

Novice

Lincoln Douglas

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
La Reina Pavlath	Max = 30	Westmont Sebastian	Max = 30
Elizabeth Pavlath	<u>24</u>	Jose Sebastian	<u>25</u>

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Overall, Jose has a professional appear & well prepared. His body language & eye contact shown his confidence. His arguments and points are more prepared. Other party just say "common sense".

He timed him self & check the timer as well. to make sure what he's doing. Other party's support points are strong but not enough to support her value & statement. Therefore, Jose's doing better, but relative close to tie.

Room: Mission H
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Schwinger~~ Emily
Pun's 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
Bishop O'Dowd Ordonez	Max = 30	St Mary's Carlson	Max = 30
Aldo Ordonez	<u>29</u>	Cort Carlson	<u>28.5</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: Carly M. P.

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff

Neg

- instead of explaining your arguments to the neg during your CX & trying to get him to concede, ask sneaky questions that make him say what you want
- did you shift your advocacy?

- it's customary to read the NC, then respond to the AC. I recommend it - it will help you a lot with the value/criterion debate
- signpost your arguments! tell the judge where you are on the flow ALL THE TIME
- you support torture?!?!?!?!?!?

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	Westmont Gubler	Max = 30
Deepthrisri Suresh	<u>28</u>	Mark Gubler	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: J. L. H. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF:

- Build a good case.
- Good presentation.
- Tied her value, value criterion and contentions.
- Provided definitions when NEG did not and used those definitions to defend her case and show weaknesses in NEG's case.

NEG:

- Did not provide any definitions. ^{could not}
- Agreed to AFF's definition and ~~got caught~~ and explain ~~explaining~~ his contentions according to these definitions.
- Not very clear at some points.
- Suggested that providing one evidence for a contention is not sufficient and therefore opponents contentions should be dropped.

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 Nair	Max = 30
Kai-Siang Ang	<u>27</u>	Pooja Nair	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: P. A. [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

I voted affirmative because I believe the Aff argument was better supported by evidence. Aff also pointed out in rebuttal that Neg had not refuted the Aff contentions. Neg made compelling arguments but these were more effectively refuted in cross.

Comments.

Aff made good support with evidence.

Aff was effective at refuting actual contentions.

Aff did seem to misunderstand the use of information gained from interrogations.

Neg also makes good, supported contentions.

Room: Mission O
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

LYNB Rook
Alamzai, Mujda
Ashok Krishnamoorthy

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 Desai	Max = 30	Evergreen Deglurkar	Max = 30
Harshi Desai	<u>28.5</u>	Sampada Deglurkar	<u>28</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: Ashok

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

'Aff' (Harshi) presented her argument that the value of 'justice' & the criterion of 'human rights' can be achieved without compromising National Security. By asking for evidence about why 'Neg' felt that military tribunal was more fair than civil courts, she effectively challenged the conventional position. She also pointed to the constitution applicability of life, liberty & freedom for citizens & non citizens alike.

'Neg' (Sampada) spoke her points in a thoughtful & deliberate manner. Her response to counters could have been stronger.

A good debate

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

MSJ Murugappan

Max = 30

Abirami Murugappan

28

NEGATIVE

POINTS

YGD Gnanansekhar

Max = 30

Aditi Gnanansekhar

28

The better debating was done by the

NEG
AFF or NEG

from

Aditi Gnanansekhar
TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

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

Signed: _____

Mack Wilson

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF laid out values & contentions clearly & well. Support for points were ~~backed~~ backed by evidence, even ~~was~~ the ~~method~~ comparison of deaths in bombings or related to the chances of dying in terrorist attacks.

NEG also laid out ~~clear~~ clear arguments and ~~made~~ asked some good questions regarding AFF's contentions but kept to the point of time. NEG rebuttal was solid, pointing out several key problems with AFF's rebuttals.

This particular debate was very close, with a number of points in the rebuttal landing well. Ultimately, the AFF's argument that terrorism is rare and ~~the~~ therefore we ~~should~~ should extend rights to non-citizens did not feel ~~to~~ as if it were truly supported by the facts, which the NEG discussed. ~~the~~ While never were apparent in both speakers, both acquitted themselves well as they went on. Best of luck to both participants.

