

Room: Mission K  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Park, Sarah

# 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
Olive Children Bisen	Max = 30	Harker Ramachandran	Max = 30
Jay Bisen	<u>28</u>	Neelesh Ramachandran	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF ~~AFF~~ from Jay Bisen  
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:

Jay  
value - justice  
criteria human rights & human <sup>welfare,</sup> law  
Good rebuttal

Neelesh  
Good research  
Good counter

Room: Benson 21  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~MSJ-LD-03, MSJ-L~~

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	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Hernando	Max = 30	Douglas Striplin	Max = 30
Jonas Hernando	<u>26</u>	James Striplin	<u>28</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Douglas Striplin  
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 Const Good, clear opening arguments. If your speech ends and you have time left, feel free to take this time to elaborate your points or explore them more in depth - or end your speech early. Repeating your points doesn't help your case - as we've already heard them once.

Neg Const Good counter arguments, as well as refutations of aff case. Cross x - Aff - be careful of questions like "Do you believe..." as the aff doesn't have to agree.

Aff rebuttal Use this opportunity to elaborate on your points and really clarify your stance.

Neg rebuttal Good arguments and case. If referring back to evidence, feel free to re-summarize or re-state, particularly as you had plenty of time.

Affirmative's argument failed to evolve to really counter neg case. Neg wins on flow for presenting arguments that aff did not answer directly.

Room: Benson 21  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~MSJ-LD-03, MSJ-L~~

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	NEGATIVE	POINTS
YGD Miguel	Max = 30	James Logan Suresh	Max = 30
Edlene Miguel	<u>28</u>	Deepthrisri Suresh	<u>27.5</u>

The better debating was done by the Aff from YGD Miguel  
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 case Clear argument, impassioned delivery, very lively.

Neg case Strong evidence, good use of data + imperial facts. Be consistent on cross X. You can't say both accusation = guilt but also uphold "innocent until proven guilty."

Aff rebuttal You wasted valuable rebuttal time shuffling through papers - take time to get your evidence in order. Good clash + answers to neg case.

Neg rebuttal You do a thorough job countering aff points, but you've got a difficult case to prove when you say accusation = guilt and that dehumanizes happens (implied when you said "mass-murderers are less than human). While you do a good job of following the flow, these are tough arguments to defend.

Room: Mission G  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

MUNIRA SHAHMAZ  
MSJ-LD-06, MSJ-L

# 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	St. Francis Wang	Max = 30
Jerry Chen	<u>25.5</u>	Stanley Wang	<u>25</u>

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

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

Signed: M. Shaahmaaz

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both of them are equal (almost), I voted affirmative as his contentions are more logical, he tried to proof how US may loose friendships with other countries ~~and~~ as they are showing double standard.

Room: Benson 15  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Milrea, Ileen  
Raiivansky (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
YGD Kapoor	Max = 30	St. Francis Magan	Max = 30
Eish Kapoor	<u>28</u>	Yanika Magan	<u>29</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>AFF</u> from <u>Eish Kapoor</u>		TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME	
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The debate was quite ~~interesting~~ interesting  
 Both AFF & NEG had good cards and  
 evidence. Both spoke well.  
 AFF won the debate because the  
~~res~~ resolve was about U.S. and not ICC,  
 and he could prove that.  
 Some facial expressions and  
 behavior from AFF side could be  
 avoided. He lacked maturity a bit,  
 and lacked respect for time.

Room: Mission C  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Helle, Eric~~  
MARIE VITON

# 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 Gilela	Max = 30	MSJ Nair	Max = 30
Sidharth Gilela	<u>28.5</u>	Pooja Nair	<u>27.8</u>

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

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

Signed: Marie Viton

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: JUDGES NOTES ONLY.  
 AFF Moral Obligation. In process 5th Amendment to Amendment  
 or Philosophy of Rights - Neg. doesn't fill them for cross; massive  
 d. Apples to apples cross first debate. Nervous and understandable  
 4:55 Tim McElroy. ~~discussed~~ discussed. intensity to boy never get into the  
 argument - 1st discussion of domestic terrorism but he's a US citizen so...  
~~Rebuttal (NEG) - nicely argued, although could take more time.~~  
 (4 out of 6 minutes used).

Comments:  
 I've provided verbal comments - overall good work  
 from both AFF + NEG. ~~Both~~ ~~sports~~ AFF's greater  
 experience showed well and provided the stronger  
 evidence and points. NEG made good points  
 but could use more of her time to elaborate  
 on these points and provide even stronger evidence.  
 Best of luck to both.

Room: Mission C  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Helle, Eric~~  
MARK LITTON

# 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

James Logan Omarkhil

Max = 30

Mirwais Omarkhil

28.8

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Sebastian

Max = 30


Jose Sebastian

27.9

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: \_\_\_\_\_



### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF Utilitarianism. (1) Not greatly increases terrorism. (2) divider can attack terrorism. Kenneth Ross quote, Cross El New citizens don't get due process. Security v. fairness. Terrorism should be done in military tribunals/committees. Timing/torture, i.e. torture works. If ~~to~~ one side has no morality why should we ~~not~~ treat her w/ morality?

