.

Neg: Criteria was too vague to be supported suspicious activity is actually basis for police action, back in 1930s & 1940 (my grandfather was a cop). We in US moved beyond that concept.

Evidence citing Florida prison radicalism was good.

Presentation: You were nervous & need to be more confident. Preparation will help support that feeling.

I found you to be honest intellectually, good job.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Johal	Max = 30	Palo Alto Lu	Max = 30
Simran Johal	<u>28</u>	Anna Lu	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from Johal
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff did a better job arguing for broader values.
 Neg's examples were very specific, yet argued ~~against~~ against the use of discrete examples in their rebuttal.
 Cross X should be used for more productive purposes than making the opponent repeat themselves.
 Neg needs to provide a clearer analysis of their evidence. ~~Give~~ Give specific analysis of why it is relevant.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Murugappan	Max = 30	Saratoga Desai	Max = 30
Abirami Murugappan	27.1	Shrey Desai	28.2

The better debating was done by the AFF from MSJ MURUGAPPAN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted affirmative because she demonstrated the need to extend non-US citizens the right of Due Process. The United States has a moral obligation to process non-citizens accused of terrorism with the same protection as everyone else, ~~as well as show their intent and on~~ The affirmative also explained that Drone strikes to kill terrorist leaders does not occur on US soil and is exempt from the negative argument.

AFF

- Varied arguments
- stumbled over words too much
- Good presence

NEG

- Great energy
- Powerful presence
- Needs to check facts on terrorist attacks outside US
- Spent too much time on Drone Strikes

JARBO, MATT

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

LD is double flighted; Please start Flight B IMMEDIATELY following your first debate.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
James Logan Omarkhil	Max = 30	MSJ Nair	Max = 30
Mirwais Omarkhil	<u>27.5</u>	Pooja Nair	<u>27.9</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Mirwais Omarkhil
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Matt Jarbo

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative: ~~The~~ The Affirmative crafted an argument for the fairness of basic human rights for everyone (not just limited to US citizens). He also affirmed that extending due process to non-citizens accused of terrorism allows for ~~but~~ fewer terrorist recruitment. ~~that~~ Additionally he stated that ~~extending~~ allowing full case disclosure for Federal trials of suspected terrorists will result in little media attention.

Negative: The negative argued that there is no benefit, or moral obligation, of ^{extending} due process to non-citizens. She said that holding a open court trial of suspected terrorists would be bad for national security, as well as claiming that it would be a media circus.

JUDGEMENT:

I voted affirmative because they showed ~~that~~ that extending a basic human right to non-US citizens will allow for a more open world forum and a better way to protect us from future threats. The negative needed a better argument explaining why not extending due process to non-citizens would threaten this country's safety.