



Room: Mission I  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

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

Evergreen Deglurkar

Max = 30

Harker Wang

Max = 30

Sampada Deglurkar

26.8

Timothy Wang

26.7

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

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

Signed: Wang

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

Affirmative  
Deglurkar

clear definitions. Have good quotes  
proved examples  
Two categories:  
Clear good presentation. Clear answers  
good frust.  
Frame work

The affirmative has better analysis and stronger supporting  
points

Negative  
Wang

ask good questions  
good and clear definition, having good quotes.  
better prepared

The negative is good, but need better arguments

Room: Mission K  
 Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
 Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

WADHERA, NISHI  
~~Helle, Eric~~  
 MSJ-LD-05

# 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 Gnanansekhar	Max = 30	Evergreen Husain	Max = 30
Aditi Gnanansekhar	<u>29</u>	Ammar Husain	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Wadhera

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Justice - law & order - ~~terror~~ due process; terrorist & freedom fighter (hostile; military courts not good)  
 Morality - Min terrorism - rights → morality → terrorism not moral  
 Soft Power  
 (2) federal trial - leakage - with 10 days later was aware  
 Society vs few accused citizens | Soft Power (B)  
 (A) Startup people just how moral - Morality abt indiv rights (Yes Aff Neg)  
 (1) Radicalizer & Recruitment argument - evidence - invalidated (off)  
 Min terrorism → end state - consequentialism (most am of morality)  
 (3) More attacks → Partner to more attacks as well. federal courts good today  
 (A) Utilitarian not always true.  
 (B) Soft Power good - on both VC.  
 (A) VC - valid - not linking - Morality - end-states - benefits - utilitarian  
 vs. indiv rights. One person arrested, providing terror punishment  
 just for overall benefit.  
 (1) Due Process - negative - recruit terrorism (but does not touch upon AFF's contention on it being invalid as other areas have the same issue.  
 (2) Conventional - leak - same evid. - federal courts good (SAME)  
 (3) Soft Power  
 Indiv rights - Soft Power - Partnership small benefit. Due Process - Morality  
 Moral & Just - Rights - Not terrorist in their country. Soft Power key role  
 Moral & Justice close. Accused - Think they

# 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 Balemurughan

Max = 30

Anna Lu

28

Niveda Balemurughan

29

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

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

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

*Wadhwa*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

<p>Morality - Maximizing Human Rights to life</p> <p>1) Non Citizens aggravated</p> <p>2) promote soft power</p> <p>3) Due Process so that never suspended</p> <p>4) Due Process - info</p> <p>A) War on US not applicable for due process</p> <p>B) Public Safety endangered if tried in courts</p> <p>VC Do not deserve rights. Better way is to have justice in military. Due Process for terrorist; greatest amt of good vs innocent civilians. Minimizing terrorism -&gt; greatest amt of good is value directly links to the resolution. It is not an assumption. Value of morality &amp; due process stated in the case - yes. Incorrect that neg conceded.</p> <p>Methodical &amp; complete arguments - NEG</p>	<p>Utilitarianism - Majority people away from harm</p> <p>no evidence</p> <p>All accused terrorist are actual terrorist - not moral</p> <p>WWII rights away from citizens (sacrifice)</p> <p>trial harms security keep us safe</p> <p>70% of innocents not high declared war threat to public safety 5th amendment</p> <p>terrorist trial in courts unsafe, G &amp; B constructed specifically for it</p>	<p>Trial in military tribunal</p> <p>At war, precautionary actions due process so info.</p> <p>out of time</p> <p>Incorrect that neg not responded.</p>
---	---	---

Room: Casa Commons C  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Bhateja, Rajiv

# 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 Gubler**

Max = 30

**Olive Children Reddy**

Max = 30

Mark Gubler

24

Krithi Reddy

26

The better debating was done by the

Neg  
AFF or NEG

from

~~Westmont~~ Olive children  
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

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

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: Give economic reason for protect citizens.

Neg: Security. well prepared speech.

Aff: treat equal will reduce terrorist.

Neg: More organized speech. catch the key point.