### Comments:

A good debate, especially for novice level. AFF was especially well spoken and made clear, reasoned arguments with supporting material. I would suggest he could use prep time to his advantage, even if he feels he doesn't need it - something can occur to you during that time. For the Neg, I would like to see more support of his points. ~~as~~ In cross, he ~~did~~ conceded he didn't have evidence of particular points. Using prep to fill that evidence would help. ~~Overall~~, overall, the more persuasive argument was made by the AFF in speaking & evidence. Good luck to both!

Room: Engineering 325  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Cotta, Irene~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

MSJH - 04

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

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

YGD Venkatesh

Max = 30

Nikita Venkatesh

25

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Lu

Max = 30

Anna Lu

28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Nikita and Anna both did a great job debating. Anna was very strong during cross-examination and Nikita was not able to rebut Anna's comment fully.

Nikita was not able strongly argue against Anna's C#1 and C#3 criterion.

Also when contradicted by Anna about Nikita's value is justice being not the right value, Nikita keep reiterating justice without providing enough support.



Room: Mission E  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Mathur, Preety

# 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

Evergreen Sayeed

Max = 30

Sumaiya Sayeed

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Harker Ang

Max = 30

Kai-Siang Ang

26

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

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

Signed: Preety Mathur

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The aff. debater was very organized in her presentation of the case, the rebuttals, and following through the contentions, except the neg's contention 2 about threat to jury — you did not respond to that. Your cross-ex. was great and really threw-off your opponent and your point on changing the status quo was strong. You could not convince me on how your value was more important than the neg's, and we are not working to please the tourists so they are not mad → that is appeasing their ego. So, that did not convince me either. Neg. won his argument there. The neg. was confused about his contentions during cross-ex. and could work on this part more. You read out all your cards as evidence for rebuttals — instead you should just read a small part of it & explain more how it supports your case. Your evidence about torture better than being killed is questionable. You had a good hold on your value throughout & upheld it well.

Room: Mission O  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Chou, Kevin~~  
Bystrom, Todd

# 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 Desai	Max = 30	Palo Alto Zhang	Max = 30
Harshi Desai	<u>26</u>	Hannah Zhang	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Todd Bystrom

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff put together a good case w/ good contentions supporting the V/DC. I think being able to crisply restate these later in the debate would improve your effectiveness.

Neg put together a very solid case, and unless I didn't follow the ARI, Aff did no rebutt any Neg contentions. In all, the neg case was stronger.

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

3

~~Garcia, Dean~~  
SCU

# 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 Ratnagiri

Max = 30

Jananni Ratnagiri

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Gilchrist

Max = 30

Daniel Gilchrist

no show

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

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

Signed: Katie Hosan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

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

3

~~Garcia, Dean~~  
sew

# 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

Evergreen Kadakia

Max = 30

Viraj Kadakia

24

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Diablo Valley Kannappan

Max = 30

Anand Kannappan

28

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

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

Signed: Katie Moran

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff-

• dont just say something, you need to prove it too

Neg-

- good coverage of points
- nice tone

Room: Kennedy A  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Mandracchia, Joe

# 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

Evergreen Maniyar

Max = 30

Sruthi Ramabadran

27

Yash Maniyar

29

The better debating was done by the

NEG  
AFF or NEG

from

YASH MANIYAR  
EVERGREEN MANIYAR  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Lucille Zing*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Yash presented strong reasons for the negative side. He has good presentation style and is well dressed.

Sruthi has done her research in presenting the affirmative statements. She is good in attacking her opponent with questions.

Room: Kennedy A  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Mandracchia, Joe

# 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

**Westmont Gubler**

Max = 30

Shivane Sabharwal

29

Mark Gubler

27

The better debating was done by the

AFF  
AFF or NEG

from

Shivane Sabharwal  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME  
MSJ SABHARWAL

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Lucille Jip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Shivane has very good presentation style. He is good in attacking his opponent. Mark presented good reasons for the negative case.

Room: Kennedy E  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Schwing, Emily

# 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 Suzio	Max = 30	Mountain View Gavra	Max = 30
Isaiah Suzio	<u>28.2</u>	Inbar Gavra	<u>25.5</u>

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I voted for Aff because they were able to examine the Neg's Evidence and pointed out its flaws very well. Their justice as a value really made your case much stronger. You were able to support all your main points and Neg was not able to find many flaws in it.

- NEG needs to try and not assume what is logical without having any facts to back it up. The Neg's Examples & Evidence can be stronger which will help the Neg's case be much stronger. The Neg was able to stick w/ her values but need some more Evidence to back it up.