Room: Sobrato C-B
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6
Tom HARASHI

Kataria, Seema
Granite Bay HS

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 Venkatesh

Max = 30

Shrey Desai

29

Nikita Venkatesh

25

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

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

Signed: Tom Harashi

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff edged Neg on case evidence, delivery, refutation and analysis of the resolution

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 Chan

Max = 30

Evergreen Maniyar

Max = 30

Karina Chan

27.5

Yash Maniyar

28.0

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

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

Signed: Deepak Sabharwal

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

IA 6 minutes Speech

- will increase govt morality
- value = morality

- ① Guantanamo Bay - some are connected to AQ & some are not. Due process is thoroughly.
- ② Military tribunals are ineffective. Civilian courts are better.
- ③ CIPA - safe classified info

CX 3 minutes

How does it get decided in CIPA whether info can be kept secret or not? Example presented where info was leaked by CIPA.

IN 7 minutes Speech

- Value = morality
 - invasion - net benefits
- ① giving terrorist due benefits increases terrorist acts, come out.
 - ② leakage of classified info radicalizes.
 - ③ judges are biased in federal courts due to mass media. Instead should choose ICC as an alternative.
- Info has been released in CIPA. Using ICC will give more soft power to US

CX 3 minutes

what makes ICC different?
 - less biased
 - terrorists feel less victimized

IA Rebuttal 4 minutes

- ① Don't put them in same jail.
- ② CIPA leaks does not mean anything.
- ③ Judges are not biased.
- ④ ICC will not increase soft power for US because inc. burden for other states.

INR 6 minutes

- ① US favorability went down. Therefore better to give to ICC.
- ② CIPA was used & info was leaked. Also no guarantee where to use CIPA & where not to.
- ③ US courts will always be biased.

IA 3 minutes

- ① favorability can go down for multiple reasons

① CIPA may not the reason for info leak.

AFF presented a good case but wilted during CX.
 NEG presented the case more clearly and made a strong case for ~~ICC~~ that AFF was not able to poke holes into. NEG also showed evidence about info leak at CIPA. AFF was not able to counter this evidence effectively. NEG showed that we can provide a fair trial at ICC.

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	Leland Huang	Max = 30
Praveen Batra	<u>28.7</u>	Sonya Huang	<u>28.9</u>

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

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

Signed: Shaw LEGAN

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Really well done! Presentation styles were effective for both as described.

Neg: contentions #1 & #2 as well as value criterion were accepted by Aff. Attacks by Aff on #3 were weak & ineffective. Did not overcome #3.

Aff: when citing, give dates of publication. Strong rebuttal; Strong cross examination responses! Well done. You were clearly listening. Referring back to FISA Courts was a strong point. Evidence was clearly researched well & presented.

Other feedback given orally.

Well DONE! Great Job!

Room: Mission N
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

~~DeBettencourt, M~~
NARAYANNAN, L

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

JAMES LOGAN (T)

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
Polytechnic Sehgal	Max = 30	Presentation Sharma	Max = 30
Suchi Sehgal	<u>25</u>	Kriti Sharma	<u>26</u>

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

The better debating was done by the NEG. HEG was very clear in their own contention and clearly refuted all of the Aff's contentions.

Aff

Neg

① Talked more about immigration and emigration rather than use the word terrorism - so I was confused

② Aff gave a more emotional speech rather than trying to fight the Neg's contention through cards/evidence.

① Very relevant cross-examination questions: What does immigration have to do with terrorism?

② Gave a good alternative but used the same point for all of the rebuttals to Aff.

Room: Casa Commons C
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

Mabie, Ben
Peters, Bud

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

Max = 30

Palo Alto Liu

Claire Liu

27

NEGATIVE

POINTS

Max = 30

Douglas Striplin

James Striplin

26

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

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

Signed: *Mabie*

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Claim
Excellent case, good job managing cross-ex.

James
Using your opponents value in your own definition, and then claiming it is undefinable, is a mistake.

BFD
Neg. never adequately refutes the definition of "accuse" or the turn of the definability of "morality". Aff wins on the framework, modern interpretation of the Constitution, the recent Supreme Court decision and role of government.

Room: Sobrato B-C
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

1, Leland Judge
La

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 Shankar

Max = 30

La Reina Gardner

Max = 30

Sahiti Shankar

28.5

Kasey Gardner

26.5

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: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Reading new orders in the IAR is okay.