Aff: world peace. is more important. expect terrorist change

I vote for Neg because she uses better evidence

You can not wish for terrorist to change.

Room: Casa Commons C  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Bhateja, Rajiv

# 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

Leland Huang

Max = 30

Palo Alto Liu

Max = 30

Sonya Huang

29.5

Claire Liu

29

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:

Aff: Give clear and reasoning speech. did a lot of research. lot off reference. Give very good reasoning.

Neg: value: satty.  
good and organized speech

Aff: > 90% in G Bay is not terrorist.

Neg: protect citizen. good reasoning. good debator.  
Both of them are very good. hard to say who is better.

Super job for both of you!!!

Room: Sobrato B-D  
 Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
 Novice Lincoln Douglas

5 HARKER PACHAURI, KUSH  
 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
YGD Katrina LE	Max = 30
Katrina LE	<u>27.5</u>

NEGATIVE	POINTS
MSJ Desai	Max = 30
Harshi Desai	<u>28</u>

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

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

Signed: Kush Pachauri - KUSH PACHAURI  
HARKER SCHOOL

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: I voted AFF for the following reasons.  
 ① The AFF debater had listed more reasons with better support for each reason.  
 ② The reasons included equality, + 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> + 14<sup>th</sup> amendments.  
 The NEG debater had better skills but had not provided good reasons to negate the case. The rebuttals by the NEG debater were also better. Hence, the higher points

**AFFIRMATIVE**  
 Defined the terms Citizen, Due-process, Justice + Equality.  
 ① Giving due-process to all is beneficial to everyone.  
 ② We want to get the same treatment from others.  
 ③ Torture hinders the reputation of US.  
 ④ Due process denial destroys US image and is morally de-based.  
 ⑤ It violates the right of nations.  
 ⑥ 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments. quotes right to speedy trial.  
 Value - Justice  
 Value-Criterion: - Equality

**NEGATIVE**  
 Value: Utilitarianism.  
 Value Criterion: - Minimize terrorist threats.  
 ① Terrorism is slowing down. US is winning the war-on-terror.  
 ② Drones have had a big effect and have killed several terrorists like Bin Laden who is symbolic of Jihad against the US.  
 ③ Giving due-process and legal privileges will slow down justice.  
 ④ These are highly-suspected terrorists and the right-to-life does not extend to them.

Room: Sobrato B-A  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Mitrea, Heen~~  
Jamil Chan ~~SA~~ paly

# 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 Carlson	Max = 30	YGD Xu	Max = 30
Cort Carlson	_____	Justin Xu	_____

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: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

*Neg Never showed up.*

# 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**

Evergreen Maniyar

Yash Maniyar

POINTS

Max = 30

23

**NEGATIVE**

St Francis Magan

Yanika Magan

POINTS

Max = 30

23

The better debating was done by the NEG from St. Francis.  
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. - Started well. Could focus more being direct.  
In the rebuttals dropped two contentions.  
Could be little better and be confident.

Neg:

Contentions were to the point. Good analysis on the flow of the debate.  
Should focus more on tying all the pieces together. Has a great scope to improve.  
She won only because both of them are equal learners.

Room: Mission R  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

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

James Logan Xu

Max = 30

Mountain View Khan

Max = 30

Bruce Xu

26

Julia Khan

30

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

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

Signed: *[Signature]*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Winner had better justification for value & value criterion & very effectively refuted opponent's value & criterion including contentions.

Room: Mission R  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

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

Mountain View Gavra

Max = 30

James Logan Johal

Max = 30

Inbar Gavra

27


Simran Johal

28

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

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

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



COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Winner justified value, criterion & contentions better than her opponent.

Room: Sobrato C-A  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Aggarwal, Bereni

# 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 Carson

Max = 30

Evergreen Gilela

Max = 30

Deirdre Carson

29.5

Sidharth Gilela

29

1/02

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: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

generally reading cards in ~~the~~ is a bad idea.