Room: Kennedy E  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Schwing, Emily

# 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
Milpitas Rehman	Max = 30	Mountain View Khan	Max = 30
Aysha Rehman	<u>27.5</u>	Julia Khan	<u>26.2</u>

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I voted for the Aff because she held up the moral value stronger.  
The Aff was able to keep the definition of morals in line w/ her  
ground. The Neg had a similar value but contradicted herself during  
the debate. The neg did do a good job for the cross examination, but  
~~the~~ the Aff responded very well.

Room: Mission Q  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Kataria, Seema

# 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
<b>MSJ Jangle</b>	Max = 30	<b>Harker Wang</b>	Max = 30
Himaja Jangle	<u>25.9</u>	Timothy Wang	<u>23.1</u>

The better debating was done by the Ag from Himaja Jangle  
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 did not understand the negative presentation, therefore I chose Affirmative.*

Room: Mission Q  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Kataria, Seema

# 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
<b>Olive Children Reddy</b>	Max = 30	<b>Saratoga Desai</b>	Max = 30
Krithi Reddy	<u>25.2</u>	Shrey Desai	<u>28.1</u>

The better debating was done by the neg from Shrey Desai  
AFF OR NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: MA

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The negative side was clear & precise. He delivered his presentation well, He blocked his opponent with great confidence - I voted for the negative.

Room: Mission I  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

DeBettencourt, M

# 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 Shah

Max = 30

Harker Batra

Max = 30

Paras Shah

27

Praveen Batra

28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

For me this debate can be decided upon the issue of the framework. The Neg did a good job of refuting the idea of international law as being used to weigh the arguments. Situations can indeed vary from place to place a time to time. I actually agree with the Aff though, that the neg failed to quantify with examples the actual threat to the U.S. if we were to give suspected terrorists trials. Though, I think the neg did enough on the case to outweigh an framework. Close debate though, good job.

Room: Ben 1c  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

*CHEN, Cheyenne*  
**Shaw, Bryan**  
*St. Francis HS*

# 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 DeLorenzo**

Max = 30

**Westmont Cheng**

Max = 30

Carina DeLorenzo

Joel Cheng

The better debating was done by the NEG from Westmont Cheng  
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:

Room: Ben 1e  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

MARGOT PARKER  
~~Gao, Guilian~~

# 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
<b>Evergreen Vijaapurapu</b>	Max = 30	<b>Bishop O Dowd Carson</b>	Max = 30
Sandhya Vijaapurapu	<u>25.6</u>	Deirdre Carson	<u>25.1</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Evergreen  
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:



Room: Engineering 108  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

1, Leland Judge

# 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 Zaidi

Max = 30

James Logan Xu

Max = 30

Ali Zaidi

Bruce Xu

30

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: Tyler King

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No Show

Room: Engineering 108  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

1, Leland Judge

# 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 Balemurughan

Max = 30

Niveda Balemurughan

30

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Monta Vista Li

Max = 30

Daniel Li

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

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

Signed: Tyler D...

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

No Show

Room: Ben 1a  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Krishna, Shaila

# 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	MSJ Goyal	Max = 30
Michelle Weth	<u>27</u>	Neal Goyal	<u>28</u>

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: \_\_\_\_\_

Signed: 

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: -

- ① good eye contact, loud and methodical presentation
- ② would require more rational ~~and~~ contentions and arguments.

NEG

- ① good offline roadmap and eye contact
- ② excellent arguments and ~~be~~ very rational and effective rebuttal.

Winner - NEG

Room: Ben 1a  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Krishna, Shaila

# 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 Gnanansekhar	Max = 30	Presentation Sharma	Max = 30
Aditi Gnanansekhar	<u>29</u>	Kriti Sharma	<u>27</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Aditi G  
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 :-

- impressive presentation, clear ~~and~~ ~~const~~ contentions with evidences
- energetic and rational arguments as well refute.
- professional demeanor.

NEG :-

- good eye contact, presentation with loud voice
- it would be helpful to have more concere evidences to support logical argument next time.

Winner - AFF

Room: Engineering 105  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Tran, Fei Long  
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

YGD Xu

Max = 30

St Mary's Singh

Max = 30

Justin Xu

24

Anmol Singh

25

The better debating was done by the

~~AFF~~ <sup>NEG</sup>  
AFF or NEG

from

~~JUSTIN XU~~ ANMOL SINGH  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Rajant H*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Good contentions. Did not need to improve defense of his contentions. Argued well against opponent's case. Needs to use ~~time~~ full time given. Speaks well.

NEG: Good contentions. Needs to improve cross ex. - good defense. Argued well against opponent's case.

Room: Engineering 105  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

Tran, Fei Long

# 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 Chan

Max = 30

Karina Chan

26.9

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Kashyap

Max = 30

Jashan Kashyap

27.1

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: Rajant H

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Speaks well, Good arguments, Defended them well. Needs to improve on attacking opponents case.