ORAL

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 DeLorenzo	Max = 30	Bishop O'Dowd Carson	Max = 30
Carina DeLorenzo	<u>25</u>	Deirdre Carson	<u>27</u>

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: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff: International human right. website as resource.
Good presentation.

Neg: value: nation security. prevent information leak
good speaker. good debator.

Overall, Neg is the more strong debator, more convince.
So I will vote Neg.

Room: Sobrato B-B
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

~~Yao, Sharon~~

Pragna Batra

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Harker

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 Gupta

Max = 30

YGD Ramabadran

Max = 30

Rishi Gupta

27

Sruthi Ramabadran

27.5

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: Pragna Batra

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Rishi Good opening, read most of time which was okay; could use isoon words to express better. He could say more in speech.

Sruthi Good material but read in speech/lecture style vs. debate. could say more versus reading from papers. could speak louder

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	Westmont Green	Max = 30
Yanika Magan	<u>28.5</u>	Austin Green	<u>28.5</u>

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: Scott Bortner

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Aff gave a clear ~~opening~~ opening argument.

Neg's cross-ex of Aff did pull out some of the weaker points of the contentions, and got Aff a little confused on the issue of legitimacy vs her original statement of the risk of increasing moral legitimacy.

Neg ~~clearly~~ countered all 3 contentions of Aff.

Neg ~~clearly~~ clearly linked his value and value criterion to his opening arguments.

Aff gave a good cross-ex, drilling in on Neg's understanding of military tribunals.

Neg was ~~strong~~ strong in arguing that his position is upheld if only one aspect of due process.

Aff was not able (or did not have time) to rebut Neg's 2nd contention about prisons being breeding grounds for terrorists.

Aff engaged Neg's argument on about only needing to alter one aspect of con due process to win debate, but didn't have a strong counter argument.

Neg missed that Aff missed addressing Neg's 2nd contention.

Aff did pick up on Neg's 2nd content in the 2nd Aff rebuttal.

Neg made argument that torture wouldn't be used unless it was effective, neg did not dispute that that torture was effective, but only ~~did not~~ applied that torture was immoral and against internationally recognized human rights.

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 Johal

Max = 30

Evergreen Vijaapurapu

Max = 30

Simran Johal


29

Sandhya Vijaapurapu

27.5

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

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

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

^{AC}
1 ~~AP~~ - well-revered constructive. I would have liked more convincing warrants to contention 2a. Handled cross-exam with intelligence + stayed on point.

NC → 2nd contention is your strongest argument. This was already being attacked, though, in cross-ex.

1 AP → masterful work - you hit all the right notes - especially your refutation of opponent's 1cc contention.

NR → you kept fighting, so I give you "props" for that. However you damaged your own case on 2 pts. - 1. "we need to just get them off the streets!" - this is not justice. Then you couldn't successfully refute her attack of the 1cc being ~~overstretched~~ overstretched & vulnerable to corruption. you sidestepped this - didn't address the reality, but referred to the ideal.

2 AP - not your strongest moment in the debate, but you sealed the deal.

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 Hernando

Max = 30

Westmont Gilchrist

Max = 30

Jonas Hernando

22

Daniel Gilchrist

20

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

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

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF

Morality is net benefits.

National Security

Extended due process

~~_____~~

Amendment

Unconstitutional.

Neg:

No proof for National Security.

Terrorist attack
Jurisdiction.

~~_____~~

Defendant is proved.

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 Xu

Max = 30

La Reina Dhaliwal

Max = 30

Justin Xu

27

Manvir Dhaliwal

~~28~~ 28

The better debating was done by the Neg from La Reina Dhaliwal
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 affirmative started informative speech with a lot of evidence. Both sides spend times to ask the opponents to repeat the contention without arguing or debating on most of the contention, against to each other. The negative side wins because the more persuasive points had delivered. The main reason is that negative side is much more confident than the affirmative side.

Room: Mission P
Flight B: Start 5:00pm
Novice Lincoln Douglas

6

Sabnis, Sudheer
Xu, Kai

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 Kapoor	Max = 30	Harker Pachauri	Max = 30
Eish Kapoor	<u>27</u>	Sara Pachauri	<u>25</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: _____
[Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: Good open statement, tho a little nervous. Well prepared.
Strong argument in cross exam. good defence.

NEG: No eye contacts, but ^{material} ~~speech~~ is well prepared, could do a better speech by ~~high~~ emphasis more on key points rather than busy reading.