ORAL

Room: Mission P  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Batra, Pragya~~

Schwiny, Emily

# 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 Green

Max = 30

Evergreen Sayeed

Max = 30

Austin Green

26.5

Sumaiya Sayeed

25.5

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: \_\_\_\_\_



### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- I vote for AFF for this debate. The AFF was able to hold up his argument better than the NEG, especially w/ the value & VC. Both sides should work on providing stronger evidence to back up their side. AFF's contentions seemed to flow better while the NEG were a little disorganized.

- The Neg brought up soft power but did not expand much on it as the AFF was able to point out the weakness.

Room: Mission P  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Batra, Pragma~~  
Schwing / Emily

# 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 Wang

Max = 30

James Logan Suresh

Max = 30

Stanley Wang

28.5

Deepthrisri Suresh

26.7

The better debating was done by the AFF from Stanley Wang  
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 vote for the AFF

The Aff has supported his values and value criterion very well through the whole debate. He has also attacked the NEG's values & value criterion and was able to show the weakness that were present in it. Work on not connect military tributes w/ due process. It makes you have a weaker case through the way you presented it.

The neg needs to understand and stick with a consistent definition of human rights. The neg flip-flopped on this definition, which made the case weak. If you are going to us targeted killing make sure it fits in ~~well~~ well with the purpose of the speech. When using sound contrasts ~~use~~ use some more examples to make it stronger.



Room: Casa Commons D  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

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

**Douglas Striplin**

Max = 30

**MSJ Sabharwal**

Max = 30

James Striplin

28.5

Shivane Sabharwal

29

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

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

Signed: Sharon Yao

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: well prepared. ~~in~~  
good ~~speech~~ ~~speech~~  
good arguments.

Neg: good speaking  
very good argument  
very good rebuttal

Work on: ~~Impressional~~  
to use voice  
Try to avoid argument of  
racism, ~~racism~~  
During rebuttal, try to give  
more ~~the~~ evidence to rebuttal opponent  
arguments

~~MSJ~~ Do I vote for NEG because he convinced me  
that national security is threatened if using conventional  
trial for terrorists.

Room: Casa Commons D  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Yao, Sharon

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

Olive Children Bisen

Max = 30

Anmol Singh

28

Jay Bisen

27

The better debating was done by the AFF from St Mary's Singh  
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: Sharon Yao

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: good speech  
good arguments  
good questions

Neg: good speech  
well prepared  
good arguments

work on:  
slow down a little  
since you have <sup>more</sup> ~~lot~~ of  
than 1 min for your speech

work on:  
rebuttal  
ask more questions

I vote for AFF because he convinced me that basic human rights is also important to non-citizens. And the <sup>percentage of</sup> ~~number~~ of terrorists is lower among the detained prisoners.

Room: Casa Commons B  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

Hinojisa, Justin

HO, KEVIN  
Evergreen  
Valley  
High  
San Jose

# 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

Diablo Valley Kannappan

Max = 30

Anand Kannappan

28

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Asokan

Max = 30

Anu Asokan

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: [Signature]

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Speaking firmly and confident  
Response to argument  
Responds with good evidence  
Crossfire with strong arguments

Speaking firmly and confident  
May need to work on eye contact  
Research has done very well  
Response - Quick response and organized. Contention did bring very good points  
May need to work on eye contact during debates

Anand. were very well prepared and gave very good response with good evidence during crossfire. Anu. also was very very confident and arguments on terrorism were very positive.

Both sides were very close on debating with good attention and good evidence. Anu might be slightly needing more confidence during crossfire with firm eye contact. It was a very close call.

# 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

**Palo Alto DeLorenzo**

Max = 30

Makda Medhanie

27

Carina DeLorenzo

26.5

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

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

Signed: M. Litton

**COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:**

AFF: Morality = value. Value. Human rights core to society. Suicide/Gitmo. Lack of rights leads to loss of rights = 2C - will to deny rights/slippery slope. Thin rights universal. From Bill of rights argument. - THINKING may RIGHT CREATES PERSONALITY. Threaten own security. NEG. Political morality vs morality. Protecting inalienable rights of US citizens. For citizens. Mistake could be made to push into. More citizens have not entered social contracts. Point out slippery slope argument (countered?) It's never a terrorism it is. Gas. centric on defining terms of morality - the debate

Comments: AFF in opening remarks - speech - needs to engage judge/audience more directly. Mostly readily notes and not looking up enough. Persuade w/ tone as well as words. NEG in remarks. Fighting difficult room lots of distracting noise. Because of these distractions, more concentration or focus are required. up are doing a good job of maintaining focus.