NEG: Needs to be more clear when speaking. Good arguments and well defended. Good attack on opponents value & value criterion. Needs to

Room: Engineering 107  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Kannan, Shanti

# 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 Katrina LE

Max = 30

Katrina LE

27

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Bishop O Dowd Medhanie

Max = 30

Makda Medhanie

28

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

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

Signed: Shanti

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~When~~ During cross-ex, don't look at your opponent. Look at the judges.  
AFF For novices, both candidates did decently.  
NEG did win the round because she defended her case better (not much rebuttal) and also refuted AFF's case.  
AFF's CI stands but she did not stress it forcefully enough in 1AR & 2AR.

Room: Mission K  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Park, Sarah

# 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 Gupta	Max = 30	YGD Dattatreya	Max = 30
Rishi Gupta	<u>28</u>	Rahul Dattatreya	<u>29</u>

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: Sarah Park

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rishi

- Good points.
- value - saving the most amount of lives
- quality of justice

Rahul

- Great cross examiner
- Interesting points.
- value - national security
- passionate debater
- At times generalize too much

overall good debate.

Room: Kennedy C  
Flight B: Start 7:45  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Aggarwal, Bereni~~

SHAW, BRYAN 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

Evergreen Cochinwala

Max = 30

Nadia Cochinwala

29.0

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

St Mary's Carlson

Max = 30

Cort Carlson

28.7

The better debating was done by the

AFF  
AFF or NEG

from

NADIA COCHINWALA  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

BSHAW

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Style - excellent - gestures/modulation/eye contact superb.  
Constructs were organized, logical & clearly followed.  
Using your rebuttal on SIRA was strong. Would be stronger if linked to public trial.

Neg: Weakest part of argument was WR. You were actually winning in my mind until then. You had strong statement in your contentions w/ McVeigh & "Justice delayed is Justice denied" statements.  
Good argument about new evidence introduction during rebuttal but she made the case to include it.  
Great cross examination of opponent! You were listening & taking good notes.  
Presentation style was excellent.

Room: Kennedy C  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

Aggarwal, Bereni

# 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 Shankar	Max = 30	MSJ Asokan	Max = 30
Sahiti Shankar	<u>28.8</u>	Anu Asokan	<u>29.0</u>
The better debating was done by the <u>NEG</u> from <u>ANU ASOKAN</u>			
Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____			
Signed: <u>[Signature]</u>			

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Really well done! Very close & hard to decide.

Aff: Style - Really good presentation - voice modulation, gestures, passion etc were excellent.

Well organized & smooth transition for contentions. Good definitions & thorough.

Best IAR I have heard today. Strong Link of contentions back to values.

Cross exam wasn't strong - demonstrated listening skills.

What hung you up was the unsupported evidence of 6/7 terrorism cases. Redflag for me since there was no cite & it contradicted what I heard before.

Neg: Strong, varied evidence carried the debate for you. "It is a breach of Justice if a responsible party is not punished!" Strong Link to Value.

Questioning the 6/7 evidence was vital to your case.

A

Ben 1c

Bishop Ordóñez

Palo Alto Mercur

23

~~New~~

28.5

~~Substantive~~

- Appalling lack of organization, to the detriment of simple substitution

- Outstanding familiarity with case material
- Outstanding articulation

Room: Nobli A  
Flight A: Start 7:00  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

3

~~Sania Baqai~~  
Mackinnon, Jesse

# 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
<b>Palo Alto Cai</b>	Max = 30	<b>Evergreen Husain</b>	Max = 30
Tiffany Cai	<u>25</u>	Ammar Husain	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the Neg from Evergreen  
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 proved that terrorism was itself an act that deprived people of rights.  
 Aff ~~was~~ didn't show that lack of due process would be a greater deprivation of rights.  
 Aff was clear and well organized, but needed more energy.  
 Aff's first contention was very well put, but not tied effectively enough to their value.  
 Aff's soft power ~~was~~ examples should have been emphasized earlier in the round.  
 Neg lost some energy during their rebuttal

CASAB

RA & Novice  
LA ~~IB~~

Ryan Shulrick

Neg

~~Edward Smith~~

Douglas Striplin

29.5

Aff

~~Edward Striplin~~

MSJ Strick

28.2

Winner: Neg from Douglas

Both sides did a great job in terms of clarity and made solid contentions, rebuttals, and crosses. However, the "Safety is needed to achieve justice" was a strong case that the Aff fell just short of being able to rebut.

X ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

Room: Mission N  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Chow, Stephen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Evergreen Maniyar	Max = 30	Evergreen Joshi	Max = 30
Yash Maniyar	<u>26</u>	Rahul Joshi	<u>25</u>

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

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

Signed: B. H.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Content & research equal  
creativity in case equal  
debating & speech  
Yash little eye contact, Rahul better  
Yash smoother in rebuttal. Rahul too many  
pauses and less of thought

Room: Mission N  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Chow, Stephen

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Leland Huang</b>	Max = 30	<b>YGD Gnanansekhar</b>	Max = 30
Sonya Huang	<u>30</u>	Aditi Gnanansekhar	<u>29</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both excellent

Sonya  
 excellent delivery, intonation, gesturing  
 excellent cross examination  
 Aggressive in driving case home  
 cited cases that made opponent stumble a bit  
 excellent performance for novice debater

Aditi  
 excellent intonation & gesturing, Read too much  
 of ~~from~~ beginning from paper. Better at ad lib.  
 excellent cross examination

Room: Mission J  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Alamzai, Mujda

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Harker Batra**

Max = 30

**YGD Xu**

Max = 30

Praveen Batra

N/A

Justin Xu

N/A

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: N/A

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

JUSTIN XU DID NOT SHOW UP FOR THE DEBATE

Room: Mission J  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Alamzai, Mujda

St /

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

St Mary's Singh

Max = 30

Palo Alto Cai

Max = 30

Anmol Singh

29

Tiffany Cai

25

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: YES

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The winner refuted opponent's arguments <sup>more</sup> reflectively. The loser provided ~~new~~ new useful information <sup>data</sup> to support his argument but that was provided in the last round of AFF" to have to be ignored per the rules.

Host: Sobrato B-C  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

A. J. Eiserloh, Harker  
~~Kinojisa, Justin~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Westmont Gubler</b>	Max = 30	<b>YGD Ramabadran</b>	Max = 30
Mark Gubler	<u>25.2</u>	Sruthi Ramabadran	<u>24.1</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: value: equality  
criteria: humanitarian

1) slows war on terror

ought is defined in webster as  
as a moral obligation  
what?

5 convictions in past year

3) closing Guantanamo bay will benefit  
everyone → save money

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

I still was not sure what  
all of your 3 contentions  
were but you spoke ~~clearer~~  
clearer and you were more confident

value = safety @ value criterion = law + order

law + order first to achieve  
safety - not exactly

2) trials cost money

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

You should've spoken more loudly,  
I couldn't really hear you

You were not that confident in  
your speaking ability

Room: Mission Q  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Nguyen, Joseph  
BONNY HUSAIN

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Evergreen Husain

Max = 30

YGD Venkatesh

Max = 30

Ammar Husain

27.3

Nikita Venkatesh

26

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- A:
1. Constitutional right is the fundamental to all people.
  2. humanity is key to all human being.
  3. humiliating is not a way to treat human being.
  4. speak not rudely.
  5. narrative than evidence.

- N:
1. Safety Security. they are not the reason to violate the constitution.
  2. Court not effective.
  3. not convincingly to present her case.
  4. lack of evidence.
  5. reasoning not clearly and convincingly.
  6. presented a very weak argument.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
St Francis Magan	Max = 30	Olive Children Reddy	Max = 30
Yanika Magan	30.	Krithi Reddy	29.5

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- A.
- 1) max human right.
  - 2) us's bad parts. / need a subcl process to keep human right.
  - 3) not reduce the terrorists
  - 4) emotionally and firmly presented her case.
  - 5) spoke fluently.
- both are young bright girls !!
- B.
- 1) if other country dont give American citizen the due right?
  - 2) security most important. US government is only obligation to its citizen.
  - 3) Govt's trial may disclose the info important to the security.
  - 4) terrorist doesnot deserve the US's constitutional right.
  - 5) spoke fluently and firmly.

Room: Sobrato B-A  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

~~Mathur, Preety~~  
DHAR, SANJAY

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

### Mountain View Khan

Max = 30

### MSJ Desai

Max = 30

Julia Khan

29

Harshi Desai

26.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from Mountain View/LA High  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sanjay Dhar

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Julia

- Better delivery, good eye contact
- Stronger contentions
- Stronger rebuttals
- Overall Better Prepared

Desai

- The rebuttal arguments were weak & lacked evidence
- Delivery needs to be improved, perhaps more preparation needed
- No/ <sup>little</sup> eye contact

Room: Sobrato B-A  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Mathur, Preety

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Harker Wang**

Max = 30

**Bishop O'Dowd Ordonez**

Max = 30

Timothy Wang

26

Aldo Ordonez

29.5

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Sanjay Dhan

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both of the debaters were quite good on their own rights. Wang was good considering he is only a 6th grader. Obviously maturity in thought, delivery, argument strength were bit weak considering the opponent. Aldo was much stronger in his rebuttals, made clear points, eye contact, showed high confidence. Little bit better preparation would help Aldo make his points with conviction.