AFF - Make some good general points in response to NEG; would like to see even more specific support of points - esp. regarding the slippery slope argument.

Ultimately, this debate was settled in the rebuttals. The AFF assertion that his argument was built on a Supreme Court case remained persuasive despite a contention that did appear to be built on a slippery slope and was even referred to as a slippery slope by the AFF (avoid logical fallacy terms when it comes to your own argument). NEG rightly pointed this problem out but other points by AFF remained strong. A good debate for both under difficult room conditions.

Room: Sobrato B-B  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

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

Presentation Sharma

Max = 30

MSJ Shah

Max = 30

Kriti Sharma

26.5

Paras Shah

28

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

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

Signed: Mark Lisk

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~AFF~~

AFF + NEG. Taking into consideration that this is a first debate experience, both AFF + NEG performed well. Regarding speaking - Negative was self-assured, to the point, AFF had a little more trouble - occasionally stumbling with the points & words. As far as the debate points themselves - both sides argued well - but the stronger case appeared to be made on behalf of the NEG side. The Q&A material & notebook examples were effective. ~~But~~ On the AFF side, the argument that expanding rights to non-citizens would help prevent further negativity was also good. In the end, though, a combination of clear speaking and number of points for the NEG won the arguments. Good luck to both participants!

Room: Mission L  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Zhang, Xuemei~~  
Gao, Guilian

# 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

Leland Weth

Max = 30

Michelle Weth

26.5

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

YGD Shankar

Max = 30

Sahiti Shankar

27

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

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

Signed: Ali Creed

## COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Michelle used torture as her main argument for the need of dual process but failed to provide any evidence during cross examination.

Sahiti ~~also~~ used arguments that dual process in conventional court can cause leak of sensitive information and military tribunal does not take away defendant's right, Michelle did not address either ~~the~~ adequately in her rebuttal.

Sahiti also makes better eye contact and better speech.

Room: Mission L  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Zhang, Xuemei~~  
Gao, Guilian

# 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

James Logan Omarkhil

Max = 30

Mirwais Omarkhil

27.5

## NEGATIVE

POINTS

MSJ Agrawal

Max = 30

Ruchika Agrawal

27.0

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: Ali Gao

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Mirwais was successful in tearing down neg's case by:

- 1). pointed out that the main argument used by the neg's that 9/11 attack was direct result of information spread in open court trial.
- 2). dispute track record of military tribunal in terrorist cases -

Mirwais was also successful in providing evidence to support effectiveness of dual process.

# 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

YGD Ratnagiri

Max = 30

Jananni Ratnagiri

28

### NEGATIVE

POINTS

Palo Alto Chan

Max = 30

Karina Chan

25

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

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

Signed: Marka C. Parker

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Very loud in here! I did not catch #1, but I got 2 & 3 clearly.

Good job questioning the dubious claim of U.S. life > other. Bit too much detail? I get the point (stories are good) but you maybe spend more time than needed on story details. So far have missed the other dubious point by Nay.

In first rebuttal I got all 3 points.

Good use of references, if a bit inarticulate sometimes.

Did call opponent on various weak points,

Few weak points, or possible weak points:

- ① U.S. cit life > other life
- ② Military Tribunals are infallible. (That was strongly implied.)
- ③ makes sense in a technical way only.

Few arguments are a bit circular. Life trumps all. Stating that you have proven something ≠ actually having proven that something. Arguments getting creepy!

Time of crisis, make sure we are not all dead by Target Kill as much as poss, get them first. Collateral killing is OK since U.S. life counts more.

Room: Mission O  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

~~Zhang, Yiru~~  
Marla Parker, Westmont

# 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

James Logan Kashyap

Jashan Kashyap

POINTS

Max = 30

23

## NEGATIVE

MSJ Murugappan

Abirami Murugappan

POINTS

Max = 30

25

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

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

Signed: Marla C. Parker

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Started out clearly and made some clear arguments. But then got a bit confused about military tribunals, Good use of references, Bit of exaggeration.

In rebuttal, leaped to conclusions ~~sometimes~~. Stop gitmo → stop terror → I win. Silly math games - if more non citizens, then I win. Dismissive of arguments.

Decision on reverse side

Started out clear but got lost a few times. I did not hear the value criteria until cross exam.

Made some dubious points: lives of many > dirtbag risk. Military Tribunals are safer so I win. Open is dangerous.

Good job making similar weak points of opponent; - not all terror caused by gitmo - cleared up silly math misunderstanding, but claim only U.S. (Next) matter, - caught the ref to "only a little mb leak"

I am pretty sure the statement morality ≡ max good of society is false.

Room: Mission H  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

~~Chow, Stephen~~ <sup>Huang</sup>

# 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

Palo Alto Zhang

Hannah Zhang

POINTS

Max = 30

27

## NEGATIVE

Evergreen Cochinwala

Nadia Cochinwala

POINTS

Max = 30

26.5

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: Conie X. HS

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Affirmative:

- speak clearly.
- deliver argument clearly. good point.
- good reasoning toward opponent
- ~~clear~~ good rebuttal with strong analysis.
- I vote Affirmative

Negative:

- speak clearly
- good cross examination
- the reasoning toward opponent is not convincing

Room: Mission Q  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5.

~~Schwing, Emily~~

*Costy*  
**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

**Palo Alto Groetsina**

Max = 30

Arianna Groetsina 27

**NEGATIVE**

POINTS

**Westmont Cheng**

Max = 30

Joel Cheng 26

The better debating was done by the Arianna from Palo Alto  
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:

Arianna supported her case and contending well. She made the point that providing the rights to non-citizens does not diminish the rights of citizens.

Joel had a good value & contention, but could improve by showing the weakness of the opponent's standards.

Room: Mission Q  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Schwing, Emily

*Lofty*

# 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 Jangle**

Max = 30

**Evergreen Suzio**

Max = 30

Himaja Jangle

26

Isaiah Suzio

25

The better debating was done by the

*ADP*  
Himaja

from

MSJ

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:

*Isaiah is very strong at pointing out the weakness of the opponents case and could have won if he developed his case into a stronger argument. There were times that his insights are excellent. Isaiah, work on your case, I'm*

*Himaja did a good job on her case and did support her points overall. Himaja could improve by showing the weakness of the opponents argument.*

Room: Sobrato B-C  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Nguyen, Joseph

# 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	Saratoga Desai	Max = 30
Pooja Nair	<u>27</u>	Shrey Desai	<u>26.5</u>

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

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

Signed: Alok

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I finally concluded that the 'Aff' won the debate on the basis that the approach, demeanor and tone of the 'Neg' was unilateral and ~~arrogant~~ <sup>arrogant</sup>; It was a very acrimonious debate and perhaps, <sup>over</sup> the worst, I have ~~seen~~ sat through.

'Aff' made a strong points around morality, basic rights to due process but clearly got rattled by the 'Neg' during the cross exam. She wasn't able to defend her points confidently.

On the other hand, 'Neg' was assertive in making his points but many of them were thrown with data which sounded unbelievable like 'There have been 5 trillion cases tried through the conventional process & only 2 through military tribunal.'

In summary, neither ~~person~~ person made their case effectively with substantiated and evidence supported points. However, ~~if~~ if I were to declare 'Neg' as the winner, I would be condoning inappropriate behavior in debating & public speaking. I would therefore declare the 'Aff' as the WINNER.