Room: Mission R  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Lim, Wee-Lee

PF

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Xu

Max = 30

Milpitas Rehman

Max = 30

Bruce Xu

✓ 27.5

Aysha Rehman

27.9

The better debating was done by the NEG from MILPITAS AYSHA REHMAN  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

9:24 → AFF BEGIN

[ AFF began with human rights for Accused Terrorists

9:30 → AFF END.

9:34 → CROSS ENDS.

9:37 → Begin PRO

- Civilian Court bias.  
- Zero-Sum

9:43 : XAE

9:48 : AFF rebuttal :

[ Guantanamo Bay.

9:52 :

9:56 :

Please turn over

Room: Mission L  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Cotta, Irene

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012


Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Mountain View Gavra	Max = 30	James Logan Omarkhil	Max = 30
Inbar Gavra	<u>28</u>	Mirwais Omarkhil	<u>28</u>

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: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both AFF and NEG did a good job developing their cases. AFF well established her V and value criteria. ~~The~~ AFF arguments were well supported. NEG did not argue against all of AFF's assertions and conceded.

Need to stop debate on time.

Sobrato C-B  
A: Start 8:00am  
Voice Lincoln Douglas

4

Zhang, Xuemei

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Presentation Sharma**

Max = 30

**Monta Vista Zaidi**

Max = 30

Kriti Sharma

25

Ali Zaidi

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

win by default.  
No show by opponent  
Good presentation

Room: Sobrato C-B  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Zhang, Xuemei

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Sebastian

Max = 30

Evergreen Sayeed

Max = 30

Jose Sebastian

25

Sumaiya Sayeed

27

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: TAG US support Resolution 4-6-8

Affirm - Emph. Basic Cons. Ryhtz

Neg - Am. 5, 14 Good Counterpoint

---

Affirm JUSTICE VS MORALITY ?  
USING the constitution to support Argument.  
Rebottal that Mil. courts are inherently biased.

---

Neg Due process - weak sentences  
Point A - Military commissions are diligent.  
Sens. Fols - protected

---

Affirm - many good counterpoints  
bad



Room: Mission O  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Batra, Pragma

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**MSJ Nair**

Max = 30

**Leland Gupta**

Max = 30

Pooja Nair

\_\_\_\_\_

Rishi Gupta

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

Signed: A. Wheeler

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative forfeited — No show as at 8:20 a.m

Room: Mission O  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Batra, Pragma

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**MSJ Goyal**

Max = 30

**Palo Alto DeLorenzo**

Max = 30

Neal Goyal

24

Carina DeLorenzo

26

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: A. Weebee

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Aff. should speak a little slower & more clearly.

On balance, the negative made a clearer case of setting up the context & agent of the resolution and establishing that within this context, the U.S. government ought not to provide the same constitutional due process to everyone.

The affirmative needed to show why unequal due process itself would be immoral. He cites evidence that US violated various codes & conventions which may be unlawful but not necessarily immoral. He needed to show the link between the inhumane treatment and the type of due process more clearly. Also, analytical warrants are valid, not only empirical warrants.

Neither side presented a clear case of the impact of their position.

I would encourage both sides to develop this part of their presentations further.

Room: Mission I  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Flight A: Start 3:00am

4

~~Aggarwal, Bereni~~  
Meyyappan, Uma  
(MSJHS)

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL


11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Bishop O Dowd Medhanie	Max = 30	James Logan Johal	Max = 30
Makda Medhanie	<u>26</u>	Simran Johal	<u>26</u>

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bishop O Dowd Medhanie  
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 - Great speaker  
Clear contentions. could do little better in direct refutations. Liked the way of reiterating the definition of duo process. with little more work and practice she can be a great debater.

Neg - Started off really well. Very confident.  
She needs to build of refutation skills. Great questions of cross x. But just need to learn to tie it together.

Room: Mission I  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Aggarwal, Bereni

(Meyyappan, Uma) MSSHS.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

James Logan Kashyap

Max = 30

Palo Alto Liu

Max = 30

Jashan Kashyap

27

Claire Liu

28

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both are great debaters for a Novice level.

1: Sobrato C-A  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Yao, Sharon

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Monta Vista Li**

Max = 30

**Evergreen Hernando**

Max = 30

Daniel Li

Jonas Hernando

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*[Handwritten Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Daniel Li did not show.*

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
<b>Bishop O'Dowd Hurtado</b>	Max = 30	<b>YGD Shankar</b>	Max = 30
Sebastian Hurtado	<u>28</u>	Sahiti Shankar	<u>27</u>

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

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

Signed: [Handwritten Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff. value: quality of life  
 criterion: maximize fair treatment  
 c1 - wrongly detain accused lack of habeas corpus  
 c2 - reduce international corporation  
 c3 - abuse detainee increase terrorist activity

Neg. value: safety and security  
 criterion: utilitarian  
 c1 - convention court system does not work  
 c2 - due process need to be defined for terrorist.

Aff. point out that abuse and torture did exist in Guantanamo Bay, and promote terrorist's quality will decrease terrorist's activity.

Neg successful state that improve citizen's quality of life is more important than terrorists'. Citizen pays taxes, terrorist destroy our economy.

Neg state current military tribunal has given proper due process to terrorist, and there is no need to use torture.

It is not clear to me Neg side believe there is no torture in Guantanamo Bay or not. Not clear to me that ~~current~~ military tribunal has given the same due process ~~to~~ to the terrorists as to ~~the~~ us citizens.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

James Logan Suresh

Max = 30

Olive Children Bisen

Max = 30

Deepthrisri Suresh

29

Jay Bisen

28.5

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

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~9:16~~ OR

I voted AFF for constructing and defending her position against a well-argued case by NEG.

9:16

NEG: wants to establish value as National Supremacy and rights of US citizens. Defended against external threats.

~~NEG~~: Linking linked back to ~~more~~ value of protecting citizen rights & National Security.

AFF: spoke for human rights as the value prop and how military courts may not value human rights as well as civilian courts.

Room: Mission K  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Schletzbaum, Cha  
UDEY CHAUDHRY

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Ang	Max=30	MSJ Sabharwal	Max=30
Kai-Siang Ang	<u>27.1</u>	Shivane Sabharwal	<u>28.0</u>

The better debating was done by the NEG from NEGATIVE (SHIVANE SABHARWAL)  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Udey Chaudhry

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Ang presented cogent arguments, however, did not support his arguments with evidences ~~given~~.

I support ~~to~~ <sup>team's</sup> NEGATE the resolution, the arguments presented by Shivane were convincing and supported by evidences.

Shivane made cogent arguments as to how detaining non-citizens in prisons such as Guantanamo Bay / Abu Garib can help protect US ~~citizens~~ and thus ensure National security.

The linkage between National Security & morality made by Ang was not very strong. However, Shivane made (cited evidences) excellent linkage between our current policies & those help in safeguarding our National Security.

Room: Mission K  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Schletzbaum, Cha  
CHAUDHRY, UDEY

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Palo Alto Zhang

Max = 30

YGD Miguel

Max = 30

Hannah Zhang

28

Eylene Miguel

27.5

The better debating was done by the AFF from PALO ALTO (ZHANG)  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Udey Chaudhry

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

This was an excellent debate. Both sides had good arguments to support their case.

I felt that Affirmative presented a slightly stronger case. The argument about using 'softer power' over 'hard power' AND US moral obligation to protect both citizens & non-citizens (as they live with US territorial land) were the key arguments for the Affirmative team.

The Negative team made some good arguments as to why we need to extend the same due process to the 'non-citizens'. However, the differentiation between Legal vs illegal was diffused w/ citizen & non-citizen status.

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Palo Alto Lu

Max = 30

YGD Ratnagiri

Max = 30

Anna Lu

28.00

Jananni Ratnagiri

27.5

The better debating was done by the Anna Lu from Palo Alto  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Harvey He

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

<p>Anna Lu:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient evidents <sup>example</sup> good preparation.</li> <li>• good speaking</li> <li>• little bit nervous.</li> <li>• good eye contact</li> </ul> <p>40%</p>	<p>85%</p>	<p>Jananni:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being able to detect weakness points.</li> <li>• Voice is a little weak when questioning</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detailed questioning →</li> <li>* with confidents.</li> <li>* with logic reasoning →</li> </ul> <p>40%</p>	<p>85%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nice contents / Writing during presentation</li> <li>• leak of eye contacts during presentation.</li> <li>• good / fair <del>presentation</del> argumenting skill</li> <li>• clear defensive skill. →</li> </ul>
<p>85%</p> <p>① ② ③          100% 50% 100%          own points.</p> <p>less fluent when summarizing opponent attack skill ↓</p>	<p>90%</p>	<p>convincive answering presentation good on own point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good defensive skill. ↑</li> <li>• Her voice is getting strong in these part</li> </ul>

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Palo Alto Marur

Max = 30

MSJ Jangle

Max = 30

Anant Marur

26.00

Himaja Jangle

28.00

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

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

Signed: Henryan He

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Anant

Himaja Jangle

80% {  
 • nice speaking 80% & touching eye  
 • good eye contact  
 • nice writing  
 • good answering, but not firm enough

90% {  
 • strong arguments  
 • dominant, on questioning  
 • doesn't give time for opponent to interrupt } for answer.

attacking: start.  
 80% • good questioning (starts)  
 • too nice / give opponent battle field → should take the opportunity → keep on

90% {  
 presentation:  
 • good presentation "loud voice"  
 • good eye contact  
 • good writing, sufficient support material  
 attacking: gripping targets/walking points accurate  
 ①. ②. - convincing ③  
 right on time. ← good time management  
 defensive: good

100% {  
 • defending own, "what if"  
 Reasonable → making good answer point, good argument  
 attacking ← good argument

85% {  
 depending: miss one point from opponent  
 find good targets.  
 If focus on a few issues increasing strength would be better

• convincing  
 • reasonable.