Room: Sobrato B-C  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Nguyen, Joseph

# 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 Vijaapurapu

Max = 30

Harker Ang

Max = 30

Sandhya Vijaapurapu

28.5

Kai-Siang Ang

28

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

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

Signed: Aslak

### COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Sandhya

Kai's contentions of 1) current approach of not granting due process to non-citizens accused of terrorism is helping in reducing terrorism as is evident from data  
2) if accused are released because of due process, it will fuel more terrorism. Risk/danger to judges & jurors was referred to  
Morality ~~on the basis~~ was the basis of his argument but National Security was the highest priority

Sandhya was too fast & not very clear in her 1st 6 min affirmator speech. Her 4 minute aff rebuttal was more deliberate. Human rights ~~overrode~~ was the predominant factor to uphold the constitution. She made an arg point that 'due process' is granted by the Constitution to everybody, including non citizens

Sandhya made up in the latter part of the debate and is being declared the WINNER by a narrow margin. She made the case for the basic human

# 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 Chen

Max = 30

YGD Dattatreya

Max = 30

Jerry Chen

27


Rahul Dattatreya

27.5

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:

The negative case argued that national security was better protected by not providing ~~not~~ constitutional protections to non citizens ~~and~~ and cited examples supporting the failure when ~~the~~ constitutional protections were provided. The Affirmative case argued that a lack of due process harms international relations but negative was able to make the case that international relations persisted. Overall the neg case seemed slightly stronger.

It was an honor to judge your debate.

Room: Mission M  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Glenn, Kelsey  
WONG, PHIL

# 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 Kadakia

Max = 30

Neelesh Ramachandran 27

Viraj Kadakia 28

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: Philip K. Wong

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The NEG position attempted more rebuttal point to point than the AFF. Both side presented good logical arguements but NEG seem to present more. ~~NEG~~ AFF had an excellent opening speech. well written - could have looked up for eye contact at beginning but did more later. The NEG, as I have state good at attempting to take each point; but at ~~the~~ times slightly choppy in deliverand, hard to listen. Glad he used logical arugments in rebuttal

Room: Mission M  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Glenn, Kelsey  
WONG, PHIL

# 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 Cai

Max = 30

YGD Miguel

Max = 30

Tiffany Cai

27

NEG

Edlene Miguel

28

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

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

Signed: Philip X. Wong

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AWARDED debate to the NEG because overall presented arguments against the AFF position more aggressively and more point to point than AFF. Liked ~~NEG~~ AFF opening speech though wish there were more eye contact ~~than~~ with either judge or NEG position speaker. Both could use better eye contact. AFF did not state rebuttals in a firm way, but kind of review what was being said and how she refuted it. Admired BOTH speakers and wish them ~~the~~ well.

Room: Mission N  
Flight A: Start 12:30pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

~~Pachauri, Shalin~~  
JARBO MATT

# 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>MSJ Goyal</b>	Max = 30
Sebastian Hurtado	<u>27.5</u>	Neal Goyal	<u>25.0</u>

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: Matt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted AFFIRMATIVE because he had a clear argument for due process for non-citizens accused of terrorism in the USA. He used a very clear argument, and cited non-rebuttable facts in his argument.

## AFF

- Powerful presence in delivery
- very little eye contact
- too much reading from script
- Good cross X
- Understood and debated NEG contentions

## NEG

- ~~reads~~ - Reads too much from script
- Kept hands in pocket & was fidgety during rebuttal
- Needs a better understanding of ~~material~~ material.
- Did raise a good argument about GITMO & Military Tribunals

Room: Mission N  
Flight B: Start 1:15pm or ASAP  
Novice Lincoln Douglas

5

Pachauri, Shalin

JARBO

MATT

# 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>Palo Alto Marur</b>	Max = 30	<b>Milpitas Rehman</b>	Max = 30
Anant Marur	<u>28.5</u>	Aysha Rehman	<u>27.0</u>

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

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

Signed: Matt

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted affirmative because Anant had a concise argument for the extension of Due Process to non-citizens. He affirmed through solid contentions, as well as cross examinations to win the argument.

AFF

- concise arguments
- good verbal presence
- had trouble answering all cross x questions
- provided a very effective cross x of his own

NEG

- Good argument
- Good cross X
- Cited <sup>good</sup> examples of issues in argument
- couldn't rebut AFF's contentions in cross X