→ see back

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
Harker Ramachandran	Max = 30	Evergreen Gilela	Max = 30
Neelesh Ramachandran	<u>28</u>	Sidharth Gilela	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: J. Nuthukrishnan (NUTHUKRISHNAN, RAMALINGAM)

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFG: Ramachandran took right times, He did good cross examiners, His points good & there is no evidence.

NEG: Gilela took extra 30 - 50 sec extra, thank he explained very well with evidence. Points are valid.

Good debate

Room: Casa Commons C  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Schletzbaum, Jam

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

### AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Cheng

Max = 30

Evergreen Cochinwala

Max = 30

Joel Cheng

24

Nadia Cochinwala

28

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

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

Signed: R. Puthukrishnan (MUTHUKRISHNAN, RAMAKRISHNAN)

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both are finished their presentation on time.  
NEG: Cross examination questions are good, and she explained in detail of answer with her opponent answers. she brought lot of evidences. she spoke very good.

Good Debate

Room: Casa Commons D  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Roza, Diane

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**MSJ Asokan**

Max = 30

**Westmont Green**

Max = 30

Anu Asokan

28

Austin Green

27

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:

[Signature]  
All met. ~~Just to score.~~  
[Signature]

Room: Casa Commons A  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Zhang, Yiru

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

AFFIRMATIVE	POINTS	NEGATIVE	POINTS
YGD Dattatreya	Max = 30	Evergreen Suzio	Max = 30
Rahul Dattatreya	<u>29</u>	Isaiah Suzio	<u>27.5</u>

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

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

Signed: P. C. Sakher

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The Aff arguments included specific examples on why Current process ~~is~~ has not reduced terrorism, wrongly put innocent civilians in jails (only 3/5000 actually charged were convicted), how it violates fundamental rights, and <sup>how it</sup> has been very expensive. The Aff has been able to refute all cross examination questions with credible data/answers.

The negg focused on national security but was not able to crisply relate to the topic. The negg focussed on drone strikes and military activities but again could not tie this to the topic in discussion.

Room: Sobrato B-B  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Mabie, Ben  
SHAW, BRYAN

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Groetsina

Max = 30

Evergreen Vijaapurapu

Max = 30

Arianna Groetsina

28.8

Sandhya Vijaapurapu

28.6

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

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

Signed: B. Shaw

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Will done } very close!*  
*AFF: Style - Good gestures, eye contact voice modulation.*  
*Contentions - well supported w/ evidence cites.*  
*Logically stated } well organized. I could follow.*  
*Circled back in IAR for closing "impact" on contentions.*  
*Well done.*

*Neg: Style - Good speaking voice } clear. Spoke into paper rather than to Judge. No eye contact.*  
*INR was weak } cost you the debate.*  
*You were leading w/ strong points on impact in INC.*  
*Got caught on SCOTUS remark by AFF.*

Room: Sobrato B-B  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Mabie, Ben  
SHAW, BRYAN

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

## AFFIRMATIVE

POINTS

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

Westmont Gilchrist

Max = 30

Evergreen Deglurkar

Max = 30

Daniel Gilchrist

28.9

Sampada Deglurkar

28.4

The better debating was done by the Aff from Daniel Gilchrist  
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:

Well done!

Aff: Strong presentation style - good eye contact, voice modulation, gestures, etc.

Cites strong  
IAR was strong

Neg: Great presentation style!

Very good cross examination. You were listening & taking good notes.

Didn't rebut Bias in Mil. Tribunals. Important to understand all aspects of appeals process & safeguards in place for Tribunals. You only mentioned 4.

Room: Mission H  
Flight A: Start 8:00am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

*Hemant Koppal*  
~~Milrea, Ileen~~

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

Saratoga Desai

Max = 30

YGD Balemurughan

Max = 30

Shrey Desai

*28*

Niveda Balemurughan

*28*

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

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

Signed: *A.S. Koppal*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Shrey Desai was very good.  
Equal to Niveda  
- but was a bit too low.*

Room: Mission H  
Flight B: Start 8:45am  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

4

Milrea, Heen

Hemant Kirpeta

# SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

Please begin Flight B IMMEDIATELY following the first debate. You may give half points, but not tenths.

**AFFIRMATIVE**

POINTS

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Diablo Valley Kannappan**

Max = 30

**Palo Alto Chan**

Max = 30

Anand Kannappan

29

Karina Chan

28

The better debating was done by the

Aff  
AFF or NEG

from

Diablo Valley  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

H. S. Kirpeta

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Karina made good points but her speech was too fast. ~~I~~ i.e. she spoke too quickly. She needs to slow down while speaking.

Both speakers made excellent points.